



# THEORISING EMOTIONS

An Enquiry into the Emotion Knowledge  
of Premodern Tamil Treatises

**Barbara Schuler**



## Theorising Emotions



Theorising Emotions  
An Enquiry into the Emotion Knowledge of  
Premodern Tamil Treatises


Barbara Schuler



### About the Author

Dr. phil. Barbara Schuler, Universität Hamburg, is an Indologist, with a focus on Tamil. Her current research focuses on the history of emotions in premodern Tamil-speaking contexts. She worked as Principal Investigator of a DFG-funded project in the field of the History of Emotions and is the author of "Introduction: Historicizing Asian Community-Based Emotion Practices" and "Food and Emotion: Can Emotions Be Worked On and Altered in Material Ways? – A Short Research Note on South India" (in *Historicizing Emotions: Practices and Objects in India, China, and Japan*, ed. Barbara Schuler, Leiden: Brill, 2017).

### ORCID®

Barbara Schuler  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9984-1373>

The publication of this volume was made possible by the financial support of the German Research Council (DFG).

### Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie, detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.



This book is published under the Creative Commons License 4.0 (CC BY-SA 4.0). The cover is subject to the Creative Commons License CC BY-ND 4.0.



Published by Heidelberg Asian Studies Publishing,  
Heidelberg University Library 2022.

The electronic open access version of this work is permanently available on the website of Heidelberg Asian Studies Publishing: <https://hasp.ub.uni-heidelberg.de>

URN: <urn:nbn:de:bsz:16-hasp-963-5>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.11588/hasp.963>

Text © 2022 Barbara Schuler

*Cover illustration:* The king enjoying the amorous water-sports. South Indian mural.  
Courtesy: Virtual Academy, Chennai (Tamil Nadu)

ISBN 978-3-948791-31-5 (Softcover)

ISBN 978-3-948791-21-6 (PDF)

*To my parents*





# Contents

Preface	xi
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	
<b>1 What Tamil thinkers did not engage with</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2 Tamil thinkers, their interest in emotions, and premodern shifts in Tamil emotion knowledge</b>	<b>11</b>
<i>Tolkāppiyānār's chapter on literary emotion, Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram Meyppāṭṭiyal, mid-first millennium(?) CE</i>	11
<i>Puttamittiraṅ's Vīracōḷiyam, c.1060–1068 CE and its commentary by Peruntēvaṅār, late eleventh or early twelfth century(?)</i>	13
<i>Ceyirriyaṅār's Ceyirriyam, late eleventh or early twelfth century</i>	16
<i>Iḷampūraṅar's commentary on the Tolkāppiyam's emotion root-text (Meyppāṭṭiyal), late eleventh or a few decades later(?)</i>	18
<i>Anonymous, Taṅṅiyalaṅkāram, mid-twelfth century(?)</i>	20
<i>Aṭiyārkkū Nallār's commentary on the narrative poem Cilappatikāram, closing decades of twelfth century</i>	21
<i>Pērācīriyar's commentary on the Tolkāppiyam's meyppāṭu root-text, early thirteenth century</i>	22
<i>Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar's Māraṅalaṅkāram, sixteenth century (with Irattīṅak Kavirāyar's seventeenth-century commentary)</i>	26
<i>Vaiṭṭiyānāta Tēcikar's Ilakkaṅa Viḷakkam, seventeenth century (with Vaiṭṭiyānāta Tēcikar's auto-commentary)</i>	27
<i>Concluding Remarks</i>	31

<b>3</b>	<b>Problems in translating Tamil technical writings into English</b>	<b>32</b>
	<i>Temporal and linguistic layers</i>	32
	<i>Translation of Tamil technical terms</i>	33
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>The state of research on <i>meyppāṭu</i></b>	<b>37</b>
<b>2</b>	<b><i>Meyppāṭu</i> source readings</b>	<b>41</b>
	<i>The Sanskrit foundational treatise on rasa: Bharata's Nāṭyasāstra (Treatise on Drama), c.300 CE – Core ideas</i>	42
	<i>The Tamil root-treatise on meyppāṭu: Tolkāppiyam, Poruḷatikāram Meyppāṭṭiyal, mid-first millennium(?) – Core ideas</i>	44
	<i>Meyppāṭu biologised and cuvai introduced: The Vīracōḷiyam and its commentary – Core ideas</i>	48
	I. The <i>Poruḷ</i> ('meaning' or poetic content/theme) subchapter and its model of <i>meyppāṭu</i>	48
	II. The <i>Alaṅkāram</i> (poetic ornamentation or embellishment) subchapter	50
	<i>Meyppāṭu upgraded and cuvai altered: The Ceyirriyam – Core ideas</i>	54
	<i>The meyppāṭu theory expanded and cuvai consolidated: Iḷampūraṇar on the Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram Meyppāṭṭiyal – Core ideas</i>	56
	<i>Figures of speech at centre stage: The Taṅṭiyalaṅkāram – Core ideas</i>	63
	<i>Visualisation of literature: Aṭiyārkkū Nallār's commentary on the Cilappatikāram – Core ideas</i>	64
	<i>Harmonisation of the meyppāṭu problem: Pērācīriyar on the Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram Meyppāṭṭiyal – Core ideas</i>	66
	<i>Meyppāṭu and cuvai theologised: The Māraṇalaṅkāram of Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar (and its commentary) – Core ideas</i>	81

<i>A return to Tolkāppiyāṅār's view of meypṭāṭu, and cuvai as a poetic ornament: The Ilakkaṅa Viḷakkam of Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar (with Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar's auto-commentary) – Core idea</i>	83
I. <i>Poruḷatikāram</i> (poetics), <i>Akattiṅai</i> chapter and its model of <i>meypṭāṭu</i>	83
II. <i>Poruḷatikāram</i> , <i>Aṅi</i> chapter on poetic embellishment	87
<b>References</b>	<b>89</b>



## Preface

Emotions have a history. And emotions are defined, theorised and practised in different ways by different cultures and subcultures. This short monograph is based on this idea. It adopts an approach that is standard in the History of Emotions, a vivid young and growing subdiscipline in scholarship on emotion.

The author of this monograph believes that emotion theories as they were developed in premodern (11th to 17th century) Tamil-speaking South India is a field that should be integrated into global historical research on emotions. Indeed, comparative studies on emotion may well profit from non-Western Indological perspectives. This systematic study on emotion knowledge of premodern Tamil treatises across time may provide a valuable case in point. It offers a chance for readers to familiarise themselves with theoretical developments in emotion knowledge in premodern Tamil India that until now were unavailable in a concise and structured form of this type.

This study has deliberately abstained from addressing how theories of literary emotion were applied in poetic composition. However, the present study can nonetheless serve as a meaningful guide to how emotion treatises established emotion rules or norms, and how the emotion concepts as prescribed in these treatises provide models for emotion practices.

This monograph has been an attempt to interpret the sources through the eyes of the period that produced them. The study also responds to today's scholarly debates and interests within the field of the history of emotion, as well as in the wider intellectual world, albeit such comments are only found in footnotes (see, e.g., ch. 1, n. 93). Furthermore, the study attempts to show that although the close interaction and interpellation of Sanskrit (an Indo-European language) and Tamil (a Dravidian language) cannot and must not be denied, the Tamil scholiasts' theorisation is nevertheless to be taken seriously on its own terms.

The reader will note that the volume's structure is the inverse of the more usual order, namely, that of presenting an investigation and then offering a conclusion. This unusual structure has a straightforward reason. The first chapter makes the Tamil material available to non-specialist readers who do not read Tamil (or to those who do read Tamil, but have no experience with the rather complicated language of medieval scholastic literature). Through this, it is hoped that this volume can also be attractive to such readers. For historians of emotions in Western or Chinese cultures who wish to go further afield and look into non-Western/non-Chinese cultures of the past, chapter 1 provides a survey of key areas in current Tamil emotion research, enabling an understanding of Tamil premodern theoretical emotion knowledge and how this culture theorised emotions. Equally, it allows the reader to see what Tamil thinkers *did*

not engage with. The second chapter is mainly for readers who are specialists in the field of Indology.

For the Tamil texts, the transcription system and diacritic marks of the *Tamil Lexicon* have been used; for Sanskrit terms, the transcriptions are those found in the Monier Williams *Sanskrit–English Dictionary*. Non-English texts are italicised, and plurals of terms are indicated by the addition of the English ‘s’. The English translations of passages from non-English works cited in the bibliography are, unless specified otherwise, my own. Also any brackets [ ] used within citations are mine, if not stated to the contrary.

This volume was developed during my research as Principal Investigator on pre-modern community-based and honour-related emotions. It is an extension and by-product of that research. Generous funding was received from the DFG German Research Council, for which I am very grateful.

The book’s trajectory has been wonderfully supported by colleagues both in the United States and India, and I thank all of them for their invaluable engagement with my research. I am particularly indebted to the insights that emerged from my close collaboration with Professor Dr Anne E. Monius (Harvard Divinity School at Harvard University). The suddenness of her death in August 2019 fills me with sadness. Dr E. Annamalai, University of Chicago, deserves special thanks for answering questions related to appropriate final translations and for giving valuable comments.

My work has been greatly enriched through sustained intellectual interchange and collegiality with a number of scholars in Chennai. I would above all like to thank Professor P. Marudhanayakam (retired Director of the Central Institute of Classical Tamil, CICT), Dr P. Selvakumar (Head of Linguistics, International Institute of Tamil Studies, IITS), and Dr Gandhi Rajan (Art Historian, Tamil Virtual Academy).

This short monograph was completed in the summer of 2020 and it has not undergone any changes since then. Two scholars were particularly influential for me. Ideas from the early work of the historian of Western medieval emotions Professor Barbara Rosenwein contributed significantly to the research direction of this volume. This is equally true for the Sanskritist Professor Sheldon Pollock, the author of *A Rasa Reader*, to whom I owe my inspiration for the volume’s structure.

I must also express my thanks to the two peer-reviewers for their comments and enthusiasm. At Heidelberg Asian Studies Publishing, Nicole Merkel-Hilf assisted me with a wide range of advice during the printing process. I value her patience and guidance. Finally, a ‘thank you’ goes to Cynthia Peck-Kubaczek, who corrected the English text. It goes without saying that any mistakes in this study are entirely my own responsibility.

## Introduction

What do we know about the history of emotion in Tamil South India? How did pre-modern Tamil thinkers understand emotion? And how did they define and apply that understanding? What was the role of emotion theory? And what changes took place over time in theoretical emotion knowledge? Tamil theorising on emotions is a field that should be integrated into historical emotion research. However, research on the history of emotion in Tamil-speaking southern India is challenging. This is not only due to the conceptual asymmetry between the Western umbrella category ‘emotion’ and the Tamil meaning of emotion in theoretical-technical terms.<sup>1</sup> It is also because the extant Tamil treatises on emotion are solely treatises on poetics.<sup>2</sup> Other than these treatises, there are no treatises on emotions as such, whether on the phenomenology or sociology of emotions, or on emotions as expressed in all forms of literature.<sup>3</sup>

It seems that Tamil intellectual culture felt no compulsion to theorise on emotion as such. Only one early school theorising on emotion in poetry is known today, the school that developed from the *Tolkāppiyam*, a treatise on grammar.<sup>4</sup> While in certain

- 
- 1 On the difficulty of defining emotion in Western contexts and the lack of a consensus, see Thomas Dixon, ‘“Emotion”: One Word, Many Concepts,’ *Emotion Review* 4.4 (October 2012): 387–88; and James A. Russell, ‘Introduction to Special Section: On Defining Emotion,’ *Emotion Review* 4.4 (2012): 337. See also Paul R. Kleinginna, Jr. and Anne M. Kleinginna, ‘A Categorized List of Emotion Definitions: With Suggestions for a Consensual Definition,’ *Motivation and Emotion* 5.4 (1981): 345–79; as well as Kevin Mulligan and Klaus R. Scherer, ‘Towards a Working Definition of Emotion,’ *Emotion Review* 4.4 (2012): 345–57.
  - 2 In contrast, the Greek Aristotelian concept of emotions was determined by the arena of debate and public persuasion, being part of rhetoric theory; see Aristotle’s *Rhetoric II*. On emotions in Aristotle’s ethical theory, see also *Nicomachean Ethics IV*. See William W. Fortenbaugh, ‘Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* on Emotions,’ *Archiv fuer Geschichte der Philosophie* 52 (1970): 40–70; William W. Fortenbaugh, *Aristotle on Emotions* (London: Duckworth, 2003); David Konstan, *Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006). Translations consulted: Gernot Krapinger, trans./ed., *Aristoteles Rhetorik*, 2. Buch (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2018), in particular, 76–114; Gernot Krapinger, trans./ed., *Aristoteles Nikomachische Ethik*, 4. Buch (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2017), 88–117.
  - 3 There are, of course, schools of Indian philosophy (in Indian traditions, there are no formal distinctions made between religious texts and philosophical texts), but few or none of them give a central role to emotions. It is rather taught that one should overcome emotions (e.g., Sāṃkhya-Yoga). Only when leading a devotional *bhakti* life are emotions welcomed, those emotions, however, that are directed towards god. For various philosophical accounts of emotions, see Joerg Tuske, ‘The Concept of Emotion in Classical Indian Philosophy,’ *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (1 March 2011, last modified 26 July 2016): <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/concept-emotion-india/>
  - 4 Tamil grammars consider phonology and morphology to be inseparable from the treatment of

texts it is possible to find influences from other schools of grammar, no treatise from those schools have survived. The *Tolkāppiyam* grammar, dating to the middle of the first millenium, contains in its third section (*Poruḷatikāram*, ‘section on meaning’) an authoritative grammar on poetics. It was here that rules and conventions with regard to a theory of emotions were established, rules and conventions that were followed at least until the seventeenth century. Although a new type of treatise emerged in the sixteenth century, the *pāṭṭiyal* type (which did not belong to the school of *Tolkāppiyam*), it did not offer any contemporary systematic thoughts on literary emotions.

Since the only extant early school that we have derives from the *Tolkāppiyam*, we also have no category for emotion other than the technical term it uses, namely, ‘*meyp̄p̄āṭu*’. This term represents the Tamil concept of emotion, in this case, literary emotion (or, to be even more precise, literary emotion within the framework of the themes of love and war, the two main themes discussed in the *Tolkāppiyam*). This is our point of departure.

It should be made clear that the *Tolkāppiyam* is not the central object of study in this monograph, but rather the concept of emotion that developed out of its discourse on *meyp̄p̄āṭu*. The interest here lies in the history of emotion theories, and thus in the enquiries into emotion knowledge in treatises and commentarial works in premodern Tamil-speaking South India, in particular, in two periods: from the eleventh to thirteenth century, and the sixteenth to seventeenth century. Particularly the first period experienced a pinnacle of debates on literary emotion, with concepts elaborated in constant dialogue with rival currents, with an unprecedented and sudden increase in the number of Tamil treatises and commentaries on emotion.<sup>5</sup> At this critical moment in history, a number of changes in emotion knowledge can be detected. And since Tamil thinkers only theorised on literary emotions (curiously neglecting, as mentioned above, any study of emotions as such), this monograph restricts its enquiry to that.

Emotions occupy a fundamental place in texts on poetics and dramaturgy, this going back to the Tamil *Tolkāppiyam*, and in Sanskrit, to the *Nāṭyaśāstra* (c.300 CE). The natural starting point for an investigation on emotions would thus be these two treatises. To settle one thing right away, premodern Tamil thinkers did not investigate emotions in the same way<sup>6</sup> Sanskrit discourses on ordinary emotion and aesthetic

---

poetic theory.

- 5 In Sanskrit according to Sheldon Pollock, trans./ed., *A Rasa Reader: Classical Indian Aesthetics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016), 49, the commentarial tradition on the Sanskrit *rasa* (‘aesthetic emotion’) theory began most probably not much before the early ninth century.
- 6 The viewpoint in this study is more nuanced than that taken by Whitney Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism to Intellectual History in the Poetics of the Medieval Tamil Country,’ in *Bilingual Discourse and Cross-Cultural Fertilisation: Sanskrit and Tamil in Medieval India*, eds Whitney Cox and Vincenzo Vergiani (Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry, École Française d’Extrême-Orient [Collection Indologie 121], 2013, 115–60). According to Cox, we are ‘faced with the relative theoretical poverty of the received theory of *meyp̄p̄āṭu*’ (119).



emotion (*bhāva-rasa*) did.<sup>7</sup> In Tamil there is no discourse on emotion that could have led to the far-reaching paradigm shifts we find in Sanskrit theoretical writings, of which some were quite revolutionary (as for example in the works of the Kashmiri theorist Abhinavagupta, c.1000 CE)<sup>8</sup>. Rather, Tamil thinkers show a continuing preference for older (pre-Abhinavagupta) paradigms. They did so even though texts codifying emotions were part of a multilingual field and the boundaries between the languages were permeable due to multilayered processes of transfer.<sup>9</sup> An excellent source reader exists for Sanskrit *rasa* theory,<sup>10</sup> Sheldon Pollock's *Rasa Reader*, but it does not include any discussion of Tamil thinkers. Although a reception of the Sanskrit *rasa* theory did exist in the South Indian Tamil tradition, this was beyond the scope of Pollock's book.

In this monograph several priorities have been set. First of all, it does not deal with the relationship between emotions as expressed in Tamil literature and what is theorised as *meyp̄p̄āṭu*. It also does not answer the question of how *meyp̄p̄āṭu* mapped onto Tamil poetic compositions.<sup>11</sup> It rather examines emotion knowledge as it stood at the height of debates on literary emotion. Such debates began in the eleventh century, when various strands of thought regarding emotion knowledge were brought together and related in different ways to earlier knowledge systems. This study examines the development of these currents. A number of discoveries will be presented, as for example, the sources of certain influences found in the concepts in question, and the points when certain emotion words passed out of use or lists of emotions changed. It will also be shown when Tamil literary theories of emotion introduced something akin to *rasa* (aesthetic emotion).

Regarding the technical term *meyp̄p̄āṭu* used in Tamil theories of literary emotion, one may ask: Does this term have an accepted etymology? Do we know what the term

---

7 Sanskrit was the *lingua franca* in India and beyond. Both Sanskrit and Tamil can be considered the classical languages of India.

8 The dominant question had come to be that of the nature of aesthetic reception (Whitney Cox, 'Bearing the *Nāṭyaveda*: Śāradātanaya's *Bhāvaprakāśana*,' in *Modes of Philology in Medieval South India* by Whitney Cox [Leiden: Brill, 2017], 81). On 'aesthetics' in classical India, see Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 1ff.

9 On multilingual processes of transfer, see in particular, the writings of Anne Monius and Whitney Cox, who make this very clear. See also Jean Filliozat, 'Tamil and Sanskrit in South India,' in *Passages: Relationships Between Tamil and Sanskrit*, eds M. Kannan and Jennifer Clare (Pondicherry: French Institute of Pondicherry and Tamil Chair, Department of South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of California at Berkeley, 2009), 1–10.

10 In my translations I distinguish between *rasa* as an aesthetic emotion and *bhāva* as an ordinary emotion.

11 Grammar was strongly allied from the start with poetic praxis. However, there was no one-to-one correspondence between the grammarians' normative rules and poetry; see David Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2016), 31.

originally meant? Unfortunately the answer is no. Much hinges on the multiple meanings of *mey*, which range from ‘body’ to ‘truth’ or ‘reality’. Lexicons such as the *Glossary of Historical Tamil Literature (up to 1800 AD)*, *Tamiḷ ilakkiyaḷ pēraḱarāṭi* note that the first occurrence of *meypḱāṭu* is in the grammar *Tolkāppiyam* and translate it as emotion.<sup>12</sup> However, the eighth- to thirteenth-century medieval reference lexica *Tivākaram* and *Piṅkala nikaṅṱu* (which were used for interpretive questions as well as in the active production of texts) do not list the term in this particular technical meaning.<sup>13</sup> Despite this, whatever the correct etymology or meaning, the technical term *meypḱāṭu* can be translated with the meta-category ‘emotion’. In the *Tolkāppiyam* emotion root-text, as I understand it, literary poetic emotion is simply emotion (equivalent to Sanskrit *bhāva*, ordinary emotion). Also in the *Tolkāppiyam*’s commentarial tradition up to the seventeenth century, the processes involved are not essentially different from those operative for ordinary emotion.

What Tamil thinkers and commentators of the medieval period (eleventh to thirteenth century) were quite sure of was that emotions cannot be reduced to an inner space. Rather the opposite: they conceived emotions as arising through outer causal factors or situatedness. They can then be read in faces, physical postures, emotives,<sup>14</sup> or physical manifestations such as horripilation, tears, or perspiration caused by bodily change. In addition to the causal impact of emotions on the sensory organs, it was understood that emotion is based on perceptive power and the mind, and that there is no basic opposition between reason and emotion.<sup>15</sup> Whether it was theorised that objects have specific emotion-inducing properties is unclear with the information currently available.<sup>16</sup> But what can be said with certainty is that the Tamil treatises define

---

12 See *Glossary of Historical Tamil Literature (up to 1800 AD)*, *Tamiḷ ilakkiyaḷ pēraḱarāṭi*, vol. 5 (Chennai: Cānti Cāṭaṅā, 2002), 2054, s.v., *meypḱāṭu*: ‘uḷḷattu uṅarcci’.

13 See *Tivākaram and Piṅkala nikaṅṱu* (Ti 11:242; Pi 10:100) in *Concordance of Three Nigandus / tivākaram – piṅkalam – cūṭāmaṅi akarāṭi aṅṱavaṅai* (Chennai: Cānti Cāṭaṅā, 2000).

14 William Reddy calls emotional utterances ‘emotives’; see William Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 104. Here I adopt only the term ‘emotive’, rather than the entire theory developed by Reddy. I would consider ‘sighing’ an emotive linked to conscious processes.

15 It is notable that the generic Tamil key term *uṅarcci*, a term referring in various ways to the modern term ‘emotion’, does not designate a dualistic polarisation between reason and emotion. The term *uṅarcci* is derived from the verb root *uṅar* and has a broad semantic range: 1. to be conscious of, know, understand; 2. to think, reflect, consider, 3. to examine, observe; 4. to experience as a sensation; 5. to realise; 6. to feel (*Tamil Lexicon*, 6 vols and supplement (University of Madras, 1982).

16 Neither the root-text nor the expository prose in the commentarial works gives a clue regarding this. Modern Tamil grammar encourages the view that emotion comes to the person: Dative + emotion-noun + verb *irutaḷ* = being affected by / happens to. This denotes the receptivity and passivity of the subject. E.g. *x-kku* (dative) *aruvaruppāka iruntatu*, ‘x was disgusted’; *x-kku ericcalāka iruntatu*, ‘x was annoyed’. – Tamil is an agglutinative Dravidian language, building left-branching sentences that produce a set of mental processes different than in Indo-European languages; for more details, see Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography*, 7ff.

which emotions are expected for particular objectives or causal factors and thus, which are appropriate. This again involves registers of emotion knowledge such as an appraisal of the causal factor (with four factors usually mentioned), the actors involved, and cultural expectations.<sup>17</sup> According to Tamil treatises, anger, for example, is not the same from one social group to another (such as kings or warriors, brahmins, merchants, or shepherds). Tamil premodern theorists view with approval the anger of a warrior, anger of someone whose kin has been harmed, or anger caused by murder and killing. In contrast, they view a warrior's fear with disapproval. This is a telling indication of how emotion treatises established emotion rules or norms, and how concepts of emotions as prescribed by these treatises led to emotion practice.<sup>18</sup> However, only in the Buddhist emotion treatise under consideration is a categorical distinction made between good and bad, that is, between emotions that are pleasant and those that are painful or produce suffering.<sup>19</sup>

If we compare the premodern Tamil list of emotions with Western premodern lists of words describing emotions,<sup>20</sup> it is striking that in the Tamil treatises, various functional aspects are pooled under the single umbrella term of *meyp̄p̄ātu*. Some of the listed emotions are very close to Western ones, as for example disgust, joy, affection, jealousy and sloth,<sup>21</sup> but other terms for emotions are closer to mental states (remembering, doubt, dreaming).<sup>22</sup> Still others are of a physiological nature (trembling, weeping, laughter, perspiration, horripilation). The Tamil theorists did not make such distinctions, save presenting a double list of eight plus an additional thirty-two *meyp̄p̄ātus*.<sup>23</sup>

---

17 For example, the emotion of disgust is evoked by four causes old age, disease, pain, and low social status.

18 An example of such a prescribed Tamil emotion notion is *ūṭal-uvakai*, the 'pleasure derived from reunion after sulking' (a staged emotion practice that still today is often part of the emotional life of amorous or married couples in the real world). On *ūṭal*, see also Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography*, 96. – For a discussion of the premodern domination of theory (*sāstra*) over practical activity, as part of an Indian 'centrality of rule-governance in human behaviour', see Sheldon Pollock, 'The Theory of Practice and the Practice of Theory in Indian Intellectual History,' *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105.3 (July-Sept. 1985): 499–519 (500).

19 This categorical distinction is an important part of discussions in Christian treatises on emotion.

20 Barbara H. Rosenwein, 'Emotion Words,' in *Le sujet des émotions au Moyen Âge*, ed. Piroška Nagy and Damien Boquet (Paris: Beauchesne, 2008), 93–106.

21 On *acedia* and that sloth has gone out of fashion in today's western emotion vocabulary, but in Thomas Aquinas' medieval Europe, sloth was seen as an emotion, even a deadly sin, see Ute Frevert, *Emotions in History – Lost and Found* (Budapest, New York: Central European University Press, 2011); and Rom Harré, ed., *The Social Construction of Emotions* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), 11.

22 Modern neuroscience has shown that emotions have an integrated functionality in human mental life. See Lisa Feldman Barrett and Ajay B. Satpute, 'Historical Pitfalls and New Directions in the Neuroscience of Emotion,' *Neuroscience Letters* (2017): 1–10: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2017.07.045>

23 In these Tamil treatises, as in similar treatises in Sanskrit (see Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 8), there is

Although no systematic thoughts regarding emotion are available other than the theories on literary emotions of the Tamil grammarians, practical emotion knowledge existed, of course, as for example in Tamil *siddha* medicine, which is based on bodily humours, the causal role of emotions in disease and recovery, and the link between diet and emotion.<sup>24</sup> This medical science, which developed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, was interested in the mental-somatology of the emotions. However, to my knowledge, it did not develop a specific thought system regarding emotions. Also in other types of texts, practical emotion knowledge is found, such as in the ethical aphorisms of the *Tirukkural*.<sup>25</sup> In this text, also known as the *Kural*, we find aphorisms offering advice on virtue, right conduct, and fame, as well as on the emotions of envy, wrath, sympathy, sloth, etc. This practical emotion knowledge represents a future perspective for research on the history of Tamil emotions.

This volume is divided into two chapters; these are, however, not in the sequence usually expected. Sections 1 and 2 of the first chapter contain the results of my enquiry into emotion knowledge as found in premodern Tamil treatises. They present the questions that premodern Tamil thinkers were interested in, as well as those they did not engage with. Moreover, they summarise the changes that occurred over time in emotion knowledge (with detailed evidence for this given in the ‘*Meyp̄p̄ātu* source readings’ of chapter 2). Section 3 discusses the problems in translating Tamil technical terms. The second chapter has two sections. Section 1 presents the current state of research on *meyp̄p̄ātu*. Section 2 contains the *Meyp̄p̄ātu* source readings. Rather than a philological enquiry, it presents a systematic overview of how *meyp̄p̄ātu* was seen by premodern Tamil theorists. The source reader investigates core ideas and changes, and provides Tamil texts and translations.<sup>26</sup> For a deeper understanding of the current Indological scholarly debate, the latest research results on the Sanskrit *rasa* theory are also outlined briefly.

---

a preference for ‘counting and listing’, and the belief ‘that emotional phenomena can be listed and counted’. Today one might make possible distinctions between these emotions based on their characteristics or nature (simple external *meyp̄p̄ātu* [e.g. perspiration], complex higher order external *meyp̄p̄ātu* [e.g. anger, joy, disgust], internal short-lasting *meyp̄p̄ātu* [e.g. doubt], or internal *meyp̄p̄ātu* with respect to reactions [e.g. recollection]).

- 24 On diet and emotion, as well as the regulation of emotions, see Barbara Schuler, ‘Introduction: Historicizing Asian Community-Based Emotion Practices’ and ‘Food and Emotion: Can Emotions Be Worked On and Altered in Material Ways?’, both in *Historicizing Emotions: Practices and Objects in India, China, and Japan*, ed. Barbara Schuler (Leiden: Brill, 2017).
- 25 In later times, this work became known as an example of *nīti* literature. On the *Tirukkural*, which dates to the middle of the first millennium or somewhat later, see Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography*, 94. On the author of the *Tirukkural*, Tiruvaḷḷuvar, as a collective persona, see Shulman, *ibid.* – The editions used are *Tirukkural mūlamum parimēlaḷakar uraiyum*, ed. Vaṭivēlu Ceṭṭiyār, 3 vols (Maturai: Maturaip Palkalaikkalākam, [1904] 1972–1976); *Tirukkural teḷivurai*, ed. Pa. Cuppiramaṇiyaṅ (Tirucci: Icaiyaraci Patippakam, n.d.).
- 26 An overview of all positions held in the Tamil debate on the nature of literary emotion is, however, beyond the scope of this *Meyp̄p̄ātu* source readings.

This survey contains available current knowledge, but it will, no doubt, need to be revised as more research into these matters is undertaken.

Readers who would like to focus on the original texts, literally rendered, and on the changes chronologically presented, may wish to skip the discussions in chapter 1. For those who would like to gain a deeper understanding of the premodern scholarly debate and the emotion knowledge involved, chapter 1 is the place to begin.



# Chapter 1

## 1 What Tamil thinkers did not engage with

Although Tamil grammarians and thinkers most probably adopted Bharata's concept of Sanskrit *bhāva* or real-world emotion (from the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, c.300 CE), most scholars would agree that the Tamil engagement with this topic was less animated than the response of thinkers writing in Sanskrit. Tamil thinkers were, for instance, uninterested in the Sanskrit concept of 'false emotion' or *bhāva-ābhāsa*,<sup>1</sup> a concept introduced as early as 800 CE in Sanskrit emotion treatises and which worked as a literary moral authority, relating emotion to status or focusing on emotions marked by social impropriety.<sup>2</sup> The question of 'literary promulgation of an immoral order'<sup>3</sup> and knowledge related to this did not find its way into the Tamil emotion discourse.<sup>4</sup> The 'sociology of emotion' (Pollock) was never a topic in the Tamil emotion discourse, nor was the question of insincere versus authentic emotions.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, the matter of

- 
- 1 Respectively, *rasa-ābhāsa* or 'semblance of *rasa*' as translated by Sheldon Pollock, with *ābhāsa* meaning 'not itself the authentic entity, and sometimes even fraudulent' (Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 28). The phrase *rasa-ābhāsa* or 'semblance of *rasa*' was first used (and probably invented) by Udbhata (c.800 CE) to characterise narratives that were 'contrary to social propriety and thereby violated a core feature of *rasa*, its ethical normativity. To identify something as semblance of *rasa*, accordingly, is to make a judgment on the nature of the aesthetic experience it produces "contrary to social propriety," to see it as a new prescriptive turn in the history of *rasa* – perhaps a sort of conservative traditionalisation on the threshold of modernity' (*Rasa Reader*, 28).
  - 2 Emotions 'contrary to social propriety' were, for instance, 'marital determination on the part of a lowborn man' or 'laughter directed at one's father' (Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 29), but also a disciple's love toward his guru's wife. As Pollock (*ibid.*, 27) writes, 'the erotic and the heroic pertain only to characters of high status; the comic, by contrast, only to those of low or middling status. If the fearful is found in men of high status it will always be a matter of simulation: they do not, indeed cannot, fear their guru's anger, for instance, but they must simulate fear to be a dutiful devotee. More complex than these correlations and more revealing of the history of *rasa* is the tragic, where kinship rather than status is the social element at issue.' See also, Sheldon Pollock, 'The Social Aesthetic and Sanskrit Literary Theory,' *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 29 (2001): 197–229 (214f.).
  - 3 Pollock, 'The Social Aesthetic,' 214.
  - 4 Is a possible reason the fact that Tamils had (and still have) the widely read moral epigrams of the *Tirukkural*? This text deals with emotions such as envy, slander, sloth, compassion, wrath, and the like.
  - 5 For Chinese notions of sincerity and a discussion on the sincerity or insincerity of emotions, see Schuler, 'Introduction,' in *Historicizing Emotions*, 18f. n. 51.

emotion conjunctures, such as one emotion giving way to another, or an emotion co-existing with others in a set of emotions, was rarely discussed theoretically.<sup>6</sup> Also rarely considered (with the exception of Pērācīriyar) was the fact that weeping can just as well be the result of happiness or an eye disease, not only of sorrow.<sup>7</sup>

Striking as well is that while there was a great predilection for counting and listing emotions, there was no interest in organising emotions into emotion families, that is, clusters sharing common characteristics (e.g., positive emotions, prosocial emotions, or savoring emotions [such as contentment, sensory pleasure, or desire]). Further, there is little evidence that Tamil *meyp̄p̄ātu* thinkers pondered the question of whether there are specific ‘religious emotions’ (e.g., being possessed by a god, love towards a god, being angry with god, or doubt in god).<sup>8</sup> Nonetheless, commentators on the *Tolkāppiyam meyp̄p̄ātu* root-text explicitly exclude the emotion of quiescence (*naṭuvunilai*), since they consider this emotion possible only for ascetics, those detached from the world. Moreover, the sixteenth-century Vaiṣṇava poet-devotee-theorist Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar considered literature (albeit devotional literature) and the technical terms *meyp̄p̄ātu* and *cuvai* appropriate for concepts of religious emotions.<sup>9</sup>

Although it seems as if the Tamil theorists were uninterested in a number of areas, we should remain sceptical of commonly accepted views regarding their conservatism and lack of innovation. It is also possible that Tamil theorists were not interested in

---

6 For instance, *Narriṇai* 371: when joy is replaced by sorrow, the lover grows physically thin and her glistening bangles loosen on her arms; see *Narriṇai: Text, Transliteration and Translations in English Verse and Prose*, vol. 2, comp./ed. V. Murugan (Chennai: Central Institute of Classical Tamil, 2011), 1139–41. The idea that *meyp̄p̄ātus* can be experienced in combination seem to have been introduced by the seventeenth-century commentator on the *Māraṇalaṅkāram*; see ch. 2, *Meyp̄p̄ātu* source readings below, s.v. *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, point j. – On the questions of conjunctures of emotions in Sanskrit, cf. Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 28.

7 This is something that Sanskrit thinkers did write about, as for instance Abhinavagupta; see Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 200.

8 One would have expected this at least from the time of the *Tēvāram* onward, when devotional *bhakti* was the main focus of religion. According to Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography*, 74, there is evidence that the *Tēvāram* in its present form was edited and arranged ‘in the course of the eleventh century’ in the Cōḷa country.

9 See Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar’s sixteenth-century grammar *Māraṇalaṅkāram (Māraṇalaṅkāram mūlamum paḷaya uraiyum*, ed. Ti. Vē. Kōpālaiyar [Chennai: Śrīmath Aṅṅavaṅ Acciramam Śrīraṅkam, 2005]; also ch. 2, *Meyp̄p̄ātu* source readings below, s.v. *Māraṇalaṅkāram*). This finding refutes a statement by Jennifer Steele Clare that Tamil theories of poetics did not address or incorporate religious *bhakti* devotion (‘Canons, Conventions and Creativity: Defining Literary Tradition in Premodern Tamil South India’ [PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2011], 15, 102). Cf. the Sanskrit case: Sheldon Pollock, ‘Rasa after Abhinava,’ in *Ṣaṅskṛta-sādhutā: Goddess of Sanskrit: Studies in Honour of Professor Ashok Aklujkar*, eds Chikafumi Watanabe, Michele Desmarais and Yoshichika Honda (New Delhi: D. K. Printworld Ltd., 2012), 429–45 (431), where it is described how the *rasa* (aesthetic emotion) discourse spilled over into religious *bhakti* domains, engendering theological aesthetics. See also Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 300f.



certain aspects of Sanskrit inventiveness, because there were Tamil categories that already covered similar topics.<sup>10</sup>

## 2 Tamil thinkers, their interest in emotions, and premodern shifts in Tamil emotion knowledge

The goal of this section is to understand the emotion knowledge of particular groups of people or individual thinkers in the past. Here, I outline briefly how the key Tamil emotion term *meyp̄p̄āṭu* is used in various treatises and commentarial works dating to a specific period of time, namely, from about the mid-first millennium CE to the seventeenth century. I roughly delineate the shifts and the semantic net in these texts, as well as the codified emotion knowledge related to them. The Tamil emotion theorists' focal points and emphases have not been always the same when they talked about emotion. To corroborate the observations in this outline, the *Meyp̄p̄āṭu* source readings in chapter 2 of the book offer passages from these source texts with their translations.

### **Tolkāppiyaṅār's<sup>11</sup> chapter on literary emotion, *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram Meyp̄p̄āṭṭiyal*, mid-first millennium(?) CE<sup>12</sup>**

The Tamil root-text of the emotion theory (the *meyp̄p̄āṭu* chapter of the *Tolkāppiyam*) with which we begin brought important changes regarding the sphere where emotions

---

10 Such as, for example, the Sanskrit concept of *dhvani*, in which Tamil theorists were not interested, since they had the technical category of *uḷḷurai*, 'implicit meaning', first mentioned in the *Tolkāppiyam*; see Cānti Cātaṅā's *Glossary of Historical Tamil Literature*, vol. 2, 435. See also the sixteenth-century grammar *Māraṅalaṅkāram*, p. 218, and Ti. Vē. Kōpālaiyar, *Tamiḷ ilakkaṅap perakarāṭi*, vol. 12, *poruḷ: aṅi* (Chennai: Tamiḷmaṅ, 2005), 139. On the *dhvani* 'resonance' theory (ninth century) about meaning or content that is not explicitly stated, see Lawrence McCrea, "'Resonance" and Its Reverberations: Two Cultures in Indian Epistemology of Aesthetic Meaning,' in *The Bloomsbury Research Handbook of Indian Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Art*, ed. Arindam Chakrabarti (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 25–41 (28). On the term *uḷḷurai* and the complementary category *iraicci*, 'suggestion', see also Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography*, 45.

11 Tolkāppiyaṅār is the fictive name of the author (whether a single person or a group of compilers) of the work called *Tolkāppiyam*. This name was already used by the *Tolkāppiyam*'s premodern commentators. The editions used are: [TPIḷam] *Tolkāppiyam, poruḷatikāram, meyp̄p̄āṭṭiyal, ḷampūraṅam*, ed. Mu. Caṅmukam Piḷḷai (Chennai: Mullai Nilaiyam, [1996] 2014) with ḷampūraṅar's commentary; and [TPPēr] *Tolkāppiyam, poruḷatikāram, meyp̄p̄āṭṭiyal, Pērācīriyar urai*, ed. Ku. Cuntaramūrṭti (Chidambaram, Annamalainagar: Annamalai University, [1985] 2012) with Pērācīriyar's commentary.

12 This dating is subject to debate. Some contemporary scholars are of the opinion that the *Tolkāppiyam* is by a single author, others consider it a composition from different time layers, with the *meyp̄p̄āṭu* discussion an addition to the Tamil poetic theory adapted from the Sanskrit model of the seventh chapter of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Of course, the question of dating also involves the question of which text is earlier, and thus which influenced the other. The present overview will

were discussed. In this Tamil grammar on poetics,<sup>13</sup> the most important change is the move of emotion from dramatic theory to poetic theory, whereby the emotion template is extended from play (*paṇṇai*), as explicated in the Sanskrit *Treatise of Drama* (*Nāṭyaśāstra*, c.300 CE),<sup>14</sup> to the poem (*ceyyuḷ*). Implicit in this shift is the locus of emotion moving from actors on the stage to text-internal characters. Despite the obscure and perhaps complicated process of this historical transition, what is important regarding the concept of emotion in Tolkāppiyaṇār's *meypṇāṭu* emotionology is his appropriation of the Sanskrit notion of *bhāva* or ordinary emotion, rather than Sanskrit aesthetic emotion or *rasa*, which 'cannot be a response to the real world, the world outside the theater, for there, grief is truly grief' (Pollock).<sup>15</sup> However, the emotion knowledge embodied in these two language-bound concepts, Tamil *meypṇāṭu* and Sanskrit *bhāva*, is not exactly the same, since the latter served the realisation of *rasa*.

