# 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*,[1] 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.[2] The question of 'literary promulgation of an immoral order'[3] and knowledge related to this did not find its way into the Tamil emotion discourse.[4] The 'sociology of emotion' (Pollock) was never a topic in the Tamil emotion discourse, nor was the question of insincere versus authentic emotions.[5] 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 *Tirukkuṟaḷ*? 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.[6] Also rarely considered (with the exception of Pērāciriyar) was the fact that weeping can just as well be the result of happiness or an eye disease, not only of sorrow.[7]

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 *meyppāṭu* 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).[8] Nonetheless, commentators on the *Tol-kāppiyam meyppāṭu* root-text explicitly exclude the emotion of quiescence (*naṭuvunilai*), since they consider this emotion possible only for ascetics, those de-tached from the world. Moreover, the sixteenth-century Vaiṣṇava poet-devotee-theo-rist Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar considered literature (albeit devotional literature) and the technical terms *meyppāṭu* and *cuvai* appropriate for concepts of religious emo-tions.[9]

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, *Naṟṟiṇai* 371: when joy is replaced by sorrow, the lover grows physically thin and her glistening bangles loosen on her arms; see *Naṟṟiṇai: 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 *meyppāṭu*s can be experienced in combination seem to have been introduced by the seventeenth-century commentator on the *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram*; see ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v. Māṟaṉalaṅkāram*, point j. – On the questions of conjunc-tures 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 elev-enth century' in the Cōḻa country.

9   See Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar's sixteenth-century grammar *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram* (*Māṟaṉ-alaṅkāram mūlamum paḻaya uraiyum*, ed. Ti. Vē. Kōpālaiyar [Ceṉṉai: Śrīmath Āṇṭavaṉ Ācci-ramam Śrīraṅkam, 2005]; also ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v. Māṟaṉalaṅkāram*). 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, Berke-ley, 2011], 15, 102). Cf. the Sanskrit case: Sheldon Pollock, 'Rasa after Abhinava,' in *Saṃskṛta-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.[10]

## 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 *meyppāṭu* 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 *Meyppāṭu* source readings in chapter 2 of the book offer passages from these source texts with their translations.

**Tolkāppiyaṉār's[11] chapter on literary emotion, *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram Meyppāṭṭiyal*, mid-first millennium(?) CE[12]**

The Tamil root-text of the emotion theory (the *meyppāṭu* 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 Cātaṉā's *Glossary of Historical Tamil Literature*, vol. 2, 435. See also the sixteenth-century grammar *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram*, p. 218, and Ti. Vē. Kōpālaiyar, *Tamiḻ ilakkaṇap perakarāti*, vol. 12, *poruḷ: aṇi* (Chennai: Tamiḻmaṇ, 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 *iṟaicci*, 'suggestion', see also Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography*, 45.

11  Tolkāppiyaṉār 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: [*TP*Iḷam] *Tolkāppiyam, poruḷatikāram, meyppāṭṭiyal, Iḷampūraṇam*, ed. Mu. Caṇmukam Piḷḷai (Chennai: Mullai Nilaiyam, [1996] 2014) with Iḷampūraṇar's commentary; and [*TP*Pēr] *Tolkāppiyam, poruḷatikāram, meyppāṭṭiyal, Pērāciriyar urai*, ed. Ku. Cuntaramūrtti (Chidambaram, Annamalainagar: Annamalai University, [1985] 2012) with Pērāciriyar'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 *meyppāṭu* 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,[13] 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),[14] 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 Tolkāppiyaṉār's *meyppāṭu* 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).[15] However, the emotion knowledge embodied in these two language-bound concepts, Tamil *meyppāṭu* and Sanskrit *bhāva*, is not exactly the same, since the latter served the realisation of *rasa*.

