

BULLETIN
OF THE
RAMA VARMA
RESEARCH INSTITUTE

VOL: VII PART II.

JULY 1939

**PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INSTITUTE,
TRICHUR, COCHIN STATE.**

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE INSCRIPTIONS OF SARVANGANATHA <i>(Prof. K. R. Pisharoti, M. A.)</i>	33
A PRIMER OF MALAYALAM PHONOLOGY <i>By L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar, M.A., B.L.</i>	102
STUDIES IN THE MUSAKAVAMSA <i>By A. Govinda Warriar B.A., B.L.</i>	118
“GOVINDA” THE GREATEST MUSICAL THEORIST OF SOUTH INDIA <i>By V. K. R. Menon & V. K. Raghavan (Sangeetha Bhushanan).</i>	140
TIRUKKURAL IN MALAYALAM <i>By L. V. Ramaswamy Aiyar, M.A., B.L.</i>	18—43

THE BULLETIN
OF THE
SRI RAMA VARMA RESEARCH INSTITUTE.

THE INSCRIPTIONS
OF
SARVĀṄGANĀTHA
(PROF. K. R. PISHAROTI, M. A.)

Three Samskrit inscriptions, alleged to belong to King Āditya Varma *alias* Sarvāṅganātha, have been published in the *Travancore Archaeological Series*.¹ It has been presumed that all these three inscriptions belong to one and the same individual and that he should be assigned to the year 1374-75 A.C. on the basis of the chronogram *Colapriya*, mentioned in the first of these inscriptions as the date of king Sarvāṅganātha.² The equation of this Sarvāṅganātha with Āditya Varma and the identification of all the personalities, mentioned in the three sets of inscriptions, and the consequential assignment of all of them to the year, mentioned in the first of these records, are justified neither by the texts of the inscriptions themselves, nor by the known facts of history. A study of these inscriptions shows that the identification, originally advanced by the late Mr. Sundaram Pillai³ and subsequently accepted by the late Mr. Gopinātha Rao, is untenable; and it elucidates the *process* of history

1. Vide *TAS.*, Vol. I, pp. 171—173.

2. What has only been presumed is here stated as a fact. The editor has raised no doubts as regards the identification. It is really surprising that the central point of identity has yet to be proved.

3. The assumption was made in his paper *Some Early Sovereigns of Travancore*, vide *IA.*, Vol. XXIV, pp. 278 ff.

building, which writers of Travancore History have generally adopted.

The three series of inscriptions hail from different places, the first and the third of the series from Trivandrum and the second from Vadasseri⁴, a suburb of Nagercoil. So far as we could make out, the only basis for postulating an identity of the personalities mentioned in them appears to be *not* anything found in the inscriptions themselves, *but the mode of printing⁵ them and the fact of their being inscribed on the walls of a Kṛṣṇa shrine*. It is, no doubt, a very uncritical assumption in itself, adopted by the editor of the *series*, and it has *unfortunately* been accepted by all later day writers⁶, who have gone, ludicrously enough, to the extent of dubbing the title of *Sarvāṅganātha* on every Āditya Varma they meet with in inscription and literature.⁷

The inscription, edited as No. I of the *Series*, occurs on the north wall of the Tiruvayambadi Kṛṣṇasvāmi shrine in the Padmanābhasvami temple at Trivandrum, which Mr. Pillai would call the *Gosūla Kṛṣṇa* shrine;⁸ and the inscription states that king Sarvāṅganātha⁹ built in *proper form* a *Gośūla*, a *Dīpikūṅṭha*, a

4. Vide *TAS.*, Vol. I, p. 171 f.

5. As has been done in the volume of the *TAS.* already mentioned.

6. Amongst them may be mentioned Messrs. U. S. P. Iyer and A. K. Pisharoti.

7. This aspect is particularly stressed by Mr. Iyer in his latest paper, *Vanjirājavamśam*, published in the *Sahādaya*, a Malayalam Magazine (vide Vol. III, part V, pp. 15 ff).

8. Compare *EI.*, Vol. IV, p. 201, *footnote*.

9. Compare *TAS.*, Vol. I, pp. 171—2.

simhaste ca br̥haspatau samakarodabde ca colapriye
gośālāñca sudīpikāgṛhamaho kṛṣṇālayammanḍapam /
bhaktyā caiva yaśorthamapyatītaram dharmāthamapyādarāt
syānandūrapure sukīrtisahitassarvāṅganātho nṛpaḥ //

shrine of *Kṛṣṇa* and a *Maṇḍapa* at Trivandrum¹⁰ in the year, noted by the chronogram *Colapriya*,¹¹ which is taken as referring to the *Saka* era and which has, therefore, been computed to refer to the year 1374-75 A. C.¹² The second inscription, from the same shrine, incised on the south base of the *Maṇḍapa* and printed as the third in the *Series*, states that king Āditya Varma renovated three of the structures, mentioned above, namely the *Gośāla*, the *sanctum sanctorum* and the *Maṇḍapa*,¹³ i. e. *three* out of the four originally constructed by king Sarvāṅganātha, thus leaving the *Dipikāgrha* untouched.

10. *Ibid* note *ante*.

11. *Ibid*.

12. The exact date, according to Dr. Kielhorn, must fall between 10th October 1374 and 26th March 1375 A. C. or several months before October, according as one takes the position of Jupiter as the mean or the true one (vide *EI.*, Vol. IV, p. 202). Mr. Rao, in editing this inscription, accepts the first of these alternatives as the correct one, for which, however, he has given no reasons. Mr. Nagamayya mentions in his *SM.* (vide Vol. I, p. 265) that Mr. Sundaram Pillai assigns this record to 1372 A. C., the basis of which again is not clear. Further, none of these writers has explained why the chronogram should be understood as a *Śaka* chronogram, while its computation as 1296 is still further open to question, an aspect we have elaborated in the last paragraph of the present study. The statement of Mr. Iyer that Dr. Kielhorn has fixed the date of the document as the *first* of the dates mentioned above—this is what is given by Mr. Rao—is *not* correct. Here, then, are a series of statements which have no basis for their postulation except the fancies of the aforesaid writers.

13. Compare *TAS.*, Vol. I, p. 172 :

Śrigoṣṭhakṛṣṇālayamaṇḍapānām
gavāṇca kṛṣṇasya ca bhūsurānām /
niveśanārtham kṛtavān navatvam
ādityavarmā paravīravīrah //

It is accepted by all those¹⁴ who have written about these two Tiruvayambadi inscriptions, or utilised these inscriptions for the purpose of dating certain literary works,¹⁵ that king Sarvāṅganātha of the first inscription and king Āditya Varma of the second inscription are identical. This identification is untenable. The assumption has been advanced possibly on the basis that the expressions *Samakarot* and *kṛtavān Navatvam* have reference to *one and the same item of work*, an assumption that is categorically put forward by Mr. Ullur S. P. Iyer who says that these two expressions must be taken together,¹⁶ since he holds that the temple must have been in existence even before the time of Sarvāṅganātha of 1374-75 A. C.¹⁷ though, unfortunately, he forgets that there is nothing impossible in a shrine being renovated by two different kings of different periods. In view of the fact that the temple was in existence even earlier, as evidenced by an inscription¹⁸, written on the same north wall just above the first of the inscriptions under study, the two expressions must certainly be taken in the same sense, in the sense of *renovation*, but necessarily *not* as referring to the same item of work. *Why should the same work of the same king in the same shrine be described twice in the same shrine in the same language? This is certainly superfluous and a parallel cannot be cited.* In view, therefore, of the fact that a repetition of the king's work is uncalled for, in view of the fact that the walls of a shrine are not the place for exercises in mediocre versification, in view of the fact that the *names*

14. Such for instance as Messrs. Sundaram Pillai, Dr. Kielhorn and Mr. Rao.

15. Such for instance, as Messrs. U. S. P. Iyer and A. K. Pisharoti.

16. Vide *VD.*, part I, p. 97.

17. *Ibid.*

18. This inscription is edited by Dr. Kielhorn : vide *EI.*, Vol. IV, p. 202 ff.

given in the two inscriptions do not agree,¹⁹ and in view also of the fact that the *items of renovation work are not identical*,²⁰ we have necessarily to conclude that the two inscriptions refer to distinctly different individuals who carried out similar renovation work at different times in the same temple. King Sarvāṅganātha of the first inscription on the north wall of the *Sri Koyil* cannot, therefore, on the basis of the inscriptions merely, be identified with king Āditya Varma of the second inscription on the south base of the *Maṇḍapa* of the same temple.²¹

The identification of king Sarvāṅganātha with Āditya Varma being thus untenable, we have to conclude that the two inscriptions belong to different individuals; and of these two, the latter is *prima facie* later in date than the former.²²

19. One is king Sarvāṅganātha, and the other is king Āditya Varma. We have no reason to assume that Sarvāṅganātha is the title of Āditya Varma, particularly when it is remembered that the two inscriptions, in which these names appear, are in different structures in the *Gośāla* shrine.

20. Sarvāṅganātha renovates *four* of the items in the temple, but Āditya Varma renovates only *three* of them.

21. Be it also remembered that there is nothing said in the inscriptions themselves that Sarvāṅganātha or Āditya Varma or Sarvāṅganātha Āditya Varma, as these exponents would have it, was a *king of Travancore*, irrespective of the sense in which they might understand the term *Travancore*: vide note 53 following.

22. Otherwise, it will be difficult to explain the ornamental work he did in connection with the *Maṇḍapa*. Notice also the nature of the construction work done. Apparently, Sarvāṅganātha constructed all the items, except the central shrine, of which he must have renovated only the *Śikhara*; for, otherwise, it will be difficult to explain the presence of the *Āditya Rama* inscription on the north wall, just above the Sarvāṅganātha

King Sarvāṅganātha first renovated all the four structures, forming part of the *Goṣālakṛṣṇa* shrine, while, at a later date, king Āditya Varma renovated three of them again, making the superstructure of the *Maṇḍapa* more ornate.²³

Before, however, we turn our attention to the Vadasseri record, we must perforce notice another record of the Tiruvayambadi shrine, already mentioned as being found on the *same* north wall, in which an Āditya Rāma²⁴ is described as having presented a silver drum to the shrine²⁵. This inscription

inscription. Similarly, so far as the shrine was concerned, Āditya Varma must have repaired only the roof. Āditya Varma's major item of work must, therefore, have consisted in the ornamentation of the *Maṇḍapa*.

23. Compare *TAS.*, Vol. I, p. 172.

maṇḍitam maṇḍapam dr̥ṣtvā kṛṣṇasya purataḥ sthitam/

24. Adityarāma is the name given by Dr. Kielhorn in his study of the inscription mentioned *ante*. This is also the reading given and accepted by Mr. K. V. Subramaniya Iyer, (vide *TAS.*, Vol. IV. p. 26). Mr. U. S. P. Iyer would read the text as Āditya Varma (vide *VD.*, part I, p. 100), which is subsequently repeated by him in his paper *Vaṇīirajavamśam* in the *Sahrdaya*, Book III, Part V, pp. 15-38.

25. Vide *EI.*, Vol. IV, p. 201:

syānandūraikagoṣṭhālayakamaladr̥ṣe godamārtāṇḍakolam--
pādhīśacchatravāhi dhanuṣi ca kṛtanaivedyamuttungajive /
śrīmānādityarāmāssahi rajatakṛtam ḍiṇḍimam mandarābham
diṇḍirākhaṇḍaṣaṇḍhadyutiśubhamadiśan mānya ātmā kṣamāyāḥ //

We have already noticed that, while Dr. Kielhorn reads *Ādityarāma*, Mr. U. S. P. Iyer reads it as *Ādityavarma* (see note *ante*). Mr. Rao would accept both the variants and use them promiscuously: compare his *AR.*, for 1084, p. 8.

is written just above the *Sarvāṅganatha* record and consists of two parts, a Samskrit part written in *Grantha* script and a vernacular version of the same in *Vatteluttu* script. This inscription tells us that one Āditya Rāma donated a silver drum to the temple. He is here described also as the *umbrella-bearer* of king Godamārtāṇḍa of Quilon. Mr. Sundara Pillai who first edited this inscription said that there was a chronogram intended in the word *martāṇḍa* and, therefore, ascribed the same to the year 365 M. E. i.e. 1190 A. C.,²⁶ and then elaborated the text by saying that Goda Mārtāṇḍa here mentioned was the first king of Quilon, and that it was he who founded the *Kollam Era*. Both these assumptions are equally unfounded, and the latter is an absurd one to boot²⁷; these have been discarded by later writers, though there are even now some who pin their faith to Mr. Pillai and his theory²⁸. According to Dr. Kielhorn, the inscription is to be assigned to the latter half of the fourteenth century, more or less to the age of the *Colapriya* inscription²⁹. Mr. K. V. Subramania Iyer agrees with Dr. Kielhorn in rejecting Mr. Pillai's dating³⁰, but ascribes the record to the period, mentioned by Mr. Pillai³¹ and thinks that *Āditya Rāma* of the text was not a king of Venadu³². Mr. Gopinatha Rao also rejects Mr. Pillai's dating and accepts

26. Vide *EI.*, Vol. IV, pp. 200–201.

27. How Mr. Pillai could spin out the theory that Godamārtāṇḍa was the founder of the royal family of Quilon and of the *Quilon Era*, *alias Kolla-Varsha*, still remains a mystery.

