

## Chapter 2

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

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

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

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

---

1 Cox, ‘From Source-Criticism.’

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

11 Manuel, 'Meyp̄p̄ātu,' 134–45.

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

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

14 Monius, *Imagining*, 34.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

20 Thirugnanasambandhan, 'A Study of Rasa.'

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

28 Cox, 'From Source-Criticism.'

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

## 2 *Meypṭāṭu* source readings

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Core ideas**

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- f. These *bhāvas* or emotions include:

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

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

---

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

41 See Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 51.

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

43 See Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 53.

44 See Pollock, *Rasa Reader*, 54.

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

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

### Core ideas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

For each of the basic *meypṭāṭus* in the first list, there are four causes/contexts.<sup>61</sup> What is the cause/context that generates the emotion of excellence or pride?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*kaṇṇiṇuṅ ceviyiṇun tiṅṇitiṅ uṇarum | uṇarvuṭai māntark kallatu teriyiṅ |  
nannayap poruḷkōḷ eṇṇaruṅ kuraittē ||* (final verse MI 27 = TPIḷam 271 = TPPēr 275)

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

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

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

#### Core ideas

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

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

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

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

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

70 VC refers to Puttamittiraṅ's *Vīracōḷiyam* and VCC to Peruntēvaṅār's commentary (*urai*) thereon. I cite both from Kōvintarāḷ Mutaliyār, ed. *Puttamittiraṅār iyarriya Vīracōḷiyam mūlamum, Peruntēvaṅār iyarriya uraiyum*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

78 Peruntēvaṇār (VCC), citing another authority.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The nine *cuvais* are:

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

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

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

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

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



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

---

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

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

94 Monius, *Imagining*, 150.

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

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

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

### Core ideas

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

*mattimam eṇpatu mācarat teriyir* | *collap paṭṭa ellāc cuvaiyotu* | *pullātākiya polivir*’ *eṇpa* || (TPIḷam 245, p. 34, ll. 18–20)

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

*nayanūtai maraiṇ itaṇpayam yāt’eṇir* | *cettiyōrkkun cāntupaṭṭuppōrkkum* | *oppa nirkum nilaiy ir*’ *eṇpa* || (TPIḷam 245, p. 34, ll. 21–23)

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

*uyppōr itaṇai yār eṇiṇ mikkatu* | *payakkun tāpatar cāraṅar camaṅar* | *kayakk’ aru muṇivar arivarōṭu pīrarun* | *kāmam vekuḷi mayakkam nṅkiya* | *vāymaiyāḷar vakuttaṅar pīrarum* | *accuvai eṭṭum avarkk’ ila ātaliṇ* | \**iccuvai*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On the two loci of *cuvai*:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*uyppōṅ ceytatu kāṅpōrkḱ’ eytutal | meypṇāṭ’ eṅpa meyyuṇarn tōre* (TPIḷam 247, p. 35, ll. 25–26)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Core ideas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Cuvai: Terms and their definition*

For Iḷampūraṇar, *cuvai* is the following:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

‘Cuvai occurs in two types of locus.’

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

He then explains the citation as follows:

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

*meyyiṅkaṇ tōṇṟutaliṅ meypṭāṭ’ āyirru. aḱṭēl, ivvilakkaṅam kūṭṭiṇuṭ payaṅpaṭal unṭāṭaliṅ iṅṭu vēṅṭāṅ eniṅ, iṅṭuṅ ceyyūṭ ceyyūṅkāṟ cuvaipaṭac ceyya vēṅṭutaliṅ iṅṭuṅ kūṟa vēṅṭum eṅka.* (*TPIḷam* 247, p. 35, ll. 29–32)

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

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

126 *Tirukkuraḷ* 118: *camaṅceyṭu cīṟṭūkkūṅ kōḷpōḷ amaintorupār | kōṭāmai cāṅṟōṟk kaṇi*, ‘The balance (*camaṅceyṭu*) not inclined to one side, that is the ornament (*aṅi*) of the noble (*cāṅṟōṟ*) minded.’

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

128 ḷampūraṅār both asks the question and provides the answer.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Core ideas

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Core ideas

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

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

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

148 Cuppiramaṇiyaṅ, *Aṭiyārkku Nallār uraiṭṭiraṅ*, 135.

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

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

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

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

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

### Core Ideas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

c. Definition of *meyppāṭu*.