It remains unclear what Tolkāppiyaṇār exactly means with the term *meypṇāṭu*, and thus, its translation is difficult.<sup>16</sup> What does seem clear is that the term cannot be reduced to Sanskrit *sāttvikabhāva*, 'bodily reaction'. How early the concept of the somatisation of emotion was introduced remains an open question. Although Tolkāppiyaṇār never addresses emotional events in the body, in mid-first-millennium moral literature there is clearly an emotion knowledge of internal emotion attached to external gestures (see, for example, *Tirukkuraḷ*, 696).<sup>17</sup> Also unclear is why Tolkāppiyaṇār places laughter at the top of his list, an indication of its importance.<sup>18</sup>

---

not participate in this debate. The dating fourth- or fifth-century has been proposed by Anne E. Monius, 'Love, Violence, and the Aesthetics of Disgust: Śaivas and Jains in Medieval South India,' *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 32 (2004): 113–72 (130 n. 52). For more about the text's possible dates, see K. Balasubramanian, *Studies in Tolkappiyam: Professor T. P. Meenakshisundaran Birth Centenary Volume* (Chidambaram, Annamalai Nagar: Annamalai University, 2001). For the various proposed dates, see the long list in Gregory James, *Colporuḷ: A History of Tamil Dictionaries* (Chennai: Cre-A, 2000), 83 n. 20.

13 On the tradition's view that grammar preceded poetry as the condition of the latter's practice; see Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography*, 39.

14 See in the *Meypṇāṭu* source readings of chapter 2 below details to the Sanskrit *Nāṭyaśāstra*, chapters 6 and 7, with an overview of its ideas.

15 It was precisely the difference between these two types of experiences that preoccupied Sanskrit thinkers (see Pollock, *Rasa Reader*). – Most modern scholars, including Cox, Thirugnanasambhandhan, and Marr, agree that the *Tolkāppiyam*'s theory of *meypṇāṭu* is based on the conception of ordinary real-life emotion (Skt. *bhāva*) rather than aesthetic emotion (*rasa*); see Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 134; P. Thirugnanasambhandhan, 'A Study of Rasa – Thlokāppiyar [sic!] and Bharata,' in *The Earliest Complete Grammar Studies in Tolkāppiyam*, eds Pa. Marutanāyakam, Ku. Civamaṇi and M. Dominic Raj (Chennai: Sekar Pathippagam, 2010), 332–343 (332ff.); John Ralston Marr, *The Eight Anthologies: A Study in Early Tamil Literature* (Madras/Chennai: Institute of Asian Studies, 1985), 56.

16 See section 3 below on the problems of translation.

17 The precise sectarian affiliation of the *Tirukkuraḷ* remains unclear; see Anne Monius, *Imagining a Place for Buddhism: Literary Culture and Religious Community in Tamil-Speaking South India* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 157.

18 Cf. Abhinavagupta's *The New Dramatic Art* (*Abhinavabhāratī*, 1000 CE), a commentary on

**Puttamittiraṅ's *Vīracōḷiyam*, c.1060–1068 CE<sup>19</sup> and its commentary by Peruntēvaṅṅār, late eleventh or early twelfth century(?)<sup>20</sup>**

The *Vīracōḷiyam*, a treatise on Tamil grammar and poetics, in verse form,<sup>21</sup> ‘models itself on the *Tolkāppiyam* and applies Sanskrit rules and usage to that Tamil paradigm.’<sup>22</sup> This highly Sanscriticised<sup>23</sup> Buddhist text was seemingly a marginal text.<sup>24</sup> The Tamil-speaking Buddhist known as Puttamittiraṅ composed the *Vīracōḷiyam* in honour of his royal Cōḷa patron Vīrarācēntira/Vīrarājendra.<sup>25</sup> As Monius states, ‘the VC can anticipate an audience of literary audience well versed in the poetics of the Caṅkam anthologies’<sup>26</sup> and equally well acquainted with the *Kāvyaḍarśa*,<sup>27</sup> thus showing that there was a long-standing sense of ‘equality’ between Tamil and Sanskrit.<sup>28</sup>

---

Bharata's *Treatise on Drama (Nāṭyasāstra)*, which states (in Pollock's translation): ‘Insofar as love is readily accessible to all creatures and thus entirely familiar, and thereby pleasing to all, the erotic is named first.’ (Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 206).

19 This dating is that of Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 119.

20 This date has been suggested by Monius, *Imagining*, 138.

21 181 verses.

22 Monius, *Imagining*, 118.

23 See the *Vīracōḷiyam*'s bold statements that it will explain Tamil grammar and poetic theory ‘according to the ancient rules of grammar [sanctioned by] northern texts [*vaṭa nūl*, BS]’ and that the principles of poetic ornamentation in particular will be discussed in light of ‘the statements of Taṅṭi’. This signals an ‘entirely new sort of Sanskrit influence at work, a brand of self-conscious appropriation and incorporation of Sanskrit analytic terms and framework without precedent in Tamil’ (Monius and *Imagining*, 129).

24 See Eva Wilden, *Manuscript, Print and Memory: Relics of the Caṅkam in Tamilnadu* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 308; Monius, *Imagining*, 120.

25 See *Vīracōḷiyam*, preface, v; I refer to the edition from Kā. Ra. Kōvintarāj Mutaliyār, ed., *Puttamittiraṅṅār iyarriya Vīracōḷiyam mūlamum, Peruntēvaṅṅār iyarriya uraiyum* (Chennai: Pavāṅṅantar Kaḷakam, 1942). – As Monius (*Imagining*, 138) states: ‘The *Vīracōḷiyam* and its commentary are [...] the sole remaining artifacts of [...] Buddhist Cōḷa-era literary culture of southern India.’ ‘The commentary of the VC provides a glimpse of what must have once been a flourishing Buddhist literary culture in Tamil’ (ibid.). The commentary of Puttamittiraṅ's disciple Peruntēvaṅṅār is perhaps one of the earliest prose commentaries: ‘The commentator on the *Vīracōḷiyam* [...] displays his significant erudition in all manner of Tamil poetic composition, citing both literary classics and earlier theoretical works on grammar and poetry’ (Monius, *Imagining*, 143).

26 Anne Monius, ‘The Many Lives of Daṅḍin: The *Kāvyaḍarśa* in Sanskrit and Tamil,’ *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 4.1 (2000): 1–37 (12).

27 According to tradition, the author of the *Kāvyaḍarśa*, Daṅḍin, lived at the seventh-century Pallava court at Kāñcīpuram, South India (Monius, *Imagining*, 129). The Pallavas supported Jainism, Buddhism, and Hinduism. For a comparative discussion of the *Kāvyaḍarśa*, the *Vīracōḷiyam* and the *Taṅṭiyalaṅkāram*, see Monius, ‘Many Lives of Daṅḍin,’ 1–37.

28 Monius states (*Imagining*, 125–27): In the *Vīracōḷiyam* ‘the regional language (Tamil) and its literary/poetic corpus are the focus, and northern [Sanskrit, BS] textual traditions are invoked to show the translocal qualities of Tamil. Tamil thus becomes a grammatical and poetic standard, like Sanskrit’. That is, the VC is ‘the exposition of Tamil as a literary language in full accord with Sanskritic rules of grammar and aesthetic principles [...]’ (ibid., 127). Also another of Monius’

The emotion discourse of the medieval period was marked by intellectual dynamism. While the Sanskrit *rasa* theory had created a paradigm shift around 900–1000 CE from aesthetic emotion in literary characters to the aesthetic response of the reader or spectator,<sup>29</sup> it was not, however, this paradigm that spilled into the theory of *meyp̄p̄ātu*. The learned Tamil discourse of the eleventh century felt another influence, as can be witnessed in the Tamil *Vīracōliyam*. In this Buddhist grammar, a fundamental reconfiguration of emotions takes place, including their semantic net and knowledge related to them. Though the discussion remains purely related to texts and characters, the third section, Poruḷ, of the *Vīracōliyam* introduces *meyp̄p̄ātu* as both a bodily event and a verbal expression, an interpretation far beyond that presented in the emotion root-text of the *Tolkāppiyam*.

A second change found in the *Vīracōliyam* is the assimilation of Sanskrit aesthetic principles into Tamil *meyp̄p̄ātu* knowledge (absent in the *Tolkāppiyam*), with the incorporation of the Sanskrit aesthetic emotion (*rasa*) of erotic love or *śṛṅgāra*<sup>30</sup> into the list of the eight basic *meyp̄p̄ātus*. In exchange, the Tamil *meyp̄p̄ātu* of anger has been discarded. It is striking that erotic love/desire<sup>31</sup> (*śṛṅgāra/kāma*) is not only placed at the top of the list, indicating its importance, but also, and above all, it is understood as the ultimate *meyp̄p̄ātu*.<sup>32</sup> These shifts (of particular concern for Buddhists<sup>33</sup>) did not occur without new technical terms being introduced, such as *kuṛippu*, a functional term denoting the physical or mental signs of the desire (*vēṭkai*) felt by lovers.<sup>34</sup> We meet this term again in the later discourse, but with a different connotation.

---

observations is noteworthy, namely ‘that much of Sri Lanka was under Cōḷa rule in the era of the *Vīracōliyam*’s composition (roughly the mid-tenth through late-eleventh centuries) and that at least one Tamil-speaking Buddhist monastery, the Rājarājaperumpallī, is believed to have flourished in the Trincomalee District of Sri Lanka during the eleventh century [...] [W]hat is readily apparent is that from the eleventh century onward, Buddhist community begins to be imagined and expressed in new and different ways’ (ibid., 126).

29 Pollock (*Rasa Reader*, 99) states that this had been ‘fully naturalized [by Sanskrit theorist] Kuntaka’s date’ (i.e. c.975 CE), but the Kashmiri thinker Abhinavagupta (c.1000 CE) made the paradigm shift irrevocable.

30 Although it must be noted that this had already appeared in a perhaps ninth or tenth-century Tamil poetic treatise; see *Puṛapporuḷvenpāmalai*, below ch. 2, *Meyp̄p̄ātu* source readings, s.v. *Vīracōliyam* I.b, footnote).

31 The erotic love refers above all to desire.

32 Is it possible that here the *Vīracōliyam* was influenced by the Sanskrit poet-king Bhoja? Bhoja’s (1025–1055) literary treatises, according to Pollock, ‘were read widely, at least in southern India’ (Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 111). Bhoja says that all emotions arrive from passion: ‘Passion is the sole *rasa*.’ (ibid., 120). If Bhoja’s text experienced a very quick transmission, this is plausible, but manuscript evidence would be needed to make this definitive. It is, then, interesting that neither the *Vīracōliyam* nor its commentary name Bhoja as a source, but both freely name Daṇḍin. – On *śṛṅgāra* receiving a Buddhist tone, see Monius, ch. 2, *Meyp̄p̄ātu* source readings below, s.v. *Vīracōliyam* II.b, footnote.

33 For Buddhists anger is a harmful emotion and passion underlies all suffering and rebirth.

34 For a listing of the *kuṛippus*, see ch. 2, *Meyp̄p̄ātu* source readings, s.v. *Vīracōliyam* I.d, footnote.

The third shift initiated by the *Vīracōḷiyam* (in the fifth section, *Alaṅkāram*) is the incorporation into Tamil literary concepts of the Sanskrit poetic ornament theory<sup>35</sup> of Daṇḍin (c.700 CE), a theory that considers aesthetic emotions (*rasa*) to be poetic ornaments.<sup>36</sup> In this, the *Vīracōḷiyam*'s author Puttamittiraṅ made conceptual space for *cuvai* (Tamil 'taste') as a technical term for aesthetics equivalent to *rasa* (in Skt. literally 'taste'). Accordingly, Tamil literary theories of emotion now took into account something akin to *rasa*.

The situation becomes still more intricate through the fact that a fourth significant innovation was introduced by Peruntēvaṅṅār, the commentator on the *Vīracōḷiyam* (late eleventh or early twelfth century). He does not list eight canonical aesthetic emotions or *cuvais/rasas*, but nine, adding quiescence or *cāntam*, a calque of Sanskrit *śānta-rasa*. The inclusion of quiescence as a ninth aesthetic emotion was not an innovation of Daṇḍin, nor was it part of the Tamil tradition.<sup>37</sup> Also striking is the fact that in the commentary the nine aesthetic emotions are described as dramaturgical *cuvais*, that is, aesthetic emotions in the dramatic performing arts rather than in texts.<sup>38</sup> Whatever the case may be, this dramaturgical context within the Daṇḍin-infused section on poetic ornamentation (*alaṅkāram*) is puzzling.

However complex the different layers of knowledge at the time of the commentator Peruntēvaṅṅār may have been, his knowledge of aesthetics and emotion is marked distinctly by a Sanskrit paradigm. That includes the aesthetic emotions (*rasa/cuvai*), albeit nine in number, as well as a notion of the locus of aesthetic emotion that is not

---

35 From Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaḍarśa* (*Mirror of Poetry*). This work, according to Pollock (*Rasa Reader*, 59) 'is one of the most influential works in the global history of poetics, probably second only to Aristotle's treatise in breadth of impact. It was translated into a number of South Asian languages and exerted influence on literatures as distant as Recent Style Chinese poetry of the late Tang dynasty and seventeenth-century Tibetan poetry. Dandin deals mainly with figures of speech in poetry.' According to Pollock (*ibid.*, 59) in the mid-tenth century there was a Buddhist monk by the name of Ratnashrijnana from Sri Lanka who wrote a commentary on Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaḍarśa* and translated it into Sinhalese. – As Pollock (*Rasa Reader*, 11) states, for Daṇḍin *rasa* 'did not yet constitute the heart of literariness'.

36 Monius (*Imagining*, 131) was the first to write extensively about this new aspect, especially the fact that the *Tolkāppiyam* confined ornamentation to that based on sound (*toṭai*). For more, see the *Meypṭāṭu* source readings, *s.v. Vīracōḷiyam* below.

37 On this, see references to Monius, ch. 2, *Meypṭāṭu* source readings below, *s.v. Vīracōḷiyam* II.b, footnote. Monius suggests that this innovation was introduced by the Buddhist commentator into the Cōḷa-era literary Tamil culture. Cox argues that this was appropriated from Abhinavagupta. See also ch. 2 (*Meypṭāṭu* Source Reader) below, *Vīracōḷiyam* II.b, footnote: the commentary on the *Vīracōḷiyam* (VCC) cites another authority with regard to nine *cuvais*.

38 It is possible that the commentator on the *Vīracōḷiyam* was influenced by a drama-related work, perhaps Abhinavagupta's *The New Dramatic Art* (*Abhinavabhāratī*, c.1000 CE), which was known in South India. The *Vīracōḷiyam* and its commentary belong to an era in which new Sanskrit texts were – quite literally – 'arriving daily in Cōḷa courts', with brahmins seeking royal patronage (personal communication with Anne Monius, 27 November 2018). It remains an open question whether there are any explanations for this other than possible direct textual influence. – *The New Dramatic Art* is a commentary on Bharata's *Treatise on Drama* (*Nāṭyaśāstra*).

connected to the new reader-centred aesthetics (the concept of aesthetic emotion in the reader/spectator,<sup>39</sup> *en vogue* in Sanskrit theoretical circles, but not in Tamil ones).

The fifth shift in the *Vīracōḷiyam* commentary and the most distinctive, also found in the fifth section on poetic ornamentation (Alāṅkāram), is a change of connotation: Buddhist erotic love or *śṛṅgāra* is not the *śṛṅgāra* of aesthetic discourse but a source of suffering. Similarly other aesthetic emotions or *cuvais*, such as the heroic and disgust, receive a unique Buddhist colour.<sup>40</sup>

To conclude, the *Vīracōḷiyam*, with its multiple layers of ideas, thus expresses a translingual expansion. However, the principal focus of its author as well as its commentator was a resolute Buddhist understanding of emotion.

### **Ceyirriyaṅār's<sup>41</sup> *Ceyirriyam*, late eleventh or early twelfth century<sup>42</sup>**

This now lost treatise was a work entirely about drama.<sup>43</sup> It was written before the commentarial work by Ḥampūraṅar (discussed below), but after Abhinavagupta's *The New Dramatic Art* (*Abhinavabhāratī*, c. 1000 CE) and the *Vīracōḷiyam* by Puttamittiraṅ (c. 1060–1068); the question of whether the *Vīracōḷiyam* commentary by Peruntēvaṅar preceded the *Ceyirriyam* or vice versa must still be sorted out. The *Ceyirriyam* was one of the most important influences on later medieval commentators on the *meypṇātu* root-text (*Tolkāppiyam*), as well as on the poetic narrative *Cilappatikāram*, *The Tale of an Anklet* (post-*Caṅkam*, date uncertain<sup>44</sup>). Indeed, it is primarily (though not exclusively) through quotes in Ḥampūraṅar's commentary on the *meypṇātu* root-text that we know the now lost *Ceyirriyam*.<sup>45</sup> The author of the *Ceyirriyam* seems quite in touch with the latest trends and turns of Sanskrit aesthetics, including ideas in Abhinavagupta's *The New Dramatic Art*, which he appropriated.<sup>46</sup> That *The New Dramatic*

39 Initiated by the Sanskrit Bhatta Nayaka; see Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 188.

40 For my translations of examples of reinterpretation and a reference to Monius's analysis of the *Vīracōḷiyam*, see the footnotes in ch. 2, *Meypṇātu* source readings below, *s.v.* *Vīracōḷiyam*.

41 Just as the author of the *Tolkāppiyam* is called Tolkāppiyāṅār, the title of the *Ceyirriyam* is used for the name of its unknown author.

42 Dating according to Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 152. A major question for thinkers after Abhinavagupta was the nature of aesthetic reception; Cox, 'Bearing,' 81.

43 See also Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 123.

44 On the dating of the *Cilappatikāram*, see Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography*, 334 n. 103: 'a somewhat earlier date [than the eighth century] remains possible'; cf. Kamil V. Zvelebil, *Companion Studies to the History of Tamil Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 29 n. 30: 'ca. 450 A.D.?'; also Steele Clare, 'Canons,' 65: 'fifth-century'.

45 On the mentioning or quoting of the *Ceyirriyam* in various medieval works, see Zvelebil, *Companion Studies*, 85.

46 For Cox's arguments, see 'From Source-Criticism,' 127–129, and below ch. 2, *Meypṇātu* source readings, *s.v.* *Ceyirriyam*, (end of) point c, footnote. – For the writings of Abhinavagupta, see Pollock (*Rasa Reader*, 193), who states: 'Two important cautions need to be offered [... Abhinava's] thinking is subtle, sometimes even counterintuitive [...] a style [...] syntactical complex [...] and semantic idiosyncratic [...] refreshing [...] turbid [...] it is far too early in the history of Abhinavagupta studies for anyone to presume to describe his theory with any precision, let

*Art* was known in South India is evident, since a manuscript of the work is today extant in Malabar, south-western India.<sup>47</sup>

Like the *Vīracōḷiyam*'s commentator Peruntēvaṇār, the author of the *Ceyirriyam* explicitly discusses adopted Sanskrit aesthetic emotions in reference to drama (something to be both seen and heard) and includes the ninth aesthetic emotion (*cuvai/rasa*) of quiescence. While the *Vīracōḷiyam* uses the Sanskrit calque *cāntam*, *Ceyirriyaṇār* translates Sanskrit *śānta-rasa* as Tamil *mattimam*, 'in the middle'. However, this is also where the *Vīracōḷiyam* and *Ceyirriyam* depart from one another, since in the *Ceyirriyam* quiescence is not equal to the other eight aesthetic emotions.

Experiencing quiescence is reserved for sages and ascetics, those who have renounced desire (*kāmam*), anger, and delusion.<sup>48</sup> It seems that the *Ceyirriyam* considers it possible to represent quiescence, the aesthetic emotion of emotionlessness, in dramatic performance.<sup>49</sup>

The material reality of emotions through bodily events is at the core of Indian emotion theory. However, the first Tamil emotion treatise to supply a term for this is the drama-based *Ceyirriyam*. Although the Buddhist *Vīracōḷiyam* hints at the Sanskrit *bhāva* emotion concept of *sāttvikabhāva*, the Tamil word *cattuvam* to describe the external indication of (internal) emotion is only used from the *Ceyirriyam* onward.<sup>50</sup> The term *cattuvam*, which *Ceyirriyaṇār* either adopted or perhaps even coined, is described as having various properties (ten in number): horripilation, shedding tears, trembling, perspiration, and so on. As noted above, Tamil emotion treatises developed a technical vocabulary only slowly. In part, this was the result of different concerns. Nonetheless, it is also clear that a treatise examining dramatic literature, which produces the visualisation of emotion through an actor's performance, would be interested in external expressions accessible to the viewer.

The *Ceyirriyam* does not stop its investigation here. It rather widens the Tamil *meypṭātu* discourse by extending the focus from bodily transformation (horripilation and so on), external indications of emotions, to include the sensory perception of the

---

alone completeness.'

47 See Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 189.

48 Pollock (*Rasa Reader*, 206) translates Abhinavagupta (1.261.15) as follows: 'the peaceful [...] is in essence the cessation of all acts in contrast to the ethos of engagement in the group of three ends of man, love, wealth, and morality; its end result is spiritual liberation.'

49 However, Pollock, in his introduction to the Sanskrit intellectual history of *rasa*, states: 'The [Sanskrit] dispute over the peaceful *rasa* [...] speaks [...] to the difficult extension from performance, where it could not be represented, to narrative, where it could [...].' (*Rasa Reader*, 15). However the medieval Tamil *Tolkāppiyam* commentaries on the *meypṭātu* root-text (as for example by Pērācīriyar in the early thirteenth century, see below n. 96; also ch. 2, *Meypṭātu* source readings, s.v. Pērācīriyar, point h) take exactly this point as a criterion for excluding quiescence from narrative poetic composition, asserting that it is not possible to represent quiescence in poetry.

50 The quotes referring to *cattuvam* are not attributed by ḷampūraṇar to *Ceyirriyaṇār* by name, but it is very likely that they are by him.

viewer, thus extending the focus of *meyp̄p̄ātu* to the viewer.<sup>51</sup> In particular, the early thirteenth-century *meyp̄p̄ātu* root-text commentator Pēraciriyar (see below) takes up this point.<sup>52</sup> For the *Ceyirriyam*, *meyp̄p̄ātu* is the meaning gained by the viewer (who cognises the emotion) through the actor's performance.<sup>53</sup> This is, however, all we can ascertain in light of the fact that we have access only to fragments of Ceyirriyaṅār's thoughts.

Also belonging to this fragmentary transmission is the phrase 'two loci of *cuvai*'. How far Ceyirriyaṅār followed Abhinavagupta in his new viewer-centred locus of aesthetic emotion (*cuvai/rasa*) is difficult to say.<sup>54</sup> With certainty, however, it can be said that in the later Tamil emotion discourse, Abhinavagupta's viewer-centred locus of aesthetic emotion is not included by commentators on *meyp̄p̄ātu*, or only with reservation (as for example Pēraciriyar).<sup>55</sup>

### **᱑ampūraṅār's commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam*'s emotion root-text (*Meyp̄p̄āṭṭiyal*), late eleventh or a few decades later(?)<sup>56</sup>**

This work of ᱑ampūraṅār is the earliest extant commentary on the Tamil emotion root-text.<sup>57</sup> Here we shift back to poetic theory. ᱑ampūraṅār's work encompasses not only explications of the root-text, but also later (medieval) layers of the emotion discourse, especially the drama-based *Ceyirriyam*, which he cites extensively (this, in turn, going back to Abhinavagupta's new *rasa* postulates).<sup>58</sup> However, the *Vīracōḷiyam* seems either not known or ignored; at least it is not mentioned by name.

The commentator introduces several new ideas into the *meyp̄p̄ātu* discourse of his time. On one hand, in order to provide new questions, he consolidates and strengthens the relationship between Tamil emotion (*meyp̄p̄ātu*) and Sanskrit aesthetics (which had been first extended to Tamil poetics in the Buddhist *Vīracōḷiyam*). On the other, he attempts to understand the experience of aesthetic emotion, *cuvai/rasa*, and how it arises in a character. He introduces various technical terms into the Tamil lexis, either adopted or coined by him, that are in conjunction conducive to producing aesthetic

51 See ch. 2, *Meyp̄p̄ātu* source readings below, s.v. *Ceyirriyam*, text and translation, point e.

52 See below, ch. 2, *Meyp̄p̄ātu* source readings, s.v. Pēraciriyar, point c, definition of *meyp̄p̄ātu*.

53 See my translation, *Meyp̄p̄ātu* source readings below, s.v. *Ceyirriyam*, point e.

54 For *rasa* theory by Abhinavagupta, see Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 187ff.

55 Pēraciriyar speaks of two loci for *cuvai/rasa*, one in the taster/leading character and the other in the viewer. He asserts, however, that they are not the same. See my passage on Pēraciriyar below, as well as ch. 2, *Meyp̄p̄ātu* source readings, s.v. Pēraciriyar, point d (*cuvai* has two loci).

56 I must acknowledge my indebtedness to Whitney Cox's reading and translation of ᱑ampūraṅār's commentary. My own ideas have often taken shape in reaction to his. – The dating is that in Cox, 'Bearing.' See also Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 129. Cf. Wilden, *Manuscript*, 309: eleventh century.

57 ᱑ampūraṅār is said to be a Jain.

58 For the sequence of borrowing, see Cox (ch. 2, section 1 below, State of Research): Abhinavagupta's *Abhinavabhāratī* → *Ceyirriyam* → ᱑ampūraṅār; see also Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 129f.



emotion, including the causal factor he calls ‘the object that is tasted’ (*cuvaippaṭu poruḷ*), the cognitive response of the mind (*kuṟippu*,<sup>59</sup> a reinterpretation of the term *kuṟippu* as found in the *Vīracōliyam*), and bodily expression (*cattuvam*). If this sounds familiar, it is because much of the same terminology (but in Sanskrit wording) is mentioned in the late eleventh/early twelfth-century commentary on the *Vīracōliyam*. This emotion knowledge was surely also found in the late eleventh- or twelfth-century *Ceyirriyam*. At least with respect to the functional Tamil term *cattuvam*, we can be certain that it was taken from the *Ceyirriyam*.

With these discussions, Ṇampūraṇar’s exposition departs from its object of enquiry, the *Tolkāppiyam* emotion root-text, which did not deal with aesthetics of emotion (*cuvai/rasa*) at all, either lexically or conceptually. From this point of view, Ṇampūraṇar’s most important contribution is the independence he shows: first, in making conceptual space for *cuvai* to function as ‘taste’ (in contrast to Puttamittiraṇ’s *Vīracōliyam*, where *cuvai* is an ornament, *alaṅkāram*); second, in asserting that emotion or *meypṭāṭu* can be tasted; and third, in singling out emotion or *meypṭāṭu* as a decisive aspect in poetic composition. In addition, Ṇampūraṇar seems to collapse the boundary between ordinary real-world emotion (*meypṭāṭu/bhāva*) and aesthetic emotion (*cuvai/rasa*), in other words, between the real world and art (so important for thinkers of Sanskrit aesthetics). On his part, at least, there seems no difficulty with regard to these categories.

However, Ṇampūraṇar did not always want to keep up with the current thinking of his time. Whereas all Sanskrit theorists (and mentioned in the *Vīracōliyam* commentary as well) agreed on the unidirectional theorem that ordinary emotion (*bhāva*) leads to aesthetic emotion (*rasa*), he inverted this, asserting that *cuvai/rasa* leads to *meypṭāṭu*,<sup>60</sup> an idea that went against the grain of centuries of thinking. Should this be interpreted as a competing attitude that reveals the tensions over defining the Tamil literary theory?<sup>61</sup>

What other positions does Ṇampūraṇar hold? First, a central aspect in his definition of *meypṭāṭu* is the somatisation and biologisation of emotion, as well as its visibility for the viewer.<sup>62</sup> However, he never addresses the question of how a viewer knows or experiences this (a question taken up by the later commentator Pērāciriyaṇ).

---

59 My reading deviates from the translation of P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, who has looked for clear one-to-one parallels or analogies with Sanskrit. He understands *kuṟippu* in Ṇampūraṇar’s commentary as ‘stable emotion’. See P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, *Tolkāppiyam: The Earliest Extant Tamil Grammar, With a Short Commentary in English, Volume 2: Poruḷatikāram* (Chennai: The Kuppaswami Sastri Research Institute, [1936] 2002).

60 Already in Bharata’s *Treatise on Drama* (*Nāṭyaśāstra*, c.300 CE), the Sanskrit foundational text of the *rasa-bhāva* theory, it is stated that *rāsa* arises from *bhāva* (*Nāṭyaśāstra* 6.32–33). See *The Nāṭyaśāstra*, ed. Manomohan Ghosh (Calcutta: Granthalaya Private Ltd., 1967).

61 A tension between the authority of the *Tolkāppiyam* (and its supreme, albeit only technical term *meypṭāṭu*) and newer literary developments? The studies of Steele Clare, ‘Canons,’ 9, would speak for it.

62 See ch. 2, *Meypṭāṭu* source readings below, s.v. Ṇampūraṇar, point f.

Second, in aesthetic terms, he does not speak of how ‘tasting’ is produced in the reader, but rather of how this is generated in a text. Third, he discards the ninth aesthetic emotion of quiescence (Tam. *naṭuvunilai*, *mattimam*, *cāntam*; Skt. *śānta*) due to its non-worldly practice whose end result is spiritual liberation and the cessation of all acts.<sup>63</sup> We may assume that Ṭampūraṇar considered the emotional state of emotionlessness unsuitable for *belles-lettres* (*kāvya*). Thus, he not only departs from the *Vīracōḷiyam* commentary of Peruntēvaṇār, but also from the *Ceyirriyam* and the thinking of Abhinavagupta, who had made quiescence a *rasa* of distinction in Sanskrit aesthetics. This is not surprising given his commentarial project.

#### **Anonymous, *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*, mid-twelfth century(?)<sup>64</sup>**

The *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram* is a Tamil translation and interpretation of the *Mirror of Poetry* (*Kāvyaḍarśa*, c.700 CE) by the Sanskrit critic and poet Daṇḍin, who was attached to the southern Indian Pallava court at the end of the seventh century.<sup>65</sup> It is concerned exclusively with the nature of literary language in *belles-lettres* (*kāvya*), with the focus entirely on textual form, not reader response. It confirms the unidirectional theory that emotion, or *meypṭāṭu*, leads to aesthetic emotion (*cuvai*) – not the reverse, as had been claimed by Ṭampūraṇar – and lists eight aesthetic emotions, notably (different than Daṇḍin, but like Ṭampūraṇar<sup>66</sup>) placing the heroic in first position to indicate its primacy. As found in the work of Daṇḍin, the notion that aesthetic emotions are figures of speech returns to centre stage here.<sup>67</sup> It should be recalled that the Buddhist author of the *Vīracōḷiyam* (c.1060–1068) was the first to extend Daṇḍin’s Sanskrit poetic ornament theory to Tamil poetics. The *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*, having no other category to place it in, conceives aesthetic emotion (*cuvai*) to be a rhetoric phenomenon inherent in a text, a particular type of expressive language use like other familiar figures of speech, such as false praise (Tam. *pukaḷāp pukaḷcci aṇi*) and the like. There is no question that here, Tamil *meypṭāṭu* and Sanskrit *bhāva* are functionally identical.<sup>68</sup>

63 See Edwin Gerow, ‘Abhinavagupta’s Aesthetics as a Speculative Paradigm,’ *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114.2 (1994): 186–208.

64 The dating is that of Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 133. *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram, mūlamum teḷivuraiyūm*, ed. V. T. Irāmaccuppiramaṇiyam and Mu. Caṇmukam Piḷḷai (Chennai: Mullai Nilaiyam, 2017).

65 On the Tamil *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*, see also Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography*, 182. On Daṇḍin’s Sanskrit *Kāvyaḍarśa*, see *Daṇḍin’s Poetik: Kāvyaḍarśa, Sanskrit und Deutsch*, ed. and trans. Otto Böhtlingk (Leipzig: von H. Haessel, 1890), 2.281–2.292 (pp. 69–71).

66 Cf. the order in Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyaḍarśa* 2.281–291: the erotic, the furious, the heroic, the tragic (*kāruṇa*), disgust, the comic, the wondrous, the fearful.

67 According to Pollock (*Rasa Reader*, 60), ‘Dandin [in his *Kāvyaḍarśa*] had no category other than figuration under which to theorize the phenomenon of *rasa* in poetry’.

68 See also Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 133.

**Aṭiyārkku Nallār's commentary on the narrative poem *Cilappatikāram*, closing decades of twelfth century**<sup>69</sup>

Whatever the reason for the thinkers' oscillation between poetics and dramaturgical theory, from the late eleventh century to the thirteenth century there was a continuous interest in the process of the visualisation of literature (see also Pēraciriyar, below). In keeping with this, Aṭiyārkku Nallār in his commentary on the fifth-century(?) *Cilappatikāram*, investigates the performative aspects of aesthetic emotion concepts. As building blocks in his conceptual system, he adopts all the key terms found in the *Ceyirriyam*, the commentary by Iḷampūraṇar, and the *Taṅṅiyalaṅkāram*.<sup>70</sup> However, the first thing that strikes the reader of his commentary is his exposition of the concept of 'threefold Tamil' (*muttamiḷ*), which includes the literature of poetry or prose (*iyal*), literature put to music and sung (*icai*), and literature to be enacted as dance-drama (*nāṭakam*).<sup>71</sup> It is with respect to poetry that he uses the technical term *meypṇāṭu*. For theorising on the phenomenon of the actor's emotion in dance and drama, Aṭiyārkku Nallār uses no category other than aesthetic emotion (*cuvai*) and its aesthetic elements (bodily reactions, and so on). His conception of *cuvai* includes the various affective dimensions of dramaturgical expression, to which he adds a new register of acting, namely, staged gestures (Skt. *avinaya*) such as an uplifted eyebrow, red blood-shot eyes, or curled lips, seeing these as necessary counterparts to the given aesthetic emotion. He lists nine aesthetic emotions (*cuvai*) and includes quiescence. From this, one may assume that Aṭiyārkku Nallār considered the aesthetic state of emotionlessness a suitable subject for stage presentation and something attractive for sensitive viewers.

However, Aṭiyārkku Nallār does not limit his category of staged gestures to this list of nine aesthetic emotions or *cuvais*, but opens it up and extends it to emotional states (what the *Tolkāppiyam* calls the thirty-two auxiliary emotions, and the *Nāṭyaśāstra* the thirty-three transitory emotions), such as laziness, envy, and the like. Thus, we not only find the staged gesture of red blood-shot eyes to represent anger, but also appropriate gestures for someone who is possessed, shy/ashamed, or even dead (24 in number).

69 The date is that of Cox, 'Bearing.' According to Cox (ibid.), Pēraciriyar and Aṭiyārkku Nallār were active very close to the lifetime of Śāradātanaya (1175–1250). Cf. the dating according to Monius: twelfth to thirteenth century, in 'Many Lives of Daṇḍin,' 34 n. 41. – The *Cilappatikāram* is a Jain narrative poem, Aṭiyārkku Nallār himself was a Śaiva and his patron is said to have been a Jain minister; see Steele Clare, 'Canons,' 30.

70 For details, see ch. 2, *Meypṇāṭu* source readings below, s.v. Aṭiyārkku Nallār.

71 On the 'threefold Tamil', see Zvelebil, *Companion Studies*, 140–43. See also Eva Wilden, 'Depictions of Language and Languages in Early Tamil Literature: How Tamil Became Cool and Straight,' *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 31.2, La nomination des langues dans l'histoire (2009): 117–41, doi: 10.3406/hel.2009.3122: 'This term [*muttamiḷ*] is attested from post-Canṅam times onward, and it is not clear whether it is pre-theoretical or based on some lost early treatise' (129). – For Aṭiyārkku Nallār's famous erudition with respect to music and drama, see Wilden, *Manuscript*, 296 n. 287.

### Pērācīriyar's commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam*'s *meyppātu* root-text, early thirteenth century<sup>72</sup>

Unlike Iḷampūraṇar, who seemed to have attempted to open a debate on the root-text's *meyppātu*, it seems that Pērācīriyar wished to close it.<sup>73</sup> He does this, first by directing attention away from the root-text and building on earlier interpretations (as found in the *Ceyirriyam* and of Iḷampūraṇar), but then returning abruptly to the root-text as the only correct statement. In his attempt to make the root-text accessible and its meaning clear, he tries to harmonise the problems found in Iḷampūraṇar's earlier commentary.

Jennifer Steele Clare sees the commentator Pērācīriyar as rejecting the contemporary developments of his time.<sup>74</sup> Admittedly, in conclusion he does insist on traditional views, but *en route* he offers us a multi-voiced assessment of emotion knowledge as was circulating during his lifetime<sup>75</sup> (even though he does not discuss the latest paradigm shift to aesthetics of reception, which had been famously established by the Kashmiri Abhinavagupta<sup>76</sup>). What motivated Pērācīriyar's assertive return to traditionalism and, thus, to the limited emotion knowledge of his root-text is uncertain. Whitney Cox has offered a possible answer, stating that Pērācīriyar's 'defensive canon-policing'<sup>77</sup> makes sense in the light of the problem of lost works (such as the *Ceyirriyam*) and apprehension that even *Tolkāppiyāṇār*'s treatise on emotions could vanish without a trace. Another possible answer may be the competing larger sectarian projects of defining Tamil literary theory at the time, as Steele Clare suggests.<sup>78</sup>

But even if Pērācīriyar was concentrating on such concerns, acknowledging alternative scholarly perspectives only due to rhetorical strategy, it does not follow that his

72 The date is that of Cox, 'Bearing.' See also, Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography*, 203. Cf. Wilden, *Manuscript*, 309: twelfth century.

73 See Christina S. Kraus and Christopher Stray, *Classical Commentaries: Explorations in a Scholarly Genre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), ch. 1 'Form and Content' by Christina S. Kraus and C.A. Stray, 1–18: 'commentaries [...] may be viewed as opening or closing, starting or stalling, debate' (10).

74 Steele Clare, 'Canons,' 102.

75 Two authorities flourished very close to Pērācīriyar's own lifetime: Śāradātanaya (1175–1250) and Aṭiyārkkū Nallār (closing decades of twelfth century) (see Cox, 'Bearing,' 87), though to my knowledge, Pērācīriyar never refers to either by name.

76 I.e. the Sanskrit idea that *rasa* is related to the aesthetic response of the viewer/reader. It would have been possible for both Iḷampūraṇar and Pērācīriyar to have known about the developments in the theory of *rasa*, the avant-garde paradigm of aesthetics of reception. However, as Pollock (*Rasa Reader*, 113) points out, the Sanskrit poet-thinker Bhoja (1025–1055) was not responsive to these developments either. As mentioned earlier, there was a southern Indian reception of Bhoja's work.

77 It was Cox who captured this in a nutshell, when characterising Pērācīriyar ('Bearing,' 90). In the context of his Śāradātanaya discussion, Cox states: 'It was in Śāradātanaya's life time that the sort of proliferation of new authorities like the *Ceyirriyam* began to meet with the dogged resistance of an assertive classicism, a reaction that may well have hastened that work's eventual loss' (ibid., 86).