28. One amongst them is Mr. A. K. Pisharoti : vide his *TC.*, pp. 24–25.

29. Vide the citation in *EI.*, Vol. IV, p. 201.

30. Vide *TAS.*, Vol. IV, p. 26.

31. *Ibid.*

32. *Ibid.*

Dr. Kielhorn's dating, but would have it that *Āditya Varma*, as he would read the text, was a king of *Travancore*³³. Other writers agreed with Mr. Rao³⁴, or with Mr. Iyer, according as the exigencies of their speculations demanded. But it is significant that no one cared to consider whether the *Āditya Rāma* of this record could, or could not, be equated with king *Sarvāṅganātha*, mentioned in the immediately following record. If king *Sarvāṅganātha* of the second inscription on the north wall of the *sanctorum* could be identified with *Āditya Varma* on the south base of the *Maṇḍapa* in front of the shrine and then again with *Sarvāṅganātha* and *Āditya Varma* of the Vadasseri record, we see no reason why this *Āditya Rāma* of the Goda-mārtanḍa epigraph could not be identified with king *Sarvāṅganātha*, thus postulating the equation *Āditya Rama*³⁵ titled *Sarvāṅganātha* = *Āditya Varma alias Sarvāṅganātha* of the Vatasseri record. The only reason why the equation has not been advanced so far appears to be the fact that *Āditya Rāma* is found described as the umbrella-bearer of king Goda Mārtanḍa of Quilon. If the *Sarvāṅganātha* *Āditya Varma* equation has any basis, then the same basis would surely justify the extension of the equation to embrace *Āditya Rāma*, figuring in the inscription above the *Sarvāṅganātha* record. It needs scarcely be said that the procedure adopted in regard to the equation of *Āditya Varma* with *Sarvāṅganātha* was eminently uncritical, and this has led to many mistakes still rampant in popular books on the subject.

In conclusion it deserves to be emphasised that in the same way as the *Āditya Rāma* and *Sarvāṅganātha* of the

33. Vide *AR. 1084*, p. 8, already noticed.

34. Mr. U. S. P. Iyer agrees with Mr. Pillai in his dating of this inscription, as is clear from his *VD.*, part I, p. 100.

35. Vide citation in note 33 *ante*.

inscriptions on the north wall of the shrine are different,³⁶ so also king Sarvāṅganātha, mentioned in the inscription on the north wall of the shrine, and king Āditya Varma, mentioned in the inscription on the south base of the *Maṇḍapa* in front of the shrine, must be pronounced to be different: *there are, so far as we could see, no reasons to equate the one person of one inscription with another person of another inscription.*

In editing the two inscriptions from the *Gośāla* shrine in the Padmanabhasvāmi temple, Mr. Rao has thrust in between the two another inscription from Vatasseri, a suburb of Nagercoil. This inscription is inscribed on the north and east bases³⁷ of the *Maṇḍapa* in front of the shrine of *Kṛṣṇa*, and it consists of *five* verses³⁸ which fall into *three* sets. The three verses comprising the first two sets are complete, but the third set is incomplete, since we have only the opening portion of the fifth verse. The first of the verses is in the *first person*, and it explains why the *speaker* styled himself Sarvāṅganātha³⁹.

36. That is the view of Messrs. Pillai, Rao, K. V Subramania Iyer and U. S. P. Iyer—a view that is totally unfounded.

37. It is curious that Mr. Rao, who stated in his *AR.* for 1084 M. E. that this inscription was on the east face of the *Maṇḍapa*, should have said, in editing the inscription, that it was on the north and east faces.

38. Vide *TAS.*, Vol. I, p. 172; Mr. Rao speaks of *three* verses; this is wrong, for there are *five* verses. Probably, he means three *sets* of verses.

39. Compare *TAS.*, Vol. I, page 172 :

śabdajñosmyatha lakṣyalakṣaṇaguruḥ sāhityasungītayoh
smṛtyarthātmapurāṇaśāstranigamān jāne pramāṇānyapi
ṣaḍtrimśatsvapi hetīṣu śramaguṇaiśśobhe kulānām kulānya-
bhyāse yudhi bhūpatimśca vijaye sarvāṅganāthosmyataḥ

It is funny, indeed, that Mr. U. S. P. Iyer should have added to

The second and third verses state that Āditya Varma—we are not told if he was a king—was a great scholar and warrior⁴⁰. The fourth verse sings the glory of Lord Kṛṣṇa⁴¹. Thus they form three independent sets of verses without any internal connection⁴². They apparently belong to different periods of time,

the title of Āditya Varma, as he would have it, the title of *Sakalakala* (vide *Vanjirūjavamsam* in the *Sahṛdaya*, Vol. III, part V). He has, however, not mentioned the source, on the basis of which he has dubbed him with this title, and then metamorphosed him into a king. Another metamorphosed *Sakalakala-Sarvūṅganatha* Āditya Varma he makes of the author of the two works, *Daśūvataracaritam* and *Avataraṇadaśakam* and he assigns him to the period 1375 to 1399, A. C., thus making the process of history-building so easy. He also identifies this Āditya Varma with a prince of the same name of the Vettat royal family in South Malabar ! Such loose lucubrations are the feature of his writings, both literary and historical.

40. Compare, *TAS.*, Vol. I, p. 172 :

sāhitye nipuṇāḥ kecit kecit śāstre ca kovidāḥ /
 kecidgīte kṛtābhyāsāḥ kecit śāstre kṛtaśramāḥ //
 ādityavarman bhavatassāmyamicchanti te katham /
 pāramgatena vidyānāmekām vidyām samāśritāḥ //

Note the term *bhavataḥ* in the first *pāda* of the second verse above : it should be read as *bhavatā*.

41. Ibid :

navajaladasamābhāḥ kañja (netre kṛtankāḥ)
 patitacikurasangham vārayannaṅgulibhiḥ /
 vṛjayuvatisamūham sasmitam prekṣamānaḥ
 vasatu hṛdi sadā me bālakṛṣṇasya bhāvaḥ //

42. The first verse of the inscription, vide note 39 *ante*, describes why the speaker has taken the title

of which the last may, or may not, be coeval with the first verse or the second set of verses; and one is not justified to rear up the *Sarvāṅganātha Āditya Varma equation* on the basis of this record merely. For, this record would simply tell us that there were two persons, one an unknown person who had the title *Sarvāṅganātha* and the other an Āditya Varma who was a great scholar and warrior.

It deserves to be mentioned here that the *Vatasseṛi record* is undated. Mr. Gopinatha Rao had given this record a date by assuming that Āditya Varma and the Sarvāṅganātha title-holder are identical and that the postulated Sarvāṅganātha Āditya Varma was identical with king Sarvāṅganātha of the *Colapriya* record. The process of dating here adopted by Mr. Rao, it needs scarcely be said, is eminently uncritical.

We may now tabulate the results of our study of the four inscriptions we have noticed, so as to make the position clear: -

Sarvāṅganātha. Hence it must be the statement of the title-holder himself. The second set of two verses, mentioned in note 40 *ante*, is a description of an Āditya Varma by a protege of his, and, therefore, the two, namely Sarvāṅganātha of the first verse and Āditya Varma mentioned in the latter two verses are not identical. If they were identical, the second poet should have mentioned the name Sarvāṅganātha also in his *praśasti*, and that has not been done. So, for a *prima facie* reason, we have to conclude that Sarvāṅganātha and Āditya Varma, figuring in these two sets of verses, must be different. The fourth verse is in praise of Lord Kṛṣṇa, and it may or may not have been composed by the poets of the foregoing verses or it may be by some other poet. There is no indication either way. In view of this, it is preposterous that any scholar should have assumed that all these verses were by one and the same person, and that the person mentioned in these verses was Āditya Varma titled *Sarvāⁿganātha* and that he was a king,—a king of Venād.

Place	Situation	Name	Title	Contents	Date
Tri-vandrum <i>Gosāla</i> shrine	<i>Śrīkoṭṭil</i> North Wall No. I.	Āditya Rāma	<i>Chatravāhi</i> of the Lord of Quilon	Presented a silver drum to the shrine	Nil
	Do No. II	Sarvāṅganātha	King	Renovation of <i>Gosāla</i> , <i>Dīpikāgrha</i> , <i>Maṇḍapa</i> , & shrine	1374—75
	<i>Maṇḍapa</i> South base	Āditya Varma	King	Renovation of all items but <i>Dīpikāgrha</i>	Nil
Vatasserī	<i>Maṇḍapa</i> North & east bases No. I	Nil	Sarvāṅganātha	Explains the significance of the title	Nil
<i>Kṛṣṇan</i>	Do—No. II	Āditya Varma	Nil	Scholarship praised	Nil
<i>Koṭṭil</i>	Do—No. III	Lord Kṛṣṇa		<i>Prasasti</i>	Nil

From the analysis given above, it will be clear that all the Sarvāṅganāthas and Āditya Varma, mentioned in the epigraphs from the two shrines, are not identical, and that there is no basis for holding that the postulated Sarvāṅganātha Āditya Varma was a king of Venad. We are, therefore, forced to conclude that *the Gośāla record and the Vadaśseri record cannot be cited in support of each other*, and that on the basis of this citation one cannot justifiably advance the *Sarvāṅganātha Āditya Varma equation*. In view of this position, it has necessarily to be said that in any scheme of the study of the Gośāla record, the notice of the Vatasseri record has no place; and, therefore, this latter should not have been mixed up in the study of the former, as Mr. Rao has so uncritically done.⁴³ Such a procedure tends and has tended, to lead the unwary student to accept an *untenable* equation and build up, on this *assumed* identity, further theorisings on the subject of history, as has actually been done even by well-known scholars.⁴⁴

Since the equation itself and the consequential ascription are both untenable, there are found to exist differences of opinion on the subject, so far as Mr. Rao's later day followers are concerned. We may notice two of them in this context. Mr.

43. In his introductory note to his study of these inscriptions, Mr. Rao has said that he was putting together all the inscriptions, mentioning Sarvāṅganātha (vide *TAS.*, Vol. I, p.171). It is, however, unfortunate that he has not included in this *series* another Sarvāṅganātha inscription from the same *Gośāla* temple—the one found on the *Belikkal* in front of the shrine. Is this a *suppression* or an *omission*? If this also had been noticed, the equation he has advanced and the identity of the personalities mentioned therein would not have been so easily swallowed by his readers. Vide note 47 following.

44. Compare the dating of the *Uṇṇunīlisandēśam*, advanced by Mr. U.S. P. Iyer, as set forth in his paper in *VD.*, Part I, page 88 ff, and by Mr. A. K. Pisharoti in his *Introduction* to his edition of the work.

Ullur S. Parameswara Iyer, who accepted the view of Mr. Rao and advocated this equation, utilised it for his dating of the *Unṇunṇiṇṇisandēsa*⁴⁵; but he noticed the weakness of the same on the literary side⁴⁶ and tried to explain it away on the assumption that *samakarot* is the same as *kṛtavan navatvam*, and that the temple was in existence even much earlier. i. e. even before the *postulated* Sarvāṅganātha Āditya Varma renovated it.⁴⁷ Mr. Attur Krishna Pisharoti also accepted the equation roundly, but his historical sense prevented him from identifying the personalities of the *Gosāla records* with those of the *Vataśseri records*⁴⁸; and hence he bifurcated Sarvāṅganātha Āditya Varma into an earlier and a later one,⁴⁹ Sarvāṅganātha Āditya Varma of the Vataśseri record being, according to him, the earlier king.⁵⁰ Thus, the two later day exponents of this equation of Mr. Rao have accepted the same, Mr. Iyer accepting it in a qualified form on literary considerations and Mr. Pisharoti in a modified form on historical considerations. These writers have both used this equation to fix up the date of the *Unṇunṇiṇṇisandēsam*, each, however, in his own way, on account of their acceptance of the equation in different ways; and since we have shown that the equation itself is untenable, the dating of the *Sandēsa*, in so far as it is based on this equation, cannot

45. Vide *VD.*, part I, pp. 88 ff.

46. *Ibid*, page 97.

