The Metagrammatical Vocabulary inside the Lists of 32 *Tantrayukti*-s and its Adaptation to Tamil: Towards a Sanskrit-Tamil Dictionary[*]

Jean-Luc Chevillard (CNRS, University Paris-Diderot, UMR7597)

Abstract: This article explores the way in which a set of 32 technical terms, meant to expound to students the articulation of argumentation *(yukti)* in several Sanskrit treatises, was translated into Tamil during one of the stages of the gradual growth of Tamil technical literature, of which the *Tolkāppiyam* seems to be the oldest representative. The following issues are examined here: (1) the difficulties inherent in the pioneering task which is termed here "First-translation", (2) the possible strategies that can be used in order to create a terminology in the target language, and (3) the subsequent attempts, traces of which are found in several texts. The dilemma of Tamil authors is also examined, who face a discrepancy between the terminological uses of Sanskrit grammar *(vyākaraṇa)*, where *anuvṛtti* rules are followed, and the prevailing conventions of śāstric literature, inside which they wanted to make a place for the Science of Tamil.

1. Introduction: languages in contact

The question of Sanskrit-Tamil "bilingualism"[1] (or "tri-lingualism?"[2]) in Tamil Nadu at various periods, and of what was achieved thanks to it in the development of Tamil scholarly literature, is not often discussed, probably for several contributory reasons.[3] The present study will be devoted to the examination of a clear-cut case, where a [not precisely identified] set of (ideally) 32 Sanskrit technical terms, originally referred to as *32 yukti*-s and later called *tantra yukti*-s (henceforth **TY**) was "FIRST-translated"[4] into a list of 32 Tamil technical expressions, that first Tamil list being followed in the course of time

---

[1] I put the word "bilingualism" between double quotes because one might be tempted to talk of Sanskrit-Tamil "diglossia". However, the use of "diglossia" seems restricted in the literature I have consulted to the description of cases where Sanskrit coexists with various vernacular Indo-aryan languages (one could speak of a Bengali-Sanskrit diglossia) or to cases where H-Tamil coexists with vernacular L-Tamil (see Britto [1986] and E. Annamalai [2004]).

[2] The three languages are **a.** Vernacular Tamil, **b.** CTamil (Classical Tamil, or *Centamiḻ*) and **c.** Sanskrit (see Chart 1). As an example of "Sanskrit-Tamil tri-lingual" person, one can mention Campantar, one of the three authors assigned to the *Tēvāram*. See his description of himself as: *Muttamiḻ nālmaṟai ñāṉacampantaṉ* "Ñāṉacampantaṉ who knows the four Vedas [and] the three-fold Tamil" (*Tēvāram*, 3-2, 11). Campantar was not referring to the fact that he was a native Tamil speaker, although he was most certainly one. What he was claiming for himself in his song was mastery of two poetical languages: Classical Tamil (called here *muttamiḻ* "threefold Tamil") and Vedic Sanskrit (and its 4 Vedas). I do not say that he was consciously distinguishing vernacular Tamil and literary Tamil. He may have perceived them as two sides of the same gold coin. However, for us, he was a three languages user. Another element in the language constellation would be Vernacular Prakrit.

[3] A first reason might be that a specialist of Tamil who wants to explore the field has to do an enormous amount of reading, concerning a very technical literature. A second reason is that there has been some polarization at times. See for instance the remark made by Kamil Zvelebil in 1972 in an "Introductory Note" to his still incomplete translation of the *Tolkāppiyam*: "The *Tolkāppiyam* has been translated, partly or fully, into English before, with a strong pro-Sanskritic, and an equally strong anti-Sanskritic, bias." (JTS, 1, p. 43). It is not clear to me what a "pro-Sanskritic" (or an "anti-Sanskritic") bias is, although I understand he most probably refers to P.S. Subrahmanya Sastri and to S. Ilakkuvanar's translations, but I suppose I must make explicit some of my own (implicit) assumptions. They are the following: **A.** there have been Sanskrit grammars before there existed Tamil grammars (for a chronology of Sanskrit grammatical literature, see for instance Scharfe [1977]); **B.** Tamil seems to be the first non-Indo-Aryan language for which a grammatical description was attempted in India; **C.** the person (or the group of persons) who made the first attempt at a grammatical description of Tamil had a good working knowledge of at least one Sanskrit grammatical text (but which one is not clear) and of other Sanskrit texts, and part of the effort consisted in FIRST-translating (i.e. translating for the first time and adapting) an existing terminology. It must be emphasized that the task was a doubly difficult one, because **(a)** the target language was quite different from previously "described" (or normalized) languages

by several others, all of them being the subject of this study. The original Sanskrit set might have been:

(1) **[A1]** *adhikaraṇam*, **[A2]** *vidhānam*, **[A3]** *yogaḥ*, **[A4]** *padārthaḥ*, **[A5]** *hetvarthaḥ*, **[A6]** *uddeśaḥ*, **[A7]** *nirdeśaḥ*, **[A8]** *upadeśaḥ*, **[A9]** *apadeśaḥ*, **[A10]** *atideśaḥ*, **[A11]** *pradeśaḥ*, **[A12]** *upamānam*, **[A13]** *arthāpattiḥ*, **[A14]** *saṃśayaḥ*, **[A15]** *prasaṅgaḥ*, **[A16]** *viparyayaḥ*, **[A17]** *vākyaśeṣaḥ*, **[A18]** *anumatam*, **[A19]** *vyākhyānam*, **[A20]** *nirvacanam*, **[A21]** *nidarśanam*, **[A22]** *apavargaḥ*, **[A23]** *svasaṃjñā*, **[A24]** *pūrvapakṣaḥ*, **[A25]** *uttarapakṣaḥ*, **[A26]** *ekāntaḥ*, **[A27]** *anāgatāvekṣaṇam*, **[A28]** *atikrāntāvekṣaṇam*, **[A29]** *niyogaḥ*, **[A30]** *vikalpaḥ*, **[A31]** *samuccayaḥ*, **[A32]** *ūhyam*

an enumeration which is found in the *Arthaśāstra*[5], but we can have no absolute certitude that it was this specific Sanskrit text which was used as a source, although this has been assumed by several scholars.[6] The Tamil text resulting from the "FIRST-translation" (of this list or of a similar one) from Sanskrit into Tamil, is an enumeration of 32 phrases, starting with *nutaliyataṟital* and ending with *uyttukkoṇṭuṇarttal* which has been transmitted to us inside the last verse (or *sūtra*) of the *Marapiyal*, "Chapter on conventions", the 27th (and last) chapter of the *Tolkāppiyam*.[7] However, as we shall see, the two commentaries which are

---

and because **(b)** FIRST-translating a terminology (thus creating a new metalanguage) is full of pitfalls and may fail to receive acceptance from the target community (creating no *saṃjñā*). Besides, the task was not only to describe a language, but also to make explicit (or to codify?) part of what made that language into a literary language (such as for instance the "rules" of its metrics).

[4] A "FIRST-translation" is not a translation. It is **an attempt at translating**. It can fail or succeed, partially or fully. It has to create its target (neologism). Ulterior translations follow an already open inter-linguistic path [un chemin déjà frayé], based on consensus.

[5] The enumeration appears at the beginning of Book XV.

[6] See below charts 5a, 5b and 5c. Other possible Sanskrit sources (such as the *Carakasaṃhitā*) are presented in Appendix A.

[7] The *Tolkāppiyam* is a "grammar" (in a wide acception of the term), which probably incorporates as its core the first attempts at codifying a literary variety of Tamil, often designated by the term *Centamiḻ* "Pure Tamil" (see Chevillard [2008b]). In its present form, it is divided into 3 books: *Eḻuttu* "Letters", *Col* "Words" and *Poruḷ* "Matters", which will be referred to here as TE, TC and TP. Each book has 9 chapters, and chapters contain *sūtra*-s (more precisely *cūttiram*, in Tamil). *Sūtra* references cannot be given without specifying a commentator because the *Tōlkāppiyam* text is split variously depending on the commentary used. The last *sūtra* in the *Tolkāppiyam* is thus TP656**i**, if we read it inside **I**ḷampūraṇar's commentary and TP665**p**, if we read it inside **P**ērāciriyar's commentary. There are differences, which we shall examine, between the reading found in TP656i and the reading found in TP665p. Unless otherwise specified, all references to the *Tolkāppiyam* text(s) and commentaries are based on the 14-volume edition by T.V. Gopal Iyer, which contains: the commentary by Iḷampūraṇar on TE, TC and TP (4 vol.: TE1i to TE483i; TC1i to TC456i; TP1i to TP192i; TP193i to TP656i) , the commentary by Cēṉāvaraiyar on TC (1 vol.: TC1c to TC463c), the commentary by Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar on TE, TC and part of TP (5 vol.: TE1n to TE483n; TC1n to TC463n;

available for the *Marapiyal*, by Iḷampūraṇar (11th or 12th cent.) and by Pērāciriyar *(13th cent.?),* do not completely agree on how the list should be read and split. And they do not agree either on the designation of the items (did the author of the *Tolkāppiyam* call them *utti* or *utti vakai*?)[8], because, as we shall see, they understand differently the first line of that sūtra (TP656i/TP665p). The simpler explanation is the one given by Iḷampūraṇar. Before examining one by one the 32 elements of the list, he starts with the preliminary explanations that TP656i is an enumeration of the *tantiravutti*-s, that a *tantiravutti* is used "to point to a specificity pertaining to the interpretation of a sūtra" (*cūttirattiṉ pāṟ kiṭappatoru poruḷ vēṟupāṭu kāṭṭuvatu*), that *tantiram* , the 1st component of *tantira-v-utti*, has the same meaning as *nūl* and that its 2nd component, *utti,* is a *vaṭamoḷic citaivu* "deformed Sanskrit word".[9]

　　　Before going on with our examination of the 32 *utti*-s, or *tantiravutti*-s (henceforth TU), it seems necessary to clarify in this introduction the purpose of this study. Although the topic of TUs (and TYs) is interesting for its own sake, because one cannot really read and understand Tamil (or Sanskrit) śāstric litterature fully if one does not have a clear grasp of the TUs (or of the TYs), our primary goal in this article is however to examine a phenomenon which occcurs when languages are in contact, on the basis of the texts left by those who used them. The languages to be considered here, as far as Tamil Nadu is concerned,

TP1n to TP91n; TP92n to TP248n; TP-cey1n to TP-cey242n [there is a discontinuity in the numbering because Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's commentary is available only for chapters 1 to 5 and chapter 8 (Ceyyuḷiyal) of TP]), the commentary by Pērāciriyar on part of TP (2vol.: TP249p to TP312p; TP313p to TP665p), the commentary by Teyvaccilaiyār on TC (1 vol. TC1t to TC453t), the commentary by Kallāṭaṉār on part of TC (TC1k to TC260k).

[8] See the remarks by T.V.Gopal Iyer (TVG) in the first paragraph of the entry **utti** in the 16th volume (p. 228-230) of his 17-volume *Tamiḷ Ilakkaṇap Pērakarāti,* where Pērāciriyar's viewpoint is explained. According to TVG, Pērāciriyar contrasts a straightforward way of giving information in a treatise (*nūrceytikaḷaic cevvaṉam collutal*), called *utti,* with a sophisticated indirect way of giving information, which reveals one's refined knowledge and will be pleasant to the learned, and which should be called *utti vakai.* TVG seems to say that this corresponds to the original point of view of the *Tolkāppiyam*, but the explanation given by Iḷampūraṇar, which we shall examine, seems to me more likely to be the original point of view. That being said, Pērāciriyar's point of view also belongs to the history of Tamil thought, and we have to understand it.

[9] The "deformation" (*yukti* becoming *utti*) is in fact an adaptation to Tamil phonological constraints. I have translated *vaṭa-moḷi* (lit. "Northern word") by "Sanskrit word" in order to respect Iḷampūraṇar's point of view, but it must be said that when the *Tolkāppiyam* mentions the "Northern words" (*vaṭa-col,* another designation for *vaṭamoḷi*) in TC391i and explains in TC395i & TC396i how to use them, what is said might originally have also concerned Prakrit words. Iḷampūraṇar gives as an illustration for "deformed (forms)" (*citaintaṉa*) the Sanskrit *daśa(n)-* "ten" appearing in a Tamil poem as *taca*.

are presented in chart 1 (see below), and three of them have already been mentioned.[10]

C-Tamil (Classical Tamil / *Centamiḻ*)	Sanskrit (several *śāstra*-s)
Vernacular Tamil varieties	Vernacular Prakrit(s)

[Chart 1: languages in contact]

Additionally, it must be observed that, it is not sufficient to characterize an item as being a sanskrit word but that one has to specify from which particular *śāstra* (or discipline) it is taken. For instance, several of the items in list 1 have precise meanings in the discipline called *vyākaraṇa*,[11] and these meanings can be very different from those traditionally attributed to those items in the context of discussions concerning the TY list. But, since the disciplinary field covered by the *Tolkāppiyam* includes, among other topics, part of what *vyākaraṇa* deals with, one cannot exclude the fact that, even while commenting on the Tamil equivalent of a TY list, a Tamil commentator might prefer an explanation more in conformity with the usage of sanskrit grammarians. One such case will be discussed in section 15.

2. Four strategies for FIRST-translation

The type of contact between languages which we are a considering here, namely the case of a "FIRST-translation" of a scholarly text, can be summarized thus: one person (or a group of people), who was a native Tamil speaker, but who was at the same time an educated Sanskrit user[12], felt at some point the

---

[10] The fourth item will play no role in this study of *tantiravutti*-s and *tantra yukti*-s, but is included in this chart as a reminder that many items (*vaṭṭam* "circle", etc.) have entered the vocabulary of the diglossic {Vernacular Tamil, Ctamil} pair coming from Indo-Aryan vernaculars, designated here as "Vernacular Prakrit", to distinguish them from literary Prakrits. The linguistic landscape also included other Dravidian languages.

[11] It does not belong in the present article to fully discuss this question but I feel it is necessary, at this stage, to give a few references: **(a)** there are entries in Abhyankar & Shukla [1986] for the following 20 items from list 1: *Atideśaḥ* (pp. 10-11), *Uddeśaḥ* (p. 82), *Upadeśaḥ* (p. 85), *Upamānaṃ* (p. 87), *Ekāntaḥ* (p. 99), *Nidarśanaṃ* (p. 220), *Niyogaḥ* (p. 222), *Nirdeśaḥ* (p. 224), *Nirvacanaṃ* (p. 224), *Padārthaḥ* (pp. 236-237), *Pradeśaḥ* (p. 268), *Prasaṅgaḥ* (p. 273), *Yogaḥ* (p. 318), *Vākyaśeṣaḥ* (p. 346), *Vikalpaḥ* (p. 352), *Vidhānaṃ* (p. 355), *Viparyayaḥ* (p. 356), *Vyākhyānaṃ* (p. 378), *Samuccayaḥ* (pp. 417-418), *Saṃbhavaḥ* (p. 208); **(b)** this is also the case for two other items, found in other TY lists (see Appendix A): *Dṛṣṭāntaḥ* (p. 200), *Prayojanaṃ* (p. 270); **(c)** several of these terms occur in Pāṇini's grammar, and/or in the *Vārttika*-s of Kātyāyana, and/or in the *Mahābhāṣya:* See for instance (in Oberhammer et alii [1996: 29-30]) the explanations given by Patañjali on the distinction to be made between *uddeśaḥ* and *upadeśaḥ.* **(d)** additional information can be found in Renou's TGS.

[12] It may be that one of the Tamil designations for Sanskrit, namely *vaṭa-moḻi* "Northern language" has given the impression to some in Tamil Nadu that Sanskrit belongs to the North exclusively and is foreign to the South. The historical truth seems however to be

need to express in C-Tamil some notion (or concept) for which there was in Sanskrit a designation which was familiar to him (or to them), but which had never been expressed in C-Tamil, because the need had not existed or not been felt. He (or they) had at least the following range of options:

- **Strategy A.** import a Sanskrit word into Tamil (in some cases adapting it to the Tamil phonological system)
- **Strategy B.** take an existing Tamil word and give it a new meaning (preferably imitating a metaphorical use existing in Sanskrit)
- **Strategy C.** create a new Tamil word on the basis of Tamil morphological resources (possibly emulating a device existing in Sanskrit morphology)
- **Strategy D.** use a paraphrase (in some cases translating a Sanskrit paraphrase of the original Sanskrit term)

Such an enumeration describes of course only the beginning of the process. Other factors to be considered are (α) the success of the operation and (β) the stability of the result, especially from a semantic point of view. If we imagine a virtual Sanskrit-Tamil dictionary collecting the results of such "First-translation acts", we might see recorded inside that virtual dictionary the fact that a tentative translation of a Sanskrit item X was not really accepted by the audience for which it was intended and occurs only once in texts (the virtual dictionary might also tell us whether some other word or expression was later more successfully accepted as a translation of X). Other observations might be that an item has become current which was originally intended as a translation of X but that its ascertainable meaning widely deviates from the meaning that a Sanskrit user, not knowing Tamil, would assign to X. There are in fact many ways to fail to achieve a translation and there are many ways of producing unintended results. Nevertheless, really preparing the virtual Sanskrit-Tamil dictionary we have been contemplating here (as a thought experiment) might be useful for retracing an important chapter in the history of rational thought in Tamil Nadu. I hope that what follows will be regarded as a first step in that direction.

---

that for many centuries Sanskrit has belonged as much to the South as to the North, being nowhere a vernacular, but everywhere a language used by scholars. See the position expressed by TVG in an interview in November 2005: "*vaṭamoḻi nāṉ ēṟkaṉavē kūṟiyiruntapaṭi yārālum pēcappaṭāta moḻi. camaskirutam eṉṟālē tiruttiyamaikkappaṭṭatu eṉṟu poruḷ. antak kālattil aṟiñarkaḷ tattamatu kalācārattiṉ parimāṟṟattiṟkāka ēṟpaṭuttik koṇṭa moḻi vaṭamoḻi. itil mikavum kuṟippiṭappaṭa vēṇṭiyatu vaṭamoḻiyaip peritum ātarittu vaḷarttavarkaḷ tamiḻarkaḷē. utāraṇamāka upaniṭaṅkaḷukku viḷakkamāka viyācar pirammacūttiram eḻutiṉār. itaṟku urai eḻutiya caṅkarar, matvar, rāmānujar, śrīkaṇṭar, śrīpati paṇṭita ārātyar aivarum tamiḻarkaḷ. caṅkararaiyum matvaraiyum nāṉ tamiḻar eṉpatai nīṅkaḷ kavaṉikkavēṇṭum. appōtu malaiyāḷam kaṉṉaṭam eṉkira pākupāṭu illai*" (Amudhasurabhi, November 2005, pp.37-39). I express my gratitude to Mr M. Gobalakichenane for providing me with the text of this interview (partially translated by him into French in the *Lettre du Cercle Culturel des Pondichériens*, Collection N°1, 2008, p. 250).

As an example of **Strategy A.**, we have already encountered (1) *utti* (from *yukti*), (2) *tantiram* (from *tantra*), (3) *cūttiram* (from skt. *sūtra*). The first one is homophonous with a number of lexical items, some of which might have the same origin.[13] The same problem does not arise with the latter two, but the question whether the meaning(s) of *tantiram*[14] and of *cūttiram* in Tamil literature are in accordance (see **(β)** above) with the meaning(s) of *tantra* and of *sūtra* in Sanskrit literature defies simple answers, although the question has to be raised, if only as a warning against premature (or naïve) conclusions.

As an example of **Strategy B.**, we can cite (1) *nūl*. The term, like Sanskrit *sūtra*, originally means "thread, string"[15], but acquired another meaning of *sūtra*, namely "treatise".[16] Interestingly, *nūl* did not acquire the dual meaning of "aphorism inside a treatise", which *sūtra* also has. In that case, the words used were either *cūttiram* (applying strategy A) or *nūrpā*.[17] As we have seen, Iḷam-pūraṇar explains *tantiram* as being an alternative designation of *nūl*.[18]

The case of **Strategy C.** deserves a study of its own. I shall simply say that examples of that category are typically seen when authors want to express in Tamil distinctions which are made in Sanskrit by the means of *upasarga*-s (preverbs).[19]

As for **Strategy D.**, we will see examples among the *utti*-s (alias *tantiravutti-*s, see next section) in the course of this article.

---

[13] The T.Lex. distinguishes 5 items, among which the one we examine is *utti* [4]. Prominent in Sangam literature is *utti* [1]., a head-ornament (for women [*Tirumuru*. 23], for horses [*Akam*. 400-5]). Another one found in literature is *utti* [2] "spots on the hood of the cobra" (see *Naṟṟiṇai*. 129.7).

[14] See section 12, where the use of *tantiram* in literature is examined, later in this article.

[15] The values of *nūl* in the *Kuṟaḷ* are discussed in section 13, later in this article. Occasionally, *sūtra* has also been borrowed (Strategy A) by Tamil with its primary meaning: see the example under TC76c: *kaṭi-cūttirattiṟku poṉ* "gold for [making] a waist-string" (Chevillard[1996: 168]). The pure Tamil equivalent is *"arai-ñāṇ"*.

[16] Another value of *nūl* is *śāstra* "science, disciplinary field". It is seen in several expression of the form X-*nūl* "the science of X". See for instance: *yāṉai nūl* "elephantology" (under TC37c), *icai-nūlār* "musicologists" (under TC174c).

[17] The use of *nūrpā* as a (pure?) Tamil equivalent of *cūttiram* in the sense of "aphorism inside a treatise" seems to be late. I do not find any example in the *Tolkāppiyam* commentaries. T.Lex. lists only two meanings for *nūrpā*: 1. a type of *akaval-ōcai* (i.e. one of the basic metrical sound patterns); 2. "Warp (in weaving)" [*taṟiyiṟ piṇaikkum pā*]. As an example of 1., see for instance YV[1998] (p. 281) where that (metrical) sound pattern is also referred to as *oḷukicai akaval-ōcai*. But we see *nūrpā* used as an equivalent of *cūttiram* in the *Ilakkaṇak kottu*. See p. 246 in TVG's edition, in the context of the explanations (*atikārattāl moḷi varuvittal)* pertaining to the Tamil equivalent of *anuvṛtti*.

[18] This might indicate it was not obvious to his Tamil audience that both mean the same.

[19] Here, they may use converbs (*viṉai eccam* of the *"ceytu"* type) as specifiers of a main verb. *Eṭuttuk kāṭṭu* "example" could, for instance, be an imitation of *udāharaṇa-*.

3. The *muppattiru-vakai utti* (32 TUs)

We now come closer to the precise study of the Sanskrit and Tamil lists which we wish to compare. As already said, the designations of the elements in these lists seem to have changed in the course of time, from *yukti*[20] to *tantrayukti* (**TY**) for Sanskrit and from *utti* to *tantiravutti* (**TU**)[21] for Tamil, as exemplified by Iḷampūraṇar, who glosses *utti* in the *Tolkāppiyam sūtra* TP656i by *tantiravutti* in his commentary. He does the same for another *sūtra*, TP644i, which characterizes *nūl*, and which is the first one where the word *utti* appears. The end of that *sūtra* is:

(2)   [...]// *īr-aiṅ kuṟṟam um iṉṟi nēritiṉ* // **muppattiru vakai uttiyoṭu puṇariṉ** // *nūl eṉa moḻipa nuṇaṅku moḻip pulavar* (TP644i)

"...., avoiding the twice-five faults, if it is **joined with/by the thirty-two-fold *utti*-s (joints?)**, they will say it is a *nūl* ("threaded-treatise"), (who are) subtly-worded scholars."

