KĀRAKA THEORY IN THE VĪRACŌḺIYAM AND ITS SANSKRIT ANTECEDENTS

Victor B. D'Avella

NETamil, University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

Abstract

In the present study I will examine the relationship between the *Vīracōḻiyam*, an 11ᵗʰ century grammar of Tamil by the Buddhist Puttamittiraṉ, and the Sanskrit grammatical treatises that served as its likely models. Based on the sections that describe the *kāraka*s "factors of an action", I have been able to establish that two texts in particular, the *Kātantra* and the *Prayogamukha*, heavily influenced Puttamittiraṉ's presentation of the Tamil language. Furthermore, it has become evident by comparing the number and names of the sub-*kāraka*s in these works with those in the *Saddanīti*, a Pali grammar of the 12ᵗʰ century, that the *Prayogamukha* travelled in Buddhist circles as one of the basic texts for extending Sanskrit grammar to foreign languages, a thesis that is further substantiated by the presence of the *Prayogamukha* in Tibetan during the first wave of translation.

Résumé

J'examinerai, dans la présente étude, les relations entre le *Vīracōḻiyam*, une grammaire du tamoul composée au XIᵉ s. par le bouddhiste Puttamittira, et les traités grammaticaux du sanskrit qui lui ont probablement servi de modèle. En me fondant sur les sections qui traitent des *kāraka* (« facteurs d'action »), j'ai pu établir que deux textes en particulier, le *Kātantra* et le *Prayogamukha*, avaient considérablement influencé la présentation que Puttamittiraṉ fait de la langue tamoule. En outre, en comparant le nombre et les noms des sous-types de *kāraka* qui figurent dans ces textes à ceux que l'on trouve dans la *Saddanīti*, une grammaire du pali du XIIᵉ s., il apparaît de façon évidente que le *Prayogamukha* a été utilisé, au sein des cercles bouddhistes, comme texte de référence à partir duquel la grammaire sanskrite a pu être étendue à des langues étrangères ; cette thèse est par ailleurs étayée par la présence du *Prayogamukha* au Tibet durant la première vague de traduction.

1 INTRODUCTION

Toward the end of the first millennium CE[1] grammarians throughout South Asia and beyond began to adopt the structure and theory of Sanskrit grammars to new languages including those of the Dravidian family.[2] Earlier examples are, of course,

---

1 All dates are CE unless otherwise stated.

2 The first extent Tamil grammar, the *Tolkāppiyam* (T), likely dates back to the first half of the first millennium. Although it certainly evinces influence from the Sanskrit grammatical tradition, the T represents a much freer and innovative adoption than in the grammars under discussion here.

available for the Prakrit languages and Pāli, but the application of these models to Dravidian languages, structurally much further afield than the Sanskrit daughter languages, forced a variety of new theoretical choices in the description of the target languages as well as about their relation to Sanskrit. Understanding how these new grammars relate to their Sanskrit predecessors requires both a close reading of the grammars themselves and a fairly broad knowledge of the possible source texts. Work on the grammars of Dravidian languages has been rather uneven, and, excepting Tamil, only a relatively small number of studies exist on the grammars of Kannada, Malayalam, and Telugu. Even in the case of Tamil, for which there is more extensive secondary literature,[3] there remains substantial work to be done on the numerous grammars of the second millennium before they can be properly situated in the history of grammatical literature in India.

One such Tamil grammar, the *Vīracōḻiyam* (VC), composed in the 11th century by Puttamittiraṉ and commented on by Peruntēvaṉ in the 12th,[4] represents an attempt to incorporate Sanskritic elements into the grammatical and poetological description of Tamil even though a more suited grammar cum poetics for Tamil, the *Tolkāppiyam* (T), had long been in existence.[5] As I and others have discussed elsewhere, the motivation for creating such a grammar at the time and place that Puttamittiraṉ did is complex and stems not only from the general milieu in which the vernacular languages looked to Sanskrit as a model of a literary language regulated by a grammar, but also from Puttamittiraṉ's personal interest to convey Sanskrit knowledge to a Tamil audience. In addition, the Buddhist literary

---

3 Subramanya Sastri (1997), Meenakshisundaran (1974) and Meenakshi (1984) cover Sanskrit influence on Tamil grammars more generally. In my forthcoming article on the VC, I discuss the secondary literature in more detail.

4 Monius (2001 & 2013) are two of the most recent and in depth publications on the VC and should be consulted for further information about the historical and cultural background of the grammar. The date of Puttamittiraṉ is secured thanks to his references to Vīracōḻaṉ / Vīrarācentiraṉ = Skt. Vīrarājendra. The date of the commentator, Peruntēvaṉ is somewhat more problematic. See Zvelebil (1997, p. 555, 587 & 772) on Peruntēvaṉ, Puttamittiraṉ, and the *Vīracōḻiyam*, respectively.

5 This is in sharp contradistinction to the grammars of the three other major Dravidian languages, Telugu, Kannada, and Malayalam, where the first grammars of these languages followed Sanskrit models far more closely than the T. Grammars for Kannada start in the 9th cent. with the *Kavirājamārga*, although this is more of a work on poetics with some grammatical discussions. More full-fledged grammars followed in the 12th and 13th centuries, viz. the *Karṇāṭakabhāṣābhūṣaṇa* of Nāgavarman II and the *Śabdamaṇidarpana* of Kēśirāja. Cf. Kulli (1976). The beginning of the Telugu grammatical tradition is difficult to pin down owing to the likely spurious ascription of the *Āndhraśabdacintāmaṇi* (in Sanskrit!) to Nannaya Bhaṭṭāraka (11th cent.; see the contribution of Patel in this issue). In any case, the tradition was off and running by the 13th cent. with the appearance of the *Āndhrabhāṣābhūṣaṇamu* (in Telugu) by Mūlaghaṭika Kētana. For a summary of Telugu grammars see Purushottam (1996, p. 3–37). Malayalam received its first grammar only in the 14th cent. with the *Līlātilakam* (in Sanskrit). For a précis of the premodern grammars for Dravidian languages, see Annamalai (2016, p. 716–734).

community that Puttamittiraṉ belonged to clearly determined which texts he used as models. The present paper, a continuation of a preceding article,[6] will focus on detailing the system of *kāraka*s "factors of an action" in the VC and which texts served as its sources. As I have demonstrated in the aforementioned essay, this line of research helps to illuminate both how the source material has been appropriated for a different language and, conversely, which Sanskrit sources had importance for the literary circles during the period in question. As I will show, to understand the VC, we must look outside of the Pāṇinian school at works hardly studied nowadays, especially the *Prayogamukha* (PM), but ones that are paramount for understanding the development and spread of grammar in South Asia.

2 KĀRAKAS AND CASE

2.1 Introduction to Kāraka Theory

The relation between an object, as denoted by a noun, and an action, as expressed by a verbal root, forms one of the core facets of Sanskrit grammar. To describe these relations, Pāṇini has defined in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (A) six *kāraka*s "factors"[7] which can be applied to both nominal stems involved in an action as well as to suffixes added to a verbal root. For example, if one has the three elements *devadatta* (nomen proprium), *odana* "rice", and *pac* "to cook", the speaker will label the two nouns according to the role they are to play in the syntactic unit. If Devadatta is independently responsible for the act of cooking, he will receive the designation *kartṛ* "agent",[8] and if the rice is the thing which one most wants to obtain through the act of cooking, it is labelled the *karman* "patient".[9] Similarly, the 3rd pers. sing. ending -*ti* in *pacati* "cooks" is likewise said to express the agent, hence we know it is an active verb in the sentence *devadatta odanaṃ pacati* "Devadatta cooks rice". Within the framework of Pāṇini's grammar these labels serve primarily to produce correct morphology. The simplest application is that a noun labelled with a particular *kāraka* will take a particular case. If, for example, a noun has been labelled the *karaṇa* "instrument" of an action, then it will receive the third or "instrumental" case by P. 2.3.18 *kartṛkaraṇayos tṛtīyā* "there is the third (instr.) case when (the noun) expresses the agent or instrument (provided neither are

---

6 (D'Avella forthcoming).
7 For the complete list see p. 71 below. The relevant sūtras are P. 1.4.23–55. For a more detailed description and analysis of the topic see (Joshi & Roodbergen 1975, p. i–xix). A succinct and accurate summary is given in Vergiani (2013, p. 162–166). For the sake of uniformity, I have consistently used the stem *kāraka* throughout even in reference to Tamil texts, for which one would properly use *kārakam*. I refer to the sūtras of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in the following format: P. X.Y.Z where X is the *adhyāya*, Y the *pāda* and Z the sūtra number.
8 By P. 1.4.54 *svatantraḥ kartā* "The independent one is the agent."
9 By P. 1.4.49 *kartur īpsitatamaṃ karma* "What is most desired on the part of the agent is the *karman.*"

already expressed)."[10] Similarly, if it is labelled *karman*, it takes the second or accusative case by P. 2.3.2 *karmaṇi dvitīyā* "the second (acc.) case occurs when the patient is expressed (provided it is not already expressed)." It is important to note that in the sūtra the word for the second case (*dvitīyā*) is in the nominative and the corresponding word for the patient *kāraka* (*karmaṇi*) is in the locative, since this syntax will be repeated in the VC.

