10 - Dividing Texts: Visual Text-Organization in North Indian and Nepalese Manuscripts by Bidur Bhattarai

The number of manuscripts produced in the Indian sub-continent is astounding and is the result of a massive enterprise that was carried out over a vast geographical area and over a vast stretch of time. Focusing on areas of Northern India and Nepal between 800 to 1300 CE and on manuscripts containing Sanskrit texts, the present study investigates a fundamental and so far rarely studied aspect of manuscript production: visual organization. Scribes adopted a variety of visual strategies to distinguish one text from another and to differentiate the various sections within a single text (chapters, sub-chapters, etc.). Their repertoire includes the use of space(s) on the folio, the adoption of different writing styles, the inclusion of symbols of various kind, the application of colors (rubrication), or a combination of all these. This study includes a description of these various strategies and an analysis of their different implementations across the selected geographical areas. It sheds light on how manuscripts were produced, as well as on some aspects of their employment in ritual contexts, in different areas of India and Nepal.

15 - Studies on Greek and Coptic Majuscule Scripts and Books by Pasquale Orsini

The volume contains a critical review of data, results and open problems concerning the principal Greek and Coptic majuscule bookhands, based on previous research of the author, revised and updated to offer an overview of the different graphic phenomena. Although the various chapters address the history of different types of scripts (i.e. biblical majuscule, sloping pointed majuscule, liturgical majuscule, epigraphic and monumental scripts), their juxtaposition allows us to identify common issues of the comparative method of palaeography. From an overall critical assessment of these aspects the impossibility of applying a unique historical paradigm to interpret the formal expressions and the history of the different bookhands comes up, due to the fact that each script follows different paths. Particular attention is also devoted to the use of Greek majuscules in the writing of ancient Christian books. A modern and critical awareness of palaeographic method may help to place the individual witnesses in the context of the main graphic trends, in the social and cultural environments in which they developed, and in a more accurate chronological framework.
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What a Multiple-text Manuscript Can Tell Us about the Tamil Scholarly Tradition: The Case of UVSL 589

Jonas Buchholz and Giovanni Ciotti | Hamburg

1. Introduction
UVSL 589 is a palm-leaf manuscript that is now kept in the U. V. Swaminatha Iyer Library (UVSL) in Chennai (Tamil Nadu, India) (Fig. 1). This multiple-text manuscript is unusual both with regards to its contents and its layout. It contains a remarkably large number of excerpts from Tamil texts, which are arranged in a systematic way and represent the domains of grammar and literature. At the same time, the layout facilitates navigation between the texts in a way rarely found in Tamil palm-leaf manuscripts. Taken together, these features invite us to investigate the cultural context of UVSL 589. This case study intends to show how a deeper understanding of the cultural history of texts can be gained by studying manuscripts as objects in their own right, rather than just as a disparate collection of texts – an approach rarely adopted in Tamil studies so far.

2. Codicological features
UVSL 589 consists of 100 folios of regular size (36.5 × 5.5 cm), all of which are made of the same palm-leaf material (Fig. 2). The general state of preservation is rather good. The first two leaves, which are presumably guard leaves, are blank, whereas the following 98 leaves contain texts inscribed on both sides by what appears to be one and the same hand. The manuscript was obviously produced very carefully. The script is neat and tiny – the scribe managed to fit between 14 and 20 lines of text on each leaf. The text was meticulously proof-read, as shown by numerous occurrences of interlinear additions (marked in the line with a + sign) and crossed-out characters. A few uninked notes and emendations show that the manuscript was proof-read at least twice, before and after it was inked (Fig. 3). It is impossible to ascertain when the uninked elements were added, but the hand seems to be the same hand that wrote the rest of the manuscript.
Folio numbers are marked on the left margin of the recto sides. The system of foliation is quite peculiar as the manuscript contains several macro-sections with individual foliation in both Tamil digit-numerals and Telugu letter-numerals. Despite such disparate numbering, we are inclined to think that the whole manuscript is the result of a single production act as the size, material and scribal hand appear to be the same for all the leaves of UVSL 589. It seems that the different foliations found in the manuscript were used intentionally in order to structure the manuscript. As we will see later, by and large, the macro-sections marked by the foliation have specific thematic foci. Secondary pagination in Western numerals from 1 to 194 (counting the recto and verso of each folio separately) was added later, most probably when the manuscript became part of the UVSL collection. For the sake of convenience, we have decided to use this pagination for reference purposes in this article. A synopsis of the original foliation and the corresponding secondary page numbers is found in Table 1.

Unfortunately, the manuscript neither contains any record concerning the date and place of its production,
nor does it mention the name of its scribe or of any other person potentially involved in its production (such as the commissioner or proof-reader, for example).³ The catalogue of the U. V. Swaminatha Iyer Library does not contain any information about the manuscript’s provenance either. As for the date of the manuscript, we can only make an educated guess. Due to the climatic conditions there, palm-leaf manuscripts had a rather limited lifespan in South India and had to be copied regularly as a result. Most of the manuscripts that have survived to this day are therefore not very old. The majority of dateable palm-leaf manuscripts from that region range from the end of the eighteenth to the end of the nineteenth century.⁴ It is very likely that UVSL 589 was crafted sometime during this period, too.

While UVSL 589 contains little direct information about the circumstances of its production, it does provide some hints about the milieu in which it was produced. First of all, the person who produced the manuscript seems to have been an adherent of Śaivism. This is apparent from the numerous paratexts found in the manuscript. For instance, the very beginning of the manuscript is a stanza from the Tēvāram (3.54.1), which is quoted as an invocation.⁵ The Śaiva affiliation is confirmed throughout the manuscript by means of numerous invocations placed at the ends of texts or sub-units of texts. These invocations are mostly in Sanskrit written in Tamilian Grantha script (Fig. 4a), but they can also be in Tamil written in Tamil script (Fig. 4b).⁶ Most of the Sanskrit invocations contain names of Śiva as the lord of Chidambaram, a prominent site of Śaiva worship, (e.g. Citambareśa, ‘Lord of Chidambaram’ Kanakasabhānaṭeśa, ‘lord of dance in the golden hall [in the temple of Chidambaram]’).⁷ The Tamil invocations mostly praise the Tamil Śaiva saint Cuntarar. A complete list of the invocations along with their translations can be found in Appendix 1 below.