47. Mr. Iyer has not given any reasons for his dating.

48. Vide *Introduction* to the edition of the *US*.

49. *Ibid*.

50. His reason is that the significance of the title is explained in the *Vataśseri record* only and that, therefore, a successor could use it as a well-known title.

commend itself to the serious student either of literature or of history.⁵¹

To sum up, the Trivandrum *Gōśūla* inscription on the north wall of shrine speaks of king Sarvāṅganatha, assigned to the year 1374-75 A. C., while that on the south base of the *Maṇḍapa* speaks of king Āditya Varma who repeated the renovation work done by king Sarvāṅganātha. The first verse of the *Vatasseri* record tells us why one person took upon himself the title of Sarvāṅganātha, while the second set of two verses informs us that Āditya Varma was a great scholar and warrior. From these categorically stated facts, it is impossible to come to the conclusions so loosely advanced by Mr. Rao and accepted by the

51. Some suggestions to improve the text given in the *TAS.* may not be out of place here. In the first *pāda* (note 39 *ante*) *suṅgīṭayoh* should be read as *saṅgīṭayoh* and in *pāda* 3, *kuḷānūm* must be read as *kalānūm*. In line iii, (vide note 40 *ante*) the text, as we have mentioned already, must be *bhavatū* instead of *bhavataḥ*. In No. III, line 3, (vide *TAS.* cited *ante*) *maṇḍite maṇḍape* should be *maṇḍilam maṇḍapam*, in the same form as it is repeated in the next verse, while the last line should be read *janūnūm netramāṇḍanam*. As regards the translation we may be excused if we may make some suggestions. *Sukīrti* is rendered as *possessed of good report*. *Fame* is certainly a better word, and we would, therefore, render it as *possessed of good fame*, or *well famed*. We would prefer the term *devotion to faith* to render the word *bhaktyā*. *Lakṣyalakṣaṇaguruḥ* has been rendered as *master of the science and art of music and composition*. This is an unfortunate rendering, because it does not bring out the full idea. In *literature* and *music* he was well versed in *lakṣya* and *lakṣaṇa*, i. e., theory and practice. *Sūhitya*, be it noticed, is not *composition*, but *literature* and this unhappy rendering has been repeated in the next verse also. *Built newly* is wrong rendering: it ought to be *renovated*. In the fourth verse, the translation does not convey the idea correctly: the *maṇḍapa*, ornamented with figures, i. e., sculptures, was an *ornament* to the eyes of the spectators.

writers we have mentioned above. It may, therefore, be said that the two inscriptions of Trivandrum and the Vatasseri record of three sets of verses, cannot be taken as proving (i) that Sarvāṅganātha and Āditya Varma are *identical*; (ii) that the former is the *title* of the latter; (iii) that thus titled Āditya Varma was himself the personage mentioned in *both* the records, both from Trivandrum and Vatasseri; (iv) that he lived in 1374-75 A. C.; and (v) that he was a *king of Venad*.⁵²

52. It is significant that almost all writers mentioned in the course of this paper have assumed that king Sarvāṅganātha, associated with the chronogram *colapriya*, was a king of *Travancore*, though what exactly they mean by this term still remains unexplained. Mr. Iyer has explained what he means by it in his latest paper *Vaṅjirājavamśam*, already mentioned. Whatever the connotation of this term might be—and this connotation was varying in the course of centuries—the *SM.* mentions that at this period Kottar and other places were in the occupation of Koccataya Varma, *alias* Trbhuvana Cakravarti Sri Parākrama Pāndyadeva who renovated the temple of Rajendra-calesvaram at Kottar in the Saka year 1295 (but really in Saka 1293 as seen from the *Colapuram* record, *TAS.*, Vol. VI, p. 28,) and who made still thirteen years later some gifts of land to the Sucindram temple in 1385 A. C., as seen from the *SM.*, Vol. I, p. 265, which categorically states that he ruled over Nanjanad for 13 years, i.e., 548—561 M. E. (1373—1388 A. C). At the same time, mention is made of a Sri Vira Udaya Martanda Varma, as king of Venād, from 538 to 557 M. E. (1363—1382 A. C.,) who is described as being engaged in successfully fighting against Parākrama Pandya in South Travancore! The author also cites Mr. Sundaram Pillai who mentions a king Sarvāṅganātha Āditya Varma II, “*who built the temple of Gopalakrishnaswamy at Trivandrum in 1372*” and states that he “*was probably a governor or sub-king under this Martanda Varma*”. *Prima facie* Mr. Pillai's Āditya Varma is none other than the Aditya Varma we have been speaking of and loosely associated with the *Colapriya* chronogram, but the date mentioned by Pillai is not found accepted by

In conclusion, we may notice one more point in connection with the study of these inscriptions,—we mean the dating of the record on the north wall of the *Gōśāla* shrine at Trivandrum. It is assumed probably with a large amount of truth that the chronogram mentioned in the epigraph bespeaks the *śāka* Era, though it has to be pointed out that no reason has been advanced for understanding it as such. Conceding this view is correct, there is yet another point to be considered. The expression *Colapriya* could be written only with a liquid—l—, and this sound stands for *not* nine but only *three* in the accepted scheme of notation. It is not known how this term has been interpreted to mean *nine*. If we take the expression, as it stands, the date of the record would be not 1296 S. E. but 1236 S. E., which would correspond to 1314—1315 A. C., just one year after the Tiruvadi inscription of Ravi Varma Kulasekharadeva of Kūpaka. We know that at that date Ravi Varma was at the height of his glory and political greatness. We also know that at that time he had truly become a *Colapriya* i.e. beloved of the Colas, not only because of the tradition that he was the son of a Cola prince, but because he had now turned the tables on the Pandyas who had subdued the Colas. May we

any other writer. In any case, the Sarvāṅganātha Āditya Varma they have been speaking of was not *at that period* the king of Venad, or Travancore, as these writers would interpret. He was but a *governor* or *sub-king* under the king of Venad in 1374—75, if the equation advanced and interpretation accepted are correct. The opinions expressed here would show that Āditya Varma of the Vatasserī record might as well be taken as referring to one who was not a king.

The postulation of an Udaya Mārtāṇḍa Varma as the *king of Travancore* for the period covered by the chronogram *Colapriya*, as they have interpreted it, would show that Āditya Varma could not be the *then* king. Udaya Mārtāṇḍa Varma has been postulated, as the citation shows, on the basis of dated epigraphs, and therefore, an Āditya Varma of an undated record cannot be allowed to displace him.

not, therefore, assume that king Sarvāṅganātha of the *Gōśāla* record was the great Ravi Varma himself? A pious devotee of *Śrirāṅganātha* of Srirangam and born in a family which has for its patron deity the lord enshrined in the Trivandrum temple of Sri Padmanābha, it is not surprising that after his successful tour in the East Coast districts and his coronation on the banks on the Vegavati, he should, on his return to his kingdom, renovate the *Gōśāla* shrine in the temple of his family deity, the renovation of a temple being the first thing a king orders after his coronation. There is, indeed, the objection that the title Sarvāṅganātha is not found mentioned in his other epigraphs, but our answer to that objection is that all his inscriptions do not necessarily give us all his titles. In any case, the assumption of this title sits with becoming grace upon this glorious *Lord of Kolamba*, Ravi Varma Māravarman Kulāśekharadeva Tṛbhuvana cakravarti.

Indeed, a partial confirmation of this view we obtain from the damaged inscription incised on the *Balikkal* of the *Gōśāla* shrine at Trivandrum. This inscription, it is stated (vide *Annual Report for 1084*, p. 17. No. 35, refers to a Sarvāṅganātha Ravi Varma Tṛppāppūr Muttatiruvati. Though the inscription has not been noticed in any detail by any one, yet the presence of the title Sarvāṅganātha as associated with Ravi Varma as well as of the title of Tṛppāppūr Muttatiruvati may be taken as supporting our view. In any case this inscription is very important in the scheme of the study of the inscription here considered; and it definitely shows that Sarvāṅganātha is not *necessarily* the title of Āditya Varma, as aspect that once and for all bowls down the Sarvāṅganātha Āditya Varma *equation* as well as the identification of the records of Trivandrum and of Vatasserī. It is hoped that before long we may have a fuller notice of this record⁵³.

53. In getting this paper ready, I am deeply indebted to Mr. A. G. Warriar, B. A., B. L., Secretariat, Ernakulam.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. Travancore Archaeological Series (*TAS.*)
2. Annual Report of the Superintendent of Archaeology Travancore (*AR.*)
3. Indian Antiquary (*IA.*)
4. Epigraphia Indica (*EI.*)
5. Travancore State Manual (*SM.*)
6. Tiruvitāṅkur Caritram (*TC.*)
7. Vijñānadīpika (*VD.*)
8. Uṇṇunīlisandēśam (*US.*)

A PRIMER OF MALAYĀLAM PHONOLOGY

BY

L. V. RAMASWAMI AIYAR, M. A., B. L.

CHAPTER VI

Affiliations

The bearing of Malayālam phonology on the question of the affiliations of Malayālam has to be considered with reference to three topics :—

A. Intimacy of the kinship of Malayālam to Tamil in the correspondence of numerous phonetic and other features.

B. A few old preservations in Malayālam.

C. The light shed on the origins of Malayālam by those early phonetic evolutions which differentiated Malayālam from the “parent” speech.

A

The closeness of the kinship of Malayālam to Tamil,—a fact which will have already emerged from the preceding pages — rests upon the fundamental oneness in Malayālam and in Tamil of (i) the sound-systems, particularly in respect of the distinctive sounds like the alveolar plosives, and the difference between dental *n* and denti-alveolar *n*, (ii) the occurrence and distribution of the sounds, and (iii) sandhi rules. Many of these resemblances could be shown to be special to Tamil and Malayālam.

On the other hand, there are scarcely any features in Malayālam, which can be said to be nearer related to Kannaḍa or to Telugu than to Tamil.

Further, in the course of the above discussions, I have here and there adverted to the close correspondence of Malayāḷam features to a stage of Tamil which is linguistically posterior to that of Śaṅgam Tamil or Old Tamil and which may therefore be described as Middle Tamil,¹ the literary forms of which linguistic stage begin to appear in the literature of Tamil from about the 5th century onwards, while the colloquial developments are preserved in the inscriptions of the Pallava and the Cōḷa periods.

I would here sum up these remarkable parallelisms, the testimony of which is unmistakeable.

1. The āydam fell into desuetude in the colloquials of the post-Śaṅgam dialects. This is proved by the disuse of the sound in the colloquial forms of Middle Tamil inscriptions. The descriptions of the production of the sound in Vīracōḷiyam and in ṇānnūl differ from those given in Tol. Eḷ.; and this difference may have been due to the fact that the sound was kept on only in the literary dialect, its original sound-value having been forgotten on account of its disappearance from the colloquials. Malayāḷam has no āydam.

2. The sound t represented to-day usually as r is regarded as a vallinam by the Old Tamil grammar, while the confusion between the symbol for this sound and r in the colloquial forms

1. The continuity of linguistic evolution from Śaṅgam Tamil or Old Tamil to Middle Tamil (which latter language is used in the works of the Āḷvārs and the Saivites) can be established for a large number of linguistic types. It is true that there are also a number of Old Tamil types which have left behind no "descendants" in Middle Tamil. I do not consider all such features as artificial creations or abstractions or standardizations of learned people having no basis in the living speech of a remote past. Even if some of these features had been "gekünstelt" to a certain extent, the statement that Malayāḷam is more closely related to Middle Tamil than to what is known as Śaṅgam Tamil would still stand.

of Middle Tamil inscriptions shows that the short t had already become a trill (with its point of articulation perhaps retracted).

Malayalam short r has from the earliest stages of that speech been but a palato-cerebral trill.

3. Old Tamil forms like yāṇḍu, yāru, yāmai, yār appear to have lost the y- at a later linguistic stage.

Malayāḷam has only forms without the y-.

4. The Old Tamil forms poruń, veriń and uriń went out of use in Middle Tamil. Malayāḷam does not have them.

5. The incorporation of the enunciative in forms like ṛellu, kaṇṇu, vāḷu is a post-śaṅgam (=Middle Tamil) feature. The corresponding peculiarity has become permanently recognized in literary Malayāḷam.

6. In sandhi, Malayāḷam features show resemblances to Middle Tamil colloquial peculiarities in respect of the use of the front instead of the back glide, the use of short v in forms like iviḍe, ivūr etc., the elision of vowels in compounds, the absence of gemination of initial plosives of the second constituents of compounds and sequences, and the absence of some of the external sandhi changes of Old Tamil [Chapters II to IV].