Each *kāraka* does not, however, correspond to one case ending, and the addition of the overt case is contingent on several conditions, including the type of suffix added to the verbal root. At present the most important condition is that for rules like P. 2.3.2 and 18 to apply, a noun's *kāraka* must not be expressed elsewhere in the relevant syntactic unit. In effect, this means that if a suffix added to a verbal root expresses the same *kāraka* as a noun involved in the action expressed by that root, then the general rules for adding a case to that noun are barred.[11] Accordingly, when the speaker wishes the personal ending *-ti* in *pacati* to express the *kartṛ* "agent", then we can no longer add the instr. to *devadatta* by P. 2.3.18, because the *kartṛ* is already expressed. In such instances, the nominative case will be used since it is not associated with any particular *kāraka*, only the meaning, etc. of the nominal stem.[12] Therefore, *devadatta* stands in the nominative in the sentence *devadatta*$_{nom.}$ *odanam*$_{acc.}$ *pacati* "Devadatta$_{nom.}$ cooks[13] rice $_{acc}$", and not the instrumental. On the other hand, if the personal ending added to *pac* should express the *karman* "patient", then P. 2.3.2 is barred, and *odana* "rice" will take the nominative case. Since the personal ending does not express the agent in this case, *devadatta* will receive the instrumental case ending by P. 2.3.18, and the resulting sentence is: *odano*$_{nom.}$ *devadattena*$_{instr.}$ *pacyate* "Rice$_{nom.}$ is cooked[14] by Devadatta$_{instr.}$" Through the introduction of the condition *anabhihite* at the beginning of P. 2.3 and leaving the nominative case without a specific *kāraka*, Pāṇini is able to account for

---

10 In many Sanskrit as well as Tamil grammars, the cases are referred to by the ordinal numerals "first" through "seventh". In Latinate terminology these correspond to the nominative, accusative, instrumental, dative, ablative, genitive, and locative, respectively. Unlike their Latinate counterparts, the Sanskrit designations for the cases bear no semantic value, a prudent strategy since one and the same case can express very different relations, as will be seen below. I will retain the cardinal numerals with the corresponding Latinate case name in parentheses when translating from Sanskrit. Elsewhere I will use the Latinate terms.

11 The rules that relate the cases to nouns labelled with a *kāraka* occur in P. 2.3. This section of the grammar is headed by the rule P. 2.3.1 *anabhihite* "if not already expressed," which, being in the loc., modifies the *kāraka*s in the following rules and permits them to apply only when the *kāraka* in question is not expressed elsewhere in the relevant syntactic unit. Traditionally, the *kāraka* can be expressed by four elements: personal endings, *kṛt* "primary" suffixes, *taddhita* "secondary" suffixes, and compounding. Cf. *Kāśikāvṛtti* (KV) ad P. 2.3.1.

12 By P. 2.3.46 *prātipadikārthaliṅgaparimāṇavacanamātre prathamā* "The first (nom.) case occurs only to express the meaning, gender, measure and number of the nominal stem."

13 The ending *-ti* in *pacati* expresses the agent by P. 3.4.69.

14 The ending *-te* in *pacyate* expresses the patient by P. 3.4.69.

active and passive constructions in a quite ingenious manner. Although one could add much detail to my brief summary of the *kāraka*s in the A, for our present purpose the above outline will suffice.

In the subsequent commentarial literature on the A, the *kāraka*s generated erudite and philosophically deep discussions about the nature of linguistic expression and how the speaker wished to describe the external world, emanating, as always, out of discussions about Pāṇini's *sūtras* and how they can or cannot account for linguistic usage. Of lasting importance is the *Sādhana-samuddeśa* "lesson on factors" in the *Vākyapadīya* (VP) by Bhartṛhari (5th cent.), where the theoretical discussions of the *Mahābhāṣya* (MBh) of Patañjali (2nd cent. BCE?) are summarized and elaborated in verses called *kārikā*s. One point of interest was the subdivision of the *kāraka*s so that one could speak more precisely about an agent, patient, etc. in relation to a verbal action: the act of making a pot has a very different kind of effect on the patient (*karman*) than the act of looking at the sun. Membership to some of these subclasses also has formal linguistic implications.[15] Although Bhartṛhari adduced several of these subvarieties from the MBh and introduced some of his own, later authors expanded and refined this list.[16] At some point, these "sub-*kāraka*s" became part of the basic curriculum in Sanskrit grammar and the number of subtypes were versified in the very popular introductory work variously known as the *Prayogamukha* (PM), *Vārarucasaṃgraha* or, in a shortened form, *Kārakacakra* (not to be confused with the work by Puruṣottamadeva), about which I will have much more to say shortly.[17] This work along with a commentary attributed to Dharmakīrti clearly served as the basis for sections of the VC, a fact already noted with regard to the *tokaip-paṭalam* "Section on Compounds".[18] The theory of *kāraka*s also disseminated into later non-Pāṇinian grammars in different ways; some remained relatively faithful to Pāṇini's

---

15 For example, only certain types of *karman,* the *nirvartya* and *vikārya*, can occur in *karmavadbhāva* "(the agent) being like the direct object" constructions, such as *pacyate odanaḥ svayam eva* "the rice cooks by itself." See Vergiani (2013, p. 175) for further detail on the relevance of the *karman* subtypes for the application of Pāṇinian *sūtras*.

16 The *Mahāvṛtti* "Great Gloss" by Abhayanandin (7th cent.) on the *Jainendravyākaraṇa* (JV) of Devanandin (5th cent. CE?) is likely the first extant source to give versified lists of sub-*kāraka*s ad JV 1.2.116 (*adhikaraṇa*) and 1.2.120 (*karman*) that do not stem from the VP, albeit the content is similar. On the latter, see Vergiani (2013, p. 182f.). All references to the JV are according the version of the grammar with the *Mahāvṛtti*.

17 NB that only the number of subvarieties is given in the verses. Their names had to be supplied by a teacher or written commentary.

18 Subrahmanya Sastri (1997, p. 209–212) remarks that the section on compounds (*tokai*) in the VC and *Pirayōkavivēkam* are "exactly the translation of the *kārika*s on *samāsa* assigned to the authorship of Vararuci in Sanskrit." As I will demonstrate for the present section, Puttamittiraṉ must have specifically known the commentary by Dharmakīrti in one form or another.

definitions and overall plan,[19] while others altered the terminology and simplified the scheme at the sacrifice of theoretical elegance and rigor.[20] For the VC, these non-Pāṇinian grammars were of as much importance as Pāṇini's A (if not more so), and their customary place in the backseat of scholarship on the history of Sanskrit grammar has resulted in a rather skewed view of the discipline's development. This neglect is, however, slowly being remedied.

2.2 Kārakas in the Vīracōḻiyam

The VC contains two sections that treat the description and assignment of case: the *vēṟṟumaip-paṭalam* "Section on Case" and the *upakārakap-paṭalam* "Section on the Sub-*Kāraka*s." As I have treated the former at some length elsewhere, I will here only mention a few relevant details from the former before moving onto my study of the *kāraka*s. Puttamittiraṉ links the cases to the *kāraka*s in VC 34 & 35 using much the same syntax as the Sanskrit grammarians, i.e., the case in the nom. and the *kāraka* in the loc. or oblique standing for a loc. Although the nominative is also reserved for expressing merely the meaning of a nominal stem (VC 33), we do not find any rule similar to P. 3.2.1 *anabhihite* much like in the Kā.[21]

In the *upakāraka-paṭalam* (VC 38–43), the *kāraka*s that were initially listed in (VC 29) are now defined at the outset (VC 38), exemplified in a sentence (VC 39), and subdivided into 23 *upakāraka*s "sub-factors" (VC 40–41). Thereafter comes a set of exceptions to the general correspondences between the cases and the *kāraka*s set out in the *vēṟṟumaip-paṭalam*, some of which appear to be more descriptive of Sanskrit than Tamil usage (VC 42–43). This section of the VC provides us with some of the richest material for comparison with the Sanskrit sources because of the specificity necessary in naming and defining of the *kāraka*s and their subdivisions. In the present section I will analyze the definitions in light of the Sanskrit sources and then turn to the *upakāraka*s, a term that does not occur in Sanskrit in the same meaning, to the best of my knowledge, though its meaning is clear.[22] Since I have already discussed the

---

19 Of the non-Pāṇinian grammars that predate the VC, the JV follows the A most closely in both general layout as well as the reproduction of Pāṇini's theoretical scheme, although by incorporating various corrigenda and addenda from the MBh and shortening technical terms, Devanandin achieves greater accuracy and brevity than Pāṇini. The *kāraka*s are treated in JV 1.2.109–126 and the assignment of the case endings in JV 1.4.1–1.4.77.

20 I have in mind the *Cāndravyākaraṇa* (CV) of Candragomin (5th cent.) and the *Kātantra* (Kā.) of Śarvavarman (4th cent.?). These are two non-Pāṇinian schools of grammar that were quite popular in premodern times, the former almost exclusively in Buddhist circles. Cf. Scharfe (1977, p. 167ff.). For a study of the case systems in each grammar, see Gornall (2014) and Shen (2014), respectively. I will return to these below.

21 Cf. Shen (2014, p. 48 fn. 109).

22 *Upa* often occurs in the sense of "subordinate, subtype" of the noun it is attached to, much like English "sub-", e.g. *upa-netra* "sub-eye, glasses", *upa-dvīpa* "sub-island, minor island". Hence, *upakāraka* is a "sub-*kāraka*". This meaning of *upa* stems from its more general sense of *samīpa* "proximity". Cf. *Viṃśatyupasargavṛtti* p. 40.

peculiarities of the Tamil names for the *kāraka*s and their likely sources elsewhere, I will focus on the definitions themselves.