The presence of both Tamil and Sanskrit in one and the same manuscript should come as no surprise, considering the importance of Sanskrit as a pan-Indian scholarly and religious language. However, given that Tamil studies have long tended to ignore the history of the interaction between Tamil and Sanskrit, the use of Sanskrit invocations in a manuscript which only contains Tamil texts is notable. Moreover, there is a third language with which the scribe of UVSL 589 was obviously acquainted, namely Telugu (Fig. 4c). This is the main language of the present-day states of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana, but it is also spoken by a sizeable minority in Tamil Nadu.⁸ We have already seen that the foliation of UVSL 589 partly uses Telugu letters. Apart from that, the manuscript also contains a few annotations that are written in Telugu script, although their language is Tamil (listed in

---

³ Like most Indic manuscripts, one cannot exclude the possibility that a single person produced the whole manuscript, wrote and emended its text(s), and kept the object for his own use.

⁴ The dates recorded in the colophons of palm-leaf manuscripts from the area of what is now Tamil Nadu clearly point to such a timespan; see Ciotti and Franceschini 2016.

⁵ The Tēvāram, a work of devotional poetry in praise of Śiva, forms the most important part of the Tamil Śaiva canon (Drunuṟṟai).

⁶ Besides Telugu script, Tamilian Grantha (which is also known as Tamil Grantha) is the main script used in south-east India in order to write Sanskrit.

⁷ Invocations may help link a manuscript with a specific place if they mention the local manifestation of a deity worshipped in a particular temple; see Ciotti and Franceschini 2016, 80–81. The case of Śiva in Chidambaram, though, does not allow for any conclusions about the place of production of UVSL 589 since Chidambaram is a place of worship of transregional importance.

⁸ Secondary literature on the Telugu community in Tamil Nadu is scarce. The Census of India 2001 puts the number of Telugu speakers in Tamil Nadu at 3.5 million, which amounts to almost six per cent of the total population of that state, see <http://censusindia.gov.in/Census_Data_2001/Census_Data_Online/Language/parta.htm>.
Appendix 2 below). The rationale for using the Telugu script is not very clear. Possibly it reflects a slip of the hand on the part of the scribe since he only used this script occasionally and in the last case even mixed Tamil and Telugu scripts.

To sum up, UVSL 589 must have been produced in a multilingual Śaiva milieu, in which Tamil co-existed with other languages such as Sanskrit and Telugu. What we still do not know is in what context the manuscript was meant to be used. In this respect, it is important to note from the codicological point of view that UVSL 589 seems to have been designed with the intention of easing its navigation. We have already seen that the manuscript is divided into several series of foliations, the end of which coincides with the end of a text or a group of texts. Furthermore, the consistent use of invocations at the end of texts or sub-units of texts can also be said to ease navigation. Text titles are often stated in the left-hand margin of the folios where the texts begin. Where stanzas start somewhere in the middle of a line or are interspersed with so much commentary that it is difficult to find them, the beginning of the stanza (pratīka in Sanskrit) has been put in the left-hand margin. The most striking feature of the layout, however, is that large parts of the manuscript contain one stanza per line, with a line number appearing at the right-hand side of the folio. This is in marked contrast to the usual layout of Tamil palm-leaf manuscripts, where the text is written in a continuous script without any line-breaks.

It seems that the purpose of the layout in UVSL 589 was not to fit as much text as possible on a palm-leaf, but rather to make it easy to locate a given stanza in the manuscript. Another noteworthy feature, rather uncommon at least in manuscripts from southern India, is an internal reference that guides the reader from one folio of the manuscript to another. Certainly, the envisaged user of UVSL 589 was not expected to read the manuscript from beginning to end, but to browse through it and consult various sections according to his needs.

One can speculate about the possible didactic character of the manuscript on the basis of the variety of navigational

---

9 Such annotations (words or short sentences added to the main texts) are found in several places in UVSL 589. They are usually written in Tamil using Tamil script.

10 Line numbers also justify each line in accordance with the overall layout of the manuscript, which has one text-block per folio side. In this respect, one can also see that whenever the space needed to write a stanza exceeded the length of the line, what is left was written on the far right-hand side of the folio and marked with curly brackets. Was this possibly done under the influence of Western conventions?

11 Page 77, line 20 has a note stating "immēṇṟu ceyṟukum urai 42m e..." (‘the commentary for these three stanzas ... [is found in folio] no. 42’). Folio 42 of section 3 corresponds to page 114, where we indeed find the commentary of the three stanzas quoted on page 77.

12 It is worth noting a further codicological feature of UVSL 589 here, namely the use of puḷlis (little circles added above characters to indicate that the inherent vowel ‘a’ should not be read; e.g. ந ‘na’ vs ந் ‘n’). Puḷlis are rarely used in manuscripts, but in many sections of UVSL 589 these were added when the first member of a consonant cluster is at the end of a line and the second member is at the beginning of the following line. Such a feature, which may seem like an insignificant scribal idiosyncrasy at first, helps greatly in overcoming the ambiguity of the unmarked version of Tamil script by preventing the pronunciation of an unrequired ‘a’ vowel. Within the same line, when one can clearly see what character comes next, puḷlis are not that necessary for anyone proficient in Tamil. However, when one has to read over two different lines, having a puḷḷi in the position just described is rather convenient.
aids it incorporates. It could have been used by a teacher or a student, either in class – perhaps as a memory aid – or by a student for reference. Because of the lack of direct evidence, as is the case for many Indic manuscripts, we do not know who actually owned UVSL 589. The question of the intended use of the manuscript, however, becomes especially relevant with regard to its unusual contents, to which we will turn in the following section.