Before commenting on this unit of text, and in order to support the tentative translation ─especially the use of "joined" and "joints"─ which I have provided for it, I include, as a counterpoint, the Sanskrit sentence containing the enumeration of TYs at the beginning of Book XV in the *Arthaśāstra* (*AŚ*). As has already been explained, that enumeration (see **1** p. 73) is embedded inside a sequence that seems to be an elucidation of what makes the *AŚ* a *śāstra*. A first sentence explains what is referred to by *artha*, and a second sentence explains what kind of topic is dealt with by the *śāstra* which is called *Arthaśāstra*. This is then followed by a statement which probably stands there to vouch for the śāstric character of the *AŚ*:

(3)   *tad dvātriṃśadyuktiyuktaṃ, [A1] adhikaraṇam, [A2] vidhānam,[...] [A32] ūhyam iti,*

"that [*śāstra*] is joined with/by *(yuktam)* the 32 joints *(yukti)*, namely **(A1)** *adhikaraṇam* **(A2)** *vidhānam* [...] **(A32)** *ūhyam*"

where *yukti* and *yuktam* are both based on the same root YUJ ("to join, to unite").[22] If we make the hypothesis that the Tamil phrase "*32-vakai uttiyoṭu*

---

[20] When not preceded by a specifier (be it "32" or be it "*tantra*"), *yukti* is explained as "argumentation, reasoning" in ADSG and as "« connection » de mots par le sens" par Renou (TGS, p. 255, with a reference to Kielhorn's *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*, p.XII). See also the translation by Oberhammer [1996: 161-162, *parīkṣā* "Untersuchung"] for the passage in the *Carakasaṃhitā* (sū. 11.17) which enumerates four *pramāṇam* "Erkenntnismittel", the first three being *āptopadeśaḥ* "Glaubwürdige Mitteilung", *pratyakṣa* "Wahrnehmung" and *anumāna* "Schlußfolgerung" and the fourth one being *yuktiḥ* "Denken in Zusammen-hängen" (the passage is found in Sharma, R.K. & Bhagwan Dash, vol. I, pp. 210-215).

[21] There being no ambiguity for us to use the same terminology as commentators, we shall ourselves refer to the elements of the lists we discuss as TYs or TUs.

puṇariṉ"[23] is a "FIRST-translation" (or a reminiscence) of the Sanskrit phrase "*32-yukti-yuktam*", we must observe that the incoherence between the "FIRST-translation" strategies for *yukti* (strategy A, resulting in *utti*) and for *yuktam* (strategy B, resulting in *puṇarntu*), has broken the echoing symmetry (or the reassuring redundancy) present in the original wording. If strategy B had been used for *yukti*, we would have had *puṇarppu*, instead of *utti*.[24]

4. What stands between the *Tolkāppiyam* and Iḷampūraṇar?

Before we can into a discussion of how the First-translation for the individual elements of the TY list {*adhikaraṇam*, *vidhānam*, [...]; *ūhyam*} was performed, we have, for the sake of clarity, to say something about chronology. There is supposed to be an important time gap between the *Tolkāppiyam* and its first commentator, Iḷampūraṇar. The latter has variously been dated between the 10th and the 12th century.[25] The former remains a text difficult to date and extremely divergent positions are found in print,[26] although there seems to be a

---

[22] The wording "joined with/by" used in 3 is meant to capture the fact that *yukta* is ambiguous: it could be semantically strong, in which case we would render it by "articulated with/by (means of)"; but it could also be semantically much weaker, being then rendered by "endowed with", "possessed of (the 32 *yukti*-s)". Preserving a degree of ambiguity is necessary because English is used here as an instrument in the process of examining a translation from Sanskrit into Tamil. I am grateful to Dominic Goodall and to Vincenzo Vergiani for their very helpful comments on this and other passages.

[23] Another feature to be noticed in the phrase is the use of the *-oṭu* case marker with *puṇartal,* which reminds one of similar constructions found in the descriptions of words *(col)* as made of letters *(eḻuttu)*: See the last line in TC401c, *eḻuttoṭu puṇarnta col* (which Cēṉāvaraiyar rewords as *eḻuttiṉāṉ iyaṉṟa col*) and see the definition given by Iḷampūraṇar for *col*, under TC1i: *col eṉpatu eḻuttoṭu puṇarntu poruḷ aṟivikkum ōcai*. More details in Chevillard[1996, p. 477 (fn. 401.1) and p. 37 (fn.1.4)]. A possible explanation for these slightly strange constructions, which the commentators feel compelled to justify, is that *puṇartal* itself might be semantically weakened, just as this might be the case for *yukta* in 3 (see fn.22).

[24] One can note however the (rare) use of *puṇarppu* in *nūr-puṇarppu*, which TVG considers as an equivalent of *tantiravutti* (TIPA-16: 318).

[25] The most detailed discussion of the sources is in M. Govindasamy [1977:155-159]. He places Iḷampūraṇar in his chapter on the 12th century and discusses the arguments of scholars who place him in the 11th century. He provides pointers to references to Iḷampūraṇar by ancient scholars, such as Mayilaiṉātar (13th century?), the first commentator on *Naṉṉūl* (13th cent.?), who mentions the opinions of Iḷampūraṇar. See N359m ("*iḵtu olkāp pulamait tolkāppiyattuḷ uḷaṅ-kūr-kēḷvi iḷampūraṇar eṉum ētamiṉ mātavar ōtiya v-urai y-eṉṟuṇarka*") and see the second mention under N369m ("*iṉi, iḷampūraṇa-vāciriyar vēṅkaippūveṉpataṉai muṉṉiṭattiṟkum, aṭaikaṭaleṉpataṉaip piṉṉiṭattiṟkum kāṭṭuvar*"). The 10th or 11th century dating is proposed by T.P. Meenakshisundaram [1974: p. 4]

[26] A review of arguments is found in Zvelebil[1995: 705-708]. Zvelebil writes: "The final redaction of T. including *Poruḷatikāram* may be prob. fixed as 5th c. A.D. However, it is most prob. based on a much earlier *Urtext* [...] which could be dated back as far as c. 100

general agreement that some parts are earlier than others. For instance, the two sūtras, TP644i and TP656i; which we have mentioned so far are part of a section containing 18 sūtra-s (from TP639i to TP656i) which some consider as being interpolated,[27] and which others consider as being part of a final redaction. If for instance the dating proposed in Zvelebil [1995] is accepted, the instance of FIRST-translation we are examining here might have been done in the 5th century. That would leave us with a gap of 700 years between the original list of *muppattiru vakai utti* (TP644i) and Iḷampūraṇar's gloss where they become *muppattiraṇṭu vakaippaṭṭa tantiravutti* (TP644i, com.). In between, a number of treatises have been composed, many of which have unfortunately been lost (such as *Avinayaṉam*, etc.). The remaining treatises and their commentaries partly compensate for the loss because they contain many fragments from those lost works. All these texts provide us with a wealth of information concerning the TUs which I have tried to extract and present here. Among them, the most important are the *Vīracōḻiyam* (VC), the *Yāpparuṅkalam* (YA), the *Yāpparuṅkalak kārikai* (YK), etc. and the commentaries to these texts, the most complex one being the *Yāpparuṅkala virutti* (YV), which comments on YA. Interestingly, these texts provide, as we shall see, lists of TUs, which differ from the one found in the last sūtra of TP, but which mostly coincide with a list of TUs found in the *pāyiram* (preface) section of the *Naṉṉūl* commentaries. We summarize the chronological information given so far in Chart 2.

B.C. (or earlier?). As extremist position A, one could quote S. Ilakkuvanar [1963: 9]: "it is possible to conclude that Tholkāppiyar might have lived in the age between 1000 B.C. and 600 B.C. It may be somewhere about 800 B.C. or 700 B.C." As illustration of the extremist position B, I shall reproduce the beginning of a footnote found in S. Pollock [(2006) 2007 (Indian edition), p. 399, fn. 39]: "while the *Tolkāppiyam* is often dated to the early centuries of the first millennium, one sober assessment places it a few centuries before the appearance of its first commentaries in the thirteenth century (Swamy 1975)." The "sober assessment" referred to (which I could not consult) is (according to p.644 in Pollock's bibliography): Swamy, B.G.L., 1975, "The Date of the *Tolkāppiyam*: A Retrospect." In *Silver Jubilee Volume, AORM* 25: 292-317.

[27] S. Ilakkuvanar (op.cit., p. 19-20), explaining that these 18 verses deal "with the kind of books, the authors, the commentaries, the faults to be avoided in the books and the devices supposed to be employed in the making of literature by the authors" remarks that the proper place for including these verses should have been the *Ceyyuḷiyal*, and not the *Marapiyal*. He then explains that "*Sūththiram* and *uththi* are definitely the words of Sanskrit language of later period. When Sanskrit was popular in Tamil Nad and when its study became the fashion of the day, these verses might have been added at the end of the book by some Sanskrit student who learnt Tamil without knowing where to insert them in the body of the book". I shall add that another possible explanation for the incoherence is that the *Tolkāppiyam*, as we now have it, is a compilation incorporating treatises which were originally independent, and that the *Ceyyuḷiyal* is one of those.

Period	Event
[Before time T1]	A Sanskrit list of 32 *yukti*-s (*AŚ* ?) exists
Time T1 (=5th cent. AD?) (pre-final[28] *Tolkāppiyam*) (first theories for *nūl* "treatise")	A sequence of 18 *sūtra*-s containing the first Tamil list of 32 *utti*-s (**list A**) is included in the *Tolkāppiyam*.
[Between T1 and T2] (the term *"tantiravutti"* becomes current and replaces *"utti"*; theories about *nūl* become more complex) (the **list B** is made: is it a new translation from Sanskrit?)	● lost grammarians (6th-8th?) ● YA (10th cent. ?) ● VC (11th cent. ?) ● YV (11th cent. ?) (list B1) ● VC commentary (12th cent. ?) (list B2)
Time T2 (=12th cent. AD?)	Iḷampūraṇar comments on TP and produces a gloss for the list of TUs (list A1)
[After time T2]	● Preface to *Naṉṉūl* (list B3) ● Pērāciriyar modifies the TP list (list A2) ● *Māṟaṉ Alaṅkāram* list [see Appendix C]

(**Chart 2**: concise chronology)

5. The TUs in List A in its two variants

We now examine the individual TUs contained in List A, scrutinizing, to begin with, the differences between list A1, based on Iḷampūraṇar's readings (Chart 3a) and the list A2, based on Pērāciriyar's (Chart 3b). We shall then list alphabetically the distinct items contained in these two lists. Because of the variant readings and because of the difference in splitting between the two commentators, the combination of list A1 and list A2 contains 40 elements (See Chart 4).

---

[28] I believe that the dating of the *Tolkāppiyam* has to be done piecemeal. For each chapter, one must have a separate discussion, which will sometimes involve setting apart some *sūtra*s or groups of *sūtra*s. One could for instance imagine that at some stage the *Tolkāppiyam* consisted of TE (*Eḻuttu*), TC (*Col*) and the *Ceyyuḷ Iyal*, that last part, on metrics, being the crown of the treatise. It would have resembled the *Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya* (which also ends with a sub-treatise on metrics). In that scenario, the chapters on *akam, puṟam, kaḷavu, kaṟpu*, etc. would have been added later, in a re-ordered version. And the chapters on *meyppāṭu* and *uvamai* could have been added even later. Each of these successive versions is thus "pre-final".

List A1: TP656i list (the TUs as per Iḷampūraṇar's reading)

(I1) nutaliyatu aṟital, (I2) **atikāra muṟai**, (I3) tokuttuk kūṟal, (I4) vakuttu meyn niṟuttal, (I5) **moḻinta poruḷō ṭoṉṟa vaittal**, (I6) **moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉṟi muṭittal**, (I7) vārātataṉāṉ vantatu muṭittal, (I8) **vantatu koṇṭu vārātatu muṭittal**, (I9) muntu moḻintataṉ talaitaṭumāṟṟu, (I10) oppak kūṟal, (I11) **orutalai moḻi**, (I12) taṉkōṭ kūṟal, (I13) **uṭampoṭu puṇarttal**, (I14) piṟaṉ uṭampaṭṭatu tāṉ uṭampaṭutal, (I15) iṟantatu kāṭṭal, (I16) etiratu pōṟṟal, (I17) moḻivām eṉṟal, (I18) kūṟiṟṟu eṉṟal, (I19) tāṉ kuṟiyiṭutal, (I20) **orutalai aṉmai muṭintatu kāṭṭal**, (I21) āṉai kūṟal, (I22) pal poruṭku ēṟpiṉ nallatu kōṭal, (I23) tokutta moḻiyāṉ vakuttaṉar kōṭal, (I24) maṟutalai citaittut taṉ tuṇipu uraittal, (I25) piṟaṉ kōḷ kūṟal, (I26) aṟiyātu uṭampaṭal, (I27) poruḷ iṭaiyiṭutal, (I28) etir poruḷ uṇarttal, (I29) colliṉ eccam colliyāṅku uṇarttal, (I30) tantu puṇarntu uraittal, (I31) ñāpakam kūṟal, (I32) **uyttukkoṇṭ(u) uṇarttal**.

(Chart 3a)

List A2: TP665p list (the TUs as per Pērāciriyar's reading)

(P1) nutaliyatu aṟital, (P2) **atikāra muṟaimai**, (P3) tokuttuk kūṟal, (P4) vakuttu meyn niṟuttal, (P5) **moḻinta poruḷō ṭoṉṟa vavvayiṉ moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉṟi muṭittal**, (P6) vārātataṉāṉ vantatu muṭittal, (P7) **vantatu koṇṭu vārātatu uṇarttal**, (P8) muntu moḻintataṉ talaitaṭumāṟṟu, (P9) oppak kūṟal, (P10) **orutalai moḻital**, (P11) taṉkōṭ kūṟal, (P12) **muṟai piṟaḻāmai**, (P13) piṟaṉ uṭampaṭṭatu tāṉ uṭampaṭutal, (P14) iṟantatu kāṭṭal, (P15) etiratu pōṟṟal, (P16) moḻivām eṉṟal, (P17) kūṟiṟṟu eṉṟal, (P18) tāṉ kuṟiyiṭutal, (P19) **orutalai aṉmai**, (P20) **muṭintatu kāṭṭal**, (P21) āṉai kūṟal, (P22) pal poruṭku ēṟpiṉ nallatu kōṭal, (P23) tokutta moḻiyāṉ vakuttaṉar kōṭal, (P24) maṟutalai citaittut taṉ tuṇipu uraittal, (P25) piṟaṉ kōṭ kūṟal, (P26) aṟiyātu uṭampaṭal, (P27) poruḷ iṭaiyiṭutal, (P28) etir poruḷ uṇarttal, (P29) colliṉ eccaṉ colliyāṅ kuṇarttal, (P30) tantu puṇarntu uraittal, (P31) ñāpakam kūṟal, (P32) **uyttukkoṇṭ(u) uṇartal**

(Chart 3b)

As can be seen by comparing these two tables, each list has 32 items, but only 24 of them are found identical in both lists, although their rank may differ. As for the discrepancies, they are the following:

- I2 and P2, I8 and P7, I11 and P10, and I32 and P32 differ slightly.

- I13 (*uṭampoṭu puṇarttal*) is unique to List A1

- P12 (*muṟai piṟaḻāmai*) is unique to List A2

- I5 (*moḻinta poruḷō ṭoṉṟa vaittal*) and I6 (*moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉṟi muṭittal)* are combined into P5 *(moḻinta poruḷō ṭoṉṟa vavvayiṉ moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉṟi muṭittal)*
- I20 (*orutalai aṉmai muṭintatu kāṭṭal)* is broken into P19 (*orutalai aṉmai*) and P20 (*muṭintatu kāṭṭal)*

Combining the two lists alphabetically, we obtain the following 40 items:

1. atikāra muṟai, I2   2. atikāra muṟaimai, P2

3. aṟiyātu uṭampaṭal, I26, P26

4. āṇai kūṟal, I21, P21

5. iṟantatu kāṭṭal, I15, P14

6. uṭampoṭu puṇarttal, I13

7. uyttukkoṇṭu uṇartal, P32

8. uyttukkoṇṭu uṇarttal, I32

9. etir poruḷ uṇarttal, I28, P28

10. etiratu pōṟṟal, I16, P15

11. oppak kūṟal, I10, P9

12. orutalai moḻi, I11

13. orutalai moḻital, P10

14. orutalai aṉmai muṭintatu kāṭṭal, I20

15. orutalai aṉmai, P19

16. kūṟiṟṟu eṉṟal, I18, P17

17. colliṉ eccam colliyāṅku uṇarttal, I29, P29

18. ñāpakam kūṟal, I31, P31

19. tantu puṇarntu uraittal, I30, P30

20. taṉkōṭ kūṟal, I12, P11

21. tāṉ kuṟiyiṭutal, I19, P18

22. tokutta moḻiyāṉ vakuttaṉar kōṭal, I23, P23

23. tokuttuk kūṟal, I3, P3

24. nutaliyatu aṟital, I1, P1

25. pal poruṭku ēṟpiṉ nallatu kōṭal, I22, P22

26. piṟaṉ uṭampaṭṭatu tāṉ uṭampaṭutal, I14, P13

27. piṟaṉ kōṭ kūṟal, I25, P25

28. poruḷ iṭaiyiṭutal, I27, P27

29. maṟutalai citaittut taṉ tuṇipu uraittal, I24, P24

30. muṭintatu kāṭṭal, P20

31. muntu moḻintataṉ talaitaṭumāṟṟu, I9, P8

32. muṟai piṟaḻāmai, P12

33. moḻinta poruḷōṭu oṉṟa vaittal, I5

34. moḻinta poruḷōṭu oṉṟa vavvayiṉ moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉṟi muṭittal, P5

35. moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉṟi muṭittal, I6

36. moḻivām eṉṟal, I17, P16

37. vakuttu meyṉ niṟuttal, I4, P4

38. vantatu koṇṭu vārātatu uṇarttal, P7

39. vantatu koṇṭu vārātatu muṭittal, I8

40. vārātataṉāṉ vantatu muṭittal, I7, P6

Chart 4 (items in lists A1 and A2)
[I = Iḷampūraṇar; P = Pērāciriyar]

6. Dikshitar's and Sastri's identifications of TUs with TYs

Remembering that our main goal is not to study the TUs for their own sake, however important a task that might seem, but to determine which TYs they might have been intended to FIRST-translate, we now turn to the task of providing answers to that question. We have been preceded in this task by two scholars, although they may have viewed the problem in a different light:

- V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar (1896-1954), who in 1930, in an article published in the *Journal of Oriental Research* (Madras), was, to my knowledge, the first to propose an identification between some of the TYs that are listed in the *Artha Śāstra* and some of the TUs that appear in the *Tolkāppiyam* (with Pērāciriyar's commentary)

- P.S. Subrahmanya Sastri (1890-1978), who in 1936, in his English translation of *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram*, also proposed a number of identifications (making use of both commentaries, by Iḷampūraṇar and by Pērāciriyar)

Possibly because the two scholars attacked the problem from opposite ends,[29] a striking fact is that, among the 32 *yukti*-s from the *AŚ* list,

- 5 are equated with the same TU by Dikshitar[1930] and by Sastri[1936]
- 17 are not equated with the same TU by the two scholars[30]
- 10 do not receive a TU-identification by either scholar.

Leaving aside the 10 from that last group (namely [A03] *yogaḥ*, [A04] *padārthaḥ*, [A05] *hetvarthaḥ*, [A14] *saṃśayaḥ*, [A15] *prasaṅgaḥ*, [A21] *nidarśanam*, [A22] *apavargaḥ*, [A24] *pūrvapakṣaḥ*, [A30] *vikalpaḥ* and [A31] *samuccayaḥ*), I list the identifications made by the two scholars in the following charts, the first one containing the points of agreement, while the second and the third indicate their points of disagreement.

TY (*Artha Śāstra*)	Sastri [1936] & Dikshitar [1930]
[A09] *apadeśaḥ*	*piṟaṉ kōḷ kūṟal* (I25 & P25)
[A16] *viparyayaḥ*	*muntu moḻintataṉ talaitaṭumāṟṟu* (I9 & P8)
[A18] *anumatam*	*piṟaṉ uṭaṉpaṭṭatu tāṉ uṭampaṭutal* (I14 & P13)
[A23] *svasaṃjñā*	*tāṉ kuṟiyiṭutal* (I19 & P18)
[A28] *atikrāntāvekṣaṇam*	*kūṟiṟṟu eṉṟal* (I18 & P17)

Chart 5a: 5 points of agreement between Dikshitar [1930] and Sastri [1936]

---

[29] Dikshitar was examining the full list of TYs and noting down those for which he saw an equivalent TU, whereas Sastri was performing the symmetrical task of examining the list of TUs and searching for an equivalent TY.

[30] I include under "different identification" the cases when one of the two scholars has proposed a Tamil equivalent for a TY while the other has not.

TY (*Artha Śāstra*)	Sastri [1936]	Dikshitar [1930]
[A01] *adhikaraṇam*	(I2) *atikāra muṛai*	(P1) *nutaliyatu aṛital*
[A02] *vidhānam*	NO IDENTIFICATION	(P2) *atikāra muṛaimai*
[A06] *uddeśaḥ*	(I3) *tokuttuk kūṛal*	(P23) *tokutta moḻiyāṉ vakuttaṉar kōṭal*
[A07] *nirdeśaḥ*	(I4) *vakuttu meyn niṛuttal*	(P29) *colliṉ eccañ colliyāṅ kuṇarttal*
[A08] *upadeśaḥ*	(I11) *orutalai moḻi*	(P12) *muṛai piṛalāmai*
[A10] *atideśaḥ*	(I8) *vantatu koṇṭu vārātatu muṭittal*	(P10) *orutalai moḻital*
[A11] *pradeśaḥ*	(I7) *vārātataṉāṉ vantatu muṭittal*	(P16) *moḻivām eṉṛal*
[A12] *upamānam*	(I10) *oppak kūṛal*	NO IDENTIFICATION
[A13] *arthāpattiḥ*	NO IDENTIFICATION	(P5) *moḻinta poruḷō ṭoṉṛa vavvayiṉ moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉṛi muṭittal*
[A17] *vākyaśeṣaḥ*	NO IDENTIFICATION	(P6) *vārātataṉāṉ vantatu muṭittal*
[A19] *vyākhyānam*	(I6) *moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉṛi muṭittal*	(P4) *vakuttu meyn niṛuttal*
[A20] *nirvacanam*	NO IDENTIFICATION	(P27) *poruḷ iṭaiyiṭutal*
[A25] *uttarapakṣaḥ*	NO IDENTIFICATION	(P24) *maṛutalai citaittut taṉ tuṇipu uraittal*
[A26] *ekāntaḥ*	(P19) *orutalai aṉmai* (??)	(P21) *āṇai kūṛal*
[A27] *anāgatāvekṣaṇam*	(I17) *moḻivām eṉṛal*	(P15) *etiratu pōṛṛal*
[A29] *niyogaḥ*	(I21) *āṇai kūṛal*	(P11) *taṉkōṭ kūṛal*
[A32] *ūhyam*	(P32) *uyttukkoṇṭu uṇartal*	(P26) *aṛiyātu uṭampaṭal*

**Chart 5b: 17 points of disagreement on TYs between
Dikshitar [1930] and Sastri [1936]**

TUs (*Tolkāppiyam*)	Sastri [1936] (mostly based on Iḷampūraṇar)	Dikshitar [1930] (based on Pērāciriyar)
atikāra muṟai (I2) *atikāra muṟaimai* (P2)	[A01] *adhikaraṇam* (equivalent to I2)	[A02] *vidhānam* (equivalent to P2)
vakuttu meyn niṟuttal (I4 & P4)	[A07] *nirdeśaḥ*	[A19] *vyākhyānam*
orutalai moḻi (I11) *orutalai moḻital* (P10)	[A08] *upadeśaḥ*	[A10] *atideśaḥ*
vārātataṉāṉ vantatu muṭittal (I7 &P6)	[A11] *pradeśaḥ*	[A17] *vākyaśeṣaḥ*
moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉṟi muṭittal (I6) moḻinta poruḷō ṭoṉṟa vavvayiṉ moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉṟi muṭittal (P5)	[A19] *vyākhyānam*	[A13] *arthāpattiḥ*
moḻivām eṉṟal (I17 & P16)	[A27] *anāgatāvekṣaṇam*	[A11] *pradeśaḥ*
āṇai kūṟal (I21 & P21)	[A29] *niyogaḥ*	[A26] *ekāntaḥ*

Chart 5c: points of disagreement on TUs between Dikshitar [1930] and Sastri [1936]

7. What are *tantra yukti*-s and what are they used for?

I have so far postponed the moment when I would have to explain what a TU or a TY is, and what they are used for. One of the main reason for that is that I wish to present a long view of the matter and that there have been a lot of variations (and reinterpretations) in the course of history. This is a field where no element seems to be stable[31] and yet an elusive sense of continuity persists. The divergence of opinion between Sastri [1936] and Dikshitar [1930], to which I have just drawn attention, looks like a good opportunity to make matters clearer. We shall start with the easiest part, namely the examination of the 5 points of (apparent?) agreement listed in chart 5a.