The six *kāraka*s listed in VC 29 and defined in VC 38 are the following: 1) *karuttā* (= Skt. *kartṛ*) "agent", 2) *karumam* (= Skt. *karman*) "patient", 3) *karaṇam* (= Skt. *karaṇa*) "instrument", 4) *kōḷi* "recipient", 5) *avati* (= Skt. *avadhi*) "limit", 6) *ātāram* (= Skt. *ādhāra*) "base". The final three differ from their respective Pāṇinian counterparts, *sampradāna* "recipient", *apādāna* "departure", and *adhikaraṇa* "locus". The reason for the last two is that Puttamittiraṉ follows the terminology used in the CV, namely *avadhi* in CV 2.1.81 and *ādhāra* in CV 2.1.88.[23] *kōḷi*, the only *kāraka* with a Tamil name – the remainder are direct borrowings from Sanskrit with the necessary phonological/orthographic adaptations – has been translated, I have argued, because according to some grammarians the Sanskrit term is expressly *anvartha* "etymologically significant", whereas the other *kāraka*s are not. This departure from the Pāṇinian model continues when we examine the definitions given for the *kāraka*s and further demonstrates the importance of the non-Pāṇinian schools in the dissemination of Sanskrit grammar.

For each of the six *kāraka*s Pāṇini has given one, at times quite complex, primary definition and then several supplementary definitions under specific lexical or semantic conditions. Later Sanskrit grammarians of non-Pāṇinian schools do not uniformly follow these definitions and there is often much simplification in wording.[24] Puttamittira has likewise taken a simpler approach, one that mirrors what we find in the Kā., and its primary commentary, the *vṛtti* by Durgasiṃha (6th – 8th cent.?). To demonstrate this most effectively it is worth citing VC 38 in full along with parts of its commentary.

> VC 38 *mētaku nal toḻil ceyvāṉ karuttā. viyaṉ karuvi*
> *tītil karaṇam. ceyappaṭṭatu ākum tiṟal karumam.*
> *yātaṉiṉ nīṅkum avati atu ām. iṭam ātāram ām.*
> *kōtu aṟu kōḷi maṉ koḷpavaṉ ākum koṭiyiṭai-ē.*[25]
> The *karuttā* "agent" is the one who performs an eminent, good deed;
> The faultless *karaṇam* "instrument" is the excellent means;
> The strong *karumam* "patient" is what is done;
> The *avati* "limit" is that from which one departs;
> The *ātāram* "base" is the place;
> The blemish free *kōḷi* "recipient" is the permanent one who receives,
> O vine-waisted girl!

23 The *ādhāra* is likewise given in place of *adhikaraṇa* PM 3b.
24 The CV has not defined the *kāraka*s but nevertheless assumes such a system and freely uses the names of the *kāraka*s (e.g. CV 2.1.62f.) as well as "*kāraka*" itself, as in CV 2.2.16 *kārakam bahulam*. The JV 1.2.109–126 retains the same basic scheme as Pāṇini but incorporates the many suggestions made in the MBh for improving and economizing Pāṇini's rules. The Kā. defines the *kāraka*s in Kā. 2.4.8–15 but these are significantly different and less complex than Pāṇini's, though the presence of his rules can still be felt.
25 Out of consideration of space I have only given the Tamil text in transliteration and without proper sandhi.

If we compare these definitions with the corresponding ones in the A, the rather introductory and pragmatic level of Puttamittiraṉ's text becomes clear. For example, in the A the *karman* is defined as *kartur īpsitatam* "what is most desired on the part of the agent" (P. 1.4.49); the agent is *svatantraḥ* "independent" (P. 1.4.54). The Tamil definitions will, however, sound slightly less shallow if we recall that, save *kōḷi,* the names of the *kāraka*s are in Sanskrit whereas the definitions are in Tamil so that one also gets the feeling of an explanation of a foreign technical term. Still, the definition for *kōḷi* − the recipient is the one who receives − cannot but sound tautological. But leaving Pāṇini aside, we find parallels in the Kā. and its *vṛtti*. To demonstrate this, let us look at how two *kāraka*s are defined in the respective texts.

> 1) *karuttā* / *kartṛ*
> VC 38 *mētaku nal toḻil ceyvāṉ karuttā.*
> The *karuttā* "agent" is the one who performs an eminent good deed.
> Gloss: *yāt' oru toḻilaic cevāṉ evaṉ, avaṉ karuttāk-kārakam ām.*
> The one who performs some action is the agent-*kāraka*.

> Kā. 2.4.16 *yaḥ karoti sa kartā.*
> *The agent is the one who performs.*
> Gloss: *yaḥ kriyāṃ karoti sa kartṛsaṃjño bhavati.*
> He who performs an action has the technical term "agent".

> 2) *avati* / *apādāna*
> VC 38 *yātaṉiṉ nīṅkum avati atu ām.*
> The *avati* "limit" is that from which one departs.
> Gloss: *yātoṉṟiṉṟum oru poruḷ nīṅkuvatu akt' avatik-kārakam ām.*
> That from which an object departs is the limit-*kāraka*.

> Kā. 2.4.8 *yato 'paite bhayam ādatte vā tad apādānam.*
> The *apādāna* is that from which one departs, (of which) there is fear, or (from which) one receives.
> Gloss: *yasmād apaiti yamād bhayaṃ bhavati yasmād ādatte vā tat kārakam apādānasaṃjñaṃ bhavati.*
> That *kāraka* from which one departs, of which there is fear, or from which one receives has the technical term "departure".

There are several striking parallels between the Sanskrit and Tamil texts, in particular Peruntēvaṉ's gloss. At the level of syntax, both make use of relative clauses,[26] a construction that was originally foreign to Tamil.[27] Although Puttamittiraṉ only uses the relative construction for *avati*, Peruntēvaṉ uses it in his gloss on all six *kāraka*s. In fact, I have so far not been able to find any further

---

26 The relative pronouns in Tamil are *evaṉ, yātaṉiṉ,* and *yātoṉṟiṉṟum.* In Sanskrit: *yaḥ, yato* (*yataḥ*), *yasmād.*
27 Relative clauses with relative pronouns are infrequent and of a late appearance in Classical Tamil. They are clearly in imitation of Sanskrit syntax.

occurrences of this relative clause construction in the VC and its commentary. Its frequency here must be attributed to the imitation of the Sanskrit definitions, in all likelihood those of the Kā.[28] With regard to lexical choice, Puttamittiraṉ and Peruntēvaṉ both have recourse to the root *ceytal* "to do, perform" in defining the agent just as in the Kā. and its gloss with the Sanskrit equivalent *kṛ* "to do, perform". The same parallel also arises for the definition of *karumam* / *karman*[29] and to a somewhat lesser extent in the case of *karaṇa*.[30] The definition of the two remaining *kāraka*s, *ātāram* and *kōḻi*, show even less similarity to what we find in the Kā. and its *vṛtti* besides the relative clause construction. This need not erase the significance of the other parallels since I do not wish to argue that Puttamittiraṉ and Peruntēvaṉ were translating the Kā. sūtras or its commentary into Tamil. Rather, the VC represents more of an attempt to import the general ideas about language from Sanskrit into Tamil, and I believe I have sufficiently shown that the general framework for the definitions of the *kāraka*s derives from what we find in the Kā. school as opposed to any of the other schools current at the time.[31] This fits well with the Buddhist environment in which the VC was produced, since the Kā., though generally popular in India, traveled with Buddhists into Tibet already in the first wave of translations.[32]

3 THE 23 *UPAKĀRAKAM*S

3.1 The Origins of the Upakārakams

In addition to a general definition for each *kāraka*, Pāṇini adds a number of additional sūtras that describe other conditions under which a noun may be labelled a particular *kāraka*. For example, the *karman* "patient" is not only what is most desired to be obtained on the part of the agent,[33] but also what is "similarly related

---

28 The Pāli Grammars, *Kaccāyanavyākaraṇa* by Kaccāyana 143ff. and *Saddanīti* (SN) 548ff. by the Burmese monk Aggavaṃsa (12th cent.), also use relative clause constructions in defining the *kāraka*, most likely also under the influence of the Kā. Cf. Kahrs (1992 p. 33f.). We will encounter further similarities between the VC and SD below.

29 In both languages the patient is, prosaically, "that which is done"- Kā. 2.4.13 *yat kriyate tat karma*. Commentary ad VC 39 *yāt' oṉṟu ceyyappaṭṭatu atu karumam ām*.

30 The overall construction is no longer parallel, but the use of the verb "to do" remains. Kā. 2.4.13 *yena kriyate tat karaṇam* "the instrument is that by which (something) is done," is more concise than the Tamil gloss on *karaṇam*: *attoḻiliṉaic ceytaṟkuk karuvi āyiṟṟu yātu atu karaṇak-karaṇam* "whatever is the means for doing that action is the instrument-*kāraka*."

31 The glosses of Pāṇini's *kāraka* rules also usually contain relative constructions, e.g. KV ad P. 1.4.24, but the relative clauses serve mostly to give the defining descriptors of the *kāraka* from the sūtra.

32 On the Tibetan translations see (Verhagen 1994, p. 48–84). As noted above, the Buddhist Pāli grammars also appear to have made use of the Kā. The main commentator on the Kā., Durgasiṃha, was also Buddhist.