3. Description of the contents

UVSL 589 contains an astounding number of Tamil texts, partly in full, partly in excerpts. Their arrangement is shown in Table 2. The rationale behind this arrangement is not immediately clear, but we can make at least partial sense of it by looking at the distribution of texts on the basis of our knowledge of Tamil literature. In this way, we can see that the macro-sections group related texts together to a certain extent. The manuscript contains excerpts of fourteen literary works, for instance, all of which belong to a corpus known as Patinenkilkkakku, or just Kīḻkkaṇakku for short. Nine of them are grouped together as part of the first macro-section (sections d to n), whereas five more are found in the third macro-section (sections w to z and bb). Apart from the Kīḻkkaṇakku works, we can find four other literary works at various places in UVSL 589: the first half of the Kallātam (section u), excerpts from the Tiruvalluvamālai (section cc), the whole Tirumurukāṟṟuppati (section dd), and excerpts from the Cīvakacintāmani (section ee). In addition to the literary texts, UVSL 589 contains four grammatical treatises, namely Nagūl, Akkaporuḷ Viḷakkam, Yāpparutikalakkārikai, and Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram, which are placed together at the beginning of the second macro-section of the manuscript (sections p to s). Furthermore, the manuscript also includes what can be called illustrative stanzas, that is, stanzas which were specifically composed to exemplify certain poetological topics. These illustrative stanzas have been taken from the commentary on the Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram (sections a, c and aa) and from another treatise, the Puyapporuḷ Venpāmālai (section b). Finally, there are two sections which combine stanzas from literary works (Cīvakacintāmani and Cilappatikāram) with illustrative stanzas from the Puyapporuḷ Venpāmālai (sections t and v).

Section o is a special case, which is labelled in the margin as caṅkīram (lit. ‘mixture’, probably in the sense of ‘miscellanea’). This section contains 105 stanzas taken from a wide array of different sources. Sometimes the source is identified after the stanza, but mostly it is not. Due to the nature of this section, it was difficult to identify all of the stanzas. The sources which we could identify include well-known literary texts such as Cilappatikāram, Muttoḷḷāyiram, and Nālaṭiyār, but also religious poems from the Śaiva Tirumurugai canon, minor works of the so-called Pirapantam genre, and occasional stanzas which were later included in collections of individual poems (Tanippattāl Tirattu).

As we have seen, UVSL 589 includes both poetical works and theoretical treatises on grammar. This reflects a view prevalent in Tamil scholarly tradition, where literature (ilakkiyam) and grammar (ilakkaṇam) were seen as a complementary pair. ‘Grammar’ in the Tamil sense of the word includes not only grammar sensu stricto, but also the study of poetical conventions, metrics and figures of speech. This complementarity is reflected in the terms ilakkiyam (from Sanskrit laksya, lit. ‘what should be described’) for literature and ilakkaṇam (from Sanskrit laksana, lit. ‘description’) for grammar. In other words, grammar represents the toolbox for studying and producing literature. The co-existence of grammatical and literary texts in UVSL 589 is quite remarkable. Given the lack of information available to us, we can only speculate about the ways in which this manuscript was used, but it seems quite possible that UVSL 589 formed a kind of syllabus. It contains both grammatical works which a student of Tamil was expected to master and excerpts from literary works to which he could apply his theoretical knowledge. The fact that most of the literary works are only included in excerpts and come without a commentary (even in the case of texts which were regularly transmitted together with a commentary) suggests that they were not meant to be studied as pieces of literature.

---

13 Kār Nāṟpatu and Aintinai Aimputu are actually included twice. As we will see, the first instances of these two texts (sections d and e) are connected with the preceding section rather than with the Kīḻkkaṇakku block.

14 The Puyapporuḷ Venpāmālai is unusual if compared to the other grammatical treatises insofar as the illustrative stanzas are not contained in the commentary, but in the text itself (Zvelebil 1995, 584). Whether or not these stanzas are later additions is hard to tell on the basis of the information available.

15 A substantial number of Tamil literary works exist as e-texts on various websites on the internet. In many cases, it has therefore been possible to identify the stanzas simply by using a web search engine. The limitations of this kind of approach are obvious, of course. What is really needed is a comprehensive, searchable electronic corpus, but unfortunately, the situation in Tamil studies is far from ideal – much more has been achieved in Classical Studies thanks to the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, for example.

| a. | Selection of illustrative stanzas from the commentary on the Taṇṭiyalarṅkāram  | pp. 1–2 |
| b. | Selection of illustrative stanzas from the commentary on the Purapporu Venpāmalai | pp. 2–13 |
| c. | Selection of illustrative stanzas mostly from the commentary on the Taṇṭiyalarṅkāram (labelled anicṅkāran mēkam, ‘miscellanea on figures of speech – [dealing with] clouds’) | pp. 13–14 |
| d. | Kār Nāṟpatu (11 stanzas) | p. 15 |
| e. | Aintinai Aimpatu (2 stanzas) | p. 15 |
| f. | Inṉā Nāṟpatu (10 stanzas) | pp. 15–16 |
| g. | Iniyavai Nāṟpatu (11 stanzas) | pp. 16–17 |
| h. | Kār Nāṟpatu (15 stanzas) | p. 17 |
| i. | Kalavaji Nāṟpatu (17 stanzas) | p. 18 |
| j. | Aintinai Aimpatu (25 stanzas) | pp. 19–20 |
| k. | Aintinai Elupatu (6 stanzas) | p. 20 |
| l. | Tinaimoḷi Aimpatu (4 stanzas) | pp. 20–21 |
| m. | Tinaimalai Nūṟraimpatu (63 stanzas) | pp. 21–24 |
| n. | Kainnilai (5 stanzas) | pp. 24–25 |
| o. | Selection of stanzas from various sources (labelled cṅkīran, ‘miscellanea’) | pp. 25–31 |
| p. | Naṅgul | pp. 32–49 |
| q. | Akapporu Vilakkam | pp. 49–66 |
| r. | Yēpparukalakkārikai | pp. 67–71 |
| s. | Taṇṭiyalarṅkāram | pp. 71–76 |
| t. | Three stanzas from the Cīvukacīntāmanī and one illustrative stanza from the commentary on the Purapporu Venpāmalai, with commentary | p. 77 |
| u. | Kallātam (stanzas 1–57) | pp. 78–114 |
| v. | One stanza from the Cīlappatikāram, twelve from the Cīvukacīntāmanī and three illustrative stanzas from the commentary on the Purapporu Venpāmalai, with commentary | pp. 114–117 |
| w. | Palaṃḷḷi Nāṉṟuru (135 stanzas) | pp. 118–126 |
| x. | Ĉrūpaṅcamūlam (31 stanzas) | pp. 127–128 |
in their own right, but rather for illustrative purposes. Seen against this background, the selection of texts in UVSL 589 becomes meaningful. In the following sections, we will try to find out just what this selection can tell us about the learned milieu in which UVSL 589 was produced and used.

