



# The “colourful” retrospective horizon of Vīracōliyam-143 at the advent of the Daṇḍin doctrine in Tamil Nadu (DRAFT 3v)

Jean-Luc Chevillard

## ► To cite this version:

Jean-Luc Chevillard. The “colourful” retrospective horizon of Vīracōliyam-143 at the advent of the Daṇḍin doctrine in Tamil Nadu (DRAFT 3v). 2019. halshs-02179709v1

**HAL Id: halshs-02179709**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02179709v1>**

Preprint submitted on 11 Jul 2019 (v1), last revised 9 Dec 2020 (v2)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# The “colourful” retrospective horizon of *Vīracōliyam*-143 at the advent of the Daṇḍin doctrine in Tamil Nadu (DRAFT 3v)\*

Jean-Luc Chevillard

CNRS, UMR7597 (HTL), Université Paris-Diderot

This small essay is an attempt at giving an “insider’s perspective” on the terminological dimension of the encounter, which took place in the eleventh century,<sup>1</sup> between Puttamittiraṇār, a Tamil-speaking admirer of Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyaḍarśa* (DK), who composed a text called *Vīracōliyam* (VC), in which the fifth (and last) section, called *Alaṅkārapaṭalam* (AP), is explicitly based on the DK, and the Tamil scholarly tradition, an ever growing collection of Tamil śāstric texts (*ilakkaṇam*), cultivated by Tamil poets, of which the VC became a part, which was then dutifully transmitted, upto the present period, and printed in book form for the first time in 1881 (BIB). The Tamil scholarly tradition had been for at least eight centuries (see Chart 3, inside section 2), at the time of the encounter, the backbone of literary activities in Tamil Nadu, based on a special form of the language, called *Centamiḷ* “perfect Tamil”,<sup>2</sup> inside what Paṇampāraṇār had called the “beautiful Tamil-speaking world”<sup>3</sup> (*Tamiḷ kūṟu nal-l-ulakam*), when composing his “Special Preface” (*ciṟappup pāyiram*) to the *Tolkāppiyam* (T) (BIB), a treatise which is the most ancient component of the Tamil scholarly corpus. Because the subject is potentially very vast, with many hundreds of Tamil technical expressions falling under its scope, I shall here concentrate on the small core vocabulary found in VC-143, and on that part of the vocabulary which is directly in contact with it, inside the graph of connected technical terms. My use of the word “insider”, when I could equally well have said “outsider”, if addressing a different component of the potential audience, should be clarified by saying that I am, in a manner of speaking, trying to answer the following hypothetical question: “If we had only Tamil sources, in an imaginary situation where the original Sanskrit sources on Daṇḍin would have all been lost (or would have become unreadable or unintelligible<sup>4</sup> in Tamil Nadu), what kind of image or profile would we obtain of the Daṇḍin episode and doctrine, seen from a Tamil perspective? How could we reconstruct a sequence of events and a logic? Would it be an orthodox “faithful” one or would it possess what the French language refers to as “couleur locale”? In this respect, among the questions examined here, a potentially important one might be the following: why did Puttamittiraṇār have to mention the traditional component called *vaṇṇam*<sup>5</sup> in VC-143 (see section 1), when a later, more faithful adaption of the DK, in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, by another author who composed the *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram* (TA) and is now known as “Tamiḷ Taṇṭi”, left it out?

\* This essay is dedicated to the memory of my teacher, T.V. Gopal Iyer (TVG) (1926-2007), one of the rare persons who could navigate with ease the totality of the terminological maze of Tamil śāstric literature. Among his many accomplishments, he published in 2005 an edition of the VC (BIB), adding his own notes, to the traditional commentary by Peruntēvaṇār. He also compiled a magnificent *Tamiḷ Ilakkaṇap Pēraḱarāṭi*, in 17 volumes, thanks to which I have felt confident enough to try to give the beginning of an answer to the questions examined here.

<sup>1</sup> Zvelebil 1995: 772.

<sup>2</sup> The expression *Cen Tamiḷ* seems to correspond exactly to the expression *saṃskṛtā bhāṣā*, with *saṃskṛtā* replaced by *cem* “perfect” and *bhāṣā* replaced by *Tamiḷ*.

<sup>3</sup> Line 3 in the “Special Preface” (*ciṟappup pāyiram*) to the *Tolkāppiyam* (3<sup>rd</sup> cent. AD?)

<sup>4</sup> My hypothetical question can nowadays almost sound realistic if we observe that the number of bilingual scholars, equally at ease in Sanskrit and in Classical Tamil, is not very high in Tamil Nadu and that a sincere Tamil student, who cannot receive help from his Tamil professors as far as Sanskrit sources are concerned, is not in a situation very different from the perspective considered in the first sentence of this essay.

<sup>5</sup> In the T, *vaṇṇam* is the 26<sup>th</sup> limb of poetry, and comes in 20 varieties.

## 1. A Tamil proof of the existence of Daṇḍin

The first (Tamil) proof of the existence of Daṇḍin, or rather Taṇṭi, viewed through Tamil sources, is the *kārikai*<sup>6</sup> found at the beginning of the *Alaṅkārap paṭalam* (AP), the fifth section of the *Vīracōḷiyam* (=VC), an innovative and very dense Tamil “treatise”. That *kārikai* reads, in metrical form:

(1a) {urai-y-ūṭa l-āka}<sup>A</sup> {v-uyir-poru l-āka}<sup>B</sup> {v-uraitta-vaṇṇa // nirai-nīra m-ā}<sup>C</sup> {naṭai y-ē-cela v-ā}<sup>D</sup> {niṇṇa}<sup>E</sup> {ceyyuṭka!-ān // tarai-mali māṇiṭar}<sup>F</sup> {tam-m-alan kārāṅka!}<sup>G</sup> {taṇṭi-conṇa // karai-mali nūliṇ paṭi-y-ē}<sup>H</sup> {y-uraippan}<sup>I</sup> {kaṇaṅ-kulaiyē!}<sup>J</sup>

Due to the metrical constraints, the syntax of this verse gives a certain appearance of complexity, until we perceive the set of five elementary identifications inside five pairs of topics or entities. Those five identifications are, according to the VC commentator, constitutive of an instance of the figure called *uruvakam* (i.e. *rūpaka*), and they are marked by several forms of the copula, which appears twice as *āka*, twice as *ā* and once as *ām*. See the following chart, which must be read vertically, column by column (with an inversion in column 2), with a preliminary English translation of the key terms, except for *vaṇṇam* which is better left untranslated at this stage:

A	B (inverted)	C	D	E, F	G	H, I, J
1. <i>urai</i> “speech”	4. <i>poru!</i> “value, topic, matters” <i>āka</i>	5. {v-uraitta} <i>vaṇṇa nirai</i> “series of <i>vaṇṇam</i> -s”	7. <i>naṭai</i> “gait/style” -y-ē	9. {niṇṇa} <sup>E</sup> <i>{ceyyuṭka!}</i> “compositions ” -ām	<i>tam-m alan- kārāṅka!</i> “orna- ments”	11. <i>taṇṭi</i> (“Daṇḍin”) <i>conṇa karai mali nūliṇ paṭi-y-ē y-uraippan kaṇaṅkulaiyē</i>
2. <i>ūṭa!</i> “body” <i>āka</i>	3. <i>uyir</i> “soul”	6. <i>nīram</i> “colour” -ā	8. <i>celav(u)</i> “going” -ā	10. <i>tarai-mali māṇiṭar</i> } <sup>F</sup>		
see sections 2 and 3		section 5	section 3		section 4	all sections

Chart 1a: Key terms in VC143  
(and sections where they are further discussed)

(1b) “{O Lady with heavy jewelled earrings (*kaṇaṅkula!*)!}<sup>I</sup>, {I shall expound (*uraippan*)}<sup>I</sup> {in the very manner (*paṭi-y-ē*) of the treatise (*nūli*), [which is] [a life-saving] shore (*karai*) [for an] abundant (*mali*) [number of people]<sup>7</sup> [and] which Daṇḍin<sup>8</sup> uttered (*conṇa*)}<sup>H</sup> [that TOPIC which is] **the equivalent<sup>9</sup> of the ornaments (*alaṅkāram*)** }<sup>F</sup> for {poems (*ceyyuṭka!*), when they are [identified with] the human beings (*māṇiṭar*) who are abundant (*mali*) on Earth (*tarai*) }<sup>F</sup>. [In the identification, they stand (in parallel manner)]<sup>E</sup>, {Speech (*urai*) being the body [*ūṭa!*]}<sup>A</sup>, {[of which] the *uyir* (life/soul) is the topic/value (*poru!*) }<sup>B</sup>, { the colours [*nīram*] are the ((previously explained)) series [*nirai*] of *vaṇṇam*}<sup>C</sup>, {[and] the going [*celavu*] is indeed the style [*naṭai*] (litt. gait).”