78 Steele Clare, 'Canons,' 10.

inquiries are not simultaneously motivated by an interest in emotion knowledge as such. In fact, Pēraciriyar discusses various central questions regarding emotion and aesthetics:<sup>79</sup> (1) He applies the central gustatory analogy to emotional tasting.<sup>80</sup> (2) He is responsive to knowledge related to the sensory and cognitive processes at work in the emerging of *cuvai*,<sup>81</sup> incorporating into his understanding the aspect of past experience (perhaps his own idea).<sup>82</sup> (3) He shows an interest in the notion of the two loci of *cuvai* experience (the taster's and the viewer's), an idea from his reading of the *Ceyirriyam*.<sup>83</sup> (4) He is responsive to the idea of variability in the *cuvai* experiences of viewers (what for one viewer is *y* is *z* to another).<sup>84</sup> (5) He shares with his readers the existing model of *cuvai* (eight in number), including quiescence and excluding

- 
- 79 For the Tamil text and translations, see ch. 2, *Meypāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Pēraciriyar.
- 80 In Pēraciriyar's excursion on *cuvai*, taste has the metaphorical implication of a gustatory experience, in the way bitterness and the like can be tasted. Taste, in turn, is inseparable from its causal factor/object (an idea from the *Ceyirriyam*). On the gustatory analogy, see *TPPēr* 249, p. 9; see also ch. 2, *Meypāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Pēraciriyar, point d.
- 81 In the group of texts under investigation here, Pēraciriyar's commentary is the first to mention sense-organ perception (*poriyunaru*). This new term may have been coined (by him or in the *Ceyirriyam*?) to explain a newly perceived phenomenon.
- 82 *TPPēr* 249, p. 9, ll. 22–25, 27–28, p. 10, l. 1; for the Tamil text and translation, see below ch. 2, *Meypāṭu* source readings, *s.v.* Pēraciriyar, point d. – Cf. current scholarship on emotions in general. According to Lisa Feldman Barrett, neuropsychologist and theorist of constructed emotions (TCE, formerly CAT), prior experience is used to construct the predictions that will be most functional in a given situation. See [emotionresearcher.com/lisa-feldman-barrett-why-emotions-are-situated-conceptualizations/](http://emotionresearcher.com/lisa-feldman-barrett-why-emotions-are-situated-conceptualizations/) (accessed 24 October 2018); see Maria Gendron and Lisa Feldman Barrett, 'Emotion Perception as Conceptual Synchrony,' *Emotion Review* 10.2 (April 2018): 101–10, doi: 10.1177/1754073917705717.
- 83 See details, ch. 2, *Meypāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* *Ceyirriyam*, point d. Bhatta Narasimha, the Sanskrit commentator (dates unknown) on Bhoja's *Necklace for the Goddess of Language* (c.1025), distinguishes between a 'primary' and a 'secondary' sense of *rasa*, the first referring to the character's experience, the second to the reader's (Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 128); as noted above, Bhoja's discourse on *rasa* is not concerned with literary reception (as Abhinavagupta's is). – Cf. the research of Gendron and Barrett, 'Emotion Perception,' 104: '[...] both "perceivers" and "experiencers" are engaging in situated conceptualization (engaging in prediction), but the sensory signals constraining conceptualization, and the individuals' goals, are distinct. [...] The] set of predictions in [sic!] based on both the perceiver's prior state, as well as her past experiences with that *emotion* (including experience conferred indirectly through culture).'
- 84 *TPPēr* 249, p. 10, ll. 14–17; see the Tamil text and translation in ch. 2 below, *Meypāṭu* Source Reader, *s.v.* Pēraciriyar, point d (*s.v.*, *cuvai* has two loci). On Śāradātanaya's *Bhāvaprakāśana* (*On the Displaying of Theatrical Emotion*) and the idea of the 'variability of the *rasa*-experience depending upon the mental state of the spectator', see Cox, 'Bearing,' 82; also 71. Śāradātanaya is from the Tamil-speaking South (*ibid.* 60). Cox, *ibid.*, 75, states that Śāradātanaya drew on many eminent thinkers, among others, Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta, Bhoja, and Mammaṭa. – For instance, the Sanskrit thinker Anandhavardhana (c.875 CE) made *rasa* the central phenomenon for both poetic and dramatic forms; see Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 87.

anger, as well as a model of the emergence of *cuvai* operating only for the basic canonical emotions,<sup>85</sup> and further, gives an account of the ideas of the drama theorist Ceyirriyār as to how *cuvais* emerge in a leading character and in the theatre viewer.<sup>86</sup>

As tantalising as these excursions into the theories and innovations of other thinkers may be for today's scholars looking for a conceptual history of emotion, or students of the phenomenology of emotions, Pērācīriyar returns to the *Tolkāppiyam* as the sole authority in matters of emotionology.

Thus, in the end *meyppātu* reigns supreme in the Tamil literary theory.<sup>87</sup> With this commentarial project in mind, he aimed at making the most of the root-text, while being fully aware of the lack of *cuvai* there.<sup>88</sup> *Meyppātu* can only be transformed into emotional tasting if a concept exists for it; it is precisely here that his root-text and the sources for his excursions are in conflict.

However, the tasks and responsibilities of a commentator seem to have been clear to Pērācīriyar. He introduces topics and supplies conclusions to the questions that arise about the root-text itself.<sup>89</sup> (1) In his examples, he leaves no doubt that the *Tolkāppiyam*'s eight basic emotions (laughter, anger, joy, and the rest) have a stable character,<sup>90</sup> whereas the thirty-two auxiliary emotions (such as laziness, envy, recollection, trembling, and the rest) are of an ephemeral nature, that is, they arise (quickly) and

85 Unlike Pērācīriyar's commentary, there were Sanskrit strands in *rasa* theory that expanded the fixed list of the emotions that can be 'tasted', either considering the number of *rasa* to be in principle limitless, or including transitory emotions (*bhāva*) in the list; see Pollock (*Rasa Reader*, 85) on Rudraka (850 CE) and Bhoja (1025–1055); Bhoja (I cite *Rasa Reader*, 119) says: 'The conventional wisdom that the term "*rasa*" refers only to the 8, has come out of nowhere and is hardly more than a superstition.' Bhoja goes one step further in postulating: 'A given emotion can be now stable, now transitory' (ibid., 125). – The mechanism of *cuvai*'s emergence works through the combined force of causal factor, sense organ and the rest constituting taste; see ch. 2, *Meyppātu* source readings below (points d and e), Pērācīriyar's excursion that refers to existing *cuvai* theories.

86 See ch. 2, *Meyppātu* source readings below, s.v. Pērācīriyar, point e.

87 See ch. 2, *Meyppātu* source readings below, s.v. Pērācīriyar, point f.

88 Pērācīriyar is fully aware that in the source-text he is commenting on, a theory developed for drama (to be seen) has been appropriated for poetry (to be heard/read).\* He points to the basic conceptual tension between poetry and drama, when rhetorically asking: Why is dramaturgy part of a theoretical analysis of poetry? Like him, other thinkers before him (as for example Ḹampūraṇar) had also puzzled over this; however, they arrived at a different answer. \*The term *paṇmai* in the opening verse of the *Tolkāppiyam*'s emotionology, interpreted by Pērācīriyar as entertainment in a courtly context, offered enough evidence for him, the more so as it was quoting a source other than the *Tolkāppiyam* itself. See the Tamil text and translation in ch. 2, *Meyppātu* source readings below, s.v. Pērācīriyar, point a.

89 As Cox ('From Source-Criticism,' 121) has stated, for today's reader, Pērācīriyar's commentary seems less an explanation of the root-text than a creative and constructive discussion of its ideas.

90 Pērācīriyar may have had the Sanskrit distinction between stable and transitory emotions (*sthāyī-bhāvas* and *vyabhicāribhāvas*) in mind. Pērācīriyar does not seem interested in the fact that some emotions diminish in direct relation to the diminution of their cause.

then disappear.<sup>91</sup> (2) The mind–body scheme and questions of cognition are clearly part of Pēraciriyar’s definition of the group of thirty-two emotions.<sup>92</sup> (3) He makes it clear that there is no categorical boundary between the terms *meyppātu* and *cuvai* (in contrast to the Sanskrit *rasa* theory).<sup>93</sup> (4) He made *meyppātu* the central phenomenon for both poetic and dramatic forms.<sup>94</sup> (5) He also explains why laughter is first (in the list of the eight *meyppātus*) and joy is last.<sup>95</sup> And (6) he rejects the emotion of ‘emotionless’ quiescence (*naṭuvunilai/śānta*), which has no place in Tamil literary culture. We see that the Tamil debate on *naṭuvunilai/śānta* ends precisely at this point in history.<sup>96</sup>

---

91 See ch. 2, *Meyppātu* source readings below, s.v. Pēraciriyar, point k (e.g. *meyppātu verūtal*, ‘being startled’). Note that in his root-text, Tolkāppiyaṇār did not introduce category definitions. Readers of the *Tolkāppiyam meyppātu* root-text would have puzzled over the relationship between the two listed groups of emotions: on one hand, the eight basic emotions and their four causal factors, and on the other, the thirty-two auxiliary emotions.

92 See ch. 2, *Meyppātu* source readings below, s.v. Pēraciriyar, point j.

93 The collapse of the categorical boundaries between the terms *cuvai/rasa* and *meyppātu/bhāva*, that is, between artistic representation and real life, is encountered already in ḷampūraṇar (see ch. 2, *Meyppātu* source readings below, s.v. ḷampūraṇar, point e). Today’s students of literature looking for parallels to the so-called ‘paradox of fiction’ debate and debates on real-life and fiction-based emotional response will find this interesting. On the current Western state of research on the debate on the (pseudo) ‘paradox of fiction’, see Ingrid Vendrell Ferran, ‘Emotion in the Appreciation of Fiction,’ *Journal of Literary Theory* 12.2 (2018): 204–23: <https://doi.org/10.1515/jlt-2018-0012>. Many authors now reject the idea that there is a paradox of fiction (i.e. a difference between emotional reactions toward fiction and real-life emotions.) The nutshell of the debate is why we respond emotionally to plays and feel moved by characters we know do not exist. Vendrell Ferran is among the majority of authors in the contemporary Western debate who accept that emotion does not always require belief, let alone belief in the existence of the object towards which it is directed. In her view, emotional responses to fiction are as real as the emotions towards reality. One does not have to feel exactly what the depicted character is supposed to feel; one rather experiences an emotion of the same type (220).

94 See ch. 2, *Meyppātu* source readings below, s.v. Pēraciriyar, point n. Cf. Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 87, where this view in Anandhavardhana’s thinking is presented, albeit in regard to *rasa* (aesthetic emotion).

95 See ch. 2, *Meyppātu* source readings below, s.v. Pēraciriyar, point g. Cf. the convincing argument for the order of *rasa* in drama (love being named first, since it is readily accessible to people) given by Abhinavagupta in his commentary on Bharata’s *Treatise on Drama (Nāṭyasāstra)*: Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 206, citation in my discussion on Tolkāppiyaṇār above (ch. 1, section 2, Tamil thinkers). In contrast, Pēraciriyar is less convincing in his argument for Tolkāppiyaṇār’s order of the eight fundamental *meyppātus* and why laughter is first.

96 It is not surprising that Pēraciriyar does not include the ‘emotionless’ emotion. This is not only because it belongs to non-worldly practice, which has no place in poetry (in consensus with ḷampūraṇar). It is also possibly to mark the dominance of (Śaiva) interpretations of the *Tolkāppiyam*, where *śānta* can have no meaningful place in literature. See also the *Tirukkuraḷ* and its ethos of engagement in the group of the three ends of man: morality, wealth, and love. – Quiescence is not connected to any cognitive or bodily changes or transformations, by definition a prerequisite for real-world emotions. For the Tamil text and translations, see ch. 2, *Meyppātu* source readings below, s.v. Pēraciriyar, point h.

Indeed, Pērācīriyar was a staunch traditionalist in reasserting the authority of the *Tolkāppiyam*'s codified emotionology against innovations.<sup>97</sup> This was his commentarial programme when dealing with the *meyp̄p̄āṭu* root-text. And this had consequences for the theorisation of emotion knowledge.

**Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar's *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, sixteenth century (with Irattīṅak Kavirāyar's seventeenth-century commentary)**

The *Māraṇalaṅkāram* (1575)<sup>98</sup> exhibits important changes in the sphere of discussions on emotions. The most important change in this grammar on figures of speech ('ornamentation') is the discourse on emotions being moved from secular poetry to theology. But the *meyp̄p̄āṭu-cuvai* complex not only includes theology, it is restricted to theology, or more precisely, to Vaiṣṇava theology. Probably not coincidentally, we find significant parallels in the sixteenth-century Sanskrit discourse on *rasa*.<sup>99</sup>

Perumāḷ Kavirāyar, a Teṅkalai Śrīvaiṣṇava and Vēḷāḷa merchant, modelled his grammar about figures of speech on the *alaṅkāram* grammar of Taṅṭi,<sup>100</sup> but adds more examples of such figures (Tam. *aṇi*), evidently with the ambition of creating something new, quite in contrast to the conservative attitudes of Pērācīriyar.<sup>101</sup> The *Māraṇalaṅkāram* (*carpu nūl*) and the earlier *Taṅṭiyalaṅkāram* (*mutal nūl*, primary source) are the only grammars on figuration (*alaṅkāram*). However, while the *Taṅṭiyalaṅkāram* is a grammar for secular poetry, the *Māraṇalaṅkāram* is a treatise on and for Vaiṣṇava *bhakti* devotion, thus providing us first valuable insights into

97 See also Cox's characterisation of Pērācīriyar's 'uncompromisingly rigid adherence to literary tradition (*marapu*) centered exclusively on the *Tolkāppiyam* and a defined canon of classical texts' ('Bearing,' 86).

98 For this dating, see Kamil V. Zvelebil, *Lexicon of Tamil Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 419. The edition used is *Māraṇalaṅkāram mūlamum paḷaya uraiyum*, ed. Kōpālaiyar. The edition includes the author's (Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar's) text, the commentary of Irattīṅak Kavirāyar, himself a poet, as well as the editor's (Ti. Vē. Kōpālaiyar's) own commentary (the latter in square brackets).

99 Rūpa Gosvāmī, a sixteenth-century theoretician from Bengal (c.1470–1557, born in Karnataka) who wrote in Sanskrit, adopted aesthetic emotion (*rasa*) conceptions of secular literature in his thoughts on Vaiṣṇava devotional *bhakti*; see Pollock, 'Rasa after Abhinava,' 431–32. See also Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 302; and Kiyokazu Okita, 'Salvation through Colorful Emotions: Aesthetics, Colorimetry, and Theology in Early Modern South Asia,' in *Historicizing Emotions: Practices and Objects in India, China, and Japan*, ed. Barbara Schuler (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 100–12.

100 Like Taṅṭi's grammar, the *Māraṇalaṅkāram* begins with a *ciṟappuppāyiram*, a 'specific preface' (usually by a person other than the author, here, by Irattīṅak Kavirāyar, a commentator). In this preface '*Taṅṭi mutal nūl aṇi*' is mentioned; see *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 2, point 5, *ciṟappuppāyiram*, verse beginning with *ulakam*. On the grammar on *ciṟappuppāyiram*, see *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 55, verse 61.

101 Cf. Sheldon Pollock, 'New Intellectuals in Seventeenth-century India,' *The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 38.1 (2001): 3–31 (7): on newness.



Vaiṣṇava concepts of grammar (*ilakkaṇam*) and how it should be written.<sup>102</sup> Implicit in the paradigm shift from secular poetry to devotion is the locus of emotion shifting from text-internal characters to the devotee as character. In this fundamental reconfiguration of emotions, including their semantic net and knowledge, religious aesthetic principles become dominant.

The author of this grammar on figures of speech was in many ways a remarkable theoretician: (1) He composed the examples of figures of speech himself, using the poetic technique of triple entendre, including a lover, the Vaiṣṇava saint Nammālvār (whose name Māraṇ is borrowed for the title of the treatise), and the god Māl Viṣṇu.<sup>103</sup> (2) He shifts *cuvai* from being the aesthetic tasting of literature to *cuvai* representing the aesthetics of religious experience. (3) Thereby, emotion is not tasted by a character in a literary text, but in the heart of the devotee. (4) He gives priority to the *cuvai perumitam* (greatness, grandeur), listing it as the first of the *cuvais*, since it pertains to Viṣṇu, who is great. This is different from the order in every list of *meypṭāṭus* seen so far.<sup>104</sup> (5) In contrast to the Tamil foundational treatise on emotions (*TPiIam*, 7: 247), Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar not only begins his eight-point list of emotions (*meypṭāṭu*) with greatness (*perumitam*), he also makes various other changes to establish a new Tamil emotional aesthetics of religion. The inclusion of quiescence as a ninth *cuvai*, as well as the idea that *meypṭāṭus* can be experienced in combination (e.g. fear and wonder), seem to have been added by Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar's commentator, Irattiṇak Kavirāyar, whereby the Daṇḍin model has been left behind.<sup>105</sup>

### **Vaiṭṭiyanāta Tēcikar's *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam*, seventeenth century (with Vaiṭṭiyanāta Tēcikar's auto-commentary)**

Later works, such as the seventeenth-century *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam*,<sup>106</sup> do not advance our understanding to any great degree of either the substance of *meypṭāṭu* theory or

102 The *Māraṇalankāram* grammar includes the author's own preface (*taṅcīrappuppāyiram*), a chapter on the nature of the types of prefaces (*pāyiram*), a chapter with a general discussion (*potu*), the chapter *poruḷaṇi* on various figures of speech (which include *uvamai* [comparison], *uḷḷurai* [implicit meaning], *iraicci* [suggestion], and *cuvai*), a chapter on word ornaments (*collaṇi*), and a chapter containing other, leftover things, that is, things not yet discussed but relevant to understanding (*eccam*). Note that *poruḷ* precedes *col*. On the figures of speech *uvamai*, *uḷḷurai*, and *iraicci* in the *poruḷaṇi* chapter, see *Māraṇalankāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 133–94 (2. *uvamai*); 217–31 (4. *uḷḷurai*); 300–04 (22. *iraicci*).

103 See *Māraṇalankāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 2–3, *taṅcīrappuppāyiram* (with a 'specific' preface by Tirukkuraip Perumāḷ himself); with verses referring to Nammālvār, Māl Viṣṇu, the title of the book, and the author himself.

104 See also ch. 2, *Meypṭāṭu* source readings, s.v. *Māraṇalankāram*, point f.

105 See ch. 2, *Meypṭāṭu* source readings, s.v. *Māraṇalankāram*, points j and k.

106 For this dating, see Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 118; Wilden, *Manuscript*, 21. On the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam (IV)*, a comprehensive grammar and the last of the five-division grammars, and on the *IV*, a synthesis based on first-hand knowledge of the grammatical tradition, see Wilden, *Manuscript*, 21, 313. Similar to the *Viracōliyam*, the *IV* contains a section on *meypṭāṭu*

its history. The *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam* (and this holds true for the auto-commentary as well)<sup>107</sup> reproduces the same set of topics in play from the time of Pērācīriyar and adds nothing contemporary, despite the height of Nayaka power being a remarkable period in south Indian culture. High traditionalism manifests itself,<sup>108</sup> a traditionalism uninterested in the complex and multi-voiced *meyp̄p̄ātu* discourse of earlier centuries.<sup>109</sup> To explain this, we need look no further than the early thirteenth century and Pērācīriyar. The end of the discourse was heralded by him.<sup>110</sup>

The view of *meyp̄p̄ātu* of the author of the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam*, Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar, is based solely on the authority of the *Tolkāppiyam* emotion root-text and the coherence of its system. This links the seventeenth-century author to the earliest extant Tamil tradition of theorising emotions in poetry. Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar builds one-to-one on the emotion knowledge of the early Common Era,<sup>111</sup> failing to grasp the historical transformation that the language of emotion certainly must have undergone

---

as well as one on *āni/alankāram* (poetic ornamentation), the latter discussing *cuvai*. On Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar, the teacher of Paṭikkācuppulavar (author of the *Toṅṭaimaṅṭala Catakam*) who, in turn, was a court poet of Raguṇātha Sētupati of Rāmanātapuram (1685–1723), see *Ilakkaṇa viḷakkam, eḷuttatikāram + collatikāram + poruḷatikāram* [by Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar with his auto-commentary], ed. Ci. Vai. Tāmōtarampiḷḷai (digitised by Roja Muthiah Research Library, Chennai; front matter missing), 2 (Tāmōtarampiḷḷai’s editorial introduction, *patippurai*). According to Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography*, 302, Tāmōtarampiḷḷai edited and published the *IV* in 1889. Ci. Vai. Tāmōtarampiḷḷai (1832–1901), a Jaffna Vēḷāḷa, was a senior contemporary of U. Vē. Cāminātaiyar (1855–1942). – I cite throughout from *Ilakkaṇa viḷakkam*, ed. Tāmōtarampiḷḷai, rather than from *Ilakkaṇa viḷakkam: poruḷatikāram-akattiṇaiyiyal* [by Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar], ed. Ti. Vē. Kōpālaiyar (Tañcāvūr: Caracuvati Makāl Nūnilaiyam, 1972), 754–870.

107 Tāmōtarampiḷḷai, in his editorial introduction (*Ilakkaṇa viḷakkam*, 2), explains that the commentary and the whole work (*mūlam* and *urai*) of the *IV* was written by Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar. But some of the sūtras on *col-āni* and the laudatory preface (*ciṟappup pāyiram*) were written by his elder son. Moreover, the *pāṭṭiyal* (genre) at the end of the *poruḷatikāram* chapter was not written by Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar either. Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar, whose work is also called ‘little *Tolkāppiyam*’ (*kuṭṭit tolkāppiyam*, p. 2) does not add his own explications or readings to his commentary. Rather he gives the impression that he considers writing commentaries a form of slavish intellectual deference. For this mode of discourse, see Pollock, ‘New Intellectuals in Seventeenth-century India,’ 7, where seventeenth-century intellectuals are characterised as follows: ‘[...] the master who made the primary statements in a discussion [...] was viewed as a superior partner [...]. In the face of the grandeur of the past, intellectuals typically assumed an attitude of inferiority [...]’. – On Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar’s auto-commentary, see also Wilden, *Manuscript*, 310.

108 On the conservative views of Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar, see also Wilden, *Manuscript*, 351.

109 Since Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar’s commentary on the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam* is based on Pērācīriyar’s commentary, we can rule out the possibility that the seventeenth-century Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar was aware of these other voices.

110 This was a period when, alternative scholarly perspectives met with the resistance of an assertive classicism that privileged the *Tolkāppiyam*. See Cox, ‘Bearing’ 86.

111 In contrast, Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar’s auto-commentary builds one-to-one on Pērācīriyar’s (the second commentator on the *Tolkāppiyam*) explications of *meyp̄p̄ātu*, but without the latter’s reflective reporting of other scholars. Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar’s conservatism is based solely on

between Pēraciriyar (early thirteenth century) and the seventeenth century, even more so since the period from 1600 onward had seen a surge of new literary genres (such as ballads [*katai*], picaresque dramas [*noṅṅinātakam*] and the like),<sup>112</sup> as well as new social groups coming to the fore politically. Instead of introducing contemporary emotion knowledge, such as ‘new’ emotion preferences, or novel ideas, such as fake emotions, misinterpreted emotions due to cognitive error, or gendered emotions, Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar’s conservatism is based solely on the *Tolkāppiyam*’s categorisation and understanding of *meypṇāṭu* as well as add-ons from Pēraciriyar’s commentary reproduced in Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar’s auto-commentary.

However, one thing is novel. In contrast to the traditional *Tolkāppiyam* framework of ‘emotion’ poetry that lacks a conceptual analogue to *cuvai/raśa* (aesthetic emotion), Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar models the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam* on the *Vīracōḷiyam* and applies *Vīracōḷiyam*, or respectively, the *Taṅṅiyalaṅkāram* usage of *cuvai* as a poetic ornament (*aṇi/alāṅkāram*), to his Tamil paradigm. Thus, the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam* is the first text in more than five hundred years to be modelled in this way on the *Vīracōḷiyam*, thus attempting to synthesise Tamil and Sanskrit principles with regard to emotion theory.<sup>113</sup> However, the discussion remains purely related to text and character, and to eight *cuvais* (with the heroic [*vīram*] first and laughter [*nakai*] last). In conclusion, Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar does insist on traditional views.

---

Pēraciriyar’s final understanding of *meypṇāṭu*: (1) the self-explanatory nature of the thirty-two auxiliary emotions (including the occasionally occurring auxiliary emotion of calm/tranquillity [*naṭumilai*]); (2) the problematic of a *cuvai* of quiescence (*naturvunilai*) without acknowledging its post-Abhinavagupta sense; (3) the interchangeable use of the technical terms *meypṇāṭu*, *cuvai*, and *kuṛippu*; (4) acknowledgement of collective concepts (object of taste, sense-perception of taste, cognitive response, bodily changes). For details, see ch. 2, *Meypṇāṭu* source readings below, s.v. *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam*, points a–h. – Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar’s auto-commentary borrowed from Pēraciriyar, without attributing this to him, or only referring to ‘the great commentary’. On this mode, see Pollock, ‘New Intellectuals in Seventeenth-century India,’ 7: ‘[...] systematic thought in South Asia [...] disembedded from any spatio-temporal framework [...] by the elimination of all historical referentiality. The names and times and places of participants in intellectual discourse across fields are largely excluded even where such exclusion makes it appreciably more difficult to follow the dialogue between disputants [...] this [...] also implied that all intellectual generations, [...] were thought of as coexistent: the past was a very present conversation partner’. – Tāmōtarampiḷḷai, in his editorial introduction (*patippu urai*), asks why Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar simply reproduces the *Tolkāppiyam*, answering that the reason for this is that students must easily memorise it. Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar facilitates this by citing the root-text (*mutal nūl*) (*Ilakkaṇa viḷakkam*, ed. Tāmōtarampiḷḷai, 15, ‘*cūttiraṅkaḷaip pāṭam...*’).

112 To the *katai* genre belong *villuppāṭṭu*, *ammānai*, and *kummi*. On the *katai* genre and the *villuppāṭṭu*, see Barbara Schuler, *Of Death and Birth: Icakkiamman, a Tamil Goddess, in Ritual and Story* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009). [*Ethno-Indology* 8, Heidelberg Studies in South Asian Rituals], with the DVD *A Ritual of the Vēḷāḷas in Paḷavūr, India*).

113 On the grammatical-poetic-compositional project of the *Vīracōḷiyam* and the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam* and their relation to each other, see Anne E. Monius, ‘“Sanskrit is the Mother of All Tamil Words”: Further Thoughts on the *Vīracōḷiyam* and Its Commentary,’ in *Buddhism Among Tamils in Tamilakam and Īlam, Part 3: Extension and Conclusions*, eds Peter Schalk and Astrid van

Although in premodern India, lack of change was not considered a defect or something negative,<sup>114</sup> it remains an open question as to why there was no creative push or impact on the emotion theories in the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam*,<sup>115</sup> written at a time experiencing remarkable literary and social upheavals. An answer might lie in the *pāṭṭiyal* handbooks, a specific type of treatise that describes and prescribes forms, types, genres, and subgenres of medieval and early modern literary texts, as for example, *ulā*, *ammāṇai*, *mālai*, etc.<sup>116</sup> Perhaps it was exactly in reaction to this ‘new’ type of grammar that the *meypṭāṭu* discourse in the seventeenth century presents an image of intellectual stagnation. The *pāṭṭiyal* treatises, to my knowledge, do not speak of *meypṭāṭu* or *cuvai*; nonetheless, they do contain ‘emotion’ in their theorised genres of praise (e.g. *meykkīrti*; also *ulā*, processional poems).<sup>117</sup> Another possible answer may be that it was in reaction to the great upheavals of the time, with these giving rise to a retrogressive reorientation and conservative traditionalism in literary *meypṭāṭu* theory by the theorists who held sovereign power.

Whatever the case may be, this had consequences for the theorisation of emotions in the early modern period, since only new paths lead to the production of innovative paradigms. With some certainty, however, it can be said that after the seventeenth century the technical term *meypṭāṭu* lost its appeal.<sup>118</sup> Mapping out the precise date is a task still to be done. The same fate befell the *meypṭāṭu* emotion word *perumitam* (greatness, excellence), so prominent in the *Tolkāppiyam* emotionology, already much earlier.<sup>119</sup>

---

Nahl (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet [Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 33], 2013), 103–29 (103 n. 3). See also Tāmōtarampiḷḷai and his editorial introduction (*paṭippu urai*) to the *Ilakkaṇa viḷakkam*, ed. Tāmōtarampiḷḷai.

114 See Pollock, ‘The Theory of Practice,’ 499.

115 It would be reasonable to expect this after reading the statement of Pollock (‘New Intellectuals in Seventeenth-century India,’ 7): ‘[...] by the seventeenth [century at the latest ...] “new” has ceased to connote “worse” in discourses. This finds also expression in Pollock, *ibid.*, 10, where he states that in the seventeenth century an understanding began of ‘how new knowledge can actually be produced’.

116 *Pāṭṭiyals*, ‘literary genres’; nature/quality (*iyal*) of poetic compositions (*pāṭṭu*). On the list of *pāṭṭiyals*, see Zvelebil, *Lexicon of Tamil Literature*, 540. See also Ti. Vē. Kōpālaiyar, *Tamiḷ ilakkaṇap perakarāti*, vol. 16, *poruḷ: pāṭṭiyal* (Chennai: Tamiḷmaṇ, 2005), 1–189 (12, 35, 163).

117 Although Kōpālaiyar, *Tamiḷ ilakkaṇap perakarāti* (vol. 16), 170–71 lists ‘*meypṭāṭiyal*’, he mainly refers to *TPPēr* 249–250 in his summary. I myself could not find any theoretical treatment in the chapters in the *Citamparappāṭṭiyal*, ed. Ki. Irāmānujaiyaṅkāṛ (Madurai: Madurai Tamiḷcaṅka Muttirācālai, 1932) encompassing *uruppiyal*, *ceyyuḷiyal*, *oḷipiyal*, *poruttaliyal* and *marapiyal*.

118 Note also that the concept of *meypṭāṭu* was confined to the themes of love and war (*akapporuḷ* and *puṟapporuḷ*).

119 While *perumitam* denotes excellence rather than valour (*vīram*), this term had been discarded and replaced by *vīram* by the time of ḷampuranar at the latest. I refer here to commentarial works and post-*Tolkāppiyam* treatises.

### Concluding Remarks

As an outline of the larger picture, it is possible to say that thinking about literary emotions was in full swing in Tamil lands from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, when it reached its zenith, and then acquired fresh energy in the early modern period. Within this history, four distinct strands of theoretical literary emotion knowledge can be seen: (1) the conservative-ideological *Tolkāppiyam* strand, which deals with emotions based on normative patterns bound to rules; (2) the Buddhist strand, in which thoughts on emotions are ethically oriented; (3) the devotional Vaiṣṇava strand involving the emotional aesthetics of religion; and (4) the *alankāram/ani* figuration strand, which deals with the aesthetic use of emotions as ornaments or figures of speech. These variations of emotion knowledge were contingent on intellectual or religious affiliation, and each had its own theoretical or commentarial agenda. On occasion, it is possible to observe the reappearance of certain ideas in the *Tolkāppiyam*-Pēraciriyar line or the *alankāram* strand of thinking. Concurrent innovative and conservative emotion knowledge strands can also, at times, be encountered (with both holding an authoritative status). The Buddhist and Vaiṣṇava strands moved in their own innovative directions. A particular finding is that there was no self-contained emotion knowledge in the theories on poetics. While there was historical linearity, there were also breaks and peripheral emotion knowledge. The prioritising of certain emotions was often connected to identity (as for example the Buddhist ideal of quiescence, or the Vaiṣṇava view of the emotion of greatness).

Common to all strands is a taxonomy wherein eight main emotions are found. Although some strands add the emotion of quiescence to the canonical eight, they never depart from the total number of emotions as given in the *Tolkāppiyam* or *Ṽracōḷiyam*. Moreover, the locus of these emotions, whether in a literal or figurative form, is always the character, also in the case of Vaiṣṇava theories on emotion, where the god and his devotee are considered characters.

Tamil thinkers on literary emotion theorised aesthetic concepts of emotion rather late when introducing *cuvai*, literally ‘taste’, an idea akin to *rasa*. It is likely that the *cuvai* aspect of emotion was already evident in Tamil literature in the post-*Caṅkam* period, from the *Cilappatikāram* (*The Tale of an Anklet*) onward, but was only theorised later. As in Sanskrit, the concept of taste, that is, the act of tasting, is typically tied to the causal factors involved (the objects being tasted). When reconstructing the history of *cuvai* one finds various shifts. This ranges from *cuvai* being newly introduced in the Buddhist *Ṽracōḷiyam*, altered in the drama-based *Ceyirriyam*, and consolidated by Iḷampūraṇar, to *cuvai* as a figure of speech in the first *alankāram* grammar, and its falling victim to Pēraciriyar’s ‘cancel culture’, a threshold that can be clearly distinguished. A fundamental shift appeared in the sixteenth century, when after a period of incubation, *cuvai-meyppāṭu* appeared in the avant-garde theories of Vaiṣṇava religious thinkers.

In turn, the concept of *meyppāṭu* (ordinary emotion) that goes back to the *Tolkāppiyam* root-text dating to the middle of the first millennium, was somatised in the

*Vīracōḷiyam*, upgraded in the *Ceyirriyam*, and expanded by ḷampūraṇar. Finally, the commentator Pēraciriyar returned the *meypṣāṭu* concept to the original notions of the *Tolkāppiyam* root-text, which involved a great loss of emotion knowledge. In the Tamil context, the boundary between *meypṣāṭu* and *cuvai* (ordinary emotion and aestheticised emotion) is somewhat blurred. The enhancing of emotions or their having variable intensity was not theorised in relation to *cuvai*, despite the fact that ‘emotional intensity’ was practised, particularly as part of devotional religion. Indeed, Tamil thinkers on emotion left certain aspects of the complex concept of emotion far from clear.

When mapping the history of the canonical emotion words, one similarly finds various shifts. A fundamental shift appeared in the Buddhist *Vīracōḷiyam*, in which the emotion word *perumitam* (greatness, grandeur) disappeared.<sup>120</sup> This word then lost its appeal and was replaced by *vīram* (valour, heroic),<sup>121</sup> an emotion word that carries quite different connotations. But surprisingly, *perumitam* had a comeback in the late sixteenth century, when religious emotional aesthetics were introduced into the emotion theory of the *Māraṇalaṅkāram*.<sup>122</sup> The commentator of the *Māraṇalaṅkāram* then expanded on this theory in the seventeenth century, introducing new ideas such as the possibility of two emotions being experienced at the same time.

### 3 Problems in translating Tamil technical writings into English

#### Temporal and linguistic layers

The texts on *meypṣāṭu* were written in a multilingual region; their Tamil authors could draw on sources in Sanskrit, in the original.<sup>123</sup> In my overview the texts vary from elaborate commentaries interspersed with quotations in Tamil verse, to rare occasions in which the texts, though written in Tamil script, are actually linguistic variants of Sanskrit. I present the text collection in strict chronological order, although the various emotion concepts may be from different temporal or linguistic layers. Some treatises (as for example the *Ceyirriyam*) are only extant as fragments in the form of citations by later authors. Chronology remains a problem. Often we can determine the date of

120 See ch. 2, *Meypṣāṭu* source readings, s.v. *Vīracōḷiyam* I.b, in which *perumitam* is replaced by *uṭkōḷ*.

121 See ch. 2, *Meypṣāṭu* source readings, s.v. Pēraciriyar, point f, (6) *perumitam* means *vīram*.

122 See ch. 2, *Meypṣāṭu* source readings, s.v. *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, point f.

123 For the gradually increasing influence of Sanskrit in the Tamil country around the fourth century CE, ‘when the language of the chancellery of the Pallavas, which formerly was Prakṛt, gave place to Sanskrit’, see Filliozat, ‘Tamil and Sanskrit in South India,’ 6. At the end of the fourth century CE there also lived several famous Buddhist Tamils (including Buddhadatta of Uṛaiyūr and Dhammapāla) who wrote works in Pāli (ibid., 7). In Filliozat’s opinion, the influence of Sanskrit in the Tamil country became distinct only after Tamil literature was already highly developed (ibid., 10).

an author or a text only on the basis of relative chronology: who is quoted or who quotes it. Classical Tamil texts are particularly difficult to date and opinions among scholars vary. My chronology follows the text-critical arguments of Indologists who are particularly familiar with these texts and have sorted out who quoted whom, or who adopted whose ideas. On my part, I have tried not to omit any significant argument that the commentators of these treatises have left for us.

The presence of commentaries is an additional complication, or help, for the chronological order. I quote here Pollock (*Rasa Reader*, Preface, xiii), who states:

On the one hand, these [commentaries] are works intimately related to their primary texts – which can sometimes be almost incomprehensible without them – and it is reasonable to present them together. On the other, commentaries often exhibit much later thinking, and to present them along with the texts risks violating a core historical principle [...].

Alertness is particularly called for when a commentator contradicts his root-text on the basis of emotion concepts that were unavailable to the root-text's author. The late eleventh- or twelfth-century commentator on the *Tolkāppiyam meyppātu* chapter (mid-first millennium(?) CE), for example, applies in the commentary *cuvai* (Skt. *rasa*) and *naṭuvunilai* (Skt. *śānta*) ideas to passages of the root-text that neither mention *cuvai/rasa* (aesthetic emotion) nor knew the concept of aesthetic emotion, such as quiescence, Skt. *śānta*. We must keep this in mind when reading the following overview.

For reasons of comprehensiveness, included here are all commentaries and treatises concerning not only the term *meyppātu*, but also the term *cuvai*. I provide the *cuvai* discussion as well, since the main arguments of the *meyppātu* discourse would be otherwise unintelligible. And to do justice to the ideas at work in the historical *meyppātu* discourse, we must also include Buddhist and Jain thought (as for example the Buddhist grammar *Vīracōliyam*).

### Translation of Tamil technical terms

There is consensus among Tamil scholars that the interpretation and, thus, the translation of the technical term *meyppātu* is a major problem. Indra Manuel translates *meyppātu* as ‘experienced [*ōpātu*] in the body [*mey*°]’.<sup>124</sup> Cutler and Selby understand the noun *meyppātu* to mean ‘the conditions (*ōpātu*) of the body (*mey*°)’, while Monius opts for the similar translation ‘appearing (*ōpātu*) in the body (*mey*°)’.<sup>125</sup> Cox submits

124 Indra Manuel, ‘Meyppātu,’ in *Literary Theories in Tamil* by Indra Manuel (Pondicherry: Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture, 1997, 134–45), 134.

125 Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 119. See also Monius, *Imagining*, 34: ‘meyppātu, literally “appearing in the body”’.

(as far as the *Tolkāppiyam* emotion chapter is concerned) a new interpretation, translating *meyp̄pātu* as that which ‘makes real’.<sup>126</sup>

I have chosen not to translate the term *meyp̄pātu*, since much of the discourse on this term is, in fact, directed toward answering the question of what exactly it is. However, taking *meyp̄pātu* as an umbrella category and translating it as ‘emotion’, that is to say as ‘ordinary, real-world emotion’ (in contrast to aesthetic emotion) is a viable option for historians of emotion. It is actually best if we do not expect conceptual symmetry with the English term, since, according to Dixon,<sup>127</sup> the word ‘emotion’ entered the English lexis quite late (its antecedents being words such as ‘passion’, ‘affectus’, and ‘sentiment’).

The translations of other technical terms have offered no fewer difficulties. However, leaving all of the emotion terminology untranslated would probably make it impossible for lay readers to follow these texts. I therefore translate all terms except for the key term *meyp̄pātu*. Regarding the translation of the main Sanskrit terms, I follow Pollock and translate *bhāva* as ‘emotion’, and *rasa* (Tam. *cuvai*) as ‘aesthetic emotion’.

Not only is it problematic to grasp the distinctions between the different components that are in sum called *meyp̄pātu*, but also to render them in intelligible English. In contrast to the Sanskrit *rasa-bhāva* doctrine, the *meyp̄pātu* root-text *Tolkāppiyam*, for instance, does not introduce any functional terms, such as stable emotions (Skt. *sthāyi-bhāva*) and transitory emotions (*vyabhicāri-bhāva*), causes/factors (*vibhāva*), etc., but simply speaks of eight *meyp̄pātus* and thirty-two auxiliary *meyp̄pātus*.

Another problem for the translator is the question of equivalence. Is the technical Tamil term *meyp̄pātu* equivalent to Sanskrit *bhāva* (emotion)? And is Tamil *cuvai* equivalent to Sanskrit *rasa* (aesthetic emotion, Pollock: literary emotion, lit. ‘taste’)? Or is *cuvai*, literally ‘taste’, a lower physical faculty, more akin to the five bodily senses and related to objects of a primarily material nature (gustatory, etc.)? Uncertainty grows when we come across the commentator’s remark that ‘*meyp̄pātu* and *cuvai* are interchangeable’. Further, is Tamil *cattuvam* (body changes or bodily reactions made known by various phenomena, such as horripilation, trembling, and the like) equivalent to Sanskrit *sāttvika-bhāva*, translated by Sanskritist Sheldon Pollock as ‘psychophysical responses’? And what about *meyp̄pātu uvakai*? I think this should be translated as ‘joy’, rather than ‘desire’ as it is translated by Cox. For the Sanskrit *rasa* term *śṛṅgāra*, which is concerned above all with physical desire, I have adopted from Pollock the translation ‘erotic love’,<sup>128</sup> a translation that I use for its equivalent Sanskrit *kāma* as well. For the Tamil emotion term *nakai* I prefer the translation laugh-

126 For details, see chapter 2, section 1 below, s.v. Cox; and Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 133.

127 Thomas Dixon, *From Passions to Emotions: The Creation of a Secular Psychological Category* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2004).

128 Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, Preface, xvii.



ter (rather than amusement, as in Pollock). Analogous to this are the cognitive faculties, which here are mostly called *uḷlam*, ‘inner, internal, mind-heart’, or *maṇam*, ‘mind, cognitive faculty’. Another important distinction made by the authors of these treatises is between the different artistic domains: literature to be recited (*ceyyuḷ*, poetry); drama-literature to be performed on stage in a theatre (*nāṭaka vaḷakku*); and real-world practice (*ulaka vaḷakku*). I have considered it essential to maintain consistency in the translations of such technical terms so that the reader is able to follow the chronological path of the discourse.



## Chapter 2

### 1 The state of research on *meyp̄p̄āṭu*

Among scholars doing research on *meyp̄p̄āṭu*, there is no consensus about how their research should be conducted. Should it focus on a diachronic historical approach or should investigations be comparative and synchronic? Should it focus on aspects of linguistics, conceptual history, or the history of discourse? A guiding light for the present study has been the broad overview of the intellectual history of the Sanskrit *rasa* theory offered by Sheldon Pollock in *A Rasa Reader: Classical Indian Aesthetics*, published in 2016, a volume that reflects the current state of research on aesthetic emotions in the Sanskrit context. A similar, albeit briefer, overview of the Tamil context and *meyp̄p̄āṭu* theory appeared in 2013 in an article by the Sanskrit-Tamil scholar Whitney Cox.<sup>1</sup>

The various studies on *meyp̄p̄āṭu*, starting especially in the 1980s and continuing into the first decade of the twenty-first century, examine some of the same issues taken up by Pollock and Cox (P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri 1936, Marr 1985, Takahashi 1995, Manuel 1997, Monius 2001, Tamiḷaṅṅal 2004, Cantiracēkaraṅ 2007, Thirugnanasambhandan 2010). Despite this point of commonality, however, a number of differences in their approaches are apparent. Here I will confine myself to the most important questions and findings of those who have dealt with *meyp̄p̄āṭu*.