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

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

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

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

– Pērācīriyar’s long excursion

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

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

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

*Cuvai: Terms and their definition*

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

*Cuvai* appears as a conjunction of:

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pērācīriyar compares this process to palatal tasting:

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

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

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

*Cuvai* has two loci.

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

*iruvakai nilaṇēṇpaṇa uyppōṇ ceytatu kāṇpōrkkū eytutalanrō eṇiṇ cuvaiyēṇpatu oppiṇāṇāya peyarākalāṇ vempucuvaittavan aṇṇinta kaiṇp’ ariviṇai nāvuṇarviṇār pīraṇuṇarāṇ, ivāṇ kaiṇppuc cuvaittāṇ eṇak kaṇṇunarviṇāṇ aṇṇivataṇṇi (5–9) [...] aṇṇiṇāṇaik kaṇṇu nakutaluṇ karuṇaiceyṭaluṇ kaṇṇōrkkup pīrappataṇṇi accam pīravātākalāṇ uyppōṇ ceytatu kāṇpōṇ uyta ariviṇ perriyār cellātākaliṇ iruvakai (14–17)* (TPPēr 249, p. 10, ll. 5–9, 14–17)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*avai onpatātār̄kup pakutiymuṭaiyavenpatu; enṇai? ‘urittiran taṇṇōṭu onpat’ ākum’ enpavākaliṇ.* (TPPēr 250, p. 13, ll. 15–18)

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

*ivaiyum paṇṇait tōṇriya enṇāṅk’ enapaṭṭaṇa.* (TPPēr 250, p. 13, ll. 18–19)

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

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

*marrivarratu payanenṇaiyeṇiṇ; poruḷatikārattuk kūrukiṇra vaḷakkiyalē amaiyum enpatu kūri, accuvaikku ētuvāya poruḷiṇai araṅkiṇuḷ niṇṇi, atu kaṇṭu kuṇṇippuṇ cattuvamum nikaḷttukiṇra kūttaṇaiyum araṅkil tantu, piṇṇar avaiyaraṇṇōṇ avāṇ ceykiṇra meyp̄pāṭṭiṇai unarvārāka varukiṇra muraimaiyellām nāṭakavalaḷakkirkē uriya pakutiyeṇavum* (TPPēr 250, p. 13, ll. 21–27)

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

---

no longer used, the *meyp̄pāṭu* called *perumitam* or greatness/pride, so prominent in the *Tol-kāppiyam* emotionology, was also no longer in use (except in the quite late sixteenth-century *Māraṇalaṅkāram* by Kurukaip Perumāl Kavirāyar and seventeenth-century *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam* by Vaittiyanāta Tēcīkar).

173 The entire sentence reads as follows: *ummai irantatu taḷiyirṇātālāṇ ivaiyum paṇṇait tōṇriya enṇāṅk’ enapaṭṭaṇa. avarrup pakutiyeṇa ituvum piṇṇāṅkōṭi kūriyavārāyirru.* (TPPēr 250, p. 13, ll. 18–20), ‘Since the aforementioned (*ummai irantatu*) was accepted (*taḷutal*), these (*ivai*) were said (*enapaṭṭal*) to appear (*tōṇrutal*) in the play/entertainment or *paṇṇai* as eight times four [= thirty-two]. [...] This, too (*ituvum*), is part (*pakuti*) of those (*avarru* = *avai*), according to another’s (*piṇṇāṅ*) opinion.’

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

*innāṇam aṭaṅkum eṅpatu nāṭaka nūluḷḷuṅ collupavōveṅiṅ, collupavākaliṅ anṅē ataṅvali nūlceyta āciriyaṅ ceyirriyaṅār* (TPPēr 250, p. 13, ll. 28–30)

[The phrase] ‘In this manner (*innāṇam*) it is reduced (*aṭaṅkutaḷ*) [to sixteen and eight]’, if it is asked (*eṅiṅ*) whether this is explained (*collupavō*) in the writing on drama (*nāṭaka nūḷ*), [the answer is] an emphatic affirmative (*anṅē*), since it has been explained (*collupavākaliṅ*) by Ceyirriyaṅār, the author (*āciriyaṅ*) who wrote (*ceytaḷ*) the [*Ceyirriyaṅ*] work (*nūḷ*) [on drama] in that way (*ataṅvali*).