7. The sandhi change of -ḷ + ṛ = ṇ in instances like vāṇāḷ, kiṇṇōkkiya is met with only in Middle Tamil literature, and it is expressly mentioned by the grammar Vīracōḷiyam.

Vāṇāḷ is quite a usual, albeit literary, form in Old Malayāḷam.

But the principle of this sandhi change has become permanently embodied in Malayāḷam past stems like vāṇṇ- from at least the 12th century.

8. Malayāḷam aṇṇanē, iṇṇanē, eṇṇanē correspond directly to Middle Tamil aṇṇanē, iṇṇanē, etc. Middle Tamil aṇṇanam, etc. may have been derived from older forms like āṅgaṇam, iṅgaṇam, yāṅgaṇam.

For further correspondences to Middle Tamil, see C below.

Now, even assuming that the āydam, the forms poruñ, etc. and some of the external sandhi changes referred to above as being absent in Middle Tamil were standardizations of learned men in Śaṅgam Tamil,—for which assumption there is (I think) no warrant—the other resemblances and parallelisms listed above point to the close relationship of Malayāḷam to Middle Tamil.

B.

Malayāḷam, however, has preserved three old features which seem to have disappeared partially or wholly from the colloquials of the Cōḷa Tamil period.

1. One of the most important among these, in the sphere of phonology, is the strict difference observed by Mal. (both the literary and the colloquial dialects) between dental spread-blade ṇ and denti-alveolar point-contact n.

In Middle Tamil inscriptions, the two sounds become “confused.” Today, the value given to both the n- sounds in Tamil is that of n.

When exactly the “confusion” started in Tamil is not clear.

It is quite possible that the preservation of the distinction may have been a very ancient feature which partially or wholly went to ruin in post-Śaṅgam Tamil.

2. Equally important is the preservation in Malayāḷam of the pure alveolar value of the group tt', while the Late Middle

1. Malayāḷam regional ellāttilum is, I think, due to the influence of Tamil.

Tamil grammar *Vīracōḷiyam* already refers to the value of a dental tt for tt. Today tt is evaluated as tt in the south Indian Tamil colloquials except in a few forms like *kaḷaṭṭ*—for literary *kaḷatt*—.

South Indian nd in Tamil colloquials is evaluated as nn or as ṇṇ, and forms showing this nn appear already in colloquial portions of Late Middle Tamil inscriptions.

It is said, however, that Jaffna Tamil retained the alveolar value till about a generation ago, side by side with a slightly cerebralized value ṇḍ.

Even in south Indian Tamil colloquials, *kuṇḍumaṇi* (for literary *kundumaṇi*) and nāṇḍ- (for literary *nāṇḍ*—, the past stem of *nāl*—) show the cerebral groups.

In Malayāḷam nd changed regularly to ṇṇ, which feature has remained in both the literary and colloquial dialects.

3. Initial ñ-was quite common in Old Tamil, while in Middle Tamil colloquials ñ was replaced by ṇ which was perhaps already in the Middle Tamil period evaluated as n. To-day, all words which correspond to Old Tamil words with ñ- have in the colloquials only n-, though the correct value is given to ñ- when Old Tamil is read.

Malayāḷam has preserved the old ñ-in words like the following :—

Malayāḷam	Old Tamil
ñāṇḍə	ñāṇḍu, ñeṇḍu
ñāṇḍə	ñāṇḍu
ñāṇ	ñāṇ
ñāyirə	ñāyiru
ñāl-	ñāl-

In view of these instances the absolute rule outlined by KP. (p. 177) that Tamil *ń* changed to Malayāḷam *ñ*- would not hold good. It may also be noted that in view of Old Tamil *ñ*- appearing in later Tamil as *ń*- (and later as *n*), the question of the relationship of Malayāḷam *ñāval* and Tamil *ńāval*, Malayāḷam *ñārambā* and Tamil *ńārambu* does not admit of such a simple solution as is suggested by KP.

A unique *ñ*- appears in Malayāḷam *ñān*, *ñāñhal*, *ñāval*, *ñāre*.

4. Initial *c*- is recognized in Tol. as a *vallinam*; so, it must either have been a front stop, or it must have had the stop element of a front affricate.

Malayāḷam gives uniformly the affricate value to initial *c*-; in Tamil, however, only certain regional colloquials give the sound this value.

It is difficult to fix the period when the evaluation of *c*- as *ś*- arose in the regional colloquials of Tamil'.

C

While the phonetic evolutions dealt with in Chapter V above are those that occurred in the course the history of the language, and furnish material which enables us to demarcate more or less roughly an early stage and a late stage in the history of Malayāḷam phonology, the phonetic changes with which the present chapter is concerned are some of the earlier ones that differentiated Malayāḷam from the "parent" speech. I have discussed these already in the previous chapters under different

1. The preservation in Malayāḷam of the long demonstratives *ā* and *ī* which may have been rare at a certain stage even in Śaṅgam Tamil—as one is led to infer from the statement in Tol. Eḷ. that such demonstratives were found only in poetry—is a morphological "archaism".

headings; but I shall here sum them all up and point out how the changes mentioned below are all linguistically “forward” evolutions from Tamil and further how some of the Malayālam changes had their starting point at a stage corresponding to that of Middle Tamil.

Though all the changes mentioned below belong to what I have called Early Malayālam (since they are all attested in texts or inscriptions of this period which has been fixed by me in Chapter V as extending down till the end of the 14th century), the changes may have started and materialised at different periods and in different stages. The exact periods cannot be determined, though on the basis of the present materials one may roughly postulate that changes which are already embodied in the tenth century inscriptions of the west coast,—like the ‘nasal assimilation,’ the ‘palatalisation’ of $tt > cc$ and of $rd > rñj$, the changes giving rise to the Malayālam fourth case ending—(n)u [later—(n)ə], the change of medial ai to a—may have been some of the earliest ones that differentiated Malayālam from the “parent” speech.

Vowels.

1. Medial-ai (of past stems) $> -a$, as in *vacc-*, *amacc-*, etc.

Colloquial portions of Early Middle Tamil inscriptions show stems like *vacc-*, *amacc-*.

2. Final ai (of nominal bases) $> -a$.

Colloquial forms of Early Middle Tamil inscriptions show the change of -ai to -e.

3. Accusative -ai $> -e$.

4. The change of i (in *ind-*, the present tense affix corresponding to Middle Tamil *gind*) to u may have started at a fairly early stage in Malayālam, though it became universal only at a later stage.

5. The change (in forms like *vaññidū < vaññadū*) of a > ə > u (owing to the influence of the final u) > i (owing to the advancing of the tongue-position) is a very early one.

Early Middle Tamil inscriptions show forms embodying the change, and the Late Middle Tamil grammar, *Viracōḷiyam*, mentions colloquial forms embodying the change. Beside forms like *vaññidū*, there are in Malayāḷam others like *vaññudū* with penultimate u instead of i. This u is due to the lip-rounding of u < ə < a. Tamil colloquials show forms like *vaññudū* with penultimate u or centralised u.

6. The change of a to a frontalized ə (and to e) in *keṭṭū < kaṭṭū*.

7. Though the change of the infinitival a to ə (and then to e) is not met with in 10th century inscriptions in Malayāḷam, it became common at a later stage.

8. The postposition *kāl* of Tamil had its vowel shortened in the earliest Malayāḷam inscriptions which have forms like *vāyirkāl*. *Orikkāl* appears in US, Līl. and RC and sometimes even in the campus; but *orukkal* with short a is also met with in a 13th century inscription.

The ancient Malayāḷam forms *aññū*, *iññū*, *iññū*, correspond to Middle Tamil *aṅgū*, *iṅgū* which are perhaps "descended" from Old Tamil *aṅgū*, *iṅgū*.

9. e in Malayāḷam *ceru*, *ceriya* appear only in inscriptions composed after the 10th century. Though literary Tamil has *ciru*, a definitely more open value is heard for the vowel in the radical syllable in modern colloquials.

10. *cilavū* (for *celavū*) occurs in a 12th century west coast document.

11. *pōr-* (< Old Tamil *pō-tar*)- appears in Middle Tamil

and in Malayālam. I think that the past participle pōḍ- may at first have been formed by haplology from po-taḍ- and that pōr- (beside pōd-) may have been formed as a new base from pōḍ-.

“Contraction” accounts for the so-called -aṭṭē (< -aṭṭumē or -oṭṭumē in parayaṭṭē, kāṇaṭṭē, etc.), and in -ōḷam (< -aḷavum), both of which appear in Old Malayālam literature.

Consonants.

1. One of the most important of the changes involving consonants is the “nasal assimilation” in nd > ṇṇ, ṅg > ṇṇ, ṇj > ṇṇ, ṇd > ṇṇ, and mb > mm. All these except nd > ṇṇ, are met with in the earliest 10th century west coast inscriptions.

It may be stated at once that this assimilation is uniform and absolute only for nd > ṇṇ, while for the other groups there are exceptions varying in numerousness with the groups concerned. These exceptions are least numerous for ṅg > ṇṇ, while they are so numerous for mb > mm that the change of mb > mm could not be regarded as characteristic or distinctive in Malayālam.

It is difficult to account for the exceptions with precision, owing to lack of knowledge of all the conditions in which the changes materialised. Perhaps each exception may have to be considered on its own merits. It may, however, be roughly stated that one or more of the following factors may have been active:—

(i) the character of the plosive concerned, and the degree of resistance offered by it to the change;

(ii) the frequency of the use of forms containing the groups concerned;

(iii) the possibility of conflict with other words, which would act as a check to the process of assimilation;

(iv) in compounds, the extent to which the constituents are remembered as separate units by the Sprachgefühl,—a factor which would act as a bar to the change.

(a) nd > nń.

The earliest stages of Malayālam had nd only in internal positions, the external sandhi changes producing nd in the meeting of different words never having struck deep root in Malayālam.

The change of nd to nń is absolute and uniform in Malayālam, though the 10th century inscriptions do not have examples.

(b) ng > nn.

The change in this group as stated already is represented numerously in the earliest (10th century) inscriptions.

Exceptions occur today like taṅgam, koṅga, paṅgə, (old inscriptional paṅṅu), tiṅgaḷ 'moon' and 'Monday' differentiated sometimes from tiṅṅaḷ 'month').

So far as compounds and intimate phrases are concerned, the assimilation materialises only in those instances where the constituents are not felt as separate entities.

ṅg in old plurals with kaḷ has completely changed to nń, whether this ṅg was from -m + kaḷ (already in 10th century inscriptions) as in taṅṅaḷ, or from -ṇ + kaḷ as in āṅṅaḷ, peṅṅaḷ.

The change affecting ṅg of old compounds with -kāy as the second constituent is an early one (10th century), as in māṅṅā < māṅgāy.

Compounds like kuḷaṅṅare, embodying the change, occur in 12th century inscriptions which also show forms like kaṅṅāṇiccu beside kṅagāṇiccu (kaṇ + kāṇiccu). It is significant that in the earliest Malayālam documents the group ṅg < n + k

(as in enḡil < en + ḡil, adiṅgal < ad+iṅ+kal) does not show the assimilation, though in later stages there are instances like māḡattinṅal and ḡōpurattiniṅal and though today even enḡil is heard in colloquials with nṅ as in forms like uṇḡenṅil.

Today where the constituents are not remembered as separate units by the speech-consciousness, the assimilation is frequent:—Cf. kariṅṅālī (< karun+kālī) with kariṅgallə (< karum+kallə);

āttiṅgal and āiṅṅal, ciṅgaṅṅi and ciṅṅaṅṅi are both heard today.

(c) ṅj > ṅṅ.

Exceptions like aṅjə, piṅje, taṅjam, aṅj- 'to fear', koṅj- 'to fondle' 'to talk caressingly' (beside koṅṅam in KG).

The compound kaḡiṅṅūl (< kaḡum+cūl) shows today the assimilation, while others like malaṅjāl, malaṅjarivə do not show the change. ṅj < ṅc < ṅ + c, as in puṅja, ṅaṅja, does not show the change.

In texts, both paṅjam and paṅṅam 'famine,' ṅaṅjə and ṅaṅṅə, koṅj- beside koṅṅi (only as a past participle, so far as I can see) occur.

(d) ṅd > ṅṅ.

Exceptions are taṅḡa, ḡṅḡə, the verb-bases māṅḡd-, poṅḡd-, the past stems veṅḡd- and ṅoṅḡd-, and the interrogative eṅḡə (perhaps here on account of the possibility of conflict with the form eṅṅə 'which day'?)