P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri (1936<sup>2</sup>) translated *Meyp̄p̄āṭṭiyal* as ‘Chapter on manifest physical expression of emotions’, thus cementing for later generations of scholars not only a definition of the term *meyp̄p̄āṭu*, but also its equation with Sanskrit *bhāva*.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, he demonstrated the parallels between the *Tolkāppiyam*’s *meyp̄p̄āṭu* chapter and the sixth and seventh chapters of the Sanskrit *Nāṭyaśāstra* by Bharata, and added a corresponding Sanskrit terminology to the Tamil terminology introduced by ḷampūraṅar (absent in the *Tolkāppiyam* root-text itself) (e.g. Skt. *sāttvikabhāva* for Tam. *cattuvam* or *virāl*; *sthāyibhāva* for *maṅakkurippu*; note 1 on TPIḷam 245).

---

1 Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism.’

2 Subrahmanya Sastri, *Tolkāppiyam*. Subrahmanya Sastri’s preoccupation with the topic began earlier, see P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, *History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil and Their Relation to the Grammatical Literature in Sanskrit* (Chennai [Madras]: The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, [1934] 1997). His translation of the sixth chapter of the third part of the *Tolkāppiyam* is based on the ḷampūraṅar edition, which begins with verse (*cūttiram*) 245.

3 The first to question this was Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 117. See also *Tamil Lexicon* (TL), s.v., *meyp̄p̄āṭu*: ‘Manifest physical expression of the emotions, of eight kinds, viz., *nakai* [...]’.

The foundation for more in-depth engagement with *meyp̄p̄ātu* was laid in John Ralston Marr's *Eight Anthologies* (1985), where Pērācīriyar's commentary (early 13th c.) on the *Tolkāppiyam*'s *meyp̄p̄ātu* chapter is examined. Marr was particularly interested in the commentary on the first three verses or *cūttiram* of the root-text: *TPPēr* 249, 250, 251 (= *TPIḷam* 245, 246, 247), where he finds fundamental changes from the root-text, as well as influences from Abhinavagupta's<sup>4</sup> *śāntarasa* (quiescence, Tam. *naṭuvunilai*). Marr also shows that this influence is already found in works by the late eleventh-century *Tolkāppiyam* commentator ḷampūraṇar. Marr was the first to state explicitly that Pērācīriyar considers *meyp̄p̄ātu* equivalent to Skt. *bhāva* (emotion) rather than Skt. *rasa* (aesthetic emotion).<sup>5</sup> Moreover, Marr observes that Pērācīriyar's commentary contains terms that are completely absent in the root-text, such as *cuvai* (Skt. *rasa*),<sup>6</sup> as well as Tamil terms for causal factor, consequence, stable emotion and bodily expression: *cuvaiporuḷ*, *cuvaiyuṇarvu*, *maṇakkurippu* and *viṛal* or *cattuvam* (each a group of eight, thus totaling thirty-two), which together are called *meyp̄p̄ātu*. Marr thus sees these as corresponding to the Sanskrit *bhāva* hyponyms.<sup>7</sup>

Marr also points out a peculiarity of the commentator, namely, that he regards *cuvaiporuḷ* and *cuvaiyuṇarvu* to be an inseparable unit, and, additionally, merges *cattuvam*/*viṛal* with *maṇakkurippu* (*TPPēr* 251), whereby the *Tolkāppiyam*'s *uruttiram* (anger) (*TPPēr* 249) is omitted. Marr also points to the original drama-centric locus of *meyp̄p̄ātu*.<sup>8</sup>

The discussion in Takanobu Takahashi's *Tamil Love Poetry and Poetics* (1995<sup>9</sup>) revolves around the idea of the *Tolkāppiyam*'s *meyp̄p̄ātu* chapter being an interpolation or a supplementary text to the work's other parts.<sup>10</sup>

4 The Kashmirian Abhinavagupta (c.1000). This date is that given in Pollock, *Rasa Reader*.

5 Marr, *Eight Anthologies*, 57 (referring to *TPPēr* 250): '[...] it is clear that Pēr. regarded *meyp̄p̄ātu* as the equivalent of the Sanskrit term *bhāva*.'

6 Marr, *Eight Anthologies*, 56 (referring to *TPPēr* 249 [= *TPIḷam* 245]): 'The equivalent of the Skt. term *Rasa* [Ta.] *Cuvai*, does not appear in this section, though the application of the ideas of "taste" to poetic sentiments is fully discussed in Pērācīriyar's commentary to *cū*. 249, the opening *cūttiram* of *Tol. Poruḷ. Mey* [*Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram Meyp̄p̄āṭṭiyal*].'

7 Skt. *vibhāva*, *anubhāva*, *sthayibhāva* and *sāttvikabhāva*. Marr, *Eight Anthologies*, 57 (referring to *TPPēr* 249 [= *TPIḷam* 245]): '[...] the figure of 32 is comprised of eight *Cuvai*poruḷ, eight *Cuvaiyuṇarvu*, eight *Maṇakkurippu* and eight *Viṛal* or *Cattuvam*. [...] All these 32 are specifically referred to as *Meyp̄p̄ātu* by Pēr[ācīriyar] in his commentary on the next *cūttiram*, 250 [...].' Marr equates *cuvai*poruḷ to *vibhāva* or causal factor; *cuvaiyuṇarvu* to *anubhāva* or sign of emotion, consequence; *kurippu* to *sthayibhāva* or stable emotion; *viṛal*/*cattuvam* to *sāttvikabhāva* or expression.

8 Marr, *Eight Anthologies*, 56, translates the commentary on *TPPēr* 249 as follows: 'Thirty-two are the things experienced by those who see actresses performing', i.e. dancing and singing (*āṭalum pāṭalum*).

9 Takanobu Takahashi, *Tamil Love Poetry and Poetics* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

10 See Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 117: '[Takahashi] places the *meyp̄p̄ātu* and *uvamai* sections in the most recent fringe of the work. However, Takahashi notes that the *purattinaiyiyal* seems to be itself an addition to the basic text of the *Tolkāppiyam*; its pronounced lack of a Sanskrit-

Commendably, Indra Manuel (1997<sup>11</sup>) undertakes a comparative-synchronic study of various Tamil treatises concerned with the *meyp̄p̄ātu* theme and works out their differences. However, the study lacks the diachronic view called for by Cox.<sup>12</sup> She points to three trends in *Tolkāppiyam meyp̄p̄ātu* research: (1) scholarship that notes the similarities between the *Tolkāppiyam* and Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* and equates the Tamil eight and thirty-two *meyp̄p̄ātus* to the Sanskrit eight *rasas* and thirty-three *bhāvas*; (2) scholarship that suggests a southern origin of the theory and underlines the differences between the thirty-two *meyp̄p̄ātus* and thirty-three *vyabhicāribhāvas* (transitory emotions); (3) scholarship that considers the *Tolkāppiyam meyp̄p̄ātu* chapter a taxonomic work rather than a theoretical one.

In particular, Manuel compares the lists of Tamil emotion terms as found in the *Tolkāppiyam meyp̄p̄ātu* root-text with various later commentaries: the eight canonical *meyp̄p̄ātu* terms, the thirty-two auxiliary *meyp̄p̄ātus*, and the respective causal factors and terms for bodily expressions. The works used for comparison are: Pēraciriyar's commentary (all *cūttiram* comments, especially 249, 250, 251, 252–259), the *Vīracōḷiyam* with the commentary by Peruntēvaṅṅār, Aṭiyārkkku Nallār's commentary on the long narrative poem *Cilappatikāram*, and the seventeenth-century *Ilakkāṇa Viḷakkam*. Her comparison reveals the new emotion *naṭuvunilai* (quiescence, Skt. *śānta*). Manuel also emphasizes the importance of *meyp̄p̄ātu* as a fundamental element of poetics (134), and translates *meyp̄p̄ātu* as 'experienced in the body' (134).

In two studies by Anne Monius (2000 and 2001),<sup>13</sup> *meyp̄p̄ātu* is understood as 'psychophysical manifestations of emotion'. She translates the term literally as 'appearing in the body'<sup>14</sup> and equates it to Sanskrit *rasa*.<sup>15</sup> She also offers a survey of modern accounts of *meyp̄p̄ātu*.<sup>16</sup>

The scholar Tamiḷaṅṅal (2004<sup>17</sup>) applies Communication Theory to the *meyp̄p̄ātu* term. He examines the term *pannai* used by Tolkāppiyaṅṅār and points to the meaning found in the *Tolkāppiyam* itself in the *urīyiyal* chapter. He examines where *meyp̄p̄ātu* takes place, concluding that the *Tolkāppiyam* is based entirely on poetry, not on drama. He points out that in his theory of *meyp̄p̄ātu*, Tolkāppiyaṅṅār never uses *cuvai* (*rasa*) as a synonym for *meyp̄p̄ātu*.<sup>18</sup> Tamiḷaṅṅal considers Pēraciriyār's commentary

---

derived lexis and its thematic independence from the bulk of the TP might suggest that it was an independent composition incorporated *en bloc* into the grammar.'

11 Manuel, 'Meyp̄p̄ātu,' 134–45.

12 Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 118.

13 Monius, 'The Many Lives of Daṇḍin,' 1–37; Monius, *Imagining*, 34–35.

14 Monius, *Imagining*, 34.

15 Monius, 'Love, Violence, and the Aesthetics of Disgust,' 130 n. 52.

16 See Monius, *Imagining*, 177–78 n. 130; see also Anne Monius, 'Loving Śiva's Liṅka: The Changing Emotional Valences of a Beloved Image in the Tamil-Speaking Śaiva Tradition,' in *Historicizing Emotions: Practices and Objects in India, China, and Japan*, ed. Barbara Schuler (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 113–45.

17 Tamiḷaṅṅal, *Tolkāppiyariṅ ilakkīyak kolkaikaḷ* (Maturai: Mīṅāṭci Puttaka Nilaiyam, 2004), 151ff.

18 Tamiḷaṅṅal, *Tolkāppiyariṅ ilakkīyak kolkaikaḷ*, 154: Tolkāppiyaṅṅār 'uses both words *cuvai*

on the *Tolkāppiyam* to advance a *meyp̄pātu* theory that is clearer and more conclusive in its formulation.

Irā Cantiracēkarāṇ and P. Caravaṇaṇ (2007<sup>19</sup>) apply the *Tolkāppiyam*'s *meyp̄pātu* theory, which includes the cause and consequence of emotion, to the poetic narrative (*mahākāvya*) *Cilappatikāram*, supplying many examples.

P. Thirugnanasambandhan (2010<sup>20</sup>) numbers among those scholars who do not consider the *Tolkāppiyam meyp̄pātu* chapter as a borrowing from Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* and rather suggests that they are both 'heir to a common heritage'<sup>21</sup>. Thirugnanasambandhan's comparative Tamil-Sanskrit study concludes the following: (1) the *Tolkāppiyam*'s theory of *meyp̄pātu* is based on a conception of real-world emotion (*bhāva*) rather than aesthetic emotion (*rasa*);<sup>22</sup> (2) *meyp̄pātu* should not be interpreted as reader-centred emotion;<sup>23</sup> (3) whereas *Tolkāppiyaṇār*'s list of eight *meyp̄pātus* starts with laughter (*nakai*), in the Sanskrit *Nāṭyaśāstra*, a dramaturgical compendium, this is not the case;<sup>24</sup> (4) *Tolkāppiyaṇār* makes no distinction between the eight and thirty-two *meyp̄pātus*;<sup>25</sup> (5) a discussion dismissing Skt. *raudra* (ferocity, Tam. *uruttiram*) in favour of *camanilai* (quiescence, Skt. *śānta*) is not conducted by the Sanskrit theorists;<sup>26</sup> (6) the fourfold causal factors of a particular emotion are only examples and not subject to any restrictions.<sup>27</sup>

Unlike Withney Cox's precursors, who focused primarily on *meyp̄pātu* enumerations and their numerical irregularities, and operated with ahistorical concepts of *meyp̄pātu*, Cox (2013<sup>28</sup>) (as does the Sanskritist Pollock) proceeds from the following two premises: First, he is convinced that there was a wide-reaching network between scholars in India. And secondly, he considers pre-modern scholarly works on *meyp̄pātu* to be literary-cultural products that varied in their interpretation (by Buddhist, Jain, Sanskrit and Tamil theorists) both historically and culturally.

Cox deals with the concept of *meyp̄pātu* within the collected volume *Bilingual Discourse and Cross-Cultural Fertilization: Sanskrit and Tamil in Medieval India*, discussing in particular Ḫampūraṇār's commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam*. To his merit, into the history of the *meyp̄pātu* discourse he includes the few extant quotes as found in Ḫampūraṇār's commentary on the otherwise today lost work of the *Ceyirriyam*.

---

(Rasa) and Meyppaadu [*meyp̄pātu*; BS] in various contexts, in his treatise. But, in regard to the theory Meyppaadu, he never uses "cuvai" (Rasa) as a synonym to Meyppaadu'.

19 Irā Cantiracēkarāṇ and P. Caravaṇaṇ, *Cilappatikāratil meyp̄pātukaḷ* (Chennai: Rāmaiyā Patip-pakam, 2007).

20 Thirugnanasambandhan, 'A Study of Rasa.'

21 Thirugnanasambandhan, 'A Study of Rasa,' 334.

22 Thirugnanasambandhan, 'A Study of Rasa,' 342, also 337.

23 Thirugnanasambandhan, 'A Study of Rasa,' 337.

24 Thirugnanasambandhan, 'A Study of Rasa,' 339.

25 Thirugnanasambandhan, 'A Study of Rasa,' 338.

26 Thirugnanasambandhan, 'A Study of Rasa,' 340.

27 Thirugnanasambandhan, 'A Study of Rasa,' 339.

28 Cox, 'From Source-Criticism.'

Cox establishes various intertextual connections, seeing evidence of a sequence of reception and assimilation as follows: the Kashmirian Abhinavagupta's *Abhinava-bhāratī* → the Tamil *Ceyirriyam* → Ḥampūraṇar.<sup>29</sup> He proposes that the *Tolkāppiyam*'s theory of literary emotions is based solely on a conception of *bhāva* rather than *rasa*.<sup>30</sup> In this, he is in agreement with Marr (1985) and Thirugnanasambandhan (2010). However, he proposes a new interpretation, translating *meypṭāṭu* in the root-text as that which 'makes real'.<sup>31</sup> While rejecting a somatic meaning of the word *meypṭāṭu* for the root-text,<sup>32</sup> he posits that a somatic understanding already existed by the time of Ḥampūraṇar.<sup>33</sup> Cox is the first to note Ḥampūraṇar's attempt of reconciling his root-text with other systems of thought,<sup>34</sup> in contrast to the later root-text commentator Pēraṅcīriyar, who attempted to harmonise the contradictions found in Ḥampūraṇar's explanations.<sup>35</sup>

## 2 *Meypṭāṭu* source readings

The following survey is an attempt to present the history of Tamil *meypṭāṭu* knowledge in texts of systematic thought, this on the basis of my own reading as well as the major earlier investigations by Whitney Cox, Indra Manuel and others. In particular, the studies of Cox and John Ralston Marr have disentangled a number of matters (as, for example, text relationships). While I will present the main ideas of the Tamil treatises in questions, we must keep the foundational treatise on the Sanskrit *rasa/bhāva* theory in mind as well. The survey sketched here thus begins with a brief outline of latest research results regarding the Sanskrit theory. All translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own.

The discussion that Sheldon Pollock has unfolded with respect to the Sanskrit *rasa* theory focuses on the question of the locus of *rasa/bhāva*. This question is of importance to the Tamil case as well, and thus will be taken up along with other issues. The following questions are the basis of my enquiry:

---

29 Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 129.

30 Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 134. See also, Cox, 'Bearing,' 84.

31 Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 133. Cox states: '[...] this understanding of *meypṭāṭu* as that which "makes real" is reminiscent of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*'s own *nirukti*-etymologies of *bhāva*. Indeed, there are strong grounds to believe that this sense of *meypṭāṭu* – and *not* the somatic understanding of the word – was that intended by the author-compilers of the *Tolkāppiyam*.' Cox derives this new interpretation from "'making" (*pāṭu* as derived from *paṭuttal*) "real" (*mey*).'

32 The somatic understanding, so Cox, 'has tended to reduce the status of *meypṭāṭu* even further, suggesting [...] an equation with the *NS*'s *sāttvikabhāvas*, [with] the "natural" or involuntary reactions' as signals of emotions ('From Source-Criticism,' 119). He refers to the definition and details in *Nāṭyaśāstra* 7.94–107.

33 Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 119, 133.

34 Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 122.

35 Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 117, 136.

- a. Where is the locus of *meyp̄p̄āṭu*? Within the poet, within the literary text, within the character of the drama, or within the reader/listener/spectator?
- b. Is the theorist's focus on literary text-internal communication or literary reception?
- c. For the Tamil theorist-commentator, is *meyp̄p̄āṭu* a real-world emotion (*bhāva*) or an aesthetic emotion (*rasa*)?
- d. What definitions are given?
- e. What questions interest the Tamil theorist-commentator?
- f. Do any of the commentators provide a coherent account of how *meyp̄p̄āṭu* works within a text or in the reader/spectator?

The Sanskrit foundational treatise on *rasa*: Bharata's *Nāṭyasāstra* (*Treatise on Drama*), c.300 CE<sup>36</sup>

**Core ideas**

- a. The basis of *rasa* theory is dramatic performance (the domain of dramaturgy in the theatre).
- b. *Rasa* (aesthetic emotion) is located in the character of the enacted drama. (This holds true also for Bharata's earliest commentators Bhatta Lollata, c.825 CE,<sup>37</sup> and Bhoja, early 11th c.<sup>38</sup>). (According to Pollock, however, the locus of *rasa* in dramatic characters was abandoned by Kashmiri thinkers over the course of the 10th c., never really to return.<sup>39</sup>)
- c. *Rasa* arises from a conjunction of factors, reactions, and transitory *bhāva* emotions.<sup>40</sup>

---

36 The dating is that of Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 47.

37 See Sheldon Pollock, 'Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa and the Problem of *rasa*: A Historical Introduction and Annotated Translation,' *Asiatische Studien: Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft* 52.1 (1998): 117–92 (123). Pollock states: 'For how long before Lollata this view in fact prevailed, how widely it was shared, how restricted its perspective may have been – was the readerly dimension totally excluded from consideration? – are questions very hard to answer.'

38 It is the characters alone, the *nāyaka* and *nāyikā*, whom Bhoja shows to be implicated in the process of *rasa* production (Pollock, 'Bhoja's,' 127). Nowhere in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* (SP) does Bhoja ascribe stable emotions to the *reader* (ibid., 130). Abhinavagupta was unknown to Bhoja, although they were contemporaries (Pollock, 'Bhoja's,' 125). In the early eleventh century Bhoja replaces 'possession' and 'dying' with 'jealousy' and 'attachment' (Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, Preface, xvi).

39 Pollock, 'Bhoja's,' 124. The beginnings of the epistemic shift of the locus of *rasa*, it being transferred from text to reader, can be detected in the new concerns of Anandavardhana (ca. 850) in his *Dhvanyāloka* (ibid. 124).

40 As Pollock (in *Rasa Reader*, Preface, xvi) states, '*bhāva* [...has a] very wide domain of reference.' It cannot be embraced by a single English word, because *bhāva* comprises 'not only the subjective sense of emotion but also its objective cause', the foundational factor. Thus we have primary (or 'stable') emotions (*sthāyibhāvas*) in response to certain objects (*ālambanavibhāvas*). In turn, these emotions are nuanced [in given cases] by more transient feelings



The stable emotions (*sthāyibhāvas*) when in the presence of the various factors and emotions turn into *rasa* (e.g. *rasas* are produced by the *bhāva* emotions and other aesthetic elements and not the reverse: emotions through *rasas*).<sup>41</sup>

- d. Bharata's eight fundamental *rasas* (*NŚ*, Ch. 6) that are prevalent in an actor of drama.

*śṛṅgāra* (erotic), *hāsyā* (comic), *karuṇā* (pathetic), *raudra* (furious) *vīra* (heroic),<sup>42</sup> *bhāyanaka* (terrible), *bhibhatsa* (odious), and *adbhuta* (marvellous).

(Abhinavagupta, in his *Abhinavabharati*, c.1000 CE, expands these eight to nine, also including *śānta* [quiescence], whereby the locus is, then, in the reader. Abhinavagupta's point of view is accepted by all later theorists.)

- e. Definition of *bhāva* (*NŚ*, Ch. 7)<sup>43</sup>

*Bhāva* (emotions) are so called because they bring into being the meaning of a literary work. An emotion is something brought about by foundational and stimulant factors [*vibhāva*, BS], and apprehended through the reaction (verbal, bodily, or psychophysical registers of acting) [*anubhāva*, BS].

- f. These *bhāvas* or emotions include:

the eight stable emotions (sexual love/desire *rati*, laughter *hāsyā*, weeping/sorrow *śoka*, anger *krodha*, feeling energetic *utsāha*, fear *bhaya*, disgust *jugupsā*, amazement *vismaya*), thirty-three transitory emotions (*vyabhicāribhāva*), and eight psychophysical reactions (*sāttvikabhāva*: perspiration etc.). The *rasas* arise from them all. However, only the stable emotions turn into *rasas*. The thirty-three transitory emotions and the eight physical reactions are subservient to the stable emotions and serve them.<sup>44</sup>

There are forty-nine *bhāvas*: sexual love/desire, joy, shivering, firmness, pride, laughter, intoxication, longing, worry, recollection, reflection, speculation, feeling energetic, anger, impatience, resentment, jealousy, ferocity, disgust, amazement, sleep, dreaming, waking, fickleness, torpor, fear, doubt, terror, trembling, shame, dissimulation, paralysis, fatigue, perspiration, sickness, madness, exhaustion, grief, pallor, depression, breaking of the voice, shock, weeping, delusion, fainting, insensibility, profound indifference, peacefulness.<sup>45</sup>

---

(*vyabhicāribhāvas*) and made manifest by physical reactions (*anubhāvas*)' (Pollock, 'Bhoja's,' 121).

41 See Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 51.

42 Sanskrit *vīra* in the *NŚ* is different from Tamil *perumitam* in *Tolkāppiyam*; see also Tamilaṅṅal, *Tolkāppiyarīṇ ilakkīyak koḷkaikaḷ*, 155.

43 See Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 53.

44 See Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 54.

45 See Pollock, 'Bhoja's,' 154.

## The Tamil root-treatise on *meyppātu*: *Tolkāppiyam*, *Poruḷatikāram* *Meyppāṭṭiyal*, mid-first millennium(?)

### Core ideas

- a. Tolkāppiyaṅār begins his chapter on *meyppātu* with the words of another person, using the term *paṅṅai*<sup>46</sup> (the domain of *viḷaiyāṭṭu* or play).

*paṅṅait tōṅriya eṅṅāṅku poruḷum [...] eṅpa* || (TPMI 1)<sup>47</sup>

They say (*eṅpa*)<sup>48</sup> all of the eight times four (*eṅ nāṅku*)<sup>49</sup> elements/things (*poruḷ*) appear<sup>50</sup> in [the domain of] *paṅṅai* or play.<sup>51</sup>

46 Regarding the cryptic term *paṅṅai* (MI 1): Tolkāppiyaṅār does not explain the term *paṅṅai* in the *meyppātu* chapter, but in the *uriyiyal* chapter (UI 319), where he explains that it denotes ‘*viḷaiyāṭṭu*’. (The *uriyiyal* is the earliest extant Tamil glossary or lexicon; it contains a selection of some 120 ‘non-frequent words’, whose meanings the author feels necessary to explain in terms of synonymous ‘frequent words’; see James, *Colporuḷ*, 60.) Tolkāppiyaṅār (UI 23=319) states: *keṭavaral paṅṅai āyiraṅṅum viḷaiyāṭṭu*, ‘*Keṭavaral* and *paṅṅai* both denote *viḷaiyāṭṭu* or play as a pastime’; ‘*Keṭavaral* and *paṅṅai*, those two [are] *viḷaiyāṭṭu* “game”’ (trans. Jean-Luc Chevillard, “Rare Words” in Classical Tamil literature: From the *Uriyiyal* to the *Tivākaram*, *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung* 63.3 (2010): 301–17 [305]). Chevillard adds (305f.): ‘How this statement must be understood exactly is not completely clear but we seem to have here at least a relationship of approximate synonymy. The statement made [... here...] probably meant that in a poetical utterance containing U44 (*keṭavaral*), substituting *viḷaiyāṭṭu* for *keṭavaral* would provide an approximately equivalent utterance.’ – The *Tamil Lexicon (TL)* gives for *paṅṅaiyāṭṭal*, ‘to play’; *TL s.v.*, *paṅṅaipāyital*, ‘to sport in water’. The entry *paṅṅai* in *TL*: ‘agricultural field’; in Cānti Cāṭaṅā’s *Varalāṅṅu murait tamil ilakkīyap pērakarāti* (Chennai: Cānti Cāṭaṅā, 2002): ‘games played by men and women as well as the place where they play’. Subrahmanya Sastri (*Tolkāppiyam*) translates *paṅṅai* in MI 1 as ‘places of sport like garden, river-side etc.’, and states in ‘note 2’, ‘*paṅṅai* should be taken as an *upalakṣaṇa* [looking at/beholding, *Akt des Beobachtens*, BS] to the drama and the *kāvya* [poetry] that describe the experiences there’. Cox (‘From Source-Criticism,’ 120) translates *paṅṅai* as ‘field’ and says that the original sense of *meyppātu* is difficult to understand. – Tolkāppiyaṅār’s commentators Iḷampūraṅar and Pēraṅciyār apparently interpret the cryptic term in different ways; see *s.v.* below.

47 *Tolkāppiyam*, *Poruḷatikāram*, *Meyppāṭṭiyal* verse 1 corresponds to Iḷampūraṅar’s commentary *TPI*am. 245, and Pēraṅciyār’s commentary *TPP*ēr 249. I cite throughout Tolkāppiyaṅār’s *cūttirams* according to *TPI*am.

48 Note that it is Tolkāppiyaṅār himself who declares the first verse or *cūttiram* to be a statement made by someone else. The set phrase *eṅpa* (so they say) was a repeated model for references to unnamed authorities.

49 For ‘eight times four’, see translation, ch. 2, *Meyppātu* source readings below, *Tolkāppiyam*, points d–f.

50 Those familiar with Tamil grammar will note that in my shortened sentence versions, due to sentence adjustments I do not translate *tonṅriya* as the relative participle *peyreccam* as found in the original.

51 The complete verse reads as follows: *Paṅṅait tonṅriya eṅṅāṅku poruḷum | kaṅṅiya purāṅe nāṅṅk’ eṅpa*. Whitney Cox (‘From Source-Criticism,’ 120) translates: ‘They say that that domain [consisting of] all of the eight times four elements which appear in the field (*paṅṅai*) amounts to four

- b. Tolkāppiyānār discusses *meyp̄pātu* in reference to poetry (rather than play/drama).
- c. Tolkāppiyānār's *meyp̄pātu* theory is based on the conception of real-world emotion (Skt. *bhāva*) rather than aesthetic emotion (Skt. *rasa*).<sup>52</sup> He includes *meyp̄pātu*, but not *cuvai* (Tam. lit. 'taste', Skt. *rasa*).  
In the *Tolkāppiyam* emotionology, no conceptual or terminological equivalent of *rasa* or aesthetic emotion is found; nor is *cuvai* used as a synonym for *meyp̄pātu*.
- d. There are two lists of *meyp̄pātus*, one with eight, the other with thirty-two.<sup>53</sup>  
There are eight *meyp̄pātus* (MI 3)<sup>54</sup> – there is no ninth one (cf. the commentary by Ṇampūraṇar) – and thirty-two auxiliary *meyp̄pātus* (MI 12 = *TPI*Ṇam 256 = *TPP*ēr 260).<sup>55</sup> There are no technical terms for class divisions (as in the Sanskrit *Nāṭyasāstra*: e.g. *sthāyin* or stable and *vyabhicāri* or transitory as two of the several kinds of *bhāvas* or emotions).
- e. Tolkāppiyānār's first list of eight fundamental/basic *meyp̄pātus* contains: laughter (*nakai*), weeping (*aḷukai*), disgust (*iḷivaral*), amazement (*maruṭkai*),<sup>56</sup> fear (*accam*), greatness/excellence, pride (*perumitam*),<sup>57</sup> anger (*vekuḷi*), joy (*uvakai*).<sup>58</sup>

---

times four'. Subrahmanya Sastri (*Tolkāppiyam*, 135) translates: 'They say that the thirty-two things that are manifest in places of sport like garden, river-side etc., may be considered to come within sixteen'.

- 52 There is consensus among various scholars that *meyp̄pātu* is equivalent to Sanskrit *bhāva* (for example, Marr, Thirugnanasambandhan, Cox). According to Cox ('From Source-Criticism,' 134) it can be considered a 'direct calque of the *Nāṭyasāstra*'s *bhāva*'.
- 53 These are *meyp̄pātus* for both *akam* (love theme, inner, domestic life) and *puram* (war theme, valorous life). There are a further 62 *meyp̄pātus* belonging exclusively to the various stages of *akam*; I do not list them here, but they are listed in *TPI*Ṇam 261–266 and *TPP*ēr 270–272. For a brief overview, see Manuel, 'Meyp̄pātu,' 136–38.
- 54 These may be equated with the Skt. *sthāyibhāvas*, stable emotions.
- 55 These may be equated with the thirty-three *vyabhicāribhāvas*, transitory emotions.
- 56 Cf. Douglas Cairns, *Emotions Between Greece and Rome* (London: University of London/Institute of Classical Studies, 2015), 5, where it is noted regarding 'surprise': 'Surprise in the list of basic emotions is not because it is prototypically an emotion, but because it has, at least in the eyes of some observers in some cultures, a characteristic facial expression'.
- 57 Subrahmanya Sastri (*Tolkāppiyam*, 136) in his translation of *TPI*Ṇam verse 247 adds to the Tamil term *perumitam* the Skt. *rasa*-(aesthetic emotion)-term *vīra* (the heroic), which in my opinion, is incorrect. The Tamil technical term *perumitam* denotes 'greatness, excellence, pride'. This translation is supported by the emotion's four causal factors: scholarship (*kalvi*), fearlessness/bravery (*taṟukan*), fame (*pukal*), and generosity (*koṭai*, lit. 'gift'). I also consider incorrect Cox's translation 'boldness' ('From Source-Criticism,' 120), which also has in mind the Skt. term *vīra* (the heroic).
- 58 I think *uvakai* should be translated as 'joy', rather than 'desire' as it is translated by Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 120. Similarly, Subrahmanya Sastri (*Tolkāppiyam*, 136), in his translation of *TPI*Ṇam verse 247, adds the Skt. *rasa* (aesthetic emotion) term *śṛṅgāra* (erotic love) to the Tamil term *uvakai*, which in my opinion is incorrect.

*nakaiyē aḷukai iḷivaral maruṭkai [...] eṭṭām meypṭāṭ' enpa* (MI 3 = TPIḷam 247 = TPPēr 251)

And indeed they say that this set are the eight *meypṭāṭus*: laughter, weeping, disgust, amazement [...].

Tolkāppiyaṅār (MI 3) lists laughter (*nakai*) first.<sup>59</sup> This is different in Bharata's Sanskrit *Nāṭyaśāstra*, where the list of real-world emotions (*bhāva*) in Ch. 7 begins with sexual love/desire (*rati*),<sup>60</sup> and, respectively, the list of aesthetic emotions (*rasa*) in Ch. 6, with erotic love (*śṛṅgāra*). Tolkāppiyaṅār's commentator Pēraciriyar (early thirteenth century) offers arguments for the root-text's preference (see below).

- f. There are four causes for each of the fundamental/basic emotions.

For each of the basic *meypṭāṭus* in the first list, there are four causes/contexts.<sup>61</sup>

What is the cause/context that generates the emotion of excellence or pride?

*kalvi tarukaṅ pukaḷmai koṭaiyeṇac | collap paṭṭa perumita nāṅkē ||* (MI 9 = TPIḷam 253 = TPPēr 257)

The source of *perumitam* [greatness/excellence, pride] mentioned is four: scholarship, bravery [lit. fearlessness], fame, and generosity.

What is the cause/context that generates the emotion of anger or wrath?

*urupparai kuṭikōḷ! alaikalai enra | veruppa vanta vekuḷi nāṅkē ||* (MI 10 = TPIḷam 254 = TPPēr 258)

59 On this order, see Pēraciriyar's commentary on verse 251. See also 'Note 5' in Subrahmanya Sastri (*Tolkāppiyam*, 136) for parallels of statements in the commentary on the Sanskrit *Nāṭyaśāstra* (*NŚ*).

60 The order of the Sanskrit *bhāvas* in the *NŚ* (in comparison to the *Tolkāppiyam*) is: *hāsa* 2, *soka* 3, *jugupsā* 8, *vismaya* 7, *bhaya* 6, *utsāha* 5, *krodha* 4, *rati* 1.

61 For a list of all the causes mentioned in the *Tolkāppiyam*, see Subrahmanya Sastri's translation (*Tolkāppiyam*, 137ff. vv. 248ff. [square brackets BS]): the 4 causes for laughter (*nakai*): 'mockery, childishness, ignorance and credulity'; causes for weeping (*aḷukai*): 'contemptible treatment, loss, change for the worse and poverty'; causes for disgust (*iḷivaral*): 'old age, disease, pain and low status'; causes for amazement (*maruṭkai*): 'newness, greatness, littleness [smallness] and transformation'; causes for fear (*accam*): 'evil spirits, wild animals, thieves and one's own king'; causes for joy (*uvakai*): '[prosperity (*celvam*)]\*, [knowledge (*pulaṅ*)]\*\*', sexual union and sport [play] (in gardens etc.)'. \*There are various translations for *celvam*: 'enjoyment' (*TL* and Marr, *Eight Anthologies*, 62); 'wealth' (Manuel, 'Meypṭāṭu,' 136); 'love' (Subrahmanya Sastri, *ibid.*); 'nukarcci' (Tol:24:11), 'pākkiam' (Aka:105:8) (Cānti Cāṭaṅā's *Varalārū*, s.v., *celvam*). \*\*There are also various translations for *pulaṅ*: 'experience of pleasures (like beauty etc.)' (Subrahmanya Sastri, *ibid.*); 'arivūṭaimai' (Tol:26:233), 'cuvai, oḷi [...] [the 5 senses]' (*Kuraḷ*:111:1) (Cānti Cāṭaṅā's *Varalārū*, s.v., *pulaṅ*); see also below *Meypṭāṭu* source readings, s.v. *Ilakkana Viḷakkam*, point d, footnote, Vaitṭiyānāta Tēcikar's paraphrase in his auto-commentary: *kalvippayaṅākiya arivūṭaimai*.

The source of *vekuḷi* [anger] is fourfold: the extremely painful cutting of limbs, destruction of family, plunder and murder. (Trans. Subrahmanya Sastri, 138; brackets BS).

- g. Tolkāppiyaṅār's second list, containing auxiliary *meyp̄p̄āṭus*, thirty-two in number.<sup>62</sup>

The thirty-two auxiliary *meyp̄p̄āṭus* seem an alternative to the eight *meyp̄p̄āṭus* of the first list.<sup>63</sup>

Among the thirty-two auxiliary *meyp̄p̄āṭus* are: calmness (*naṭuvunilai*),<sup>64</sup> being gracious (*aruḷ*), affection (*aṅṅu*), bashfulness, shame (*nāṅal*), blabbering (*ararru*), dream (*kaṅavu*), recollection (*niṅaital*), sloth [acedia] (*maṭimai*),<sup>65</sup> envy (*porāmai*), perspiration (*viyarṭtal*), trembling (*naṭukkam*), among others (MI 12 = TPIḷam 256 = TPPēr 260)

- h. There are causes for the eight basic *meyp̄p̄āṭus*, but none is mentioned for the thirty-two auxiliary *meyp̄p̄āṭus*.
- i. *Meyp̄p̄āṭu* as the character's emotion, not the audience's emotion.  
Regarding the locus of *meyp̄p̄āṭu*, for Tolkāppiyaṅār, it is located in the character of the literary text alone.<sup>66</sup>

62 The remaining twenty-one auxiliary *meyp̄p̄āṭus* are: '(1) the feeling of ownership/possessing s.th. (*uṭaimai*), (2) satisfaction, [contentment] (*iṅṅural*), [...] (5) remaining in one's own nature (*taṅmai*), (6) modesty (*aṭakkam*), (7) restraint (*varaital*), [...] (9) exceeding the bounds (*kaimmikal*), (10) tormenting others, [afflict] (*nalital*), (11) pondering, [deliberation] (*cūḷcci*),\* (12) wishing health/well (*vāḷttal*), [...] (14) sleeping (*tuṅcal*), [...] (17) [hatred] (*muṅṅital*), [...] (19) [fright, being startled] (*verūttal*), [...] (21) thinking mood (*karutal*), (22) [critically examining] (*ārāycci*), (23) haste, [impatience] (*virāivu*), (24) sighing (*uyirppu*), (25) [helplessness] (*kaiyāru*), (26) [misery reflected by shrunken eyes] (*iṭukkan*), (27) forgetfulness (*pocčāppu*), [...] (30) [doubt arising] (*aiyam*), (31) [arrogance, haughty] (*mikai*), [...]' (see Subrahmanya Sastri, *Tolkāppiyam*, 139–40, Manuel, 'Meyp̄p̄āṭu,' 136; square brackets, BS). \*For a different meaning of *cūḷcci* (= *cūḷarci*, TL trouble, agitation of mind, *maṅakalakkam*) given by the commentator Pērācīriyar, see below.

63 Tolkāppiyaṅār states: *āṅk' avai oru pālāka [...] ivaiyumu ḷavē avaiyalaṅkaṭaiyē* (MI 12 = TPIḷam 256, ll. 1–2, 11) 'Those mentioned above being on one side, the following being on the other side, are included under *meyp̄p̄āṭu* in a way, different from them.' (Trans. adopted from Subrahmanya Sastri, *Tolkāppiyam*, 139). – Compare the thirty-three so-called transitory emotions in the Sanskrit *bhāva* model, which serve the so-called eight stable emotions; see Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 54, and here above in the *Meyp̄p̄āṭu* source readings, the discussion on the core ideas of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*.

64 It is noteworthy that *naṭuvunilai* or calmness, in the second list of thirty-two *meyp̄p̄āṭus* in MI 12 of the *Tolkāppiyam*, is picked up prominently in the commentaries of both ḷampūraṅar and Pērācīriyar as the ninth *cuvai* (lit. 'taste', equivalent to Skt. *rasa* or aesthetic emotion); see also below.

65 *Acedia* is found in the list of emotions of Thomas of Aquino (see Rosenwein, 'Emotion Words,' 104); for him and in the Christian religion it is a deadly sin particularly linked to monks (see Frevert, *Emotions in History*).

66 See also Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 135.

- j. Not a reception-centred view, but the visual and auditory perception of the recipient is required to understand the implications of *meyp̄p̄ātu*.<sup>67</sup>

*kaṇṇiṇuñ ceviyiṇun tiṇṇitiṇ uṇarum | uṇarvuṭai māntark kallatu teriyiṇ |  
nannayap poruḷkōḷ eṇṇaruṇ kuraittē ||* (final verse MI 27 = TPIḷam 271 = TPPēr 275)

The *meyp̄p̄ātu* of fine quality cannot be understood except by those [insightful people] who possess a correct perspective of things through correct observation [*kaṇ*] and hearing [*cevi*].<sup>68</sup>

### *Meyp̄p̄ātu* biologised and *cuvai* introduced: The *Vīracōḷiyam* and its commentary

In the *Vīracōḷiyam* (VC)<sup>69</sup> of Puttamittiraṇ, c.1060–1068 CE, and its commentary (VCC)<sup>70</sup> by Peruntēvaṇār, late eleventh or early twelfth century(?), we have two subchapters (*paṭalam*) that add information about the medieval *meyp̄p̄ātu/cuvai* discourse: I. The *Poruḷ* section discussing *meyp̄p̄ātu* (VC 90, p. 90; VCC pp. 102–03) and *kuṛippu* (pp. 101–02); and II. The *Alaṅkāram* section discussing *cuvai* (pp. 214ff.).