It remains unclear what Tolkāppiyaṉār exactly means with the term *meyppāṭu*, and thus, its translation is difficult.[16] 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 Tolkāppiyaṉār 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, *Tirukkuṟaḷ*, 696).[17] Also unclear is why Tolkāppiyaṉār places laughter at the top of his list, an indication of its importance.[18]

---

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, Annamalainagar: 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 *Meyppāṭu* source readings of chapter 2 below details to the Sanskritic *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 *meyppāṭu* 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 *Tirukkuṟaḷ* 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

### Puttamittiraṉ's *Vīracōḻiyam*, c.1060–1068 CE[19] and its commentary by Peruntēvaṉār, late eleventh or early twelfth century(?)[20]

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

---

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 *Vīracōḻiyam*'s bold statements that it will explain Tamil grammar and poetic theory 'according to the ancient rules of grammar [sanctioned by] northern texts [*vaṭa nūḻ*, BS]' and that the principles of poetic ornamentation in particular will be discussed in light of 'the statements of Taṇṭi'. 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, *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 *Vīracōḻiyam*, preface, v; I refer to the edition from Kā. Ra. Kōvintarāj Mutaliyār, ed., *Puttamittiraṉār iyaṟṟiya Vīracōḻiyam mūlamum, Peruntēvaṉār iyaṟṟiya uraiyum* (Chennai: Pavāṉantar Kaḻakam, 1942). – As Monius (*Imagining*, 138) states: 'The Vīracōḻiyam and its commentary are […] the sole remaining artifacts of […] Buddhist Cōḻa-era literary culture of southern India.' 'The commentary of the VC provides a glimpse of what must have once been a flourishing Buddhist literary cuture in Tamil' (ibid.). The commentary of Puttamittiraṉ's diciple Peruntēvaṉār is perhaps one of the earliest prose commentaries: 'The commentator on the *Vīracōḻiyam* […] 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 Daṇḍin: The *Kāvyādarśa* in Sanskrit and Tamil,' *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 4.1 (2000): 1–37 (12).

27  According to tradition, the author of the *Kāvyādarśa*, Daṇḍin, 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 *Kāvyādarśa*, the *Vīracōḻiyam* and the *Taṇṭiyalaṇkāram*, see Monius, 'Many Lives of Daṇḍin,' 1–37.

28  Monius states (*Imagining*, 125–27): In the Vīracōḻiyam '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 dyna-mism. 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,[29] it was not, however, this paradigm that spilled into the theory of *meyppāṭu*. The learned Tamil discourse of the eleventh century felt another influence, as can be witnessed in the Tamil *Vīracōḻiyam*. In this Buddhist grammar, a fundamen-tal 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 *Vīracōḻiyam* introduces *meyppāṭu* 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 *Vīracōḻiyam* is the assimilation of Sanskrit aesthetic principles into Tamil *meyppāṭu* knowledge (absent in the *Tolkāppiyam*), with the in-corporation of the Sanskrit aesthetic emotion (*rasa*) of erotic love or *śṛṅgāra*[30] into the list of the eight basic *meyppāṭu*s. In exchange, the Tamil *meyppāṭu* of anger has been discarded. It is striking that erotic love/desire[31] (*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 *meyppāṭu*.[32] These shifts (of particular concern for Buddhists[33]) did not occur without new technical terms being introduced, such as *kuṟippu*, a functional term denoting the physical or mental signs of the desire (*vēṭkai*) felt by lovers.[34] 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 Cōḻa rule in the era of the *Vīracōḻiyam*'s composition (roughly the mid-tenth through late-eleventh centuries) and that at least one Tamil-speaking Buddhist monastery, the Rājarājaperumpaḷḷi, is believed to have flour-ished 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 *Puṟapporuḷveṇpāmalai*, below ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings, *s.v. Vīracōḻiyam* I.b, footnote).

31  The erotic love refers above all to desire.

32  Is it possible that here the *Vīracōḻiyam* 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 nei-ther the *Vīracōḻiyam* nor its commentary name Bhoja as a source, but both freely name Daṇḍin. – On *śṛṅgāra* receiving a Buddhist tone, see Monius, ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v. Vīracōḻiyam* II.b, footnote.

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

34  For a listing of the *kuṟippu*s, see ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings, *s.v. Vīracōḻiyam* I.d, footnote.

The third shift initiated by the *Vīracōḻiyam* (in the fifth section, Alaṅkāram) is the incorporation into Tamil literary concepts of the Sanskrit poetic ornament theory[35] of Daṇḍin (c.700 CE), a theory that considers aesthetic emotions (*rasa*) to be poetic ornaments.[36] In this, the *Vīracōḻiyam*'s author Puttamittiraṉ 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 Peruntēvaṉār, the commentator on the *Vīracōḻiyam* (late eleventh or early twelfth century). He does not list eight canonical aesthetic emotions or *cuvai*s/*rasa*s, 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.[37] Also striking is the fact that in the commentary the nine aesthetic emotions are described as dramaturgical *cuvai*s, that is, aesthetic emotions in the dramatic performing arts rather than in texts.[38] 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 Peruntēvaṉār 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 *Kāvyādarśa* (*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 *Kāvyādarśa* and translated it into Singhalese. – 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 *Meyppāṭu* source readings, *s.v. Vīracōḻiyam* below.