33 P. 1.4.49 *kartur īpsitatamam karma*.

but not desired" and what "is not denoted by any other *kāraka*".[34] Kātyāyana, whom Patañjali follows, makes further semantic distinctions among the *karman*, classifying some as *nirvartyamāṇa* "being created" and others as *vikriyamāṇa* "being modified" in an effort to restrict the application of P. 3.2.1.[35] It is Bhartṛhari, however, who collects these subtypes into *kārikā*s and presents them in the *Sādhana-samuddeśa*, the seventh section of the *Padakāṇḍa* of the VP, which deals with the *kāraka*s. The subtypes of *karman*, which are spread out in the MBh, are presented together in VP 3.7.45–48, though not every *kāraka* receives such a clear-cut subdivision. Bhartṛhari was, therefore, responsible for systematizing and deepening the discussion about the *kāraka*s and gave the impetus for later grammarians to simplify his presentation of the *kāraka* subtypes and modify them as was seen fit.

One text that lays out only the number of subdivisions for each *kāraka*, 23 in total, is a set of 26 verses on the basics of Sanskrit grammar[36] according, more or less, to the Pāṇinian system and which generally goes by the name *Vārarucasaṃ-graha*. In order to know the names of each subtype, however, a commentary is necessary,[37] and based on the specific names of the sub-*kāraka*s I wish to demonstrate that the commentary attributed to Dharmakīrti must have been known to Puttamittiraṉ and Peruntēvaṉ. In manuscripts this commentary along with the verses are sometimes referred to as the *Prayogamukha*, and I will also use this title out of convenience for both the main text and commentary.[38] Further information about the text's authorship and place of composition are unfortunately unknown, although the distribution of manuscripts containing the text makes its popularity across the subcontinent indisputable and its influence on the VC places it at least as far back as the beginning of the second millennium.[39] Furthermore, the PM must

---

34 P. 1.4.50 *tathāyuktaṃ cānīpsitam* and 51 *akathitaṃ ca.*

35 MBh II.94.2–3.

36 The topics covered are: *kāraka*s, compounds, secondary suffixes, personal endings, and primary suffixes.

37 There are multiple extant commentaries, atlhough only two are now published. Cf. the entry under *prayogamukha* in the New Catalogus Catalogorum vol. 13 (Veezhinathan 1991, p. 64).

38 This work has a complicated transmission history, and there is much variation in the commentary in the mss., the details of which far exceed the bounds of this article. I will refer to the *Prayogamukha* with Dharmakīrti's commentary as published in Śaśinātha Jha's edition of the *Prayoga-Pallava* as an appendix (p. 148–205). I have not yet been able to locate a copy of the editio princeps by M. Rangacarya, 1927, cited in Coward & Raja (1990, p. 476). Another commentary, *Dīpaprabhā* by Nārāyaṇa, has been published by Gaṇapati Śāstrī (1913).

39 To the best of my knowledge, the earliest citation of the PM in a Sanskrit work is to be found in the *Durghaṭavṛtti* by Śaraṇadeva (12th cent.) who cites **by name** the PM ad P. 1.4.52, 3.3.128, and 8.1.4. Cf. Renou (1940, p. 60f.). The first citations are from the commentary and the last is *kārikā* 15b. We have, therefore, evidence that both the *kārikā*s and the commentary went by the same name in the 12th cent. Perhaps not surprisingly, Śaraṇadeva was also a Buddhist.

have had strong currency among Buddhist circles. In addition to influencing the VC, it was also, as I will show, used by Aggavaṃsa for his Pāli grammar, the *Saddanīti*, and travelled to Tibet in the first wave of Sanskrit grammatical works to be translated as part of the collection *Bstan-'gyur* "Translation(s) of the (exegetical) treatises (i.e. commentaries and compendia)" in the early 14th century, under the title *Rab-tu-sbyor-ba'i-sgo'i-'grel-pa* or *Prayogamukha-vṛtti*.[40] Despite this popularity, other works of Sanskrit grammar do not follow the PM in listing the subtypes or even the same number of subtypes of *kāraka*s when they are given. In commenting on the relevant sūtras in the A, grammarians are more likely to quote from the VP and repeat the divisions found there. In fact, I am not aware of any works within the Sanskrit grammatical tradition that presents the exact same scheme as in the PM.[41] In Tamil, we find renewed interest in the topic some centuries later in the *Pirayōkavivēkam* by Cuppiramaṇiya Tīkṣitār (17th cent.), which has long been known to be a translation of, or at least closely modeled on, the *Vārarucasaṃgraha*, or however the text was known at the time. I will return to this work at the end of the next section.

3.2 The Prayogamukha and the Upakārakams in the Vīracōḻiyam

Both the PM vv. 1–7 and the VC 40–41 divide the six *kāraka*s into 23 subtypes.[42] As noted above, for the precise names of these subdivisions we must rely on a commentary, and it is evident that Puttamittiraṉ was familiar with the list as Dharmakīrti gave it. This should come as no surprise given that both texts were written in Buddhist circles. The later commentary of Nārāyaṇa, by way of comparison, shows a number of divergences and follows more closely the Pāṇinian school. A full exposition of each *kāraka* along with its examples would far exceed the scope of this paper, so at present I will only discuss here 2 *kāraka*s in detail, the *kartṛ / karuttā* "agent" and the *sampradāna / kōḻi* "recipient". Nevertheless, this will be sufficient to prove the relation between the texts.

The agent is said to have five subtypes in PM 2a, which are then specified in the commentary on p. 151f.

> *Kartṛ* "agent" − 5 subtypes:
> 1. *svatantra-* "independant-",

---

40 Cf. Verhagen (1994, p. 73–76).
41 Cf. Puruṣottamadeva's *Kārakacakra* (12th cent.), which does not give subtypes for all *kāraka*s. On the other hand, in his compendious *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* p. 235, Bhoja (11th cent.) presents eighteen subtypes of *kāraka*s, three for each: *kartrādīnāṃ ca ṣaṇṇām api pratyekaṃ triprakāratvād aṣṭādaśaprabhedā bhavanti*. There is some overlap with the presentation in the PM.
42 PM 1cd *bhedās trayorviṃśatidhā punaḥ* "But the divisions (of the *kāraka*s) are 23-fold." VC 41 *irupattumū vakik kārakam-ē* "the *kāraka*s have 23 divisions." The SN also knows a list of 23 subtypes, although alternative classifications are given as well.

    3. *karma-* "patient-",
    2. *hetu-* "cause-",
    4. *abhihita-* "expressed",
    5. *anabhihita-kartṛ* "unexpressed-agent".

All of these categories can be traced back to the A itself. The first two derive from P. 1.4.54 and 55, the two definitions of *kartṛ* given in the *kāraka* section of the A. The former defines the *kartṛ* as the one independent (*svatantra*) in effecting the action; the latter accounts for the agent of causation in causative constructions by also terming the instigator (*prayojaka*) of an independent agent *kartṛ* "agent", whereby it also receives the designation *hetu* "cause". Thus in sentences such as in "John makes Bill cook," Bill is independent with respect to carrying out the act of cooking, but John instigates Bill to act. In Sanskrit such an agent is termed the *hetu-kartṛ*. The third type, the *karma-kartṛ*, refers to the agent in constructions like *pacyata*[43] *odanaḥ svayam eva* "The rice cooks by itself," where the Sanskrit grammarians conceptualize the agent, in this case the rice, as also acting like the patient (*karmavat*) according to P. 3.1.87. The final two categories harken back to the heading sūtra P. 2.3.1 *anabhihite* discussed above and indicate where the agent-*kāraka* is expressed. When the agent is expressed (*abhihita*) — we must understand expressed by the personal ending on the associated verb — the agent stands in the nominative case, i.e., we have an active construction. When the agent is not expressed (*anabhihita*), the personal ending on the finite verb expresses the *karman* (or *bhāva* "the action itself"), and the agent is consequently put in the instrumental, i.e., we have a passive (or impersonal) construction. Furthermore, these last two categories apply concomitantly to a *kartṛ* that already has one of the first three labels.[44] E.g., a *svatantra-kartṛ* can be either *abhihita* or *anabhihita* depending on whether the main verb is active or passive. In essence, this fivefold classification does not add anything new to what we find already in the A nor does it add any particular insight into the nature of the agent. It is, however, a handy way for beginning students to identify agents according to the sūtra primarily responsible for their derivation and whether the sentence is active or passive. As yet, I am not aware of any other Sanskrit text that gives this exact list,[45] although the SN recognizes the exact same fivefold classification.[46]

---

43 *pacyata* is a sandhi form for *pacyate* before vowels other than short *a*.

44 The *karma-kartṛ*, however, must always be expressed (*abhihita*) by the verbal ending.

45 Usually we find a threefold classification that leaves out the *abhihita-* and *anabhihita-kartṛ*s. Cf. Singh (1981, p. 203) for other works that follow the threefold classification.

46 Commentary ad SN 548: *api ca abhihitakattā anabhihitakattā cā ti ime dve te ca tayo ti kattūnaṃ pañcavidhattam api icchanti garū.* "Given these two: the expressed agent and unexpressed agent, and those three (sc. *suddhakattā*, *hetukattā*, and *kammakattā* already discussed), the teachers also accept the agents to be fivefold." Cf. Kahrs (1992, p. 37f.). Vergiani (2013, p. 187) has already noted that the classification of the *kamma* in the *Saddanīti* reflects VC's *upakārakam*s for the *karumam*.