4. Strategies of transmission of grammar

The selection of grammatical treatises found in UVSL 589 mirrors the predominant configuration of Tamil grammar, which includes five sub-domains respectively focusing on the study of ēḻuttu, col, poruḷ, yāppu, and anī. These domains roughly correspond to phonology, morphology, poetics, metrics, and the study of figures of speech. In particular, UVSL 589 contains the Naṉṉūl of Pavaṇanti Muṉivar (twelfth century), which deals with phonology and morphology, the Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam of Nāṟkavirāca Nampi (thirteenth–fourteenth century), which deals with poetics, the Yāpparuṅkalakkārikai of Amitacākarar (tenth–eleventh century), a treatise on metrics, and the Tāṇṭiyalaṅkāram, a twelfth-century adaptation of the Kāvyadarśa by the Sanskrit scholar Daṇḍin (seventh–eighth century), which deals with figures of speech. As such, all five domains of grammar are represented in the manuscript. One should note that the Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam only deals with one of the two subdivisions of Tamil poetics, namely the study of love poetry (puraṁ). The other genre of heroic poetry (puram) is also represented in UVSL 589, but by illustrative stanzas taken from the Puṟapporuḷ Venpāmālai by Aiyaṉ Āritaṉār (prob. ninth century). Even though the treatise itself is not included, it can be argued that the person who produced the manuscript considered the Puṟapporuḷ Venpāmālai to be an important reference work for analysing heroic poetry.

We know that some of these texts were popular at the time the manuscript was produced. In particular, despite its antiquity, the Naṉṉūl was broadly used for teaching Tamil well into the nineteenth century. The popularity of the Naṉṉūl is corroborated by the numerous commentaries, printed editions and translations that were published during that time. Similarly, the Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam seems to have been the standard text on poetics during that period, as is shown by the fact that nineteenth century poetical compositions generally followed its rules. Furthermore, it seems that the five treatises which we find in UVSL 589 were frequently combined in order to cover the five domains of grammar. This can be inferred from secondary sources. For instance, the eighteenth-century missionary C. G. Beschi hinted at this fivefold list in his grammar of the high register of Tamil, where he mentions exactly the same texts we find in UVSL 589 (with the exception of the Puṟapporuḷ Venpāmālai).

---

17 See Gover 1874, 54; Cāminātaiyar 1950, 115.
18 Ebeling 2009, 244–246.
19 Ebeling 2010, 92, n. 84.
20 See Beschi 1822. 1822 is the year of publication of the English translation by Benjamin Guy Babington. The original Latin work was only published in 1917 (Trichinopoly: St. Joseph’s Industrial School Press).
21 Reading Beschi, though, one has the impression that he thought that the Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam also deals with puraṁ topics. In fact, he probably did not even know the title Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam, as this is the only work he refers to by the name of its author rather than its title.
There are also a number of primary sources, manuscripts and early printed books that somehow intersect with this ideal syllabus. It is clear, in fact, that there is a discrepancy between the ideal five-fold composition of Tamil grammar, the selection of texts forming the corpus used to engage with it, and the actual material realisation of the corpus. For instance, various libraries throughout Tamil Nadu host multiple-text manuscripts containing some of the five grammars of UVSL 589, sometimes together with non-grammatical texts.22 However, none of these manuscripts contain all five grammars, and each collection of texts has some unique characteristics. UVSL 601, for instance, combines three of the five grammars (Naṉṉūl, Yāpparunñikalakkārikkai and an incomplete copy of the Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam) together with a selection of ethical texts, including the Tirukkuṟaḷ, the Nāḷaitiyār, and the Tirikaṭukam. In this respect, it comes close to being an ideal counterpart to UVSL 589, which combines grammars with texts that are mostly literary.

In addition, there are at least two books printed in the nineteenth century that seem to present the same corpus or part of it. As early as 1835, which was quite early in the history of Tamil printed books, Tāṇṭavarāyamutaliyār, a pioneer part of it. As early as 1835, which was quite early in the history of the nineteenth century that seems to present the same corpus or grammars with texts that are mostly literary.

There are also a number of primary sources, manuscripts and early printed books that somehow intersect with this ideal syllabus. It is clear, in fact, that there is a discrepancy between the ideal five-fold composition of Tamil grammar, the selection of texts forming the corpus used to engage with it, and the actual material realisation of the corpus. For instance, various libraries throughout Tamil Nadu host multiple-text manuscripts containing some of the five grammars of UVSL 589, sometimes together with non-grammatical texts.22 However, none of these manuscripts contain all five grammars, and each collection of texts has some unique characteristics. UVSL 601, for instance, combines three of the five grammars (Naṉṉūl, Yāpparunñikalakkārikkai and an incomplete copy of the Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam) together with a selection of ethical texts, including the Tirukkuṟaḷ, the Nāḷaitiyār, and the Tirikaṭukam. In this respect, it comes close to being an ideal counterpart to UVSL 589, which combines grammars with texts that are mostly literary.

In addition, there are at least two books printed in the nineteenth century that seem to present the same corpus or part of it. As early as 1835, which was quite early in the history of Tamil printed books, Tāṇṭavarāyamutaliyār, a pioneer part of it. As early as 1835, which was quite early in the history of the nineteenth century that seems to present the same corpus or grammars with texts that are mostly literary.