The following chart (chart 1b) tries to clarify the manner in which each of these technical terms will be further discussed inside the AP, for which this *kārikai* acts as a small table of contents:

<sup>6</sup> All Tamil treatises are versified. The stanzas (referred to as *kārikai*-s) seen in the VC have four metrical lines of five feet each, and frequently contain a vocative addressed to a Lady. Additionally, in a given stanza, all the lines contain the same number of *akṣara*-s, which can be either 16 or 17, depending on the nature of the first syllable. This means that the length of one *kārikai* in the VC is almost exactly the length of two thirty-two syllable *śloka* elements in the KD. (XREF\_1)

<sup>7</sup> Litterally: “the treatise which abounds as a shore”, shore meaning salvation (if I understand correctly).

<sup>8</sup> Daṇḍin is not the only external source to be explicitly named in the VC. We also have a reference to Avinayaṇār in VC85 and to Akattiyar in VC76 (not to talk about the reference to Avalōkitāṇ [and Akattiyāṇ] in the prefatory section).

<sup>9</sup> In order to understand that verse, as per the intention of its author, one should probably pretend NOT TO KNOW before reading it that the word *alaṅkāram* can be applied to something else than to the ornaments used by human beings. The metaphor becomes thus a “métaphore vive”, and the verse fulfills its function which consists in giving a new figurative meaning to the word *alaṅkāram*.

Verses	Content	Additional reference
VC143 (first verse in AP)	<i>alaṅkāram</i> , applied to <i>ceyyuḷ</i> , is metaphorically explained on the basis of <i>urai</i> , <i>poruḷ</i> , <i>naṭai</i> and <i>vaṇṇam</i> . <sup>10</sup>	See (1a) and (1b)
VC144–VC147	Which <i>urai</i> & <i>poruḷ</i> <sup>11</sup> are acceptable limbs or souls (for <i>ceyyuḷ</i> )? Which are unacceptable? (metaphora continued)	
VC148–VC151	the 10 <i>āvi</i>	See chart 4, in section 3
VC152–VC177	the 35 <i>alaṅkāram</i> <sup>12</sup>	See chart 6, in section 4
VC178	broad classification <sup>13</sup> of <i>ceyyuḷ</i> genres	
VC179	<i>yamaka</i> , etc.	In the TA, the <i>col-l-aṇi</i> (śabdālaṅkāra) section is much more developed
VC180 (beginning)	Other topics ( <i>Tantra Yukti</i> )	
VC180 (cont.), VC181–183	Other types of literature	

Chart 1b: Summary of the *Alaṅkārap paṭalam* (AP)

## 2. From a three-part grammar to a five-part grammar

As already indicated, the VC is an integral part of the corpus of Tamil śāstric texts and it is only by replacing it inside its wider Tamil context, that we can hope to understand the role which it played and the expectations which it fulfilled. That status was also the reason for it to be preserved by some sections of the group of Tamil poets, and for us to be in a position to try to read it today. The most salient points usually noted are the fact that the VC is partly a “translation” (from Sanskrit) – a point which will be discussed in sections 3, 4 and 5, where I shall examine strategies (α, β and γ) for “translation”<sup>14</sup> – and that it is usually associated with the reorganisation (transition/specialization) from a three-components based global grammatical tradition to a model where there are five specialized components, whose names (inside the VC) can be seen in chart 2 which follows immediately:

Sections <sup>15</sup> of the VC	Puttamittiraṇār (11 <sup>th</sup> c.): 183 <i>kārikai</i> -s		Peruntēvaṇār commentary (12 <sup>th</sup> c.): prose & citations	
	<i>kārikai</i> id-numbers	count	Numbering of cited illustrative verses <sup>16</sup>	Numbering of cited (grammatical) <i>nūrpā</i> -s
0. <i>pāyiram</i> “preface”		2		
1. <i>eḷuttu</i> “letter/phone”	VC1 to VC28	28		
2. <i>col</i> “word” (morphology/syntax)	VC29 to VC85	57	M1 to M10	N1 to N6
3. <i>poruḷ</i> “[poetical] matter(s)”	VC86 to VC106	21	M11 to M25	N7 to N85
4. <i>yāppu</i> “[metrical] composition”	VC107 to VC142	36	M26 to M209	N86 to N132
5. <i>alaṅkāram</i> “ornament”	VC143 to VC183	41	M210 to M511	N133 to N256.

Chart 2: Content of Puttamittiraṇār’s *Viracōliyam* (VC)  
with additional information on Peruntēvaṇār’s commentary

A first remark which can be made on the basis of those figures is that the VC itself is a very short text. For instance, we can say that the length of its 5th section, the AP, which is our main concern here, is 41 *kārikai*-s: this is the

<sup>10</sup> *Vaṇṇam* has been explained in the previous chapter (*Yāppu*), in VC142.

<sup>11</sup> *Poruḷ* has already been discussed in the third big section of the VC, called *Poruḷatikāram*. In that discussion, 27 parameters (called *urai*), starting with *caṭṭakam* (which encompasses the metrical structure) have been examined.

<sup>12</sup> In the TA, this would be the *poruḷ-aṇi* (*arthālaṅkāra*) section.

<sup>13</sup> Other classifications are found in VC112 (in the *Yāppu* section).

<sup>14</sup> My point here, while using “scare quotes”, is that strategy γ does not completely qualify as “translation”. See chart 4, chart 6 and chart 7.

<sup>15</sup> If we except the second section (*col-l-atikāram*), which contains 6 *paṭalam* (“chapter”), all the other sections can be called indifferently “book” (*atikāram*) or “chapter” (*paṭalam*) because they contain a single chapter.

<sup>16</sup> The numbering for the illustrative verses and for the grammatical *nūrpā*-s is the one given by TVG in his 2005 edition of the VC. There are also unnumbered quotations.

equivalent in length of 82 śloka-s<sup>17</sup> and makes it six times shorter than the DK. A second remark is that this short text has been transmitted as part of a commentary which is, at times, quite bulky, and which contains, on the one hand, many literary illustrations and, on the other hand, many grammatical citations (referred to in chart 2 as *nūrpā*-s) from earlier Tamil treatises. The AP, for instance, contains 124 such *nūrpā*-s.

At this stage, before continuing our examination of the AP (and of its role inside the VC), it seems important also to name explicitly (and to place in a chronological sequence) some textual components (which we shall meet again) belonging to the Tamil śāstric knowledge base which Puttamittiraṇār and Peruntēvaṇār had in common with their (Tamil) audience. I shall do this by means of a chronological chart (Chart 3), in which the top rows are more recent than the bottom rows, and in which Daṇḍin (the *Kāvyādarśa* author) sits somewhere (slightly artificially) between the 7<sup>th</sup> and the 8<sup>th</sup> century.

Centuries	Curriculum Grammar ( <i>ilakkaṇam</i> ) (leaving out <i>Nāṭakat tamil</i> and <i>Icāit tamil</i> )					Applied Knowledge (every-day needs of poets)	
(Sections)	1 Eḷuttu	2 Col	3 Poruḷ	4 Yāppu	5 Aṇi	5bis Pāṭṭiyal	lexicography (Kōśa-s, alias nikaṇṭu-s or uric col)
13 <sup>th</sup> c.	<b><i>Naṇṇūl</i></b>					<b><i>Navanītap pāṭṭiyal</i></b>	
12 <sup>th</sup> c.					<b><i>Tamiḷ Taṇṭi</i></b> 126 verses totalling 326 lines	<b><i>Veṇpāp pāṭṭiyal</i></b>	
	<b><i>Vīracōḷiyam</i> commentary (Peruntēvaṇār)</b>						
11 <sup>th</sup> c.	<b><i>Vīracōḷiyam</i> (Puttamittiraṇār)</b> (elementary initiation to Sanskrit śāstra-s in 183 verses)						
10 <sup>th</sup> c.				<b><i>Yāpparuṅkala- virutti</i> (YV) <i>Yāpparuṅkalam</i> (YA)</b>		<b><i>Paṇṇiru Pāṭṭiyal</i></b>	<b><i>Piṅkalam</i></b>
9 <sup>th</sup> c.					<b><i>Aṇiyiyal</i> (lost)</b>		<b><i>Tivākaram</i></b>
8 <sup>th</sup> c.							
Daṇḍin					<b><i>Kāvyādarśa</i></b>		
7 <sup>th</sup> c.							
6 <sup>th</sup> c.	<b><i>Avinayam</i></b> (lost but for 100+ fragments)						
3 <sup>rd</sup> – 5 <sup>th</sup> c.	<b><i>Tolkāppiyam</i></b> 3 books: TE, TC & TP		part of TP: <b><i>Ceyyūḷiyal</i></b>		part of TP: <b><i>Uvamaviyal</i></b> See also: marapiyal, ceyyūḷiyal (eṭṭu vaṇappu, pukaḷ, vacai, aṅkatam)	part of TP: cf. Pāṭṭaṇ tiṇai (T) cf. marapiyal cf. eṭṭu vaṇappu	Part of TC: <b><i>Uriyiyal</i></b>

Chart 3: Fragmentary chronology and map of the Tamil scholarly tradition

<sup>17</sup> For a justification, see the information given in footnote 6 (XREF\_1).