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

38  It is possible that the commentator on the *Vīracōḻiyam* 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 *Vīracōḻiyam* and its commentary belong to an era in which new Sanskrit texts were – quite literally – 'arriving daily in Cōḻa 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,[39] *en vogue* in Sanskrit theoretical circles, but not in Tamil ones).

The fifth shift in the *Vīracōḻiyam* commentary and the most distinctive, also found in the fifth section on poetic ornamentation (Alaṅkāram), 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 *cuvai*s, such as the heroic and disgust, receive a unique Buddhist colour.[40]

To conclude, the *Vīracōḻiyam*, 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.

### Ceyiṟṟiyaṉār's[41] *Ceyiṟṟiyam*, late eleventh or early twelfth century[42]

This now lost treatise was a work entirely about drama.[43] It was written before the commentarial work by Iḷampūraṇar (discussed below), but after Abhinavagupta's *The New Dramatic Art* (*Abhinavabhāratī*, c.1000 CE) and the *Vīracōḻiyam* by Puttamittiraṉ (c.1060–1068); the question of whether the *Vīracōḻiyam* commentary by Peruntēvaṉār preceded the *Ceyiṟṟiyam* or vice versa must still be sorted out. The *Ceyiṟṟiyam* was one of the most important influences on later medieval commentators on the *meyppāṭu* root-text (*Tolkāppiyam*), as well as on the poetic narrative *Cilappatikāram, The Tale of an Anklet* (post-Caṅkam, date uncertain[44]). Indeed, it is primarily (though not exclusively) through quotes in Iḷampūraṇar's commentary on the *meyppāṭu* root-text that we know the now lost *Ceyiṟṟiyam*.[45] The author of the *Ceyiṟṟiyam* 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.[46] 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 *Vīracōḻiyam*, see the footnotes in ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v. Vīracōḻiyam.*

41  Just as the author of the *Tolkāppiyam* is called Tolkāppiyanār, the title of the *Ceyiṟṟiyam* 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 *Ceyiṟṟiyam* in various medieval works, see Zvelebil, *Companion Studies*, 85.

46  For Cox's arguments, see 'From Source-Criticism,' 127–129, and below ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings, *s.v. Ceyiṟṟiyam*, (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 idiosyncra[tic] […] 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.[47]

Like the *Vīracōḻiyam*'s commentator Peruntēvaṉār, the author of the *Ceyiṟṟiyam* 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 *Vīracōḻiyam* uses the Sanskrit calque *cāntam*, Ceyiṟṟiyaṉār translates Sanskrit *śānta-rasa* as Tamil *mattimam*, 'in the middle'. However, this is also where the *Vīracōḻiyam* and *Ceyiṟṟiyam* depart from one another, since in the *Ceyiṟṟiyam* 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.[48] It seems that the *Ceyiṟṟiyam* considers it possible to represent quiescence, the aesthetic emotion of emotionlessness, in dramatic performance.[49]

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 *Ceyiṟṟiyam*. Although the Buddhist *Vīracōḻiyam* 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 *Ceyiṟṟiyam* onward.[50] The term *cattuvam*, which Ceyiṟṟiyaṉār 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 *Ceyiṟṟiyam* does not stop its investigation here. It rather widens the Tamil *meyppāṭu* 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 *meyppāṭu* root-text (as for example by Pērāciriyar in the early thirteenth century, see below n. 96; also ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, 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 Iḷampūraṇar to Ceyiṟṟiyaṉār by name, but it is very likely that they are by him.