...
in which both quotations from literary works and illustrative stanzas from the grammatical literature are used in order to introduce particular poetological topics. What can be called illustrative stanzas are poems which were specifically composed to illustrate the topics discussed in the grammatical works. In particular, UVSL 589 contains illustrative stanzas from the commentary on the Taṇṭiyalankāram and from the Puṟapporuḷ Venpāmālai. In some cases, the stanzas are given in the order in which they appear in the text from which they are taken, as is the case with section aa.29 In other cases, the illustrative stanzas were selected according to thematic criteria. This is the case with sections a and b, which deal with a common topic: the praise of a patron. In section c, which mostly contains illustrative stanzas from the commentary on the Taṇṭiyalankāram, the common topic is the rainy season (an important theme in Tamil and, indeed, pan-Indian poetry).30 This section is directly followed by a selection of poems from two literary works, the Kār Nāṟpatu and the Aintinai Aimpatu (sections d and e), which also deal with the rainy season. Here we can observe how both stanzas from the grammatical tradition and excerpts from literary works were used as illustrations of the same poetological topic.

Another example of how quotations from literary works were used in poetological discussions is provided by sections t and v, which contain a number of stanzas from the epics Cīvakacintāmaṇi and Cilappatikāram as well as illustrative stanzas from the Puṟapporuḷ Venpāmālai, all supplemented by commentary.31 The starting point is a stanza from the Cīvakacintāmaṇi (657), which describes a beautiful lady singing and playing the lute in such a tantalising way that trees shed their leaves, stone pillars produce offshoots, and birds fall from the sky. What follows is a commentary discussing various aspects of this stanza, substantiated by further quotations. The following stanza of the Cīvakacintāmaṇi (658) is quoted to show how the poet describes the lady’s beauty in accordance with poetical conventions, while another stanza from the Cīvakacintāmaṇi (31) and an illustrative stanza from the Puṟapporuḷ Venpāmālai (357) provide parallels for the effects of music on nature. Finally, a quotation from the Cilappatikāram (7.1, lines 5–7) elaborates on the various ways of playing the lute, which were mentioned in Cīvakacintāmaṇi 657. The discussion contains numerous cross-references such as ‘this stanza, too, is an example of the stanza [beginning with] “cilaittolig pirunutal”’ [i.e. Cīvakacintāmaṇi 657]’ (icceyyulū cilaittolig pirunutal eyyuŋ eyyuŋ k’ utāraṇam, p. 114, line 14). What we are witnessing here is a sophisticated discussion of poetological topics, illustrated by quotations from various literary and theoretical sources. Unlike this section, most of UVSL 589 contains quotations without the pertaining discussion, but we can easily imagine that the manuscript could have provided the basis for similar discussions taking place in an oral setting.

6. Glimpses of a pre-modern canon

As we have seen, UVSL 589 makes use of excerpts from poetry in order to illustrate poetological topics. Seen against this background, the selection of literary works found in the manuscript becomes meaningful, as it allows us to infer which works the person who produced the manuscript deemed exemplary literature. We are therefore in a position to catch a glimpse of what might have constituted a canon of Tamil literature at the time the manuscript was produced, which was probably sometime in the nineteenth century. Of course, it is impossible to draw far-reaching conclusions from a single manuscript, but UVSL 589 certainly opens up a window into Tamil literary culture during a crucial period of its history.

The most striking feature about the literary works contained in UVSL 589 is possibly what is missing, namely the so-called Caṅkam literature. The Caṅkam texts – 18 works of erotic and heroic poetry, which are divided into two groups of texts, the ‘Eight Anthologies’ (Ēttuttokai) and the ‘Ten Songs’ (Pattuppāṭṭu) – form the oldest stratum of Tamil literature. They were probably composed during the early centuries of the Common Era (though dating is a matter of dispute). The Caṅkam works are thought to have been rediscovered during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century by men like U. V. Swaminatha Iyer (1855–1942), who collected the surviving manuscripts and produced printed editions of them, triggering a process known as the
Tamil Renaissance.\(^{32}\) Thanks to printing, the \textit{Caṅkam} works were widely disseminated and caused a major transformation of the Tamil literary canon.\(^{33}\) While there is reason to believe that the \textit{Caṅkam} works were not forgotten entirely, as is often thought, it does seem that they had become a rather marginal part of Tamil literary culture by the nineteenth century.\(^{34}\) UVSL 589 appears to confirm this verdict; in the manuscript, the \textit{Caṅkam} texts are conspicuous by their absence.

The only exception here is the \textit{Tirumurukāṟṟuppatai}, one of the ‘Ten Songs’ (\textit{Pattuppāṭṭu}). This is the only \textit{Caṅkam} work which seems to have been more widely known before the Tamil Renaissance. Unlike the other \textit{Caṅkam} works, this text belongs to neither of the genres of \textit{akam} or \textit{puṟam} poetry, but contains a hymn to the Hindu god Murukaṉ. Due to its religious contents, it came to be included not only in the \textit{Pattuppāṭṭu}, but also in the Śaiva canon (\textit{Tirumūṟū}).

As such, it enjoyed great popularity and was transmitted in numerous manuscript copies.\(^{35}\) Given the Śaiva affiliation of the manuscript, it stands to reason to assume that the \textit{Tirumurukāṟṟuppatai} was not included because of its being part of the \textit{Caṅkam} corpus, but because of its religious significance.

While the \textit{Caṅkam} texts seem to have been marginalised in the nineteenth century, they were still alive in people’s minds to some extent. The names of the \textit{Caṅkam} texts were known from a series of three so-called mnemonic stanzas which listed the constituent works of the \textit{Ēṭuttokai} and the \textit{Pattuppāṭṭu} (the two collections which make up the \textit{Caṅkam} corpus) as well as the \textit{Kīḻkkaṇakku} corpus in a versified and easily memorable form.\(^{36}\) These mnemonic stanzas are also found in UVSL 589 (as part of the ‘miscellanea’ section on p. 31). The person who produced the manuscript thus knew that the \textit{Caṅkam} works existed, but there is no evidence that he had any first-hand knowledge of them.