#### Core ideas

I. The *Poruḷ* ('meaning' or poetic content/theme) subchapter<sup>71</sup> and its model of *meyp̄p̄ātu*

The *Vīracōḷiyam*'s third subchapter departs from the earlier *Tolkāppiyam* in a number of ways. It appropriates and focuses on Sanskrit terminology and concepts not found in the Tamil root-text of *Tolkāppiyaṇār*.

67 See also Indra Manuel, *Literary Theories in Tamil* (Pondicherry: Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture, 1997), 19. See Cox ('From Source-Criticism,' 135) who states: '[For the *Tolkāppiyam*] it was enough that emotion could be vividly depicted in Tamil poetry, and that these representations could be typologically recognized by the educated [person].'

68 See the similar translation: 'The *meyp̄p̄ātu* of good quality cannot be comprehended except by those who possess proper perspective [and] through proper observation and hearing' (Monius, *Imagining*, 35). See also the translation in Subrahmanya Sastri, *Tolkāppiyam*, 146.

69 The VC tends to prefer terms closer to a direct Tamil transliteration of the Sanskrit. See, for instance, VC 154 [Alaṅkāram section], p. 214 n.\*.

70 VC refers to Puttamittiraṇ's *Vīracōḷiyam* and VCC to Peruntēvaṇār's commentary (*urai*) thereon. I cite both from Kōvintarāj Mutaliyār, ed. *Puttamittiraṇār iyarriya Vīracōḷiyam mūlamum, Peruntēvaṇār iyarriya uraiyum*.

71 Monius, *Imagining*, 150, states 'the third chapter on poetic content in the *Vīracōḷiyam* is reimaged by the commentator as a means of expressing Buddhist values.' She compares it with the *Tolkāppiyam*.

a. Somatic definition of *meyp̄p̄ātu*.<sup>72</sup>

In his VCC, Peruntēvaṇār states the following, probably citing another authority:<sup>73</sup>

*meyp̄p̄āṭṭiyal vakai mētaka virippin | meykkaṭ paṭṭu viḷankiya tōrraṇ | [...]  
ceppal marr' atuvē ||* (VCC ad 90 [Poruḷ section], p. 102, ll. 7–9)

To expand [*virital*] upon the variety [*vakai*] of *meyp̄p̄ātu* [-nature, *iyal*] it is the manifestation [*tōrram*] that appears [*paṭṭu*] in the body [*mey+kaṇ*], as well as the verbal [*ceppatal*] expression (of it). (Trans. Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 119; square brackets BS).

This interpretation of *meyp̄p̄ātu* as both bodily and verbal expression goes far beyond the *Tolkāppiyam* root-text.

b. There are eight basic 'external' *meyp̄p̄āṭṭus* (*puṛa meyp̄p̄ātu*).<sup>74</sup>

In contrast to the *Tolkāppiyam*, Peruntēvaṇār (VCC) (probably still citing another authority) first lists Skt. *śṛṅgāra* (erotic love) (surprisingly a Sanskrit term that is functionally a *rasa* or aesthetic emotion), and turns *Tolkāppiyāṇār's meyp̄p̄ātu* anger (*vekuḷi*) into a causal factor of the *meyp̄p̄ātu* heroicism (*vīram*). He replaces weeping (*aḷukai*) with sorrow (*irakkam*) and replaces the remaining others – except for *nakai* and *accam* – with synonyms.

Erotic love (*cirun̄kāram*) [*TPMI*<sup>75</sup> 3, *uvakai* 8 joy];<sup>76</sup> laughter (*nakai*); amazement (*viyappu*) [*TPMI maruṭkai* 4]; fear (*accam*); heroicism (*vīram*) [*TPMI*

72 See also Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 133, 119.

73 Monius, *Imagining*, 143 writes: 'throughout the final three chapters on poetic theme, prosody, and ornamentation, the commentary cites literally hundreds of stanzas in different meters [...]'. Several times, so Monius (143), he refers to the author of the *Tolkāppiyam*, and commenting him in verses 90–94, where also *meyp̄p̄ātu* and *karuppu* are mentioned. – Monius is uncertain as regards Peruntēvaṇār's commentary on verses 90–94, 92–98 whether his long poetic explications on the five *tiṇais* (landscapes) are his own or quotations from some source no longer extant.

74 *Meyp̄p̄ātu* in the *Vīracōḷiyam* is discussed as one of the 27 elements of love poetry, see Manuel, *Literary Theories*, 53.

75 *TPMI*: abbreviation for *Tolkāppiyam*, *Poruḷatikāram*, *Meyp̄p̄āṭṭiyal* chapter.

76 Surprisingly, in the *Puṛapporuḷvenpāmālai* (*Garland of Venpā Verses on Outer Matters*) by Aiyaṇāritaṇār (perhaps ninth or tenth century), in its *Tumpaippaṭalam* section, the term *cirun̄kāram* < Skt. *śṛṅgāra* appears in the heading '*cirun̄kāra nilai*' of the 150th *turai* or situation, in a context (a wife embracing the corpse of her husband) in which its Sanskrit *rasa* status and usual meaning of erotic love makes no sense. (It seems rather to be the author's way of expressing the Tamil *puṛam* mode of love.) It is, however, followed by the Tamil *meyp̄p̄ātu uvakai* in the heading of the 151st *turai*: '*uvakai kaluḷcci*' (joy of finding the husband alive); see *Puṛapporuḷvenpāmālai*, *mūlamum*, *uraiyum*, ed. U. Vē. Cāminātaiyar (Chennai: U. Vē Cāminātaiyar Nūlnilaiyam, [1895] 2003). On dating the *Puṛapporuḷvenpāmālai*, see Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography*, 50; Zvelebil, *Companion Studies*, 51, dates it to between 800 and 1000 CE; Wilden, *Manuscript*, 19 n. 50: 'before the 10th century?'. According to Zvelebil, *ibid*, 51, the *Panṇirupaṭalam*, a school of grammatical thought different from that of the *Tolkāppiyam*, was the basic treatise for the *Puṛapporuḷvenpāmālai* of the *mālai* genre.

*vekuḷi* 7 anger]; pride in oneself[?]77 (*uṭkōḷ*) [*TPMI perumitam* 6 excellence/pride]; sorrow (*irakkam*) [*TPMI aḷukai* 2 weeping]; disgust (*iḷippu*) [*TPMI iḷivaral* 3] (VCC *ad* 90 [Poruḷ section], p. 103, ll. 7–9)

Each of the eight *meyp̄pāṭus* has four or fewer causes/determinant factors (*kāraṇam*) (ll. 13–35), for instance, the four causes of the heroic (*vīram*) are: enmity (*pakai*), war (*ceru*), fighting/quarreling (*ikal*) and anger (*muṇivu*). (VCC *ad* 90 [Poruḷ section], p. 103, ll. 21–22)

c. There are thirty-two ‘internal *meyp̄pāṭus*’ (*aka meyp̄pāṭu*).

(VCC *ad* 90 [Poruḷ section], p. 102, ll. 24–37)<sup>78</sup>

These include twenty-one physical states: paleness (*viḷarppu*), tiredness (*cōrtal*), perspiration (*vērttal*), sighing (*mūriyuyirppu*), fainting (*mūrccaṇai*), shedding tears (*kaṇṇīr vaḷital*), among others, and eleven mental states: desire (*virumpuṭal*), melting (*urukutaḷ*), dreaming (*kaṇavu naṇi kāṇṭal*), among others.

d. There are twenty-six *kuṛippus*<sup>79</sup> reserved for love situations.<sup>80</sup>

## II. The *Alaṅkāram* (poetic ornamentation or embellishment) subchapter

The *Vīracōḷiyam*’s fifth subchapter on poetic embellishment borrows most directly from Sanskrit sources<sup>81</sup> and explicitly claims to follow Daṇḍin’s Sanskrit *Kāvyaḍarśa*<sup>82</sup> (VC 143 [Alaṅkāram section], p. 198: *taṅṭi conṇa karaimali nūliṅ*

77 *Uṭkōḷ*, lit. ‘having inside’ (*uḷ*, ‘within’). This word is unknown to me in this context. Might *uṭkōḷ* be used to mean pride or conceit in certain contexts? My translation is no better than a guess. The *Tamil Lexicon (TL)* gives for *uṭkōḷ*, ‘inmost thought, opinion, belief, conviction’.

78 Peruntēvaṇār (VCC), citing another authority.

79 VCC *ad* 90, p. 101, ll. 23–26, cites another authority: *peṅṭī rāyīṇu mainta rāyīṇum | uṅṭa vēṭkai yuḷḷatu karutik | koṅṭunāṇi ceyvatu kuṛippeṇap paṭumē*, ‘The way [the physical or mental state of] the existing (*uḷḷatu*) intense (*uṅṭa*) desire (*vēṭkai*) of either the heroine (*peṅṭīr*) or the hero (*maintar*) is perceived (*karututal*) and abundantly (*naṇi*) enacted is what is called *kuṛippu*’. The *kuṛippus* include 17 physical states of expression: the non-understanding look (*urāccīru nōkkam*), singing (*pāṭal*), being possessed by some deity (*aṇaṅku koṅṭakaittal*), blaming somebody (*kuṛram kūṛal*), among others, and 9 mental states: sulking (*ūṭal*), reconciliation (*uṅartal*), rejoicing/delighted (*uvattal*), feeling bashful (*nāṇal*), among others. (VCC *ad* 90 [Poruḷ section], p. 101, lines 27ff.). See Manuel, ‘Meyp̄pāṭu,’ 141.

80 On *kuṛippu* in the *Vīracōḷiyam*, being one of the 27 elements of love poetry, see Manuel, *Literary Theories*, 53. As Manuel understands it, *kuṛippu* in the *Vīracōḷiyam* is ‘an action revealing a latent desire for something’ (54).

81 Why the *Vīracōḷiyam* infuses an already vibrant regional literary tradition with the poetic embellishments of the Sanskrit literary tradition is discussed by Monius, *Imagining*, 131, where the following ‘possible answer’ is offered: ‘Daṇḍin’s notion of poetic ornament based on content or meaning (Tamil *poruḷaṇi*, Sanskrit *arthālaṃkāra*) does inject something truly new and productive into Tamil literary theory.’ This has been done because ‘the *Tolkāppiyam*’s discussion of poetic ornamentation is largely restricted to ornamentation based on sound (*totai*) rather than on meaning or content.’ (ibid., 131). According to Monius (ibid., 136), in the VCC, Peruntēvaṇār expands on the *Vīracōḷiyam*’s application of Daṇḍin to the *Tolkāppiyam*.

82 See Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 133, 147.



*paṭiyē uraiṭṭan*, ‘he explains [*alaṅkāram* or poetic embellishment] according to the statements of Taṇṭi.’). The commentator however does not follow the order of Daṇḍin,<sup>83</sup> but rather incorporates his *Alaṅkāram* section into an older Tamil tradition of grammar and poetics,<sup>84</sup> while giving it an ethical tone.

a. *Cuvai* (Tam. lit. ‘taste’) as ornament (Skt. *alaṅkāra*).

Puttamittiraṅ, the author of the *Vīracōḷiyam*, VC 154 [*Alaṅkāram* section], p. 213, line 19, lists *cuvai* as one of the ‘ornaments’, *alaṅkāram*.

b. There are not eight, but nine *cuvais*, including *cāntam* (Skt. *śānta-rasa*, quiescence).<sup>85</sup>

Peruntēvaṅṅār, in his commentary on the *Vīracōḷiyam* (VCC), mentions nine *cuvais*<sup>86</sup> (cf. Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyaḍarśa* eight *cuvais/rasas*, 2.292;<sup>87</sup> cf. also the eight *cuvais* in the anonymous twelfth-century Tamil *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*):

*iṅic cuvaiyāvatu, ciruṅkāra mutalākavūṭaiya nātakacuvai oṅpatum eṅak koḷka* (VCC ad 154 [*Alaṅkāram* section], p. 214, ll. 12–13)

Hereafter follows the *cuvai* that is to be taken as altogether nine dramaturgical [*nāṭakam*] *cuvais*,<sup>88</sup> starting with [the *cuvai*] erotic love or *śṛṅgāra*.<sup>89</sup>

83 See Monius, ‘Many Lives of Daṇḍin,’ 14. See also Monius, *Imagining*, 219 n. 24: ‘Whereas Daṇḍin composes his own verse examples in the *Kāvyaḍarśa*, the *Vīracōḷiyam*’s commentator [Peruntēvaṅṅār departs from Dandin’s model of exposition when he] draws on [and cites] an existing body of Tamil poetry [as examples of the various ornaments (*alaṅkāram*)]. Monius, ‘Many Lives of Daṇḍin,’ 34 n. 35: ‘Is it possible that Peruntēvaṅṅār follows here the Kashmiri tradition of Abhinavagupta, who cites Sanskrit poetic works from the *Mahābhārata* to Kālidāsa’s *Kumārasambhava* in his commentary (*locana*) on the *Dhvanyāloka*?’ Monius (*Imagining*, 150) also suggests that Peruntēvaṅṅār, while departing from Daṇḍin, is ‘lend[ing] a particularly Buddhist tone to the set of poetic embellishments’.

84 In his commentary on VC verse 176 [*Alaṅkāram* section], p. 269, Peruntēvaṅṅār mentions the earlier Tamil works *Puṛaṅāṅūru*, *Kalittokai* and *Kuṟuntokai*.

85 Monius (‘Many Lives of Daṇḍin,’ 24) assumes three points: 1. That *cāntam* (Skt. *śānta*), the peaceful or quiescent, was ‘perhaps first introduced into Sanskrit literary theory by Buddhist and Jaina authors’, 2. That ‘there is little evidence to suggest that including *śānta* among the *rasa* [...] is a regional or “Tamil” tradition’, 3. ‘The inclusion of *cāntam* as the ninth of the *cuvai/raśa* thus seems to constitute an innovation on the part of the commentator [that is, Peruntēvaṅṅār]’, doing this ‘to accommodate the ideas and values of Buddhist literary culture, [whereby] grammatical and poetic theory becomes a means of expressing Buddhist sentiments’. Monius also considers the *Tirukkūṟaḷ*, cited in the VCC some 72 times, to demonstrate moral orientation and values (ibid., 25). – In later treatises and commentaries, the term *cāntam* is also called *natuvunilai* and *mattinam*.

86 For Peruntēvaṅṅār’s possible knowledge of Abhinavagupta’s discussion of a ninth *rasa*, see Monius, *Imagining*, 223 n. 79.

87 *Kāvyaḍarśa*, ed. Böhrling, 2.281–2.292 (pp. 69–71). Daṇḍin lists *rasa* as the eighteenth of his ornaments or embellishments.

88 These nine *cuvais* can all be communicated, since they can be seen.

89 As so often in the commentary on the *Vīracōḷiyam*, what follows (VCC ad 154, p. 214, ll. 15ff.) are quotations from the ethical *Tirukkūṟaḷ* (middle of the first millennium or somewhat later), vv.

The nine *cuvais* are:

erotic love (*cirun̄kāram*),<sup>90</sup> the heroic (*vīram*), terrified fear (*accam*), disgust (*iḷippu*), amazement (*viyappu*), the pathetic, sorrow (*avalam*), anger (*uruttiram*), the comic (*muṟukiya nakai*), quiescence (*cāntam*)<sup>91</sup> (VCC *ad* 170 [Alaṅkāram section], p. 257–58)<sup>92</sup>

1329 (chapter *ūṭal uvakai*, ‘Joy of sulking’) and 774 (chapter *paṭaic cerukku*, ‘Military might’) to explain the erotic and the heroic. For the erotic: *ūṭuka maṅṅō-v oliyilai yāmirappa nīṭuka maṅṅō-v irā. itu cirun̄kāram*. Paraphrased: ‘The bright-jewelled lady may sulk and the night may last long enough to conciliate her. This is the erotic.’ (*Tirukkuraḷ* v. 1329, adopted trans. M. Rajaram, *Tirukkuraḷ: Pearls of Inspiration* [New Delhi: Rupa Publications India Pvt. Ltd., 2009], 271). And for the heroic: *kaivēḷ kaḷiṟroṭu pōkki varupavaṅ meyvēḷ paṟiyā nakum. itu vīram*. ‘Hero who hurls the spear at a war-elephant smiles and draws another from his chest’ (v. 774, adopted trans. Rajaram, *ibid.*, 158). Following the two *Tirukkuraḷ* citations, a poetic composition (*ceyyuḷ*) is cited to demonstrate that erotic love leads to suffering. It exemplifies a lovesick woman’s mental and physical changes and her miserable state, in which ‘her dress (*kalai*) became loose (*nekiḷtal*), her hair (*kuḷal*) undone (*carital*), the bangles (*vaḷai*) came off (*kaḷatal; kaḷaṅru*), her nipples turned greenish (*pacantum; pacappu nīram*), she was not like before (*muṅ pōlāl*). [...] This is [called] \*change/transformation (*vikāram*)’ (VCC *ad* 154, p. 214: *kalaikā nekiḷntu kuḷaluṅ carintu vaḷaikaḷala mulaikāl pacantumūṅ pōlāl [...] itu \*vikāram*). – In a footnote (on \**vikāram*), Peruntēvaṅṅār, the commentator, cites an ‘older comment’ (*paḷaiya kuṟippu*) which lists, including the quiescent or *śānta*, the Sanskrit-derived lexis of nine *rasas* (aesthetic emotions): *cin̄kāram* (the erotic), *āciyam* (Skt. *hāsya*, the humourous), *karuṅai* (Skt. *karuṇa*, the pitiable), *iravuttiram* (Skt. *raudra*, the terrifying), *vīram* (the heroic), *payāṅakam* (the fearful), *cukuccai* (Skt. *jugupsā*, disgust), *arputam* (the wonderous), *cāntam* (the quiescent), and mentions the Sanskrit technical terms of the group of *bhāvas* (emotions): *vibhāva* (cause), *anubhāva* (reaction/effect) etc. – Further on, this ‘older comment’ defines ‘*meyp̄p̄ātu*’ and also the relationship between *meyp̄p̄ātu* (emotion) and *cuvai* (taste) as being one of a *meyp̄p̄ātu* → *cuvai* sequence (and not vice versa): *kāraṅakāriya uṭaiṅkaḷvu iyaipulla meyp̄p̄ātuḷkaḷār piṟantu veḷippaṭṭuc cantarppittu naṭaipeṟuvatē cuvaiyātalin̄, meyp̄p̄āṭṭiṅpālataḷkiya vikārat̄taic cuvai en̄retuttu kūṟiyatu kuṟṟaman̄ru [...] enpatu paḷaiya kuṟippu*. (‘Because of *meyp̄p̄ātus* [emotions] which are closely related [*iyaipulla*] to physical manifestation [*niḷkaḷvu*] and causal factor [*kāraṅam*], and since *cuvai* [lit. ‘taste’, Skt. *rasa*] comes into being [*piṟantu*] through *meyp̄p̄ātu*, and occurs [*naṭaipeṟutaḷ*] visibly and in [particular] contexts [*cantarppam*], it is not wrong [*kuṟṟam an̄ru*] to state that *cuvai* is an emotion (*meyp̄p̄ātu*)-based [*meyp̄p̄āṭṭin̄ pālataḷ*] transformation (*vikāram*) [...], thus states an old comment [*paḷaiya kuṟippu*]).

90 Monius suggests (in *Imagining*, 151) that the commentator on the VC, Peruntēvaṅṅār, gives his first *cuvai* *cirun̄kāram* (erotic love) a different meaning, namely, by highlighting with this *cuvai* ‘the pain and anguish of love [...] rather than its rapturous joys’, and by emphasising love as a source of human anguish (in direct contrast to Daṅḍin̄’s examples), *cirun̄kāram* receives a Buddhist tone.

91 Unlike the Sanskrit term *śṛṅgāra* (Tam. *cirun̄kāram*), which from the beginning was listed in Bharata’s Sanskrit *Nāṭyaśāstra* as the first of eight *rasas*, *cāntam* (quiescence) appears in Sanskrit treatises on *rasa* theory only from Abhinavagupta (c.1000), who introduced it as the ninth and most important *rasa*, adding it to the list of the canonical eight *rasas* (see above, and Pollock, *Rasa Reader*). Peruntēvaṅṅār, the commentator on the *Vīracōḷiyam*, quotes only one verse (318) of the *Tirukkuraḷ* as an example of the quiescent (*cāntamcuvai*); see below.

92 VCC *ad* 170, pp. 257–58 illustrates the nine *cuvais* with examples. Of these I shall only mention

If compared to his list of *meyppāṭus*, Peruntēvaṇār's list of *cuvais* contains significant differences. Its order is also different: although it begins with the erotic (Skt. *śṛṅgāra*) – as in his list of *meyppāṭus*<sup>93</sup> – it ends with a new ninth element, the quiescent (Skt. *cāntam*), a Sanskrit term we encounter here for the first time in a Tamil treatise on emotions. As Monius has suggested,<sup>94</sup> the inclusion of the quiescent must be considered an add-on of Peruntēvaṇār, who thus leaves the Daṇḍin model of poetic embellishment behind him.<sup>95</sup>

---

the most relevant for our discussion, namely the *cuvais* of erotic love, the heroic, disgust, and quiescence. For the *cuvai* erotic love (*cirukāram*), again v. 1329 of the *Tirukkuraḷ* is given; see translation in n. 89 above. The example of the heroic *cuvai* (*vīram*) turns the Caṅkam ideals of warring kings on its head (see also Monius, 'Many Lives of Daṇḍin,' 23f.) by demonstrating a king selflessly giving his own flesh equal in weight to the dove that took refuge in him. The poetic example wonders: Was it valour, integrity of character, fearlessness on the battlefield, or the king's nature? The heroic is here a 'heroic caretaker', offering a vision of a heroic ethic, lending a Buddhist value to the set of poetic ornaments. The example for the *cuvai* disgust is from verse 46 of the eighth-century moral treatise *Nālaṭiyār*, which advises imagining a beautiful woman as made up of blood and entrails, all ugly things that dry up desire: '(The body) is entrails, and marrow, and blood, and bone, and connecting tendons, and skin, and here and there flesh interposed, and fat. In the midst of these, what sort of a being is she who wears the fresh garlands?' (George U. Pope, *The Nālaṭiyār: or, Four Hundred Quatrains in Tamil* [Clarendon Press, 1893], 32, v. 46). The example of the *cuvai* quiescence (*cāntam*), as borrowed from the *Tirukkuraḷ*, reads like the 'Golden Rule' common to all world religions: 'The one who knows (*aṟivāṇ*) indeed (*tāṇ*) the distress/pain (*iṇṇāmai*) for one's own (*taṇ*) life (*uyirkku*), why would one cause misery/distress (*iṇṇā ceyal*) for another's (*maṟra*) life?' (*Tirukkuraḷ* v. 318).

93 VCC [Poruḷ section], p. 103, ll. 7–9.

94 Monius, *Imagining*, 150.

95 Daṇḍin's order 2.281–287 in his Sanskrit *Kāvyaḍarśa* is as follows: 1. *śṛṅgāra*, the erotic (281) [VCC 1]; 2. *raudra*, the furious (283) [VCC 7]; 3. *vīra*, the heroic (285) [VCC 2]; 4. *karuṇa*, the tragic\* (287) [VCC 6]; 5. *bībhatsa*, disgust (287) [VCC 4]; 6. *hāsyā*, the comic (287) [VCC 8]; 7. *adbhuta*, the wonderous (287) [VCC 5]; and 8. *bhayānaka*, terrified fear (287) [VCC 3]. (In square brackets, the numeration in the VCC ad 170). – In comparison to the VCC's *meyppāṭu* list, the VCC's *cuvai* list re-includes *uruttiram* (the furious, *TPMI vekuḷi*), and *avalam* replaces *irakkam* (VCC, 103, *TPMI aḷukai*). – \* Pollock (*Rasa Reader*, 27) states that translations such as 'compassion' or 'pity' for *karuṇa* in aesthetic discourses are misleading. *Karuṇa* in an aesthetic discourse denotes the 'sense of one's own loss' rather than pity for the misfortune of others. As he notes, the latter enters the discourse of Indian emotion only with Mahayana Buddhism (ibid., 27).

## *Meyp̄p̄ātu* upgraded and *cuvai* altered: The *Ceyirriyam*

The *Ceyirriyam* of Ceyirriyaṅār is a lost source text on drama. Iḷampūraṅar, the commentator on the *Tolkāppiyam*, cites it extensively.<sup>96</sup> It was written in the late eleventh or early twelfth century.<sup>97</sup>

### Core ideas

- The basis of the *Ceyirriyam* is dramatic performance (the domain of theatrical dramaturgy).
- There is an explicit theory of *cuvai* (Tam. lit. ‘taste’, a functional calque for Skt. *rasa*) (as opposed to the *Tolkāppiyam*, where any lexical or conceptual analogue to *cuvai* is completely absent).
- There is a *cuvai* called *mattimam* (quiescence, Skt. *śānta rasa*), which can only be experienced by sages, mendicants and the like.

*mattimam eṇpatu mācarat teriyir̄ | collap paṭṭa ellāc cuvaiyotu | pullātākiya polivir̄' eṇpa || (TPIḷam 245, p. 34, ll. 18–20)*

Should you wish to clearly know [*teriyin̄*] what *mattimam* is, they say [*eṇpa*] to be that which abounds in excellence [*polivu*], untouched [*pullāta*, lit. ‘not equal to’] by all [*ellām*] the other aforementioned [*collappaṭṭa*] *cuvais* (Trans. Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 124; square brackets, BS).

*nayanūtai marapiṅ itaṇpayam yāt'eṇir̄ | cettiyōrkkun cāntupaṭṭuppōrkkum | oppa nirkum nilaiy ir̄' eṇpa || (TPIḷam 245, p. 34, ll. 21–23)*

If we ask [*eṇin̄*], ‘what is the nature [*payam*] of this [*mattimam*], according to propriety [*nayan̄*] and tradition [*marapu*]?’ They say [*eṇpa*], ‘It is that enduring state [*nirkum nilai*] that can be likened [*oppa*] to that of those who are (so) inclined [*cettiyōr*] and of those who are endowed with sandalpaste and peace of mind (*cāntupaṭṭuppōr*).’<sup>98</sup>

*uyppōr itaṇai yār eṇin̄ mikkatu | payakkun tāpatar cāraṅar camaṅar | kayakk' ar̄u muṇivar ar̄ivarōṭu pīrarun | kāmam vekuḷi mayakkam nīṅkiya | vāymaiyāḷar vakuttaṅar pīrarum | accuvai eṭṭum avarkk' ila ātaliṅ | \*iccuvai*

96 For the reconstruction of Ceyirriyaṅār’s thoughts, we depend entirely on the citations provided by Iḷampūraṅar in his commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam*.

97 Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 152, states: ‘We can with some confidence argue that the [...] composition of the *Ceyirriyam* [...] may be located within a still wider world of sāstric Tamil writing, which was evidently far more heterogeneous than those works to which we still have access [...]’

98 I follow the translation of Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 124; square brackets BS. My reading deviates slightly from the translation of Cox. He translates *cāntupaṭṭuppōr* as ‘those possessing the right qualities’.

*orutalai*<sup>99</sup> *ātaḷiṅ atanaḷi* | *meyttalaip paṭukka itaṅ mikav aṛintōrē* || (TPIḷam 245, p. 34, ll. 24–31) Cox: \**iccuvai*] conj.; *accuvai* Ed.

If we ask, ‘who are the actor-characters<sup>100</sup> [*uyppōr*] [who manifest] this [*mattimam*]?’ Those who practice great *tapas* [*tāpatar*], those who have attained magical power [*cāraṇar*, *siddhas*], Jain ascetics [*camaṇar*], and sages who cut away ignorance [*muṇivar*], and others [*piṛar*], such as the Buddhists, men of truth, who renounce [*nīṅkutaḷ*] desire [*kāmam*], anger [*vekuḷi*], and delusion [*mayakkam*], the devout [*vakuttaṇar*] and [still] others [*piṛar*]. For them, none of these eight *cuvais* [truly] exist and so, when this *cuvai* [*ex conj.*] being of a different sort, makes that [other] one appear real [*meyttalaip paṭukka*], these are [the kind of men who] truly comprehend [*mikav aṛintōrē*] this (Trans. Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 125; added square brackets with Tamil words BS).

Cox’s explanation (125f.) is valuable with regard to the unique characteristic of the *cuvai mattinam*: ‘the regular *cuvais* [...] do not exist for these adepts (saint etc.). The ninth *cuvai*, *mattinam*, inasmuch as it is qualitatively different from the rest (*orutalai*, lit. on one side) can only be experienced by these kinds of men, insofar as they alone are able to genuinely comprehend that *mattimam* manifests (*paṭukka*) the true nature or reality (*meyttal*) of any other *cuvai*.’<sup>101</sup>

- d. Two loci for *cuvai* are given, as well as ten bodily expressions (*cattuvam*).

The following quotations are not directly attributed by ḷampūraṇar to Ceyirriyaṅār, but it is very likely that they are from him:<sup>102</sup>

99 Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 126 n. 14 interprets Ceyirriyaṅār’s usage of *orutalai* ‘to imply that *mattimam* exists on its own on one side of a posited divide within the set of *cuvais*, with the other eight classed together’.

100 If we assume that *uyppor* means ‘character of a drama’ [Skt. *nāyaka*]), as proposed in Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 125 n. 11. See also Cānti Cātaṅā’s *Glossary of Historical Tamil Literature*, s.v., *uyppōṅ* < *ceyppavaṅ*, actor.

101 According to Cox (‘From Source-Criticism,’ 126f.), this has been borrowed from Abhinavagupta’s *Abhinavabhāratī*. Cox – while granting that there are ‘indeed other southern attestations of the *śāntarasa*-concept’ – sees in the *Ceyirriyam* ‘a direct echo’ of the ‘language’ of Abhinavagupta’s *Abhinavabhāratī* (127). As Cox states (128f.): ‘The crucial phrase here [TPIḷam 245, p. 34, ll. 24–31, BS], *meyttalaip paṭukka*, reproduces Abhinava’s participle as a verbal noun (*meyttal* “being true”, in the second case) and an imperfective participle or so-called “infinitive” (*paṭukka*, “to bring about”) based on the effective (or “transitive”/“causative”) stem of the root *paṭu*. It is here where I believe the influence of Abhinava’s text is most clear [...] [l]eaving aside [...] the] conceptual problem [...] due to] a fundamental misunderstanding of Abhinavagupta’s aesthetics of reception’ (129). Cox is convinced that Ceyirriyaṅār ‘was not entirely successful in either understanding or in translating Abhinava’s theory’ (127), a theory that brought a new aesthetics of reception, and that Ceyirriyaṅār ‘was evidently trying to maintain the conventional notion of *śāntarasa* – that it is possible to successfully depict the spiritual exercises of literary characters [...]’ (127).

102 See also Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 130 n. 22.

On the two loci of *cuvai*:

*iruvakai nilattiṅ iyalvatu cuvaiyē* (TPIḷam 245, p. 34, l. 36)

*Cuvai* occurs in two types of locus (Trans. Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 130)

And on the arising of bodily expression or *cattuvam*:

[...] *cuvaiyē* [...] | *oṇṛiya nikaḷcci cattuvam eṇpa* (TPIḷam 245, p. 34, ll. 38–39)

[There is] the *cuvai* itself [...] the corresponding [*oṇṛutal*] occurrence [*nikaḷcci*], they say [*eṇpa*], is *cattuvam* or bodily expression.<sup>103</sup>

A list containing ten types of external visible bodily signs or *cattuvams* is given.<sup>104</sup>

e. There is the term *meypṇāṭu* – There is an actor, there is a viewer.

*uyppōṇ ceytatu kāṇpōrkḱ’ eytutal | meypṇāṭ’ eṇpa meyyuṇarn tōre* (TPIḷam 247, p. 35, ll. 25–26)

Those with true understanding (*meyyuṇarntōr*) regard *meypṇāṭu* as the actor’s acting (*uyppōṇ ceytatu*) attaining meaning for the viewers (*kāṇpōr*).<sup>105</sup>

## The *meypṇāṭu* theory expanded and *cuvai* consolidated: Iḷampūraṇar on the *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram Meypṇāṭṭiyal*

Iḷampūraṇar’s commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam meypṇāṭu* chapter dates to the late eleventh century (or a few decades later[?]).<sup>106</sup> Iḷampūraṇar is quoted by the scholiast

103 ‘[There is] the existing *cuvai* [...] the corresponding occurrence is called the *cattuvam*’ (Trans. Cox, ‘From Source Criticism,’ 130).

104 Cox, ‘From Source Criticism,’ 130. The functional term *cattuvam* is mentioned in Iḷampūraṇar’s commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam*, TPIḷam 245: *cattuvam eṇpatu cārruṅ kālai | meymmayir cilirtal kaṇṇīr vārtal | naṭukkaṅ kaṭuttal viyarittal tēṇṇam | koṭuṅkuraṅ cūtaivoṭu niralpaṭa vanta | patteṇa moḷip cattuvan tāṇē*. ‘There are ten *cattuvams*, which come in the [following] order [*niralpaṭa vanta*]: horripilation, shedding tears, trembling, [...]’ The list does not seem complete and deviates from the list in Aṭiyārkkū Nallār’s commentary on the *Cilappatikāram* (see ch. 2 below, s.v. Aṭiyārkkū Nallār, point h, footnote. In the Sanskrit *Nāṭyaśāstra* (*Treatise on Drama*), ch. 6, there are eight: paralysis, perspiration, horripilation, change of voice, trembling, change of colour, weeping, and fainting.

105 Cf. Cox’s translation: ‘Those who understand the truth of the matter say that *meypṇāṭu* is the taking up by the spectators of the actions of the leading character [*uyppōṇ*]’ (‘From Source-Criticism,’ 131).

106 This commentary is referred to here as TPIḷam. – On Iḷampūraṇar’s commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam*, which displays an ‘independent departure’ from the root-text, see Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 121. On the commentator’s style and avoidance of Sanskrit-derived lexis, see Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 134. Iḷampūraṇar had a wide knowledge of his tradition,

Aṭiyārkkū Nallār (closing decades of twelfth century), who refers to the earlier scholar with the honorific title *uraiyācīriyarākiya ilampūraṇavaṭikaḷ*, ‘the revered Ilampūraṇar, author of the commentary.’<sup>107</sup>

### Core ideas

a. The problem of defining the root-text’s term *paṇṇai* (MI 1).

For Ilampūraṇar, the term *paṇṇai* denotes a domain where elements appear that do not appear among wise men.

*paṇṇait tōṇriya enpatu – viḷaiyāṭṭāyāt tinkaṇ tōṇriya. paṇṇaiyuṭaiyatu paṇṇai enrāyirru.* (TPIḷam 245, p. 33, ll. 11–12).

‘*Paṇṇai tōṇriya*’ means appearing (*tōṇrutal*) in the play group (*viḷaiyāṭṭu āyam*). *Paṇṇai* stands for play and the domain of play (*paṇṇaiyuṭaiyatu*).<sup>108</sup>

*īṇṭuc collappaṭukinra patiṇāru poruḷum karru nalloḷukku oḷukum arivuṭaiyār avaiḱkaṇ tonrāmaiṅār ‘paṇṇait tonriya’ enrār. enṅai? Nakaikkuk kāraṇamākiya eḷḷal avarkaṇ tonrāmaiṅiṇ. Piṇavum aṅṅa.* (TPIḷam 245, p. 33, ll. 22–25).

He [the author Tolkāppiyaṅār] said that all sixteen of the elements (*poruḷ*) mentioned here ‘appear in the domain of play/entertainment’<sup>109</sup> (*paṇṇai tōṇriya*), as they do not appear in the assembly (*avai*) of wise men (*arivuṭaiyār*) who possess good conduct and learning. Why is that? Because mockery (*eḷḷal*), which causes laughter (*nakai*), does not appear among those [wise ones]. It is the same with others (*piṇavum aṅṅa*).

Interestingly, Pēracīriyar, the second commentator on the root-text’s emotionology (early thirteenth century), places *paṇṇai* unequivocally into the context of court theatre.<sup>110</sup>

b. There is *cuvai*, there is *meypṇāṭu*, and there is a relationship between the two.

---

respected existing views, and did not restrict himself to paraphrase and explication, as commentaries for the most part usually do, but rather discussed his root-text in ways that reflect the changed historical circumstances.

107 Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 116, which refers to Mu. Varatarācaṅ, *Tamiḷ ilakkiya varalāru*. [vol. 4] *patiṇorām nūrrāṅṭu* (Chennai: The Parker, repr., 2005), 161, 164. See also Wilden, *Manuscript*, 298.

108 For *paṇṇai*, see also the detailed footnote in the discussion on the *Tolkāppiyam*, see ch. 2, *Meypṇāṭu* source readings above, s.v. *Tolkāppiyam*, point a.

109 Cf. Cox, who translates *paṇṇai tōṇriya* as ‘appear in the field’: ‘[The author] said that all sixteen of the elements mentioned here “appear in the field”, as they do not appear in the assemblies of wise men, who possess proper conduct and learning. Why is this? Because *eḷḷal* (mocking laughter), which is a cause of *nakai* (or humor), does not appear among these men. And there are other cases that are similar to this.’ (‘From Source-Criticism,’ 120)

110 See below, *Meypṇāṭu* source readings, s.v. Pēracīriyar, translation point a.

- c. An explicit model of *cuvai* (lit. ‘taste’, Skt. *rasa*) is given (as opposed to the *Tolkāppiyam*, where any lexical or conceptual analogue to *cuvai* is completely absent).

*Cuvai: Terms and their definition*

For Iḷampūraṇar, *cuvai* is the following:

*iṇic cuvai eṇpatu kāṇappaṭu poruḷār kāṇpōrakattiṇ varuvat’ oru vikāram*  
(*TPIḷam* 245, p. 34, ll. 34–35)

Hereafter, *cuvai* denotes the transformation/change (*vikāram*) that happens in the beholders’ (*kāṇpōr*)<sup>111</sup> mind (*akam*) through the object (*poruḷ*) of perception (*kāṇappaṭutal*).<sup>112</sup>

*puliyum pēyūm [...] avaraṇaik kaṇṭa kālantoṭṭu nīṅkātu niṇra accam cuvai*  
(*TPIḷam* 245, p. 35, ll. 10–11)

The *Cuvai* of fear (*accam*) is that which does not go away (*nīṅkātu*) but continues (*niṇra*) from the time (*kālantoṭṭu*) that one sees these [...] a tiger or a ghost.<sup>113</sup>

Also described is the mechanism of *cuvai*’s emergence. *Cuvai* appears as a conjunction of:

1. An ‘object that is tasted’ (causal factor)<sup>114</sup> or *cuvaiṇṇaṭu poruḷ*.<sup>115</sup>  
Elsewhere Iḷampūraṇar calls this ‘cause’, *ētu* (*TPIḷam* 245, p. 35, l. 10) or *kāranam* (*TPIḷam* 248, p. 36, l. 17);
2. A ‘feeling/response of the mind’ or *kuṛippu* – a strictly cognitive phenomena (*maṇa nikaḷcci*);<sup>116</sup>
3. Bodily expression or *cattuvam*, such as trembling (*naṭukkam*) with fear.<sup>117</sup>

111 *Kaṇpōr* does not necessarily denote a spectator of a drama, but merely someone who sees a scene.

112 Cf. the translation of Cox: ‘Now, *cuvai* is the name for the change that occurs in the awareness of the spectators, which arises due to some perceived element’ (‘From Source-Criticism,’ 130).

113 For a translation, see also Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 130f. The examples of tiger and ghost are adopted by Perācīriyar, as already noted by Cox, *ibid.*, 130.

114 *accattirku ētuvākiya puliyum pēyūm cuvaiṇṇaṭu poruḷ* (*TPIḷam* 245, p. 35, l. 10), ‘[Fear is the *cuvai*]. A tiger or a ghost (*pēy*), which becomes the cause (*ētu*) of fear (*accam*), is the object/causal factor of the *cuvai* [fear]’.

115 Iḷampūraṇar is evidently pointing to the concept that an affective quality belongs to the object. Cf. Pollock, ‘Bhoja’s,’ 122, which expresses the same concept.

116 A *kuṛippu* of fear is, for instance, bewilderment (*mayakkam*) (*TPIḷam* 245, p. 35, ll. 11–12). *Kuṛippu* happens cognitively in the mind, whereas *cattuvam* is visible to others. This distinction is made in texts on drama: *naṭukkamum [...] piṇarukkum pulāṇāvaṇa eṇru kolka; ēṇaiya maṇa nikaḷcci [...] ivarriṇ piṇivai nāṭaka nūḷiṇ kāṅka*. (*TPIḷam* 245, p. 35, ll. 13–14).

117 The definition of *cattuvam* is given by citing another authority, very likely Ceyirriyaṇār: *cuvaiyē [...] | oṇriya nikaḷcci cattuvam eṇpa*. ‘[There is] the *cuvai* itself [...] the corresponding occurrence, they say, is *cattuvam* or bodily expression.’ (*TPIḷam* 245, p. 34, ll. 38–39). For the list of



There are two loci of *cuvai*. Ṭampūraṇar cites Ceyirriyaṇār:

‘*iruvakai nilattiṇ iyalvatu cuvaiyē*’ (TPIṭam 245, p. 34, l. 36)

‘Cuvai occurs in two types of locus.’