- *apadeśaḥ* [A09] is explained by Dikshitar as "mention of other's opinion by the side of one's own" and equated by him with *"piṟaṉ kōḷ kūṟal"*, the 25th element in Pērāciriyar's list. Sastri's translation for that last one is "giving out other's opinion". Both of them mention as a support the short gloss given in the AŚ, namely *"evam asau āha ity apadeśaḥ"*.

---

[31] The count of "32" might appear as an element of stability, but some Sanskrit lists have more than 32 elements, as we shall see. The Sanskrit designations of TYs are for the greater part stable (although there are a few variations), but when one examines the meaning associated with several of these TY designations, one sees a lot of variation (see Oberhammer and Lele). And regarding TUs, the idea that there exists an immutable list of 32 elements really looks like an idealisation when one examines the comprehensive list included at the end of this article with its more than 100 elements.

- *viparyayaḥ* [A16] is explained by Dikshitar as "indication by contrast" and equated by him with *"muntu moḻintataṉ talaitaṭumāṟṟu"*, the 8th element in Pērāciriyar's list. Sastri's translation for the Tamil phrase, the 9th in Iḷampūraṇar's list, is "adopting an order contrary to that mentioned before". Both of them mention the gloss given in the AŚ: *"pratilomena sādhanaṃ viparyayaḥ"*.

- *anumatam* [A18] is explained by Dikshitar as "quotation from another authority without dissent" and equated by him with *"piṟaṉ uṭampaṭṭatu tāṉ uṭampaṭutal"*, the 13th element in Pērāciriyar's list. Sastri's translation for the Tamil phrase, the 14th in Iḷampūraṇar's list, is "agreeing with the opinion of others". Both mention the gloss given in the AŚ: *"paravākyam apratiṣiddham anumatam"*.

- *svasaṃjñā* [A23] is for Dikshitar "one's own terminology" and equated by him with *"tāṉ kuṟiyiṭutal"*, the 18th element in Pērāciriyar's list. Sastri's translation for the Tamil (the 19th item for Iḷampūraṇar) is "coining technical terms". Both mention the AŚ gloss: *"parair asamitaḥ śabdaḥ svasaṃjñā"*.

- *atikrāntāvekṣaṇam* [A28] is for Dikshitar "references to previous portions" which he equates with *"kūṟiṟṟu eṉṟal"*, the 17th element in Pērāciriyar's list. Sastri's translation for the Tamil (the 18th item for Iḷampūraṇar) is "referring to what has been stated before". Both mention the AŚ gloss: *"purastād evam vihitam iti atikrāntāvekṣaṇam"*.

Although it is reassuring to see two scholars agree on a fact, what is at stake here may still not be obvious to the reader and I believe a few additional explanations are required. TYs (and TUs) always seem to be invoked in the explanation of segmented texts, the performance (by a teacher) and the grasping (by a student) of the successive segments[32] being separated by the process of explaining and understanding each one of them in succession, as illustrated in the following (Chart 6a):

---

[32] A segment in such a text is referred to as a *cūttiram* [Skt. *sūtra*] (see the discussion on p. 77). For some texts, however, which do not belong to the earlier strata, the segments are called *kārikai* [Skt. *kārikā*]. Tamil differs from Sanskrit in that both *cūttiram* and *kārikai* are verse forms. A precise characterization of the meters used is beyond the scope of this footnote, but one can say that a *kārikai* is subject to greater metrical constraints.

```
Segment 1
        Explanations 1
......
Segment M
        Explanations M
..........
Segment N
        Explanations N                    Chart 6a (what the teacher says)
..........
```

Typically, the explanations are provided by the teacher who sees the commented base text as simply being what is in Chart 6b:

```
Segment 1
..........
Segment M
                                          Chart 6b (what the teacher sees)
...........
Segment N
...........
```

In the process of commenting segment N, the teacher who explains can be seen to resort to TYs (or to TUs, if that person speaks in Tamil). The five TYs we have just examined, regarding which there is agreement between Dikshitar and Sastri, can be seen to fall under several such purposes:

- explaining how segment N relates to an earlier segment such as segment M (see above *atikrāntāvekṣaṇam* [A28])
- explaining what it means to cite other authors' opinions: accepting them? preparing to refute them? etc. (see above *apadeśaḥ* [A09] and *anumatam* [A18])
- commenting on the terminological use (see above *svasaṃjñā* [A23])
- explaining some specific feature of the wording of segment N which is not immediately obvious. For instance, why did the author use an apparently redundant expression? why did he place enumerated items in this order? (see above *viparyayaḥ* [A16])

What I mean when saying that the teacher is seen to resort to TYs is twofold.

- It can be an overt action. The person who comments will explicitly invoke a TY (or a TU)
- It can be an implicit recognition. The participants, being familiar with the field, recognize the case as falling under this or that TY (or TU)

Another point of view is of course possible. Instead of directly linking the TYs (or TUs) with the teacher and the teaching act, we can also link them with the author and say that it is because the author has composed his treatise in conformity with the scholarly (or scholastic?) norm which the TYs embody (or make visible) that the teacher is able to explain the matter to the student, or that an advanced student is capable of studying by himself a new treatise. If this is possible, it can certainly appear as a great practical advantage, and this certainly explains the fact that TYs have sometimes been praised very lyrically,[33] as possibly providing those who mastered them with a universal "mode d'emploi" (set of instructions for use) that would be applicable to all sorts of treatises. Some Western scholars have smiled at this enthusiasm[34] but it was certainly communicative and this is probably what induced a Tamil author to provide the scholarly universe —which must have been growing from the first half of the first millennium AD onwards— of his language, in which treatises were newly composed, with the List A of 32 items found in the *Tolkāppiyam*, so that it could be the equivalent of the Sanskrit TYs.

8. *Tantiravutti*-s as attested in commentarial usage

We have so far presented a theory: the lists of TYs and TUs represent a sort of distilled practical knowledge, hidden under a small set of metagrammatical[35]

---

[33] See for instance the following verses found in Sharma, R.K. & Bhagwan Dash (*Carakasaṃhitā*, vol.VI, pp. 444-445): *yathāmbujavanasyārkaḥ pradīpo veśmano yathā* ||46|| *prabodhanaprakāśārthās tathā tantrasya yuktayaḥ* "As the sun causes blossoming of the lotus pond (lit. forest) and as the lamp enlightens the [dark] house, similarly the knowledge of these tantra-yuktis serves the purpose of awakening (blossoming) and enlightening of the physician". *ekasminn api yasyeha śāstre labdhāspadā matiḥ* ||47|| *sa śāstram anyad apy āśu yuktijñatvāt prabudhyate* | *adhīyāno'pi śāstrāṇi tantrayuktyā vinā bhiṣak* | *nādhigacchati śāstrārthān arthān bhāgyakṣaye yathā* ||48|| "The physician who has good grasp even of only one treatise can also understand other treatises quickly because of his proficiency in *tantra-yukti* or canons of composition. As a person fails to acquire wealth [in spite of his best efforts] when fortune deserts him, similarly one who is not conversant with tantra-yuktis (canons of exposition) does not understand the real implications of treatises even if he has studied many of them". See also Oberhammer[1996: 110], who translates: "Wie die Sonne [am Morgen] den Wald der Lotosblumen [erweckt], wie die Lampe das Haus [erhellt], so haben die Kompositionselemente eines wissenschftlichen Werkes den Zweck, [dessen Verständnis] zu wecken und zu erhellen. Einer, dessen Verstand auch nur in einem einzigen Lehrbuch Fuß gefaßt hat, der wird, aufgrund [seiner] Kenntnis der Kompositionselemente auch ein anderes Lehrbuch schnell verstehen. Ein Arzt [aber], der die Lehrbücher ohne die *tantrayukti*s [zu kennen] studiert, wird den Inhalt der Lehrbücher nicht verstehen, wie einer, den das Glück verlassen hat, [keine] Reichtümer [erwerben wird]."

[34] See Wright's review of Lele.

[35] The metalanguage used by grammarians (and linguists) contains two subsets, possibly overlapping. While the "grammatical" vocabulary allows one to talk about language, the "metagrammatical" vocabulary can be defined as that which allows one to talk about

vocabulary items, and the commentators accompany them by a number of illustrations of actual use. This is what Iḷampūraṇar and Pērāciriyar do for each item of the list.

- For example, Iḷampūraṇar tells us (under TP656i) that an instance of the *kūṟiṟṟu eṉṟal* TU[36] is found in TP311i, because that sūtra announces that among the (26+8) items enumerated by sūtra TP310i, at the beginning of the *Ceyyuḷiyal* chapter, the first two, namely *māttirai* and *eḻuttiyal*, will not be explained again because they have already been explained in the first book of the *Tolkāppiyam*. Ironically, he himself then starts to provide the students with a long résumé of what that information is, which is not provided inside the *Ceyyuḷiyal*.

- He tells us that an instance of the *tāṉ kuṟiyiṭutal* TU (19th item in his list) is found in TC1i, where the technical terms *uyartiṇai*[37] and *akṟiṇai* "neuter" are coined, and that one should understand that a professor (*āciriyar*) can "baptise with a technical name" (*kuṟiyiṭal*) a matter which is not current in the (ordinary) world (*ulakiṉ kaṇ vaḷakk-iṉṟi*).[38]

- He tells us that *piṟaṉ uṭampaṭṭatu tāṉ uṭampaṭutal* (14th TU in his list) is illustrated by the author of *Tolkāppiyam* agreeing with Pāṇini (*pāṇiniyār*) on the fact that the second case (*iraṇṭām vēṟṟumai*) occurs **in/on/at** the *ceyap paṭu poruḷ*.[39] But, since this is nowhere stated, we must understand that this represents a tacit agreement: the author of the *Tolkāppiyam* must be considered to have silently adopted a number of Pāṇinian doctrines, such as the one mentioned.

But, alongside these slightly artificial cases and many others, where we are supposed to understand (or to believe) that "this (or that) passage illustrates this (or that) TU" simply because the passage has been picked up by Iḷampūraṇar as illustrating one item in the TU catalogue, one also meets with cases where a commentator spontaneously and explicitly invokes a TU in order to enlighten his audience. It must be emphasized that such a TU does not necessa-

---

grammar, i.e., more precisely, as that which allows one to refer to the specific conventions of grammatical discourse and to explain them. This is necessary because such conventions are normally not obvious to the uninitiated student.

[36] The 18th item in Iḷampūraṇar's TU list: "To say that [the matter has [already] been told". Said to be equivalent to the *atikrāntāvekṣaṇam* TY by Sastri and Dikshitar.

[37] If interpreted as an ordinary word, *uyartiṇai* might have meant "upper class". In grammar, it refers to "humans" and is subdivided into "masculine", "feminine" and "epicene plural".

[38] Interestingly, that may not be exactly what all users of the [A23] *svasaṃjñā* TY had in mind: some of them may have thought that the idea was to signal the new terminology adopted by a new school, as opposed to the commonly agreed terminology (*saṃjñā*). See Aussant[2005: pp.7-10].

[39] The formulation is locative: *iraṇṭām vēṟṟumai ceyappaṭuporuṭkaṇ varum*. Iḷampūraṇar might be trying here to translate Pāṇini 2.3.2: *karmaṇi dvitīyā*. The expression *ceyappaṭuporuḷ* is the standard technical name of one of the (6+2) *mutaṉilai*-s (alias *kāraka*-s) enumerated in TC108i, alias TC112c. See Chevillard [1996: 218-220] for more details.

rily coincide with one of the TUs found in TU catalogues, such as List A (or List B). We see for instance, inside the *Yāpparuṅkala Virutti* (henceforth YV), an old commentary on the *Yāpparuṅkalam* (henceforth YA), the following passage which explains the wording of the 10th segment inside YA (noted YA-10):

(4a) *"ivai immuṟaiyē vaitta kāraṇam eṉ?" eṉiṉ, iyaṟcīr ellāc ceyyuḷuḷḷum iyaṉṟu iṉitu naṭattaliṉ, ciṟappuṭaittu eṉṟu muṉ vaikkap paṭṭatu. eṉṉai? **"ciṟappuṭaip poruḷai muntuṟak kiḷattal"** eṉpatu **tantiravutti** ākaliṉ* [YV[1998], p. 59][40]

If one asks for what reason [the 3 types of feet] have been placed in this order [in YA-10],[41] [answer that] since natural foot (*iyaṟcīr*) can be pleasantly used in all [types of] poetry (*ceyyuḷ*), it has been placed first (before the two other types). Why? This is because **"Enunciate first the (most) eminent item"** is a **TU**.

In this passage, the expression *ciṟappuṭaip poruḷai muntuṟak kiḷattal* ("Enunciate first the (most) eminent item") is characterized as being a TU and appears as a standardized explanatory principle, which could be used on many other occcasions. As far as the YV is concerned, we see indeed the same TU used while explaining YA-1 (see YV[1998], p. 17) and YA-69 (see YV[1998], p. 279). Interestingly, the wording of this phrase is reminiscent of the wording of another phrase, which we see used 5 times inside the *Cēṉāvaraiyam*, a commentary on the 2nd book of the *Tolkāppiyam* (TC). That other phrase is:

(4b) *ciṟapp-uṭai poruḷai-t **tāṉ** iṉitu kiḷattal* "Enunciate **only** the (most) eminent item"[42]

Similar observations can be made about other TUs explicitly named as such in the YV or in the *Cēṉāvaraiyam*,[43] such as:

(5) *colliṉ muṭiviṉ apporuḷ muṭittal* [YV[1998]: p. 166 (YA-39), p. 346 (YA-86); *Cēṉāvaraiyam*: TC399c]

(6a) *"talaitaṭumāṟṟam tantu puṇarnturaittal" tantiravutti ākaliṉ* [YV[1998]: p. 119 (YA-26), p. 245 (YA-58)]

---

[40] The notation YV[1998] means that the page numbers are given according to the currently avalaible edition (see bibliography). However, some of our secondary sources refer to other editions: YV[1973] (see references in TVG[2005b]) and YV[1916/1917] (page references found in *Tamil Lexicon*).

[41] To make matters clear, it must be added that segment YA-10 enumerates 3 types of feet (*cīr*), called *iyaṟ-cīr* "natural foot", *uriccīr* "proper foot" and *potuccīr* "general foot".

[42] See Chevillard [2008a:138] for the exact location of these 5 passages. For instance, Cēṉāvaraiyar uses it in TC11c to explain that a rule which apparently concerns **only** 3rd person verbs **also** concerns in fact 1st and 2nd person verbs. Note however that Cēṉāvaraiyar does not say that the expression is a TU. I am tempted to say this is a sort of *paribhāṣā*. But as we shall see, some Tamil commentators say that *paripāṭai* falls under *tantiravutti*. (See section 14).

[43] See Chevillard [2008a: 153] for pointers to the 13 TUs explicitly named inside the *Cēṉāvaraiyam*.

(6b) *muntu moḻintataṉ talai-taṭumāṟṟam eṉṉun tantiravutti* (*Cēṉāvaraiyam*: TC190c)

(7) *"pal poruṭkēṟpiṉ nallatu kōṭal" eṉṉum tantira utti ākalāṉum* [YV[1998]: p. 94 (YA-20), p. 305 (YA-78)]

(8) *"piṟa nūl muṭiṇtatu tāṉuṭampaṭutal" eṉṉum tantira utti* [YV[1998]: p. 204 (YA-52)][44] [*Cēṉāvaraiyam*: TC26c, TC463c]

(9) *itu "kūṟuvām" eṉṉun tantira v-utti* (*Cēṉāvaraiyam*: TC119c)

(10) *"vakuttu-k kūṟal" tantiravutti y-ākalāṉum* (*Cēṉāvaraiyam*: TC179c)

Among the spontaneously used TUs, some do indeed belong to the *Tolkāppiyam* list[45] (see chart 4) but some do not, as is the case with *"colliṉ muṭiviṉ apporuḷ muṭittal"*, contained in example (6), which we shall later meet with, while studying List B. It is also to be noted that some of the spontaneous TUs are not found in any canonical list. They can be reformulations of standard TUs: see *"kūṟuvām"* ("we shall say") in (9), which looks like a variant of *"moḻivām"* [I17] or of *"uraittum"*, an element of list B. They can also be totally independent from any list, as is the case for *"ciṟappuṭaip poruḷai muṉṯuṟak kiḷattal"* and for *"ciṟapp-uṭai poruḷai-t tāṉ iṉitu kiḷattal"*[46] already discussed.

9. The TUs in List B in its three variants

I have already explained, in an earlier section (see Chart 2), that a number of events took place between the time when the *Tolkāppiyam* reached its final form and the time when Iḷampūraṇar composed his commentary[47]. Among these events, there was the preparation of a new TU list, which we have already named "List B". We shall now examine the elements of List B, as found in its three available variants. As a first specimen, I reproduce a list found in *Yāpparuṅkala Virutti* (YV), inside the very long section which comments on sūtra YA-95.[48] It runs as follows:

---

[44] The same TU is found verbatim p. 305 (in YV[1998]), although it not explicitly said by the commentator to be a TU.

[45] See for instance in 7 the use of *pal poruṭku ēṟpiṉ nallatu kōṭal* "among several possible interpretations, choose the right one" (I22).

[46] The meaning of that phrase however reminds one of the *sūtra* TC49i (alias TC49c): that *sūtra* says that the name of a collective entity can be based either on the members which are the most eminent (*talaimai*) or on those that constitute the majority (*paṉmai*). See Chevillard [1996: 116-117] for more details.

[47] The appearance of Iḷampūraṇar's work certainly acted as a stabilizing factor and it must have become more difficult to tamper with the *Tolkāppiyam* text, which must earlier have been more fluid. However, as we have seen, Pērāciriyar was still able to propose a different reading for the last sūtra.

[48] Sūtra YA-95 has only 7 lines. But the commentary on these 7 lines occupies 164 pages in the 1998 edition (referred to here as YV[1998]). This means that the commentator is largely on his own, especially in this case, where he is elaborating on the word *piṟavum*

(11) *muppattiraṇṭu tantira uttiyāvaṇa:* '[**Y1**] *nutalip pukutal*, [**Y2**] *ōttumuṟai vaittal*, // [**Y3**] *tokuttuk kāṭṭal*, [**Y4**] *vakuttuk kāṭṭal*, // [**Y5**] *muṭiviṭaṅ kūṟal*, [**Y6**] *muṭittuk kāṭṭal* // [**Y7**] *tāṉeṭuttu moḻital*, [**Y8**] *piṟaṉkōṭ kūṟal*,// [**Y9**] *coṟporuḷ virittal*, [**Y10**] *iraṭṭuṟa moḻital*, // [**Y11**] *ētuviṉ muṭittal*, [**Y12**] *eṭutta moḻiyiṉ* // *eyta vaittal*, [**Y13**]⁴⁹ *iṉṉa talla* // *tituveṉa moḻital*, [**Y14**] *taṉṉiṉa muṭittal* // [**Y15**] *eñciya colliṉ, eytak kūṟal*, // [**Y16**] *māṭṭeṟin toḻital*, [**Y17**] *piṟanūl muṭintatu* // *tāṉuṭam paṭutal*, [**Y18**] *taṅkuṟi valakkam* // *mikaveṭut turaittal*,[**Y19**] *iṟantatu vilakkal*, // [**Y20**] *etiratu pōṟṟal*, [**Y21**] *muṉmēṟ kōṭal*, // [**Y22**] *piṉṉatu niṟuttal*, [**Y23**] *eṭuttuk kāṭṭal*, // [**Y24**] *muṭintatu muṭittal*, [**Y25**] *colliṉ muṭiviṉ* // *apporuḷ muṭittal*, [**Y26**] *toṭarccoṟ puṇarttal*, // [**Y27**] *yāppuṟut tamaittal*, [**Y28**] *uraittum eṉṟal*, // [**Y29**] *vikaṟpattu muṭittal*, [**Y30**] *tokuttuṭaṉ muṭittal*, // [**Y31**] *orutalai tuṇital*, [**Y32**] *uyttuṇara vaittal*' *eṉa ivai* [YV¹⁹⁹⁸: 451-452] [YV¹⁹¹⁶/¹⁹¹⁷: 405] [YV¹⁹⁷³: 427]. **[List B1]**

This translates as: "the 32 TUs are those: Y1, Y2, ... Y32." In this enumeration, we recognize three of the TUs mentioned in the previous section:

- Y4 *"vakuttuk kāṭṭal"* approximately coincides with the TU seen in (10) *"vakuttuk kūṟal"*
- Y17 *"piṟanūl muṭintatu tāṉuṭam paṭutal"* was seen in (8).
- Y25 *"colliṉ muṭiviṉ apporuḷ muṭittal"* was seen in (5)

But the TUs explicitly mentioned in (4a), (6a) and (7) do not appear in the TU list given in (8), although the YV makes use of them,⁵⁰ and this fact requires some explanations. Citation (11) is extracted from an elaborate explanation which started thus:

(12) *ic cūttirattuṭ "piṟavum" eṉṟu colliyavataṉāṉē nūlum, cūttiramum, ōttum, paṭalamum, piṇṭamum āmāṟum [...] uṇarntu koḷka.*

Because he has said *"et cetera"* (*piṟavum*) in this sūtra (YA-95), it must be understood [that the sūtra also refers to topics such as] the constitution of *nūl* ("treatise"), *cūttiram* ("sūtra"), *ōttu* ("section"), *paṭalam* ("chapter"), *piṇṭam* ("book") [...].

This statement is followed by elaborate elucidations and the passage contains a number of citations (sometimes reduced to abbreviated paraphrases) from other works quoted as authorities and illustrating the various topics touched upon. The text which we have given in (11) is one of those citations (or paraphrases) and is meant to make explicit the last one in a series of eight characterizations given for *nūl* "treatise", to which we shall come back later (in section 13). The citation seems to be attributed to one *Pāṭalaṉār urai* ("the commentary by Pāṭalaṉār"), which has apparently been lost. The series of 8 characterizations of

---

"etcaetera" found on line 6 of YA-95. This also explains why it is essential to give precise page references!

⁴⁹Y13 appears in YV¹⁹⁹⁸ as *"iṉṉa talla* // **tī***tuveṉa moḻital"*.

⁵⁰ As we have seen, some come from the *Tolkāppiyam* list.

nūl, being now completed, is then followed by 6 citations from the *Ceyyuḷiyal*, the 8th chapter of the TP, but we are not provided with the list of TUs contained in the *Marapiyal*, the 9th chapter of the TP, although the author of YV may have known it because the TUs which appear in (6a), (7) and (8) belong to it. This seems to indicate that the author of the YV knew of two lists of TUs.

● List A (from *Tolkāppiyam*) was used by him, but not quoted.
● List B (from *Pāṭalaṉār urai*) was used and quoted[51] by him

Since the original text from which the author of the YV drew his list is not available to us, we shall, from now onwards, refer to the enumeration given in (11) as "List B1" and we shall first compare it with two other lists with which it has a close resemblance. One of them (List B3), is contained in a verse which is part of the preface (*pāyiram*) attached to the 12th-century grammar called *Naṉṉūl*, where we find the following:

(13)   **[M1]** *nutalip pukutal*, **[M2]** *ōttumuṟai vaippē*, // **[M3]** *tokuttuk cuṭṭal*, **[M4]** *vakuttuk kāṭṭal*, // **[M5]** *muṭittuk kāṭṭal* **[M6]** *muṭiviṭam kūṟal*, // **[M7]** *tāṉeṭuttu moḻital*, **[M8]** *piṟaṉkōṭ kūṟal*,// **[M9]** *coṟporuḷ virittal*, **[M10]** *toṭarccoṟ puṇarttal*,// **[M11]** *iṟaṭṭuṟa moḻital*, **[M12]** *ētuviṉ muṭittal*,// **[M13]** *oppiṉ muṭittal* **[M14]** *māṭṭeṟiṉ toḻukal*,// **[M15]** *iṟantatu vilakkal*, **[M16]** *etiratu pōṟṟal*, // **[M17]** *muṉmoḻintu kōṭal* [] ~~*muṉmēṟ kōṭal*~~, **[M18]** *piṉṉatu niṟuttal*,// **[M19]** *vikaṟpattiṉ muṭittal*, **[M20]** *muṭintavai muṭittal* // **[M21]** *uraittum eṉṟal*, **[M22]** *uraittām eṉṟal*, // **[M23]** *orutalai tuṇital* **[M24]** *eṭuttuk kāṭṭal*, // **[M25]** *eṭutta moḻiyiṉ eyta vaittal*, **[M26]** *iṉṉa talla tituveṉa moḻital*, // **[M27]** *eṉciya colliṉ, eytak kūṟal*, // **[M28]** *piṟanūl muṭintatu tāṉutam paṭutal*, // **[M29]** *taṅkuṟi valakka mikaveṭut turaittal*, //, **[M30]** *colliṉ muṭiviṉ apporuḷ muṭittal*, // **[M31]** *oṉṟiṉa muṭittal* *taṉṉiṉa muṭittal* // **[M32]** *uyttuṇara vaippeṉa vuttiyeṉ ṉāṅkē* (*Naṉṉūl*, *Mayilaiṉātar uraiyum*, UVS: 5) **[List B3]**

The editors (*patippāciriyar*) of YV[1973] and YV[1998] give the impression that they believe List B1 to be a citation of List B3 because they refer to *Naṉṉūl*.[52] However, the differences between (11) and (13) are so numerous that it seems a strange suggestion.[53] Conversely, U.V. Cāmiṉātaiyar, in the introduction to his

---

[51]It could be an incomplete quotation. All the 3 editions consulted present it in verse form, but it is quite possible that some lines are missing or that the splitting into metrical lines (*aṭi*) is not the original one.