In contrast to the \textit{Caṅkam} texts, the works of the \textit{Kīḻkkaṇakku} corpus are quite well represented in UVSL 589. The \textit{Kīḻkkaṇakku} texts were composed in the period directly following the \textit{Caṅkam} texts, that is, probably in the middle of the first millennium. Most of them represent a new genre, which can be called ‘ethical literature’, i.e. they deal with questions of right conduct. Seven out of the 18 texts, however, represent the ancient genres of love poetry (\textit{akam}) and heroic poetry (\textit{puṟam}) and thus continue the tradition of the \textit{Caṅkam} literature. In UVSL 589 we find excerpts from 14 of the 18 \textit{Kīḻkkaṇakku} works, arranged in a way which reflects the order and sub-grouping found in the mnemonic stanza.\(^{37}\) Even the most obscure \textit{Kīḻkkaṇakku} text is represented: the \textit{Kainnilai}, whose inclusion in the corpus was contested for some time.\(^{38}\) This shows that the \textit{Kīḻkkaṇakku} works were transmitted as a corpus and that the \textit{Kainnilai} was accepted as a part of the corpus.

Notably, the two most popular \textit{Kīḻkkaṇakku} texts — the \textit{Tirukkūrugal} and the \textit{Nālaṭiyār} — are missing in UVSL 589, except for a few quotes from the \textit{Nālaṭiyār} in the miscellanea section. The manuscript also contains a part of the \textit{Tiruvallūvamālai}, a poem in praise of \textit{Tiruvallūvar}, the author of the \textit{Tirukkūrugal}, which was often prefixed to the \textit{Tirukkūrugal}.\(^{39}\) Nowadays, the \textit{Tirukkūrugal} is the most famous work of Tamil literature and it seems to have enjoyed great popularity throughout the ages. Though less renowned today, the \textit{Nālaṭiyār} seems to have come close to the \textit{Tirukkūrugal} in popularity in pre-modern times.\(^{40}\) Given that UVSL 589 contains stray stanzas from the \textit{Nālaṭiyār}

\(^{32}\) The manuscripts collected by U. V. Swaminatha Iyer formed the basis of the collection of the U. V. Swaminatha Iyer Library, the institution which holds the manuscript discussed in this article. It is quite possible that UVSL 589 was collected by Swaminatha Iyer himself, but there is also the possibility that the library obtained the manuscript from another source (no records exist, unfortunately).

\(^{33}\) Venkatachalapathy 2005.

\(^{34}\) Scholarship of previous decades (e.g. Ramanujan 1985, xi–xiv and Zvelebil 1992, 144–153) has tended to overemphasise the rediscovery narrative. Recent publications which question the rediscovery of \textit{Caṅkam} literature include Tieken 2010 and Rajesh 2014.

\(^{35}\) Wilden 2014, 43.


\(^{37}\) The order given in the mnemonic stanza is \textit{Nālaṭiyār}, \textit{NāṟṉeṇiṉmāṇiṆakkaṉikai}, the four \textit{Nāṟpatu} (Iṉṉā Nāṟpatu, IṉiṆvai Nāṟpatu, Kāṟ Nāṟpatu, Kalavāṉ Nāṟpatu), the four \textit{Aintinais} (Aintinai Āmpatu, Aintinai Ēḻupatu, Tinaiēmpol Āmpatu, Tinaiēmpol Nāṟṟaimpatu), the \textit{Kāṟ Nāṟpatu}, \textit{Kain nilai}, and from secondary sources we know that these two works were taught to pupils at a very early stage of their studies; Cutler 2003, 277.

\(^{38}\) Zvelebil 1995, 689–690.

\(^{39}\) Numerous manuscript copies of the \textit{Tirukkūrugal} and the \textit{Nālaṭiyār} survive, and from secondary sources we know that these two works were taught to pupils at a very early stage of their studies; Cutler 2003, 277.
and the Tiruvalļuvāḻalai, it seems certain that the person who produced the manuscript knew the Tirukkuṟaḷ and the Nāṭaiyār. We assume he chose not to include them because the user of the manuscript was expected to know them already.

It is quite remarkable to find the Kīḷkkanaṇakkku works so prominently represented in the manuscript. This is especially true of those that represent the genres of love poetry (akam) and heroic poetry (puṟam). Nowadays, classical Tamil akam and puṟam poetry is almost invariably associated with the Caiṅkam works. The Kīḷkkanaṇakkku akam and puṟam works are usually viewed as an inferior imitation of the latter, if they are not ignored completely. The attitude prevalent in modern scholarship is epitomised by Kamil Zvelebil’s statement in his History of Tamil Literature: ‘As poetry, they are not much’.

UVSL 589, on the other hand, includes excerpts of all six Kīḷkkanaṇakkku akam works and of the lone puṟam text. This shows that akam and puṟam literature was still read at the time this manuscript was produced. Moreover, for the person who produced the manuscript, the texts which were exemplary of akam and puṟam poetry were not the Caiṅkam texts, but the Kīḷkkanaṇakkku works. This may simply be due to the fact that he had no access to the Caiṅkam works or, possibly, he deemed the Kīḷkkanaṇakkku texts to be better suited as illustrations than the Caiṅkam works, which are linguistically more difficult and do not always follow the poetological conventions described in the grammars. In any case, UVSL 589 suggests that the Kīḷkkanaṇakkku works might have had a better standing in the pre-modern scholarly milieu than modern literary histories would have us believe.

At the same time, it has to be conceded that the number of surviving Kīḷkkanaṇakkku manuscripts other than Tirukkuṟaḷ and Nāṭaiyār is relatively small. Probably, not very many people were studying the other Kīḷkkanaṇakkku texts at the time UVSL 589 was produced. The fact that we find these texts in the manuscript suggests that its envisaged users must have been rather well acquainted with Tamil literature. A similar point can be made for another text, which is partly contained in UVSL 589: the Kallāṭam. This is a mediaeval (probably eleventh-century) work of Śaiva affiliation, which combines religious themes and akam poetry. Though rarely read today, in the nineteenth century this difficult work had the reputation of being the touchstone of erudition: only the most capable of scholars were thought to be able to study this complicated text. According to a saying quoted by U. V. Swaminatha Iyer in his autobiography, ‘one should not argue with those who have studied the Kallāṭam’ (Kallāṭam kaṟṟavarōṭu collāṭātē). Clearly, the reader for whom UVSL 589 was meant was an accomplished scholar, or at least a very advanced student.