- d. There is a ninth *cuvai naṭuvunilaimai* (< *śānta-rasa*, the quiescent), first introduced and then rejected. (There is no *cuvai* in the root-text).

Ṭampūraṇar (on the basis of the drama-focused *Ceyirriyam*) introduces a ninth *cuvai*, *naṭuvunilaimai*, along with its respective *kuṛippu*, but then excludes this ninth candidate from consideration, although he continues to refer to it throughout his further presentation.<sup>118</sup> His argument for excluding this ninth *cuvai* is that it does not pertain to worldly practice (*vaḷakku*). *Naṭuvunilaimai* is equivalent to ceasing all outward action.

*cuvaiyum kuṛippum. vīram, accam, iḷippu, viyappu, kāmam, avalam, uruttiram, nakai, naṭuvunilaimai eṇrum, vīrakkurippu, accak kuṛippu [...]* *naṭuvunilaimaik kuṛippu eṇrum collappaṭṭa patineṭṭiṇum naṭuvunilaimaiyum ataṇ kuṛippum oḷittu eṇaiya patinārumām.* (TPIṭam 245, p. 33, ll. 28–29, p. 34, ll. 1–4)

The *cuvai*<sup>119</sup> and its [respective] *kuṛippu*<sup>120</sup> are: the heroic (*vīram*), fear (*accam*), disgust (*iḷippu*), amazement (*vīyappu*), erotic love (*kāmam*), sorrow (*avalam*), anger (*uruttiram*), laughter (*nakai*), quiescent (*naṭuvunilaimai*) [as *cuvai*] and [as *kuṛippu*:] the heroic feeling in the mind (*vīrakkurippu*), the fearful feeling in the mind (*accak kuṛippu*) [...] the quiescent feeling in the mind (*naṭuvunilaimai kuṛippu*). If we omit the quiescent *cuvai* and its *kuṛippu* (feeling in the mind) from these eighteen, we arrive at sixteen.

*kāmam eṇiṇum ciruṅkāram eṇiṇum okkum. [...]* *Uruttiram eṇiṇum vekuliṇ eṇiṇum okkum. Naṭuvunilaimai eṇiṇum mattimam eṇiṇum cāntam eṇiṇum okkum.* (TPIṭam 245, p. 34, ll. 5–8)

There is an agreement [in sense] between [the terms] *kāmam* [Skt.] and *ciruṅkāram* [Skt. *śṛṅgāra*] [...] There is an agreement [in sense] between [the terms] *uruttiram* [Skt. *raudra*] and *vekuḷi*. There is an agreement [in sense] between [the terms] *naṭuvunilaimai* [lit. ‘the state of standing in the middle’],

---

ten bodily expressions that Ṭampūraṇar cites as *cārporuḷ* as ‘supporting material for his arguments’, see *ibid.*, p. 35, ll. 1ff.

118 See also Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 122.

119 Interestingly, Ṭampūraṇar is nearly in accord with the sequence of the list in VCC *ad* 170 [Alaṅkāram section], pp. 257–58 (see also above), rather than with the root-text *Tolkāppiyam*. The VCC mentions *śṛṅgāra* (erotic love) first; TPIṭam lists *kāmam* (synonym for erotic love) as the fifth *cuvai*.

120 The functional term *kuṛippu* does not mean the same in the *Vīracōliyam* as in TPIṭam 245.

*mattimam* [Skt. *madhyama*, middle] and *cāntam* [Skt. *śānta*). (Trans. Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 123, with additional translation, BS).

*naṭuvunilaimaiy enpatu yāt’ onrāṇum vikārappaṭāmai* (TPIḷam 245, p. 34, ll. 14–15)

The state of remaining utterly unaffected or undisturbed (*vikārappaṭāmai*) by any sort [of stimulus] whatsoever is called *naṭuvunilaimai*.<sup>121</sup>

*mattimam enpataṇai īṇṭu oḷittatu enṇai yeṇiṇ* (TPIḷam 245, p. 34, l. 16–17)

If we ask why it is that *mattimam* is excluded? [It is because of its non-worldly quality as described in the *Ceyirriyam* citation.]<sup>122</sup>

- e. There is no distinction between artistic representation and real life.<sup>123</sup>  
There is no categorical border between the terms *cuvai* and *meypṭāṭu* as found in Sanskrit *rasa* theory, where a stringent difference is made between *rasa* and *bhāva*, that is, aesthetic emotion and ordinary real-world emotion.
- f. There is *meypṭāṭu*.  
*Meypṭāṭu* is defined as emotion, externalised by bodily reactions/expression and visible for the viewer. To define *meypṭāṭu*, ḷampūraṇar cites *Ceyirriyaṇār*’s lost work on drama:

‘*uyppōṇ ceytatu kāṇpporkk’ eytatal | meypṭāṭ’ enpa meyyuṇarntōrē*’ (TPIḷam 247, p. 35, ll. 25–26)

‘Those with true understanding (*meyyuṇarntōr*) regard *meypṭāṭu* as the actor’s action (*uyppōṇ ceytatu*) attaining meaning for the beholders (*kāṇpōr*).’<sup>124</sup>

He then explains the citation as follows:

*enac ceyirriyaṇār oṭutaliṇ accamurāṇmāṭṭu nikaḷum accam avanmāṭṭuc cattuvattiṇār purappaṭṭuk kāṇpōrkkup pulanāḷkun taṇmai meypṭāṭ’ enak koḷḷappaṭum* (TPIḷam 247, p. 35, ll. 27–29)

121 Cf. also trans. Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 123. This statement regarding quiescence (*naṭuvunilaimai*) is mentioned in the context of introducing the objects/stimuli that cause *cuvai*, such as, for instance, anger caused by disrespect (*uruttiram enpatu avamatippāl pīrappatu*; p. 34, l. 13).

122 For a translation of the citation in TPIḷam, see above under *Ceyirriyam* (*Meypṭāṭu* source readings).

123 See Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 131, 136, 146.

124 Cf. trans. Cox: ‘Those who understand the truth of the matter say that *meypṭāṭu* is the taking up by the spectators of the actions of the leading character [*uyppōṇ*].’ (‘From Source-Criticism,’ 131).

As Ceyirriyaṅār says, the fear that occurs (*nikaḷum accam*) in (*māṭṭu*) a fearful person (*accamuṟṟāṅ*) and in (*māṭṭu*) him (*avaṅ*) being externalised (*puṟappaṭu-tal*) through bodily expression (*cattuvam*), and by its nature (*taṅmai*) becoming perceptible for the beholders, this is what to be understood by *meypṭāṭu*.<sup>125</sup>

g. There are eight basic and thirty-two auxiliary *meypṭāṭus*.

In additional to the eight basic *meypṭāṭus* (first list), there are thirty-two *meypṭāṭus* (second list), among which is *naṭuvunilaimai*, explained in *TPIḷam* 256, p. 44, as ‘a state of mind (*maṅa nikaḷcci*) that occurs when the mind is not wandering to one side’ (*naṭuvunilaimaiyāvatu oru maruṅku ḍāṭu nikaḷum maṅa nikaḷcci*), this supported by the *Tirukkuraḷ* verse 118.<sup>126</sup> Compare ḷampūraṅār’s long discussion on *naṭuvunilaimai* as the ninth *cuvai* (Skt. *rasa*), discussed above, that he first included and then excluded.

h. *Meypṭāṭu* is a limb of poetry creating ‘taste’.

ḷampūraṅār is only interested in the production of text-internal communication, since he speaks of poetic compositions through which *meypṭāṭu* can be tasted (*cuvai*). There is little to support a concern with the *meypṭāṭu* of the reader.<sup>127</sup>

*meyyiṅkaṅ tōṅrutaliṅ meypṭāṭ’ āyirru. aṅtēl, ivvilakkaṅam kūttiṅṭuṭ payaṅpaṭal uṅṭātalīṅ iṅṭu vēṅtāv eṅiṅ, iṅṭuṅ ceyyūṭ ceyyūṅkāṟ cuvaiṭaṭaṭ ceyya vēṅṭutaliṅ iṅṭuṅ kūṟa vēṅṭum eṅka.* (*TPIḷam* 247, p. 35, ll. 29–32)

It became (*āyirru*) [known as] *meypṭāṭu* because it comes into existence (*tōṅrutal*) in (*kaṅ*) the body (*mey*). If we conceive (*uṅṭātal*) this definition (*ilakkaṅam*) to be of use (*payaṅpaṭal*) in the case of dramatic performance (*kūttu*), will it not be required here (*iṅṭu vēṅtām*) [in the non-dramatic genre of poetry]? If asking so (*eṅiṅ*),<sup>128</sup> one should reply (*eṅka*) that here in the case of poetic composition (*ceyyūṭ ceyyūṅkāḷ*), too, it ought to be asserted (*iṅṭuṅ kūṟa vēṅṭum*), since it is relevant (*vēṅṭutal*) to make it tasteful (*cuvaiṭaṭal*).<sup>129</sup>

125 Cf. the translation of Cox: ‘When a man experiences fear, and that fear, as represented by his words, is made manifest through his [further?] words and physical reactions, and is thereby made visible to the specators, the nature of this is what we should understand by *meypṭāṭu*.’ (‘From Source-Criticism,’ 131).

126 *Tirukkuraḷ* 118: *camaṅceyṭu cīrtūkkūṅ kōḷpōḷ amaintorupār | kōṭāmai cāṅṟōrk kaṅi*, ‘The balance (*camaṅceyṭu*) not inclined to one side, that is the ornament (*aṅi*) of the noble (*cāṅṟōr*) minded.’

127 In the Sanskrit debate, Bhoja (eleventh century) was uninterested in the *rasa* of the reader, whereas the influential philosopher Abhinavagupta (c.1000) wrote about the process of *rasa* being produced in the reader.

128 ḷampūraṅār both asks the question and provides the answer.

129 Cf. the translation of Cox: ‘[...] “it has been [called] *meypṭāṭu* because it occurs in the body”; since this definition is applicable in the case of dramatic performance, should it be accepted here [i.e. when we are concerned with non-dramatic genres]? [In response to this] one should reply

[...] [this is said on the basis of the statement of Tolkāppiyānār, who] declares *meyp̄pātu* to be a limb (*uruppu*) of poetry/verse composition (*ceyyuḷ*):<sup>130</sup>

‘uyttuṇarv’ *inri talaivarum poruṇmaiḷ | meyp̄pāta muṭippatu meyp̄pāt’ ākum*’ (citation of *Tolkāppiyam* 505 [Ceyyuliyal 196])<sup>131</sup>

‘Which, without any conscious reflection [*uyttuṇartal*] succeeds [*muṭippatu*] in becoming real [*meyp̄pātutal*] through [the depiction of] its subject matter [*poruṇmai*], becomes [known as] *meyp̄pātu*.’ (Trans. Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 132; additions in square brackets BS)<sup>132</sup>

i. *Meyp̄pātu–cuvai* complex (absent in the root-text).

In the relationship between *meyp̄pātu* and *cuvai*, *cuvai* leads to *meyp̄pātu*.<sup>133</sup>

ḷampūraṇar argues that *meyp̄pātu* (emotion) arises (*piṛappatu*) from *cuvai* (Skt. *rasa*).

*nakai enpatu ikaḷcciyil piṛappatu [...]. Uvakai ciruṅkārattil piṛappatu.* (*TPIḷam* 247, p. 36, ll. 5–9).<sup>134</sup>

---

that in this case too it ought to be accepted, since when we are formulating rules of poetic composition it is accepted that [*meyp̄pātu*] is something that can be savored: bear in mind that this author [i.e. Tolkāppiyānār] declares *meyp̄pātu* also to be an element of verse composition, [when he teaches in *Ceyyuliyal*, *cū*. 192:]. “Something that is represented which, without any conscious reflection, succeeds in becoming real through [the depiction of] its subject matter, becomes [known as] *meyp̄pātu*.” (‘From Source-Criticism,’ 132).

130 *TPIḷam* 247, p. 36, ll. 3–4, literary: *ēṇa ivvāciriyaṇ* [this author] *meyp̄pātum ceyyuḷ uruppu ēṇa ḍiṇṇamai* (*ḍutal*, say) *uṇarka*.

131 Citing *Tolkāppiyam* (*muḷvatum*), ed. and comm. Puliyūr Kēcikaṅ (Chennai: Pāri Nilaiyam, 2012), 481. Also cited in *TPIḷam* 247; note that there, *poruḷiṇ* is found rather than *poruṇmaiḷiṇ*.

132 A paraphrase might read: ‘Rendering the quintessence comprehensible without conscious reflection is *meyp̄pātu*.’ My full translation: ‘*Meyp̄pātu* is that which succeeds (*muṭippatu*) in revealing (*meyp̄pātutal*) the [poem’s] key-(*talaivarum*)-subject matter (*poruṇmai*) or its inherent meaning [straightforward] without (*inri*) any conscious reflection (*uyttuṇartal*) [by the listener/reader].’ Cf. also the translation of Tamiḷaṇṇal: ‘[*Meyp̄pātu*] is manifestation of meaning powerfully communicated by the poet in his poem which discloses its subject-matter very easily and simple to the reader.’ (Tamiḷaṇṇal, *Tolkāppiyariṇ ilakkiyak koḷkaikal*, 151 [1460]). See also the translation in Manuel, ‘*Meyp̄pātu*,’ 134: ‘When the emotion to be expressed is revealed without much difficulty or introspection through the material in the poem it is *meyp̄pātu*’; Manuel also adds: ‘I.e. the poem should be so constructed that the basic *meyp̄pātu* underlying it is perceived without much difficulty.’

133 Cf. the Tamil *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*’s (mid-twelfth century) unidirectional *meyp̄pātu*-turns-into-*cuvai* [*rasa*] doctrine, *Meyp̄pātu* source readings below, s.v. *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*, point c.

134 Is disparagement (*ikaḷcci*) to be interpreted here as a causal factor (*cuvai* *piṛappatu* *poruḷ*), see above s.v. ḷampūraṇar, point c) of laughter? Noteworthy, in the *Vīracōḷiyam*, p. 103, contempt (*ikaḷvu*) is listed as a cause of laughter. See also (*TPIḷam* 247, p. 36, ll. 5–9): *aḷukai* [= *meyp̄pātu*] *enpatu avalattil* [= *cuvai*] *piṛappatu*. | *iḷivaral* [= *meyp̄pātu*] *iḷippil* [= *cuvai*] *piṛappatu*. | *maruḷkai* [= *meyp̄pātu*] *viyappil* [= *cuvai*] *piṛappatu*. | *accam* [= *meyp̄pātu* and *cuvai*] *aṅcat takuvaṇavarāḷ piṛappatu*. | *perumitam* [= *meyp̄pātu*] *vīrattil* [= *cuvai*] *piṛappatu*. | *vekuḷi*

Laughter (*nakai*) [*meyp̄p̄ātu*] arises from detraction/ disparagement (*ikalcci*). [...] Joy (*uvakai*) [*meyp̄p̄ātu*] arises from erotic love (*ciruṅkāram/kāmam*) [*cuvai*/Skt. *rasa*].

As Cox rightly remarks, the question of what arise from what or a mutually constitutive had been already discussed in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, and clarified in favour of ‘*rasas* may be said to arise from *bhāvas*’, and not the opposite. The unidirectional *bhāva*-leads-to-*rasa* doctrine is also defended by Abhinavagupta.<sup>135</sup> The *Tolkāppiyam* root-text did not have to face this problem, since it did not deal with the functional term *cuvai* (Skt. *rasa*). This is exactly the problem Ṇampūraṇar had trouble dealing with in his attempt to fit the new medieval *rasa* theory to the *meyp̄p̄ātu* root-text of a much earlier time period.

## Figures of speech at centre stage: The *Taṅṭiyalaṅkāram*

This anonymous text of the mid-twelfth century(?) is an independent treatise. It is a translation and interpretation of Daṇḍin’s *Kāvyaḍarśa* (c.700 CE), a text important to the emergence of vernacular South Asian literatures.<sup>136</sup> As Monius has stated, one can assume that the *Taṅṭiyalaṅkāram* (similar to the *Viracoliyam*) had ‘an audience of literary connoisseurs well versed in the poetics of the Caṅkam anthologies’.<sup>137</sup> The *Taṅṭiyalaṅkāram* often prefers Tamil translations of Sanskrit wording, rather than transliterations.

### Core ideas

#### a. *Cuvai* as a figure of speech (*cuvaiyaṅi*) in narrative poetry.

This treatise has no category other than figuration under which to theorise the phenomenon of *cuvai* in poetry. *Cuvai* is not the dominant feature of a literary work, but rather one among a larger group of features.<sup>138</sup>

---

[= *meyp̄p̄ātu*] *verukkat takkaṇavarṛāl p̄irappatu*. ‘Weeping (*aḷukai*) arises from sorrow, the pathetic (*avalam*). Disgust (*iḷivaraḷ*) arises from disgust/contemptuous treatment (*iḷippu*). Amazement (*maruṭkai*) arises from the wonder (*viyappu*). Fear (*accam*) arises through fear instilling things (*aṅcat takuvaṇavarṛāl*). Excellence/greatness/pride (*perumitam*) arises from the heroic/bravery (*vīram*). Anger (*vekuḷi*) arises through things worth hating or loathing (*verukkat takkaṇavarṛāl*).’ In the cases of fear and anger, the causal factor is given instead of the *cuvai*.

135 Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 135.

136 See Monius, ‘Many Lives of Daṇḍin,’ 2, 10; Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 133.

137 I cite Monius, ‘Many Lives of Daṇḍin,’ 12. As Monius (ibid., 15) has noted, it was the *Taṅṭiyalaṅkāram* that offered (similar to *Kāvyaḍarśa* 1.14–18) the first Tamil definition of ‘great poetry’ (*mahākāvya*, Tam. *peruṅkāppiyam*), which was to evoke the four human aims, one being emotional experience (*cuvaiyum pāvamum*, Skt. *rasa* and *bhāva*).

138 On Daṇḍin, see Pollock, *Rasa Reader*.

*uṇṇikal taṇmai purattut tōṇra | eṇvakai meyppāṭṭiṇ iyalvatu cuvaiyē.*  
(*Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram, Poruḷaṇi Chapter (iyal), ch. 18, v. 68*)<sup>139</sup>

*Cuvai* is constituted (*iyal*) by the eight *meyppāṭṭus* that make circumstances (*taṇmai*) occurring (*nikaḷ*) inside (*uḷ*) [the mind-heart] outwardly (*puram*) manifest (*tōṇrutal*).<sup>140</sup>

- b. There is *meyppāṭṭu*, there is *cuvai*.  
The intrinsic peculiar states that become visible on the outside are the eightfold classified *meyppāṭṭus*, which turn into *cuvai*, an aesthetic basic tone.
- c. Unidirectional doctrine of *meyppāṭṭu*-leads-to-*cuvai*[/*rasa*].  
There is a functional identity between Tamil *meyppāṭṭu* and Sanskrit *bhāva* (emotion)<sup>141</sup>
- d. There are eight *cuvais*.  
(1) the heroic (*vīram*), (2) fear (*accam*); (3) disgust (*iḷippu*); (4) amazement (*viyappu*); (5) erotic love (*kāmam*); (6) the pathetic, sorrow (*avalam*); (7) fury, anger (*uruttiram*); (8) laughter (*nakai*)<sup>142</sup>
- e. *Cuvai* as a phenomenon inherent in a text, a formal feature related to the characters in the text.

### Visualisation of literature: Aṭiyārkkū Nallār's commentary on the *Cilappatikāram*

The scholiast Aṭiyārkkū Nallār's commentary on the famous narrative poem (*kāppiyam*) *Cilappatikāram* is a dramaturgical essay. Written in the closing decades of the twelfth century, it gathers various heterogeneous sources that the author adduces and uses as references. The style reflects a new type of scholarly Tamil prose.<sup>143</sup> Aṭiyārkkū Nallār relies on the *Ceyyiriyam* in his technical dramaturgical glosses on *Cilappatikāram* 1.3, 101, and 125–128.<sup>144</sup> Aṭiyārkkū Nallār mentions Iḷampūraṇar and the *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram* by name.<sup>145</sup>

139 *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*, ed. Irāmacuppīramāṇiyam and Caṇmukam Piḷḷai.

140 Cf. the Sanskrit treatises, beginning with the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, where it is *sthāyibhāva* that gives rise to *rasa*. See also the translation of Cox: 'Cuvai is constituted by the eight *meyppāṭṭus*, making outwardly manifest conditions present in the mind' ('From Source-Criticism,' 133 n. 29).

141 On this argument, see Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 133 n. 29; *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram* 2.68.

142 The same order as found in Iḷampūraṇar's commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam*.

143 See, Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 123 n. 10.

144 See, Cox, 'From Source-Criticism,' 123 n. 10.

145 On references to Iḷampūraṇar, see *Meyppāṭṭu* source readings above, s.v. Iḷampūraṇar. – Aṭiyārkkū Nallār refers to the *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram* 70 (p. 137) when listing the gesture of the *cuvai uruttiram* (anger) (*uruttiraccuvai-y-avinayam*). On Aṭiyārkkū Nallār's knowledge of the *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*, see also Monius, 'Many Lives of Daṇḍin,' 34 n. 41.

### Core ideas

- a. Aṭiyārkkū Nallār mentions *meypṭāṭu* in reference to poetry (rather than dance-drama).<sup>146</sup>
- b. The basis of *cuvai/rasa* (aesthetic emotion) is the domain of dance and drama, a domain that uses gestural language (*avinayam*).
- c. *Cuvai* (aesthetic emotion) is located in the actor-character of the dance/drama.
- d. There is a classification of nine *cuvais*, there are *kuṛippus* (cognitive/mental feelings), and ten *cattuvams* (bodily reactions/expressions). The term *meypṭāṭu* is not used.
- e. Listed are nine *cuvais*, including *naṭuvilai*, which is equivalent to *śānta rasa* (quiescence):  
The heroic, fear, disgust, wonder, delight, sorrow/sadness, laughter, quiescence, and fury/anger.<sup>147</sup>
- f. Nine staged gestures (*avinayam*) for the nine *cuvais/rasas* (aesthetic emotions) are given.  
For instance, the gestures of the heroic *cuvai/rasa* (*vīraccuvai-y-avinayam*) are: a raised eye-brow (*murinta puruvam*), blood-shot eyes (*civanta kaṇ*), holding a sword (*piṭṭa vāḷ*), gnashing of teeth (*kaṭṭa-v-eyiṟu*), curled lips (*maṭṭa-v-utaṭu*), a frowning forehead (*curuṭṭiya nutal*), harsh words (*tiṇṇeṇa -v- uṟra col*), treating the enemy with contempt (*pakaivarai eṇṇal cellā-v-ikaḷcci*), and other [gestures] (*pīravum*).<sup>148</sup>
- g. *Kuṛippu* (cognitive/mental feeling) is that which accompanies *cuvai*.<sup>149</sup>
- h. There are ten bodily changes/expressions (*cattuvam* or *viṭal*).<sup>150</sup>
- i. Twenty-four additional staged gestures (*avinayam*) are listed.

146 C. Vē. Cuppiramaṇiyaṅ, ed., *Aṭiyārkkū Nallār uraiṭṭiraṅ* (Chennai: IITS International Institute of Tamil Studies, 1976), 73; see also *ibid.*, iv, referring to Aṭiyārkkū Nallār's *meypṭāṭu* discussion of *Cil.* 18:20–23; 19:39–42. See Aṭiyārkkū Nallār's reference to *meypṭāṭu*: p. 20 (*maruṭkai meypṭāṭu*), p. 27 (*maruṭkai, avalam*), in *Cilappatikāra mūlamum arumpatavuraiyum Aṭiyārkkū-nallār uraiyum*, ed. U. Vē. Cāminātaiyar (Chennai: Kamarkṣiyal Accukkūṭam, 1920).

147 Tam. *vīram, payam, iḷippu, arputam, iṅpam, avalam, nakai, naṭuvunilai, uruttirams* (Cāminātaiyar ed., *Cilappatikāra ... Aṭiyārkkunallār uraiyum*, 83). See also Cuppiramaṇiyaṅ, *Aṭiyārkkū Nallār uraiṭṭiraṅ*, 135. Aṭiyārkkū Nallār gives *payam* as a synonym for *accam*, p. 83, and *iṅpam* as a synonym for *kāmam*, p. 84.

148 Cuppiramaṇiyaṅ, *Aṭiyārkkū Nallār uraiṭṭiraṅ*, 135.

149 *kuṛippāvatu cuvaiyataṅ kaṭṭōṇṟuvatu* (Cuppiramaṇiyaṅ, *Aṭiyārkkū Nallār uraiṭṭiraṅ*, 137). Manuel ('Meypṭāṭu,' 140) translates this as 'Kuṛippu is explicated as that which appears in *cuvai*.'

150 Aṭiyārkkū Nallār's commentary includes the following list: horripilation (*meymmayir cilirttal*); shedding tears (*kaṇṇīr vārtal*); trembling (*naṭukka maṭuttal*); perspiration/sweating (*viyarttal*); gather confidence (*tēṟram*); rejoicing (*kaḷittal*); opening the eyes wide/staring (*viḷittal*); despondency/losing freshness (*vetumpal*); looking death-like (*cākkāṭu*); broken voice (*kural citaivu*); see Cāminātaiyar ed., *Cilappatikāra ... Aṭiyārkkunallār uraiyum*, 84.

Including: the gestures of someone who is angry (1, *vekuṅṭōṅ avinayam*),<sup>151</sup> someone who is lazy (3, *cōmpīṅōṅ*), someone who is jealous (6, *aḷukkārūṭaiyōṅ*), someone who is possessed (8, *teyvamurṛōṅ*), someone who is shy or ashamed (17, *nāṅamurṛōṅ*),<sup>152</sup> and someone who is sad (18, *varuttamurṛōṅ*), among others.<sup>153</sup>

## Harmonisation of the *meypṭāṭu* problem: Pērācīriyar on the *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram Meyppāṭṭiyal*

This commentary was written in the early thirteenth century. It mentions the lost work *Ceyirriyam*.<sup>154</sup> ḷampūraṅar is mentioned by name, as is his view of *meypṭāṭu*.

### Core Ideas

- a. The problem of defining the term *paṅṅai* in the root-text.

For Pērācīriyar the term *paṅṅai* denotes performance and entertainment in a courtly context (compare *s.v.* ḷampūraṅar’s interpretation of *paṅṅai* above).<sup>155</sup>

*paṅṅait tōṅriya [...] – muṭiyuṭai vēntaruṅ kurunilamaṅṅaru’ mutalāyiṅōr nāṭaka makaḷir āṭalum pāṭalum kaṅṭuṅ kēṭṭuṅ kāmanukarum iṅpaviḷaiyāṭṭiṅṅuḷ tōṅriya [...] (TPPēr 249, p. 8, ll. 23–26)*

*Paṅṅai tōṅriya* [means:] appearing/coming into existence (*tōṅrutal*) in the *paṅṅai*, that is, in the delightful (*iṅpam*) play/entertainment (*viḷaiyāṭu*), in which men (*mutalāyiṅōr*) such as crowned monarchs (*muṭiyuṭai vēntar*) and tributary chiefs (*kurunilamaṅṅar*) see and hear (*kaṅṭum, kēṭṭum*) actresses of

151 Such as the angry gestures of a raised chest (*malarnta mārpū*) or pressing one’s palms together (*kaipuṭaittiṭṭal*) (Cuppiramaṅiyan, *Aṭiyārkkū Nallār uraittiṅṅaṅ*, 138). Aṭiyārkkū Nallār makes it clear that his list of angry gestures is not exhaustive.

152 Gestures of shame/shyness (*nāṅam*) include a hanging head (*iṅraiṅciya talai*), surreptitious actions (*maṅainta ceykai*), a bent body (*kōṭiya uṭampū*), or a downcast look (*kīḷkaṅōkkam*), among others (Cuppiramaṅiyan, *Aṭiyārkkū Nallār uraittiṅṅaṅ*, 142).

153 In addition to the gestures listed above are gestures such as someone who is looking dead (13, *cettōṅ*) (13), suffering due to the sun (16, *veyirralaip paṭṭōṅ*), having a headache (20, *talainōvurṛōṅ*), and having eaten poison (24, *naṅcuṅṭōṅ*). For the full list, see Cuppiramaṅiyan, *Aṭiyārkkū Nallār uraittiṅṅaṅ*, 138–43. Aṭiyārkkū Nallār adds that there are also four bodily postures: standing (*nīṅṅal*), moving (*iyaṅkal*), sitting (*iruttal*) and lying (*kiṭattal*); see Cuppiramaṅiyan, *Aṭiyārkkū Nallār uraittiṅṅaṅ*, 143.

154 *TPPēr* 249, p. 10, line 3; 250, p. 13, line 30.

155 On this, see also Cox (‘From Source-Criticism,’ 121), who points out that this is the opposite of ḷampūraṅar’s interpretation, seeing this as testimony that this uncertainty already existed at the time of the two *Tolkāppiyam* commentators.



drama<sup>156</sup> (*nāṭaka makaḷir*) dancing and singing (*āṭalum pāṭalum*), and experience (*nukarum*) desireful enjoyment (*kāma*).<sup>157</sup>

At the end of his commentary on Tolkāppiyaṅār's verse MI 1 (TPPēr 249), Pērācīriyar makes it clear that the root-text's author began his emotionology of poetics by referring to another person's statement on dramatic practice:

*ivai paṇṇait tōṇruvaṇavāyiṇ itu poruḷōttiṇuḷ ārāyvat' eṇṇai' nāṭakavalakkattāṇē, oruvaṇ ceyttanaṇi oruvaṇ valakkiṇiṇrum vāṅkikkoṇṭu [...]. pīrit' eṭutt' uraittal eṇṇuṇ kurramām eṇṇpatu kaṭā, atuv' aṇrē iccūttiram pīrankōḷ kūrāl eṇṇum utti vakaiyār kūri, atutāṇē marapāyir' eṇṇpatu* (TPPēr 249, p. 11, ll. 3–9)

If these (*ivai*) [that is, the *kurippu* or feeling in the mind and its *cattuvam* or bodily expression, etc.] appear in the *paṇṇai* or play, why does the author [Tolkāppiyaṅār] consider (*ārāyvat*) it part of the *Poruḷ[atikāram]* [the section on poetics]? Isn't it a practice (*valakkam*) of drama-theatre (*nāṭakam*)? [It is.] What is done (*ceyṭal*) by someone (*oruvaṇ*), from his (*oruvaṇ*) practice (*valakku*) it is taken over (*vāṅkikkoṇṭu*) [...]. The question (*kaṭā*) is whether taking (*eṭuttal*) other things (*pīritu*) [that do not belong here (to *poruḷ* or poetics)] and stating (*uraittal*) them is a [criticisable] mistake (*kurram*). It is acceptable, if it is mentioned (*kūri*) by way of the strategy (*utti*), as happened in this verse [MI 1 = 249] that time (*aṇru-ē* emphatic), where the author [Tolkāppiyaṅār] is referring to another person's (*pīraṇ*) thought/tenet (*kōḷ*). And that has become [part of] the tradition (*marapu*).

- b. There is *meypṇāṭu*, there is a model of *cuvai* (Skt. *rasa*), and there is the application of the idea of (palatal) taste mentioned.

156 Pērācīriyar gives a brief testimony that he is convinced that Tolkāppiyaṅār's first verse MI 1, second line, is referring to drama when explaining that 'those [thirty-two] considered matter-division for the authors of drama-books (*nāṭaka nūlācīriyar*) are compressed to sixteen (four times four)', (*avai karutiya poruḷ pakuti paṭiṇārāki aṭaṅkum nāṭaka nūlācīriyarkku*) (TPPēr 249, p. 9, l. 2). Pērācīriyar adds in l. 3 (ibid.) that Tolkāppiyaṅār might have mentioned 'eṇṇa' (they say/tradition says), because he had the primary treatise/urtext (*mutaṇṇūl*) in mind [possibly the purely mythical work of the Tamil sage Akattiyaṇ, Skt. Agastya, who is introduced as the father of Tamil grammar in the Caṅkam legend of Nakkīraṇ's preamble (see Wilden, 'Depictions,' 134 BS), *atu mutaṇṇūlai nōkki kūriyavāru pōlum*. Cf. Steele Clare, 'Canons,' 19, and Cox, 'Bearing,' 87–88, who both tend toward Agastya. – On tracing the tradition of linking Agastya with Tamil, according to Wilden, 'Depictions,' 135, this finds 'support for the first time in the Pāṇṭiya copper-plates' (tenth century?).

157 Cf. the translation of Cox: 'Which appear in the *paṇṇai*' [means:] 'which appears in the pleasant entertainment in which such men as crowned kings and lesser rulers watch and listen to the dancing and singing of actresses, and have their desire excited'. ('From Source-Criticism,' 121). See also the translation of Marr: '[...] are experienced by those who see and hear actresses of drama [...] dancing and singing.' (Marr, *Eight Anthologies*, 56).

c. Definition of *meyppāṭu*.

*Meyppāṭu* is the revelation of feelings in the mind-heart.

*ulakattār uḷḷa nikaḷcci āṇṭu nikaḷttavārē purattārkkup pulappaṭuvatōr ārrān velippaṭutal* (TPPēr 249, p. 8, ll. 9–11).

The revelation (*velippaṭutal*) of what happens (*nikaḷcci*) in the mind-heart (*uḷḷa*) of the characters (*ulakattār*) is right away (*āṇṭu*) understood (*pulappaṭuvatōr*) in the proper way (*ārrān*) by onlookers (*purattār*).

d. There is a model of *cuvai* (lit. ‘taste’, Skt. *rasa*) (as opposed to the root-text *Tolkāppiyam*, where any lexical or conceptual analogue is absent).

– Pērācīriyar’s long excursion

Pērācīriyar’s model of *cuvai* expands on that of his predecessor Ḥampūraṇar, which the latter imported from the *Ceyirriyam*. Pērācīriyar seems to refer to a further layer of the *cuvai* discussion (not found in the *Ceyirriyam*) that teaches eight *cuvais*, whereby *naṭuvunilaimai*, the quiescent, is included and anger excluded:<sup>158</sup>

*onpatu cuvai enappaṭṭavaruḷ uruttiram oḷittu oḷinta eṭṭaṇaiyum kūruṅkār* (TPPēr 249, p. 9, ll. 4–6)

He [another authority] says that the nine mentioned *cuvais* (Skt. *rasa*) [including the quiescent or *camanilai/naṭuvunilaimai*, Skt. *sānta-rasa*] are reduced to eight by omitting anger/fury (*uruttiram*).

*Cuvai: Terms and their definition*

Referring to another source of knowledge (and not his root-text) in his *cuvai* presentation, Pērācīriyar discusses the application of the idea of taste (literally Tam. *cuvai*, Skt. *rasa*), expanding thereby on Ḥampūraṇar’s shorter list by introducing a fourth component, the sense organ that combined leads to *cuvai*.

*Cuvai* appears as a conjunction of:

1. An ‘object that is tasted’ or *cuvaikkappaṭum poruḷ/cuvaiporuḷ; cuvaiporuḷ* refers to the taste of bitterness, etc., as well as to objects, including wild animals, Aryans who speak Tamil, etc.;<sup>159</sup>

158 The omission of *raudra/uruttiram/vekuḷi* is not found among the Sanskrit scholiasts nor in Ḥampūraṇar’s commentary. Thirugnanasambandhan (‘A Study of Rasa,’ 340) also refers to this point. The chronologically antecedent *Vīracōḷiyam* commentator VCC *ad* 90 [Poruḷ section], p. 103, ll. 7–9, deletes *vekuḷi* (anger; *uruttiram*), but in his *meyppāṭu* list, this is replaced by *vīram* (heroic); see the *Meyppāṭu* source readings, s.v. *Vīracōḷiyam* l.b. above; the *cuvai* list of the commentary VCC *ad* 154 [Alaṅkāram section] contains nine *cuvais*, rather than eight.

159 In TPPēr 249, p. 9, ll. 15–20, Pērācīriyar explains what he means by *cuvaiporuḷ*. Here the application of the idea of ‘taste’ (*cuvai*) is given. ‘There are 6 tastes (*cuvai*): bitterness (*vēmpu*), spicy, pungency (*kaṭu*), salty (*uppu*), sour (*puḷi*), sweetness of sugar-cane (*karumpu*) and the like.’ The sixth taste is not mentioned; he is untroubled by any asymmetric conceptual tension

2. ‘The sense organ that experiences an object’<sup>160</sup> or *poriyuṇarvu* (sense-organ perception) / *cuvaiuṇarvu*;
3. ‘The feeling in the mind, mental response’<sup>161</sup> or *kuṛippu/maṇakkurippu*, strictly cognitive;
4. ‘Bodily changes/expression’ or *cattuvam/viṛal*,<sup>162</sup> such as horripilation.

The number thirty-two (four times eight *cuvai*) is derived from this (TPPēr 249, p. 9, ll. 6–14).<sup>163</sup>

Pērācīriyar refines his understanding of the cognitive processes at work in *cuvai*.<sup>164</sup>

[...] *nakaiyum accamum mutalākiya uṇarvu murkālattu ulakiyalāṇ arivāṇ oruvaṇ, avarrukku ētuvākiya poruḷ pīra kaṇṭa valit tōṇriya poriyuṇarvukaḷ avvaccuvai enppaṭum. [...] apporuḷ kaṇṭa valiyallatu nakaiyum accamun tōṇrā.* (TPPēr 249, p. 9, ll. 22–25, 27–28, p. 10, l. 1)

with regard there being eight aesthetic emotions or *cuvai*. He then lists the objects that produce, for instance, laughter (*nakaiccuvaikkup poruḷāvaṇa*): ‘Aryans speaking Tamil (*āriyar kūrun tamil*); a journey undertaken by the blind and the lame (*kurutarum muṭavarum cellum celavu*); mad men (*pittar*); a toddy drinker (*kaḷiyar*); the mocking of kinsmen (*cūrattārai ikaḷntār*); a child’s babbling (*kuḷavi kūrum maḷalai*), and the like.’ In the lines that follow, 21ff., Pērācīriyar cites another authority who lists various objects of fear (*accapporuḷ*): wild animals, such as lions (*arimā*) [...] or rutting elephants (*matamā*).

160 *ataṇai* [= *cuvai*poruḷ] *nukarnta poriyuṇarvum* (TPPēr 249, p. 9, ll. 6–7).

161 Also called *maṇattuppaṭṭavaḷi uḷḷattu nikaḷum kuṛippu*, ‘the feeling/mental response (*kuṛippu*) that occurs (*nikaḷtal*) inside (*uḷḷam*) by way of the mind/cognition (*maṇam*)’ (TPPēr 249, p. 9, ll. 7–8). ‘The loathing (*veruttal*) [of the taste of bitterness] that occurs internally in the mind-heart (*uḷḷam*) and is not externally visible (*nōkkutal*) is called *kuṛippu*’ (*kuṛippenpatu, [...] nōkkātu verukkum uḷḷanikaḷcci.*) (TPPēr 249, p. 10, ll. 20–22).

162 Pērācīriyar explains this as follows: ‘the mind-heart(*uḷḷam*)-born-feelings (*kuṛippu*) lead to bodily expressions (*cattuvam*), which [appear] through changes (*vērupātu*) in (*kaṇ*) the body (*uṭampu*), [expressions] such as shedding tears (*kaṇṇir arumpal*) and horripilation (*meymmayir cilirttal*)’ (*kuṛippukkaḷ pīranta uḷḷattār kaṇṇīrarumpalum meymmayir cilirttalum atalāka uṭampinḱanvarum vērupāṭākiya cattuvaṅkaḷum.*) (TPPēr 249, p. 9, ll. 8–10). He explains ‘*cattuvam*’ as ‘making visible the inside occurrence’ (*cattuvam [...] uḷḷa nikaḷcciyai velippaṭupatu.*) (TPPēr 249, p. 10, l. 33).

163 In these nine lines, Pērācīriyar uses *viṛal/cattuvam* interchangeably, as he also does for the other terms. – Cf. ḷampūraṇar’s terminology: Pēr *cuvai*poruḷ = ḷam *kāraṇam/ētu/cuvai*paṭu *poruḷ*; the term *cuvai*uṇarvu is not used by ḷampūraṇar. – For various translations of these terms, cf. Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 121, where *cuvai*poruḷ is translated as ‘the represented “raw materials” of *cuvai*’, and *cuvai*uṇarvu as ‘*cuvai* awareness’. Cf. Subrahmanyam Sastri, *Tolkāppiyam*, where *cuvai*kkappaṭumporuḷ is translated as the ‘object looked at and the place of looking at her’; *pori*-uṇarvu as ‘his look at her’; *maṇakkurippu* as ‘feeling in his mind’; and *cattuvam* or *viṛal* as ‘modification of the physical body’. Cf. Marr, *Eight Anthologies*, 57, where in the English translation are added, following Subrahmanyam Sastri, the Sanskrit terms as found in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*: *cuvai*poruḷ = Skt. *vibhāvas* = ‘causes/factors’; *cuvai*uṇarvu = *anubhāva* = ‘signs of emotions’; *kuṛippu* = *sthayibhāvas* = ‘stable emotions’; and *viṛal/cattuvam* = *sāttvikabhāvas* = ‘expression’.