(e) mb > mm.

The few instances here are tuḷumm- < tuḷumb-, tirumm- < tirumb-. Cimb- and cimm- 'to gather together' are both met with in Tamil.

The colloquials of both Tamil and Malayāḷam have a number of other instances embodying the change; but these are regarded as "vulgar" illiteracies. The popular feeling that mb

changes to mm perhaps accounts for back-formations like colloquial Tamil *ńamba* for *ńamma* 'our', *tumb-* for *tumm-* 'to sneeze' and Malayāḷam colloquial *mbəkkə* < *mməkkə* < *ńaməkkə*.

(f) *ṇḍ* > *ṇṇ* occurs only in Sanskrit words.

2. Medial *tt* > *cc* and *ńd* > *ńj* (> *ĩṇ*) (of past stems), on account of the palatalising influence of the vowel *i* or of the front vocalic element of the diphthong *ai* or of *y*, are very early 10th century changes that have been permanently embodied in Malayāḷam.

Such changes, as already noted, occur in Early Middle Tamil colloquial forms also.

3. The use of *(n)u* or *(nn)u* and *(iṇ)u* or *(inn)u* instead of the older *(u)ukkū* and *(iṇ)ukkū* is another distinctive feature of Malayāḷam that arose in the earliest stages.

The direct change of *nk* to *nn* (suggested by KP) appears to me to be improbable in Malayāḷam where *nk* would normally change to *ṅg* and to *ńṇ*. I feel that the opening out and elision of *k* (i. e. > *g* > voiced *x* > zero) aided by the feeling that the augment *-iṇ-* by itself may denote a fourth case force may have led to the popularisation of the ending *-(iṇ)u* and to the analogical use of *(n)u* in forms like *avaṇu*.

4. The change to *v* of the final *-m* (of nominal bases like *maram*) when followed by *um* (the *samuccaya*) has received recognition in literary Malayāḷam also. This change is not met with in 10th century west coast inscriptions.

5. The Malayāḷam change of *ṇ + ḍ* (of *ḍ* < *(u)ḍe*) in the singular 'sixth case' ending of nouns (and pronouns) with final person - denoting *-ṇ* or with the augment *-iṇ-* appears in 14th century Malayāḷam. It may have started early, though the earliest inscriptions do not show it. That the ending is a forward change from the stage of Middle Tamil is clear from the fact that the *(u)ḍe* of Malayāḷam is derived from *uḍai* appearing as

a 'sixth case' ending numerously and extensively only in the Middle Tamil stage.

6. The "popular" substitution of l for original n when pon, mun, pin are followed by plosives in compounds is condemned by the commentary on Lil.

A somewhat similar substitution of l for an original Sanskrit t in the adaptation of Sanskrit words like utpatti, utsavam, candrādityavat has been common in Malayālam. This last — mentioned candrādityavat appears beside candrādityaval in tenth century west coast inscriptions, though I have not met with ulpatti, ulsavam or śaralkālam in these inscriptions. Now this candrādityaval occurs in numerous Middle Tamil inscriptions also beside candrādityavat and candrādityavat. It is clear that this phenomenon must have been at least as old as the Middle Tamil stage.

7. The elision of final -y in forms like māññā (< māñgāy) with kāy as the original second constituent, and second personal forms like vendā(y) of US is not unrepresented in Modern Tamil colloquials.

8. y < ś is a Malayālam change that underlies Malayālam ari < ariyi < ariśi. ari is met with in early inscriptions (10th century).

payi (< pasi) and vīy- (< vīś-) and aya-kk (< aśai-kk-) also show this change, though not in 10th century inscriptions.

1. Rarely in Old Tamil texts there are phrases like avan uḍai ñāḍē, which are capable sometimes of being interpreted as conveying a "sixth case" force. The Old Tamil grammar does not mention uḍai as a sixth case ending, whereas the Middle Tamil grammars were forced to give recognition to it on account of the popularity of the usage during the Middle Tamil period.

9. 12th century inscriptions show āḷcai alternating with aṭcāi; ūrāḷma (<urāṇma) occurs in a 12th century document.

10. tiḷkk-(cf. Tamil tiṇ-mai), the “ancestor” of modern tikk-, occurs in RC.

11. Malayāḷam tr (evaluated as tr) in etra, atra, itra appears to have been derived from tn.

The group tn is a very unstable sound, and it may have easily changed to tr.

12. The earliest west coast inscriptions show causatives with -i. A reduction of the causative-denoting-vi-ṭ i in Malayāḷam is quite probable, though one cannot be absolutely certain whether apart from tar-u vi-kk-, varu-vi-kk-, iḍu-vi-kk-, viḍu-vi-kk- the mere causative-denoting ī (contracted from ī) may not have been annexed to bases without the v.

The changes discussed in C reveal the following perspectives :

(a) All the Malayāḷam evolutions had their phonetic starting points in stages corresponding to those of Tamil.

(b) Some of these evolutions have parallels in Early Middle Tamil colloquials.

(c) A few others can be proved to have been *linguistically* posterior to Middle Tamil.

(d) Since already the west coast inscriptions of the 9th and 10th centuries show a good number (see below) of these evolved features, one may postulate with a fair degree of probability that the starting points for at least these particular Malayāḷam changes may have been stages corresponding to Early Middle Tamil colloquials.

The chronology of the Malayāḷam changes dealt with in C cannot be fixed with absolute precision ; but it is possible to

mark off the following divisions on the basis of the available materials :—

I (a) The following changes already appear embodied in the earliest inscriptions of the west coast (10th century) :—

- (i) .ai (medial) > -a
- (ii) The shortening of the ā of kāl.
- (iii) The types ceydidu and ceyvidu.
- (iv) .ind > -u nd [this is not very frequent in the 10th century; but there is one conspicuous instance in a stone-inscription : náḍu vālunda (TAS).]
- (v) The type ceyyi-kk-.
- (vi) The palatalisation of tt > cc and of ná > ñj.
- (vii) “Nasal assimilation,” except nd > ní (which is represented only in inscriptions of a later period).
- (viii) The development of the fourth case -(n)u.
- (ix) The substitution of l for Sanskrit t (in candrā-dityaval).
- (x) The forms ari, vādal, etc.

(b) Early Middle Tamil inscriptions (i. e. those composed up till 1000 A. D.) show in their colloquial portions forms embodying the changes (i), (iii), (vi), (ix), and ari of (x) in (a) above. These correspondences are very important because they show how colloquialisms have been accepted and fixed as normal features in the west coast speech.

II. Illustrations embodying the following Malayālam changes (dealt with in C above) are not available in the earliest west coast (10th century) inscriptions :—

- (i) -ai (basal final) > -a.

[Early Middle Tamil inscriptions, however, have -e < -ai, which has remained in Tamil colloquials down till to-day].

- (ii) -ai (accusative ending) > -e¹.
- (iii) The form keṭṭu².
- (iv) -a (infinitive) > ə² > -e-.
- (v) The form cilavu.
- (vi) The form ceriya.
- (vii) m (before -um) > v.
- (viii) n+ḍ (of uḷe) > nd.
- (ix) kāl < kāṇil.

The fact that these changes are not represented in the 10th century inscriptions of the west coast does not necessarily mean that some of them may not have had an early origin.

The evidence of phonology thus conclusively points to the intimacy of the kinship of Malayāḷam to Tamil, and particularly in many features to a linguistic stage of Tamil which is posterior to that of Śaṅgam Tamil, though there may also have been some preservations of older forms. The evidence of phonology is thus entirely in agreement with that of morphology which I have summed up at the end of my book "Evolution of Malayāḷam Morphology" (p 148.)

The relative positions of ancient Malayāḷam at its origins on the one hand and Middle Tamil on the other could, I think, be graphically represented by two circles overlapping each other for a great portion of their areas but possessing slight extensions on either side, these latter representing features peculiar to each.

1. This is represented in modern colloquial Tamil. This change may have started in Tamil and Malayāḷam in the Middle Tamil stage.

2. Modern Tamil colloquials have sometimes a slightly frontalized ə for these two types.

STUDIES IN THE MŪṢAK AVAMŚA.

BY

A. GOVINDA WARRIAR, B. A., B. L.

I. The Perumpaṭappu Mūppils and the Kōlattiriṣ.

Introduction.

The *Mūṣakavamśa*¹ is a Sanskrit *Kāvya* by Atula,² a courtier of the Mūṣaka king, Śrīkaṇṭha *alias* Rājadharmā³. Fifteen *sargas* of this poem are said to be available. Portions from the last three *sargas* alone have been published⁴. Messrs.

1. Vide the extracts published in *TAS.*, Vol. II, pp. 87-105.

2. Cf. the colophon to the second *sarga*, quoted by Mr. U. S. P. Ayyar: -

“atulakṛtau mūṣikavamṣe dvitīyassargaḥ”.

This Atula is identified by him with Tōlan, a courtier of Kulaśekhara Varma, the dramatist, whom he assigns to 935-955 A. C. (Vide *QJSKSP.*, Vol. V, pp. 383—405 esp. p. 384) and elsewhere to the end of the eighth century (vide *VD.*, Part I, p. 45). *Contra* see note 8 f.

3. Śrīkaṇṭha was the younger brother of Vaḷabha who marched to the South to assist the Kēraḷa King against the Cōḷas.

4. *TAS.*, Vol. II, pp. 87-105; also extracts from other *sargas*, quoted by Mr. U. S. P. Ayyar in the article, referred to *ante*.

Gopinatha Rao⁵ and U. S. P. Ayyar⁶ have given a brief summary of the work. Mr. Rao⁷ is inclined to assign it to the 11th century A. C. Mr. U. S. P. Ayyar⁸, who, like Mr. Rao, claims to have seen the original, places it more or less in the same period. But the following study would show that the date has to be shifted to the 12th century.

The earlier *sargas* (I to XI) contain much legendary matter, pertaining to the traditional origin of the Muṣaka royal family, interspersed, no doubt, with scraps of really historical material. The later *sargas*, according to Mr. Rao⁹, yield us genuine historical information, subject, of course, to a thin veneer of poetic exaggeration usual to works of the kind.

The term Muṣaka is spelt indifferently as Muṣaka or Mūṣika¹⁰. The earliest mention we get of the Mūṣakas is in

5. *TAS.*, Vol. II, pp. 106-113. The promised continuation of this study has unfortunately not since seen the light of day.

6. Vide the article already quoted in note 2.

7. This view is clear from his paper on "*Buddha and Jaina Vestiges in Travancore*," *TAS.*, Vol. II, pp. 116-7.

8. It is surprising that Mr. Ayyar thinks that Tōlan, a courtier of Kulaśekhara, assigned by him to 935—955 A. C., was also a courtier of Vaḷabha's successor, who ruled several years after Rājarāja's invasions, i. e., about 1015 A. C.

9. *TAS.*, Vol. II, pp. 106 and 111.

10. Mr. U. S. P. Ayyar prefers to have it as 'Mūṣika' but this view explains only the story of the settlement of the Kōlattiris at Ēḷimalai i. e. the *rat-mountain*. That the original term was Muṣaka is seen from the earlier references. The term Mūṣika is seen used in the majority of instances in the *Kāvya*, though once it is seen referred to as Muṣaka (*sarga* XII, verse 61).

an inscription of Kharāvela of Kalinga (173-160 B. C.). They had then established themselves in the Vindhyan region to the west of the Kalingas, and were grouped along with the Haihayas and Cedis.¹¹ The *Mūṣakavamśa* attributes the migration of the Mūṣakas to Paraśurāma's war with the Haihaya King, Kārttavīryārjuna, and one of the earliest rulers who held his capital at Ēlimalai is said to have conducted a *Digvijaya* and defeated Mādhava Varman of Magadha who had captured Māhiṣmati, his ancestral capital¹². There are no early rulers of Magadha answering to this name, but Mādhava Varman III among the Viṣṇukunḍins who had established themselves to the south of the Godavari claims to have invaded Central India about 594 A. C. Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* would treat the Mūṣakas as included under the Kalingas.¹³ The *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* mentions the Mūṣakas among the Strīrājyas of Central India.¹⁴ But the *Mahābhārata* classes them along with the Keraḷas, Vanavāsikas and others.¹⁵ The first firm ground, however, that we get is the Mahākūṭa pillar inscription (601-2 A. C.) of the Western

11. The inscription is edited by Messrs. Banerji and Jayaswal in *JB and ORS.*, Vol. III, pp. 425—507 (December 1917).

12. *TAS.*, Vol. II, pp. 107—108.