Turning now to the VC, we find the following five *upakārakam*s "sub-*kāraka*s" listed for the *karuttā*:

> *Karuttā* "agent", 5 *upakārakam*s:
> 1. *kāraṇak-karuttā* "cause-agent",
> 2. *tāṉ teri karuttā* "self evident agent",
> 3. *tāṉ teriyāk karuttā* "non self evident agent",
> 4. *karumak-karuttā* "patient-agent",
> 5. *talaimaik-karuttā* "head-agent".

In analyzing these five terms, we may look at both the method by which the Sanskrit words were adopted at the lexical level into the Tamil language as well as the semantics of each term within the context of Tamil grammar.[47] In sum, Puttamittiraṉ has employed two basic methods at the lexical level: direct borrowing with only phonological/orthographic adaptations and translations/calques, which attempt to mimic the structure and meaning of the Sanskrit original. There is, however, some interesting grey area that requires more explanation. With regard to the Tamilized term's function in the grammar there is both continuity as well as nuanced modifications to better fit the peculiarities of Tamil and the grammatical system developed by Puttamittiraṉ and Peruntēvaṉ. I must emphasize, however, that we are almost entirely dependent on the commentator for understanding the details of these technical terms and in my analysis below I rely entirely on his explanations and examples.

Among the five technical terms, only the term *karumak-karuttā* "patient-agent" is a direct borrowing. It is simply the Sanskrit word *karma-kartṛ* with the necessary phonological/orthographic adaptations for Tamil, such as splitting the consonant clusters *rm* and *rt* with a *u*. Peruntāvaṉ also understands the term to have a similar meaning as in Sanskrit, i.e., the subject of a sentence which acts as both the patient and the agent, but in application there are nuanced differences on account of the Tamil verb system. Let us turn to our first example:

> Comm. ad VC 40 p. 42: *naṉmai*_{nom.} *tāṉē **veḷippaṭum** viḻumiyōr pakkal eṉpuḻi, naṉmaiyaic*_{acc.} *cāttaṉ **veḷippaṭuttiṉāṉ** eṉrār pōla naṉmai karumamāyk karuttāp piṟit' oṉṟāy nillātu karumamuṅ karuttāvun tāṉēy āy niṟṟalāl, karumak-karuttāv āyiṟṟu.*
>
> When one says "Goodness_{nom.} arises (*veḷippaṭum*) by itself (*tāṉ-ē*) in excellent people," because (the word) "goodness", just as in (the sentence) "Cāttaṉ made goodness_{acc.} arise (*veḷippaṭuttiṉāṉ*)," (but) being the patient without any other agent, occurs by itself as both the patient and the agent, it has become the patient-agent.

---

47 Cf. Chevillard 2009 for a very thorough discussion of possible translation techniques from Sanskrit into Tamil.

In Tamil the verbal root under discussion is *veḷippaṭu* "to appear, arise", which can be further analyzed as a combination of *veḷi* "outside" and the verbalizer *paṭu* "to experience, undergo". The root is intransitive when conjugated as a so-called "weak" verb, i.e., *veḷippaṭutal*, as it is in *veḷippaṭum* in the example. When, however, the root is conjugated as a "strong" verb, i.e., *veḷippaṭuttutalal*, it is causative and hence transitive "to make appear, arise, to reveal", as it is in *veḷippaṭuttiṉāṉ* in the example. Peruntēvaṉ sees the parallel between the two conjugations of *veḷippaṭu*, but does not analyze them in the way I have just done. Instead, he sees *veḷippaṭu* as inherently taking two arguments, an agent and a patient. When both are present, we have the causative/transitive conjugation, but when the agent is missing and only the patient is present, we have the intransitive conjugation, and the patient also acts as the agent. Implicit in Peruntēvaṉ remarks is that the morphology is dependent on the type of *karuttā.*

If we return now to the Sanskrit example *pacyata odanaḥ svayam eva* "the rice cooks by itself," we find a number of similarities. To begin with Peruntēvaṉ imitates *svayam eva* with *tāṉ-ē*, a satisfactory Tamil translation. Additionally one can also see in the Tamil example the notion of *sukaratā* "being easily performed", one of the semantic nuances in using the *karma-kartṛ* in Sanskrit,[48] for surely goodness arises very easily in excellent people. With regard to morphology, however, the two constructions are not exactly parallel. *pacyate* is the 3rd pers. sing. pres. pass. of the root *pac*. By the time of the VC, Tamil also had a passive, described in VC 81, and formed with an infinitive plus *paṭutal*, as in *aṭappaṭṭatu* "it was cooked." Interestingly, Peruntēvaṉ does not try to imitate the Sanskrit morphology, which would not have been idiomatic, but instead found another pair of verbal forms whose morphology is triggered by the type of *karuttā*. The other example composed by Peruntēvaṉ also follows this pattern: *aṉpu keṭum tīyōr pakkal* "Love perishes in sinful people." The verb *keṭu* can be conjugated as either weak (*keṭutal*) "to perish" or strong (*keṭuttal*) "to cause to perish, to destroy" with the same intransitive/transitive distinction noted for *veḷippaṭu*. The application of the category of *karumak-karuttā* to Tamil does not parallel what we find in Sanskrit, above all because the construction in Sanskrit is relatively rare and requires passive morphology, but Peruntēvaṉ has still adopted the category to describe a prominent morphological phenomenon in Tamil verbal conjugation with some similarities to the Sanskrit counterpart.[49]

---

48 Cf. MBh II.67.20.
49 For a similar but in many ways different construction according the T, cf. Vergiani (2013, p. 178f.).

The *kāraṇak-karuttā* is the equivalent of *hetu-kartṛ* "the causal agent", but *hetu* "cause" has been replaced with the synonym *kāraṇam*,[50] a seemingly unmotivated change given that *hetu* was well established in Tamil as *ētu* by Puttamittiraṉ's time. This alternation could be chalked up to metri causa or simply the fancy of Puttamittiraṉ, but one could also see the choice as being based on an attempt to bring the causal agent in a closer etymological relation to the name for causative verbs, namely, *kāritam* in VC 65, a technical term likely borrowed from the Kā.[51] Both *kāraṇa* and *kārita* are derivatives from *kāri*, the causative root of *kṛ* "to do". With regard to function, the *kāraṇak-karuttā* is identical to its Sanskrit counterpart: it describes the instigator of another agent in a causal construction, as the examples make clear.[52]

The three remaining terms are attempts to translate into Tamil Sanskrit technical vocabulary. The translation of *svatantra* as *talaimai* "headship, superiority" fits well with the standard meaning associated with *svatantra* in the commentaries, which usually include *pradhāna* "principal, most important thing".[53] Based on the examples and Peruntēvaṉ's explanation the *talaimaik-karuttā* functions the same as its Sanskrit equivalent.

The last two terms are perhaps the most complex in so far that their source, (*an-*) *abhihita,* has a very technical meaning within the Pāṇinian system of grammar (explained above on p. 2f.) and the general concept is not explicitly adopted in the VC. As a result, Peruntēvaṉ understands the two terms to indicate whether or not a *kāraka* is unambiguously expressed at the level of morphology, not whether the *kāraka* is expressed by the personal ending on the verb. A *tāṉ teriyāk karuttā* "non-self evident agent" describes the agent-*kāraka* that is denoted by the nominative case. It is not "self evident" because one must first check the finite verb to determine which *kāraka* the noun in the nominative has. If the verb is active, the nominative is an agent; if it is passive, the patient. Hence, a *tāṉ teriyāk karuttā* occurs in active sentences in the nominative. A *tāṉ teri karuttā* "self evident agent" refers to an agent in the reverse situation where the morphology on a noun makes it clear that it is the agent without recourse to the verb, i . e., passive sentences in which the agent is expressed by the instrumental.[54] In short, the *tāṉ teriyāk karuttā*

---

50 Both the Sanskrit and Tamil dictionaries give *kāraṇa* as a synonym for *hetu*. Cf. *Amarakośa* 1.3.28c (*kālavarga*): *hetur nā kāraṇaṃ bījam* and *Tivākaram* 8.207 *nipamum...ētuvum... kāraṇam.*

51 Cf. Kā. 3.2.9f. The causal agent, however, is still referred to as *hetu* in Kā. 2.4.15 etc.

52 Commentary ad VC 40 p. 42: *cāttaṉ korraṉai añcuvittāṉ* "Cāttaṉ made Korraṉ be afraid." *añcavittāṉ* is a causative form of *añcutal* "to be afraid".

53 Patañjali is the first to associate *tantra*, which *pradhāna* ad P. 1.4.54. MBh I.338.20: *svapradhāna iti gamyate | tad yaḥ prādhānye vartate tantraśabdas tasyedaṃ grahaṇam ||* "(*svatantra*) is understood as self-important. So, here there is mention of the word *tantra,* which occurs in the meaning of 'importance'." Cf. KV ad ibid. and AK 3.3.186a (*nānārthavarga*).

54 That the instrumental also expresses the *karaṇa* doesn't seem to bother anyone.

is found in active sentences in the nom., and the *tāṉ teri karuttā* is found in passive sentences in the instr. We can therefore equate the *tāṉ teri karuttā* with the *anabhihita-kartṛ* (both in passive constructions) and the *tāṉ teriyāk karuttā* with the *abhihita-kartṛ* (both in active constructions), an equation that becomes undoubtable when we look at the following examples along with Peruntēvaṉ's explanation.