[52] See YV[1998], p. 452 (footnote) and YV[1973], p. 427.

[53] In the *editio princeps* (YV[1916/1917]), by Pavāṉantam Piḷḷai, such a suggestion (that the verse comes from *Naṉṉūl*) is not made. There is however a discrepancy in that edition between p. vii (vol.1, 1916) where we see the spelling "māṭalaṉār" and p. 405 (vol. 2, 1917) where we see the spelling "pāṭalaṉār". This discrepancy is probably the source for the variant noted by U.V.S. in the introduction to his 1946 edition of *Naṉṉūl* with Mayilaiṉātar's commentary (p.xvii, fn. "*ippeyar māṭalaṉāreṉṟum valaṅkum*". It is noteworthy however that all three editions (1916-1917, 1973 and 1998) agree in the wording of the citation. Neither Irā. Iḷaṅkumaraṉ, nor Mē. Vī. Vēṇukōpālap Piḷḷai tried to modify the citation, in

(posthumous) 1946 edition of *Naṉṉūl* with Mayilaiṉātar's commentary, suggests (p.xvii) that all the sūtra-s found in the *Pāyiram* section come from other books, and that those numbered 9 to 13 were made by Pāṭalaṉār.[54]

Before trying to describe more precisely the differences between List B1 and List B3, we now examine the occurrence of a very similar list (List B2). It is found inside the commentary on another grammatical text, the *Vīracōḻiyam* (VC, possibly belonging to the 11th century), whereas its commentary (VCC) possibly belongs to the 12th century and might be older than the *Naṉṉūl*. The list of *tantiravutti*-s runs thus, inside VCC (as part of VCC-180, the commentary to 180th verse[55], or *kārikai*)

(14) **[V1]** *nutalip pukutal*, **[V2]** *ōttumuṟai vaittal*, // **[V3]** *tokuttuk cuṭṭal*, **[V4]** *vakuttuk kāṭṭal*, // **[V5]** *muṭittuk kāṭṭal* **[V6]** *muṭivitam kūral*, // **[V7]** *tāṉeṭuttu moḻital*, **[V8]** *piṟaṅkōṭ kūral*, // **[V9]** *corporuḷ virittal*, **[V10]** *toṭarccor puṉarttal*, // **[V11]** *iraṭṭura moḻital*, **[V12]** *ētuviṉ muṭittal*, // **[V13]** *oppiṉ muṭittal* **[V14]** *māṭṭeriṉ tolukal*, // **[V15]** *oḷintatu vilakkal*, **[V16]** *etiratu pōṟṟal*, // **[V17]** *muṉmoḻintu kōṭal* [] *muṉmēr kōṭal*, **[V18]** *piṉṉatu niṟuttal*, // **[V19]** *vikaṟpattiṉ muṭittal*, **[V20]** *muṭintatu muṭittal* // **[V21]** *uraittum eṉṟal*, **[V22]** *uraittām eṉṟal*, // **[V23]** *orutalai tuṇital* **[V24]** *eṭuttuk kāṭṭal*, // **[V25]** *eṭutta moḻiyiṉ eyta vaittal*, **[V26]** *aṉṉa talla tituveṉa moḻital*, // **[V27]** *eñciya colliṉ, eytak kūral*, // **[V28]** *piṟaṉūl muṭintatu tāṉuta̱ṉ paṭutal*, // **[V29]** *taṉkuṟi vaḻakka mikaveṭut turaittal*, //, **[V30]** *colliṉ muṭiviṉ apporuḷ muṭittal*, // **[V31]** *oṉṟiṉa muṭittal taṉṉiṉa muṭittal* // **[V32]** *uyttuṇara vaittal ena muppattiraṇṭām* (VC[1942]: 178) **[List B2]**

The problem to be solved here is a chronological one: 6 texts are involved in the understanding of the relationships between (11), (13) and (14). These texts are, in tentative chronological order:

- the *Yāpparuṅkalam* (YA), possibly composed in the 10th cent.
- the *Yāpparuṅkala Virutti* (YV), an extensive commentary on YA, possibly composed at the turn of the 11th century
- the *Vīracōḻiyam* (VC), composed during the 11th century
- the *Vīracōḻiyam* commentary (VCC), by Peruntēvaṉār, possibly composed at the beginning of the 12th century [Zvelebil 1995, Govindasamy 1977]
- the *Naṉṉūl* (N), composed in the late 12th or early 13th cent.
- the *Naṉṉūl* commentary (Nma) composed by Mayilaiṉātar (early 13th cent. [Govindasamy 1977])

As far as the TUs are concerned, the simple facts are the following

- YA does not mention TUs

order to make it conform with the list found in the *Naṉṉūl* editions.
[54] Mayilai Cīṉi. Vēṅkaṭacāmi [2003: 339-340] seems to think only only one verse is from Pāṭalaṉār. But T.V. Gopal Iyer (TIPA, vol. 16, p. 136) attributes several verses to him.
[55] There are however no serious differences between the three editions as far as the list of TUs is concerned.

- YV mentions TUs and gives a (versified?) list (List B1, see (11))
- VC mentions TUs but does not give a list
- VCC gives a prose list (List B2, see (14))
- The prefatory section (*pāyiram*) of the N gives a versified list, but UVS thinks that the *Pāyiram* is not part of the original *Naṉṉūl*, which started in fact with the *Eḻuttatikāram*.
- Nma contains the list, which appears as sūtra 13 in the *Pāyiram* section (List B3, see (13))
- List B2 and list B3 are quasi-identical, but differ rather widely from list B1, both in terms of content and of order

It must also be noted that N was a dominant text in the 19th century and that the first editor of VC, C.W. Tāmōtaram Piḷḷai, might have normalized List B2 in order to make it conform with List B3. It must also be emphasized that the link between List B2 and the VCC is stronger than the link between List B3 and the passage that follows it inside the Nma. VCC displays real interest in the TUs because it provides a lot of illustrations (all drawn from the *Kuṟaḷ*) whereas Mayilainātar is happy to say that there are variants (and additional TUs). The *Naṉṉūl Viruttiyurai*, a later commentary, does not take pains to illustrate every case and simply says that "the list has been limited to the 32 most important TU-s, for fear that otherwise there would be no limit" (Nvi, 14).[56] As a conclusion to this first exploration, and before examining the next question, I now present an alphabetized list which makes it easier to compare the 3 variants of List B, each item being characterized by a letter and by a number indicating its rank in the corresponding list.

1. *aṉṉatallatituveṉa moḻital*, V26 (cf. *iṉṉatallatituveṉa moḻital*)
2. *iraṭṭura moḻital*, Y10, V11, M11
3. *iṟantatu vilakkal*, Y19, M15
4. *iṉṉatallatituveṉa moḻital*, Y13, M26 (cf. *aṉṉatallatituveṉa moḻital*)
5. *uyttuṇara vaittal*, Y32, V32
6. *uyttuṇara vaippu*, M32
7. *uraittām eṉṟal*, V22, M22
8. *uraittum eṉṟal*, Y28, V21, M21
9. *eñciya colliṉ eytak kūṟal*, Y15, V27, M27
10. *eṭutta moḻiyiṉ eyta vaittal*, Y12, V25, M25
11. *eṭuttuk kāṭṭal*, Y23, V24, M24
12. *etiratu pōṟṟal*, Y20, V16, M16
13. *ētuviṉ muṭittal*, Y11, V12, M12
14. *oppiṉ muṭittal*, V13, M13
15. *orutalai tuṇital*, YV31, V23, M23
16. *oḻintatu vilakkal*, V15
17. *oṉṟiṉa muṭittal taṉṉiṉamuṭittal*, V31, M31
18. *ōttumuṟai vaittal*, V2, Y2
19. *ōttumuṟai vaippu*, M2
20. *colliṉ muṭiviṉ apporuṇ muṭittal*, Y25, V30, M30
21. *corporuḷ virittal*, Y9, V9, M9
22. *taṉkuṟi valakka mika veṭutturaittal*, Y18, V29, M29
23. *taṉṉiṉam muṭittal*, Y14
24. *tāṉ eṭuttu moḻital*, Y7, V7, M7
25. *tokuttuk kāṭṭal*, Y3
26. *tokuttuc cuṭṭal*, V3, M3
27. *tokuttuṭaṉ muṭittal*, Y30
28. *toṭarccor puṇarttal*, Y26, V10, M10
29. *nutalip pukutal*, Y1, V1, M1
30. *piṟaṉūṉ muṭintatu tāṉuṭaṉpaṭutal*, V28
31. *piṟaṉūṉ muṭintatu tāṉ uṭampaṭutal*, Y17, M28

---

[56] *varampiṉṟi varum uttiyuḷ talaimaiparṟik kūṟum muppattiraṇṭil vantaṉa kūṟiṉār eṉka.*

32.*piṟaṉkōṭ kūṟal*, Y8, V8, M8

33.*piṉṉatu niṟuttal*, Y22, V18, M18

34.*māṭṭerintoḻukal*, V14, M14

35.*māṭṭerintoḻital*, Y16

36.*muṭittuk kāṭṭal*, Y6, V5, M5

37.*muṭintatu muṭittal*, Y24, V20

38.*muṭintavai muṭittal*, M20

39.*muṭiviṭaṉ kūṟal*, Y5, V6, M6

40.*muṉmēṟkōṭal*, YVcom 21,

41.*muṉmoḻintu kōṭal*, V17, M17

42.*yāppuṟuttamaittal*, Y27

43.*vakuttuk kāṭṭal*, Y4, V4, M4

44.*vikaṟpattiṉ muṭittal*, V19, M19

45.*vikaṟpattu muṭittal*, Y29

Chart 7: components of List B
(V=*Vīracōḻiyam*; Y=*Yāpparuṅkala Virutti*;
M=Mayilainātar commentary on *Naṉṉūl*)

As a complement to this, it is important to note that Iḷampūraṇar must have known List B because, while commenting on the TP656i list (i.e. list A1), he equates[57] item 23 in his own list (i.e. *"tokutta moḻiyāṉ vakuttaṉar kōṭal"*) with the item *"colliṉ muṭipiṉ apporuṇ muṭittal"*, deviating slightly from the one which stands in Chart 7 as *"colliṉ muṭiviṉ apporuṇ muṭittal"* (Y25, V30, M30). He also mentions at the end of his list 3 supplementary TUs, which have not been included. Two of them *"coṟporuḷ virittal"* and *"oṉṟeṉa muṭittal, taṉṉiṉa muṭittal"* belong to List B and the third one *"māṭṭerital"* resemble two variants (*"māṭṭerintoḻukal"* [V14, M14] and *"māṭṭerintoḻital"* [Y16]) which it contains.[58]

10. More equivalences between List A and List B

The reader might wonder why I am not systematically providing English translations for the TUs and for the TYs. One of the reasons is that a number of translations exist. In addition to the works of Dikshitar [1930] and Sastri [1936] already mentioned, one can enumerate:

- The 19th-century translation of the *Naṉṉūl* "preface" by H. Bower[59]
- The 1963 *Tolkāppiyam* translation by S. Ilakkuvanar
- The 2000 *Tolkāppiyam* translation by V. Murugan

---

[57] Whether exactly the same interpretation is given to the two TUs by the commentators who make use of them is of course a different problem. We have on the one hand the examples given by Iḷampūraṇar, who says that *"tokutta moḻiyāṉ vakuttaṉar kōṭal"* is illustrated by TE67i. We have Pērāciriyar who says that this refers to the fact that forms can be used as templates (*vāypāṭu*): he quotes TC223i *"ceytu, ceyyūc ceypu ..."*, where the forms from the paradigm of *"cey"* must be understood as generating the paradigm of other verbs: *ceytu* "having done" is the model for *nakku* "having laughed", *vantu* "having come", *kaṇṭu* "having seen", etc. On the other hand, the *Naṉṉūl* commentator Caṅkaranamaccivāyar invokes *"colliṉ muṭiviṉ apporuṇ muṭittal"* twice: 1. while commenting on N109ca; 2. while commenting on N410ca, and the explanations he gives seem to draw on something different.

[58] This seems also the occasion to mention an additional TU, which belongs neither to List A nor to List B, *"uraiyiṟkōṭal"*, which Iḷampūraṇar considers as an equivalent of the 6th element in his own list: *"moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉṟi muṭittal"*.

[59] Found on pp.12-13 in the 1972 Kazhagam editions.

● The translations contained in the 1999 dictionary of technical terms by V. Murugan and M. Mathialagan

As far as TYs are concerned, one must mention at least:

● The 1981 book by W.K. Lele, which provides translations and discussions of all the TY recognized in traditional literature
● The three volume *Terminologie* by Oberhammer et alii (1991, 1996, 2006) which provides German translations of a great many Sanskrit passages where TYs are discussed.

It would not be very useful to reproduce here uncritically all those translations and the interested reader can consult them. Besides, my intention here is not to look for an elusive true meaning of TUs or TYs, but rather to understand how they can have been interpreted in so many different ways and what the contradictions teach us about the chronology and about the success (or failure) of those attempted translations which I call "FIRST-translations".[60] As a step in this inquiry, I now provide in a chart the list of equivalences proposed in Murugan and Mathialagan [1999] between some items in List B3 and some items in List A1. If those equivalences are accepted,[61] they show that only one item (*piṟaṉ kōṭ kūṟal*, M8 or I25, "quoting the view of others") is identical between the two lists, that 12 items in list B3 can be considered as rewordings of items belonging to list A1 and that for all others items there is no exact correspondence. A case deserving special mention is *etiratu pōṟṟal* (M16 and I16) which is said to mean "adoption of modern usage (according to *Naṉṉūl*)" and "anticipating in the given *cūttiram* the idea that is to be treated in the following *cūttiram* (according to *Tolkāppiyam*)".

---

[60] See Section 2. Concerning the question whether it is really possible to successfully translate everything from one linguistic universe to another one (and here from Sanskrit to Tamil), it has to be noted that some terms carry with them an enormous quantity of technical "baggage". We shall examine later (in section 15) those terms which, in some minds, evoke the *anuvṛtti* principle. Such terms somehow defy translation, if by translation we understand the production of a text in a target language that immediately makes sense. For those terms, only an act of explaining seems possible, and the explanation will be successful if one rebuilds at least partly, in the mind of the reader (and in one's own), part of the original context. But First-translations can produce unstable results, from a semantic point of view, although the text survives because the tradition is conservative and the work has high prestige. The original author, living in a bilingual (Sanskrit-Tamil) universe may have known what he intended to say, but the later users of the received text might well have been unable to make sense of the text in a monolingual (Tamil) context. This looks like the most probable explanation for the countless (and anarchical) differences of opinion between them.

[61] The list of equivalences does not include the one proposed by Iḷampūraṇar between I23 *"tokutta moḻiyāṉ vakuttaṉar kōṭal"* and *"colliṉ muṭiviṉ apporuṇ muṭittal"* (Y25, V30, M30), which we have just discussed (See fn. 57)

List B3	List A1
nutalip pukutal, M1	*nutaliyatu aṛital*, I1
ōttumuṛai vaippu, M2	*atikāra muṛai*, I2
tokuttuc cuṭṭal, M3	*tokuttuk kūṛal*, I3
vakuttuk kāṭṭal, M4	*vakuttu meyn niṛuttal*, I4
muṭittuk kāṭṭal, M5	*moḻinta poruḷōṭu oṉṛa vaittal*, I5
piṟaṉkōṭ kūṛal, M8	***piṟaṉ kōṭ kūṛal***, I25
iṟaṭṭuṟa moḻital, M11	*ñāpakam kūṛal*, I31
oppiṉ muṭittal, M13	*oppak kūṛal*, I10
>< *etiratu pōṟṟal*, M16	**>< *etiratu pōṟṟal*,** I16
muṉmoḻintu kōṭal, M17	*moḻivām eṉṛal*, I17
uraittām eṉṛal, M22	*kūṛiṟṟu eṉṛal*, I18
eṉciya colliṉ eytak kūṛal, M27	*colliṉ eccam colliyāṅku uṇarttal*, I29
piṟaṉūṉ muṭintatu tāṉ uṭampaṭutal, M28	*piṟaṉ uṭampaṭṭatu tāṉ uṭampaṭutal*, I14
taṉkuṟi vaḻakka mika veṭutturaittal, M29	*tāṉ kuṟiyiṭutal*, I19

**Chart 8: List of equivalences proposed
in Murugan and Mathialagan [1999: 57-59]**

11. What the *Kuṛaḷ* tells us about *"nūl"*.

We have started this study by considering the FIRST-translation task (from Sanskrit to Tamil) which resulted in the first TU list and which must have been performed by a native Tamil speaker who had a good knowledge of Sanskrit and its literature. Apart from the *Tolkāppiyam*, there is another book, the *Kuṛaḷ*, which is very famous and which has often been said to rely heavily on Sanskrit literature.[62] It may also have been composed at a date close to the composition of some parts of the *Tolkāppiyam*.[63] We examine in this section the use the *Kuṛaḷ* makes of the word *nūl*, which we have already discussed several times, because it constitutes the general topic of the group of 18 sūtra-s (TP639i to TP656i) inside which the *utti*-s (*yukti*-s), later called *tantiravutti*-s (TU) are presented. This exploration, where we also examine derived words such as *nūlōr*, etc., can be seen as a counterpoint to our exploration of the technical literature, because, although the *Kuṛaḷ* is learned, it stands outside the realm of technical literature

---

[62] See Takahashi [1999]: "The Treatment of King and State in the *Tirukkuṛaḷ*".
[63] Zvelebil [1995] gives A.D. 450-550 as most probable date for the *Kuṛaḷ* (p. 669) and says (p.705) that "The final redaction of T. including *Poruḷatikāram*, may be prob. fixed as 5th c. A.D.".

and provides a different perspective. Interestingly, it does not contain the word *tantiram* (Skt. *tantra*), which we shall examine in the next section.

There are 18 occurrences to be considered, which is a rather high frequency for such a short book as the *Kuṟaḷ* (which consists in 1330 couplets). Only one of them (K1273) gives *nūl* its ordinary meaning of "thread"[64] and the remaining 17 have to do with treatises and the knowledge of treatises. An especially interesting one is *Kuṟaḷ* 581, which is found inside the chapter *Oṟṟ-Āṭal* "the employment of spies" and where *nūl* is found in combination with *urai*:

(15) *oṟṟu m-urai-cāṉṟa nūl-u m-ivai-y-iraṇṭun / teṟṟ-eṉa maṉṉavaṉ kaṇ* (p. 656 in Kō. Vaṭivēlu Ceṭṭiyār edition, vol. 2).[65]

There is much dissent among the commentators concerning the meaning of the expression "*urai cāṉṟa nūl*". As seen in the *Tirukkuṟaḷ Uraikkottu* [1990: 203-204], their paraphrases are:
- *pukaḻ amainta nīti nūl* (Parimēlaḻakar)
- *muṟaiyamainta nūliṉai* (Maṇakkuṭavar)
- *uraiyamainta nūliṉai* (Paripperumāḷ)
- *manu nīti nūl* (Paritiyār)
- *urai cāṉṟa kalainūlkaḷ* (Kāliṅkar)

What is surprising is the replacement of *urai* by *pukaḻ* "fame". This seems to be a rare meaning of *urai*.[66] The paraphrases which are closest to what one would expect from someone who is familiar with the TP[67] are those by Paripperumāḷ and by Kāliṅkar. It is possible that the meaning "fame" was induced by the association with the word *"cāṉṟa"*. The commentators are of course more concerned with explaining how a spy, and a *nūl*, can be considered as long-range eyes.

---

[64] My conviction that "thread" was the normal meaning of *nūl* for a Tamil speaker relies for instance on the fact that in the 2002 *Glossary of Tamil Inscription*, among the 7 entries on pp. 372-373, only 2 are connected with the realm of treatises and knowledge whereas 6 are connected with spinning activities. In literature, we also have *nūl* as the result of the spinning activity of a spider. See in Wilden [2008, vol.1, p. 436-437]: the lines: *kāṉap puṟaviṉ cēval vāynūr // cilampi yañciṉai verūu(m)* "where the cock of the forest dove [...] is frightened on the pretty branch [even] by the spider that [makes] threads from [its] mouth" (*Naṟṟiṇai* 189_8-9).

[65] The translation provided by Kō. Vaṭivēlu Ceṭṭiyār is: "Let a king consider as his eyes these two things, a spy, and a book of laws universally esteemed". I am not sure it does justice to the expression *urai cāṉṟa nūl*. The translation in the *Tirukkuṟaḷ Uraikkottu* is: "Spies and celebrated codes of justice – know these two as a king's eyes."

[66] The Tamil Lexicon (p. 451) provides a quotation from the *Patikam* attached to the *Cilappatikāram*: *"urai cāṉṟa pattiṉi"*, which seems to rely on the explanations found in the *Arumpatavurai*: *"pukaḻ amainta pattiṉiyai"* and in the commentary by Aṭiyārkku Nallār *"pukaḻamainta kaṟpuṭai makaḷai"*.

[67] I would have expected these scholars to follow the *Tolkāppiyam*, but that might simply show I have not yet understood the real position of the *Tolkāppiyam* in those days.

Other occurrences of *nūl* in the *Kuṛaḷ* provide a glimpse on a number of scholarly activities such as

- compiling information (See *nūlōr tokuttavaṛṛuḷ*, Kuṛaḷ 322)
- disputing/discussing (See *nirampiya nūl iṉṛik kōṭṭi koḷal*, Kuṛaḷ 401)
- trying to be the best (See *nūlāruḷ nūl vallaṉ ākutal*, Kuṛaḷ 683)
- reaching conclusions (See *nūlōrkkum tuṇivu*, Kuṛaḷ 533)
- learning, studying (See *avaiyakattu añcumavaṉ kaṛṛa nūl*, Kuṛaḷ 727)
- forgetting (See *nūl maṛappar*, 560)
- being subtle (See *matinuṭpam nūlōṭu*, Kuṛaḷ 636)
- trying to be subtle (See *nuṇṇiya nūl pala kaṛpiṉum maṛṛum taṉ uṇmai aṛivē mikum*, Kuṛaḷ 373)

And we are also confronted with the difficult question of deciding who exactly were the *antaṇar*, this group of people[68] who seem to have a special place in the social order and their own books[69], which the *Tolkāppiyam* calls "*maṛai*".[70]

12. What is a *tantiram*, in Tamil literature?

We have already mentioned, at the beginning of this article, the fact that Iḷampūraṇar, while explaining the expression *tantiravutti* (TU), which he uses to gloss *utti*, says that *tantiram* means the same as *nūl*, and that his comment might mean that such an equivalence was not obvious for all Tamil users. The term certainly has a complex history.[71] We have already noted that *tantiram* is not found in the earliest strata of Tamil literature. According to the *Index des Mots de la Littérature Tamoule Ancienne*, it occurs in none of the *Eṭṭut Tokai* or the *Pattup Pāṭṭu* and it is not seen either in the *Tolkāppiyam* or in the *Kuṛaḷ*. The only

---

[68] I know of course that the term *antaṇar* is usually supposed to refer to "brahmins". The difficulty is to reconcile that identification with the frequently made statement that a great part of the Tamil literature was made by Jains. Without going to the same extremity as S. Ilakkuvanar [1963] who translates *antaṇar* (in TE102i) as "the learned" (op. cit. p. 40) and *pārppāṉ* (in Kuṛaḷ 134) as "a research scholar" (op. cit. p. 444), it seems reasonable not to accept uncritically interpretations of texts which have been transmitted in a strong religious context, after possibly being created in a different one.