Madhava Varman's conquest is referred to in the *Journal of the Department of Letters, University of Calcutta*, XI, and in Dr. Jouveau-Dubreuil's *Ancient History of the Dekhan*, p. 92. Vide also Sewell, *Historical Inscriptions of Southern India*, pp. 20 and 21.

13. *JBORS.*, Vol. I, p. 148.

14. *Ibid.*

15. *Bhīṣma Parva*, Chapter IX, verse 59. Cf.

“karnāṭaka mahiṣakā vikalpā mūṣakāstatha”.

The *Harivamśa* refers to Kōla along with Keraḷa, Pāṇḍya and Cōla.

Calūkyā king Mangaleśa Raṇa vikrama (597-608 A. C.),¹⁶ which states that his elder brother Kīrtivarma I (566-97 A. C.) conquered the kings of Keraḷa, Ganga, Mūṣaka, Pāṇḍya, Cōḷiya, Āluka, Vaijayanti, and other States in Southern India. Thus, before Kīrtivarman's time, the Mūṣakas seem to have migrated to the West Coast.

In Keraḷa itself, the Mūṣaka kingdom has been wrongly identified with that part of the West Coast which lies to the south of Quilon and north of Cape Comorin. In doing so, both Messrs. Nagamayya¹⁷ and K. P. P. Menon¹⁸ have taken their cue from Prof. Monier Williams.¹⁹ The *Keraḷōlpatti*,²⁰ also has contributed in no small measure to add to the confusion. According to it, there was a time-honoured division of Paraśurāma Kṣetram into Tuḷuva, Mūṣika, Keraḷa and Kūpaka. Tuḷuva comprised the territory between Gōkarnam and the Perumpuḷa or Candragiri river; Mūṣika, between Perumpuḷa and Putuppaṭṭaṇam; Keraḷa, between Putuppaṭṭaṇam and Kannetti, a few miles north of Quilon, and Kūpaka or Kūvala, between Kannetti and the Cape. Another version would have it that these divisions were called Tuḷuva, Kūpaka, Keraḷa and Mūṣika, respectively.²¹ A subsequent division of Keraḷa in the larger sense is

16. Fleet. *Sanskrit and Canarese inscriptions*; *IA.*, Vol. XIX, pp. 10, 14, 16 and 19; see also *EI.*, Vol. IX, p. 15, and Vol. VII, Appendix, p. 3.

17. *TSM.*, Vol. I, pp. 223, 232, etc.

18. *History of Keraḷa*, Vol. I, pp. 2 and 35. Mr. T. A. G. Rao identified it with the Kōlattiri kingdom, *TAS.*, Vol. II, p. 54.

19. *Sanskrit Dictionary*.

20. P. 19, *Mangalore Edition*.

21. *Ibid.*

also adverted to in the *Keraḷōlpatti*, as having taken place in the time of Ārya Perumāḷ, who preceded Kuluśekhara.²² In this re-division, Tuḷu, Keraḷa, Mūṣaka and Kūpaka are mentioned in order from the north. No historical reference to the country south of Quilon as Mūṣaka has yet been brought to light nor any mention of North Malabar as Kūpaka. The *Keraḷōlpatti* account has thus tended to introduce some misunderstanding, regarding the correct designation of these provinces. Mr. K. V. Subrahmanya Ayyar has shown that Mūṣaka is identical with Kōlattunāḍ and that it comprised the northern part of the modern District of Malabar.²³

Bearing on Cochin History

Though the *Mūṣakavamśa* thus treats mainly of the history of the Kōlattiris, it is not without interest to students of Cochin, for, it proves the view of Mr. Logan²⁴ and Mr. Nagamayya,²⁵ that the Cochin Raja, as the Perumāḷ's direct heir, was the most important ruler in Central Keraḷa during the post-Perumāḷ period, till about the 14th century A. C. Mr. K. P. P. Menon does not, however, accept the statement contained in the

22. *Ibid*, p. 32.

23. *J. R. A. S.*, 1927, pp. 161—75.

24. Logan, *Manual of the Malabar District*, Vol. I, pp. 281—2.

25. *TSM.*, Vol. I, p. 248. Mr. Sankunni Menon in his *History of Travancore* appears to have been very reluctant to concede this, and even he, in prostituting history in his patriotic zeal, could not but admit actual facts when he said :—

“The Cochin Raja, being considered the legitimate heir to the Perumāḷ, rose in the estimation of the people, especially of the Syrian Community who were rich and very influential,In the course of a few years the Cochin Raja also became a great power like the Zamorin, changed his title and declared himself Perumpaṭappu Svarūpam (the highly extended

Record Granthavari,²⁶ that the Perumpaṭappu Mūppils had really exercised authority over Kōlattunāḍ as they had done over Veṇṇāḍ. As a matter of fact, however, the accounts of the *Mahāmūkham*, stating that a prominent place was always reserved for the Perumpaṭappu Mūppil for the conduct of the function,²⁷ and the tradition that the Zamorin had to vacate the position of protector of the festival, if the Mūppil attended it, only substantiate the *Granthavari*.²⁸ There are also inscriptions of the Kings Kuḷaśekhara Kōyiladhikārikaḷ,²⁹ Bhāskara Ravi Varma,³⁰ Indu

or stretched power)”. p. 91. His son, Mr. K. P. P. Menon, was disposed to question Cochin’s overlordship over Keraḷa (*History of Cochin*, Vol. I, p. 27).

26. “The Valia Tampurān of Perumpaṭappu has to be obeyed by the Kōlam, Veṇṇāḍ and Ērnāḍ Svarūpams”, quoted by Mr. K. P. P. Menon, *History of Cochin*, Vol. I, p. 32.

27. *Keraḷōlpatti* and *Mūmūnkōtsvam*, p. 59, ll., 12—13;

māṭaprabhu niḷayil tōṇimel mudā
vāṭāte kaṇḍu tan māṭamuyarttinān”

28. Kuññikuṭṭan Tampurān, *Keraḷam*, Vol. I, *sarga* IV, vv. 52-6 and p. 120, note.

29. Inscription in Pantalāyani Temple, Quilandi. No. 6 of 1901, *SII.*, Vol. VII, No. 165. It closely resembles the inscription of *Kuḷaśekharakōyiladhikāri* at Perunneyil near Chenganāśseri, assigned on insufficient basis, to the 11th century A. C. (vide *TAS.*, Vol. V, pp. 37—40).

30. There are more inscriptions than one of Bhāskara Ravi from N. Malabar. There is the Tirunelli plate of the king in the 2nd + 6th + 35th year (*TAS.*, Vol. II, p. 31), and another dated in the year opposite to 46th year (*I. A.*, Vol. XX, pp. 285—92; *Madras Christian College Magazine*, Vol. VIII, pp. 198—204; Mr. S. M. Natesa Sāstri says this is dated in the year opposite to 26th year.) A stone inscription has also been discovered from the Tiruvāṇṇayūr Temple in Kāryāḍ Anśam, Kurumbranad Taluk, dated in the 35th year of Bhāskara Ravi, *SII.*, Vol. VII, No. 176.

Gōda³¹ and others³² in Malabar which go to show that the Perum-
paṭappu Svarūpam at some time or other had extended its sway
over parts of Kōlattunād and S. Malabar before the 13th century
A. C. Indeed, the traditions of the Canarese country go to con-
firm the paramount position which Cochin once occupied on the
West Coast. The Tuḷuva *Grāmapaddhati*, which is considered to
have been completed about the end of the 14th century,³³ con-
tains a description of the Tuḷuva National Assemblies, in which
the first place on the right side of their sovereign was assigned
to *Koccinātha* or *Kocci Kirīṭādhipati*.³⁴ Thus the Maharaja of
Cochin as suzerain of Keraḷa was assigned an honoured position

31. Maṇappuṟam in Calicut Taluk and Pudukkōḍe in
Palghat Taluk each yields us one record of Indu Gōda, the date
portions of which are lost. (Nos. 12 of 1901 and 354 of 1924).

32. King Gōda Ravi's inscriptions have been found in
Cōkkūr Temple in Puttūr Amśam, (No. 13 of 1901),
and Trpparaṅgōḍu in Calicut Taluk (No. 219 of 1895). An
epigraph mentioning a Śrī Bāla Rāma Varma Tiruvaḍi has been
obtained from Tiruvaṇṇūr in Calicut Taluk (No. 220 of 1895).
The present writer has published elsewhere (*J. B. H. S.*, Vol.
IV, pp. 185-190) an inscription of Āditya Ṛṣi Rāma Varma *alias*
Raṇāditya Cakravarti, from Paṟambum Taḷi near Mullaśśēri
(vide also *KSP.*, II Series, pp. 341-5), a king whose name is
hitherto unknown.

33. B. A. Saletore, *Ancient Karnātaka*, Vol. I, *History of*
Tuḷuva, pp. 341-7.

34. *Ibid*, p. 306. On the left of the King of Tuḷuva was
to be stationed Vāmanjūru Rāmanātha, also called Rāmanta,
whom we would identify with the Kōlattiri, who had the title
Rāmaghaṭa Mūśakeśvara, and had his capital at Rāmantaḷi
(*Mūśakavamsa*, *sarga* XIV, verses 1 and 7, *sarga* XIII, verse
30.)

According to the *Record Granthavari*, there were 34
Svarūpis between Gōkarṇam and Kanyākumāri under the sway

even outside Keraḷa proper, and it will therefore be worth while to see if the *Mūṣakavamśa* also has any bearing on problems connected with the history of the Perumpaṭappu Svarūpam. In the course of this paper, we propose to take up this question, to examine the dating of the *Kavya* as suggested by Messrs Rao and Ayyar and to place some of the chief incidents mentioned in it, in what we consider to be their proper historical perspective.

Overlordship of Raghupati, the Keraḷa Cakravarti.

According to the *Mūṣakavamśa*, the Keraḷa King Raghupati *alias* Jayarāga³⁵ married the daughter of Kuṭṭi Varman,

of Cēramān Perumāḷ, of whom 17 were from the country to the north of Nīleśvaram (one of the northern family seats of the Kōlattiris) and 17 to the south (namely the chieftains of the traditional seventeen *nāḍs* excluding Perumpaṭappunāḍ). The Perumpaṭappu sovereign was appointed the protector and suzerain of the 34 Svarūpams, for which they in return were each to send the annual tribute or *Rakṣābhāga* ranging between 360 and 51 *rāṣi* fanams to Tiruvancikkulam, on or before the Śivarātri festival there (cf. the passage quoted by Mr. K. P. P. Menon, *History of Cochin*, Vol. I, p. 27). The *Grāma paddhati* thus corroborates in full the tradition embodied in the *Granthavari*.

35. *TAS.*, Vol. II, pp. 87 ff., *sarga* XII, verses 34 and 50.

“vāhinī raghupaterapicaivam”

“.....prakupito jayarāgaḥ”.

ruler of Mūṣaka³⁶ and had a son named Gōda *alias* Keraḷaketu³⁷. Kuñṇi Varman was succeeded by his son, Īśāna Varman.³⁸ On

36. *Ibid*, verses 1, 5 and 6 :—

athaprṥthubhujavīryopārjjitāśeṣabhūbhṛn-
 makuṭamaṇimayūkhā mṛṣṭpādāmbujanmā /
 aśiṣadavanimenāmudhṛtail:ātapatram
 jagati bhudhajanānāmañcitaḥ kuñcivarmā //
 abhavadamalakīrtterātmaajā tasya kācit-
 tadanu cā kuladīpassūnuriśānavarmā /
 dadhadiva vijigīṣurvīkramam nītiyuktam
 dharaṇipatirubhābhyāmuccakairābabhāse //
 mahati duhitaram tāmīśvare keraḷānām
 prathitayaśasi kṛtvā rājalakṣmīm tanūje /
 apagatagurubhāram puṇyasambhāramuccai-
 raviśadupadadhānaḥ sthānamākhaṇḍaliyam //

37. *Ibid*, verse, 53 :—

jṛmbhitambunidhivibhramabhājor-
 maddhya eva pitṛmātulayossaḥ /
 setubandha iva keraḷaketuḥ
 pratyadṛśyata tayoratha godaḥ //

38. *Ibid*, verse 5 quoted in note 36 end verse 7 :—

atha pituradhigamya projvalām rājalakṣmīm
 diśi diśi vilasaḍbhissadguṇānām sahasraiḥ /
 sakalajanamanojñām candrikām prāpya candrā-
 duḍubhiriva niśāyāśśovakāraścakāś'e //

Īśāna Varman is also referred to as 'Raṇamāni' in verse 49:-

durvilaṅghyamitaretaradhāmnā
 tam niśāndhayugaḷadhvajapaṭyoh /
 keraḷendrapṛtanāmatha bāṇaiḥ
 viddhyati sma kupito raṇamāni //

the advice of his ministers,³⁹ he married a Cedi princess. named Nandini,⁴⁰ who had been residing in the the neighbouring country of Mayūra Varma. Her father, the Cedi King, had been ousted from his ancestral dominions, and he was living with his family in the guise of Brahmans in the territory of the *adhirāja* of the place⁴¹. After Īśāna Varman's marriage, he reinstated his father-

39. *Ibid*, verse 8 :—

parinayavidhiyogye prāptavidyam kadāci-
dvayasi kṛtapadām tām vallabhe manmathasya /
tadanu guṇakalatrānveṣaṇavyagracetāh
vaca iti varamantri mantravidvyājahāra. //

40. *Ibid*, verse 12:—

itigiramupakarṇya śreyasī(ma)rthabandho-
rapigalitasamṛdhiścedivamśyonnatasya 1
paṭusacivamukhena ślāghanīyānvayastā-
mavṛṇuta varakanyāmadarānmūṣikendraḥ //

The Cedis were the Kaḷacūris or Kālacūryas of Tripuri or Tewar near Jubbulpore. They claimed descent from the Haihayas. Nandini was presumably a grand-daughter of the Cedi king Kokkala I or of one of his sons, and probably slightly elder in age than Amōghavarṣa III who married the daughter of Yuvarāja, one of Kokkala's grandsons (Cf. the Kārḍa plates, 1. 23, 1A., Vol. XII, p. 368).