> Commentary ad VC 40 p. 42: *korṟaṉāl*ᵢₙₛₜᵣ. *koḷḷappaṭṭatu vīṭu eṉpuḷik karuttā iṭaṉ terintu niṟṟalāl, tāṉ terikaruttāv āyiṟṟu.*
> When one says "the house was purchased by Korṟaṉᵢₙₛₜᵣ.," because the agent occurs with its (syntactic) place[55] known, it has become the self evident agent.

> PM p. 153: *anabhihitakartā. yathā: ...pacyata odanaḥ sūpakeṇa.*[56]
> The unexpressed agent. For example: "The rice is cooked by the cook."

> Commentary ad VC 40 p. 42: *tēvatattaṉ cōṟṟai aṭukiṉṟāṉ, eṉpuḷit tēvatattaṉ eṉṉuñ col tāṉē karuttā eṉṉum iṭaṉ terintu nillāmaiyāṉum, cōṟṟai eṉṉuṅ kārakapatattāṉum aṭukiṉṟāṉ eṉṉuṅ kiriyāpatattāṉuṅ karuttā eṉṟu ariyappaṭutalāṉum, tāṉ teriyākkaruttāv āyiṟṟu.*
> When one says "Tēvatattaṉ is cooking riceₐcc.," the word *tēvadattaṉ* has become the non-self evident agent because the syntactic place "agent" does not occur as known, and because it is understood as the agent by means of the *kāraka*-word[57] "riceₐcc." and by means of the action word (i.e., verb) "is cooking".

> PM p. 152f.: *abhihitakartā. yathā: ...odanaṃ pacati sūpakāraḥ.*
> The expressed agent. For example: The cook cooks rice.

Peruntēvaṉ clarifies that the *iṭam*, perhaps something like "syntactic place", i.e., *kāraka*, is known in the case of the *tāṉ teri karuttā*. We can supply from context and the following example, that it is known immediately by the case ending. For the *tāṉ teriyāk karuttā*, its syntactic place is only inferable by reference to the other words in the sentence. The examples from the PM confirm the functional relation between the Sanskrit and Tamil terms described above.

Now that the function and meaning of the terms are clear, we can return to the specifics of the translation. The phrases *tāṉ teri* and *tāṉ teriyā* are both built off the verb *terital* "to be known, evident" with the 3ʳᵈ pers. sing. nom. pronoun *tāṉ*,

---

55 The word *iṭam* cannot have here the more common technical meaning "grammatical person", but must refer to a *kāraka*, as can be seen from the following example where we have *karuttā eṉṉum iṭam* "the place called agent". Dr. Vergiani (personal communication) has pointed out that one of the meanings of *iṭam* is "ability, power." Cf. *Piṅkalam* 10.130, p. 289 *vīṭum valiyum paṭuppatum iṭam* "*iṭam* means house, strength, and what is effected." This would be a suitable translation Skt. *śakti*, one of the synonyms for *sādhana*. Cf. Helārāja ad VP 3.7.1: *kriyānirvṛttau dravyasya śaktiḥ sādhanam* "*sādhana* is the power of an object to effect an action."

56 By the ellipsis I have omitted an explanation of the privative prefix and a few other comparable examples.

57 *kārakapatam* is used in the VC to refer to nouns that have been assigned a *kāraka*.

often used as an emphatic particle like "itself" in English. Cf. *tāṉ-ē* in the examples for the *karumak-karuttā* above. *teri* is simply the bare root used in place of the relative participle *teriyum*; *teriyā*, on the other hand, is the negative relative participle. The pair nicely reflects *abhihita* and *anabhihita* which are also without and with negation, respectively. As I have demonstrated, the positive Tamil form *tāṉ teri* does not functionally correspond to the positive *abhihita*, nor the negated *tāṉ teriyā* to *anabhihita*. The reason for this is given by Peruntēvaṉ in the passage quoted above. One possible explanation for this oddity is that Peruntēvaṉ took *abhihita* to refer to a *kāraka* that is clearly expressed by the case ending on the word itself, not, as it is in Sanskrit, to a *kāraka* expressed by the personal endings on the main verb (*inter alia*). On account of this mismatch, which we can only attribute to Peruntēvaṉ with certainty, we have the rather counterintuitive correspondence between the Tamil and Sanskrit terms.

As a brief aside, I note that these same two terms do not apply to the *karumam* in exactly the same manner and hence no longer exactly relate to the (*an-*)*abhihita karman*s in Sanskrit. The *tāṉ teri karumam* is, as we expect, with an overt accusative ending and corresponds to the *anabhihita-karman* in the PM as can be seen from the corresponding examples:

> Comm. ad VC 41 p. 44: *vīṭṭai*$_{acc.}$ *eṭuttāṉ taccaṉ*.
> "The carpenter built the house$_{acc.}$."
>
> PM p. 155 *anabhihitaṃ karma yathā kaṭam*$_{acc.}$ *karoti naraḥ*.
> "The unexpressed patient. For example: The man makes a mat$_{acc.}$."

The other pair, however, does not correspond in the same manner as the Sanskrit and Tamil agents did above. The *abhihita karman* refers to a patient that takes the nominative, the *karman kāraka* being expressed by the personal ending on the finite verb. This is the case in passive constructions as the example for *abhihita karman* in PM p. 155 shows: *kaṭaḥ kriyate devadattena* "A mat is made by Devadatta."[58] In the VC the *tāṉ teriyāk karumam* still refers to a patient in a sentence where the *karumam* is expressed by ambiguous morphology, but, based on the examples given by Peruntēvaṉ, not to the expected passive construction.[59] Rather, it refers to instances where the patient simply lacks an overt case ending in an active

---

58 Cf. the examples ad *Saddanīti* 551 for the *abhihitakamma*: *mayā ijjate buddho...buddhādayo abhihitakammaṃ nāma, ākhyātena paccayena vā kathitattā*. "'The Buddha is worshiped by me...' *buddha* etc. are termed the expressed patient because (the patient-*kāraka*) is related by the verb or the suffix."

59 For the sake of completeness, I must mention that Peruntēvaṉ's commentary differs rather dramatically in some manuscripts from the printed editions. In a manuscript at the GOML, D. 91/TD 34 p. 57 (as numbered), we find the expected type of examples for the *tāṉ teriyāk karumam*, namely passive constructions. The first example given is: *taccaṉāl eṭukkappaṭṭa vīṭu* "The house built by the carpenter."

construction, a common feature of Tamil.[60] Indeed, the VC expressly accounts for such unmarked accusatives by permitting the acc. suffix to sometimes be elided.[61] Accordingly, we have an example very similar to the one just given but without the acc. case ending *-ai*: *vīṭu taccaṉ kaṭṭiṉāṉ* "The carpenter constructed a house." Given this reasoning, in the VC the terms *tāṉ teri* and *tāṉ teriyā* have come to refer to the presence or absence of an unambiguous case ending, the instrumental for the agent and the accusative for patient. For the agent there is a direct parallel with Sanskrit *anabhihita-* and *abhihita-kartṛ*, but because of a peculiarity of Tamil grammar, *tāṉ teriyāk-karumam* also refers to the unmarked accusative (according to some versions of Peruntēvaṉ's commentary), and this has no parallel in Sanskrit.[62]

The other *kāraka* I would like to discuss is the *sampradāna* / *kōḷi* "recipient". What sets this one apart from the *kartṛ* / *karuttā* and the *karman* / *karumam* is that their subtypes have no direct link to any categories found in the A or MBh. For the three types of *sampradāna* we must look to Bhartṛhari. In adopting these categories into Tamil Puttamittiraṉ was rather creative in finding satisfactory Tamil equivalents.

The *sampradāna* or *kōḷi* "recipient" has three subdivisions in the PM and the VC:[63]

> PM p. 156: *katamat trividhaṃ sampradānam? prerakam ānumantrikam anirākartṛkaṃ ca.*
> What are the three types of recipient? The instigator, pertaining to one who consents,[64] and pertaining to one who does not reject.
>
> VC 40d: *cīr aṇaṅku ārvam kiṭappu irappu ām kōḷi, tēmōḻiy-ē.*
> The recipient is affectionate, joined with goodness, circumstantial, (and) requesting, o girl with honey(-sweet) words![65]
>
> I would equate the terms as follows: *ārvam* ~ *ānumantrika*, *kiṭappu* ~ *anirākaraṇa*, and *preraṇa* ~ *irappu*.

---

60 In Tamil the accusative case ending is not obligatory on a direct object. Its absence is, however, more common with inanimate objects and more likely to occur when a specific object is spoken of.

61 Cf. VC 34 *orukāl paiya aḻitarum* "it (sc. the acc. suffix *-ai*) sometimes gently perishes."

62 It follows from this discussion that Vergiani (2013, p. 184 and 188) is not exactly correct to equate *tāṉ teri karumam* with *abhihita karman* and *tāṉ teriyāk karumam* with *anabhihita karman*. As was the case with the *karuttā*s, the negative relative participle *teriyā* does not mirror the privative prefix *naÑ* (= *an*) in *an-abhihita*.

63 As does the SN. Cf. the commentary ad SN 533: *taṃ pan' etaṃ sampadānaṃ tividhim hoti: anirākaraṇ'-ajjhesanānumativasena* "furthermore, this *sampadāna* (= Skt. *sampradāna*) is threefold: by the force of a lack of rejection, a request, or assent."

64 *ānumantrika* is derived from *anumantṛ*, the agent noun of *anu* + *man* "to consent".