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

Also belonging to this fragmentary transmission is the phrase 'two loci of *cuvai*'. How far Ceyiṟṟiyaṉār followed Abhinavagupta in his new viewer-centred locus of aesthetic emotion (*cuvai/rasa*) is difficult to say.[54] 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 *meyppāṭu*, or only with reservation (as for example Pērāciriyar).[55]

### Iḷampūraṇar's commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam's* emotion root-text (*Meyypāṭṭiyal*), late eleventh or a few decades later(?)[56]

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

The commentator introduces several new ideas into the *meyppāṭu* discourse of his time. On one hand, in order to provide new questions, he consolidates and strengthens the relationship between Tamil emotion (*meyppāṭu*) and Sanskrit aesthetics (which had been first extended to Tamil poetics in the Buddhist *Vīracōḻiyam*). 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, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Ceyiṟṟiyam, text and translation, point e.
52  See below, ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, point c, definition of *meyppāṭu*.
53  See my translation, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Ceyiṟṟiyam, point e.
54  For *rasa* theory by Abhinavagupta, see Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 187ff.
55  Pērāciriyar 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 Pērāciriyar below, as well as ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, point d (*cuvai* has two loci).
56  I must acknowledge my indebtedness to Whitney Cox's reading and translation of Iḷampūraṇar'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  Iḷampūraṇar 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* → *Ceyiṟṟiyam* → Iḷampūraṇar; 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*,[59] 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 *Ceyiṟṟiyam*. At least with respect to the functional Tamil term *cattuvam*, we can be certain that it was taken from the *Ceyiṟṟiyam*.

With these discussions, Iḷampūraṇar'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, Iḷampūraṇar's most important contribution is the independence he shows: first, in making conceptual space for *cuvai* to function as 'taste' (in contrast to Puttamittiraṉ's *Vīracōliyam*, where *cuvai* is an ornament, *alaṅkāram*); second, in asserting that emotion or *meyppāṭu* can be tasted; and third, in singling out emotion or *meyppāṭu* as a decisive aspect in poetic composition. In addition, Iḷampūraṇar seems to collapse the boundary between ordinary real-world emotion (*meyppāṭu/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, Iḷampūraṇar 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 *meyppāṭu*,[60] 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?[61]

What other positions does Iḷampūraṇar hold? First, a central aspect in his definition of *meyppāṭu* is the somatisation and biologisation of emotion, as well as its visibility for the viewer.[62] However, he never addresses the question of how a viewer knows or experiences this (a question taken up by the later commentator Pērāciriyar).

---

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 Iḷampūraṇar'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 Kuppuswami 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 Nāṭyasāstra*, ed. Manomohan Ghosh (Calcutta: Granthalaya Private Ltd., 1967).

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

62  See ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Iḷampūraṇar, 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.[63] We may assume that Iḷampūraṇar considered the emotional state of emotionlessness unsuitable for *belles-lettres* (*kāvya*). Thus, he not only departs from the *Vīracōliyam* commentary of Peruntēvaṉār, but also from the *Ceyiṟṟiyam* 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(?)[64]

The *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram* is a Tamil translation and interpretation of the *Mirror of Poetry* (*Kāvyādarśa*, 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.[65] 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 *meyppāṭu*, leads to aesthetic emotion (*cuvai*) – not the reverse, as had been claimed by Iḷampūraṇar – and lists eight aesthetic emotions, notably (different than Daṇḍin, but like Iḷampūraṇar[66]) 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.[67] It should be recalled that the Buddhist author of the *Vīracōḻiyam* (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. *pukaḻāp pukaḻcci aṇi*) and the like. There is no question that here, Tamil *meyppāṭu* and Sanskrit *bhāva* are functionally identical.[68]

---

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 teḷivurai-yum*, ed. V. T. Irāmacuppiramaṇiyam and Mu. Caṇmukam Piḷḷai (Chennai: Mullai Nilaiyam, 2017).

65  On the Tamil *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*, see also Shulman, *Tamil: A Biography*, 182. On Daṇḍin's Sanskrit *Kāvyādarśa*, see *Daṇḍin's Poetik: Kāvyadarśa, 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 *Kāvyādarśa* 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 *Kāvyādarśa*] 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**[69]

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 Pērāciriyar, 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 *Ceyiṟṟiyam*, the commentary by Iḷampūraṇar, and the *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram*.[70] However, the first thing that strikes the reader of his commentary is his exposition of the concept of 'threefold Tamil' (*muttamiḻ*), 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*).[71] It is with respect to poetry that he uses the technical term *meyppāṭu*. 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 *cuvai*s, 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.), Pērāciriyar and Aṭiyārkku Nallār were active very close to the lifetime of Śaradātanaya (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, *Meyppāṭu* 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 [*muttamiḻ*] is attested from post-Caṅkam 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.