[69] See Kuṛaḷ 543: *antaṇar nūṛkum aṛattiṛkum ātiyāy niṉṛatu maṉṉavaṉ kōl*.

[70] See TE102i: *ellā v-eḻutt-um veḷippaṭak kiḷantu // colliya paḷḷi y-eḻutaru vaḻiyiṉ // piṛappoṭu viṭuvaḻi uṛalcci vāratt(u) // akatt-eḻu vaḻi y-icai y-aril tapa nāṭi // aḷapiṛ kōṭal antaṇar maṛaitt-ē*. Iḷampūraṇar explains *antaṇar maṛaittu* by "*pārppār vētattuk kaṇṇatu*".

[71] According to Abhyankar and Shukla's *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar* [182-183], the word "is frequently used in the *Mahābhāṣya*, in the sense of 'intended' or *vivakṣita*. [...] The word is also explained in the sense of 'important'." See also Renou [TGS: 156]. On the other hand, in *Nyāya Sūtra* 1.1.27, *tantra* seems to refer to a philosophical school. See Ganganatha Jha's translation (vol. 1, p. 345): "Doctrine is of four distinct kinds: − (1) doctrine common to all philosophies, (2) doctrine peculiar to one philosophy, (3) doctrine resting on implication, and (4) hypothetical doctrine." (*saḥ caturvidhaḥ sarvatantrapratitantrādhikaraṇābhyupagamasaṃsthityarthāntarabhāvāt*).

important ancient text where this term has a visibility is the *Cilappatikāram*,[72] where we find several interesting examples:

- a reference to the *tantira karaṇam* (*Cilap.* 16-180) which the commentator explains as *"karavaṭa nūl"*[73], i.e. "A treatise on theft" (T.Lex, p. 744).
- a mention of the *tantira viṉaiñar* (Cilap. 26-41) which appear as one among four series: *"karuma viṉaiñaruṅ kaṇakkiyal viṉaiñarum // taruma viṉaiñarun tantira viṉaiñarum"* apparently in a royal context. The commentary is sadly missing, except for the portion that tells us that the *karuma viṉaiñar* are the *purōkitar* (i.e. the *purohita*-s, the priests), and we can probably hypothesize that the *kaṇakkiyal viṉaiñarum* are the accountants (or the mathematicians?), the *taruma viṉaiñar* might be the judges, but are the *tantira viṉaiñar* the magicians, as suggested by R.S. Pillai [1989: 101]?[74] We would like to know.
- An appearance in an even longer enumeration (Cil. 16-167) of 8 techniques which thieves use: *"mantiran teyva maruntē nimittam // tantira miṭaṉē kālaṅ karuviyeṉ // reṭṭuṭa naṉṟē yiḻukkuṭai marapiṟ // kaṭṭuṇ mākkaḷ ..."*.[75]

At a later period, we find *"tantiram"* in the *Tēvāram*, always accompanied by *"mantiram"*, and a standard explanation is that it refers to the "manual acts done in worship"[76] or to the *āgama*-s[77] See for instance:

---

[72] The *Index* also lists occurrences in *Iṉiyavai Nāṟpatu* (18-2) and *Ācārak Kōvai* (34-4).

[73] The *Arumpatavurai* says: *tantirakaraṇam — karavaṭanūl; kaḷavunūliṟ collukiṟa kiriyaiyumām*. ("*Tantirakaraṇam* [means] the treatise by Kharapaṭa; it is also the action described in the treatise on theft" (*Cilappatikāram* [UVS], p. 422). Interestingly, Kharapaṭa is known to the 7th century Pallava king Mahēndravarman, author of the Sanskrit play *Mattavilāsa-Prahasanam*. See Lockwood & Bhat [2005: 154-155]: *Namaḥ kharapaṭāyeti vaktavyaṃ yēna cōra-śāstraṃ praṇītam!* "You should say, 'Glory be to Kharapaṭa' — who taught the science of theft!".

[74] His translation of the series is: "the priests, [...], the time-keepers, moral teachers and magicians". Dikshitar [1939/1977, p. 342] has: "the purōhita [...], financiers, upholders of dharma, and executive officers". Daniélou and R.S. Desikan [1961: p. 198] seem to have missed one item in the enumeration, having only "aux prêtres, aux percepteurs d'impôt, aux administrateurs". And R. Parthasarathy [1993: p. 228] has "the royal priests, tax collectors, guards and officials".

[75] R.S. Pillai [1989: 68] translates: "Thieves who live on stolen goods have practices // Like magic, mystery, medicine, omen, cleverness // Place, time and tool, from which to choose."

[76] See VMS' explanations for the following *Tēvāram* hymns: 6-016(1) *mantiramum tantiramum āṉārpōlum* "is Vedic hymns and manual acts done in worship"; 6-096(5) *tantiramantirattarāy aruḷikkoṇṭār* "redeemed [the] living beings by manual acts in worship and *mantiram*."

[77] See VMS' explanations for the following *Tēvāram* hymns: 6-054(8) *mantiramum tantiramum maruntum ākit* "Being the *mantiram* of five letters, *ākamam*-s and rites performed according to the rules of *ākamam*-s."

(16)   *tantiram aṟiyāt takkaṉ vēḷviyait takarttañāṉṟu* (*Tēv.* 4-065_5) "on that day when the Lord destroyed the sacrifice of Takkaṉ who did not know the proper procedure." (VMS)

See also the famous hymn:

(17)   *mantiram _āvatu nīṟu; vāṉavarmēlatu nīṟu; // cuntaram _āvatu nīṟu; tutikkappaṭuvatu nīṟu; // tantiram _āvatu nīṟu; camayattil _uḷḷatu nīṟu;* (Tēv. 2-066_1)

"The sacred ash is our mantra, // the ash covers the bodies of the gods; // the sacred ash is all beautiful things, // the ash is all that is praised. // The sacred ash is the tantra text, // the ash is the core of our faith" (transl. Indira Viswanathan Peterson, 1991, p. 277)

13. The genesis of a rational universe: defining *nūl*, a *sūtra* style for Tamil

We now leave the world of men and celestial beings and return to technical literature and its long history in Tamil. I shall try to provide in a more detailed way pointers to the successive stages through which it may have passed. Although this was probably not the case at the beginning, at some point in its history this literature became self-conscious and technical texts began to incorporate, as appendices, a description of what technical literature should look like.[78] That self-consciousness was of course part of a wider movement towards a norm, which had been expressed in Sanskrit and in other languages[79] of India and which was percolating into the Tamil-speaking universe in the form of an unstable terminology. We see traces of the many Tamil attempts in a number of texts, none of which are easy to date.[80]

---

[78] Whether the norm was indeed used for composing new books is of course a question to be asked (if we compare the situation with our modern world, where a NORM is implemented in many individual books) but which is difficult to answer, because all we seem to find is a succession of singular books. Another possible point of view is to say that, in the multilingual Indian universe, Tamil itself was becoming a "scientific" topic, as the result of an effort emulating those efforts which had long ago resulted in the ripening of disciplines such as *Vyākaraṇa*, *Nyāya*, *Arthaśāstra*, etc. In this context, "scientific" (trans-linguistically) means "which can be characterized by a *sūtra* (or a *tantra*, etc.)". This means that some users of Tamil were competing for defining a "perfect *sūtra*" for Tamil. In that way, the SINGLE norm can coexist with a PLURALITY of attempts (or intentions) of creating a treatise. But all that remains for us to see is the book which succeeded in being composed as an incarnation of this norm, and which contains, as an appendix, a self-conscious tentative description of the norm that it wanted to implement.

[79] See N. Balbir [1987]: "The perfect sūtra as defined by the Jainas". Interestingly in that case the number "32" is attached to "the number of *doṣa*-s" (op. cit. p. 10).

[80] Another text might have been included in the present enumeration: Nakkīrar's commentary on Iṟaiyaṉār's *Kaḷaviyal*. It quotes old verses characterizing *nūl* and *cūttiram*.

- **[A]** An early instance is found in the *marapiyal*, the last chapter inside the *Tolkāppiyam*. That chapter contains, from TP 639i to TP 656i, a characterization of what a *nūl* "treatise" is or should be. That characterization describes the two types of *nūl*, called *mutal nūl* and *vaḻi nūl*, the second type being further subdivided into four. The description mentions the constitution and the various components involved: *cūttiram*, *kāṇṭikai*, *urai*. It also explains the ten defects (*citaivu*) to be avoided and enumerates those technical devices, the TUs, which we have been examining since the beginning of this article, and which are called the *utti*-s (skt. *yukti*) in the TP.

- **[B]** Another early instance is found inside what is now considered as the 8th chapter of the TP, the *Ceyyuḷiyal*, in the group of six *sūtra*-s starting with TP 468i and ending with TP 473i. The *Ceyyuḷiyal* may have originally been an independent work and the following paragraphs point to possible contradictions which would be solved if this was the case.

- **[C]** Another instance is found inside the *Pāyiram* section of the YV, that commentary to the YA which we have already examined a number of times [cf. supra 11 and 12]. That section combines a number of anonymous verses with verses explicitly said to belong to the *Tolkāppiyam*, all of them being surrounded by prose explanations.[81]

- **[D]** Still another instance is found inside the last section of the YV.[82] The starting point in that case is also *nūl*, but *nūl* is subdivided this time into three types, called *tantiram*, *cūttiram* and *virutti*.[83] Among the features mentioned, we find the seven *āciriyar mata vikaṟpam*-s, the ten faults (*kuṟṟam*), the ten qualities (*māṇpu*), the thirteen *urai*, and the 32 *tantira-vutti*-s, for which the complete list that we have already reproduced in 8 is given, whereas the other features are not completely enumerated, because the enumerations have been made in the *Pāyiram* section (see C). As we have already explained, while discussing 10, the modern editors of the YV link these elements with the *Naṉṉūl*, but this is unlikely[84] and it is said that these elements stem from a lost text, the *Pāṭalaṉār urai*, mentioned just after these elements.[85]

---

[81]The passages to be considered are on the following pages: YV[1998][2-5, 10-14].

[82] [YV[1998]: 451-452] [YV[1917]: 405] [YV[1973]: 427].

[83] It is not clear whom the commentator is quoting while making this enumeration.

[84] See the explanations by UVS and TVG (vol. 16 of TIPA, p. 136) already mentioned.

[85] To give an example, the *pattu vakai māṇpu* are said in YV (which does not give the list) to start with *curuṅka vaittal*, but the N *sūtra* referred to by the YV editors is "[1] *curuṅkac collal* [2] *viḷaṅka vaittal* // [3] *naviṉṟōrk kiṉimai* [4] *naṉmoḻi puṇarttal* // [5] *ōcai yuṭaimai* [6] *yāḷamuṭait tātal* // [7] *muṟaiyiṉ vaippē* [8] *yulakamalai yāmai* // [9] *viḻumiyatu payattal* [10] *viḷaṅkutā raṇatta* // *tākuta ṉūliṟ kaḷakeṇum pattē*." Interestingly, the VC version of that list (called *tantirakuṇam*, cf. Infra) starts with "[1] *curuṅka vaittal* [2] *viḷaṅkac collal* // [...]" and its order is slightly different because [7] and [8] exchange their positions.

- **[E]** The passage just mentioned is followed inside YV by a series of six verses which seem to be borrowed from the *Ceyyuḷiyal*,[86] 8th chapter of the TP, although the author of the YV does not say that he is quoting from the TP, as he often does. The interesting (and strange) fact, however, is that although these six verses start as an explanation of *nūl*, still another classificatory scheme is mentioned in those verses, which explain *cūttiram*, *ōttu*, *paṭalam* and *piṇṭam*.

- **[F]** Interestingly, if the YV was really quoting from the TP (and its *ceyyuḷiyal*), the choice of six verses was made carefully, so as not to make it apparent that the explanation of *nūl* was part of a wider explanation, where *nūl* was one item among seven varieties (*eḻu nilam*) of what, collectively called *yāppu* and defined in TP384i, is the metrical level standing above *aṭi,* "line". The complete enumeration of seven varieties is 1. *pāṭṭu*, 2. *urai*, 3. *nūl*, 4. *vāymoḻi* (alias *mantiram*), 5. *pici*, 6. *aṅkatam* (alias *coṟ-kuṟippu*), 7. *mutucol*

- **[G]** Another possible reason for the YV not to quote the TP completely is that the author may have objected to having too many contradictions in the terminological usage. If the seven varieties just enumerated above are varieties of *yāppu*, they have to be metrical forms, made of lines, which forces one to give a special meaning to the word *urai*. This might be the reason why the YV preferred to cite verses giving the opinions of two other authors (whose works are now lost).

- **[H]** One of them, Palkāyaṉār, mentions the fact that "even though *urai* (and also *nūl*) are not divided into metrical lines, this is not to be rejected",[87] a statement that presupposes that commentaries are usually written in prose.[88] And he also says that the same is true of three other genres: *moḻi*,[89] *pici* and *mutu-col*.[90] Still another verse by him explicitly mentions eight genres. The enumeration is: 1. *pāṭṭu*, 2. *urai*, 3. *nūl*, 4. *mantiram*, 5. *pici*, 6. *mutucol*, 7. *aṅkatam*, 8. *vāḻttu* and ends with *piṟavum* ("and others").

- **[I]** The other one, Naṟṟattaṉār, says essentially the same thing about *urai* and *nūl*, which do not have to be divided into metrical lines. And he says this also applies to *vāymoḻi*, to *pici* and to *mutucol*.

The general impression drawn from all these fragments is that the early treatises were struggling to stabilise the meaning of words borrowed or translated from Sanskrit. As words borrowed, one can mention: *cūttiram* (*sūtra*), *utti* (*yukti*), *tantiram* (*tantra*), *virutti* (*vṛtti*), *mantiram* (*mantra*), *paṭalam* (*paṭala*),

---

[86] They are identical with the group of six starting with TP 468i and ending with TP 473i.

[87] *uraiyoṭu nūlivai aṭiyila naṭappiṉum // varaivila eṉpa vāymolip pulavar* (YV[1998], p. 453).

[88] As far as *nūl* is concerned, the statement seems to make more sense for Sanskrit grammatical literature, in which the *sūtra* is not a verse form, as opposed to *kārikā*.

[89] This could be the equivalent of the *vāy-moḻi*.

[90] *moḻi pici mutucol mūṉṟum aṉṉa* (YV[1998], p. 453).

piṇṭam (*piṇḍa*), *matam* (*mata*). As Tamil words used as equivalent of Sanskrit words, one can mention *nūl* (*sūtra*), *vāy-moḻi* (*mantra*). As words which are probably used as Tamil equivalents of Sanskrit words, one can mention *kuṟṟam* (*doṣa?*), *urai* (*bhāṣya?*), *pici* "enigma, riddle" (*brāhmaṇa?*), *mutu-col* (proverb?). As words of unclear origin, one can mention *kāṇṭikai* "concise commentary",[91] *aṅkatam* "satire". Another general impression is that these early theoreticians were sometimes translating classificatory schemes without necessarily being interested in all the branches of the original scheme. This is seen in the fact that *nūl* and *cūttiram* get the lion's share (after *pāṭṭu*, of course) in the descriptive schemes, whereas some other items are dealt with very briefly. One of the main goals was of course to standardize for Tamil the equivalent of the *sūtra* style. It was decided that *sūtra* would be translated as *nūl* when it referred to a whole treatise and that individual *sūtra*-s would be referred to as *cūttiram*. An additional difficulty in the adaptation was that the *sūtra* in Sanskrit was not a metrical form, but rather a prose form constrained by aphoristic brevity achieved by such means as *anuvṛtti,* requiring words or expressions stated once to continue to be supplied through several subsequent *sūtra*-s, whereas the genre which was being defined for Tamil was a metrical one, making use of a metre which would be called *āciriyam*/*āciriyappā* (or *nūṟpā?*),[92] based on a rhythm/beat (*tūkku*) specified as *akaval* (or *akavalōcai*). And as far as reconduction techniques of *anuvṛtti* were concerned, they never seem to have been very strictly adapted to Tamil, although the intention was probably there to use them, and although a number of Tamil theoreticians knew how they were supposed to operate in a Sanskrit text, as can be seen from the explanations they give concerning the technical term *atikāram*, one of the 32 *tantiravutti-* s.

    As other sources of information (besides the YV and TP), we have also mentioned the VC, that Tamil Buddhist grammatical text, possibly belonging to the 11th century, and its commentary (VCC). Especially interesting is verse (or *kārikai*) 180[93] of the VC. That verse reads:

(18a) *tantira vutti kuṇamata mēyuraitark kantaṉṉil // vantiya leṇkōṇ mutalā yuḻamālai māṟṟumuṉṉā // vantiyal cittira meṉṟiṉ ṉavumalaṅ kārameṉṟē // tantiya laccilar coṉṉā ravaṟṟaiyuñ cārntaṟiyē.* (VC 1942: 270)

---

[91] Note that a proper noun (*khaṇḍika*) is mentioned in Pāṇini 4.3.102, from which the KV derives *"khāṇḍikīyāḥ"*.

[92] However, it became possible, after a few centuries had elapsed, to find the equivalent for Tamil of an opposition between *sūtra* and *kārikā*, because it became at some point the fashion to write treatises in a new (and more constrained) meter, called *kaṭṭaḷaik kalittuṟai*. The VC and the YK make use of that metre.

[93] Our reference is to T.V. Gopal Iyer's 2005 edition, where the verse is on p. 678. Inside the 1942 edition, the verse is numbered 178 (and found on page 270), whereas inside the 1881 *editio princeps* (dated *vicu varuṣam, cittirai mācam*) (Chicago University library, S. Vaiyāpuri Piḷḷai's copy) by Ci. Vai. Tāmōtaram Piḷḷai, the verse is the 38th inside the 5th section (*Alaṅkārappaṭalam*), on p. 183.

Only the first part of that verse is of concern to us here,[94] and the commentator glosses it, in a preliminary way, thus:

(18b) *tantiravuttiyum   tantirakuṇamum   āciriyamatamum   tantiravuraiyum*
tantiranūliṟconṉa   veṇkōḷum   ētuvum   eṭuttukkāṭṭum   piramāṇamum
mutaliyaṉavum (VC 1881: 183)

He then proceeds to give a list of the 32 *tantiravutti*, which we have already examined (See (14), above). That list is followed by a list of ten *tantirakuṇam* (Sanskrit *tantra-guṇa*), which turns out to be almost identical with the list of 10 beauties (*aḻaku* or *māṇpu*) of a *nūl*, but which does not seem to have much in common with the list of *tantraguṇa*-s found in the Sanskrit text *Yuktidīpikā* (See Oberhammer 1996:109). Then comes a list of the seven *āciriyamatam*, which is almost identical with the one in N10m (except that items 1 and 2 have exchanged places). Finally, there is a list of fourteen *tantiravurai*, which is quite similar to but has one more item than the "*patiṉmūṉṟu vakai urai*" mentioned in the YV, although both start with "*cūttiram tōṟṟal*".[95] It must be noted that the explanations and the examples seem in fact rather clumsy. A possible explanation is that the form used for composing the VC, the *tilatam* verse, i.e. a form of *kaṭṭaḷaik kalittuṟai*,[96] is not at all adapted to the *sūtra* style (much less than the *āciriyam*[97]).

14. Do *paribhāṣā*-s exist in Tamil technical literature?

Another important ingredient, for the Sanskrit speaking world, in the characterization of a *sūtra* literature lies in the presence of *paribhāṣā*-s.[98] In the case of the Sanskrit grammatical tradition, we find in Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* some

---

[94] Unlike a *cūttiram* (*sūtra*), a *kārikai* (*kārikā*) can contain several unconnected topics grouped together. The second part of the *kārikai* deals with special figurative poetic genres (*cittirac ceyyuḷ*), such as *mālaimāṟṟu*, etc.

[95] This time, the full list of thirteen does not appear in the *Naṉṉūl*, but in the *pāyiram* section of the YV. It reads: *patiṉmūṉṟu tiṟam āvaṉa* [1] *cūttiraṉ tōṉṟal* (VAR?), [2] *col vakuttal*, [3] *coṟporuḷ uraittal*, [4] *viṉātal*, [5] *viṭuttal*, [6] *vicēṭam kāṭṭal*, [7] *utāraṇam kāṭṭal*, [8] *āciriya vacaṉam kāṭṭal*, [9] *atikāra varavu kāṭṭal*, [10] *koṭuttu muṭittal*, [11] *virittuk kāṭṭal*, [12] *tuṇivu kūṟal*, [13] *payaṉoṭu puṇarttal*.

[96] See VC[1942], p. 174, footnote.

[97] So called because it was the metre appropriate for teachers.

[98] See for instance Renou [1963:178], reprinted in Balbir & Pinault [1997:582]. "Mais la nouveauté qui devait être la plus importante, au moins par ses effets indirects, est celle des *paribhāṣā* ou « règles interprétatoires » : axiomes qui doivent être présents à l'esprit de l'usager en sorte qu'on puisse en suppléer le contenu à l'endroit précis qui convient. Il n'y avait rien de pareil dans les Br. où le discours progressait sans implications « gouvernantes ». Dans les Sū., le procédé a concouru à l'économie de mots, puisque les choses enseignées par voie de *paribhāṣā*, s'appliquant en principe « à tous les sacrifices », comme précise Śāṅkh 1.1, 29, n'auront pas besoin d'être redites. Le système des *paribhāṣā* du rituel n'est ni aussi cohérent ni aussi articulé que celui des pbh. pāṇinéennes qui dépendent souvent d'un indice révélateur puisé dans les sū. mêmes (un *jñāpaka*) ...".

paribhāṣā sūtra-s, "meta-rules",[99] with a high level of metagrammatical[100] vocabulary. Other meta-rules are contained in texts that comment on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, such as Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* . The need was felt to regroup these meta-rules together in special treatises, such as the *Paribhāṣāsaṃgraha*, attributed to Vyāḍi, or the *Paribhāṣenduśekhara*, composed by Nāgeśabhaṭṭa, or in special subsections of treatises, such as the 2nd chapter of the *Siddhāntakaumudī*,[101] the famous reordered version of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, or the 17th chapter (*Nyāyakhaṇḍa*) inside the *Prakriyāsarvasva*.[102] In the case of the Tamil grammatical tradition, although metagrammatical vocabulary exists, the necessity does not seem to have been felt for an independent treatise to be composed, which would deal with meta-rules. However, the Sanskrit word *paribhāṣā* itself is used at least once in a Tamil text, under a suitably adapted form. We find indeed inside the initial part of the YV the following explanations:[103]

(19a) *cūttiram āṟu vakaippaṭum. peyarc cūttiram, vitic cūttiram, vilakkiyaṟ cūttiram, niyamac cūttiram, atikārac cūttiram, ñāpakac cūttiram eṉa. [...] paripāṭaic cūttiram eṉpaṉavum uḷa. avai īṇṭut tantira uttiyuḷḷē paṭṭu aṭaṅkum eṉak koḷka.* (YV[1998], p.11-12).

Several types of translations are possible for this passage, depending on the type of knowledge which is presupposed from the reader. Readers familiar with the Sanskrit grammatical terminology, as expounded inside Abhyankar and Shukla's A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar (henceforth ADSG) might be offered a preliminary "translation" (or gloss) such as what follows in 19b,[104] although the phrase *jñāpaka sūtra* might appear problematic to them, because *jñāpaka* "indirect or implicit revealer" usually seems to be understood as an "indicatory wording"[105] which appears inside a *sūtra*, rather than as a category of *sūtra*.

---

[99] See for instance, the two *sūtra*-s "*tasminn iti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya*" (P 1.1.66) and "*tasmād ity uttarasya*" (P 1.1.67). Katre [1989: 26] writes about 1.1.66: "This is a metalinguistic rule (*paribhāṣā*) and denotes the right context before which the operation takes place". About 1.1.67, he says: "This indicates the left context after which the operation indicated obtains."

[100] See footnote 32.

[101] That chapter contains thirteen *sūtra*-s, numbered 34 to 46. The two *sūtra*-s mentioned in footnote 2 are S 40 and S 41.

[102] That chapter contains 118 *nyāya*-s (See Narayanapisharoty, K.P., 1998, pp. 538-550). The work was composed by Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa in 1616.

[103] This is contained in the section commenting the *ciṟappup pāyiram* "special preface".

[104] Note however that there is no entry for *tantrayukti* in the ADSG.

[105] See in ADSG, p. 163, the entries *jñāpaka* and *jñāpaka samuccaya*.