### 3. What does it mean/imply for the *Alaṅkārap Paṭalam* (AP) to be an (attempted) translation of the KD? (to be a partial translation from Skt into Tamil)<sup>18</sup>

The general context being given, we shall now return to an examination of the ramifications of the *kārikai* (VC143) given in (1a) and translated in (1b) inside section 1. That *kārikai* (and the key terms which it contains) can be characterized as an allusive “table of content” (TOC) for the AP (5<sup>th</sup> section of the VC) which at the same time connects it with the four previous sections, because the term *poruḷ* (see chart 1) “value, meaning, topic, [poetical] matters” is for instance the master term (and the title) for the 3<sup>rd</sup> section of the VC, the *Poruḷ-atikāram*, where the first *kārikai* (VC86) makes twin claims to two dimensions:

- the traditional realm of poetological topics, where Puttamittiraṇār expounds a four-fold scheme for *poruḷ* (*akam*, *puṛam*, *akap-puṛam*, *puṇap-puṛam*) which goes beyond the traditional two-fold scheme of the T, which was only the opposition between *akam* “inside” (love poetry) and *puṛam* “outside” (other types of poetry).<sup>19</sup>
- the philosophical realm of *PRAMĀṆA* (“means of knowledge”) theory, partly adapted to Tamil when VC86 states that discussing *poruḷ* also involves understanding *aḷappāṇ* (“measurer”), *aḷavai* (“measure”) and *piramēyam* (skt *prameya*).

However, traveling back and forth between the sections of the VC can be fraught with terminological difficulties because if the use of *poruḷ* seems “commensurable” between VC86 and VC143, the same cannot be said of URAI, which seems to be used meta-linguistically in VC89 for referring (inside 3<sup>rd</sup> section) to the 27 topics<sup>20</sup> which are part of [poetological] “explanation/commentary”, whereas URAI seems to refer (as a normal linguistic item) in VC143 to the materiality of “speech” (see 1b), identified as a body (*uṭal*) of which the *poruḷ* “topic” will be the “soul/life”.

My general impression, while reading the VC, is that it is not “a grammar for Tamil literature”, as is sometimes said, but that it is a **normalizing**<sup>21</sup> introduction (composed in Tamil) to some currents inside mainstream/dominant (or fashionable?)<sup>22</sup> Indian Thought (as reflected in current [at the time] Sanskrit technical literature (and that includes the DK), and that it accomplishes that through three possible means of action, when trying to express a concept which has been discussed inside Sanskrit technical literature :

- **(α)** find a Tamil equivalent to the Sanskrit technical term (possibly skewing the original meaning of the Tamil term)
- **(β)** if there is an ancient loanword<sup>23</sup> (from Prakrit or from Sanskrit), use that term
- **(γ)** if no suitable term is found, use a Sanskrit term, adapted to Tamil phonology

It is however to be noted that, because of the extreme brevity (already mentionned) of the VC, the whole process would result in totally cryptic lists, if the VC text was not accompanied by Peruntēvaṇār’s commentary. In practice, the *Alaṅkārap Paṭalam* (AP) of the VC frequently appears as being simply a “Table of content”, partly translated into Tamil (and often reordered), of Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyādarśa* (DK), where the bare lists of technical terms occasionally contain a few inserted words of explanation (or some inserted translation). As for illustrative verses, none are found

<sup>18</sup> This echoes some of the questions in my 2009 *tantra yukti* article (BIB), concerning what it means (in practice) to translate (a NEW topic) from skt into Tamil, although the concern for Puttamittiraṇār may have been to go towards STANDARDIZATION.

<sup>19</sup> Between those two schemes, we have the 3-fold scheme of Avināyaṇār (*akam*, *puṛam*, *akap-puṛam*), whose grammar is lost but which we know thanks to YV, who mentions it, while discussing the 4-fold scheme (*iṇi*, *oru cārār*, *‘akattiṇai*, *puṇattiṇai*, *akappuṇattiṇai eṇa mūṇṇāy aṭaṅkum*, *‘eṇpa. āmāru avinayattuṭ kāṇka*, YV1998, p. 608).

<sup>20</sup> Among those 27 urai-s (explicitly enumerated in VC90 and VC91), the first one, *caṭṭakam* “[metrical] frame” is understood by commentators as encompassing *Yāppu* “meter” and the 9<sup>th</sup> one, *moḷi-vakai* “categories of words”, is certainly a bridge with the second section of the VC, namely *col* “word”.

<sup>21</sup> For instance, in the second section of the VC, Puttamittiraṇār introduces the list of six *kāraka*-s used in Sanskrit grammars, although Tamil grammarians were in fact happy to have their own list of eight *kāraka*-s, which they called *toḷiṇmutanilai* (see T596: *viṇaiyē*, *ceyvatu*, ...), as can be seen from the fact that in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the *Naṇṇūl* retained (in N320: “*ceypavaṇ*, *karuvi*, ...”) the core of the T list.

<sup>22</sup> I hesitate between « mainstream » and « fashionable ».

<sup>23</sup> An ancient loanword is a term such as *ētu* (*hetu*), already found in the *Tolkāppiyam* or in intermediate texts.



in the AP<sup>24</sup> (unlike in DK) but they are provided only by the commentator. Specifically, regarding the three strategies ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ ) mentioned above, we have two occasions for examining them inside the AP:

- the first one is with the list of 10 terms used in the AP for rendering the *guṇa*-s of Daṇḍin which are prominent in the discussion of the two styles/paths associated with the Vaidarbhas and the Gauḍas (although Puttamittiraṇār has his own way of dealing with them, as we shall see)
- the second one is with the list of 35 *alaṅkāra*-s (examined in section 4).

In the chart which follows (chart 4), I compare the proportions in the use of strategies ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ ) by Puttamittiraṇār and by the Tamil Taṇṭi when handling the *guṇa*-s of Daṇḍin, which the former calls *āvi*-s [skt doublet of *uyir* “soul, life”], when the latter uses *kuṇaṇ*<sup>25</sup> for *guṇa*). The numbering refers to the position of the items in each of the three authors lists (because they differ). The striking fact is of course that Puttamittiraṇār judged that ONLY THREE TERMS out of ten could be explained to his audience in Tamil, and decided to use the Tamilized form of SEVEN SANSKRIT terms, which does not look like a completely successful translation. In the TA, the proportion is inverted.

	Strategies	Daṇḍin ( <i>guṇa</i> -s)	Puttamittiraṇār ( <i>āvi</i> -s)	Taṇṭi (TA) ( <i>kuṇaṇ</i> )	Remarks
A	<b><math>\alpha \alpha</math></b> (Same Tamil term)	D4 <i>mādhuryaṃ</i>	V10 <i>iṇṇam</i>	T4 <i>iṇṇam</i> “pleasure”	
B	<b><math>\alpha_1 \alpha_2</math></b> (different Tamil terms)	D2 <i>prasāda</i>	V4 <i>pulaṇ</i> “simplicity” (or “[lucid] knowledge”)	T2 <i>teḷivu</i> “clarity”	See T1497 ( <i>pulaṇ</i> ) <sup>26</sup>
		D6 <i>arthavyakti</i>	V7 <i>poruṭ-ṭeḷivu</i> ( <i>poruṭ+^teḷivu</i> ) “clarity of meaning”	T7 <i>uyttal-il-poruṇmai</i> “signification [obtained] without [complicated] deduction”	See T1610 ( <i>uyttuk koṇṭ-uṇarttal</i> )
C	<b><math>\gamma \alpha</math></b> (“Sanskrit” vs. Tamil)	D1 <i>śleṣa</i>	V1 <i>cilīṭṭam</i> <sup>27</sup>	T1 <i>ceṇivu</i> “tightness”	
		D5 <i>sukumāratā</i>	V9 <i>cukumāratāi</i>	T5 <i>oḷukicai</i> “flowing sound”	
		D8 <i>ojas</i>	V8 <i>ōcam</i>	T9 <i>vali</i> “strength”	
D	<b><math>\gamma \beta</math></b> (Standard “Sanskrit” vs. adopted form)	D3 <i>samatā</i>	V5 <i>camatai</i>	T3 <i>camanilai</i> “neutrality”	See Kuṇaḷ <sup>28</sup>
E	<b><math>\gamma_1 \gamma_2</math></b> (variety of learned borrowings)	D7 <i>udāratvaṃ</i>	V2 <i>utāratai</i>	T6 <i>utāram</i>	Not yet adopted in Modern Tamil <sup>29</sup>
		D9 <i>kānti</i>	V3 <i>kānti</i> <sup>30</sup>	T8 <i>kāntam</i>	
F	<b><math>\gamma \gamma</math></b> (learned borrowing)	D10 <i>samādhi</i>	V6 <i>camāti</i>	T10 <i>camāti</i>	
	<b>Sanskrit/Tamil proportion</b>		<b>Seven to Three</b>	<b>Three to Seven (or four to six)</b> <sup>31</sup>	

**chart 4: Two ways of applying three strategies ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ )  
for explaining the *guṇa*-s of Daṇḍin to a Tamil (learned) audience.**

<sup>24</sup> An exception to my statement is the presence of the many vocatives, addressed to ladies (*makaṭū muṇṇilai*) in 67 of the 183 kārikai-s (cf. TVG [2005, pp. 724-726]). See the example “O Lady with heavy jewelled earrings (*kaṇaṅkuḷai*)! in (1b).