### Pērāciriyar's commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam's meyppāṭu* root-text, early thirteenth century[72]

Unlike Iḷampūraṇar, who seemed to have attempted to open a debate on the root-text's *meyppāṭu*, it seems that Pērāciriyar wished to close it.[73] He does this, first by directing attention away from the root-text and building on earlier interpretations (as found in the *Ceyiṟṟiyam* 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 Pērāciriyar as rejecting the contemporary developments of his time.[74] 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[75] (even though he does not discuss the latest paradigm shift to aesthetics of reception, which had been famously established by the Kashmiri Abhinavagupta[76]). What motivated Pērāciriyar'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 Pērāciriyar's 'defensive canon-policing'[77] makes sense in the light of the problem of lost works (such as the *Ceyiṟṟiyam*) and apprehension that even Tolkāppiyaṉār'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.[78]

But even if Pērāciriyar 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 Pērāciriyar's own lifetime: Śāradātanaya (1175–1250) and Aṭiyārkku Nallār (closing decades of twelfth century) (see Cox, 'Bearing,' 87), though to my knowledge, Pērāciriyar 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 Pērāciriyar 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 Pērāciriyar ('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 *Ceyiṟṟiyam* 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, Pērāciriyar discusses various central questions regarding emotion and aesthetics:[79] (1) He applies the central gustatory analogy to emotional tasting.[80] (2) He is responsive to knowledge related to the sensory and cognitive processes at work in the emerging of *cuvai*,[81] incorporating into his understanding the aspect of past experience (perhaps his own idea).[82] (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 *Ceyiṟṟiyam*.[83] (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).[84] (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, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar.

80  In Pērāciriyar'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 *Ceyiṟṟiyam*). On the gustatory analogy, see *TP*Pēr 249, p. 9; see also ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, point d.

81  In the group of texts under investigation here, Pērāciriyar's commentary is the first to mention sense-organ perception (*poṟiyuṇarvu*). This new term may have been coined (by him or in the *Ceyiṟṟiyam*?) to explain a newly perceived phenomenon.

82  *TP*Pēr 249, p. 9, ll. 22–25, 27–28, p. 10, l. 1; for the Tamil text and translation, see below ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, 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/ (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, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v. Ceyiṟṟiyam*, 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  *TP*Pēr 249, p. 10, ll. 14–17; see the Tamil text and translation in ch. 2 below, *Mēyppāṭu* Source Reader, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, 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,[85] and further, gives an account of the ideas of the drama theorist Ceyir̲r̲iyan̲ār as to how *cuvai*s emerge in a leading character and in the theatre viewer.[86]

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, Pērāciriyar returns to the *Tolkāppiyam* as the sole authority in matters of emotionology.

Thus, in the end *meyppāṭu* reigns supreme in the Tamil literary theory.[87] 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.[88] *Meyppāṭu* 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 Pērāciriyar. He introduces topics and supplies conclusions to the questions that arise about the root-text itself:[89] (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,[90] 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 Pērāciriyar'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 c*uvai*'s emergence works through the combined force of causal factor, sense organ and the rest constituting taste; see ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below (points d and e), Pērāciriyar's excursion that refers to existing *cuvai* theories.

86  See ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, point e.

87  See ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, point f.

88  Pērāciriyar 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 Iḷampūraṇar) had also puzzled over this; however, they arrived at a different answer. *The term *paṇṇai* in the opening verse of the *Tolkāppiyam*'s emotionology, interpreted by Pērāciriyar 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, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, point a.

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

90  Pērāciriyar may have had the Sanskrit distinction between stable and transitory emotions (*sthāyibhāva*s and *vyabhicāribhāva*s) in mind. Pērāciriyar does not seem interested in the fact that some emotions diminish in direct relation to the diminution of their cause.

then disappear.[91] (2) The mind–body scheme and questions of cognition are clearly part of Pērāciriyar's definition of the group of thirty-two emotions.[92] (3) He makes it clear that there is no categorical boundary between the terms *meyppāṭu* and *cuvai* (in contrast to the Sanskrit *rasa* theory).[93] (4) He made *meyppāṭu* the central phenomenon for both poetic and dramatic forms.[94] (5) He also explains why laughter is first (in the list of the eight *meyppāṭu*s) and joy is last.[95] 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.[96]

---

91  See ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, point k (e.g. *meyppāṭu verūutal*, 'being startled'). Note that in his root-text, Tolkāppiyaṉār did not introduce category definitions. Readers of the *Tolkāppiyam meyppāṭu* 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, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, point j.