(19b) "There are six types of *sūtra*-s: *saṃjñā-sūtra*-s, *vidhi-sūtra*-s, *pratiṣedha-sūtra*-s, *niyama-sūtra*-s, *adhikāra-sūtra*-s[106] and *jñāpaka-sūtra*-s.[107] There exist also those called **paribhāṣā-sūtra-s**. [But] one can consider that they are included here under **tantrayukti-s**."[108]

It must, however, be noted that, although the continuation of this passage characterizes the word *cūttiram* as a *vaṭa-moḻi tiri-col* "a word adapted from Sanskrit", and although the six expressions *vitic cūttiram, niyamac cūttiram, atikārac cūttiram, ñāpakac cūttiram, paripāṭaic cūttiram* and *tantira utti* are visibly borrowings from Sanskrit adapted to Tamil phonology (the original Sanskrit expressions being those used in my translation), two expressions, *peyarc cūttiram* and *vilakkiyaṛ cūttiram* could be described as loan translations. And the reason I have "translated" them as *saṃjñā-sūtra*-s and *pratiṣedha-sūtra*-s is because they are part of a traditional Sanskrit list of six types of *sūtra*, which ADGS reproduces from a verse contained in the commentary on *Kātantra* I.1.2

(20) *saṃjñā ca paribhāṣā ca vidhir niyama eva ca ǀ pratiṣedho'dhikāraś ca ṣaḍvidhaṃ sūtralakṣaṇam* (ADGS, p. 432, s.v. *sūtra*)

It is clear that the lists in (19a) and (20) do not coincide exactly. It must also be noted that although the apparent identity of the designations, allowed by the borrowing, might lead one to think that the meaning is the same, the author of the YV provides us with Tamil explanations concerning the six subdivisions of *cūttiram*,[109] and it is these explanations, and not the (apparent) Sanskrit translation, which can really tell us what these expressions are intended for, in their original context. We cannot expect them to necessarily coincide with what someone familiar with Sanskrit grammatical literature would spontaneously read into them. For instance, the explanation concerning *sūtra*-s of the *atikārac cūttiram* type is as follows:

(21) *atikārac cūttiramāvatu, āṛṛoḻukku, arimāṉ nōkkam, cārccivaḻi (var. cāraccilvaḻi) oḻukutal, tavaḷaip pāyttu eṉpaṉavaṛṛuḷ oṉṛu ēṛkum vakaiyāl iyaintu poruḷ viḷaippatu* (YV 1998, p 11)

Such a passage, when literally translated, would probably be understood differently by someone more familiar with the Pāṇinian tradition and by someone who has only studied Tamil grammatical literature. For the Sanskritist, the expression *adhikāra-sūtra* "governing *sūtra*", if used in order to render *atikārac cūttiram*, would bring to mind a central feature in the organization of Pāṇini's grammar, which S.D. Joshi and S. Bhate describe in

---

[106] Superintending aphorism, which gives its meaning in the number of aphorisms that follow. (Abh. p.15). This seems identical with *adhikāra* (Abh.p. 14) "governing rule" and related with the 4th meaning of Adhikaraṇa (Abh. p. 14).

[107] In Sanskrit terminology, as described in Abhyankar [1986: 163], *jñāpaka* means "indirect or implicit revealer", i.e. "indicatory wording" found in a *sūtra*, but "*jñāpaka sūtra*" does not seem to be a received category.

[108] Readers who do not wear Sanskrit spectacles might however consider, rightly, this translation as unsatisfactory.

[109] These explanations stand in the omitted section in (1).

their 1984 book *The fundamentals of Anuvṛtti*. Additionally, the expression *tavaḷaip pāyttu* "frog jump", found inside (3), would bring to the Sanskritist's mind the expressions *maṇḍūkapluti* "frog jump" and *maṇḍūkagati* "frog gait",[110] which according to Renou [1940, Vol. 1, p. 85] refer mostly to an audacious ("audacieux") procedure ("procédé") made use of in late commentaries, in order to extend the power of *anuvṛtti*. Similarly, *arimāṉ nōkkam* "lion's (backward) look, (as he advances)", would bring to their mind the *siṃhāvalokana*, which Renou [1940, Vol. 1, p. 85] describes, possibly facetiously, as "une autre extension grave", i.e. "far-reaching extension"[111].

15. Some difficulties in interpreting TYs: *anuvṛtti* features

Despite the enthusiastic view (see fn.33) which can be had of TYs (and of TUs), because of their utility, it remains a fact that they are not an easy subject. In the case of TYs, the main reasons which make the subject into a complex one are **1.** that several divergent enumerations of TYs exist, some having more than 32 terms, **2.** that some of the TYs are understood very differently by different authors, as can be seen from the glosses and examples which they provide, and **3.** that many of the individual TYs have a long history as technical terms in the field of *vyākaraṇa* "grammar", which does not seem to recognize the category of TY,[112] although it is possible that one subset of the TY list may have been linked with an attempt to describe the *anuvṛtti* mechanism, which it is necessary to master, if one wants properly to decode the sūtra-s of Pāṇini's grammar.[113] Examining this question does not directly belong in the present study, but it is nevertheless necessary to say something about it in order to explain some of the statements made by Iḷampūraṇar while explaining the second element in his list *atikāra muṟai*.[114] It is also required, if one wants to understand some of the discrepancies between Dikshitar [1930] and Sastri [1936], which we have listed

---

[110] Cf. ADSG, p. 298.

[111] One can imagine the smile on his face while examining the successive (sometimes *ad hoc*) reinterpretations. See also ADSG, p. 428, entry *siṃhāvalokitanyāya*.

[112] Lele [1981] says that Pāṇini himself knew the TYs, but this opinion does not seem to be accepted by all: Abhyankar includes no entry for *tantrayukti* in his dictionary.

[113] Note for instance the presence of the words *yoga* "(following) rule" and *nirdeśa* "mention (of a term)" in the *vārttika* cited in (6) (cf. infra). Both of them belong to several TY lists, although with a different meaning. But stability of meaning does not seem to be a key feature of enumerations. Another item found with a different meaning in the TY lists and in Kātyāyana's vocabulary is *vidhāna*. "prescription" Cf. *lavidhānād vihitam* (Vt.2 ad Pāṇini 1.3.12) "[the endings called *parasmaipada* and *ātmanepada*] have been prescribed after the prescription of [the section heading] *lasya*" (transl. Roodbergen: 1991: 294). See also the discussion on *vidhi* and *vidhāna* in Bhate [1970: 171]. Renou [1942: 494] explains, concerning *vidhāna* (in the section devoted to non-pāṇinian terminology): "Whitney propose « fait de mettre à part »".

[114] See also the passage (TC1c, par.6, p.38 in Chevillard [1996]) where Cēṉāvaraiyar explains how Sanskrit grammarians *(vaṭa nūlar)* understand the word *atikāram*.

in Chart 5b. Those discrepancies involve the two first TYs in the AŚ list on the one hand, and the two first TUs in the Tolkāppiyam list on the other hand. The facts are the following.

- *adhikaraṇam* [A01] is explained by Dikshitar as "that division of a book which centres round a chief topic and deals wholly with that topic" and is equated by him with *"nutaliyatu aṟital"*, the 1st element in Pērāciriyar's list.

- Contrary to that, *adhikaraṇam* [A01] is equated by Sāstri with *"atikāra muṟai"*, the 2nd TU in Iḷampūraṇar's list, which he translates by "deciding the extent where one serves as *adhikāra sūtra*[115] or a word or words in a *sūtra* taken along with the *sūtra*-s that follow"

- In contradistinction to that, Dikshitar, who follows Pērāciriyar and reads the 2nd TU as *"atikāra muṟaimai"*, equates it with *vidhānam* [A02], which he translates as "the subject of treatment in due order"

- Finally, Sastri does not propose a TY equivalent for *"nutaliyatu aṟital"*, the 1st element in Iḷampūraṇar's list, but translates is as "understanding the purport of a *sūtra*"

If Dikshitar's understanding of [A01] *adhikaraṇam* and [A02] *vidhānam* seems to be in accordance with the views which are expressed in the chapter XV of the *Arthaśāstra*,[116] it is not obvious that the *Tolkāppiyam* commentators would have agreed with his translations (or with his identifications). Sastri's remarks, on the other hand, seem to be more in line with the commentators' point of view, but cannot be understood without making a small incursion into Pāṇini's grammar because the phenomenon he refers to is based, according to tradition, on *sūtra* 1.3.11 in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī,* which reads:

(22) *svaritenādhikāraḥ* "an *adhikāra* is marked with a *svarita* accent" (Joshi & Bhate [1984])[117]

That *sūtra* is complemented by a *vārttika*, which says

(23) *adhikāraḥ pratiyogaṁ tasyānirdeśārthaḥ* "An *adhikāra* 'heading rule' is meant for the non-mention of X with regard to each (following) rule" (Joshi & Bhate [1984])

---

[115] He adds in a footnote: "*Adhikāra-sūtra* is one which does not operate by itself but it is taken on to the succeeding *sūtra*-s. The device is used for the sake of brevity."

[116] According to several sources (such as Fezas [1994]), *adhikaraṇa* [A01] and *vidhāna* [A02] have to do with the division of the AŚ into "books" (*adhikaraṇa*), "chapters" (*adhyāya*) and "sections" (*prakaraṇa*), the *vidhāna* [A02] being the "table of contents", which occupies chapter 1 in Book 1.

[117] The translation given here and for the following 2 item is the one by S.D. Joshi and Saroja Bhate in their 1984 book *The Fundamentals of Anuvṛtti* (p. 1), where the recurrence mechanism is examined in a very detailed way. 105 conventions governing *anuvṛtti* are summarized on pp. 271-279.

Another explanation (or description of the phenomenon) is found in the *Kāśikāvṛtti*, where it is said that:

(24)   "the word-form which is marked with *svarita*-quality presents itself in the following rule, because it is appointed over (i.e., commissioned to do so)" (Joshi & Bhate [1984])

That such an organizational system (of some Sanskrit texts) was known to a Tamil commentator like Iḷampūraṇar is clear from the statement he makes[118] while commenting on the TU *"atikāra muṛai"* and also from the examples he gives[119]. However such a rigid organizational principle (as is the *anuvṛtti*) is probably not characteristic of the *Tolkāppiyam*, which, partly for metrical reasons, does not seem to strive especially for brevity of expression. One may also wonder whether the commentators think that the list of TUs found in in TP656i/TP665p applies to the the *Tolkāppiyam* itself. Must a treatise describe itself? One could of course also think that they provide illustrations for the various *utti*-s drawn from the *Tolkāppiyam*, because it is an easier task and because their students already know the T. It remains however difficult to say what their real opinion may have been. They may also have been quite puzzled by the presence of some items in the list and by the task of distinguishing seemingly synonymous expressions.

16. The strategies used in the First-translation of TYs

We finally come back to the question of the strategies which have been used for the creation of the TU lists, and which we try to distinguish, using the letter A, B, C and D (see the beginning of the article).

      Among them, **Strategy A**, which consists in directly importing a Sanskrit word, was used extremely sparingly in List A, which contains 2 (or possibly 3) Sanskrit words and one borrowed from Prakrit. They are:

- *atikāram* (Skt. *adhikāra)*, which appears in *atikāra muṛai* (I2) or *atikāra muṛaimai* (P2)

- *ñāpakam* (Skt. *jñāpaka*)[120], which appears in the TU *ñāpakam kūṛal*.

- *āṇai* (Pkt. *āṇā*, Skt. *ājñā*), which appears in the TU *āṇai kūṛal* (I21/P21).

Sanskrit words are used even more sparingly in list B, which has only 2:

---

[118] *oru cūttirattilē karutiṉa poruḷai vaittu varukiṉṟa cūttirattuḷ otātu ataṉ kāriyam āyiṉa kūṛiya - vaḻi ataṉaic cūttiran tōṛuṅ koṇarnturaittal* "having reserved (for future use) the topic of one sūtra, not having to formulate it again in [each] following sūtra, when what is to be effected by that [sūtra-s] is said, bring it to each of the [following] sūtras!"

[119] He refers to the reconduction of item *"kacatapa"* (a phonological context) from rule TE204i to rule TE205i.

[120] The possible third Sanskrit word is *tantu* (inside I30) See discussion in fn. 124 (infra).

- *ētu* (Skt. *hetu*), which appears in the TU *ētuviṉ muṭittal*

- *vikaṟpam* (Skt *vikalpa*), which appears in the TU *vikaṟpattiṉ muṭittal*.

However, if these two last TUs are likely candidates for being the translations of the TYs *hetvarthaḥ* and *vikalpaḥ*, the correspondences are not so obvious for the first three, and we have seen that Sastri and Dikshitar disagree (see Chart 5c) on the TYs which must be considered as the originals for *āṇai kūṟal* and for the two competing variants *atikāra muṟai* and *atikāra muṟaimai*.

As far as **Strategy B** is concerned, which consists in using Tamil items but giving them a new meaning, one is tempted to see it used in the making of *oru-talai moḻi* (I11) as a calque of *ekāntaḥ*. [...]

Strategy C might have been used in order to solve the very difficult problem caused by the absence of *upasarga*-s in Tamil.[121]

Strategy D is probably the one which has been used the most because quite a number of TUs look like translations not of the TY term itself, but of the gloss which normally accompanies it. The strongest argument for that is that all TYs are nouns, in which one can distinguish one or several preverbs, combined with a verbal root and a nominal suffix. By contrast, all TUs are nominalized sentences. This means that a direct equation between one TY and one TU never seems to be possible, because TYs are too compact. TUs rather appear as glosses of TYs, or, possibly, as Tamil translations of traditional (Sanskrit?) glosses of TYs. More precisely, there seem to be resemblances between the TUs and several of the Sanskrit glosses seen in the 15th chapter of the *Arthaśāstra*.[122] The following chart (Chart 9) reproduces those Sanskrit glosses and indicate a few TUs[123] that might be adaptations:

Artha Śāstra glosses	TUs
1. *yam artham adhikṛtyocyate tad adhikaraṇam*	
2. *śāstrasya prakaraṇānupūrvī vidhānam*	
3. *vākyayojanā yogaḥ*	
4. *padāvadhikaḥ padārthaḥ //*	

---

[121] Making use sometimes of Tamil converbs *(viṉai eccam)* in a strange way.
[122] That I make use of the AŚ glosses in this inquiry does not mean that I believe that they were the source. I have currently no precise opinion on the question, because I think the preliminary task is to bring the data to a state of "availability for comparison" which will make it possible to draw conclusions later. As indicated in the Appendix, the TY literature in Sanskrit is quite copious. Besides, the original source for List A might very well be a Prakrit text. And all sorts of texts can be usefully compared (see for instance Hara [1974, pp.79-80], where Kauṇḍinya's commentary is compared with the the 15th chapter in the *Arthaśāstra*. This promises to be a long inquiry.
[123] The fact that most cells on the right-hand side of Chart 9 are empty simply means that my inquiry is not over and will be continued in forthcoming articles.

Artha Śāstra glosses	TUs
mūlahara iti padam	
5. *hetur arthasādhako hetvarthaḥ*	
6. *samāsavākyam uddeśaḥ*	*tokuttuk kūṟal*, I3
7. *vyāsavākyaṃ nirdeśaḥ*	*vakuttu meyn niṟuttal*, I4
8. *evaṃ vartitavyam ity upadeśaḥ*	
9. *evam asāv āhety apadeśaḥ*	*piṟaṉ kōṭ kūṟal*, I25
10. *uktena sādhanam atideśaḥ*	*vantatu koṇṭu vārātatu muṭittal*, I8
11. *vaktavyena sādhanaṃ pradeśaḥ*	*vārātataṉāṉ vantatu muṭittal*, I7
12. *dṛṣṭenādṛṣṭasya sādhanam upamānam*	
13. *yad anuktam arthād āpadyate sārthāpattiḥ*	*moḷiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉṟi muṭittal*, I6
14. *ubhayatohetumān arthaḥ saṃśayaḥ*	
15. *prakaraṇāntareṇa samāno 'rthaḥ prasaṅgaḥ*	
16. *pratilomena sādhanaṃ viparyayaḥ*	
17. *yena vākyaṃ samāpyate sa vākyaśeṣaḥ*	
18. *paravākyam apratiṣiddham anumatam*	
19. *atiśayavarṇanā vyākhyānam*	
20. *guṇataḥ śabdaniṣpattir nirvacanam*	
21. *dṛṣṭānto dṛṣṭāntayukto nidarśanam*	
22. *abhiplutavyapakarṣaṇam apavargaḥ*	
23. *parair asamitaḥ śabdaḥ svasaṃjñā*	
24. *pratiṣeddhavyaṃ vākyaṃ pūrvapakṣaḥ*	

Artha Śāstra glosses	TUs
25. *tasya nirṇayanavākyam uttarapakṣaḥ*	
26. *sarvatrāyattam ekāntaḥ*	
27. *paścād evaṃ vihitam ity anāgatāvekṣaṇam*	
28. *purastād evaṃ vihitam ity atikrāntāvekṣaṇam*	
29. *evaṃ nānyathēti niyogaḥ*	
30. *anena vānena veti vikalpaḥ*	
31. *anena cānena ceti samuccayaḥ*	
32. *anuktakaraṇam ūhyam*	

Chart 9 (Artha Śāstra TY glosses)

17. Conclusions and perspectives

I have now reached the end of this paper but certainly not a fully conclusive position concerning the problem I have started here to explore. I would like to try now to sum up some of the points made and some of the problems encountered.

- The scholar who composed the final *Tolkāppiyam* sūtra (TP656i /TP665p) must have been a bilingual (Sanskrit-Tamil) scholar and he certainly knew what he was trying to say from the point of view of Sanskrit, although the exact nature of his original source **(List X)** remains hidden to us (but several scholars think it was the AŚ list).

- Those who came after him and memorized/used his text had to understand it in a Tamil monolingual context, and their degree of proficiency in Sanskrit may have been quite variable.

- In the practice of commenting, there arose different interpretations as to which TU might be applicable in a given context.[124]

---

[124] To give one more example of dissent between commentators, both Iḷampūraṇar and Naccinārkkiṉiyar think that the phrase *"niṟṟal vēṇṭum"* found in TE34i/TE34n (a *sūtra* which deals with *kuṟṟiyal ikaram*) must be reconducted in TE36i/TE36n (a *sūtra* which deals with *kuṟṟiyal ukaram*). However, Iḷampūraṇar says (under TE36i) that the reconduction is accomplished thanks to the TU *"tantu puṇarntu uraittal"* (I30/P30) whereas Naccinārkkiṉiyar says (under TE36n) that this happens thanks to the TU *"atikāra muṟaimai"* (P2). Naccinārkkiṉiyar's statement is in conformity with Pērāciriyar's illustration of P2 (under TP665p). Iḷampūraṇar does not explicitly mention TE34i and TE36i while generally explaining I30 (under TP656i) but his explanations might have to do with the fact that one jumps over TE35i, whereas Pērāciriyar's interpretation of the same TU seems to be completely different. And the word *"tantu"* inside the phrase *"tantu puṇarntu uraittal"* could be the Sanskrit noun *tantu* "thread" (see T.Lex. p.1747) in the context of Iḷampūraṇar's interpretation whereas it must be the converb of *tarutal*

- In the field of Sanskrit scholastic literature, several concurring TY lists were in use and a number of commentators produced a number of glosses which often differed widely as to what the intended meaning of individual TYs might be (See Appendix A).

- An additional difficulty was that many items in the TY lists were also technical terms with a precise meaning in the field of *vyākaraṇa*, that meaning being different from the one attributed to them in the context of the TY lists.

- Inside the Tamil community of scholars, the need was felt to prepare a new list (List B), but it is not clear whether that new list was intended **(a)** as a reformulation of List A, meant to remove unclarity of expression, **(b)** as an original translation from Sanskrit, based on a precise list **(list Y)** probably not identical with List X, or **(c)** as an original Tamil creation, drawing eclectically on many theoretical sources and at the same time rooted in practice.

- The partisans of List A may have resisted the introduction of the new list but as seen in actual practice, they welcomed some of the new additions and even the combination of lists A and B was not sufficient for all commentarial use, as is seen in the use of stray TUs. Nobody however seems to have tried to compile a list of *paribhāṣā*-s.

Coming now to the modern period, the main problem which one faces when trying to read Tamil śāstric literature is often simply to understand the texts which luck has handed down to us. What I mean by problem with "understanding the text" is the following:

- We know what scholars of the past seem to have done (and are remembered for) but we often do not know **what they were trying to do** and what their academic and linguistic background was.[125]

- We do not know enough about the way subjects were taught and about the interaction between the various schools

- We often do not have very reliable editions of the texts, but preparing such an edition requires not only rigorous methods of textual criticism but also at least a basic understanding of these very difficult subjects.

Fortunately, we have the good fortune that a lot of work has been done in the modern period by scholars, several of whom have been cited in this article, who understood the difficulty of the task and who devoted their efforts to the critical retrieval of lost knowledge systems. The best homage we can pay to those

---

used inside an idiomatic expression in the context of Pērāciriyar's interpretation.

[125] See fn. 39 where I raise the question whether Iḷampūraṇar is quoting Pāṇini 2.3.2.

scholars is to read their work[126] and to try to continue it, recognizing like them the need to take a wide view of the matter. Hopefully, thanks to ongoing cumulative work, the wish expressed by Jean Filliozat and Louis Renou in 1954, in the "avant-propos" to Renou's 1954 *Vocabulaire du rituel védique* ,[127] will continue to be progressively fulfilled, one recent addition being the TFPSI (*Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien*) prepared by Gerhard Oberhammer (et alii), which examines the use and meanings of more than 350 Sanskrit technical terms across several disciplines, and which is especially useful for understanding all the interpretations provided for TYs. It is only by painstaking comparison of individual glosses for TYs and TUs, making extended use of the TIPA, TIFPS, as well as many other works enumerated in the bibliography that one can hope to finally rediscover the lost bridges that have linked Tamil and Sanskrit technical literatures for a long time.

---

[126] I am drawing inspiration from the legacy we have received from our teacher, T.V. Gopal Iyer, in the form of all the books he has written, and especially from two of them:

- the *Tamiḻ Ilakkaṇap Pērakarāti* "A Tamil Grammatical Encyclopedia" in 17 volumes (2005), which covers the various subfields of Tamil grammar and poetology, and which contains in volume 16, in the section entitled *"pāyiram, marapiyal"*, almost 70 entries devoted to items such as *"atikāra muṟaimai"* (p. 197), *"aṟiyātu uṭampaṭal"* (p. 203), *"āṇai kūṟal"* (p. 212), *"iraṭṭuṟa moḻital"* (p. 216), ..., all of which are elements of at least one of the several lists of 32 *utti*-s (alias *tantiravutti*-s) [see Appendix B, which provides the page references for these 70 entries]

- the *Pirayōka Vivēkam* (1973), where T.V. Gopal Iyer has shown, by preparing the four appendices which occupy the pages 414 to 474, how important he considered it for a specialist of the Tamil grammatical tradition to also have a knowledge of Sanskrit grammatical literature [These appendices are: *Vaṭamoḻi ilakkaṇac ceytikaḷ* "Sanskrit grammatical information" (pp. 414-424), *Uraiyil kāṇappaṭum vaṭamoḻi ilakkaṇa āciriyar, nūlkaḷ paṟṟiya kuṟippu* "Sanskrit grammarians and grammars mentioned in the commentary" (pp. 425-439), *Eṭuttukkāṭṭu vaṭacorkaḷum coṟṟoṭarkaḷum* "Sanskrit words and phrases used as examples" (pp. 440-452), *Ilakkaṇa marapupaṟṟiya vaṭacorkaḷum* "Sanskrit technical terms" (pp. 453-474).]

[127] This was the first volume (totalling 176 pages) in a new "collection de vocabulaires techniques du sanskrit", and they wrote the following: « Au point où nous en sommes des études indiennes, il serait éminemment souhaitable que nous puissions disposer de répertoires décrivant le vocabulaire propre à telle ou telle des grandes disciplines qui composent l'indianisme classique. [...] Les dictionnaires de l'usage ne peuvent donner ici le détail nécessaire. On sait que le vocabulaire sanskrit se répartit rigoureusement selon les "techniques", que le langage de la grammaire, de la logique, des sciences, des philosophies, des arts, etc. forme, sinon autant de cloisons étanches, du moins autant de systèmes largement indépendants les uns des autres. Il est important de les étudier tels qu'ils se présentent, avant d'amorcer une étude comparative. » That volume was to be followed in 1957 by the 542 pages of the new edition of Renou's *Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit*, (the 1st edition had appeared in 1942).