65 In Tamil *ārvam* "affection", *kiṭappu* "lying", and *irappu* "requesting" are all nouns, but since they modify *kōḷi*, I have translated them as adjectives.

All three of these are based on the causes for an object to gain the status of a *sampradāna* listed in VP 3.7.129:[66] *anirākaraṇa* "not rejecting", *preraṇa* "instigation", and *anumati* "consent". The idea is that someone can be termed "recipient" because the person does not reject, i.e., is indifferent to, the donation, instigates the giving of an object, or consents to receiving it. The three corresponding Tamil terms have all, to some degree, added semantic nuances that are not inherently in the Sanskrit, although I believe that Puttamittiraṉ tried to reflect some of the contextual meaning that comes out in the examples associated with the each type of *sampradāna*.

Of the three subtypes of *kōḷi*, the *irappuk-kōḷi* "requesting recipient" has the clearest link with its corresponding Sanskrit term, *preraka* "instigator" and may be considered as a simple translation. Examples for this subtype involve donating to Brahmans[67] and giving alms to beggars,[68] because such people first ask for what they receive. The *kiṭappuk-kōḷi* "circumstantial recipient" appears, at first blush, to not fit well with *anirākaraṇa* "non-rejection". Neither the privative prefix *a-* nor the semantics of the Sanskrit original ("rejection") are replicated in the Tamil. Nevertheless, the meaning of *kiṭappu*, a *nomen actionis* from the verbal root *kiṭattal* "to lie, sleep, be inactive", actually reflects the gist of the *anirākaraṇa* rather well. A *kiṭappu*-recipient is simply there, not doing anything, not rejecting the offering, just standing around hence, "circumstantial". These are recipients who do not need the given object and so have not compelled the donor to give it. In the examples we find deities and memorials as the circumstantial recipients of flowers, something they don't need or ask for.[69]

The *ārvak-kōḷi* "affectionate recipient" is perhaps the furthest from its Sanskrit equivalent *anumati*, but the examples and explanation still reflect a similar conceptualization, even if expressed in different terms. Peruntēvaṉ gives two examples for this *upakārakam*: giving food to ascetics and giving a place to guests.[70] The PM has a similar example involving the proper gifts for a

---

66 Later grammarians often quote this verse in connection with P. 1.4.32. Puruṣottamadeva cites a similar verse with different wording in his *Kārakacakra* p. 109.

67 PM p. 156: *brāhmaṇāya gāṃ dadāti gṛhasthaḥ* "The householder gives a cow to the Brahmin." Comm. ad VC 40 p. 43: *antaṇarkkup poṉ koṭuttāṉ aracaṉ* "The king gave gold to the Brahmins."

68 Comm. ad VC 40 p. 43: *iravalarkkup piccai iṭṭāṉ.* "He gave alms to the beggars." The PM has only the example with the Brahmins, but other Sanskrit texts give examples with beggars, e.g., *Padamañjarī* ad KV ad P. 1.4.32, vol. 1 p. 546: *yācakāya bhikṣāṃ dadāti* "S/He gives alms to the beggar." Cf. the Pāli example ad SN 553 *yācakānaṃ bhojanaṃ dadāti* "S/He gives food to the beggars."

69 Comm. ad VC 40 p. 43: *tēvarkkup pūv iṭṭāṉ* "He gave flowers to the gods." PM p. 156: *caityāya puṣpaṃ dadāty upāsakaḥ* "The worshipper gives flowers to the funeral monument."

70 Comm. ad VC 40 p. 43: *aruntavarkku ūṇ koṭuttāṉ. viruntiṉarkku iṭaṅ koṭuttāṉ.* "He gave food to the ascetics. He gave a place to the guests."

guest.[71] Peruntēvaṉ then explains how *ārvam* "affection" is connected: *aruntavar ārvattōṭu koṇṭamaiyāṉum karuttā ārvattōṭu koṭuttamaiyāṉum ārvak-kōḷiy āyiṟṟu.* "Because the ascetics receive with affection and because the agent gives with affection, it has become the affectionate recipient." In contradistinction to the other two types of recipient, the acts of both giving and receiving involving an *ārvak-kōḷi* are performed willingly by the participants. Although I have not found any strict equivalent to this passage in Sanskrit texts, Peruntēvaṉ has still captured the basic idea expressed in the PM, that the *ānumantrika* recipient occurs when two conditions are fulfilled: the giver is not spurred on by the recipient, i.e., the gift is willingly given, and the recipient actively accepts the given object, i.e., the gift is graciously accepted. As the PM shows,[72] the *ānumantrika* recipient stands in contrast to the two other subtypes, the *preraka* recipient who instigates the act of giving and the *anirākartrika* recipient who does not actively accept the gift. Puttamittiraṉ's choice to reframe this type of giving through *ārvam* is intriguing and may be tied to the meritorious status accorded to donations in Buddhism, although it is certainly not restricted to Buddhism. I have also not been able to turn up any passages in the extant Buddhist literature where *ārvam* serves as a key term, but further research might offer more clues.

4 CONCLUSIONS

The *kāraka*s and 23 *upakārakam*s in the VC provide rich material for studying the transmission and extension of grammatical concepts in South Asia and beyond. To understand the evolution of their number and names in Tamil, one must begin with the A itself and follow the treatment of the *kāraka*s in the hands of the latter commentators and grammarians both within and without the Pāṇinian tradition. Although one must have familiarity with the great works of Patañjali and Bhartṛhari, I have shown that the influence of the non-Pāṇinian schools, such as the CV and Kā. also played an important role in how the *kāraka*s are defined and named in the VC. Furthermore, the little studied PM with the commentary of one Dharmakīrti undoubtedly served as the basis for both the number and names of the *upakārakam*s in the VC and likewise the *kāraka* subtypes in SN. Given the additional translation of the PM with a commentary attributed to Dharmakīrti into Tibetan in the 14th century, one can safely conclude the PM travelled in Buddhist circles (but not to the exclusion of others) and had a great impact on Buddhist grammarians when they wrote grammars for other

---

71 PM p. 156 *atithaye phalamūlaṃ dadāti tapodhanaḥ.* "The ascetic gives fruits and roots to his guest."

72 PM p. 156 *sa hy atithiḥ phalaṃ mūlaṃ ca dātuṃ na taṃ prerayati, tena ca dīyamānam anumanyate.* "For the guest does not instigate him to give fruits and roots and accepts what is being given by him."

languages. That a relatively simple and concise work, like the PM, should have replaced the complex arguments and theorization found in the MBh and VP will come as no surprise for those familiar with these texts; it was surely because of its brief but nevertheless complete presentation of the *kāraka*s and their subvarieties that the work was chosen as the basis for transmitting this topic into other languages. Further research, especially into the manuscripts of the PM and VC will undoubtedly reveal a more complex picture than the one I have presented here relying primarily on the printed editions.

The VC also provides us with further material for how Sanskrit terminology was conceptualized and adopted into Tamil, if even by a small community that was destined to disappear. For the names of the *upakārakam*s I have discussed several techniques of Tamilizing Sanskrit: simple borrowing (*karumak-karuttā*), borrowing with some modification (*kāraṇak-karuttā*), literal translation (*talaimaik-karuttā*), and various types of adaptations that express the basic concept of the Sanskrit original but where the Tamil lexemes have a different meaning (*tāṉ teri karuttā*, *ārvak-kōḷi*, etc.). The translation of the technical vocabulary is evidence for a need to naturalize the language of grammar for its Tamil readership, an urge that was lost by the time of the PV in the 17th cent., a work in which much more Sanskrit terminology is simply borrowed with the necessary phonological changes.

Finally, I emphasize that I have only begun to scratch the surface of a potentially much larger project that would ideally involve a complete and systematic analysis of all 23 *upakāraka*s, their counterparts in the both the PM and the SD, as well as the PV. Such work must, however, be founded on a better understanding of these texts' manuscript history and take into account the variability found therein. This task is reserved for a later point in time.

ABBREVIATIONS:

A   Aṣṭādhyāyī
CV   Cāndravyākaraṇa
JV   Jainendravyākaraṇa
Kā.   Kātantravyākaraṇa
KV   Kāśikāvṛtti
MBh   Mahābhāṣya
PM   Prayogamukha
PV   Pirayōkavivēkam
SN   Saddanīti
T   Tolkāppiyam
VC   Vīracōḻiyam
VP   Vākyapadīya

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Aggavaṃsa, 1928–1949. *Saddanīti, la grammaire palie d'Aggavaṃsa*, ed. Smith, Helmer 4 vols., *Acta Reg. Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis*, XII: 1–4. Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup.

Amara, 1913. *The Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana (Amarakosha) of Amarasimha with the Commentary (Amarakoshodghāṭana.) of Kshīrasvāmin*. ed. Oka, Krishnaji Govind, Poona, Law Printing Press.

Bhartṛhari, 1963. *Vākyapadīya* with the commentary of Helārāja, Kāṇḍa III, Part 1, ed. K. A. Subramania Iyer, Deccan College Monograph Series 21, Poona, Deccan College Postgraduate Research Institute.

Bhoja, 1998. *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, ed. Raghavan, Venkatarama, part 1, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Candragomin, 1918. *Candra-vṛtti, der Original-kommentar Candragomin's zu seinem grammatischen Sūtra*. ed. Liebich, Bruno. *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. 14. Leibzig, Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft.