41. *Mūṣakavamsa Sarga XII*, verses 9 and 10 :—

adhivasati mayūrotpātamatraiva rāṣṭram
bhṛṣātaramadhirājenānvitastadbhavana 1
avirahitakuṭumbo'vipraveṣāvalambī
svaripubhiravaruddhaścedivamśyo narendrah 11
anupamaguṇarūpā nandinītyasti kāci-
dvayasi śithilabālye vartamānāśya kanyā 1
ciraparicayaśilapremabandhassaleśam
svayamiva ripuhastādāgatā rājyalakṣmīh 11

Banavāsi or Vaijayanti (Rice, *Mysore and Coorg*, pp. 14, 21--3) was the capital of the early Kadamba king Mayūra Varma. Banavāsi was then under the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

in-law on the Cedi throne". On his way back to Kōlattunāḍ, he heard that his brother-in-law, the Keraḷa Cakravarti, had proceeded to invade Mūṣaka.⁴² The Kōlattiri soon gathered together his forces, and the contending armies met on the banks of the Paruṣṇi river.⁴³ The sanguinary engagement that

42. *Mūṣakavamśa*, *sarga* XII, verse 14:—

prathitavipuladaṇḍāḥ prābhṛtādhānatuṣṭai-	
rupahitabalavāhyastasya sāmantamukhyaiḥ	1
aghaṭayadatidūrabhraṣṭayā rājyalakṣmyā	
punarapiguruśaktim cedipam hehayendraḥ	11

43. *Ibid*, verses 15, 16, 17 and 27:—

svabhuvamabhijigīṣurmūsikendro baloghaiḥ	
sarathagajaturaṅgaissārddhamṛddhānubhāvam	1
calitamacalitaśrīḥ keralendram purā svāt	
puramathana samānaḥ so, tha śuśrāva tāvat	11
sannis'amyā saruṣastamudantam	
bhūpatermukharitādriguhena	1
tasya yānapaṭahena gabhīram	
dadhvane kanakakonahatena	11
gandhasindhuraghaṭākṛtabhāsvat-	
setubandhasukhalaṅghitasindhuh	1
tam tamuddharabalassadharāyā	
deśamāsu samalaṅghyadiśaḥ	11
yānadundubhiravadhvanitāsam	
vāhinībharāṇanāmitabhūmiḥ	1
reṇujālapihitāntaramuccai-	
rūsasāda saritam sa parusṇim	11

44. *Ibid*, XII, *sarga* verses 34 and 35:—

vāhinī raghupaterapicaivam	
sannanāha sahasāhavahetoḥ	1
durjayārijayalampaṭacittā	
duśravapratibalānakaśabdā	11

ensued did not result in a decisive victory for either side, and hence the two rulers engaged themselves in a deadly single combat.⁴⁵ In the thick of the fight, Gōda interposed his body between his sire and uncle, and besought them to desist from the work of destruction.⁴⁶ The principals complied and retired for the day. In pursuance of this and also on the advice of their ministers and intermediaries, they came to terms.⁴⁷ After

te parasparasametapadāti-	
syandane hayahayādisamūhe	1
udyatāyudhabhuje prathane dve	
samprahartumabhisamvavṛtāte	11

Vide also verse 49 quoted in note 5 *ante* and verse 50 :—

bhidyamānamamunā visikhaughaiḥ	
samvilokya balamākulayodham	1
pratyaiddhyadarisainyamamasamkhyaiḥ	
patribhiḥ prakupito jayarāgaḥ	11

The river Paruṣṇi seems to be identical with the Kōṭṭa river to the south of Vaḍakara in N. Malabar.

45. *Ibid*, v. 52 :—

tāvubhāviti parasparabeti-	
vrātapātaviraḷikṛtasainyau	1
dvandayuddhamatimānuṣasatvau	
karttumāhitamatī samabhūtam	11

46. *Ibid*, v. 53, already quoted in note 37.

47. *Ibid*, verses 55 and 56 :—

aviralaśaravarṣāvagrahatvam prapanne	
narapati tanaye' sminsamparāyānnivṛttau	1
bhuvanamavanipālāvandhayatyandhakāre	
sapadi balaniveśam svam svametāvayātām	11
tāvanyedussamarasulabhajyākīṇākālpabhājau	
śauryādhārau prakṛtivacanātsaṅgatau	
bandhubhūtau	1
śāntadveṣau punarupacitapremabhārau narendrau	
lajjām yuddhasmaraṇajanitām sandadhāte	
muhūrtam	11

this, the Keraḷa sovereign resided for some time in the imperial palace at Kōlam, the Mūṣaka capital. There he entertained Īśāna Varma, and received also the homage of the prominent gentry of the Kōlattiri's Kingdom.⁴⁸ The costly presents he got from his vassals he made over to the Kōlattiri; and then he returned to his own capital by the inland route, receiving on his way the willing tribute of the hill tribes and rural population.⁴⁹ A few years after these incidents, Īśāna Varman, who was childless, married the daughter of the Cōḷa King, probably, much to the chagrin of his Cedi partisans.⁵⁰ The Cōḷa

48. *Ibid*, verse 57:—

bhūyaḥ prāpya pramuditamanāssyālamāhūya kolam
 prṭhvīpālaḥ punaranupamo lokapālo pamānam 1
 sampannābhīrurutamudam satkriyābhissa cakre
 nānārupaljanapadajanaiḥ prābhṛtairāhṛtaiśca 11

As Kōlam is on the western bank of the Pratana, it appears to be identical with Kollam north of Pantalāyani and Quilandi and west of the Akalappuḷa.

49. *Ibid*, verse 58:—

tatroṣitvā katicana nīṣā nirggataissotha mārge
 taistairdaityairupahṛtamahātithya satkāra eva 1
 kṛcchrāttēna svayamanumataḥ snehanighnena
 rājñām
 prājyaīśvaryām sadhṛtiraviśatsvāmpurīm
 keralendraḥ 11

50. *Ibid*, verses 60 to 61:—

praṇayaparavaśātmā lālayan preyasīm tām
 śriyam iva prṭhuhastādāhṛtām dīrghakālam 1
 prabhavamiha sukhasya śreyasomutra cānya-
 ddharaṇipatirapatyam nāśu tasyā mavindat 11
 vythitamatirabhāvāt putralābhotsavasya
 ślathitasakalabhogaśślāghanīyānvayasya 1
 subahubhirabhirāmām svairgunairmūṣakānām
 patiratha pariṇīnye kanyakām colabhartuḥ 11

Queen soon bore him a son named Nṛparāma,⁵¹ and not long after, Nandini too was blessed with a son called Pālaka.⁵² Nandini's father wanted to see his grandchild, and Pālaka went to the Cedi Kingdom where he resided with his maternal grandfather for a long time.⁵³

Let us now try to place the above incidents in a historical setting. The Keraḷa King Raghupati *alias* Jayarāga appears to be identical with Cēramānar Vijayarāgadēvar, whose daughter Ravi Nili is seen making an endowment to the Ādhipuriśa temple at Tiruvotṭiyūr in the Chingelput District in the 29th year of Madhuraikkōṇḍa Parakēsari Varman Parāntaka I (936 A. C.).⁵⁴ This Vijayarāgadēvar has been

51. *Ibid*, verse 62:—

prathamamatha narendraḥ paścimāyām mahiṣyā-
malabhata nrparāmam sūnumānandahetum 1
nijavibhavaśikhāyāmunnatam komalāyām
phalanicayamivoccairbhuruhaḥ pārijātaḥ 11

52. *Ibid*, verse 70:—

pramadamatha vibhuddhā samvibhajya svabhartṭr-
gaṇamanaticireṇa priṇayantī sakhinām 1
alabhata sutamekam nandinī pālakākhyam
duhitaramapi kaścit dukhaviddhvamsihetum 11

53. *Ibid*, verse 71:—

karikalabhavilāsam pālakam bālameva
priyataramabhirāmaissvairguṇairapyasubhyaḥ 1
nikaṭamaṭididṛkṣoḥ preṣayāmāsa dhīra-
stanayamavanipālataṣṭasya mātāmahasya 11

54. Compare "...Matiraikkōṇḍa kō ppara kēcari varmaṛku yāṇḍu irupattonpatāvatu Cēramānar Vijayarāgadēvar makaḷ Iravi Nili Tiruvotṭiyūr mahāḍēvaṛkkoru nandāviḷakku ācandra tāramum erippataṛku vaitta poṇṇu" etc. *SII.*, Vol. III,

identified⁵⁵ with Kōyiladhikārikaḷ Viyarākaṇadēvar (Vijayarāghavadēvar) who figures in the Kottayam plates issued in the fifth year of Sthāṇu Ravi, and assigned to about 875 A. C.⁵⁶ He has also been equated with Vijayarāgadēvar, whose queen Kiḷānaḍikaḷ made a gift to the Tirunandikkara Śiva Temple in South Travancore. The Travancore archaeologists have assigned to this Vijayarāgadēva a reign of about 25 to 35 years from 900 A. C.⁵⁷, but I have shown elsewhere that King Gōda Ravi of the Taḷi inscription in Cochin State ascended the throne in 911-12 A. C., and that consequently Vijayarāgadēva must have

p. 236. There is no evidence to postulate that she is identical with the Queen of Parāntaka I, as opined by Mr. U. S. P. Ayyar (*op. cited*, p. 396), nor does the record presuppose that Vijayarāgadēva lived up to 936 A. C.

55. *TAS.*, Vol. III, p. 144.

56. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 80, 11. 6—7.

57. *Ibid.* Vol. III, p. 144; *T. A. Report*, 1096, p. 47; *TAS.*, Vol. V, p. 113.

Mr. U. S. P. Ayyar if the Kiḷānaḍikaḷ herein mentioned could be identified with the sister of Īśāna Varman. This does not appear to be quite probable, as the Kiḷānaḍikaḷ of the Tirunandikkara epigraph is stated to have been the daughter of a Kulaśekharadēva (Cf. Kulaśēkaradēvār makaḷār Vijayarākadēvār dēviyār Kiḷānaḍikaḷ) and not of the Kōlattiri chief Kuññi Varman. We have no evidence to show that this Kulaśekharadēva is identical with Kuññi Varman.

58. Vide my paper on 'the Rājasimhas of Ancient Keraḷa', *J. B. H. S.*, Vol. I, pp. 166-7; also my articles on "the Taḷi inscriptions in Cochin State", *I. H. Q.*, Vol. IV, pp. 154-5, and on 'King Gōda Ravi Varma in Cochin History', *Bulletin of the R. V. R. I.*, No. 1, pp. 39-44. The Taḷi inscriptions, Nos. 343 and 344 of 1924, Madras Epigraphical Collection, have since been published in *TAS.*, Vol. VIII.

ceased to reign before that date. As King Sthāṇu Ravi, contemporary of Āditya I (871-906 A. C.), is taken to have become the sovereign about 870 A. C., and his latest regnal year known from epigraphs is only seventeen,⁵⁹ it is likely that Vijayarāgadēva became king about 890 A. C., and continued to be Perumpaṭappu Müppil till 911-12 A. C.