Appendix A: the TY lists

In addition to the *Arthaśāstra* list[128] of TYs, there are other well-known lists, such as those found inside medical treatises, namely the *Carakasaṃhitā* (CS)[129] and the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* (SS), and their commentaries. They do not coincide exactly but there is much overlap. Detailed individual presentations are found in Lele [1981] and in the 3 volumes published by Oberhammer et alii (1991, 1996 & 2006). These occurrences can be summarized by the following chart, which is given in alphabetical order, on the basis of the compiled list given by Lele, which contains 39 terms. Among those,

- L13 (upamānaṃ) is found only in the AŚ
- L22 (naikāntaḥ/anekāntaḥ) is found only in CS and SS.
- L9 and L19 are in complementary distribution
- L11, L25, L27 and L36 are found only in CS[130]
- L16 (Dṛṣṭāntaḥ) is a variant found in the *Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa.*
- The remaining 30 items are common to all lists, if we overlook variations seen in items L1, L4, L7, L15, L18, L22 and L31.

Lele (pp. 34-160)	A (=*Arthaśāstra*), C (=*Carakasaṃhitā*), S (=*Suśrutasaṃhitā*)	Oberhammer et alii (I=1991, II=1996, III=2006)
L1. *Atikrāntā-vekṣaṇaṃ*	A28, C25 (Atitāvekṣā), S23	I, p. 22: "Bezugnahme auf Vorhergehendes"
L2. *Atideśaḥ*	A10, C12, S10	I, pp. 22-24: "Einbeziehendes Hinweisen"
L3. *Adhikaraṇaṃ*	A1, C1, S1	I, pp. 26-27: "Thema"
L4. *Anāgatā-vekṣaṇaṃ*	A27, C26 (Anāgatāvekṣā), S22	I, p. 34: "Bezugnahme auf Folgendes"
L5. *Anumataṃ*	A18, C22, S20	I, p. 42: "Gebilligtes, Billigung"
L6. *Apadeśaḥ*	A9, C11, S8	I, p. 71: "[Begründender] Hinweis", "Begründung"

---

[128] See the enumeration provided in 1 (inside section 1) and the short glosses provided in Chart 9 (in section 16).

[129] In the case of the *Carakasaṃhitā*, there is a list of TYs towards the end of the *Siddhisthāna*. That list is contained in some verses attributed to Ḍṛḍhabala, which runs thus: *tantrādhikaraṇaṃ yogo hetvartho'rthaḥ padasya ca ‖41‖ pradeśoddeśanirdeśavākya-śeṣāḥ prayojanam ǀ upadeśāpadeśātideśārthāpattinirṇayāḥ ‖42‖ prasaṅgaikāntanaikāntāḥ sāpavargo viparyayaḥ ǀ pūrvapakṣavidhānānumatavyākhyānasaṃśayāḥ ‖43‖ atītānāgatā-vekṣāsvasaṃjñohyasamuccayāḥ ǀ nidarśanaṃ nirvacanaṃ saṃniyogo vikalpanam ‖44‖ pratyutsārastathoddhāraḥ saṃbhavastantrayuktayaḥ ǀ* (see CS, vol. VI, p. 436). Explanations and illustrations for the individual TYs are provided by Cakrapāṇidatta, who belongs to the 11th cent (according to Oberhammer [1991: 143]).

[130] They are: *uddhāraḥ, pratyutsāraḥ, prayojanaṃ, sambhavaḥ.*

L7. *Apavargaḥ*	A22, C18, S11 (Apavarjaḥ)	I, pp. 71-72: "Einschränkung", "Aussetzen [der Gültigkeit einer Regel]"
L8. *Arthāpattiḥ*	A13, C13, S13	I, pp. 88-92: "Selbstverständliche Folgerung", "Implikation"
L9. *Uttarapakṣaḥ*	A25, (not in C), (not in S)	II, p. 20: "Antwortende Stellungnahme"
L10. *Uddeśaḥ*	A6, C6, S5	II, p. 28-30: "Angabe [des Gegenstandes]"
L11. *Uddhāraḥ*	(not in A), C35, (not in S)	II, pp. 30-31: "[Antwortendes] Hervorheben"
L12. *Upadeśaḥ*	A8, C10, S7	II, pp. 33-36: "Anweisung", "Unterweisung"
L13. *Upamānaṃ*	A12, (not in C), (not in S)	II, pp. 43-49: "Vergleich", "Analogie"
L14. *Ūhyam*	A32, C28, S32	II, pp. 56-57: "Anzupassendes", "[Von einem selbst] Abzuleitendes"
L15. *Ekāntaḥ*	A26, C16 (*Aikānta*), S16	II, pp. 58-59: **1.**"Ausnahmslos [vertretene Auffassung]", "Eindeutige [Aussage]", **2.**"Universelle [Aussage]"
L16. *Dṛṣṭāntaḥ*	---	II, pp. 120-122: "Beispiel", "Beleg"
L17. *Nidarśanam*	A21, C30, S28	II, p. 134: "Beispiel", "Beleg"
L18. *Niyogaḥ*	A29, C32 (*Saṃniyogaḥ*), S29	II, p. 137:"Vorschrift", "Weisung"
L19. *Nirṇayaḥ*	(not in A), C14, S19	II, p. 140-142:"Erwiderung", "Entscheidung","Urteilende Erkenntnis"
L20. *Nirdeśaḥ*	A7, C7, S6	II, pp. 143-144: "Detaillierte Angabe [eines Gegenstandes]"
L21. *Nirvacanaṃ*	A20, C31, S27	II, pp. 144-146: "Worterklärung", "Verdeutlichung"
L22. *Naikāntaḥ*	(not in A), C17, S17 (Anekāntaḥ)	II, p. 146: "Nicht eindeutig [festgelegte Aussage]", "Nicht als einzige [anerkannte Meinung]"
L23. *Padārthaḥ*	A4, C4,[131] S3	II, pp. 153-156: "Wortgegenstand", "Lehrgegenstand", "Kategorie"
L24. *Pūrvapakshaḥ*	A24, C20, S8	II, pp. 167-168: "[Gegnerische] Stellungnahme"
L25. *Pratyutsāraḥ*	(not in A), C34, (not in S)	III, pp. 62-63: "Entgegensetzen"
L26. *Pradeśaḥ*	A11, C5, S9	III, pp. 64-65: "Einbeziehung", "Repräsentative Darlegung"

---

[131] The verse cited in fn. 129 contains in fact *"(a)rthaḥ padasya"*.

L27. *Prayojanam*	(not in A), C9, (not in S)	III, pp. 76-78: "Zweck", "Beweggrund"
L28. *Prasaṅgaḥ*	A15, C15, S15	III, pp. 78-83: **1.**"Wiederaufnahme", **2.**"Abgeleitete Folge", "Ableitung [der Konsequenz einer Annahme]"
L29. *Yogaḥ*	A3, C2, S2	III, pp. 97-99: "Sinnzusammenhang"
L30. *Vākyaśeṣaḥ*	A17, C8, S12	III, pp. 115-117: "[Sinngemäße] Ergänzung des Satzes"
L31. *Vikalpaḥ*	A30, C33 (*Vikalpanam*), S30	III, pp. 131-132: "Alternative", "Zulässigkeit mehrerer Möglichkeiten"
L32. *Vidhānam*	A2, C21, S21	III, pp. 141-142: "Anordnung", "Erklärende Differenzierung"
L33. *Viparyayaḥ*	A16, C19, S14	III, pp. 143-144: "Darstellung des Entgegengesetzten"
L34. *Vyākhyānam*	A19, C23, S25	III, pp. 171-173: "Erklärung", "Erklärende Darlegung", "Zusätzliche Erklärung"
L35. *Samuccayaḥ*	A31, C29, S31	III, p. 230-231: "Sowohl-als-auch", "Verknüpfung", "Summierung"
L36. *Saṃbhavaḥ*	(not in A), C36, (not in S)	III, p. 232-235: "Entstehungsrund", "Enthaltensein", "Dazugehören"
L37. *Saṃśayaḥ*	A14, C24, S24	III, p. 204-212 : "Zweifel"
L38. *Svasaṃjñā*	A23, C27, S26	III, p. 269-271: "Terminus technicus"
L39. *Hetvarthaḥ*	A5, C3, S4	III, p. 282-284: "Verdeutlichung", "Verdeutlichender Sachverhalt"

These are the possible sources which may have inspired the adoption of TUs by the Tamil scholarly tradition. These texts are however not the only possible sources of inspiration. As observed by Dikshitar [1930: 82], there is a mention of the TYs inside a work belonging to the field of Logic: the *Nyāyabhāṣya* by Vātsyāyana, but this text does not seem to contain a list of TYs, although many of the individual TYs that appear in the AŚ, CS and SS lists also appear in the text.[132] We do not know what the early influences were, on the pioneers of Tamil technical literature.[2] Besides their interest in the grammatical disciplines, they may have been eclectically interested in those other disciplines, such as logic, which had developed or were developing collections of sūtra-s.[133] A possible answer to this question might lie in an examination of the wider context of the TYs, namely the characterization of *nūl* "treatise".

---

[132]The statement referred to is: "*paramatam apratiṣiddham anumatam iti hi tantrayuktiḥ*" (NySBh_1,1.4, [p. 121 in the Taranatha Nyaya-Tarkatirtha edition, Calcutta : Metropolitan Printing & Publ. 1936-1944 (Calcutta Sanskrit Series, 18 & 19) [according to GRETIL text].

[133]Another global impression, if the *Kuṟaḷ* is a good guide, is that they were probably more interested in the *Arthaśāstra* than in medical works.

Appendix B: global list of TUs (*tantiravutti*-s)

The following list combines the items found in Chart 4 (i.e. "List A" in its two variants: I= Iḷampūraṇar; P= Pērāciriyar), the items found in Chart 7 (i.e. "List B" in its three variants: V= *Vīracōḻiyam*; Y= *Yāpparuṅkala Virutti*) and a number of stray items [indicated by an initial (C)]. A **page reference** is given for those that appear in **TVG's TIPA (vol.16)**.

1. (A) atikāra muṟai, I2
2. (A) atikāra muṟaimai, P2 (p. 197)
3. (C) aruttāpatti [mentioned by several commentators (e.g. Pērāciriyar under P5)]
4. (A) aṟiyātu uṭampaṭal, I26, P26 (p. 203)
5. (B) aṉṉatallatituveṉa moḻital, V26 (var. iṉṉatallatituveṉa moḻital)
6. (A) āṉai kūṟal, I21, P21 (p. 212)
7. (B) iraṭṭuṟa moḻital, Y10, V11, M11 (p. 216)
8. (A) iṟantatu kāṭṭal, I15, P14 (p. 222)
9. (B) iṟantatu vilakkal, Y19, M15 (p. 223)
10. (B) iṉṉatallatituveṉa moḻital, Y13, M26 (var. aṉṉatallatituveṉa moḻital) (p. 223)
11. (A) uṭampoṭu puṇarttal, I13 (p. 228)
12. (C) upatēca muṟaimai (cf YV1998, p. 195)
13. (A) uyttukkoṇṭu uṇartal, P32 (p. 230)
14. (A) uyttukkoṇṭu uṇarttal, I32
15. (B) uyttuṇara vaittal, Y32, V32
16. (B) uyttuṇara vaippu, M32 (p. 232)
17. (B) uraittām eṉṟal, V22, M22 (p. 232)
18. (B) uraittum eṉṟal, Y28, V21, M21 (p. 233)
19. *(C) uraiyiṟkōṭal [alias for "moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉṟi muṭittal" (I6)]
20. (B) eñciya colliṉ eytak kūṟal, Y15, V27, M27 (p. 235)
21. (B) eṭutta moḻiyiṉ eyta vaittal, Y12, V25, M25 (p. 236)
22. (B) eṭuttuk kāṭṭal, Y23, V24, M24 (p. 236)
23. (A) **etiratu pōṟṟal**, I16i, P15
24. (B) **etiratu pōṟṟal**, Y20, V16, M16 (p. 237)
25. (A) etir poruḷ uṇarttal, I28, P28 (p. 237)
26. (C) etirmaṟuttal (eṉṉum utti) [see YV1998, p. 105 &p. 626]
27. (C) ēkākkaram [alias for "orutalai moḻi" (I11)]
28. (B) ētuviṉ muṭittal, Y11, V12, M12 (p. 239)
29. (A) oppak kūṟal, I10, P9 (p. 242)
30. (B) oppiṉ muṭittal, V13, M13 (p. 243)
31. (A) orutalai aṉmai, P19 (p. 243)
32. (A) orutalai aṉmai muṭintatu kāṭṭal, I20
33. (B) orutalai tuṇital, YV31, V23, M23 (p. 244)
34. (A) orutalai moḻi, I11
35. (A) orutalai moḻital, P10 (p. 244)
36. (B) oḻintatu vilakkal, V15

37.(B) oṉṟiṉa muṭittal taṉṉiṉa muṭittal, V31, M31 (p. 246)

38.(C) oṉṟeṉa muṭittal taṉṉiṉa muṭittal   [Iḷampūraṇar supplementary item]

39.(B) ōttumuṟai vaittal, V2, Y2

40.(B) ōttumuṟai vaippu, M2 (p. 248)

41.(A) kūṟiṟṟu eṉṟal, I18, P17 (p. 266)

42.(C) kūṟuvām [see (9)]

43.(C) ciṟapp-uṭai poruḷai-t tāṉ iṉitu kiḷattal [see (4b)]

44.(C) ciṟappuṭaip poruḷai munturak kiḷattal [see (4a)]

45.(A) colliṉ eccam colliyāṅku uṇarttal, I29, P29 (p. 284)

46.(C) colliṉ muṭipiṉ apporuṇ muṭittal [alias for "tokutta moḷiyāṉ vakuttaṉar kōṭal", I23]

47.(B) colliṉ muṭiviṉ apporuṇ muṭittal, Y25, V30, M30 (p. 285)

48.(B) corporuḷ virittal, Y9, V9, M9 [also   Iḷampūraṇar supplementary item] (p. 285)

49.(A) ñāpakam kūṟal, I31, P31 (p. 286)

50.(A) tantu puṇarntu uraittal, I30, P30 (p. 287)

51.(C) talaitaṭumāṟṟam tantu puṇarntu uraittal [see (6a)]

52.(B) taṉkuṟi vaḷakka mika veṭutturaittal, Y18, V29, M29 (p. 290)

53.(A) taṉkōṭ kūṟal, I12, P11 (p. 290)

54.(B) taṉṉiṉam muṭittal, Y14

55.(B) tāṉ eṭuttu moḷital, Y7, V7, M7 (p. 294)

56.(A) tāṉ kuṟiyiṭutal, I19, P18 (p. 293)

57.(A) tokutta moḷiyāṉ vakuttaṉar kōṭal, I23, P23 (p. 295)

58.(B) tokuttuk kāṭṭal, Y3

59.(A) tokuttuk kūṟal, I3, P3 (p. 296)

60.(B) tokuttuc cuṭṭal, V3, M3 (p. 297)

61.(B) tokuttuṭaṉ muṭittal, Y30

62.(B) toṭarccoṟ puṇarttal, Y26, V10, M10 (p. 298)

63.(B) nutalip pukutal, Y1, V1, N1 (p. 308)

64.(A) nutaliyatu aṟital, I1, P1 (p. 308)

65.(A) pal poruṭku ēṟpiṉ nallatu kōṭal, I22, P22 (p. 323)

66.(B) piṟa nūṉ muṭintatu tāṉ uṭampaṭutal, Y17, M28

67.(B) piṟa nūṉ muṭintatu tāṉ uṭaṉpaṭutal, V28 (p. 329)

68.(A) piṟaṉ uṭampaṭṭatu tāṉ uṭampaṭutal, I14, P13 (p. 330)

69.(A) **piṟaṉ kōṭ kūṟal**, I25, P25

70.(B) **piṟaṉ kōṭ kūṟal**, Y8, V8, M8 (p. 331)

71.(B) piṉṉatu niṟuttal, Y22, V18, M18 (p. 332)

72.(A) poruḷ iṭaiyiṭutal, I27, P27 (p. 340)

73.(A) maṟutalai citaittut taṉ tuṇipu uraittal, I24, P24 (p. 350)

74.(C) māṭṭerital [Iḷampūraṇar supplementary item (TP656i)]

75.(B) māṭṭerintu oḷukal, V14, M14 (p. 351)

76.(B) māṭṭerintu oḷital, Y16

77.(B) muṭittuk kāṭṭal, Y6, V5, M5 (p. 354)

78.(A) muṭintatu kāṭṭal, P20 (p. 354)

79.(B) muṭintatu muṭittal, Y24, V20

80.(B) muṭintavai muṭittal, M20 (p. 355)

81.(B) muṭiviṭaṅ kūṟal, Y5, V6, M6 (p. 356)

82.(A) muntu moḻintataṉ talaitaṭumāṟṟu, I9, P8 (p. 359)

83.(C) muntu moḻintataṉ talai-taṭumāṟṟam [see (6b)]

84.(A) muṟai piṟaḻāmai, P12 (p. 360)

85.(B) muṉmēṟkōṭal, YVcom 21,

86.(B) muṉmoḻintu kōṭal, V17, M17 (p. 360)

87.(A) moḻinta poruḷōṭu oṉra vavvayiṉ moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉri muṭittal, P5 (p. 362)

88.(A) moḻinta poruḷōṭu oṉra vaittal, I5

89.(A) moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉri muṭittal, I6

90.(A) moḻivām eṉral, I17, P16 (p. 363)

91.(B) yāppuṟuttamaittal, Y27

92.(B) vakuttuk kāṭṭal, Y4, V4, M4 (p. 366)

93.(C) vakuttu-k kūṟal [see (10)]

94.(A) vakuttu meyn niṟuttal, I4, P4 (p. 366)

95.(A) vantatu koṇṭu vārātatu uṇarttal, P7 (p. 367)

96.(A) vantatu koṇṭu vārātatu muṭittal, I8

97.(A) vārātataṉāṉ vantatu muṭittal, I7, P6 (p. 371)

98.(B) vikaṟpattiṉ muṭittal, V19, M19 (p. 372)

99.(B) vikaṟpattu muṭittal, Y29

100. (C) vitanta moḻiyiṉam vēṟuñ ceppum [Nma, p. xxi, attr. to *Parimāṇa Nūl*]

101.(C) vitappuk kiḻavi vēṇṭiyatu viḷaikkum (eṉṉum utti) [YV1998, p.56]

102.(C) viḷaṅkac collal (eṉṉum nūṉ marapu) [YV1998, p. 105 & p. 647]

103.(C) viḷaṅkac collal eṉṉum (nūṉ māṉpu) [YV1998, p. 647]

Appendix C: *Māṟaṉ Alaṅkāram* list (verse 25)

This list is found on p. 26 of the edition by TVG

1. *uḷḷiyatu uṇarttal*
2. *uraimuṟai vaippu*
3. *tokaipeṟa nāṭṭal*
4. *vakaipeṟa kāṭṭal*
5. *virintavai ivai eṉa viḷumitiṉ kūṭṭal*
6. *tokutta moḻiyiṉ vakuttaṉa kōṭal*
7. *muntumoḻintataṉ talaitaṭumāṟṟu*
8. *palaporuṭku ēṟpiṉ nallavai kōṭal*
9. *moḻinta poruḷōṭu oṉra vaittal*
10. *moḻintaṉam eṉṟal*
11. *moḻivām eṉṟal*
12. *iṟantatu kāṭṭal*
13. *etiratu pōṟṟal*
14. *moḻiyātataṉai muṭṭiṉri muṭittal*
15. *vantatu koṇṭu vārātatu muṭittal*
16. *vārātatu koṇṭu vantatu muṭittal*
17. *piṟaṉ kōḷ kūṟal*
18. *taṉ kōḷ kūṟal*
19. *piṟaṉ uṭampaṭṭatu tāṉ uṭampaṭutal*
20. *aṟiyātu uṭampaṭal*
21. *āṇai kūṟal*
22. *taṉkuṟiyiṭutal*
23. *tantu koṇarntu uraittal*
24. *maṟutalai citaittut taṉ tuṇipu uraittal*
25. *māṭṭeṟintu oḻital*
26. *iraṭṭuṟa moḻital*
27. *oṉṟiṉam muṭittal*
28. *taṉṉiṉam muṭittal*
29. *māṭṭu uṟuppiṉavā maṉaṅkoḷak kūṟal*
30. *uyttukkoṇṭuṇarttal*
31. *tīpakavakaiyāl ciṟappuk kūṟal*
32. *colliṉ eccam colliyāṅku uṇarttal*

Bibliography & abbreviations

Abhyankar, K.V., 1962, *The Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgojibhaṭṭa*, edited critically with the commentary Tattvādarśa of MM. Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar, by —, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. [for translation, see Kielhorn, 1960]

Abhyankar, K.V., and Shukla, J.M., [1977] 1986, *A Dictionnary of Sanskrit Grammar*, Oriental Institute, Baroda (reprint of 2nd (revised) edition).

ADSG (see Abhyankar and Shukla)

Alsdorf, Ludwig, [1933] 1974, "Die Pratyayas. Ein Beitrag zur Indischen Mathematik", [ZII 9., S.97-157] reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, herausgegebon von Albrecht Wezler, Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden. [pp. 600 sqq.] [English translation in Sarma, Sreeramula Rajeswar, 1991]

Annamalai, E., 2004, "Post-Modern Trends in Tamil", in Chevillard, J.-L., & Wilden, E. (eds), South Indian Horizons. Felicitation Volume for François Gros on the occasion of his 70th birthday, Publication du département d'Indologie Numéro 94, IFP/EFEO, Pondicherry.

Aussant, Emilie, 2005, *La notion de* saṃjñā *dans la tradition grammaticale pāṇinéenne*, Thèse de doctorat, Université de la Sorbonne nouvelle [en cours de publication]

Balbir, Nalini, 1987, "The perfect sūtra as defined by the jainas", pp. 3-21, *Berliner Indologische Studien 3*.

Balbir, Nalini (Ed.), 1994, *Genres littéraires en Inde*, Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris.

Balbir, Nalini & Pinault Georges-Jean, 1997, *Louis Renou. Choix d'Études Indiennes*, réunies par —, Préface de Colette Caillat, Index par Christine Chojnacki, 2 vol., Réimpressions de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, n°9, Paris.

Bhate, Saroja Vidyadhar, 1970, Prepāṇinian Grammatical Elements in Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī, thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Poona, Faculty of Arts-Sanskrit, [unpublished].

Bower, Rev. H., 1972, *Introduction to the Nannūl*, Tamil Text with English Translation, with a foreword by Rev Fr V M Gnanapragasam, s.j., The South India Saiva Siddhanta works publishing society, Tinnevelly, Limited, Madras.

Britto, Francis, 1986, *Diglossia: A study of the theory with application to Tamil*, Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.

Cāmināta Aiyar, U.V. (patippāciriyar), 1946 (2nd posthumous edition), *Pavaṇanti Muṉivariyaṟṟiya Naṉṉūl mūlamum Mayilai Nātaruraiyum*, Chennai (= **Nma**)

Cāmināta Aiyar, U.V. (patippāciriyar), [1927] 1985, *Iḷaṅkōvaṭikaḷaruḷicceyta Cilappatikāra mūlamum arumpatavuraiyum Aṭiyārkkunallāruraiyum*, Tamiḻp palkalaik kaḻakam, Tañcāvūr [reprint of 3rd edition].

Cāminātā Aiyar, U.V. (patippāciriyar), [1948[1]] 1968[2], *Yāpparuṅkalak Kārikai (Kuṇacākarar uraiyuṭaṉ)*, Ṭākṭar U. Vē. Cāminātaiyar Nūl Nilaiyam, Chennai. [the 1st edition itself is posthumous with a *mukavurai* by S. Kaliyāṇacuntaram, UVS's son] (=**YK[1968]**).

Candotti, Maria Piera, 2006, Interprétations du discours métalinguistique, La fortune du sūtra A 1.1.68 chez Patañjali et Bhartṛhari, Firenze University Press.

CS = *Carakasaṃhitā*, see Sharma, R.K. & Bhagwan Dash.

Chevillard, Jean-Luc, 1996, *Le commentaire de Cēṉāvaraiyar sur le Collatikāram du Tolkāppiyam,* Publication du département d'Indologie N°84.1, Institut Français de Pondichéry & Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, Pondichéry.