—2007. *Lehrschrift über die Zwanzig Präverbien im Sanskrit. Kritische Ausgabe der Viṃśatryupasargavṛtti und der tibetischen Übersetzung Ñe bar bsgyur ba ñi śu pa'i 'grel pa*, (Editionen von Texten der Cādra-Schule. Band I), Von Dragomir Dimitrav nach Vorarbeiten von Thomas Oberlies, Marbug (Indica et Tibetica, 49).

Cuppiramaṇiya Tīkṣitar, 1973. *Pirayōka Vivēkam mūlamum uraiyum*. ed. Ti. Vē. Kōpālaiyar.

Dharmakīrti, 1983. *Vararucikṛtaḥ Prayoga-Saṃgrahaḥ Prayogamukha-vivaraṇasahitaḥ*, appendix (*pariśiṣṭa*) 1 in Jhā, Śaśinātha Jhā (ed.) *ma. ma. Bhavanāthakṛtaḥ Prayoga-Pallavaḥ*, Mahārājādhirāja-Kāmeśvarasiṃha-Granthamāla 3, Darabhaṅga, Kāmevarasiṃha Darabhaṅgā Saṃskṛta Viśvavidyālaya.

Jayāditya and Vāmana, 1985. *Kāśikāvṛtti* (Along with Commentary *Vivaraṇapañcikā-Nyāsa* of Jinendrabuddhi and *Padamañjarī* of Haradatta Miśra), ed. Miśra, Srīnārāyaṇa, 6 parts, Varanasi, Ratna Publications.

Kaccāyana, 2013. *Kaccāyana and Kaccāyanavutti*, ed. Pind, Ole Holten. Bristol, Pali Text Society.

Pāṇini, 1977. *Pâṇini's Grammatik*, ed. Böhtlingk, Otto. Hildsheim/New York, Georg Olms Verlag [Nachdruck der Ausgabe Leipzig 1887].

Patañjali, 1962–1972. *Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*, ed. Kielhorn, Franz, 3 vols, 3rd ed. revised by Kāśināth Abhyankar, Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Pūjyapāda Devanandin, 1956. *Jainendravyākaraṇam. tasya ṭīkā ācārya-abhayanandipraṇītā jainendramahāvṛtti,* ed. Paṇḍita Śambhunātha Tripāṭhī and Paṇḍita Mahādeva Caturvedī, Kāśī, Bhāratīya Jñānapīṭha.

Puruṣottamadeva, 1946. *Paribhāṣāvṛtti, Jñāpakasamuccaya, Kārakacakra*, ed. Bhattacharya, Dinesh Chandra, Rajshahi, Varendra Research Museum.

Puttamittiraṉ, 1942. *Vīracōḻiyam mūlamum peruntēvaṉār iyaṟṟiya uraiyum*, ed. Kōvintarāja Mutaliyār, Kā. Ra. Ceṉṉai, Pavāṇantar Kaḻakam.

Śaraṇadeva, 1940–56. *La Durghaṭavṛtti de Śaraṇadeva, traité grammatical en Sanskrit du XIIᵉ siècle*, 2 vol. en 6 fascicules, édité et traduit par L. Renoué Paris, Les Belles Lettres.

Śarvavarman, 1874,. *The Kātantra with the Commentary of Durgasiṃha*, ed. Eggeling, Julius, Calcutta, Stephen Austin and Sons.

Tivākarar, 2004. *Cēntaṉ Tivākaram* [together with] *Piṅgalam,* (Piṅgalam Muṉivar), *Cūṭāmaṇi* (Maṇṭala Puruṭar), Chennai, Santi Sadhana.

Vararuci, 1919,. *The Vāraruchasangraha of Vararuchi with the commentary Dīpaprabhā of Nārāyaṇa*, ed. Śāstrī, T. Gaṇapati, *Anantaśayana Sanskrit Series*, 33, Trivandrum.

Secondary Sources

Annamalai, E., 2016. "Tamil and Dravidian grammatical traditions", Hock, Hans Heinrich & Bashir, Elena (eds.) *The Languages and Linguistics of South Asia: A Comprehensive Guide*, 716–734.

Chevillard, Jean-Luc, 2009. "The Metagrammatical Vocabulary inside the Lists of 32 *Tantrayukti*s and its Adaptation in Tamil: Towards a Sanskrit-Tamil Dictionary", Wilden, Eva (ed.) *Between Preservation and Recreation: Tamil Traditions of Commentary*, 71–132.

Ciotti, Giovanni, Gornall, Alaistar and Visigalli, Paolo (eds.), 2014. *Puṣpikā: Tracing Ancient India, through Texts and Traditions*, Oxford/Havertown, Oxbow Books.

Coward, Harold G. & Raja, K. Kunjunni, 1990. *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophy: The Philosophy of the Grammarians*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Cox, Whitney & Vergiani, Vincenzo (eds.), 2013. *Bilingual Discourse and Cross-Cultural Fertilization*, Collection indologie − 121, Pondichéry, Institut français de Pondichéry & École française d'extrême-orient.

D'Avella, Victor B., forthcoming. "The *Vīracōḻiyam*: A Tamil Grammar in the Eyes of Sanskrit".

Gornall, Alastair, 2014. "*Kāraka*s in *Cāndra* Grammar: An Interpretation from the Pāli Buddhist *Śāstra*s", Ciotti, Giovanni, Gornall, Alaistar and Visigalli, Paolo (ed.) *Puṣpikā: Tracing Ancient India, through Texts and Traditions*, Oxford/Havertown, Oxbow Books, 87–114.

Hock, Hans Heinrich & Bashir, Elena (eds.), 2016. *The Languages and Linguistics of South Asia: A Comprehensive Guide*, Berlin/Boston, Walter de Gruyter GmbH.

Joshi, S.D. & Roodbergen J. A. F., 1975. *Patañjali's* Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya Kārakāhnika *(P. 1.4.23–1.4.55) Introduction, Translation and Notes*, Publication of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C no. 10, Poona, University of Poona.

Kahrs, Eivind, 1992. "Exploring the *Saddanīti*", *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 17, 1–212.

Kulli, J.S., 1997. *History of Grammatical Theories in Kannada*, International School of Dravidian Linguistics, Thiruvananthapuram.

Meenakshi, K., 1984. "Sanskrit grammars as a model for writing Tamil grammars (*Vīracōḻiyam*: A Case Study)", *Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal* XXII, Pts. i–ii, 61–85.

Meenakshisundaran, T. P., 1974. *Foreign Models in Tamil Grammar,* Dravidian Linguistics Association Publication 15, Dravidian Linguistics Association Dep. of Linguistics, University of Kerala, Kerala.

Monius, Anne E., 2001. *Imagining a Place for Buddhism: Literary Culture and Religious Community in Tamil-Speaking South India.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

— 2013. "'Sanskrit is the Mother of All Tamiḻ Words': Further Thoughts on the *Vīracōḻiyam* and its Commentary", Schalk, Peter and van Nahl, Astrid (edss.) *Buddhism among Tamiḷs in Tamiḻakam and Īḷam*, Uppsala, Uppsala Universitet, 103–130.

Purushottam, Boddupalli, 1996. *The Theories of Telugu Grammar.* The International School of Dravidian Linguistics, Thiruvananthapuram.

Renou, Louis (ed.), 1940. *La Durghaṭavṛtti de Śaraṇadeva, traité grammatical en sanskrit du xiiᵉ siècle*, vol. I, fascicule I: Introduction, Paris, Les Belles Lettres.

Schalk, Peter (ed.) & van Nahl, Astrid (co-ed.), 2013. *Buddhism among Tamiḷs in Tamiḻakam and Īḷam*. Part 3. Uppsala, Uppsala Universitet.

Scharfe, Hartmut, 1977. *Grammatical Literature*, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz.

Shen, Yiming, 2014. *A Study of the Nominal Declension in the Kātantra System*, unpublished MPhil thesis, Cambridge University.

Singh, Raghbir, 1981. *A Critical and Comparative Study of the Concept of Sādhana in Sanskrit Grammar with special reference to Sādhana-Samuddeśa of Vākyapadīya*, unpublished PhD thesis, Panjab University.

Subrahmanya Sastri, P. S., 1997. *History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil*, Chennai, Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute (Reprint, 1ˢᵗ ed. 1934).

Veezhinathan, N. & Gangadharan, N. (eds.), 1991. *The New Catalogus Catalogorum, An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied word and Authors*, vol. 13. Madras, University of Madras.

Vergiani, Vincenzo, 2013. "The adoption of Bhartṛhari's classification of the grammatical object in Cēṉāvaraiyar's commentary on the *Tolkāppiyam*", Cox, Whitney and Vergiani, Vincenzo (ed.) *Bilingual Discourse and Cross-Cultural Fertilization*, 161–197.

Verhagen, Pieter C., 1994. *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet,* vol. 1, Handbuch der Orientalistik/Handbook of Oriental Studies, zweite Abteilung Indien/India, Band 8, Leiden/NewYork/Köln, E.J. Brill.

Wilden, Eva Maria (ed.), 2009. *Between Preservation and Recreation: Tamil Traditions of Commentary.* Collection indologie − 109, Pondichéry, Institut français de Pondichéry & École française d'extrême-orient.

Zvelebil, Kamil V., 1995. *Lexicon of Tamil Literature*. Handbuch der Orientalistik/Handbook of Oriental Studies, zweite Abteilung Indien/India. Band 9. Leiden/NewYork/Köln, E.J. Brill.