There is one more text whose presence in UVSL 589 is remarkable: the Cīvakacintāmāni. This is one of the five epics of the late-classical period, probably composed in the tenth century by a Jaina author. The Cīvakacintāmāni had a special place in the history of the putative rediscovery of classical Tamil literature. In a widely quoted passage in his autobiography, U. V. Swaminatha Iyer describes how he met a certain Salem Ramaswami Mudaliar, a wealthy government official and connoisseur of literature, in 1880. During their meeting, Ramaswami Mudaliar urged Swaminatha Iyer, who was not acquainted with classical Tamil literature at the time, to study the ancient texts, and he handed him a manuscript of the Cīvakacintāmāni. Swaminatha Iyer recounts how he started studying it and thus gained access to the world of ancient Tamil literature for the very first time. In his autobiography, Swaminatha Iyer gives the impression that no-one at the time was familiar with the Cīvakacintāmāni, except for members of the Jaina community, who recited the text on the grounds of its religious merits. The fact that we find the Cīvakacintāmāni in our manuscript, which has a clear Śaiva affiliation, however, shows that the text was read as a piece of literature across religious borders. It seems that Swaminatha Iyer’s account is somewhat exaggerated. As A. R. Venkatachalapathy has shown, the Cīvakacintāmāni

---

44 Cāmināṭaiyār 1950, 504.
46 Cāmināṭaiyār 1950, 726–734.
47 Cāmināṭaiyār 1950, 735–745.
48 As Norman Cutler has pointed out (drawing on U. V. Swaminatha Iyer’s autobiography), the Vaishnava Kamparāmāyaṇam (the Tamil version of the Rāmāyaṇa) was studied in a Śaiva environment because it was similarly seen as belonging to the literary rather than the religious domain, Cutler 2003, 279.
was not as unknown as Swaminatha Iyer would have us believe. Part of it had already been published at that time, and the text was even prescribed reading in the Madras University curriculum.49 UVSL 589 is another testimony to the relative importance of the Cīvakacintāmaṇi.

To sum up, then, what we find in UVSL 589 is a glimpse of what a highly erudite person of the period immediately preceding the Tamil Renaissance could have considered a canon of Tamil literature. This canon had strong classicist leanings. The genres which played the most prominent role in contemporary literary production, pirapantam and purāṇam, are absent, except for a few stray quotations in the ‘miscellanea’ section.50 All the literary works included in the manuscript belong to the first or early second millennium. On the other hand, the very oldest stratum, which today would be characterised as the epitome of classical Tamil literature, namely Caṅkam literature, is missing. In some respects, such as the absence of the Caṅkam works, UVSL 589 seems to confirm existing notions about the pre-modern Tamil literary canon. In other respects, it further consolidates doubts about dominant narratives, e.g. U. V. Swaminatha Iyer’s account about the Cīvakacintāmaṇi. In yet other respects, UVSL 589 seems to provide new insights; for example, it gives us reason to wonder if the Kīḻkkāṇakkku texts played a more important role in the period pre-dating the Tamil Renaissance than we would generally assume today. What is needed is more research which would allow us to place our conclusions on a stronger footing than what was possible in this case study.

7. Conclusions
The selection of texts in UVSL 589 and the way in which these were put together provides us with some valuable insights on the transmission of grammatical and literary knowledge and their intimate connection within Tamil scholarship. We have seen how different grammatical treatises were put together in order to cover the whole spectrum of grammatical knowledge and how excerpts from literary works were used to illustrate poetological theory. From the latter, we were able to deduce which literary works the person who produced UVSL 589 deemed exemplary. Furthermore, the arrangement of texts in UVSL 589 together with its codicological features, which make its contents readily accessible, suggest that the manuscript served as an educational tool. As such, UVSL 589 provides a snapshot of the Tamil scholarly tradition at the time just before the printing press and Western education caused a definitive transformation of the Tamil scholarly landscape.

Such insights can only emerge by studying the manuscript in its entirety. There is nothing special about the texts contained in UVSL 589 in themselves. It is their co-occurrence in UVSL 589 that makes it such a remarkable object. As Dominik Wujastyk has recently pointed out, Indology has long tended to equate manuscripts with texts. Catalogues of Indic manuscripts usually contain lists of titles rather than of physical objects.51 This is also true of the U. V. Swaminatha Iyer Library catalogue ([Anonymous] 1956–1962). In this catalogue, texts are listed under their respective titles, but there is no list of the texts contained in the same physical object. Thus, it is simply impossible to gather information about a multiple-text manuscript as a whole unless one is already familiar with its contents. If we take our list of the contents of UVSL 589 as a starting point, however, and try to look up the individual texts, it emerges that the catalogue lists the sections that can be identified with a particular work, but omits the composite sections t and v, which contain material assembled from various texts.52 In other words, anything which is not a text in the narrow sense is excluded from the catalogue. As we hope to have shown in the case of UVSL 589, however, it is only by engaging with manuscripts as objects in their own right that we are in the position to place their textual dimension in a broader cultural frame.

51 Wujastyk 2014, 173–174. As for Tamil manuscripts, a felicitous exception is represented by the catalogue of the collection held at the Maharaja Sarfoji’s Saraswathi Mahal Library of Thanjavur (e.g. Olaganatha Pillay 1964).
52 In fact, the first part of the manuscript (up to section o in our counting) is not reflected at all in the catalogue. This is most probably due to a mistake, since most of the sections found there can easily be identified with a particular text and would be expected to be found in the catalogue. We find the following entries for the rest of the manuscript: UVSL 589-A: Naṇgiḷ; UVSL 589-B: Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam; UVSL 589-C: Yāpparunkalakkārikā; UVSL 589-D: Tāntiyalankāram; UVSL 589-E: Kāḷḍāṭam; UVSL 589-F: Paḷāmouḷi Nāṉṉu; UVSL 589-G: Cēṟupācēṟamāḷam; UVSL 589-H: Mutumouḷākkēḷi; UVSL 589-I: Éḷāṭi; UVSL 589-J: Tāntiyalankāram; UVSL 589-K: Ācēṟūkkūvai; UVSL 589-L: Tiruvāḷṉavamūḷai; UVSL 589-M: Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai; UVSL 589-N: Cīvakacintāmaṇi.