<sup>25</sup> The Tamil Taṇṭi says, nevertheless, (in verse 14) that those *kuṇaṃ* are like *uyir* “life” to the path called *Vaitaruppam*. TVG frequently refers to them (in the TIPA) as *kuṇa-v-aṇi* “qualitative ornaments” or as *potu-v-aṇi* “general ornaments”.

<sup>26</sup> However, there is also the question of the relationship between *pulaṇ* and *pulavar*. A *pulavar* is an experienced field-knower (*kṣetra-jña*). See also the characterization “*pulaṇ tokuttōṇ*” in the *ciṇṇappuṇ pāyiram* of the T. And the use of *pulaṇ-koḷal* (= *aṇṭal*) in *Maṇimēkalai* XXVII-13.

<sup>27</sup> Puttamittiraṇār says in fact *ceṇiv-ār-cilīṭṭam* “*cilīṭṭam*, which is full of tightness/density”

<sup>28</sup> *camāṇ ceytu cīr tūkkum kōlpōl amaintu orupāl kōṭāmai cāṇṇōrkku aṇi* (Kuṇaḷ 118).

<sup>29</sup> The terms are of course found in the Madras Tamil Lexicon but an examination of the CreA dictionary for contemporary Tamil shows that those three terms never found their way into mainstream Tamil with the meaning intended in the DK, although other meanings are found such as “tomb” for *camāti*, “generosity” for *utāra-kuṇaṃ* and “magnet” for *kāntam*.

<sup>30</sup> However, VC151 contains a Tamil explanation to *kānti*, when it says: *āṇā v-aḷakiṇaik kānti y-eṇkiṇratu* (“*Kānti* means “unceasing beauty”).

<sup>31</sup> The difference depend on the manner of classifying *camanilai*. My perception is that  $\beta$  is closer to  $\alpha$  as to  $\gamma$ .

At this stage, before moving, in the next section, to the discussion of the term *alaṅkāram* (and what it refers to), we must remark that although the concept of “path/style” is evoked in VC143, by the presence of the word *naṭai* “gait, style”, which is said to be to a poem (*ceyyul*) what *celavu* (going) is to a human being, and although the *vitārppar* and *kauṭar* are dutifully mentioned by Puttamittiraṇār in VC148 and VC151, he does not use the term *kuṇam* (unlike Tamil Taṇṭi) for referring to the *guṇa*-s of Daṇḍin, but refers to the ten items of chart 4, which he first enumerates in VC 148, as *āvikaḷ* (plural of *āvi* “life, soul”) using the adapted form of a sanskrit synonym of the Tamil term *uyir*, and justifies himself in VC149 by invoking Daṇḍin for the second time.<sup>32</sup>

#### 4. The Tamil prehistory of *alaṅkāram* and the 28 *alaṅkāram*-s of the lost *Aṇiyiyal*

After this brief exploration of the ramifications pertaining to the terms in the columns A, B, D and E, of chart 1, it should now be time to examine the term in column G, namely the all-important *alaṅkāram*, which gives its name to the AP. That key item is, in the general economy of the AP, expanded by means of a long sequence of 25 *kārikai*-s, starting with VC152, and ending with VC176. In this long sequence, the 35 *alaṅkāram*-s of the DK are first enumerated (in VC152-VC155) and then most of them are the object of more detailed explanations (in VC156-VC176). Among them, 21 (i.e. 60%) are given Tamil names (see chart 6), while the remaining 14 (40%) are mentioned under their “Sanskrit” names (adapted to Tamil phonology).

Before however examining those 35 items, I must at this point emphasize that the word *alaṅkāram* itself was already familiar to the Tamil audience before whom the VC was recited for the first time, once Puttamittiraṇār had composed his very dense, all-encompassing treatise. The listeners would have already heard the term when studying texts such as the *Yāpparūṅkalam* (=YA) (BIB), a tenth-century metrical treatise, and the two *Nikaṇṭu*-s or “thesauri” called *Tivākaram* (Ti) (BIB) and *Piṅkalam* (Pi) (BIB), probably composed in the ninth and the tenth centuries.<sup>33</sup> These three texts chronologically precede the VC, and they contain references to the general category of *alaṅkāram*, for instance in connection with the definition of *matura kavi* “sweet poem/poet”,<sup>34</sup> for which we have the following sūtra, identically found in the Ti and in the Pi.<sup>35</sup>

(2a) *poruḷiṇ poliv-um, collu celvam-um, // toṭai-y-um, toṭaikkaṇ vikaṭṭam-um tutaintu, // uruvakam mutal-ām alaṅkāram uṭkoṇṭu // ōcaipoli v-uṭaittāy, uytt-uṇarvōr uḷaṅkaṭṭu // mā-kaṭal amiḷtam-pōl pāṭutal matura-kavi* “A sweet poem (poet) is obtained in a singing (*pāṭutal*) which, being dense in grand topics, richness of words, rhyming/alliteration, variety of rhyming/alliteration, including the ornamental figures, which start with *uruvakam* (“metaphor”), possesses lofty sonorities, and is like the ambrosia from the great sea to the minds of those who are capable of deducting its meaning (*uytt-uṇarvōr*)” (Ti\_2335 & Pi\_367)

This mention of *uruvakam* in a 9<sup>th</sup> century text might be the earliest we now have in the whole of Tamil literature, and it is not isolated because the same *Tivākaram* contains in its 2458<sup>th</sup> sūtra, an explicit list of 28 *alaṅkāram*, starting with *uruvakam* (1) and ending with *viraviyal* (27) and with *vāḷttu* (28), which reads:

(3) [A] *uruvakam, uvamai, vaḷimaṭakku, nilaimaṭakku, // [B] (viricuṭar) viḷakku eṇa viravi varuvaṇavum, // [C] vēṇṇumai nilaiyē, vēḷippaṭu nilaiyē, // [D] vārttai, taṇmai, piṇaporuḷ vaippu eṇap // [E] pāṇṇaṭak kiḷanta pakutiyaṇ varunaṇavum, // [F] ciṇṇappumoli, cilēṭai,*

<sup>32</sup> The commentator emphasizes, while commenting VC149, that there is no contradiction in this respect between Daṇḍin and Puttamittiraṇār, because it is thanks to the 10 *āvi* “soul/life” (starting with *cilīṭṭām*) that the *poruḷ* “topic/matter” can be a perfect *uyir* “soul/life” for its *uṭal* “body” (which must of course also be perfect). The perfection (and the possible imperfections) of the “limbs” (*uṇuppu*) of the “body” is discussed by Puttamittiraṇār himself in the two *kārikai*-s VC144 and VC145. The following two *kārikai*-s (VC146 & VC 147) discuss the “eminent soul” (*ciṇṇappuyir*) and the *āviyaṇ kuṇṇam* “faults of the soul”.

<sup>33</sup> See the chronology in Chart 3.

<sup>34</sup> In Tamil, *kavi* can be used either for the poem or for the poet. Many will know that “sweet poetry” (sung by sweet poets) is one among four categories of poetry (sung by four types of poets). See Chevillard[2014]: “On four types of poets and four types of scholars: from *pulavar* to *kavi* in the changing intellectual landscape of Tamil Nadu”. Another category, the *cittirak kavi* (“extreme poetry / extreme poet”) should certainly be mentioned in connection with VC181. See also Ti2336, Pi368 and YA-96 [lines 1-14]. (this last one distinguishes several subgroups: *cittirap pā*, *vicittirap pā* and *miṇaikkavip pāṭṭu*). (YV1998, p.560-561). (An additional reference is VC[2005: p.698]).

<sup>35</sup> A slightly modified form is found in YV (see YV\_1998, pp. 586-587).