93  The collapse of the categorical boundaries between the terms *cuvai/rasa* and *meyppāṭu/bhāva*, that is, between artistic representation and real life, is encountered already in Iḷampūraṇar (see ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Iḷampūraṇar, 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, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, 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, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, 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 Tolkāppiyaṉār above (ch. 1, section 2, Tamil thinkers). In contrast, Pērāciriyar is less convincing in his argument for Tolkāppiyaṉār's order of the eight fundamental *meyppāṭu*s and why laughter is first.

96  It is not surprising that Pērāciriyar 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 Iḷampūraṇar). 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 *Tirukkuṟaḷ* 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, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, point h.

Indeed, Pērāciriyar was a staunch traditionalist in reasserting the authority of the *Tolkāppiyam*'s codified emotionology against innovations.[97] This was his commentarial programme when dealing with the *meyppāṭu* root-text. And this had consequences for the theorisation of emotion knowledge.

### Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar's *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram*, sixteenth century (with Irattiṉak Kavirāyar's seventeenth-century commentary)

The *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram* (1575)[98] 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 *meyppāṭu-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*.[99]

Perumāḷ Kavirāyar, a Teṅkalai Śrīvaiṣṇava and Vēḷāḷa merchant, modelled his grammar about figures of speech on the *alaṅkāram* grammar of Taṇṭi,[100] 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 Pērāciriyar.[101] The *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram* (*carpu nūl*) and the earlier *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram* (*mutal nūl*, primary source) are the only grammars on figuration (*alaṅkāram*). However, while the *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram* is a grammar for secular poetry, the *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram* is a treatise on and for Vaiṣṇava *bhakti* devotion, thus providing us first valuable insights into

---

97   See also Cox's characterisation of Pērāciriyar'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 *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram mūlamum paḻaya uraiyum*, ed. Kōpālaiyar. The edition includes the author's (Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar's) text, the commentary of Irattiṉak 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 Taṇṭi's grammar, the *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram* begins with a *ciṟappuppāyiram*, a 'specific preface' (usually by a person other than the author, here, by Irattiṉak Kavirāyar, a commentator). In this preface 'Taṇṭi mutalnūl aṇi' is mentioned; see *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 2, point 5, *ciṟappuppāyiram*, verse beginning with *ulakam*. On the grammar on *ciṟappuppāyiram*, see *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram*, 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.[102] 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 Nammāḻvār (whose name Māṟaṉ is borrowed for the title of the treatise), and the god Māl Viṣṇu.[103] (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 *cuvai*s, since it pertains to Víṣṇu, who is great. This is different from the order in every list of *meyppāṭu*s seen so far.[104] (5) In contrast to the Tamil foundational treatise on emotions (*TP*Ilam, 7: 247), Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar not only begins his eight-point list of emotions (*meyppāṭu*) 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 *meyppāṭu*s can be experienced in combination (e.g. fear and wonder), seem to have been added by Kurukaip Perumāḷ Kavirāyar's commentator, Irattiṉak Kavirāyar, whereby the Daṇḍin model has been left behind.[105]

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

Later works, such as the seventeenth-century *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam*,[106] do not advance our understanding to any great degree of either the substance of *meyppāṭu* theory or

---

102 The *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram* grammar includes the author's own preface (*taṟciṟappuppāyiram*), 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], *uḷḷuṟai* [implicit meaning], *iṟaicci* [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*, *uḷḷuṟai*, and *iṟaicci* in the *poruḷaṇi* chapter, see *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 133–94 (2. *uvamai*); 217–31 (4. *uḷḷuṟai*); 300–04 (22. *iṟaicci*).
103 See *Māṟaṉalaṅkāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 2–3, *taṟciṟappuppāyiram* (with a 'specific' preface by Tirukkuraip Perumāḷ himself); with verses referring to Nammāḻvār, Māl Viṣṇu, the title of the book, and the author himself.
104 See also ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings, *s.v. Māṟaṉalaṅkāram*, point f.
105 See ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings, *s.v. Māṟaṉalaṅkāram*, 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 *Vīracōḻiyam*, the *IV* contains a section on *meyppāṭu*