Pērāciriyaṅ continues his excursion on other thinkers’ ideas:

*cuvaiyuṅarvuṅ poruḷum oṅṅrāka aṭakkic cuvaiyuṅ kuṅriṅpuṅ cattuvamum eṅa mūṅṅrākki vēruvēr’ ilakkaṅaṅ kūri* (TPPēr 250, p. 13, l. 31, p. 14, ll. 1–2)

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

- f. After a long excursion: Pērāciriyaṅ calls the eight basic *meyp̄pāṭu* of Tol-kāppiyaṅār *cuvai* or *kuṅriṅpu*.

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

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

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

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

175 Pērāciriyaṅ quotes from the other grammar as follows: ‘Those who understand (*uṅarntōr*) the subtler (*nun*) aspects have stated (*nuvaltaḷ*) that the three enumerated (*eṅṅiya mūṅṅrum*) [that is, *cuvai*, *kuṅriṅpu*, *cattuvam*,] shall join together (*oruṅkutaḷ*).’ (*eṅṅiya mūṅṅrum oruṅku peṅum eṅa / nuṅṅitiṅ uṅarntōr nuvaṅṅaṅar eṅpa*) (TPPēr 250, p. 14, ll. 3–4).

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

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

*Itu, piṛarvēṅṭumārṛāṇaṅṛi innūluḷ ivvāru vēṅṭappaṭum meypṭāṭ' enpatu uṅarttatal nutaliṛru* (TPPēr 251, p. 14, ll. 21–22)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*ivai av veṅṭumāvaṇa. ivarṛaic cuvaiyeṇavuṅ kurippeṇavum vaḷaṅkiṇum amaiyum.* (TPPēr 251, p. 15, 12–13)

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

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

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

179 *arputam eṇiṇum aṅamayum* [sic]. Read *amaiyum*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

183 According to the chapter verse MI 1/249.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sleep:

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

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

Recollection:

*niñaital enpatu viruppuṛu niñaittal, niññai mikavum niñaittēñ enpatu, vaḷakkātaliṅ; anniñaivuḷlam pīrarkkup pulāñātaliṅ meyppāṭāyīṛu. (TPPēr 260, p. 42, ll. 25–27)*

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

Being startled, an emotion of a more ephemeral nature:

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

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

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

192 *naṭantuvārukiṅṛāñ* is odd.

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

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

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

Trembling:

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

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

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

The nature of caste:

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

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

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

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

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

196 A sign of penance.

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

l. Other peculiarities

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

Envy:

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

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

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

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

*marrivarrai eṅṅiya mātṭirai yallatu ilakkaṅaṅ kūrūkiṅṅirilaṅṅāl eṅṅ. collīṅ muṭiyum ilakkaṅattavākaliṅ collāṅāyiṅṅāṅ eṅṅpatu. Utāraṅam ikkūrīyavārrāṅ vaḷakku nōkkiyuṅ ceyyuṅōkkiyuṅ kaṅṅuṅarappaṭum.* (TPPēr 260, p. 43, ll. 22ff.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Core ideas

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

These are:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

208 *Māraṇalaṅkāram*, ed. Kōpālaiyar, 336.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Core ideas

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

---

while floating on the cosmic ocean.

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

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

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

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

214 *Ilakkāṇa viḷakkam*, ed. Tāmōtarampiḷḷai.

215 The commentary speaks only of poetic experience.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The eight *cuvais* are:

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

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

- b. *Cuvai* is a particular type of expressive language used in the same way as other familiar figures of speech.  
 c. *Cuvai* as a phenomenon immanent in the text, a feature related to the character in the text.

227 *Viṟal eṇiṇuṅ cattuvam eṇiṇum okkum*. (*Iḷakkāṇa Viḷakkam*, *Akattiṇaiyiyal*, commentary, ed. Tāmōtarampiḷḷai, p. 521).

228 See *Taṇṭiyalāṅkāram*: *uṇṇikaḷ taṇmai purattut tōṅra | envakai meypṭāṭṭiṇ iyalvatu cuvaiyē*. (*Taṇṭiyalāṅkāram*, ed. Irāmacuppīramāṇiyam and Caṇmukam Piḷḷai, 245. For the verse’s text and translation, see *Meypṭāṭu* source readings above, s.v. *Taṇṭiyalāṅkāram*, points a and d.

229 If compared to the *Viṟacōḷiyam*’s fifth subchapter on poetic embellishment, we have there nine *cuvais*, starting with erotic love (*ciruṅkāram* = *kāmam*), followed by the heroic, and including quiescence (*cāntam*). See VCC ad 170 [Alāṅkāram section], pp. 257–58; see also *Meypṭāṭu* source readings above, s.v. *Viṟacōḷiyam*, II.b.