*maṟuttumolī nilaiyē, // [X] nōkkē, uṭṭotar, tokaimolī, mikaimolī, // [G] uṭaṇilaik kūṭṭam, uvamāṇa muruvakam, // [H] nuvalā nuvaṛci, talaikkaṭ ṭiyamolī, // [I] nitaricaṇam, pārāṭṭu, oruṅkiya nilaiyē, // [J] aiyam, uyarvē, viraviyal, vāḷttu eṇa // [K] eytak kūṛiya irupatteṭṭu alaṅkāram (Ti-2458)*

I shall not try to translate this list into English at this stage, except when it comes to the final count, namely *irupatteṭṭu* “twenty-eight”. The reader can notice the presence of the capital letters, at the beginning of each metrical line: they have been inserted here in order to make more visible a pattern, namely **ABC DEFX GHIJK**, which can be usefully compared with other patterns, such as the one found inside another list of 28 *alaṅkāram*, starting and ending in the same manner, which the *Piṅkalam* embeds in its 1370<sup>th</sup> sūtra, inside a long (36-line) stanza explaining in detail how a patron (*puravalaṇ*) should fulfil his duty (*kaṭaṇ*) and honor a poet on the occasion of the initial performance (*araṅkēṛram*) of his poem. The pattern in that second list is **ABC XDEF GHIJK**, as can be verified by reading (4), below, which is extracted from Pi-1370:

- (4) **[A]** *uruvaka muvamai vaḷinilai maṭakkē // [B] viricuṭar viḷakkeṇa viravi varunavum // [C] vēṛrumai nilaiyē veḷippaṭu nilaiyē // [X] nōkkē yuṭkō ṭokaimolī mikaimolī // [D] vārttai taṇmai piṛarkōḷ vaippenap // [E] pārpaṭak kiṭanta pakutiyaṇ varunavuṇ // [F] ciṛappumolī cilētai maṟuttumolī nilaiyē // [G] vuṭaṇilaik kūṭṭa muvamāṇa muruvaka // [H] nuvalā nuvaṛci talaikkaṭ ṭiyamolī // [I] nitaricaṇam pārāṭ ṭoruṅkiya nilaiyē // [J] yaiya muyarvē viraviyal vāḷtteṇa // [K] veytumiru patteṭ ṭalaṅkārat tālum*

(Pi-1370, lines 1-12, out of a total of 36 lines)<sup>36</sup>

If we were not limited by time and space, we could also directly compare those two patterns with the one we can extract from a sūtra of the *Cūṭāmaṇi Nikaṇṭu*, **the most popular of all Tamil kōśa-s**,<sup>37</sup> composed in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, where we also have an explicit list of 28 *alaṅkāram*, with the same beginning and the same ending, and in which the pattern found could be represented as **ABC XDF GYHIJ**<sup>\*</sup>, where the newly inserted Y symbol is a singleton list.<sup>38</sup> However, if we want to remain focussed on the prehistory of *alaṅkāra śāstra* in Tamil, and on the period which precedes the composition of the VC by Puttamittiraṇār, it seems more urgent at this stage to examine a text belonging to a different transmissional line, namely the 10<sup>th</sup> cent. *Yāpparuṅkalam* (YA), a seminal metrical treatise, and with the very detailed evidence contained in its commentary, the *Yāpparuṅkalavirutti* (YV), which is a very important text for all historians of the Tamil śāstric tradition. Regarding the YA, I shall first of all reproduce the lines 15 and 16 (extracted from a sequence of 29 lines in all) inside the YA-96, which is the last sūtra in the YA. Inside that extract from a long enumeration of many topics, we see the following words, concerning three distinct topics, signalled here by brackets (tagged A, B and C):

- (5) <sup>A</sup>{*uruvaka m-āti viraviya l-īṛā // varum-alaṅ kāramum*}<sup>A</sup> <sup>B</sup>{*vāḷttum*}<sup>B</sup> <sup>C</sup>{*vacaiyum*}<sup>C</sup> “... <sup>A</sup>and the “ornaments” (*alaṅkāram*), [whose list contains] *uruvakam* as beginning (*āti*) and *viraviyal* as end (*īṛu*), <sup>B</sup>and the blessing (*vāḷttu*), <sup>C</sup>and the curse (*vacai*), and ...

[YA-96, lines 15-16]

Regarding the YV, which comments on YA in a very detailed<sup>39</sup> manner, when the time comes for explaining the topic which is delimited by the <sup>A</sup>{ } braces inside citation (2), YV develops this Beginning-End (virtual) list into an explicit enumeration of 27 items, which does indeed start with *uruvakam* but in which *viraviyal* is the penultimate item and not the last one, that role falling on the item *vāḷttu*.<sup>40</sup> At some point after that, we are provided (inside YV) with the

<sup>36</sup> This is based on the 1968 edition of *Piṅkalam* (p.201).

<sup>37</sup> See François Gros[1980] **[BIB]**.

<sup>38</sup> It contains the item *veruppilā makilcci* “rejoicing without disgust”, which seems to correspond to the *makilcci* of AP, and to the *preya* of Daṇḍin. This addition is compensated by the shortening of J into J\*, where the second item, *uyarvu* “elevation” (j<sub>2</sub>), has been eliminated in order to keep the (traditional) count to 28.

<sup>39</sup> Its prolixity can be illustrated by the fact that in the 1998 edition of YA, the commentary concerning the 14 lines which precede the 2 lines cited in (2b) occupies 24 pages.

<sup>40</sup> That discrepancy, which must be due to the influence of *Tivākaram* (or of *Piṅkalam*), is confusing, and the reader might suspect a misprint, because *vāḷttu* is already present in YV96 as an independent element, signalled inside my citation (2a) by the <sup>B</sup>{ }<sup>B</sup> braces, and followed on the same line 16 by item *vacai*, indicated in (2a) by the <sup>C</sup>{ }<sup>C</sup> braces. Both *vāḷttu* and *vacai* are indeed the objects of two separate sets of explanations.

remark that more information can be found inside a treatise called *Aṇi-y-iyal* (which is unfortunately lost). The list (in prose) which obtains from (5) after insertion of many items between the first item (*uruvakam*) and the last item (*viraviyal*) and after addition of *vālttu* is provided in (6), and its pattern is **ABC XDF G\*H\*ZIJ**, to be compared with the patterns found in (3) and (4):

(6) [A] (YV1) *uruvakam-um*, (YV2) *uvamai-y-um*, (YV3) *vaḷimoḷi-y-um*, (YV4) *maṭakk-um*, [B] (YV5) *tīpakam-um*, [C] (YV6) *vēṛṛumai nilai-y-um*, (YV7) *veḷippaṭai nilai-y-um*, [X] (YV8) *nōkk-um*, (YV9) *uṭkōl-um*, (YV10) *tokai moḷi-y-um*, (YV11) *mikai moḷi-y-um*, [D] (YV12) *vārttai-y-um*, (YV13) *taṇmai-y-um*, (YV14) *piṛa poruḷ vaipp-um*, [F] (YV15) *ciṛappu moḷi-y-um*, (YV16) *ciḷēṭai-y-um*, (YV17) *maṛuttumōḷinilai-y-um*, [G\*] (YV18) *uṭaṇilaik kūṭṭam-um*, (YV19) [H\*] *nuvalā nuvaṛci-y-um*, [Z] (YV20) *uyar-moḷi-y-um*, [I] (YV21) *nitaricaṇam-um*, (YV22) *māṛāṭṭ-um*, (YV23) *oruṇkiyal moḷi-y-um*, [J] (YV24) *aiyam-um*, (YV25) *uyarv-um*, (YV26) *viraviyal-um*, (YV27) *vāltt-um*.  
(YV\_1998, p. 585)

The use of symbols such as **A, B, C**, etc. in (3), (4) and (6), for representing what are in fact short lists, concatenated into bigger lists, is only intended as a preliminary “balisage” in order to show (using a bird’s eye view argument) that all those lists are related and are, most probably, descended from a primordial list which was contained in the original *Aṇi-y-iyal*, whose existence is mentionned in the 10<sup>th</sup> century YV but which is unfortunately lost. That *Aṇi-y-iyal* list must have contained 28 elements, but because of the many small discrepancies between the four texts examined so far, we cannot be sure what those 28 items were, although more evidence is in fact possibly contained inside the collection of 124 *nūrpā*-s collected by Peruntēvaṇār, when commenting on the AP (as indicated in [Chart 2](#)). I shall now present in tabular form the three patterns given for Ti, Pi and YV, and shall also provide more details concerning the content of the symbols (How many items do they stand for?) and the discrepancies between them.

<i>Tivākaram</i> (Ti-2458)	<b>ABC DEF X GHIJK (concatenation has 28 items)</b>	9 <sup>th</sup> c.
<i>Piṅkalam</i> (Pi-1370)	<b>ABC XDEF GHIJK (concatenation contains 28 items)</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> c.
<i>Yāpparuṇkalavirutti</i> (commenting YA-96)	<b>ABC XDF G*H*ZIJ (concatenation contains 27 items)</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> c.
Number of <i>alaṅkāram</i> per symbol	E and K are empty textual fillers; B, G*, H* and Z are lists of 1 item; C, G and H contain 2 items; D, I and F contain 3 items; A, J and X have 4 items.	