164 See also Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism,’ 121.

One (*oruvan*) who knows (*arivāṅ*) emotions (*uṅarvu*) such as laughter and anger from past life experience (*muṛkālatu ulakiyalāṅ*), when his sense-organ perception (*poriyuṅarvu*) becomes active due to seeing (*kāntal*) those emotion-stimulating (*ētu-ākiya*) objects (*poruḷ*), that is called (*eṇppaṭum*) *cuvai* or taste. [...] Unless the concerned object (*poruḷ*) can be perceived (*kāntal*) by a sense organ (*pori*), laughter and fear do not appear (*tōṇṇrutal*).

Pērācīriyar compares this process to palatal tasting:

*vēmpēṇṇum poruḷum nāveṇporiyun talaiṇpeyṭuḷiyallatu kaippucuvai pīravātatu.* (TPPēr 249, p. 9, ll. 26–27)

Unless the neem (*vēmpu*) object (*poruḷ*) and the tongue (*nāva*) sense-organ (*pori*) are brought together, the bitter (*kaippu*) taste or *cuvai* will not be produced.

Pērācīriyar adopts the idea that ‘taste’ only comes into existence through the combination of a sense organ (*pori*) and an object (*poruḷ*) from the *Ceyirriyam*, which he cites in this respect (TPPēr 249, p. 10, 3–4).<sup>165</sup> Interestingly, Pērācīriyar’s explanation of the process of ‘tasting’ includes past experience. In my opinion, it is also noteworthy that Pērācīriyar does not take up any aesthetic questions, such as the process by which an object of taste, that is, a material object, becomes pleasurable.

*Cuvai* has two loci.

Described is *cuvai* of the taster (*cuvaittavan̄/uyp̄pōṅ*) and *cuvai* of the viewer (*kāṇpōr*), with the two not the same. Further, the idea is introduced of the variability of viewers’ *cuvai*-experience.<sup>166</sup> What for one viewer is an instance of sympathy is for another a smile. This is due to the nature of knowledge.

*iruvakai nilaṇēṇpaṇa uyp̄pōṅ ceytatu kāṇpōrkkū eytatalaṇrō eṇiṇ cuvaiyēṇpatu oppiṇāṇāya peyarākalāṇ vempucuvaittavan̄ aṛinta kaipp’ ariviṇai nāvuṅarviṇāṛ pīraṇuṅarāṇ, ivāṇ kaippuc cuvaittāṇ eṇak kaṇṇunarviṇāṇ aṛivataṇri (5–9) [...] aṇciṇāṇaik kaṇṭu nakutaluṇ karuṇaiceytaluṇ kaṇṭōrkkup pīrapataṇri accam pīravātākalāṇ uyp̄pōṅ ceytatu kāṇpōṅ uyta aṛiviṇ perriyār cellātākaliṇ iruvakai (14–17)* (TPPēr 249, p. 10, ll. 5–9, 14–17)

If one asks (*eṇiṇ*), is it not so (*aṇrō*) that the experiencer’s/actor’s action (*uyp̄pōṅ ceytatu*) and the attained meaning (*eytatal*) for the viewers (*kāṇpōr*) are two types (*iru vakai*) of locus (*nilam*) [of *cuvai*],<sup>167</sup> [the answer is yes].

165 ‘*iruvakai nilattiṇ iyalvatu cuvaiyē*’ (*ceyirriyam*) *eṇṇār eṇpatu.* (TPPēr 249, p. 10, ll. 3–4).

166 See above, ch. 1, section 2 (Tamil thinkers), s.v. Pērācīriyar (cf. Śāradātanaya).

167 See Ḵampūraṇar (TPIam 245, p. 34, l. 36), above, who cites Ceyirriyaṇār: ‘*Cuvai* occurs in two types of locus’ (*iruvakai nilattiṇ iyalvatu cuvaiyē*).

There is no similarity (*oppinānāya*) [in the experience] of *cuvai* or taste.<sup>168</sup> One tastes (*cuvaittal*) neem (*vempu*), and the other (*piran*) does not experience (*uṇartal*) the bitterness (*kaippu*) through the tongue's sense-perception (*nāvu uṇarvu*). This [other] one (*ivan*) knows (*aṛivatu*) the bitter (*kaippu*) taste or *cuvai* only (*tān*) through eye-sense perception (*kaṇuṇarvu*). [...] [The same is for fear]. Besides that (*aṇri*) a smile (*nakutal*) or sympathy (*karuṇai*) may arise for a viewer (*kaṇṭōr*) at the sight of a fearful one; he is one who does not produce fear (*accam piravātākālān*), but rather experiences (*uytal*) through the nature (*perrri*) of knowledge (*aṛivu*) as the viewer (*kāṇpōn*) of the experiencer's (*uyppōn*) action (*ceytatu*). The two varieties (*iru vakai*) are incongruent (*cellātākaliṅ*).

- e. Eight fundamental *meypṭāṭus* that can be tasted are listed (in contrast to the root-text)

Pērācīriyar still continues his excursion: From *TPPēr* 250, p. 13, line 25, it is clear that Pērācīriyar wants us to think of *meypṭāṭu* as meaning 'emotion', equivalent to Sanskrit *bhāva*.<sup>169</sup> Pērācīriyar lists eight *meypṭāṭus* (specifically referred to as 'meypṭāṭu' by Pērācīriyar himself)<sup>170</sup> in his commentary on Tolkāppiyaṇār's verse MI 2/*TPPēr* 250,<sup>171</sup> even though the root-text's eight *meypṭāṭus* are dealt with and listed only in MI 3/*TPPēr* 251. Pērācīriyar, in striking conformity with the model of eight *cuvai* mentioned earlier, includes the *meypṭāṭu* quiescence, but excludes anger (contrary to Iḷampūraṇar):

The heroic (*vīram*), fear (*accam*), amazement (*viyappu*), disgust (*iḷipu*), erotic love (*kāmam*), sorrow (*avalam*), laughter (*nakai*), quiescence (*naṭunilai*) (*TPPēr* 250, p. 13, ll. 11–12).<sup>172</sup>

168 *cuvaiyēṇpatu oppinānāya peyarākalān*: a somewhat free translation.

169 Marr (*Eight Anthologies*, 57) is also of this opinion.

170 *TPPēr* 250, p. 13, ll. 9–11: *meypṭāṭum [...] eṭṭātalum [...]. avai vīram, accam [...] eṇṇaṇa*. 'The [thirty-two] *meypṭāṭus* [are to be reduced to sixteen and then reduced to] eight. Those [eight] are: the heroic, fear [...].'

171 Verse MI 2 (= *TPPēr* 250/*TPI*am 246) of Tolkāppiyaṇār's emotionology contains a single line, merely showing the emotion theoreticians' general penchant for counting. It translates as follows: 'The sixteen are compressed into eight' (*nāliraṇ tākum pālumā ruṇṭē*).

172 It is striking, that from the time of Peruntēvaṇār's commentary on the Tamil *Vīracōḷiyam* (late eleventh or early twelfth century), the term *vīram*, heroism/bravery, is listed as one of the *meypṭāṭus* (as opposed to Tolkāppiyaṇār's original emotionology). It is also striking that it was the commentator on the *Vīracōḷiyam* who discarded anger as a *meypṭāṭu* and instead subordinated it as a causal factor of *vīram*. Still more striking is the fact that from the time of Iḷampūraṇar's (late eleventh century or some decades later?) commentary on *TPI*am 245, *kāmam/ciruṅkāram* (erotic love), *uruttiram* (anger), *viyappu* (amazement), *iḷippu* (disgust), and *avalam* (sorrow) had become the canonical technical emotion words in the eight *meypṭāṭu* group; this also holds true for the *Taṇṭiyaḷaṅkāram* and the commentator on the *Iḷakkaṇa Vīlakkam*. As all of these emotion words had become naturalised and the original words were

Pērācīriyar adds, however, that anger/fury (*uruttiram*) may be added as a ninth *meyp̄pāṭu* (i.e. he has no clear opinion on this).

*avai onpatātarkup pakutiymuṭaiyavenpatu; enṅai? ‘urittiran taṅṅōṭu onpat’ ākum’ enpavākalin.* (TPPēr 250, p. 13, ll. 15–18)

Since he [Ceyirriyaṅār?] says, ‘with anger/fury (*uruttiram*) they become nine’, they may be nine [rather than eight].

*ivaiyum paṅṅait tōṅriya enṅāṅk’ enapaṭṭaṅa.* (TPPēr 250, p. 13, ll. 18–19)

These (*ivai*) also were said (*enapaṭṭal*) [by another authority] to appear (*tōṅṅutal*) in the play/entertainment or *paṅṅai* as eight times four [= thirty-two].<sup>173</sup>

The model of the emergence of *cuvai* only operates for the eight canonical basic or stable emotions, those *meyp̄pāṭus* ‘that can be tasted’, equivalent to the eight stable emotions (*stāyibhāvas*) in the Sanskrit *rasa* theory. Pērācīriyar gives an account of the ideas of the drama theorist Ceyirriyaṅār on how a *cuvai* emerges in the leading character as well as the spectators at a theatre:

*marrivarṅratu payaṅṅenṅaiyeṅin; poruḷatikārattuk kūrukiṅṅra vaḷakkiyalē amaiyum enpatu kūri, accuvaikku ētuvāya poruḷiṅṅai araṅkiṅṅuḷ niṅṅī, atu kaṅṅtu kuṅṅippuṅ cattuvamum nikaḷttukiṅṅra kūṭṭaṅṅaiyum araṅkil tantu, piṅṅṅar avaiyaraṅṅiṅṅōr avaṅṅ ceṅkiṅṅra meyp̄pāṭṭiṅṅai uṅṅarvārāka varukiṅṅra muṅṅaimaiyellām nāṅakavaḷakkiṅṅkē uriya pakutiyeṅṅavum* (TPPēr 250, p. 13, ll. 21–27)

Further, if it is asked what the purpose (*payaṅ*) of this is, [first] it is said (*kūri*) that it is applicable (*amaital*) for the usage (*vaḷakku*) explained in the *Poruḷatikāram* or the theory of poetry, [but, then, the focus is shifted to the theatre stage]. He [Ceyirriyaṅār] shows (*niṅṅī = niṅṅuttal*) that on a theatre stage (*araṅku*), the object (*poruḷ*) causes (*ētuvāya*) that taste (*cuvai*); further he also presents (*tātal*) [as a locus of tasting] the dancer (*kūṭṭaṅ*) on the stage who performs (*nikaḷttal*) a feeling in the mind/mental response (*kuṅṅippu*) and the bodily expression (*cattuvam*); after this, [the tasting is with] those who are the

---

no longer used, the *meyp̄pāṭu* called *perumitam* or greatness/pride, so prominent in the *Tol-kāppiyam* emotionology, was also no longer in use (except in the quite late sixteenth-century *Māraṅalaṅkāram* by Kurukaip Perumāl Kaviṅāyār and seventeenth-century *Ilakkaṅa Viḷakkam* by Vaittiyaṅāta Tēcikar).

173 The entire sentence reads as follows: *ummai iṅṅantatu taḷiyiṅṅāṅṅalāṅ ivaiyum paṅṅait tōṅriya enṅāṅk’ enapaṭṭaṅa. avaṅṅrup pakutiyeṅṅa ituvum piṅṅāṅkōṭi kūriyavārāyīṅṅru.* (TPPēr 250, p. 13, ll. 18–20), ‘Since the aforementioned (*ummai iṅṅantatu*) was accepted (*taḷtal*), these (*ivai*) were said (*enapaṭṭal*) to appear (*tōṅṅutal*) in the play/entertainment or *paṅṅai* as eight times four [= thirty-two]. [...] This, too (*ituvum*), is part (*pakuti*) of those (*avaṅṅru = avai*), according to another’s (*piṅṅaṅ*) opinion.’

theatre spectators (*araṅkiṇḍōr*) and who understand (*uṅarvārāka*) the *meyp̄pātu* or emotion that he [the dancer] enacts (*ceykiṇṇra*). All this belongs (*uriya pakuti*) and is particular (*muṛaimai*) to [the experience of staging and witnessing] the practice of drama (*nāṭakavalakku*).

*innanam aṭaṅkum eṇpatu nāṭaka nūluḷḷuṅ collupavōveṇiṇ, collupavākaliṇ anrē atavali nūlceyta āciriyaṇ ceyirriyaṇār* (TPPēr 250, p. 13, ll. 28–30)

[The phrase] ‘In this manner (*innanam*) it is reduced (*aṭaṅkutaḷ*) [to sixteen and eight]’, if it is asked (*eṇin*) whether this is explained (*collupavō*) in the writing on drama (*nāṭaka nūl*), [the answer is] an emphatic affirmative (*anrē*), since it has been explained (*collupavākaliṇ*) by Ceyirriyaṇār, the author (*āciriyaṇ*) who wrote (*ceyṭal*) the [*Ceyirriyam*] work (*nūl*) [on drama] in that way (*atavali*).

Pērāciriyaṇ continues his excursion on other thinkers’ ideas:

*cuvaiyuṅarvuṇ poruḷum oṅrāka aṭakkic cuvaiyuṅ kuṛippuṅ cattuvamum eṇa mūṅrākki vēruvēr’ ilakkaṇaṅ kūri* (TPPēr 250, p. 13, l. 31, p. 14, ll. 1–2)

[The thirty-two are reduced to sixteen and these sixteen are likewise reduced to eight. Reducing to sixteen is done by] coalescing, as two-in-one (*oṅrāka aṭakki*), the object/causal factor (*poruḷ*) and the sensory perception (*cuvai-yuṅarvu*)<sup>174</sup> [that experiences the object], whereas other (*vēru*) grammars (*ilakkaṇam*) explain (*kūri*) that taste or *cuvai*, the feeling in the mind/mental response (*kuṛippu*), and bodily expression (*cattuvam*) are treated as three (*mūṅru*) individual elements.<sup>175</sup>

- f. After a long excursion: Pērāciriyaṇ calls the eight basic *meyp̄pātu* of Tol-kāppiyaṇār *cuvai* or *kuṛippu*.

Pērāciriyaṇ returns to his own commentary voice, addressing the status of *meyp̄pātu* in the root-text’s verse MI 3, stating that the *Tolkāppiyam* portrays the only correct view.

Pērāciriyaṇ explains verse MI 3 (TPPēr 251), in which the *meyp̄pātu*s laughter, weeping, disgust, amazement, fear, excellence/greatness/pride, anger, joy are listed, as follows:

*iccollappaṭṭa eṭṭum meyp̄pāt’ eṅru colluvar pulavar* (TPPēr 251, p. 14, ll. 23–24)

174 Cox translates *cuvaiyuṅarvu* as ‘cuvai awareness’.

175 Pērāciriyaṇ quotes from the other grammar as follows: ‘Those who understand (*uṅarntōr*) the subtler (*nun*) aspects have stated (*nuvaltal*) that the three enumerated (*eṇṇiya mūṅrum*) [that is, *cuvai*, *kuṛippu*, *cattuvam*,] shall join together (*oruṅkutaḷ*).’ (*eṇṇiya mūṅrum oruṅku peṇum eṇa / nuṅṇitiṇ uṅarntōr nuvaṅṇaṇar eṇpa*) (TPPēr 250, p. 14, ll. 3–4).

The learned scholar or *pulavar* [Tolkāppiyaṅār] says that these are the eight *meyppāṭus*.

Further, Pērācīriyar makes it clear (referring to the same verse MI 3/ TPPēr 251) that his main concern is now Tolkāppiyaṅār's theory:

*Itu, piṛarvēṅṅumārṛāṅṅari innūluḷ ivvāru vēṅṅappaṭum meyppāṭ' enpatu uṅarttatal nutaliṛru* (TPPēr 251, p. 14, ll. 21–22)

The meaning of *meyppāṭu* is to be understood (*uṅarttatal*) as (*ivvāru*) required (*vēṅṅappaṭatal*) in this treatise (*nūl*) [of Tolkāppiyaṅār], and not as required by other [grammarians] (*piṛar*).

In his commentary on MI 3/TPPēr 251, Pērācīriyar gives the meaning of Tolkāppiyaṅār's technical terms of emotion either as Tamil synonyms or as Sanskrit-derived words:<sup>176</sup>

(1) *nakai*<sup>177</sup> means *cirippu*<sup>178</sup> (laughter). It is of three types: smiling (*muṇṇalittu nakutal*), moderate laughter (*aḷavē cirittal*), and laughing out loud/guffaw (*perukaccirittal*).

(2) *aḷukai* (weeping) means *avalam* (sadness/grief, sorrow). There are two types: being sad or grief-stricken oneself, and weeping or being distressed upon seeing the grief of others, the latter due to sympathy (Skt. *karuṇa*).

(3) *iḷivaral* (disgust) means *iḷipu* (contempt).

(4) *maruḷkai* means *viyappu* (amazement). Also if you say [the Sanskrit word] 'arputam', it is acceptable.<sup>179</sup>

(5) *accam* means *payam* (fear).

(6) *perumitam* means Sanskrit *vīram* (valour).<sup>180</sup>

(7) *vekuḷi* means *uruttiram* (anger/fury).

(8) *uvakai* (joy) means *kāma mutaliya maḷiḷcci* (happiness such as in erotic love or *kāma*).<sup>181</sup> (TPPēr 251, p. 14, ll. 25–26, p. 15, ll. 1–13).

*ivai av veṅṅumāvaṅa. ivarṛaic cuvaiyeṅṅavuṅ kurippeṅṅavum vaḷaṅkiṅṅum amaiyum.* (TPPēr 251, p. 15, 12–13)

176 Note that the emotion words given as synonyms by Pērācīriyar match one-to-one with the technical terms listed by Vaittiyanāta Tēcīkar's auto-commentary on the seventeenth-century *Ilakkaṅa Viḷakkam*. See *Meyppāṭu* source readings, s.v. *Ilakkaṅa Viḷakkam*, point f, footnote.

177 This is Tolkāppiyaṅār's technical term for the first enumerated *meyppāṭu* (MI 3 = TPPēr 251).

178 This is Pērācīriyar's term (TPPēr 251, p. 14, line 25).

179 *arputam eṅṅiṅṅum aṅṅamayum* [sic]. Read *amaiyum*.

180 Note *perumitam* denotes 'greatness, pride', rather than 'valour'. However, as I have shown above, *perumitam* had been discarded by the time of Iḷampūraṅar at the latest.

181 *uvakaiyeṅṅatu kāma mutaliya maḷiḷcci* (TPPēr 251, p. 15, line 11). – *payam*, *vīram*, *uruttiram*, *kāmam* are derived from Sanskrit.



These are the eight [*meyppāṭus*]. They may be called *cuvai*. They may be called *kuṛippu*.

As with *Ḥampūraṇar*, there is no categorical border between the terms *cuvai* and *meyppāṭu*.

- g. Why is laughter listed first and joy last? What is the reason for the order in *Tolkāppiyaṇār*'s root-text? *Pēraciriyar*'s arguments:<sup>182</sup>

*nakai muṇvaittatu eṇṇaiyeṇiṇ*, ‘*paṇṇait tōṇriya eṇṇāṅku poruṭkum*’ (249) [...] *eṇratarku viḷaiyāṭṭup poruṭṭākiya naikaiyai muṇvaittāṇ eṇpatu*. (*TPPēr* 251, p. 15, ll. 14–15, 16–17)

If one asks why is laughter (*nakai*) first, [or why is there this particular order, the answer is:] For the sake (*ākiya*) of matters (*poruḷ*) of entertainment (*viḷaiyāṭṭup*), [...] [implied] in the phrase ‘the thirty-two elements appear in a play/entertainment or *paṇṇai*’ (249),<sup>183</sup> he (*Tolkāppiyaṇār*) placed laughter or *nakai* first.<sup>184</sup>

*ataraku maṛutalaiyākiya aḷukaiyai atanpiṇ vaittāṇ. iḷivalar atanpiṇ vaittāṇ, aḷukaiyum iḷivalarōṭu iyaiṇṇaiyaiyṇ. tāṇ iḷivantu piṇritōr poruḷai viyakkumātaliṇ iḷivalaliṇpiṇ viyappuvaittāṇ. viyappupparriyum accampirantalṇaccattai atanpiṇ vaittāṇ. accattirku maṛutalaiyākiya vīrattai atanpiṇ vaittāṇ. avvīrattiṇṇpayāṇākip piṇrarkku varum vekuḷiyai atan piṇṇē vaittāṇ. vekuḷikku maṛutalai yākalāṇum ellāvāriṇṇum iṇṇu oṭutarukuc ciṇrantatākalāṇum mutarṇkaṇ oṭiya nakaikku iyaiṇṇaiyāṭṭakālaṇum uvakaiyai avvīrṇkaṇ vaittāṇ eṇpatu*. (*TPPēr* 251, p. 15, ll. 17–28)

He [*Tolkāppiyaṇār*] placed weeping or *aḷukai* after that [i.e. laughter], since it is the opposite side [of the coin] of that [i.e. laughter], followed by contempt or *iḷivalar*, since weeping or *aḷukai* is closely related to contemptible treatment. He places amazement or *viyappu* after contempt or *iḷivalar*, since [when] lacking self-esteem (*tāṇ iḷivantu*), one is amazed at the matters of others (*piṇritōr poruḷ*). [Further,] since amazement gives birth to fear or *accam*, he places fear after that [i.e., amazement]. Since valour/heroism or *vīram* is the opposite of fear or *accam*, he places valour after that. After [valour], he places anger or *vekuḷi*, since through the heroic, fury/anger about others (*piṇrar*) may arise. He places joy or *uvakai* at the end [for three reasons, first,] since it is the opposite of anger or *vekuḷi*, [second,] since it is here (*iṇṇu*) the best (*ciṇrantatāka*) of all

182 Note that Subrahmanya Sastri (*Tolkāppiyam*, 136 n. 5) discovered certain parallels between *Pēraciriyar*'s arguments and the commentary on the *Nāṭyaśāstra*.

183 According to the chapter verse MI 1/249.

184 Or said differently: Considering the importance of the experience of a play/entertainment or *paṇṇai*, the importance of laughter is given, which is why it is placed first, where entertainment is concerned.

(*ellāvārīnum*) [the *meyppātu*s or emotions], and [third,] since it is related to the first enumerated [*meyppātu*, namely,] laughter or *nakai*.<sup>185</sup>

- h. What was previously accepted is no longer accepted: the *meyppātu* of quiescence (*camanilai/naṭuvunilaimai*) is no longer listed as a basic *meyppātu*. Finally, Pērācīriyar, in the manner of Iḷampūraṇar, explains why he rejects the inclusion of the *meyppātu camanilai/naṭuvunilaimai*. Since the commentator's main concern (from verse *TPPēr* 251 onward) is to return to the traditional theory of his root-text, it seems only consistent that he is against what he discussed before (see above, point d, excursion).

*eṭṭaṇḍiṭuñ camanilaikaṭṭi oṇṇpatu eṇṇāmō nāṭakanūluṭpōlaleṇiṇ, atarṅku oṛ vikāramiṇmaiṇiṇ iṇṇtuk kūrīyatilaṇ eṇṇpatu; atarṅku vikāram uṇṭ' eṇiṇ muṇṇaiṇi eṭṭaṇḍiṭuñ cārttikkoḷḷappaṭum. allatūum aḷṭulakiyal nīṇkiṇār perrīyākaliṇ, iṇṇtu ulakavaḷakkiṇuṭ colliyatilaṇeṇṇpatu. oḷinta eṭṭum ulakiyalākaliṛ kūrīṇāṇ. [...]* *avai eṭṭum āmāru iṇikkūrutum.* (*TPPēr* 251, p. 15, ll. 32–33, p. 16, ll. 2–5, 7)

If we ask (*eṇiṇ*) why not (*eṇṇāmō*) nine, adding the quiescent or *camanilai* to the eight as in the writings on drama,<sup>186</sup> [we may answer:] Here (*iṇṇtu*) [in the case of poetry] there is no need (*iṇmai*) to make a change (*vikāram*) for that. If there is a relevant reason for such a change (*vikāram uṇṭu*) [in the poetic context as well], then it can be joined (*cārttutal*) to the former eight.<sup>187</sup> Moreover (*allatūum*), since quiescence or *camanilai* is [only] a quality (*perrī*) of those who have renounced (*nīṇkutaḷ*) worldly customs (*ulakiyal*) [as done by ascetics, etc.], it is not mentioned (*colliyatilaṇ eṇṇpatu*) here with worldly practices (*ulakavaḷakku*). Since the remaining (*oḷital*) eight are worldly (*ulakiyal*), he (Tolkāppīyaṇār) mentions [them] (*kūrīṇāṇ*). [...] These eight are explained (*āmāru*) and discussed hereafter.

- i. Pērācīriyar explains the list of the root-text's thirty-two auxiliary *meyppātu*s, whereby he mistakes *naṭuvunilaimai* for Skt. *śānta-rasa*<sup>188</sup> and other peculiarities.
- j. The thirty-two auxiliary *meyppātu*s.  
Pērācīriyar's explanation of the *Tolkāppīyam* root-text.<sup>189</sup>

185 Pērācīriyar continues: 'The reason (*kāraṇam*) for mentioning the first four at the beginning, and the last four of these eight at the end will become clear in the verses or *cūttirams* that follow.' (*iṇṇveṭṭaṇḍiṭuḷ mutaṇṇiṇṇra nāṇkum murkūrutarṅkum iṇṇṇiṇṇra nāṇkum pīrkūrutarṅkuñ kāraṇam varukīṇra cūttiraṇḷāṇum perutum*) (*TPPēr* 251, p. 15, ll. 29–31).

186 In the experience of drama, quiescence or *camanilai* (Skt. *śānta*) is accepted. While it is not clear whether Pērācīriyar has the *Ceyiriyam* treatise on drama in mind here, it is very likely.

187 *atarṅku vikāram uṇṭ' eṇiṇ muṇṇaiṇi eṭṭaṇḍiṭuñ cārttikkoḷḷappaṭum*: Why Pērācīriyar leaves this option open is not entirely clear to me.

188 See also Subrahmanya Sastri, *Tolkāppīyam*, 140 n. 2: Pērācīriyar '[...] takes *naṭuvunilaimai* to mean *śānta-rasa*, which is out of place'.

189 Referring to *Tolkāppīyam* MI 12: 'Those mentioned above being on one side, the following being on the other side, they are included under *meyppātu* in a way different from them.' (Trans.

*orupāl enṇapatu [...]. ap poruṇmaiṅav allātaviṭattu ivai mup-pattiraṅṭum iṅṭu meypṇāṭi' enṇappaṭum. (TPPēr 260, p. 40, l. 17, ll. 20–22)*

[The aforementioned eightfold classification of *meypṇāṭus*, each with four causal factors, is] one group (*pāl*). [...] Their meaning (*poruṇmai*) is different from these thirty-two here [in verse 260], which are also called *meypṇāṭu*.

*[irukūr' enṇapatu ...] avai muppattiraṅṭenavē ivaiyum muppattiraṅṭenapatu eṅṇi uṅaravaiṭṭāṅ enṇapatu. (TPPēr 260, p. 40, ll. 24–27)*

[What is said to be two groups (*iruk kūru*) ...] he [Tolkāppiyaṅār] has made [us] consider them both as thirty-two, those (*avai*) and these (*ivai*).<sup>190</sup>

What is *meypṇāṭu* for Pēraciriyar in the second list of thirty-two auxiliary *meypṇāṭus*?

*Meypṇāṭu* is physiological and connected to the brain. It is cognitively felt (*kuṛippu*) and externally expressed by means of physical and verbal registers.

*[...] maṅṇatti nikaḷcciyai veḷippaṭuppaṅavākaliṅ meypṇāṭi' enṇappaṭṇa (TPPēr 260, p. 41, ll. 31–32)*

[...] If [bodily changes, such as shedding tears, etc.] are brought to the fore (*veḷippaṭuṭal*), what is happening (*nikaḷcci*) in the [...] mind/cognitive faculty (*maṅṇam*) that is called *meypṇāṭu*.

*[...] enṇapatu, vaḷakkāṭaliṅ; [...] uḷḷam piṛarkkup pulāṅṇāṭaliṅ meypṇāṭāyirru. (TPPēr 260, p. 42, ll. 26–27)*

Because the [aforementioned] phrase is common practice (*vaḷakku*), and since the mind-heart (*uḷḷam*) is made visible/ cognisable (*pulāṅṇāṭaliṅ*) to others, it is *meypṇāṭu*.

*[cūḷcci ...] atu veḷippaṭuvatōr kuṛippiṅ avāṅkaṭṭōṅriṅ atuvum meypṇāṭu. (TPPēr 260, p. 42, 9–10)*

---

adopted from Subrahmanya Sastri, *Tolkāppiyam*, 139) (*āṅk' avai oru pālāka [...]* *ivaiyum uḷavē avaiyalaṅ kaṭaiyē*) (TPPēr 260, p. 40, lines 1, 10).

190 Cf. Iḷampūraṅar's commentary on the two lists of *meypṇāṭus* in the *Tolkāppiyam* root-text: 'On the one side [eight times four], which was mentioned earlier, on the other side, these thirty-two [*meypṇāṭus*] beginning with *uṭaimai*. In the absence of those [of the first list of eight times four], this second thirty-two hold good. [They complement one another.]' (*mērcollappaṭṇa orupakkamāka, oru pakkam, uṭaimai mutalāka collappaṭṇa muppattiraṅṭum uḷa, avai yallāta viṭattu*) (TPḷam 256, p. 44, ll. 11–13). – This passage is preceded by the following: 'If it is asked (*eṅṇi*) why this figure (*tokai*) is emphasised/mentioned as thirty-two, [the same number as the first group of eight *meypṇāṭus* each four causes], [the answer is:] Because he [Tolkāppiyaṅār MI 12] states "those (*avai*) there (*āṅku*) [eight times four] being on one side/one group (*oru pāl*) [...]"' (*ivai muppattiraṅṭenat tokai kūriyatiṅṇāl eṅṇi, āṅk' avai orupālāka orupāl enṇāṅkalin [...]*) (TPPēr 260, p. 40, ll. 23–24).

[Take ‘losing the balance of the mind, trouble, agitation’ or *cūlcci*<sup>191</sup> = *cūlarci*], if the feeling in his mind (*kuṛippu*) occurs and it becomes obvious (*veḷippaṭutal*) [by bodily changes], that, too, is *meyppātu*.

*nāñutal enpatu nāñuḷlam piṛarkku veḷippaṭa nikaḷum nikaḷcci. (TPPēr 260, p. 42, ll. 14–15)*

[Take shame:] *nāñutal* is the inner sense of shame (*nāñ*), occurring visibly (*veḷippaṭutal*) to others (*piṛar*).

- k. *Meyppātus* not usually found in Western lists of emotion words (a random selection).

Sleep:

*tuñcal enpatu, uṛakkam; atu naṭantuvārukiṅṛāñ kañnum viḷaṅkat tōṅrutaliṅ atuvum meyppāt’ enappaṭatu. (TPPēr 260, p. 41, ll. 15–17)*

*tuñcal* means sleep (*uṛakkam*). Since it clearly appears (*viḷaṅkat tōṅrutal*) even in (*kañnum*) the one who is [sleep-]walking (*naṭantuvārukiṅṛāñ*),<sup>192</sup> it is also a *meyppātu*.

Recollection:

*niñaital enpatu viruppuṛu niñaittal, niññai mikavum niñaittēñ enpatu, vaḷakkāṭaliṅ; anniñaivuḷlam piṛarkkup pulāñāṭaliṅ meyppāṭāyīṛu. (TPPēr 260, p. 42, ll. 25–27)*

Since the phrase ‘I thought of you a lot’ (*niññai mikavum niñaittēñ*) is common practice (*vaḷakku*), and since the remembering (*niñai*) mind-heart (*uḷlam*) is made [verbally] cognisable (*pulāñāṭaliṅ*) to others, remembering willingly (*niñaital/viruppuṛu niñaittal*) is also counted as *meyppatu*.

Being startled, an emotion of a more ephemeral nature:

*verūtal enpatu vilaṅkum puḷḷumpōla veruvinikaḷum uḷla nikaḷcci; aḷtu, añca vēñṭāṭaṅa kaṅṭavaḷiyum kaṭitiṛ piṛantu māṛuvatōr veṛi. (TPPēr 260, p. 42, ll. 27–30)*<sup>193</sup>

*Verūtal* means the inner (*uḷla*) occurrence (*nikaḷcci*) of an unreasonable sudden fright (*veruvu*), as it occurs in animals and birds (*puḷ*); even if there is no need (*vēñṭāṭaṅa*) for fear (*añca*), it arises (lit. ‘is born’, *piṛatal*) and disappears

191 Cf. ḷampūraṅar, who understands *cūlcci* as ‘tormenting others’; see Subrahmanya Sastri, *Tolkāppiyam*, 140.

192 *naṭantuvārukiṅṛāñ* is odd.

193 ḷampūraṅar, too, states that fright appears suddenly and then dies. He cites another authority: ‘Whenever I see you, I feel scared. It is sudden and disappears. It does not last long, the feeling of fright.’

(*mārūtal*, lit. ‘reversed/alterd’) speedily (*kaṭiṭil/kaṭitu*), [this kind of] frenzied state (*veṛi*).

In his explanation of the term *verūtal*, Pērācīriyar may have had the Sanskrit distinction between transitory and stable emotions (*bhāva*) in mind.

Trembling:

*naṭukkam eṇpatu, aṇpum accamum mutalāka uṭampir pulappaṭumārṛāṇ uḷḷa naṭuṅkūtal. [...] accam eṇṇuṅ cuvai pīrantataṇ piṅṅar ataṇ valittōṅriya naṭukkam accattārṛōṅriya naṭukkamām eṇpatu (TPPēr 260, p. 43, ll. 13–14, 16–17)*

*Naṭukkam* is trembling (*naṭuṅkūtal*) due to visible (*pulappaṭūtal*) bodily (*uṭampu*) changes (*mārṛu*) inside (*uḷḷa*) [that are a result of] affection (*aṇpu*) and fear (*accam*), etc. (*mutalāka*). [...] After (*piṅṅar*) the coming into existence (*pīratal*) of the *cuvai* of fear (*accam eṇṇuṅ cuvai*), the following (*ataṇvali*) trembling that appears (*tōṅriya naṭukkam*) is fearful trembling (*accattārṛōṅriya naṭukkam*), they say (*ām*).

It is evident that the thirty-two auxiliary *meypṭāṭus* (trembling, etc.) are seen as accompanying the eight fundamental *meypṭāṭus* (fear and the rest), with only the eight being tasted (*cuvai*).

The nature of caste:

Among the thirty-two auxiliary *meypṭāṭus* is also the term *taṇmai*, which is explained by Pērācīriyar as things specific to certain castes, which he portrays through small scenes:<sup>194</sup>

*taṇmaiyeṇpatu, cātittaṇmai; avaiyāvaṇa: pārppārāyir kunti mitittuk kuṛunaṭai koṅṭu vantu tōṅralum | aracarāyiṅ eṭutta kaḷuttoṭum aṭutta mārpoṭum naṭantu cēralum | itaiyarāyir kōṛkaiyuṅ koṭumaṭiyuṭaiyum vilitta vīlaiyum venpallumākit tōṅralum [...] (TPPēr 260, p. 41 s.v.)<sup>195</sup>*

*Taṇmai* means the nature of a caste. A brahmin (*pārppa*) appears standing on one leg<sup>196</sup> (*kunti mitittal*) and taking short strides (*kuṛu naṭai*); a king walks with an erect/straight neck (*eṭutta kaḷuttu*) and a battle-scarred chest (*aṭutta*

194 Cf. the Tamil moral aphorism of verse 133 in the *Tirukkuraḷ*: caste is right conduct.

195 Cf. ḷampūraṇar’s explanation of *taṇmai*: *taṇmaiyeṇpatu – cātīyiyalpu. Pārppār aracar itaiyar kuṛavar eṇriṅṅōr māṭṭu oruvarai yorubar ovvāmar kiṭakku miyalpu. atu meykkaṭamaiyiṅkaṅ vērupaṭṭu varutaliṅ meypṭāṭāyirru (TPIḷam 253, p. 44f.) ‘Taṇmai means the nature (iyalpu) of a caste (cāti). Without being similar (ovvu-t) to each other, it characterises those called Brahmin, king, shepherd, and kuriṅci-hill-dwellers/Kuṛavar. It becomes meypṭāṭu, since it brings to light changes (vērupaṭṭu) in the body (mey).’* For examples of the nature of caste, ḷampūraṇar cites from the *Puraṇāṅṅuru* and the *Kalitokai*.

196 A sign of penance.

*māṛpu*); a shepherd appears with a stick (*kōl*) in hand and a folded shawl [on his shoulders] (*koṭumaṭi uṭai*), with a whistle/shrill sound (*vīlai*) that is calling (*viḷittal*) and white (*veṇ*) teeth.

l. Other peculiarities

Once again: the term *naṭuvunilaimai* (in the list of thirty-two auxiliary *meyp̄p̄āṭus*). As P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri has noted, Pērācīriyar’s interpretation of the term *naṭuvunilai* seems out of place in the list of thirty-two auxiliary *meyp̄p̄āṭus*.<sup>197</sup> One would expect *naṭuvunilai* (lit. a ‘middle’ state) in the meaning of calmness/tranquillity, rather than in the philosophical sense of Sanskrit *śānta*.<sup>198</sup>

Envy:

*porāmaiyeṇpatu, aḷukkāru; aḷtāvatu piṛar celvaṅkaṅṭavaḷi vēṅṅātirutatal.* (TPPēr 260, p. 43, ll. 7–9)<sup>199</sup>

*Porāmai* means envy (*aḷukkāru*). By seeing the richness/wealth of someone else, there is an undesirable feeling (*vēṅṅātiruttal*).

Interestingly, Pērācīriyar thinks of wealth (as ḷampūraṅar, late eleventh century[?], also does) when defining envy. Does this explanation reveal something about how the emotion of envy was historically conceived?

m. Why are the thirty-two auxiliary *meyp̄p̄āṭus* not explained in the root-text?

*marriṅṅarai eṅṅiya māttirai yallatu ilakkaṅaṅ kūrūkiṅṅirilaṅṅāl eṅṅi. collīṅ muṭiyum ilakkaṅattavākaliṅ collāṅāyiṅṅāṅ eṅṅpatu. Utāraṅam ikkūrīyavāṅṅāṅ vaḷakku nōkkīyūṅ ceyyūṅōkkīyūṅ kaṅṅuṅarappaṅum.* (TPPēr 260, p. 43, ll. 22ff.)

197 Strangely, Pērācīriyar’s explanation here is the same as in his discussion of the root-text’s first list (eight *meyp̄p̄āṭus*), where he discusses *naṭuvunilaimai* at length and finally decides not to include it in the list of eight times four *meyp̄p̄āṭus*, since *naṭuvunilaimai* occurs only in a limited group of people, namely those who have renounced the world. For more details, see here above, *Meyp̄p̄āṭu* source readings, s.v. Pērācīriyar, point h.

198 Pērācīriyar states: ‘*naṭuvunilai* (the quiescent) means *camanilai*, which is one of the nine *cuvais* or tastes required within drama performance (*nāṭaka*) [... quote of an unknown authority ...]. It occurs (*nikaḷtal*) only within (*kaṅ*) those who are freed (*nīṅkiṅṅōr*) of erotic desire (*kāma*), anger (*vekuḷi*), and mental delusion (*mayakkam*) [...], he said’ (*naṭuvunilaiyeṅṅpatu oṅṅpatu cuvaiyūḷ oṅṅreṅa nāṭaka nilaiyūḷ vēṅṅappaṅuṅ camanilai*; [... quote of another authority ...] *atu kāmavekuḷimayakka nīṅkiṅṅōr kaṅṅē nikaḷvatu [...]* *kūrīṅṅāṅ*.) (TPPēr 250, p. 41, ll. 6–10). – For ḷampūraṅar’s explanation of the *meyp̄p̄āṭu naṭuvunilaimai* in the list of the thirty-two auxiliary *meyp̄p̄āṭus*, see TPḷam 253, p. 44, where it is stated: ‘*naṭuvunilaimai* means a state of mind (*maṅa nikaḷcci*) that occurs when the mind is not wandering to one side’ (*onaṭuvunilaimaiyāvatu – oru maruṅku oḷāṭu nikaḷum maṅa nikaḷcci*), which cites *Tirukkūṅaḷ* 118: ‘The balance (*camāṅceytu*) not inclined to one side, that is the ornament (*aṅi*) of the noble (*cāṅṅōr*) minded’ (*camāṅceytu cīrtūkkūṅ kōlpōḷ amaintu orupār | kōṭāmai cāṅṅōrkkū aṅi*).