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

The view of *meyppāṭu* 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,[111] failing to grasp the historical transformation that the language of emotion certainly must have undergone

---

as well as one on *aṇi/alaṅkāram* (poetic ornamentation), the latter discussing *cuvai*. On Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar, the teacher of Paṭikkācuppulavar (author of the *Toṇṭaimaṇṭala Catakam*) who, in turn, was a court poet of Ragunātha Sētupati of Rāmanātapuram (1685–1723), see *Ilakkaṇa viḷakkam, eḻuttatikāram + 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 Nūlnilaiyam, 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-aṇi* and the laudatory preface (*ciṟappup pāyiram*) where written by his elder son. Moreover, the *pāttiyal* (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 Pērāciriyar'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 Pērāciriyar's (the second commentator on the *Tolkāppiyam*) explications of *meyppāṭu*, but without the latter's reflective reporting of other scholars. Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar's conservatism is based solely on

between Pērāciriyar (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 [*noṇṭinātakam*] and the like),[112] 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 *meyppāṭu* as well as add-ons from Pērāciriyar'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/rasa* (aesthetic emotion), Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar models the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam* on the *Vīracōḻiyam* and applies *Vīracōḻiyam*, or respectively, the *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram* usage of *cuvai* as a poetic ornament (*aṇi/alaṅkāram*), 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 *Vīracōḻiyam*, thus attempting to synthesise Tamil and Sanskrit principles with regard to emotion theory.[113] However, the discussion remains purely related to text and character, and to eight *cuvai*s (with the heroic [*vīram*] first and laughter [*nakai*] last). In conclusion, Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar does insist on traditional views.

---

Pērāciriyar's final understanding of *meyppāṭu*: (1) the self-explanatory nature of the thirty-two auxiliary emotions (including the occasionally occurring auxiliary emotion of calm/tranquillity [*naṭunilai*]); (2) the problematic of a *cuvai* of quiescence (*natuvunilai*) without acknowledging its post-Abhinavagupta sense; (3) the interchangeable use of the technical terms *meyppāṭu*, *cuvai*, and *kuṟippu*; (4) acknowledgement of collective concepts (object of taste, sense-perception of taste, cognitive response, bodily changes). For details, see ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings below, *s.v. Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam*, points a–h. – Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar's auto-commentary borrowed from Pērāciriyar, 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*, *ammāṉai*, and *kummi*. On the *katai* genre and the *villuppāṭṭu*, see Barbara Schuler, *Of Death and Birth: Icakkiyamman, 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 *Vīracōḻiyam* 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 Vīracōḻiyam 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 some-
thing negative,[114] it remains an open question as to why there was no creative push or
impact on the emotion theories in the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam*,[115] written at a time experi-
encing remarkable literary and social upheavals. An answer might lie in the *pāṭṭiyal*
handbooks, a specific type of treatise that describes and prescribes forms, types, gen-
res, and subgenres of medieval and early modern literary texts, as for example, *ulā*,
*ammāṉai*, *mālai*, etc.[116] Perhaps it was exactly in reaction to this 'new' type of gram-
mar that the *meyppāṭu* discourse in the seventeenth century presents an image of in-
tellectual stagnation. The *pāṭṭiyal* treatises, to my knowledge, do not speak of
*meyppāṭu* or *cuvai*; nonetheless, they do contain 'emotion' in their theorised genres
of praise (e.g. *meykkīrti*; also *ulā*, processional poems).[117] 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 *meyppāṭu*
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 *meyppāṭu* lost its appeal.[118] Mapping out the precise date is
a task still to be done. The same fate befell the *meyppāṭu* emotion word *perumitam*
(greatness, excellence), so prominent in the *Tolkāppiyam* emotionology, already much
earlier.[119]

---

Nahl (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet [Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 33],
2013), 103–29 (103 n. 3). See also Tāmōtarampiḷḷai and his editorial introduction (*patippu 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  *Pāṭṭiyal*s, 'literary genres'; nature/quality (*iyal*) of poetic compositions (*pāṭṭu*). On the list of
*pāṭṭiyal*s, see Zvelebil, *Lexicon of Tamil Literature*, 540. See also Ti. Vē. Kōpālaiyar, *Tamiḻ
ilakkaṇap perakarāti*, vol. 16, *poruḷ*: *pāṭṭiyal* (Chennai: Tamiḻmaṇ, 2005), 1–189 (12, 35, 163).