**Chart 5: 3 patterns, derived from the lost table of content of the original *Aṇi-y-iyal*, which contained 28 *alaṅkāra*-s (G\* and H\* obtain from G and H by loss of the second item)**

Going beyond this preliminary stage, we discover that the devil is hidden in the details because, inside most of the small lists mentionned in chart 5, one or more items can have a slightly different shape. For example, the symbol A which represents 4 items can be expanded as {a<sub>1</sub> a<sub>2</sub> a<sub>3</sub> a<sub>4</sub>}, but if we examine the corresponding items inside the sequences given in (3), (4) and (4), we can easily verify that while a<sub>1</sub> is always the same *uruvakam* in all three texts, and a<sub>2</sub> is always the same *uvamai*, a<sub>3</sub> can have three distinct values, namely *vaḷimaṭakku*, *vaḷinilai* and *vaḷimoḷi* (which I shall call a<sub>3a</sub>, a<sub>3b</sub> and a<sub>3c</sub>) whereas a<sub>4</sub> can have two distinct values, namely *nilaimaṭakku* and *maṭakku* (which I shall call a<sub>4a</sub> and a<sub>4b</sub>). Enumerating all the distinct cases increases our stock of distinct item designations from 28 to 37 (the detailed list is provided here in an appendix [\[To be done, if needed\]](#)<sup>41</sup>). But enumerating variant forms is only a beginning, because we must be ready for two more questions:

- (Q1) if two forms are different, does it mean that what they signify is different?
- (Q2) if two forms are identical, does it mean that what they signify is the same?

As a concrete example of question Q1, the second item inside list C, namely c<sub>2</sub>, possesses two variants, namely *veḷippaṭu nilai* (c<sub>2a</sub>, found in Ti and in Pi) and *veḷippaṭai nilai* (c<sub>2b</sub>, found in YV). However, the consensus among scholars seems to be that both mean the same and that they are the original Tamil equivalent of Daṇḍin’s *vibhāvana*

<sup>41</sup> That dry list is currently (2018/04/08, 22:12, Paris time) HANDWRITTEN on a piece of paper.

(DA9), for which both Puttamittiraṇār and Tamil Tāṇṭi have preferred to keep (*mutatis mutandis*) the “original” Sanskrit designation, because they both call it *vipāvaṇai* (see chart 6, in section 5, and see VC166).

As a concrete example of question Q2, we have just seen that inside list A, the fourth item, has two variants: *nilaimaṭakku* (a<sub>4a</sub>) and *maṭakku* (a<sub>4b</sub>). That second variant is found inside the *Piṅkalam* and the modern editors of the *Piṅkalam* seem to think that in that case *maṭakku* means *maṭaṅkutaṇaviṛciyaṇi*, which is apparently (according to TVG, TIPA, vol.13, p.133) the equivalent of Sanskrit *vakrōkti*. Nevertheless, the more ordinary use of *maṭakku* in Tamil is to be the equivalent of Sanskrit *yamaka*.<sup>42</sup> It is therefore easy to be perplexed, while exploring such a complex environment.<sup>43</sup> If we make the hypothesis that inside the list A of the *Tivākaram*, which is “*uruvakam, uvamai, valīmaṭakku, nilaimaṭakku*”, some FACTORING OUT (French “factorisation”) has been performed, which has resulted in the *Piṅkalam* sequence, we find ourselves in the (to me) more natural situation where sequence A simply enumerates the *rūpaka*, the *upamā* and two types of *yamaka*, followed by sequence B, dedicated to the *dīpaka*. This succession becomes an enumeration of the four *alaṅkāram*-s known to the NŚ, which is, after all, NOT SURPRISING.

I have in this already long section only examined the tip of the iceberg. Given the fragmentary nature of the evidence, it is probably impossible to completely fulfill that task. I shall nevertheless provide as a small conclusion some statistics on the proportion of Tamil and (adapted) “Sanskrit” terms in the YV list (which is one possible representative of the old *Aṇiyiyal*). We can see (in chart 5 below) that more than 77% of the vocabulary is Tamil, because only 6 terms (out of 27) are taken from Sanskrit, and this include the ancient borrowed term *uvamai* (from skt. *upamā*), already found in the *Tolkāppiyam*. In the following section, I shall briefly do the same for the AP and the TA lists, which are adapted from the DK.

Categories	items	count
<b>α</b> (tamil term)	all items, except the six items below	21 items
<b>β</b> (ancient borrowing)	(YV2) <i>uvamai</i> , (YV12) <i>vārttai</i>	2 items
<b>γ</b> (new borrowing from Sanskrit)	(YV1) <i>uruvakam</i> , (YV5) <i>tīpakam</i> , (YV16) <i>cilēṭai-y-um</i> , (YV21) <i>nitaricaṇam</i>	4 items

**chart 6:** proportion of Tamil and adapted Sanskrit terms  
in YV *alaṅkāram* list of 27 terms

## 5. Contrasting the 35 *alaṅkāram*-s (VC and TA) with the 28 “prehistoric” *alaṅkāram*-s (Ti, Pi and YV)

In this section, I am providing the reader first with a chart similar to charts 4 and 6, where the names of the 35 *alaṅkāram* found in the VC and the TA will be “ventilated” into categories, on the basis of strategies (α, β and γ) used. The result is as follows:

<sup>42</sup> This is for instance the case in VC179.

<sup>43</sup> ,

count	Strategies	Daṇḍin <sup>44</sup>	Puttamittiraṇār	Taṇṭi
3 items	α α (same Tamil translation)	DA1, DA16, DA18	<i>taṇmai, niraṇṭrai, cuvai</i>	
12 items	α <sub>1</sub> α <sub>2</sub> (two distinct Tamil translations)	DA5, DA6, DA7, DA10, DA12, DA14, DA17, DA19, DA26, DA28, DA29, DA31	<i>mīṭci, pīra poruḷ vaippu, taṭai mōḷi, curukku, nōkku, nuṇukkam, maḱiḷcci, ūkkam, uṭaṇilaic col, nuvalāc col, terivil pukaḷcci, oruṇkiyal</i>	<i>piṇvarunilai, vēṛrup poruḷ vaippu, muṇṇa vilakku, oṭṭu, taṛkuṛippēṛram, nuṭṭam, āṛva mōḷi, taṇmēmpāṭṭurai, oppumaik kūṭṭam, mārupaṭu pukaḷṇilai, pukaḷāp pukaḷcci, puṇarunilai</i>
2 items	γ α	DA8, DA33	<b>vitirēkam, āci</b>	<i>vēṛrumai, vāṭṭu</i>
10 items	γ γ (new borrowing)	DA3, DA9, DA11, DA20, DA23, DA24, DA35	<b>uruvakam, vipāvaṇai, aticayam, pariāyam, avanuti, cilēṭai, pāvikam</b>	
	γ <sub>1</sub> γ <sub>2</sub> (two variants)	DA15, DA21, DA22,	<b>ilēcu, camāyitam, utāratai</b>	<b>ilēcam, camākitam, utāttam,</b>
2 items	β β (ancient borrowing)	DA2, DA13	<i>uvamai, ētu</i>	
6 items	α γ	DA4, DA25, DA27, DA30, DA32, DA34	<i>viḷakku, cīrappu, muraṇ, cuṭṭu, parimāṛṛam, virāvu</i>	<b>tīvakam, vicēṭam, virōtam, nitaricaṇam, parivaruttaṇai, caṇkīraṇam</b>
		<b>35 items</b>	<b>21 α, 2 β and 12 γ</b>	<b>17 α, 2 β and 16 γ</b>

chart 7: Three strategies (α, β and γ) for explaining the *alaṅkāra*-s of Daṇḍin to a Tamil (learned) audience  
 (“untranslated” Sanskrit terms are in bold)

It is of course difficult to compare things which do not have the same size. Nevertheless, I believe that it can be justified to compare proportions. In the previous section we saw (in chart 6) that 77% of the vocabulary contained in the lists derived from the lost *Aṇṭiyiḷ* was Tamil. We see in this chart that in the AP, the percentage of Tamil vocabulary is 60%, and that it goes down to 48% in the text composed by the Tamil Taṇṭi. Paradoxically the movement is the inverse of the movement seen in Chart 4), where the percentages of Tamil vocabulary for the *guṇa*-s were respectively 30% (in the AP) and 70% (in the text composed by the Tamil Taṇṭi). I shall come back to those figures in the concluding section, but it is now time to examine the topic of *vaṇṇam*, left untranslated until now, but which was one of the key terms constitutive of the *rūpaka* inside VC143, as presented in (1a) and (1b).