199 Also ḷampūraṅar says, p. 49: ‘When you see that someone else may be rich, then you feel uneasy; that kind of mental response is *meyp̄p̄āṭu*.’

If one asks (*eṇiṇ*) why [Tolkāppiyaṇār] only (*māttirai*) listed (*eṇṇutal*) these others [namely, the thirty-two auxiliary *meyp̄p̄āṭus*], but did not define them with accurate descriptions (*ilakkaṇam kūrutal*), [the answer is:] Because the word itself contains the definition (*ilakkaṇam*).<sup>200</sup> Examples or illustrations (*utāraṇam*) [for these words] may be seen and made out (*uṇartal*) by looking closely (*nōkki*) at the prevalent usage (*vaḷakku*) and looking closely at poetry (*ceyyul*).

- n. Both *meyp̄p̄āṭu* groups pertain to real world practice (love or war) and to stage performance as well; the view does not centre on the reader.<sup>201</sup>

*ivai muppattiraṇṭum mērkūriya muppattiraṇṭum pōla akattirkum purattirkum potuvāki nikaḷum meyp̄p̄āt' eṇak koḷka. Ivaiyellām ulaka vaḷakkākalāṇ ivvaḷakkē parri nāṭaka vaḷakkuḷḷuṇ kaṭiyappaṭā enravāru. (TPPēr 260, p. 43, 18ff.)*

These thirty-two [auxiliary *meyp̄p̄āṭus* of verse 260] and the aforementioned eight times four equalling thirty-two [the first group of verse 251], both are to be taken as *meyp̄p̄āṭus* that are common to *akam* (the theme of love, the inner world) and *puram* (the theme of war, the outer world). All of these [*meyp̄p̄āṭus*] pertain to life practices (as found in use in the real world) (*ulaka vaḷakku*). And referring to (*parri*) exactly (-ē) this usage (*ivvaḷakku*), they are not to be discarded (*kaṭiyappaṭatal*) in the practice of drama-theatre (*nāṭaka vaḷakku*).<sup>202</sup>

### *Meyp̄p̄āṭu* and *cuvai* theologised: The *Māraṇalankāram* of Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar (and its commentary)

The author Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar<sup>203</sup> (sixteenth century), in his *alankāram* grammar on figures of speech, the *Māraṇalankāram*, deals with *meyp̄p̄āṭu* and *cuvai* in a versified form. His work is modelled on Taṇṭi's treatise on *alankāram*. Perumāḷ Kavirāyar discusses *meyp̄p̄āṭu* and *cuvai* under the heading *cuvai alankāram* starting

200 I translate *collin mutivum* with a bit of freedom.

201 This was also noted by Thirugnanasambandhan, 'A Study of Rasa,' 337.

202 It seems Pēraṅciyār's emphasis here is on a drama-theatre that is more like the real world and less like a spectacle, and that this usage alone should be employed in drama-theatre as the correct form of a theatrical production. – Further, see Pēraṅciyār: 'If one says (*eṇiṇ*) "the elements (*porul*) that appear in the *paṇṇai* or play/entertainment", the author (*āciriyaṇ*) [someone other than Tolkāppiyaṇār] is differentiating (*vēru vēru ceyvāṇ*) between *cuvai*, *kuṛippu*, and *cattuvam*, which are performed (*iyarṟu-t*) on the dance theatre stage (*kūṭṭaṇ araṅku*), without categorising them together (*oṇṇoṇṇākkik kūṛāṭu*).' (*paṇṇait tōṇriya poruḷeṇiṇ oṇṇoṇṇākkik kūṛāṭu kūṭṭaṇ araṅkiṇuḷ iyarṟum vakaiyāṇē cuvaiyūṇ kuṛippuṇ cattuvamum eṇa vēru vēru ceyvāṇ āciriyaṇ eṇpatu*.) (TPPēr 255, p. 28, ll. 23–28).

203 Kurukai, place name; Kavirāyar, 'great poet'.

with verse 197.<sup>204</sup> The commentary (seventeenth century) is written by Irattiṇak Kavirāyar.

### Core ideas

- a. The basis of the *meypṭāṭu* theory is devotion.
- b. *Meypṭāṭu-cuvai* arises in the character, but the character is the devotee.
- c. *Cuvai* as a figure of speech (the thirty-second poetic ornament).<sup>205</sup>
- d. *Meypṭāṭu* is the basis for *cuvai*.<sup>206</sup>
- e. Sensory and cognitive processes are at work in the emerging of *cuvai*, which becomes visible to the onlooker.<sup>207</sup>
- f. Eight *meypṭāṭus* are mentioned.

These are:

- (1) greatness (*perumitam*; TP 6), (2) trembling (*naṭukkam*; TP *accam*-fear 5), (3) weeping (*aḷukai*; TP 2), (4) disgust (*iḷivaral*; TP 3); (5) anger (*uruttiram*; TP *vekuḷi* 7), (6) laughter (*nakai*; TP 1); (7) amazement (*viyappu*; TP *maruṭkai* 4), (8) joy (*uvakai*; TP 8). (*Māraṇalaṅkāram*, verse 198, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 333)

In contrast to the *Tolkāppiyam* root-text (TP11am, 7: 247), Kurukaip Perumāl Kavirāyar not only begins his eight-point list of emotions (*meypṭāṭu*) with greatness (*perumitam*) (rather than laughter [*nakai*]), but also replaces fear (*accam*) with trembling (*naṭukkam*), Tamil *vekuḷi* (anger) with the Sanskrit word *uruttiram* meaning the same, and *maruṭkai* (amazement) with the term *viyappu* (which has the same meaning).

- g. No thirty-two-member list of *meypṭāṭus* is mentioned.
- h. There are four causes for each of the eight *meypṭāṭus*.
- i. The causal factors are identical to those mentioned in the *Tolkāppiyam* root-text, however, they have a *bhakti* devotional tone. For example, fame (*pukaḷ*) is a cause that generates the *meypṭāṭu* of greatness (*perumitam*). In the Vaiṣṇava understanding, greatness caused by honour is due to the grace of the god Viṣṇu,<sup>208</sup> and joy (*uvakai*) arises due to reunion with the beloved god after having been separated from him.<sup>209</sup>

204 See *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 333–46.

205 See the commentary (by Irattiṇak Kavirāyar, alias Kāri, a Vaiṣṇava Vēlāla who was himself a poet-scholar, seventeenth century) on verse 197; *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 333.

206 The eight basic *meypṭāṭus* (Skt. *bhāva*) acquire the status of taste (*cuvai*).

207 See *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, verse 197, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 333. This is the emotion knowledge found in Pēraciriyar's commentary.

208 *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 336.

209 *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 344: *collāmai* [...]. Sexual union (*puṇarcci*) is one of the four causes for joy. The commentator explains the author's example: the beloved (the god Viṣṇu) went away, and she, the lover (the devotee), experienced the heat of separation (*vemmai*). When united again, she (the devotee) experiences her reunion like bathing in the ocean, which generates joy. The ocean is a reference to Viṣṇu, who churns the milky ocean, and sleeps on a serpent



- j. The commentator on the *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, Irattiṅak Kavirāyar, has added various elements, such as the combination of two *meypṭāṭu*s, as for example, wonder and fear, joy and pride (*perunitam*), and amazement and greatness.<sup>210</sup>
- k. Finally at the end of the chapter, the commentator Irattiṅak Kavirāyar introduces the *cuvai* of *cānta* (Skt. *sānta rasa*, quiescence):<sup>211</sup>

*Atu kāmam vekūḷi mayakkam nīnkiṅārkaṅṅē nikaḷvatām. camanilai, naṭuvunilai eṇpatum itu.* (Irattiṅak Kavirāyar’s commentary on the *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 346)

Those who are free of sexual desire (*kāmam*), anger (*vekūḷi*), and confusion (*mayakkam*): that is also called *camanilai* or *naṭuvunilai* (emotionless quiescence).

### A return to Tolkāppiyaṅār’s view of *meypṭāṭu*, and *cuvai* as a poetic ornament: The *Ilakkāṇa Viḷakkam* of Vaittiyaṅāta Tēcikar (with Vaittiyaṅāta Tēcikar’s auto-commentary)

The author Vaittiyaṅāta Tēcikar (seventeenth century) deals with the theory of *meypṭāṭu* in a versified chapter on love situations (*Akattiṅai-y-iyal*) in the *cūttirams* 578–80.<sup>212</sup> Moreover, modelled on the Buddhist *Vīracōḷiyam*,<sup>213</sup> he deals with *cuvai* in the chapter on *aṅi/alaṅkāram* (poetic ornamentation) in the *cūttiram* 665.<sup>214</sup> The commentary on the *Ilakkāṇa Viḷakkam* was also written by Vaittiyaṅāta Tēcikar.

#### Core ideas

- I. *Poruḷatikāram* (poetics), *Akattiṅai* chapter and its model of *meypṭāṭu*
- a. The basis of the *meypṭāṭu* theory is love (*akam*) poetry.
- b. *Meypṭāṭu* is a limb (*uṟuppu*) of poetry (*ceyyuḷ*).<sup>215</sup>

---

while floating on the cosmic ocean.

210 Additions of the commentator, Irattiṅak Kavirāya, to the *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 345: *meypṭāṭu accattaic cārnta maruṅkai*. According to him, this combination can take place, for instance, when someone is attacked and then saved. See also *maruṅkai cārnta perunitam* (commentary on *Māraṇalaṅkāram* [ed. Kōpālaiyar], 12), where amazement and greatness are combined in the devotee’s amazement at the god’s greatness.

211 Addition of the commentator, Irattiṅak Kavirāyar, to the *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 346: (*ētilar uṟṟār...*) *itu cāntaratam*. As he comments, if *cānta* is added, then there are nine *cuvais* (*cāntaratam eṇpatum kūṭṭic cuvai oṇpatu eṇavumpāṭum*).

212 I cite from *Ilakkāṇa viḷakkam*, ed. Tāmōtarampiḷḷai.

213 See *Meypṭāṭu* source readings above, s.v. *Vīracōḷiyam*, I. and II.

214 *Ilakkāṇa viḷakkam*, ed. Tāmōtarampiḷḷai.

215 The commentary speaks only of poetic experience.

Vaittianāta Tēcikar cites *Tolkāppiyam* 505, Ceyyuliyal 196:<sup>216</sup>

*uyttuṇarv' inri talaivaru poruḷiṅ | meypṇaṭa muṭippatu meypṇāṭ' atutāṅ*  
(*Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam, Akattiṇaiyiyal*, ed. Tāmōtarampiḷlai p. 519, verse 578)

‘That which succeeds (*muṭippatu*) in becoming real (*meypṇaṭatal*) without (*inri*) any conscious reflection (*uyttuṇartal*) through [the depiction of] its key-subject matter (*talaivarum poruḷ*) is indeed *meypṇāṭu*.’ (My trans. on the basis of trans. Cox, *From Source-Criticism*,<sup>217</sup> 132, rendering the root *meypṇaṭatal* as ‘becoming real’, rather than ‘revealing’)

- c. There is Tolkāppiyaṇār’s canonical eightfold classification of *meypṇāṭus*:<sup>217</sup> laughter, weeping, disgust, wonder/amazement, fear, greatness/pride, anger, joy<sup>218</sup> (*Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam, Akattiṇaiyiyal*, ed. Tāmōtarampiḷlai, p. 519, verse 578).
- d. There are Tolkāppiyaṇār’s canonical fourfold causal factors of each *meypṇāṭu* mentioned.  
These are mentioned in a single list, beginning with mockery (*eḷḷal*), childishness (*iḷamai*), ignorance (*pēṭaimai*), and credulity/ignorance (*maṭaṅ*) as the four causes of laughter (*Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam, Akattiṇaiyiyal*, ed. Tāmōtarampiḷlai, pp. 519–520 first line, verse 578).<sup>219</sup>
- e. There are Tolkāppiyaṇār’s thirty-two canonical auxiliary *meypṇāṭus* mentioned.

216 This verse describing *meypṇāṭu* as a limb of poetry is also cited by the *Tolkāppiyam* commentator ḷampūraṇar (see above, *Meypṇāṭu* source readings, s.v. ḷampūraṇar, point h). Note that the quote of ḷampūraṇar reads *poruṇmaiyyiṅ*, rather than *poruḷiṅ*.

217 Manuel, ‘*Meypṇāṭu*,’ 140, was the first to remark that the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam* reproduces Tolkāppiyaṇār’s early model.

218 The *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam*’s emotion words are those of Tolkāppiyaṇār’s root-text, rather than those of Tolkāppiyaṇār’s commentators: *nakai, aḷukai, iḷivaral, maruṭkai, accam, perumitam, vekuḷi, uvakai*. – Regarding the order of the eight *meypṇāṭus*, Vaittianāta Tēcikar, the auto-commentator on the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam*, tells the reader: ‘The reason for the given order of the eight [*meypṇāṭus*] you can examine (*ōr-t*) and make out (*uṇar-t*) yourself. In this, a great other commentary helps’ (*ivveṭṭiṅ kiṭakkaimuraimaik kāraṇaṅkaḷum ōntuṇarka. iṅṇu uraiṇṇirperukum*). (*Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam, Akattiṇaiyiyal*, p. 520, Vaittianāta Tēcikar’s auto-commentary on verse 578). We may assume that Vaittianāta Tēcikar’s auto-commentary is referring to Pērācīriyar’s commentary, which is the only one to raise the question of why this particular order is found in the *Tolkāppiyam*. See *Meypṇāṭu* source readings above, s.v. Pērācīriyar, point g.

219 Continuing with dishonour/disgrace (*iḷivu*), loss/deprivation (*iḷavu*), degradation (*acaivu*), and poverty (*vaṇumai*) as the four causes of weeping (*aḷukai*), and so forth, and ending with prosperity, wealth (*celvam*), knowledge (*pulaṅ*)\*\*\*, sexual intercourse (*punaru*), and play (*viḷaiyāṭṭu*) as the four causes of joy (*uvakai*). – Vaittianāta Tēcikar’s auto-commentary explains each of the thirty-two causal factors (eight times four) with a synonym or paraphrase (pp. 521–22). He paraphrases *pulaṅ*\*\* as: *kalvippayaṇākiya arivutaimai*.

The list begins with possessiveness/in the state of possessing (*uṭaimai*), includes calm/tranquillity (*naṭuvunilai*),<sup>220</sup> acedia/sloth (*maṭimai*), and envy (*poṛāmai*),<sup>221</sup> and ends with trembling (*naṭukkam*).<sup>222</sup> (*Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam, Akattiṇaiyiyal*, ed. Tāmōtarampillai, pp. 526–527, verse 579)<sup>223</sup>

- f. The terms *cuvai* and *kurippu* are both found. While not contained in the verse of the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam*, in his auto-commentary Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar uses them interchangeably for *meypṭātu*.

Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar in his auto-commentary reproduces Pērāciriyar’s explanation (with identical wording), albeit without attributing it to him.<sup>224</sup>

- 
- 220 Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar in his auto-commentary states: ‘In the acting of a drama, quiescence or *naṭuvunilai*, [also called] *camanilai*, one of the nine *cuvais* [*rasa* or aesthetic emotions], is required’ (*naṭuvunilai, onṇpatu cuvaiyu ’onṇena nāṭaka nilaiyuḷ vēṇṭappatuṅ camanilai*) (*Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam, Akattiṇaiyiyal*, commentary, ed. Tāmōtarampillai, p. 527). ‘This occurs only for those who are free of desire, anger, and delusion’ (*atu kāmam vekuḷi mayakkam nūṅkiṇōrkaṇṇē nikaḷvatu*) (*Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam, Akattiṇaiyiyal*, commentary, p. 527). ‘The author has mentioned this [among the thirty-two auxiliary *meypṭātus*], since it occasionally comes up (*cīruvara*) [in poetry]’ (*itu cīruvara viṛṛākalāṅ ivarṛoṭu kūṛiṇār*) (*Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam, Akattiṇaiyiyal*, commentary, p. 527). In my opinion, Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar was wrongly guided by Pērāciriyar’s commentary at this point and reproduced Pērāciriyar’s error in thinking; see *Meypṭātu* source readings above, s.v. Pērāciriyar, point i.
- 221 Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar in his auto-commentary gives for *maṭimai* the synonym *cōmpu*, and for *poṛāmai*, *aḷukkāru*. (*Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam, Akattiṇaiyiyal*, commentary, p. 528, fifth line from the bottom/p. 529, line 5).
- 222 As Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar in his auto-commentary explains: ‘Examples or illustrations (*utāraṇam*) [for these words] may be seen and made out (*uṇartal*) by a close look (*nōkki*) at everyday usage (*vaḷakku*) and a close look at poetry (*ceyyuḷ*)’ (*utāraṇam ikkūriyavārṛāṇ vaḷakku ’nōkkiyu ’ceyyuṇōkkiyuṅ kaṇṭukoḷka*) (*Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam, Akattiṇaiyiyal*, commentary, last sentence p. 529). Without mentioning his name, Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar uses the wording of Pērāciriyar, who called the thirty-two auxiliary emotion words self-explanatory (see *Meypṭātu* source readings above, s.v. Pērāciriyar, point m).
- 223 The full list of thirty-two auxiliary *meypṭātus* is as follows: (1) *uṭaimai*; (2) *iṇṇuḷal*; (3) *naṭuvunilai*; (4) *aruḷal*; (5) *taṇmai*; (6) *aṭakkam*; (7) *varaṭtal*; (8) *aṇṇu*; (9) *kaimmikal*; (10) *nalital*; (11) *cūḷcci*; (12) *vāḷṭtal*; (13) *nāṇal*; (14) *tuṅcal*; (15) *ararṛal*; (16) *kaṇavu*; (17) *muṇital*; (18) *niṇaital*; (19) *verūṭtal*; (20) *maṭimai*; (21) *karuṭal*; (22) *ārāycci*; (23) *viraivu*; (24) *uyirppu*; (25) *kaiyāru*; (26) *iṭukkan*; (27) *pocčāppu*; (28) *poṛāmai*; (29) *viyarttal*; (30) *aiyam*; (31) *mikai*; (32) *naṭukkam*. (*Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam, Akattiṇaiyiyal*, pp. 526–27, verse 579). For a translation, see *Meypṭātu* source readings above, s.v. *Tolkāppiyam*, point g.
- 224 See *TPPēr* 251, p. 15, ll. 12–13; for the Tamil and a translation, see *Meypṭātu* source readings above, s.v. Pērāciriyar, point f. – This also holds true for each of the eight *meypṭātu* terms. Where the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam* verse uses the technical term *nakai*, Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar’s auto-commentary equates the term with *cirippu* and so on, just as Pērāciriyar does (see *TPPēr* 251, p. 14, ll. 25–26, p. 15, ll. 1–13; see *Meypṭātu* source readings above, s.v. Pērāciriyar, point f). While the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam* verse reproduces the eight technical emotion terms of *Tolkāppiyaṇār*, Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar’s auto-commentary repeats the eight emotion words given by *Tolkāppiyaṇār*’s commentator Pērāciriyar.

*immeppāṭu eṭṭinaiyuñ cuvaiyēnavuñ kuṛippenavum vaḷaṅkiṇum amaiyum.* (*Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam*, *Akattiṇaiyiyal*, Vaittiyanāta Tēcikaṛ's auto-commentary on verse 578, ed. Tāmōtarampillai, p. 520)

These eight *meppāṭus* may be called *cuvai*, the eight *meppāṭus* may be called *kuṛippu*.

- g. The term *camanilai*, the quiescent (Skt. *sānta*), is discussed. While the term is not found in the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam* verses, Vaittiyanāta Tēcikaṛ's auto-commentary actively excludes it.

*marrivveṭṭiṇōṭuñ camanilaikūṭṭi oṇpatenṇāmō nātakanūluṭ pōlaveniṇ, atarkōr vikāramiṇmaiyiṇ iṇṭuk kūṛirrilam enpatu. atarkuvikāram unṭ' eṇiṇ muṇṇaiyēṭṭiṇuḷluñ cārttikkoḷlappaṭum. Allatūum, aḷtu ulakiyal nīnkiṇār perriyākaliṇ iṇṭu ulakavaḷakkiṇuṭ collarpārranṛ' enpatu.* (*Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam*, *Akattiṇaiyiyal*, Vaittiyanāta Tēcikaṛ' auto-commentary on verse 578, ed. Tāmōtarampillai, pp. 520–521)

If we ask whether *camanilai* (the quiescent) should not be added, as in the drama writing/book, as the ninth to the other eight, [we may answer:] Here (*iṇṭu*) [in the case of poetry] there is no need (*iṇmai*) of change (*vikāram*) for that. If it is relevant to change that [in the poetic context], then it can be joined (*cārttu-t*) to the former eight. Moreover (*allatūum*), since that [quiescence] is about those who have renounced (*nīnku-t*) worldly customs (*ulakiyal*), it need not be mentioned [as a ninth one], since [*meppāṭu*] is about worldly (*ulakam*) practice (*vaḷakku*).

Vaittiyanāta Tēcikaṛ's auto-commentary reproduces Pērācīriyar's line of argument, albeit without mentioning his name.<sup>225</sup>

- h. The terms *cattuvam*, *kuṛippu*, *cuvai* are not mentioned by the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam* verse, but they are by Vaittiyanāta Tēcikaṛ's auto-commentary.

The commentary (p. 521) on verse 578 is a close reproduction of the list of Pērācīriyar in *TPPēr* 249, pp. 9–10.<sup>226</sup>

- (1) *cuvaikkapaṭum poruḷ* denotes an object that is tasted;
- (2) *pori* denotes the sense-organ [experiencing the object];
- (3) *uṇarvākiya cuvai* denotes the sense-perceptive *cuvai* or aesthetic emotion;
- (4) *uḷḷanikaḷcciyākiya kuṛippu* denotes the cognitive response in the mind that happens internally (*nikaḷcciyākiya*);
- (5) *akkurippupparṛip purattuṭṭōṇṇrum cattuvam/viral* denotes bodily changes [made known by various properties, such as horripilation, *meymmayir cilirttal*]

225 See *TPPēr* 251, p. 15, ll. 32–33, p. 16, ll. 2–5; for Tamil quote and translation, see *Meppāṭu* source readings above, s.v. Pērācīriyar, point h.

226 See *Meppāṭu* source readings above, s.v. Pērācīriyar, point d.

that appear outside (visibly) (*purattuṭṭōṇrum*) and refer to (*parri*) internal cognitive phenomena (*kuṟippu*);  
 (6) *cattuvam* and *viṟal* are equivalent to each other.<sup>227</sup>

## II. *Poruḷatikāram*, *Aṇi* chapter on poetic embellishment

- a. *Cuvai* (Tam. lit. ‘taste’) as one of the figures of speech (*aṇi*, Skt. *alāṅkāra*) in poetry.

Vaiṭṭiyanāta Tēcīkar, the author of the *Iḷakkaṇa Viḷakkam*, verse 665, lists eight *cuvais* that correspond to the eight *meypṭāṭus* (but does not follow the *meypṭāṭus*’ order).

The eight *cuvais* are:

the heroic (*vīram*), terrified fear (*accam*), disgust (*iḷippu*), amazement (*viyappu*), erotic love (*kāmam*), the pathetic, sorrow (*avalam*), anger, fury (*uruttiram*), laughter (*nakai*) (*Iḷakkaṇa Viḷakkam*, *Aṇiyiyal*, verse 665, ed. Tāmōtarampiḷḷai, p. 675)

The *Iḷakkaṇa Viḷakkam* borrows here directly from the Tamil *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*, *poruḷaṇi* chapter 18, verse 68.<sup>228</sup> The list follows the order of this anonymous mid-twelfth-century treatise, which contains eight *cuvais*.<sup>229</sup> Vaiṭṭiyanāta Tēcīkar’s auto-commentary on verse 665 quotes the *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram* without mentioning its title.

- b. *Cuvai* is a particular type of expressive language used in the same way as other familiar figures of speech.  
 c. *Cuvai* as a phenomenon immanent in the text, a feature related to the character in the text.

227 *Viṟal eṇiṇuṅ cattuvam eṇiṇum okkum*. (*Iḷakkaṇa Viḷakkam*, *Akattiṇaiyiyal*, commentary, ed. Tāmōtarampiḷḷai, p. 521).

228 See *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*: *uṇṇikaḷ taṇmai purattut tōṇra | envakai meypṭāṭṭiṇ iyalvatu cuvaiyē*. (*Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*, ed. Irāmacuppīramāṇiyam and Caṇmukam Piḷḷai, 245. For the verse’s text and translation, see *Meypṭāṭu* source readings above, s.v. *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*, points a and d.

229 If compared to the *Viṟacōḷiyam*’s fifth subchapter on poetic embellishment, we have there nine *cuvais*, starting with erotic love (*ciruṅkāram* = *kāmam*), followed by the heroic, and including quiescence (*cāntam*). See VCC ad 170 [Alāṅkāram section], pp. 257–58; see also *Meypṭāṭu* source readings above, s.v. *Viṟacōḷiyam*, II.b.



## References

- Balasubramanian, K., *Studies in Tolkappiyam: Professor T. P. Meenakshisundaran Birth Centenary Volume* (Chidambaram, Annamalainagar: Annamalai University, 2001).
- Cantiracēkarāṇ, Irā and P. Caravaṇaṇ, *Cilappatikāratil meypṭāuka!* (Chennai: Rāmaiyā Patip-pakam, 2007).
- [*Ceyirriyam* by Ceyirriyaṇār]. A lost source text. Citations in *TPI*am.
- Chevillard, Jean-Luc, “‘Rare Words’ in Classical Tamil literature: From the *Uriyiyal* to the *Tivākaram*,” *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hung* 63.3 (2010): 301–317.
- Cilappatikāra mūlamum arumpatavuraiyum Aṭiyārkkunallār uraiyum*, ed. U. Vē. Cāminātaiyar (Chennai: Kamarkṣiyal Accukkūtam, 1920).
- Citamparappāṭṭiyal*, ed. Ki. Irāmānujaiyaṅkār (Maturai: Madurai Tamilccaṅka Muttirācālai, 1932).
- Concordance of Three Nigandus / tivākaram – piṅkalam – cūṭāmaṇi akarāti aṭṭavaṇai* (Chennai: Cānti Cātaṇā, 2000).
- Cox, Whitney, ‘From Source-Criticism to Intellectual History in the Poetics of the Medieval Tamil Country,’ in *Bilingual Discourse and Cross-Cultural Fertilisation: Sanskrit and Tamil in Medieval India*, eds Whitney Cox and Vincenzo Vergiani (Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry, École Française d’Extrême-Orient [Collection Indologie 121], 2013), 115–160.
- Cox, Whitney, ‘Bearing the *Nāṭyaveda*: Śāradātanaya’s *Bhāvaprakāśana*,’ in *Modes of Philology in Medieval South India* by Whitney Cox (Leiden: Brill, 2017).
- Cuppiramaṇiyaṇ, C. Vē., ed., *Aṭiyārkkunallār uraittiraṇ* (Chennai: IITS International Institute of Tamil Studies, 1976).
- Dixon, Thomas, *From Passions to Emotions: The Creation of a Secular Psychological Category* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- Dixon, Thomas, “‘Emotion’: One Word, Many Concepts,” *Emotion Review* 4.4 (October 2012): 387–388.
- emotionresearcher.com/lisa-feldman-barrett-why-emotions-are-situated-conceptualizations/ (accessed 24 October 2018).
- Feldman Barrett, Lisa and Ajay B. Satpute, ‘Historical Pitfalls and New Directions in the Neuroscience of Emotion,’ *Neuroscience Letters* (2017): 1–10: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2017.07.045>.
- Filliozat, Jean, ‘Tamil and Sanskrit in South India,’ in *Passages: Relationships Between Tamil and Sanskrit*, eds M. Kannan and Jennifer Clare (Pondicherry: French Institute of Pondicherry and Tamil Chair, Department of South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of California at Berkeley, 2009), 1–10.

- Fortenbaugh, William W., 'Aristotle's *Rhetoric* on Emotions,' *Archiv fuer Geschichte der Philosophie* 52 (1970): 40–70.
- Fortenbaugh, William W., *Aristotle on Emotions* (London: Duckworth, 2003).
- Frevert, Ute, *Emotions in History – Lost and Found* (Budapest, New York: Central European University Press, 2011).
- Gendron, Maria and Lisa Feldman Barrett, 'Emotion Perception as Conceptual Synchrony,' *Emotion Review* 10.2 (April 2018): 101–110, doi: 10.1177/1754073917705717.
- Gerow, Edwin, 'Abhinavagupta's Aesthetics as a Speculative Paradigm,' *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114.2 (1994): 186–208.
- Glossary of Historical Tamil Literature (up to 1800 AD)*, Tamil ilakkiyap pērakarāti (Chennai: Cānti Cātaṇā, 2002).
- Harré, Rom, ed., *The Social Construction of Emotions* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986).
- Ilakkaṇa viḷakkam, eḷuttatikāram + collatikāram + poruḷatikāram* [by Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar with his auto-commentary], ed. Ci. Vai. Tāmōtarampiḷlai (digitised by Roja Muthiah Research Library, Chennai; front matter missing).
- Ilakkaṇa viḷakkam: poruḷatikāram-akattiṇaiyiyal* [by Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar], ed. Ti. Vē. Kōpālaiyar (Tañcāvūr: Caracuvati Makāl Nūnilaiyam, 1972), 754–870.
- James, Gregory, *Colporuḷ: A History of Tamil Dictionaries* (Chennai: Cre-A, 2000).
- [*Kāvyādarśa* by Daṇḍin] *Daṇḍin's Poetik: Kāvyadarśa, Sanskrit und Deutsch*, ed. and trans. Otto Böhtlingk (Leipzig: von H. Haessel, 1890).
- Kleinginna, Paul R., Jr. and Anne M. Kleinginna, 'A Categorized List of Emotion Definitions: With Suggestions for a Consensual Definition,' *Motivation and Emotion* 5.4 (1981): 345–379.
- Konstan, David, *Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006).
- Kōpālaiyar, Ti. Vē., *Tamil ilakkaṇap perakarāti*, vols 12, 16 (Chennai: Tamilmaṇ, 2005).
- Kōvintarāj Mutaliyār, Kā. Ra., ed., *Puttamittiraṇār iyarriya Vīracōḷiyam mūlamum, Peruntēvaṇār iyarriya uraiyum* (Chennai: Pavāṇantar Kaḷakam, 1942).
- Krapinger, Gernot, trans./ed., *Aristoteles Rhetorik*, 2. Buch (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2018).
- Krapinger, Gernot, trans./ed., *Aristoteles Nikomachische Ethik*, 4. Buch (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2018).
- Kraus, Christina S. and Christopher Stray, *Classical Commentaries: Explorations in a Scholarly Genre* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).
- Manuel, Indra, *Literary Theories in Tamil* (Pondicherry: Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture, 1997).
- Manuel, Indra, 'Meyppātu,' in *Literary Theories in Tamil* by Indra Manuel (Pondicherry: Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture, 1997), 134–145.
- Māraṇalankāram mūlamum paḷaya uraiyum*, ed. Ti. Vē. Kōpālaiyar (Chennai: Śrīmath Āṇṭavan Ācciramam Śrīraṅkam, 2005).
- Marr, John Ralston, *The Eight Anthologies: A Study in Early Tamil Literature* (Madras/Chennai: Institute of Asian Studies, 1985).



- McCrea, Lawrence, ‘“Resonance” and Its Reverberations: Two Cultures in Indian Epistemology of Aesthetic Meaning,’ in *The Bloomsbury Research Handbook of Indian Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Art*, ed. Arindam Chakrabarti (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 25–41.
- Monius, Anne, ‘The Many Lives of Daṇḍin: The *Kāvyaḍarsa* in Sanskrit and Tamil,’ *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 4.1 (2000): 1–37.
- Monius, Anne, *Imagining a Place for Buddhism: Literary Culture and Religious Community in Tamil-Speaking South India* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Monius, Anne E., ‘Love, Violence, and the Aesthetics of Disgust: Śaivas and Jains in Medieval South India,’ *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 32 (2004): 113–172.
- Monius, Anne, ‘Loving Śiva’s Liṅka: The Changing Emotional Valences of a Beloved Image in the Tamil-Speaking Śaiva Tradition,’ in *Historicizing Emotions: Practices and Objects in India, China, and Japan*, ed. Barbara Schuler (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 113–145.
- Monius, Anne E., ‘“Sanskrit is the Mother of All Tamil Words”’: Further Thoughts on the *Viracōḷiyam* and Its Commentary,’ in *Buddhism Among Tamils in Tamilakam and Īlam, Part 3: Extension and Conclusions*, eds Peter Schalk and Astrid van Nahl (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet [Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 33], 2013), 103–129.
- Mulligan, Kevin and Klaus R. Scherer, ‘Towards a Working Definition of Emotion,’ *Emotion Review* 4.4 (2012): 345–357.
- Nālaṭiyār*. See Pope.
- Narṇinai: Text, Transliteration and Translations in English Verse and Prose*, vol. 2, comp./ed. V. Murugan (Chennai: Central Institute of Classical Tamil, 2011).
- [*Nāṭyasāstra* by Bharata] *The Nāṭyasāstra*, ed. Manomohan Ghosh (Calcutta: Granthalaya Private Ltd., 1967).
- Okita, Kiyokazu, ‘Salvation through Colorful Emotions: Aesthetics, Colorimetry, and Theology in Early Modern South Asia,’ in *Historicizing Emotions: Practices and Objects in India, China, and Japan*, ed. Barbara Schuler (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 100–112.
- Pollock, Sheldon, ‘The Theory of Practice and the Practice of Theory in Indian Intellectual History,’ *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105.3 (July-Sept. 1985): 499–519.
- Pollock, Sheldon, ‘Bhoja’s Śṅgāraprakāśa and the Problem of *rasa*: A Historical Introduction and Annotated Translation,’ *Asiatische Studien: Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengeellschaft* 52.1 (1998): 117–192.
- Pollock, Sheldon, ‘New Intellectuals in Seventeenth-century India,’ *The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 38.1 (2001): 3–31.
- Pollock, Sheldon, ‘The Social Aesthetic and Sanskrit Literary Theory,’ *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 29 (2001): 197–229.
- Pollock, Sheldon, ‘Rasa after Abhinava,’ in *Śaṃskṛta-sādhutā: Goddess of Sanskrit. Studies in Honour of Professor Ashok Aklujkar*, ed. Chikafumi Watanabe, Michele Desmarais and Yoshichika Honda (New Delhi: D. K. Printworld Ltd., 2012), 429–445.

- Pollock, Sheldon, trans./ed., *A Rasa Reader: Classical Indian Aesthetics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2016).
- Pope, George U., *The Nālaḍiyār: or, Four Hundred Quatrains in Tamil* (Clarendon Press, 1893).
- Puṛapporuḷ veṅpāmālai* [by Aiyaṅāritaṅār], *mūlamum, uraiyum*, ed. U. Vē. Cāminātaiyar (Chennai: U. Vē Cāminātaiyar Nūnilaiyam, [1895] 2003).
- Rajaram, M., trans., *Tirukkuraḷ: Pearls of Inspiration* (New Delhi: Rupa Publications India Pvt. Ltd., 2009).
- Reddy, William, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Rosenwein, Barbara H., 'Emotion Words,' in *Le sujet des émotions au Moyen Âge*, ed. Piroška Nagy and Damien Boquet (Paris: Beauchesne, 2008), 93–106.
- Russell, James A., 'Introduction to Special Section: On Defining Emotion,' *Emotion Review* 4.4 (2012): 337.
- Schuler, Barbara, *Of Death and Birth: Icakkiamman, a Tamil Goddess, in Ritual and Story* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009. [Ethno-Indology 8, Heidelberg Studies in South Asian Rituals], with the DVD *A Ritual of the Vēḷāḷas in Paḷavūr, India*).
- Schuler, Barbara, 'Food and Emotion: Can Emotions Be Worked On and Altered in Material Ways?,' in *Historicizing Emotions: Practices and Objects in India, China, and Japan*, ed. Barbara Schuler (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 57–70.
- Schuler, Barbara, 'Introduction: Historicizing Asian Community-Based Emotion Practices,' in *Historicizing Emotions: Practices and Objects in India, China, and Japan*, ed. Barbara Schuler (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 1–29.
- Shulman, David, *Tamil: A Biography* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2016).
- Steele Clare, Jennifer, 'Canons, Conventions and Creativity: Defining Literary Tradition in Pre-modern Tamil South India' (PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 2011).
- Subrahmanya Sastri, P. S., *History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil and Their Relation to the Grammatical Literature in Sanskrit* (Chennai [Madras]: The Kuppaswami Sastri Research Institute, [1934] 1997).
- Subrahmanya Sastri, P. S., *Tolkāppiyam: The Earliest Extant Tamil Grammar, With a Short Commentary in English, Volume 2: Poruḷatikāram* (Chennai: The Kuppaswami Sastri Research Institute, [1936] 2002).
- Takahashi, Takanobu, *Tamil Love Poetry and Poetics* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).
- Tamiḷaṅṅal, *Tolkāppiyariṅ ilakkiyak koḷkaikaḷ* (Maturai: Mīṅāṭci Puttaka Nilaiyam, 2004).
- Tamil Lexicon*, 6 vols and supplement (University of Madras, 1982).
- Taṅṅiyalaṅkāram, mūlamum teḷivuraiyum*, ed. V. T. Irāmacuppiramaṅiyam and Mu. Caṅmukam Piḷḷai (Chennai: Mullai Nilaiyam, 2017).
- Thirugnanasambhandhan, P., 'A Study of Rasa – Thlokāppiyar [sic!] and Bharata,' in *The Earliest Complete Grammar Studies in Tolkāppiyam*, eds Pa. Marutanāyakam, Ku. Civamaṅi and M. Dominic Raj (Chennai: Sekar Pathippagam, 2010), 332–343.
- Tirukkuraḷ mūlamum paṛimēḷaḷakar uraiyum*, ed. Vaṭivēlu Ceṅṅiyār, 3 vols (Maturai: Maturai Palkalaikaḷakam, [1904] 1972–1976).

- Tirukkuraḷ teḷivurai*, ed. Pa. Cuppiramaṇiyaṅ (Tirucci: Icaiyaraci Patippakam, n.d.).  
*Tolkāppiyam*. See *TPI*am and *TPP*ēr.
- Tolkāppiyam (muḷuvatum)*, ed. and comm. Puliyūr Kēcikaṅ (Chennai: Pāri Nilaiyam, 2012).
- [*TPI*am] *Tolkāppiyam, poruḷatikāram, meypṭāṭṭiyal, Iḷampūraṇam*, ed. Mu. Caṇmukam Piḷḷai (Chennai: Mullai Nilaiyam, [1996] 2014).
- [*TPP*ēr] *Tolkāppiyam, poruḷatikāram, meypṭāṭṭiyal, Pērācīriyar urai*, ed. Ku. Cuntaramūrṭti (Chidambaram, Annamalainagar: Annamalai University, [1985] 2012).
- Tuske, Joerg, ‘The Concept of Emotion in Classical Indian Philosophy,’ *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (1 March 2011, last modified 26 July 2016): <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/concept-emotion-india/>.
- Varalāṟru murait tamiḷ iḷakkiyaṭ pēraḱarāṭi* (Chennai: Cānti Cāṭaṇā, 2002).
- Vendrell Ferran, Ingrid, ‘Emotion in the Appreciation of Fiction,’ *Journal of Literary Theory* 12.2 (2018): 204–223: <https://doi.org/10.1515/jlt-2018-0012>.
- Vīracōḷiyam* [VC by Puttamittiraṅ] and its commentary [VCC by Peruntēvaṅ]. See Kōvintarāḱ Mutaliyār.
- Wilden, Eva, ‘Depictions of Language and Languages in Early Tamil Literature: How Tamil Became Cool and Straight,’ *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 31.2, La nomination des langues dans l’histoire (2009): 117–141, doi: 10.3406/hel.2009.3122.
- Wilden, Eva, *Manuscript, Print and Memory: Relics of the Caṅkam in Tamilnadu* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014).
- Zvelebil, Kamil V., *Companion Studies to the History of Tamil Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).
- Zvelebil, Kamil V., *Lexicon of Tamil Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).



It is impossible to imagine human history without emotions. But what is known about theoretical emotion knowledge in premodern South India? This volume offers a first systematic examination of emotion knowledge as found in Tamil treatises and commentaries written from the 11th to 17th century. By following different theoretical strands, it sheds light on the questions that were raised by various emotion theorists, as well as their agenda and theorising practices. It points out changes, linearity, and disruptions in their ideas, as well as historically marginal knowledge. Perhaps surprisingly, the only systematic works on emotion produced by medieval and early modern Tamil thinkers were on emotion in poetics.

ISBN 978-3-948791-31-5



9 783948 791315