Chevillard, Jean-Luc, 2008a, *Companion Volume to the Cēṉāvaraiyam on Tamil Morphology and Syntax (Le commentaire de Cēṉāvaraiyar sur le Collatikāram du Tolkāppiyam : Volume 2)*, Collection Indologie 84.2, Institut Français de Pondichéry / Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient.

Chevillard, J.-L., 2008b, "The concept of ticaiccol in Tamil grammatical literature and the regional diversity of Tamil classical literature", in Kannan M. (Ed.), *Streams of Language: Dialects in Tamil*, French Institute of Pondicherry, Pondicherry, pp. 21-50. [NB: the editor of the volume has added incorrect English translations for a few French sentences in fn.6, 7, 8, 22 &51]

Cilappatikāram (See: Cāminātā Aiyar, U.V. , [1927])

Comba, Antonella, 1994, « L'enseignement médical en Inde / Une méthode d'exposition (*tantra-yukti*) : l'*adhikaraṇa* ou spécification du sujet », pp. 151-164, in Balbir, Nalini (Ed.), Genres Littéraires en Inde

Cuppiramaṇiyaṉ, Ca. Vē. (patippāciriyar), 2007, *Tamiḻ Ilakkaṇa Nūlkaḷ (mūlamum muḻuvatum – kuṟippu viḷakkaṅkaḷuṭaṉ)*, Meyyappaṉ Patippakam, Chidambaram.

Daniélou, Alain, & Desikan, R.S., *Le Roman de l'anneau (Shilappatikâram)*, Traduit du tamoul par –, Connaissance de l'Orient, Collection UNESCO d'oeuvres représentatives, Gallimard, Paris.

Deshpande, Madhav M., 1993, *Sanskrit and Prakrit, Sociolinguistic Issues*, MLBD Series in Linguistics, Volume VI, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

Dikshitar, Ramachandra V.R., 1930, "Tantrayukti", pp. 82-89, *Journal of Oriental Research, Vol. IV*, Madras.

Dikshitar, Ramachandra V.R., [1939] 1978, *The Cilappatikāram*, translated with an introduction and notes by –, The South India Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society, Tinnevelly, Limited, Madras.

Fezas, Jean, 1994, "Remarques sur la forme de deux traités de l'Inde Ancienne: l'Arthaṣāstra et le Kāmasūtra", pp. 123-150, in Balbir, Nalini (Ed.), *Genres Littéraires en Inde.*

Glossary of Tamil Inscriptions, see Subbarayalu, 2002.

Gopal Iyer, T.V., [Kōpālaiyar, Ti. Vē.], 1973 (patippāciriyar), *Pirayōka Vivēkam, Mūlamum – Uraiyum*, Tañcāvūr makārājā carapōjiyiṉ caracuvati makāl nūl nilaiyam, Tanjore.

Gopal Iyer, T.V., [Kōpālaiyar, Ti. Vē.], 1973 (patippāciriyar), *Ilakkaṇak Kottu*, *Mūlamum – Uraiyum*, Tañcāvūr makārājā carapōjiyiṉ caracuvati makāl nūl nilaiyam, Tanjore.

Gopal Iyer, T.V., [Kōpālaiyar, Ti. Vē.], 2005a (patippāciriyar), *Vīracōḻiyam,* Śrīmat Āṇṭavaṉ Ācciramam, Śrīraṅkam.

Gopal Iyer, T.V., [Kōpālaiyar, Ti. Vē.], 2005b, *Tamiḻ Ilakkaṇap Pērakarāti*, 17 volumes. Tamiḻmaṇpatippakam, Chennai. [See especially vol. 16 (Poruḷ: pāṭṭiyal, pāyiram, marapiyal) which contains his explanations for the TUs]

Gopal Iyer, T.V., [Kōpālaiyar, Ti. Vē.], 2005c, *Māṟaṉ Alaṅkāram, Mūlamum paḻaya uraiyum viḷakkaṅkaḷuṭaṉ*, Śrīmat Āṇṭavaṉ Ācciramam, Śrīraṅkam.

Govindasamy, M., 1977, *A Survey of the Sources for the History of Tamil Literature*, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar?

GRETIL (= Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages), available at <http://www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/ebene_1/fiindolo/gretil.htm>

Hara, Minoru, 1974, review of *Pāśupata Sūtram with Pañchārtha-Bhāṣya of Kauṇḍinya*, translated with an Introduction on the history of Śaivism in India, by Haripada Chakroborti, Calcutta, 1970, Indo-Iranian Journal, Vol.16, Number 1, pp.57-80.

Hayashi, Takao [2007] « Combinatorics in Indian Mathematics », pp. 109-111 in Helaine Selin & Roddam Narasimha (Eds), *Encyclopedia of Classical Indian Sciences*.

Ilakkuvanar, S., *Tholkāppiyam, In English with Critical Studies,* [First Edition: 1963; Second Edition: 1994], M. Neelamalar, Educational Publishers, Madras.

Iḷaṅkumaraṉ, Irā., 1973 (patippāciriyar), *Amitacākarar Iyaṟṟiya Yāpparuṅkalam (Paḻaiya Viruttiyuraiyuṭaṉ)*, Tirunelvēli, Teṉṉintiya Caivacittānta Nūṟpatippuk Kaḻakam, Chennai.

Index des Mots de la Littérature Tamoule Ancienne, Index des mots de la littérature tamoule ancienne, 1967/1968/1970, Vol. I : a-au., Vol. II : ka-tau; Vol. III : na-ṉa., Publication de l'Institut Français d'Indologie n°37.

Jha, Ganganatha, (1912-1919) 1984, *The Nyāya-Sūtras of Gautama, with the Bhāṣya of Vatsyayana and the Vārtika of Uddyotakara* [reprint], 4 vol., Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

Joshi, S.D. & Bhate, Saroja, 1984 *The fundamentals of Anuvṛtti*, publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class B, N°9, University of Poona, Pune.

K = Kauṭilya's *Arthaśastra* (list of TYs is found in 15.1.1-70).

Katre, Sumitra M., 1989, *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*, Roman Transliteration and English Translation by –, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

Kielhorn, Franz, [1874[1]] 1960[2], *The Paribhāṣenduśekhara of Nāgojibhaṭṭa*, edited and explained by –, Part II, Translation and Notes, Second edition by K.V. Abhyankar, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

Kielhorn, Franz [1880[1], 1892[2], 1962[3]] 1985[4], *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya*, Edited by –, Revised and furnished with additional readings, references and select critical notes by K.V. Abhyankar, Volume I, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

Kiparsky, Paul, 1979, *Panini as a variationist*, edited by S.D. Joshi, The MIT Press, in collaboration with the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, University of Poona, Pune.

Kōvintarāja Mutaliyār, Kā. Ra. (patippāciriyar), 1942, *Poṉparri kāvalar Puttamittiraṉār iyaṟṟiya Vīracōḷiyam mūlamum Peruntēvaṉār iyaṟṟiya uraiyum*, Pavāṉantar Kaḷakam, Chennai. (= **VC[1942]**)

Kuṟaḷ (See Vaṭivēlu Ceṭṭiyār, Kō. (patippāciriyar), 1904)

Lele, Waman Keshav, 1981, *The doctrine of the Tantrayukti-s [Methodology of Theoretico-Scientific Treatises in Sanskrit]*, The Chaukhamba Surbharati Studies 3, Varanasi. [reviewed in Wright[1982]

Lockwood, Michael & Bhat, A. Vishnu, 2005, *Metatheater and Sanskrit Drama, Second, Revised and Enlarged Edition,* Tambaram Research Associates, Madras.

Mayilai Cīṇi. Vēṅkaṭacāmi, [1959[1]] 2003[2], *Maṟaintu Pōṉa Tamiḻ Nūlkaḷ*, Cāratā Māṇikkam Patippakam, Chennai. [Unfortunately the 2003 edition of the book has been recomposed but the page numbers in the table of contents have not been updated]

Meenakshisundaram, T.P., 1974, *Foreign models in Tamil grammar*, Dravidian Linguistics Association, publication 15, Trivandrum.

Mookerji, Radha Kumud, [1951] 2003 (reprint), *Ancient Indian Education, Brahmanical and Buddhist*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi. [pp. 318-319 deal with Tantra-Yukti]

Murugan, V. (Ed.) & Mathialagan, M. (Ass. Ed.), 1999, *A Dictionary of Tamil Literary and Critical Terms*, Institute of Asian Studies, Chennai.

Murugan, V., 2000, *Tolkāppiyam in English*, Institute of Asian Studies, Chennai.

N = Naṉṉūl

Narayanapisharoty, K.P., [1931-1993] 1998, The Prakriyāsarvasva of Melputtur Nārāyanabhaṭṭathiri, compiled by **–**, Editor M.S. Menon, Published by Guruvayur Devaswom, Guruvayur, Kerala

Nma = *Naṉṉūl mūlamum Mayilai Nātaruraiyum* (see Cāmināta Aiyar, U.V., 1946)

Nvi = *Naṉṉūl Viruttiyurai* (see Taṇṭapāṇi Tēcikar, Ca., 1957)

Oberhammer, Gerhard, 1991, *Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien, Band I (A-I),* Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna.

Oberhammer, G., Prets E., Prandstetter, J., 1996, *Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien, Band II (U-Pū)*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna.

Oberhammer, Gerhard, Prets, Ernst, Prandstetter, Joachim, 2006, *Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien. Ein Begriffswörterbuch zur altindischen Dialektik, Erkenntnistheorie und Methodologie. Bd III. (Pra-H).* Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna.

Paranjpe, Vâsudeva Gopâla, 1922, *Le Vârtika de Kâtyâyana, Une étude du style, du vocabulaire et des postulats philosophiques*, Thèse présentée pour le doctorat de l'université de Paris.

Parthasarathy, R., 1993, *The tale of an anklet, An epic of South India, The Cilappatikāram of Iḷaṅkō Aṭikaḷ,* translated, with an introduction and Postscript by –, Columbia University Press, New York.

Pavāṉantam Piḷḷai, Ca., 1916-1917 (patippāciriyar), *Amitacākarar Iyaṟṟiya Yāpparuṅkalam. Mūlam (Paḻaiya Viruttiyuraiyuṭaṉ)*, "Minerva" Press, Madras. [1916: pakuti-1; 1917: pakuti-2] (= **YV[1916/1917]**)

Peterson, Indira Viswanathan, (1989) 1991, *Poems to Śiva. The Hymns of the Tamil Saints* [Indian edition], Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.

Pillai, R.S., 1989, *Cilappatikāram*, translated by –, Tamil University, Thanjavur.

Pollock, Sheldon, 1995, review of Balbir[1994] (*Genres littéraires en Inde*), *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 115, No. 4., pp. 685-689.

Pollock, Sheldon, (2006) 2007, *The language of the Gods in the World of Men*, Permanent black [first indian edition published by exclusive arrangement with the University of California Press], India.

Rajam, V.S., 1981, *A Comparative Study of Two Ancient Indian Grammatical Traditions. The Tamil Tolkāppiyam compared with the Sanskrit Ṛk-Prātiśākhya, Taittirīya-Prātiśākhya, Āpiśali Śikṣā, and the Aṣṭādhyāyī*, A dissertation in Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania. [unpublished Ph.D. thesis]

Renou, Louis, [1942[1]] 1957[2], *Terminologie Grammaticale du Sanskrit*. **(TGS)**, Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, Paris.

Renou, Louis, 1956, *Vocabulaire du Rituel Védique*, Vol.1 in Collection de vocabulaires techniques du sanskrit (dirigée par Louis Renou et Jean Filliozat), Librairie C. Klincksieck, Paris.

Renou, Louis, 1963, "Sur le genre du *sūtra* dans la littérature sanskrite", *Journal Asiatique* 251, pp. 165-216, reprinted in Balbir & Pinault [1997], pp. 569-620.

Renou, Louis, Filliozat, Jean, et alii, [1947[1]] 1985, *L'inde Classique [Manuel des Etudes Indiennes], Tome Premier*, Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien Maisonneuve, Paris.

Renou, Louis, Filliozat, Jean, et alii, [1953[1]] 1985, *L'inde Classique [Manuel des Etudes Indiennes], Tome II*, Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, Paris.

Roodbergen, J.A.F., 1991, "Time for a little something", pp. 293-321, in Deshpande, Madhav, M. & Bhate, Saroja (Eds), *Pāṇinian Studies. Professor S.D. Joshi Felicitation Volume*, Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan, Number 37.

Ruben, W., 1926, "Zur Frühgeschichte der indischen Philosophie", pp. 351-357, *Beiträge zur Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte Indiens, Festgabe Hermann Jacobi zum 75. Geburtstag (11. Februar 1925)*, herausgegeben von Willibald Kirfel, Bonn.[134]

---

[134] [Quoted by Renou, 1963, p. 203, note (39), concerning the *Caraka Saṃhitā*: "Une trace indirecte du style *sū.* est la présence des *tantrayukti*, dont on a l'analogue en fin du *Kauṭilīya* (cf. W. Ruben Mélanges Jacobi, p.354): survivance des anciennes *paribhāṣā* (ci-dessous note 81)."].

Sarma, Sreeramula Rajeswar (transl.), 1991, "The pratyayas: Indian Contribution to Combinatorics", Indian Journal of History of Science, 26(1), pp.17-61. (translation of Alsdorf [1933])

Sastri: see Subrahmanya Sastri, P.S.

Scharfe, Hartmut, 1977, *Grammatical Literature,* vol. V, Fasc. 2 in *A History of Indian Literature*, edited by Jan Gonda, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

Sharma, R.K., & Bhagwan Dash, (1972) 2008 [reprint], *Carakasaṃhitā* [Text with English translation & critical exposition based on Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyurveda Dīpikā*], 7 vol. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi.

Smith, John, D., 1986, review of Joshi, S.D. & Bhate, Saroja (1984), *The fundamentals of Anuvṛtti*, Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, Vol. 49, No. 2., pp. 401-402.

Subbarayalu, Y, 2002, *Glossary of Tamil Inscriptions / Tamiḻk Kalveṭṭuc Collakarāti*, 2 vol., with an editorial note [*patippurai*] by –, Published by Santi Sadhana (Charitable Trust), Chennai.

Subrahmanya Ayyar, V.M., Chevillard Jean-Luc, & Sarma, S.A.S., 2007, *Digital Tēvāram. Kaṇiṉit Tēvāram.*, Collection Indologie n° 103, IFP / EFEO, Pondicherry

Subrahmanya Sastri, P.S., [1936] 2002, *Tolkāppiyam, The earliest extant Tamil Grammar, with a short commentary in English*, *Vol. II, Poruḷatikāram*, The Kuppuswamy Sastri Research Institute, Chennai.

Subrahmanya Sastri, P. S., [1930] 1999, *Tolkāppiyam. The Earliest Extant Tamil Grammar, With a short commentary in English, Volume I, Eḻuttatikāram*, The Kuppuswamy Sastri Research Institute, Chennai.

Subrahmanya Sastri, P. S., 1946, *An enquiry into the relationship of Sanskrit and Tamil*, University of Travancore.

S = Suśrutasaṃhitā (list of TYs is found in Uttaratantram 65)

Takahashi, Takanobu, 1999, "The Treatment of King and State in the *Tirukkuṛaḷ*", in Noboru Karashima (ed.), *Kingship in Indian History*, Manohar, New Delhi.

Tamil Lexicon, [1924-1936 & 1938-1939] 1982, Madras, University of Madras [6 volumes & supplement]

Tāmōtaram Piḷḷai, Ci. Vai. (patippāciriyar), 1881, *Poṉpaṟṟi kāvalar Puttamittiraṉār iyaṟṟiya Vīracōḻiyam. Iḵtu Peruntēvaṉār uraiyōṭu Yāḻppāṇam Ci. Vai. Tāmōtaram Piḷḷaiyāl palatēcappiratirūpaṅkaḷaik koṇṭu paricōtittu (") Ūr Ti. Kumāracāmic Ceṭṭiyārāl tañcāvūr Catāvatāṉam Cuppiramaṇiya Aiyaratu Vittiyāvarttaṉi accukkūṭattil patippikkappaṭṭatu.* Ceṉṉappaṭṭaṇam. Vicu varuṣam Cittirai mācam. (= **VC**[1881])

Taṇṭapāṇi Tēcikar, Ca. (patippāciriyar), 1957, *Śrī Mātavaccivañāṉacuvāmikaḷ iyaṟṟiya Puttamputturai eṉṉum Naṉṉūl Viruttiyurai*, Tiruvāvaṭuturai Ātīṉam (= **Nvi**)

TCc = *Tolkāppiyam Collatikāram*, as per Cēṉāvaraiyar

Tirukkuṛaḷ Uraikkottu, Poruṭpāl, 1990, mūṉrām patippu, Tirukkuṛaḷ Patippuniti Veḷiyīṭu, Śrī Kācimaṭam, Tiruppaṉantāḷ.

TIPA = Gopal Iyer, T.V., [Kōpālaiyar, Ti. Vē.], 2005b

TFPSI (See Oberhammer et alii, 3 vol., 1991-1996-2006)

TGS (see Renou, 1957)

TPi = *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram*, as per Iḷampūraṇar.

TPp = *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram*, as per Pērāciriyar.

TU = *Tantira v-Utti*

TVG (see Gopal Iyer, T.V.)

TY = Tantra Yukti

Vasu, Śrīśa Chandra, [1906[1], 1962[2]] 1995, *The Siddhānta Kaumudī*, Edited and Translated into English by ―, 2 vol., Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi (reprint).

UVS (see Cāminātaiyar, U. Vē.)

Vaṭivēlu Ceṭṭiyār, Kō. (patippāciriyar), [1904] 1972-1976, *Tirukkuṟaḷ mūlamum Parimēlaḻakar uraiyum: Aṟattuppāl, Poruṭpāl & Kāmattuppāl*, Maturaip Palkalaikkaḻakam [3 vol.].

VC = *Vīracōḻiyam*

VC[1881] (See Tāmōtaram Piḷḷai, Ci. Vai., 1881)

VC[1942] (See Kōvintarāja Mutaliyār, Kā. Ra., 1942)

VC[2005] (See Gopal Iyer, T.V., 2005a)

Vēṅkaṭacāmi Nāṭṭār, Na. Mu., [1940] 1999 (24th ed)(Ed.), Amitacākarar Iyaṟṟiya Yāpparuṅkalak Kārikai Mūlamum Kuṇacākarar Iyaṟṟiya Uraiyum, Kaḻaka Veḷiyīṭu, [1st ed. 1940], Madras. (=**YK[1940]**).

Vēṇukōpālap Piḷḷai, Mē. Vī., [1960] 1998, Yāpparuṅkalam (Paḻaiya Viruttiyuṭaṉ), Ulakattamiḻārāycci Niṟuvaṉam (IITS), Chennai. (=**YV[1998]**)

VMS (see Subrahmanya Ayyar, V.M.)

Wilden, Eva, 2008, *A critical edition and an annotated translation of the* Naṟṟiṇai, 3 vol., Critical texts of Cankam Literature 1.1, 1.2 &1.3, École Française d'Extrême-Orient &Tamiḻ Maṇ Patippakam, Chennai.

Wright, J. C. , 1982, review of Lele[1981] (*The doctrine of the Tantrayukti-s)*, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, University of London, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 415-416

Wujastyk, Dominik, 1993, *Metarules of Pāṇinian Grammar. Vyāḍi's Paribhāṣāvṛtti*, 2 vol., Egbert Forsten, Groningen Oriental Series Volume V.

Wujastyk, Dominik, [1998] 2003[2], *The Roots of Ayurveda, Selections from Sanskrit Medical Writings (revised edition)*, Penguin Classics.

YA = Yāpparuṅkalam (text commented by **YV**)

YK = Yāpparuṅkalak kārikai

YK¹⁹⁴⁰ (See Vēṅkaṭacāmi Nāṭṭār, Na. Mu.)

YK¹⁹⁶⁸ (See Cāmināta Aiyar, U.V., [1948¹] 1968²)

YV = Yāpparuṅkala Virutti

YV¹⁹¹⁶/¹⁹¹⁷ (See Pavāṉantam Piḷḷai, Ca., 1916-1917)

YV¹⁹⁷³ (See Iḷaṅkumaraṉ, Irā., 1973)

YV¹⁹⁹⁸ (See Vēṇukōpālap Piḷḷai, Mē. Vī., 1998)

Zimmermann, Francis, "Terminological problems in the process of editing and translating Sanskrit medical texts", pp. 141-151, in Paul U. Unschuld [1989], *Approaches to Traditional Chinese Medical Literature*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht / Boston / London.

Zvelebil, Kamil, V., 1972, "*Tolkāppiyam*", *Journal of Tamil Studies*, 1, pp. 43-60, International Institute of Tamil Studies, Madras.

Zvelebil, Kamil V., 1995, *Lexicon of Tamil Literature*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Zweite Abteilung, Neunter Band, E.J. Brill, Leiden / New York / Köln.

BETWEEN PRESERVATION AND RECREATION:
TAMIL TRADITIONS OF COMMENTARY

Proceedings of a Workshop in Honour of T.V. Gopal Iyer

Edited by Eva Wilden

L'*Institut Français de Pondichéry* (IFP), créé à la faveur du Traité de cession des établissements français en Inde, fait partie du réseau des Instituts de recherche du Ministère français des Affaires Etrangères. Il remplit des missions de recherche, d'expertise et de formation en Sciences Humaines et Sociales et en Ecologie dans le Sud et le Sud-Est asiatique. Il s'intéresse particulièrement aux savoirs et patrimoines culturels indiens (langue et littérature sanskrite, histoire des religions, études tamoules, ..), aux dynamiques sociales contemporaines (dans les domaines de la santé, de l'économie et de l'environnement) et aux écosystèmes naturels de l'Inde du Sud (gestion durable de la biodiversité).

The French Institute of Pondicherry (IFP) was created following the Treaty of Cession of French territories in India and is part of the network of research institutes of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It fulfils its mission of research, expertise and training in human and social sciences and ecology in South and South-East Asia. It works particularly in the domains of Indian cultural knowledge and heritage (Sanskrit language and literature, history of religions, Tamil studies,..), contemporary social dynamics (in the areas of health, economics and environment) and the natural ecosystems of South India (sustainable management of biodiversity).

French Institute of Pondicherry, 11, St. Louis Street, P.B. 33, Pondicherry 605001-India,

Tel: (413) 2334168, Email: ifpdir@ifpindia.org

Website: http://www.ifpindia.org

L'*Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient* (EFEO) est un établissement public à caractère scientifique, culturel et professionnel sous tutelle du ministère de l'Éducation nationale de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche. Elle a pour mission la recherche et la formation à la recherche, principalement par le travail sur le terrain dans toutes les disciplines qui se rapportent aux civilisations de l'Asie, en particulier de l'Asie du Sud, du Sud-Est et de l'Est. A Pondichéry, les projets de l'EFEO portent essentiellement sur l'« indologie » classique : sanskrit, tamoul ancien, archéologie.

The *French School of Asian Studies* (EFEO) is a research institute under the French Ministry of Higher Education and Research. The EFEO's mission is research and training, principally by field-work, in all the disciplines involved in the study of Asian civilizations, but especially those of South, South-East and East Asia. In Pondicherry the EFEO's projects mainly concern classical Indology: Sanskrit, Old Tamil and archaeology.

Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient,	Pondicherry Centre of the EFEO
22, avenue du Président-Wilson,	16 & 19, Dumas Street,
75116 Paris, France.	Pondicherry – 605 001,
	India.
Tel: (33) 1 53 70 18 60	Tel: (91) (413)
	2334539/2332504
Website : http://www.efeo.fr/	Email : administration@efeo-pondicherry.org

BETWEEN PRESERVATION AND RECREATION: TAMIL TRADITIONS OF COMMENTARY

Proceedings of a Workshop in Honour of T.V. Gopal Iyer

Edited by Eva Wilden

நூற்கடலில் மூழ்கி முத்தெடுக்க விழைந்தேன்

அற்புத ஆழ்கட லதுவென் றுணர்ந்தேன்

கற்பனைக் கெட்டா வறிவுகண்டு வியந்தேன்

கால்கூட நனைக்கவில்லைக் காலன் கவர்ந்துகொண்டான்

<div align="right">T. Rajeswari</div>

T.V. Gopal Iyer, Tañcāvūr 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Note: The spelling of Tamil names and places in this volume generally is designed to be a transcription of the original. Since, however, this estimable principle happens to be in collision with the usage of people very much alive and spelling their own names decidedly in a different way, unity of purpose could not be achieved. Vive l'anarchie indienne !