## 7. Why did Puttamittiraṇār mention *vaṇṇam*?

As previously indicated (see chart 1b inside section 1), *vaṇṇam* is the topic of VC142, which is the last *kārikai* inside the YP (*Yāppup paṭalam*), fourth section of the VC, devoted to metrics. That *kārikai* VC142 is however a typical example of the CRYPTIC terseness of Puttamittiraṇār, who is certainly not himself a practitioner of *arthavyakti*,<sup>45</sup> because VC142 is a totally cryptic (borrowed and reordered) list, which would be incomprehensible without Peruntevaṇār, who himself does not bring any original contribution, but contents himself with borrowing, in guise of a commentary, the (slightly simplified) text of the 20 sūtras from the *Tolkāppiyam* –totally surrendering to the most famous Tamil traditional source. More precisely, *kārikai* VC142 reads:

(7) *mellicai yēnta loḷukuruṭ ṭeṇṇoru vēmuṭuku // valliyaḷ pāvakaḷ pāṭṭu naliṅkaḷ pōṭiyaiyu // colliya cittiran tāvu purappāṭ ṭaḷapeṭaiyum // vallicai tūṅkal neṭuñcīr kuṇuñcī rivaivaṇṇamē.* (VC142)

<sup>44</sup> The sanskrit names associated to those Daṇḍi *Alaṅkāra* references are: (DA1) jāti, (DA2) upamā, (DA3) rūpaka, (DA4) dīpaka, (DA5) āvṛtti, (DA6) ākṣepa, (DA7) arthantaranyāsa, (DA8) vyatireka, (DA9) vibhāvana, (DA10) samāśokti, (DA11) atīśayavokti, (DA12) utprekṣa, (DA13) hetu, (DA14) sūkṣma, (DA15) leśa, (DA16) yathāśamkhyā, (DA17) Preya, (DA18) Rasavat, (DA19) ūrjasvi, (DA20) paryāyoktam, (DA21) samāhitam, (DA22) udāttam, (DA23) apahnuti, (DA24) śliṣṭam, (DA25) viśeṣokti, (DA26) tulyayogitā, (DA27) savirodha, (DA28) apastutapraśaṁśā, (DA29) vyājastuti, (DA30) nidarśana, (DA31) saḥokti, (DA32) parivṛtti, (DA33) āśih, (DA34) saṁkīrṇam, (DA35) bhāvika.

<sup>45</sup> Alias *poruṭṭelivu*, alias *uyttalilporuṇmai*: see chart 4 in section 3.

And the whole explanation given by Peruntēvaṇār in order to explain (7) reads thus:

(8) “(4) mellicai vaṇṇamāvatu, melleḷuttu mikuvatu. // (18) ēntal vaṇṇamāvatu, coṇṇa collē ciṇantu varuvatu. // (13) oḷuku vaṇṇamāvatu, ḍaiyiṇoḷukuvatu. // (19) uruṭṭu vaṇṇamāvatu, arākantoṭuppatu. // (15) eṇṇu vaṇṇamāvatu, eṇ peyar mikku varuvatu. // (14) orū\_u vaṇṇamāvatu, aṭiyaṭitōrum oṇṇāyt toṭaiyuṭaittāvatu. // (20) muṭuku vaṇṇamāvatu, aṭiyirratu aṇiyālākātāy, nīṇṭa aṭittāy arākattōṭu kūṭi varuvatu. // (1) pāvu vaṇṇamāvatu, nūṇpāp payila varuvatu. // (11) akappāṭṭu vaṇṇamāvatu, muṭiyātatu pōla muṭivatu. // (10) nalivu vaṇṇamāvatu, \_āyṭamuṭaittāy varuvatu. // (16) akaippu vaṇṇamāvatu, aṇṭṭaruttu oḷukuvatu. // (5) iyaipu vaṇṇamāvatu, iṭaiyeḷuttu mikuvatu. // (9) cittira vaṇṇamāvatu, kurṇeḷuttum neṭṭeḷuttum viravi varuvatu. // (2) tāvu vaṇṇamāvatu, iṭaiyiṭṭu vanta etukaittāvatu. // (12) puṇappāṭṭu vaṇṇamāvatu, muṭintatu pōṇṇu muṭiyātatu. // (6) aḷapeṭai vaṇṇamāvatu, \_aḷapeṭaiyil varuvatu. // (3) vallicai vaṇṇamāvatu, valleḷuttu mikuvatu. // (17) tūṇkal vaṇṇamāvatu, vaṇci payila varuvatu. // (7) neṭuñcīr vaṇṇamāvatu, neṭṭeḷuttup payila varuvatu. // (8) kuṇuñcīr vaṇṇamāvatu, kurṇeḷuttup payila varuvatu”

The numbers embedded by me inside that paragraph simply indicate that these short statements are in fact reformulations of the 20 individual *sūtras* which the *Tolkāppiyam* devotes to each of the 20 *vaṇṇam*, although the order has been changed to the sequence “4 18 13 19 15 14 20 1 11 10 16 5 9 2 12 6 3 17 7 8” in order to fulfil the constraints of the demanding meter used in the *kārikai*. It is of course impossible to do fully justice to this dense text, but I shall nevertheless try to explain why it must have seemed important to Puttamittiraṇār to include inside his treatise an evocation of what may appeared to many as a powerful (or magical) characterization of the Phonetic Essence of Tamil poetry, and of its multiple “**phonetic textures**”,<sup>46</sup> if we take this as a **tentative translation of *vaṇṇam***, although another meaning of *vaṇṇam* in the *Tolkāppiyam* is “colour”.<sup>47</sup>

My (probably) improvable intuition is that the idea of having a list of 20 *vaṇṇam*-s as the last of the 26 (major) “limbs of poetry” (*ceyyuḷ uruppu*) in the *Ceyyuliyal* (itself the 26<sup>th</sup> chapter of the T) may have originated from a “rêverie” on a topic similar to the *śabda guṇa*-s discussed in Tubb[1985]<sup>48</sup>. However, the material for compiling this list of 20 was original and drawn from various parts of the *Tolkāppiyam* itself.<sup>49</sup> Given the fact that the elements of the list of *vaṇṇam*-s often come in pairs –although there are also some triplets, and some “singletons”–, we can postulate that a list of 20 “phonetic textures” may have appeared as more manageable to the author than a shorter list of 10. And we can also understand why a grammarian/metrician called Avinayaṇār, whose work is lost (but who was known to Puttamittiraṇār),<sup>50</sup> had expanded the count of possible *vaṇṇam*-s from 20 to 100 (see YV1998: 434 sqq).

However, for the sake of completion, I should add that, although this is what Puttamittiraṇār clearly (if cryptically) alludes to in VC142, the reference to the *Tolkāppiyam* (or to the *Avinayam*) may not have been the only topic evoked in the mind of his audience, when hearing the word *vaṇṇam* being mentionned in VC143. I shall briefly mention here two pieces of evidence, (E1) one extracted from the corpus of Tamil devotional poetry, (E2) the other extracted from the corpus of what I have called “Applied knowledge” inside chart 3.

(E1) in the Tēvāram, we come across references by the poets to the singing of compositions called *vaṇṇam*, as in:

(9) *vaṇṇaṇkaḷ tām pāṭi ...* “singing melody-types with measures of time ...”  
(Tēvāram, 6-9, stanza 1, translation by V.M.Subramanya Ayyar)

<sup>46</sup> As in the title of Gary Tubb’s 1985 article: “Abhinavagupta on Phonetic Texture” (JAOS, vol. 105, No. 3, pp. 567-578).

<sup>47</sup> See TC416c : *vaṇṇattiṇ, vaṭiviṇ, aḷaviṇ, cuvaiyiṇ, ....* “du fait de la couleur, de la forme, de la mesure, ou de la saveur ...” (translation, Chevillard[1996, p. 499]). This was my reason for choosing as the title of my (unpublished) 2009 Kyoto WSC presentation title the following: « On the phonetic texture or the “colour” (*vaṇṇam*) of poetry ».

<sup>48</sup> See reference in footnote 45.

<sup>49</sup> For instance, the *pāa vaṇṇam*, first item in the list, is characterized in T1470, and possesses a characteristic feature, *cor-cīr*, which consists in the use of very short lines. The technical term *cor-cīr* is mentionned in the list of possible components for a poem of the *paripāṭal* category in T1379 and explained in T1380. In other parts of the T, it seems to be known under another name, namely *cirṇen*, found in T1409, in the list of possible constituents in a poem of the *ampōṭaraṇkam* type, which is a subcategory of the kali meter. Interestingly, Peruntēvaṇār, who uses the form *pāvu vaṇṇam*, reproduces in fact incompletely its characterization, and does not mention *cor-cīr*. Sic transit gloria mundi.

<sup>50</sup> See footnote 8.