117  Although Kōpālaiyar, *Tamiḻ ilakkaṇap perakarāti* (vol. 16), 170–71 lists '*meyppāṭṭiyal*', he
mainly refers to *TP*Pēr 249–250 in his summary. I myself could not find any theoretical treat-
ment in the chapters in the *Citamparappāṭṭiyal*, ed. Ki. Irāmānujaiyaṅkār (Maturai: Madurai
Tamiḻccaṅka Muttirācālai, 1932) encompassing *uṟuppiyal*, *ceyyuḷiyal*, *oḻipiyal*, *poruttaliyal* and
*marapiyal*.

118  Note also that the concept of *meyppāṭu* 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 Iḷampuranar 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 *alaṅkāram/aṇi* 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*-Pērāciriyar line or the *alaṅkāram* 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 *Vīracōḻiyam*. 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 *Vīracōḻiyam*, altered in the drama-based *Ceyiṟṟiyam*, and consolidated by Iḷampūraṇar, to *cuvai* as a figure of speech in the first *alaṅkāram* grammar, and its falling victim to Pērāciriyar'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

*Vīracōḻiyam*, upgraded in the *Ceyiṟṟiyam*, and expanded by Iḷampūraṇar. Finally, the commentator Pērāciriyar returned the *meyppāṭu* 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 *meyppaṭu* 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 *Vīracōḻiyam*, in which the emotion word *perumitam* (greatness, grandeur) disappeared.[120] This word then lost its appeal and was replaced by *vīram* (valour, heroic),[121] 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*.[122] 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 *meyppāṭu* were written in a multilingual region; their Tamil authors could draw on sources in Sanskrit, in the original.[123] 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 *Ceyiṟṟiyam*) 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, *Meyppāṭu* source readings, *s.v. Vīracōḻiyam* I.b, in which *perumitam* is replaced by *uṭkōḷ*.
121  See ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* source readings, *s.v.* Pērāciriyar, point f, (6) *perumitam* means *vīram*.
122  See ch. 2, *Meyppāṭu* 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 Prākṛt, 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 Uṟaiyūr 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 meyppāṭu* 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 *meyppāṭu*, but also the term *cuvai*. I provide the *cuvai* discussion as well, since the main arguments of the *meyppāṭu* discourse would be otherwise unintelligible. And to do justice to the ideas at work in the historical *meyppāṭu* discourse, we must also include Buddhist and Jain thought (as for example the Buddhist grammar *Vīracōḻiyam*).

### Translation of Tamil technical terms

There is consensus among Tamil scholars that the interpretation and, thus, the translation of the technical term *meyppāṭu* is a major problem. Indra Manuel translates *meyppāṭu* as 'experienced [◦*pāṭu*] in the body [*mey*◦]'.[124] Cutler and Selby understand the noun *meyppāṭu* to mean 'the conditions (◦*pāṭu*) of the body (*mey*◦)', while Monius opts for the similar translation 'appearing (◦*pāṭu*) in the body (*mey*◦)'.[125] Cox submits

---

124 Indra Manuel, 'Meyppāṭu,' 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: '*meyppāṭu*, literally "appearing in the body"'.

(as far as the *Tolkāppiyam* emotion chapter is concerned) a new interpretation, translating *meyppāṭu* as that which 'makes real'.[126]

I have chosen not to translate the term *meyppāṭu*, since much of the discourse on this term is, in fact, directed toward answering the question of what exactly it is. However, taking *meyppāṭu* 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,[127] 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 *meyppāṭu*. 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 *meyppāṭu*, but also to render them in intelligible English. In contrast to the Sanskrit *rasa-bhāva* doctrine, the *meyppāṭu* 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 *meyppāṭu*s and thirty-two auxiliary *meyppāṭu*s.

Another problem for the translator is the question of equivalence. Is the technical Tamil term *meyppāṭu* 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 '*meyppāṭu* 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 *meyppāṭu 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',[128] 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 *uḷḷam*, 'inner, internal, mind-heart', or *maṉam*, '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 vaḻakku*); and real-world practice (*ulaka vaḻakku*). 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.