49 Venkatachalapathy 2005, 539.
50 Pirapantam (from Sanskrit prabhanda, ‘composition’) or cīṟṟilakkkuṟam (‘minor literature’) is the cover term for a number of diverse poetical genres, all of which are characterised by their rather strong formalistic rigour. Purāṇam in this context mostly means temple-legends (sthālapurāṇa) expounding the greatness of a particular sacred place. See Ebeling 2010, 55–57.
Appendix 1: Invocations in UVSL 589. The invocations are provided in a diplomatic transcription. In this respect, one may note the unusual spelling of *mamgalam* for *maṅgalam*. At times, the same invocation occurs in a slightly enlarged version. These variants are reported in round brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invocations</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Page no.: line no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Sanskrit: ‘prayer to the (holy) lord of liberality [i.e. Śiva]’).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Sanskrit: ‘prayer to the (holy) lord of the Lotus Town [Chidambaram; i.e. Śiva]’).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Sanskrit: ‘prayer to the holy dweller of the Lotus Town [Chidambaram; i.e. Śiva]’).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Sanskrit: ‘prayer to the holy lord of dance of the golden hall [in the temple of Chidambaram; i.e. Śiva]’).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>(śrī)</em> citambareśāya mamgalam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76:13, 166:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Sanskrit: ‘prayer to the holy lord of Chidambaram [i.e. Śiva]’).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <em>(nampi)</em> tampirān ṭōḷa(a)y tiruvatikajē caraṇam / yām uṭaiya parṇu</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76:14 (3x), 114:5 (2x), 162:4, 162:15, 166:8 (2x), 194:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Tamil: ‘the holy feet of the companion of the (supreme) lord [i.e. Cuntarar] are the refuge / our devotion’).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. anavaratāna nāyakar tiruvatikajē caraṇam / kati</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49:10, 55:10, 76:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Tamil: ‘the holy feet of the lord of incessant liberality [i.e. Śiva] are the refuge / support’).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <em>(śrī)</em> anavaradānanāthāya mamgalam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Sanskrit: ‘prayer to the holy lord of incessant liberality [i.e. Śiva]’).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. vaṇṇoṇṭaṇār tiruvatikajē</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Tamil: ‘the holy feet of Vaṇṇoṇṭaṇār [i.e. Cuntarar]’).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Annotations written in Telugu script in UVSL 589.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annotations</th>
<th>Translations and explanations</th>
<th>Page no.: line no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. paṇḍḍāraṇa (for Tamil paṇṭāraṇa)</td>
<td>Lit. ‘Śaivite devotee’. Appended to Purapporul Venpāmālai 232 to give the gist of the stanza, which is about what one may achieve by worshipping Śiva.</td>
<td>4:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. kaivēl kailāṟṟuṭum (for Tamil kaivēl kaiḻṟuṭum)</td>
<td>Lit. ‘also [the poem which begins with] ‘kaivēl kaiḻṟuṭu’ [i.e. Tirukkuṟṟaḷ 774]’. Appended to Purapporul Venpāmālai 142, which is similar in content, to point out the parallel.</td>
<td>10:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. surumāṉbiveraiṇṭummeḍurartamuttum ve</td>
<td>(So far no explanation)</td>
<td>29:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. iṭainilaitṭivakam (for Tamil iṭainilaittivakam).</td>
<td>This is the technical term for a particular figure of speech. Appended to a stanza from the commentary on the Taṇṭiyalankāram, which illustrates this figure of speech.</td>
<td>31:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. iṅṭirinḍṭeluttu (for Tamil iṅṭ iriṇṭ eluttu).</td>
<td>Lit. ‘this [only contains] two letters’. Appended to a stanza from the commentary on the Taṇṭiyalankāram, which only employs two different consonants. The first two characters of this brief annotation are written in Tamil script, whereas the rest is written in Telugu script.</td>
<td>149:6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10 - Dividing Texts: Visual Text-Organization in North Indian and Nepalese Manuscripts by Bidur Bhattarai

The number of manuscripts produced in the Indian subcontinent is astounding and is the result of a massive enterprise that was carried out over a vast geographical area and over a vast stretch of time. Focusing on areas of Northern India and Nepal between 800 to 1300 CE and on manuscripts containing Sanskrit texts, the present study investigates a fundamental and so far rarely studied aspect of manuscript production: visual organization. Scribes adopted a variety of visual strategies to distinguish one text from another and to differentiate the various sections within a single text (chapters, sub-chapters, etc.). Their repertoire includes the use of space(s) on the folio, the adoption of different writing styles, the inclusion of symbols of various kind, the application of colors (rubrication), or a combination of all these. This study includes a description of these various strategies and an analysis of their different implementations across the selected geographical areas. It sheds light on how manuscripts were produced, as well as on some aspects of their employment in ritual contexts, in different areas of India and Nepal.

15 - Studies on Greek and Coptic Majuscule Scripts and Books by Pasquale Orsini

The volume contains a critical review of data, results and open problems concerning the principal Greek and Coptic majuscule bookhands, based on previous research of the author, revised and updated to offer an overview of the different graphic phenomena. Although the various chapters address the history of different types of scripts (i.e. biblical majuscule, sloping potend majuscule, liturgical majuscule, epigraphic and monumental scripts), their juxtaposition allows us to identify common issues of the comparative method of palaeography. From an overall critical assessment of these aspects the impossibility of applying a unique historical paradigm to interpret the formal expressions and the history of the different bookhands comes up, due to the fact that each script follows different paths. Particular attention is also devoted to the use of Greek majuscules in the writing of ancient Christian books. A modern and critical awareness of palaeographic method may help to place the individual witnesses in the context of the main graphic trends, in the social and cultural environments in which they developed, and in a more accurate chronological framework.