(E2) in treatises of the genre called *pāṭṭiyal* “Art of making poems”, which fall under the category “applied knowledge” (latin “Artes”) and which enumerate in one of their divisions the possible forms (genres) and the constraints attached to them, we see a mention of *vaṇṇam* as a particular metrical form, in which some components are called *kalai*. This is the case for instance in the 12<sup>th</sup> c. *Veṇṇāp pāṭṭiyal*, where the verse 35 explains the formation of a genre called *oliyantāti*, in which the 30 constituent elements grouped together are parameterized in terms of *īr-eṇ kalai-vaṇṇam*<sup>51</sup> “vaṇṇam-s of 16 kalai-s”. This agrees with the characterization found in the 10<sup>th</sup> cent. *Paṇṇirupāṭṭiyal*, where the *oliyantāti* (item 267) is characterized as follows:

**(10a)** *tatta miṇatti loppumuṟai piṟalātu // nālaṭi yīreṇ kalaiyuru muppatu // kōliya toliyan tāti yākuṁ* “an *oli-y-antāti* is that in which is made into a circle (*kōliyatu*) a group of thirty (*oru muppatu*) [stanzas having each] four lines (*nālaṭi*) of twice-eight kalai (*īr-eṇ kalai*) where there is no deviation (*piṟalātu*) [between the corresponding kalai-s in the various lines] in the comparable order in their own [phonetic] type (*tatta miṇatti loppumuṟai*). (*Paṇṇiru Pāṭṭiyal*, item 267, 1951, p. 40) (BIB)

Although the word *vaṇṇam* does not appear here, this description seems to fit what is nowadays known among Tamil poets as *vaṇṇap pāṭṭu*, of which the most well-known example nowadays is probably the *Tiruppukal*. Additionally, a sūtra shortly afterwards explains that:

**(10b)** *vaṇṇaka meṇpa toliyeṇap paṭumē* “that which is called *vaṇṇakam* can be called *oli*.” (*Paṇṇiru Pāṭṭiyal*, item 269, 1951, p. 40)

For additional details concerning the frequent indistinction between *vaṇṇam* and *vaṇṇakam*, see the introduction to *Vaṇṇat tiraṭṭu* by Ti. Vē. Kōpālayyar (Taṇṇai Carasvati Mahāl veliyiṭu 123, 1969)

## 8. Popularity of explanations of *guṇa*-s based on *vaṇṇam* in later Tamil *alaṅkāra śāstra* literature

The high value attached to the performance of composing poems which follow all the difficult (phonetic) constraints defining *vaṇṇam* and the continued “prestige” of the *Tolkāppiyam* name inside the “beautiful Tamil-speaking world” are the probable explanation for the echoes of the *vaṇṇam* terminology which are found inside the technical characterizations given in later Tamil *Alaṅkāraśāstra* literature of the preference, in terms of the *guṇas*, of the followers of the three *neṟi*-s “paths/styles” (i.e. *vaitaruppam/Vaidarbhi*, *kauṭam/Gauḍī*, and *pāñcālam/Pāñcālī*).<sup>52</sup> Tamil scholars, making use of that terminology, have provided technical Tamil explanations for the tastes attributed to the poets belonging to the three *neṟi*-s

We find for instance, in the commentary to *Māraṇalaṅkāram* [MA] the following statements, concerning respectively the illustrative verses 88, 89 and 90, which are reputed to illustrate the difference in taste between *vaitaruppam*, *kauṭam* and *pāñcālam* when it comes to the *guṇa* which is called *ceṟivu* by Taṇṭi-14 and by the MA, and which was called *cilīṭṭam* by VC148 (cf. TVG, p. 538), adapting the term from Daṇḍin’s *śliṣṭam*.

**(11a)** *Itu vaitaruppac ceṟivu. eṇṇa? melliṇamākiya eḷuttuc ceṟiya melliṇa vaṇṇam urru avveḷuttāṇ ākiya coṟkaḷ ceṟiyac ceṟittamaiyiṇ eṇka.* (MA p. 104)

**(11b)** *ivvāru melliṇa vaṇṇattāṇ melleḷuttuc ceṟintu varutal virumpātu valliṇa vaṇṇattāṇ valleḷuttuc ceṟinta collōṭum varkeṇat toṭuppatē vēṇṭuvar kauṭar* (MA p. 105)

<sup>51</sup> See p.32 inside *Vaccaṇantimālai eṇṇum veṇṇāp pāṭṭiyalum varaiyaṟutta pāṭṭiyalum*, (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.), 1951, kaḷakam, Chennai. The commentator glosses *vaṇṇam* by *palcantavakuppu*.

<sup>52</sup> See the remarks in TVG\_1973, Ilakkana Viḷakkam, Aṇiyiyal, p.64. See also: TVG\_MA\_2005:623 (*kauṭa iṇṇicai, kauṭa utāram*, etc.), TVG\_MA\_2005:627 (*pāñcāla iṇṇicai, pāñcāla utāram*, etc.), TVG\_MA\_2005:630-631 (*vaitaruppa iṇṇicai, vaitaruppa utāram*, etc.).



(11c) *itu pāṇcālac ceṛivu. eṇṇai? iṭaiyiṇamākiya eḷuttu mikavum ceṛiya iyaipuvaṇṇam urru avveḷuttāṇāya col ceṛiya vantamaiyāṇ eṇak koḷka.* (MA p. 106)

By doing this, Tamil scholars were reconnecting with the first encounter between the Daṇḍin school and the world of Tamil literature after a possible theoretical interruption in the importance attributed to *vaṇṇam*. I am here referring to the fact that the more “orthodox” *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram* (TA), which is not a global five-fold treatise (dealing with *pañca vatikāram*), but is concerned only with a single branch (i.e. *Aṇi*), does not make use at all of the word *vaṇṇam*, probably because the original Daṇḍin does not contain a sanskrit term of which *vaṇṇam* would be the Tamil translation.

## 9. A few conclusions (in a disorderly manner)

- The early model for *alaṅkāram* in Tamil was not Daṇḍin; otherwise we would not have such a unanimity for lists containing 28 elements (his only followers are TA, who changes his terminology, and Beschi, who follows TA). One can suspect that what Puttamittiraṇār tried to do was to TRY TO NORMALIZE what he must have perceived as the “chaos”.
- Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar never uses that terminology in his commentaries. He must not have been favourably impressed by those “young turks”, who could not understand that everything useful was already there in the *Tolkāppiyam*.
- All those explicit *arthālaṅkāra* (*poruḷ-aṇi*) figures must have seemed very clumsy to traditional scholars who were used to deal with everything in terms of *kuṟippu* (See the *Kuṟaḷ* chapter: *kuṟippaṟital*; See the expression *kūṟāmaṟ kuṟittataṇ-mēṟ cellum kaṭuṇ-kūḷi* in line 3 of the *Kaṭavuḷ Vāḷttu* of *Kalittokai*), or in terms of *muṇṇam* (*muṇṇattiṇ uṇarum kiḷaviyum uḷavē ..*), or in terms of “*icaiyeccam*” [who then needs *vakrōkti*, even if it is called *maṭaṅkal\*<sup>^</sup>naviṟci* (or *maṭakku*)], or in terms of *cuṭṭik kūṟā-v-uvaṇmai*, or in terms of *iraicci*, or in terms of *aṅkatam* (plus *vacai/vāḷttu*, *ceviyaṟivuṟūu*, etc.)
- They must have thought that it is enough to concentrate on form, because any codification of *poruḷ-aṇi* will have “lourdeur”
- We can conclude this series of observation on the “prehistory” of the use of the word *alaṅkāram* inside the Tamil sources by hypothesizing that when the author of the VC states that he will “expound in the very manner of the treatise which Daṇḍin uttered the ornaments of human beings who are abundant on earth” (see 1b above), he is emphasizing, in full awareness, the fact that his list of 35 *alaṅkāram* will be **very different**, both numerically and terminologically, from the earlier lists, which had only 28 *alaṅkāram*, and may have been that of the old *Aṇiyiyal*, perhaps with roots in the NS.
- *Piṅkalam*, as seen through the complete reading of Section 6.8 (*Anupōka vakai (Iyal vakai)*) belongs to the universe of consumers of *Pāṭṭiyal* guides –[every-day] art of making poems [*pāṭṭu*])– who want to know how to achieve *poruttam*, for various (possibly magical) purposes. Those poets are practicing poets, who make a living thanks to their poems, just like astrologers live by their horoscopes.
- The art of *vacai* and *vāḷttu* also belong to the art of practical poets.
- *Akappāṭṭu vaṇṇam* (and its symmetrical *Puṟappāṭṭu vaṇṇam*) might belong to the phonetic realm (as characterizing intonation [especially if there is not a final –ē [*īṟracai*]]), rather than to Syntax, as I have believed for some time.
- It should also be clear that there is a very low degree (less than 40%) of correspondence between the names of the *alaṅkāram* seen in the Ti, Pi and VC lists and the names which will be used by the author of the VC.

## Bibliography

VC1881, VC2005, YV, ... [TO BE DONE]

Colophon: file sent by Jean-Luc from Paris to David and to Jennifer, as “Jean-Luc\_Chevillard\_New\_vaNNam\_draft\_with\_DS\_3v.docx” (and as PDF)

on Monday 2018/04/09, at 14:41 (Paris time)