Vijayarāgadēva was on friendly terms with the Cōḷas; for we find Āditya's son Parāntaka had married a Keraḷa princess, the daughter of the Keraḷa King.⁶⁰ The Cōḷas at this time (890-912) had already conquered Toṇḍamaṇḍalam and Kongu, and were gradually supplanting the Pallavas and Pāṇḍyas in their hegemony over South India.⁶¹ Vijayarāgadēva could not,

59. Cf. the Kottayam plates issued in the 5th year, *TAS*, Vol. II, pp. 76-8; the Tiruvella plates, issued in the 17th year, *ibid*, pp. 85-6.

60. Vide the Udayendram plates, *SII.*, Vol. II, p. 379. Compare also the 16th year Rājakēsari record from Lalgudi (Trichinopoly Dt.), No 111 of 1929. This inscription mentions a gift of gold made by Kō-Kiḷān Aḍikaḷ, the daughter of the Cēramānar, and identified with the Queen of Parāntaka I, Vira Cōḷa (*ARE.*, 1929, II, para 27).

Āditya I and the contemporary Keraḷa sovereigns, Cēramān Kōttāṇu Iravi and Cēramān Vijayarāgadēva, were steadfast allies. Compare also the Tiḷḷai-sthānam inscription which shows that they made a joint grant of certain privileges to a chief Vikki Aṇṇan, who appears to have rendered them substantial help in their conquest of Toṇḍamaṇḍalam. (No. 286 of 1911, *TAS.*, Vol. II, pp. 76-7).

61. Vide the term 'Toṇḍanāḍu paravina' in the Tiḷḷai-sthānam record cited above. We have inscriptions of Āditya in the Chingelput Dt. (Toṇḍamaṇḍalam) ranging from his 3rd to 18th year (873-888 A. C.), Nos. 351 of 1908, 435 of 1905, etc. Prof. Dowson's extract from the *Kongudēsārūjūkkaḷ* (Mackenzie

therefore, brook to see this feudatory, the Kōlattiri, entering into a matrimonial alliance without consulting him, especially an alliance with the Cedis, which would inevitably entangle him and the Cōlas in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa-Calūkyā conflict. For, the Cedis were the steadfast allies of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and continued marital ties had strengthened their union.⁶² The Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Calukyās of Vengi, their eastern neighbours, were, however, deadly enemies. During the reign of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Emperor Amōghavarṣa I (814-78 A. C.), the Rāṣṭrakūṭas (some time between 860 and 866 A. C.) inflicted a signal defeat on Vijayāditya III, the ruler of Vengi

Manuscripts) assigns the conquest of Kongu by Āditya (Varman) to 894 A. C. (*J. R. A. S.*, Vol. VIII, pp. 2-6). The Pāṇḍyas had previously allied themselves with the Keraḷa king. Parāntaka Vīra Nārāyaṇa Caṭayan had married Vānavan Mahādēvi, presumably the daughter of Rājasiṃha, predecessor of Sthāṇu Ravi, and their son Caṭayamīraṇ Rājasiṃha ascended the throne in the first decade of the 10th century A. C. (cf. Cinnamanūr plates, K. V. S. Ayyar, *Sketches of Ancient Dekhan*, p. 144; *S. I. I.*, Vol. III, pp. 445 ff.) But in spite of this alliance, they were not able to hold their own against the Cōlas and Pallavas, and Parāntaka's early years were occupied with the complete subjugation of the Pāṇḍyan kingdom itself.

62. Amōghavarṣa I (814-878 A. C.) had, about 850 A. C., formed an alliance with the Kaḷacūris by getting his son Kṛṣṇa (II) married to the daughter of Kokkala I, the Cedi Chief (*IA.*, Vol. XII, p. 253). Kṛṣṇa's son, Jagattunga, who predeceased him, married Lakṣmi and Gōvindāmba, daughters of Kokkala's "sagacious and powerful" son Raṇavigrāha *alias* Śaṅkaragaṇa (*ibid.*, pp. 247 and 268); Jagattunga's son by Lakṣmi, Indra (III-912-7 A. C.) also married Vijāmba, grand-daughter of Arjuna, another son of Kokkala (*Ibid*, p. 249). Amōghavarṣa III (*ibid*, p. 268) and his son and successor, Kṛṣṇa III (*ibid*, p. 265), also took Cedi princesses as their wives.

(844—888 A. C.)⁶³. The Calūkyas, before long, rallied, and marched against the Gangas and Nolambas, whose kingdoms lay immediately to the south of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas⁶⁴. This move seems to have been countenanced, in the first instance, by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, but the Calūkyas, after crushing the Nolambas and Gangas, marched—quite unexpectedly—to the Cedi country, burned its capital, and forced the Cedis to fly from their kingdom. The most secure place they could find was the Banavāsi

63. Vide the Śīrūr grant of Amōghavarṣa I, dated 366 A.C. (IA., Vol. XII, p. 218); also the Sāngli plates of Govinda IV, which gives further details of the campaign (*ibid*, p. 249). In the Eastern Calūkyā grant of Amma I from the Kistna District, it is said of Vijayāditya (III) Narēndramṛgarāja that “aided (only) by (his) sword, the strength of which had been acquired by (his) arm, the brave king Vijayāditya, during twelve years, fought day and night a hundred and eight battles with the forces of the Gangas and Raṭṭas, which were possessed of discipline and prowess, and built the same number of great temples of Sambhu.” (*Ibid*, p. 217).

64. The Iḥar plates state that Guṇaga Vijayāditya (III) attacked the Gangas at the instigation of the Raṭṭas, beheaded Maṅgi (the Nolamba chief), frightened Kṛṣṇa himself and his ally Śankila (his brother-in-law Sankaragaṇa of the Cedi family), and burned the Cedi capital, which is in the Maliya-puṇḍi grant called Kiranapura, and also Cakrakōṭa. (*E.I.*, Vol. IX, p. 51; Vol. IV, p. 239). This is echoed in the inscription of Amma I quoted in the previous note:—

gaṅgānaḡgajavairiśaktirasamān raṭṭeṣa samcodito
 jitvā maṅgiśiro harat yudni mahābāhuvṛptavīryāryamā
 kṛṣṇam śaṅkilamaṅkitākḥilabalapṛāptorusadvikramo
 bhītārtham ca vidhāya tatpuravaram yo nirddād aha
 prabhuḥ.

“Having been challenged by the lord of the Raṭṭas, he, (Guṇagāṅka Vijayāditya, the lord—who possessed the power of

province governed by Śankaragaṇḍa, son of Bankeya, Amōghavarṣa's trusted general⁶⁵. These events occurred about 880 A.C. and Kṛṣṇa II who succeeded Amōghavarṣa had to bide his time, i. e., till Vijayāditya's death (888 A. C.), to retrieve the fallen

Āṅgajavairi, who had for (his) bosom friend the bravery that had been acquired by (his) mighty arm; (and) who was possessed of great and excellent prowess acquired by (his) notorious and perfect strength conquered the unequalled Gangas, and took the head of Mangi in battle, and having made the firebrand Kṛṣṇa frightened and distressed, burned his excellent city". *IA.*, Vol. XII, p. 221.

For the probable date of this expedition see the discussion in Altekar, *Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Their Times*, pp. 93—6.

65. Bankeya or Bankeyarasa of the Cella Kētana family was a faithful general of Amōghavarṣa. He was, about 835 A. C., rewarded for the help rendered by him in suppressing some revolts (*EI.*, Vol. VI, pp. 30 ff.) by his being made the Governor of Banavāsi 12,000, Belgōḷ 300, etc. (Compare also the Niḍaguṇḍi grant of Amōghavarṣa, *Ibid*, Vol. VII, pp. 213—4; Fleet, *Kanarese Dynasties*, p. 403). Bankeyarasa is said to have built or improved and renamed Bankāpura or Bankāpūr in the Dharwar District (See Guṇabhadra's *Praśasti* in the Jaina *Mahāpurāṇa*, verses 29 to 33 quoted by Fleet, *Sanskrit and Old Canaries Inscriptions*, *I.A.*, Vol. XII, pp. 216—7). Bankeya was succeeded by his sons Indra (*EC.*, Vol. VII, H. I, No. 13) and Śankaragaṇḍa; the last was a contemporary of Amōghavarṣa and Kṛṣṇa (*EI.*, Vol. XVI, p. 215; Fleet, *Kanarese Dynasties*, p. 35). The third son's (Lōkāditya's) earliest date is Saka 815 (893—4 A. C.) (*EI.*, Vol. XVI, pp. 278—80; Fleet, *Kanarese Dynasties*, pp. 35—7, 85, and 411, note 3). It was in his time that Guṇabhadra wrote his *Praśasti* cited above.

fortunes of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Cedis⁶⁶. The Cedi alliance with the Kōlattiris was thus another factor which enabled the trio to gain back Gangavāḍi and Nōḷambavāḍi in the south from the Calūkyas, and to consolidate their rear before they undertook their northern campaign. The allies defeated Bhōja I, the Gūrjāra-Pratihāra king of Mālva, and the Cedi ruler regained his patrimony⁶⁷. Īśānavarma, therefore, could very well claim that he helped his father-in-law to get himself reinstated on his ancestral throne.

66. Immediately after Vijayāditya's death, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas appear to have invaded the Calūkyas dominions, as seen from Eastern Calūkyas epigraph quoted in notes 63 and 64 *ante*.

“sa samastabhuvanāśrayaśrīvijayādityas catus catvārimśadvaṣṣāni tadanu savitāryastaṁgatetimirapaṭlenai varaṭṭadāyādabalenābhivyāptam veṅgīmaṇḍalam”

“He, the asylum of the Universe, Śrī Vijayāditya (reigned over the country of Vengi) for 44 years. After that, the province of Vengi was over-run by the army of the Raṭṭa claimants, as if by dense darkness on the setting of the sun”. (IA., Vol., XII, p. 221).

Kṛṣṇa was, however, not able to achieve much against the Calūkyas, as Vijayāditya's successor, Bhīma I, claims to have defeated Kṛṣṇa and his Karṇāṭaka and Lāṭa (Gujarat) allies in two battles. (Rangacari, *Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency*, Kistna Dt., No. 9). But Bhīma paid heavily for his temporary success; he lost his eldest son, a lad of 16, in this war. Kṛṣṇa was also able to see that the Calūkyas withdrew for the time being and were made powerless to cause any diversion against him in his rear.

67. EC., Vol. XI, Davanagare, No. 17; also Rice, *Mysore Inscriptions*, No. 113, p. 29.

Such an active interference in Rāṣṭrakūṭa politics must have caused no small alarm to his suzerain, the King of Keraḷa, since it meant an estrangement with the Gangas and possibly with the Cōlas, and an upsetting of the balance of power in favour of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The Keraḷa Cakravarti, therefore, took steps to punish his overgrown vassal.⁶⁸ This could have been the only provocation for the war. The fact that the Kōlattiri took the earliest opportunity to fall into line with the wishes of the Perumpaṭappu Mūppil by marrying a Cōla princess and strengthening the Cōla alliance shows that he tried to retrieve his mistake as early as possible.

This is one of the early instances which goes to illustrate the exercise of the overlordship of the all-Keraḷa Cakravarti. That Vijayarāgadēva held sway over the territories between Tirunandikkara and the Canarese Districts may legitimately be inferred from the evidence available. It is not a far cry from Kōlam in Kōlattunāḍ to Tirunelli in the Wynad Taluk of North Malabar. The theory that the Bhāskara Ravi of the Tirunelli plates was most probably a North Kōlattiri King and not a Cochin sovereign thus loses much of its strength, when it is remembered that a predecessor of his in the same century was holding sway over North Malabar, and that the *Mūṣakavamśa*

68. The Bhavanagar Museum inscription, *EI.*, Vol. XIX, pp. 174—7; the Begumra plates of Kṛṣṇarāja of the Gujarat branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas dated 888 A. C. refers to the defeat of Bhōja at Ujjain, *IA.*, Vol. XIII, p. 66). The Begumra plates of Indra III dated 914 A. C. recall the brave feats of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Emperor in his wars with the Gūrjāras (*EI.*, Vol. IX, p. 24).

does not include him even in its traditional list of Mūṣaka Kings. The episode from the *Mūṣakavamśa* also supports the tradition recorded in the *Granthavari* that both the Kōlattunāḍ and Veṇāḍ Svarūpams had to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Perumpaṭappu Mūppil.

(to be continued)

The Wārdha and Navasāri plates represent Akālavarṣa (Kṛṣṇa II) as having frightened the Gūrjāras, humbled the pride of the Lāṭa, taught humility to the Gauḍas, etc. (*J. Bom. B. R. A. S.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 239—69). The Cedi ruler and the Rāṣṭrakūṭa crown-prince Jagattunga participated in these wars (*IA.*, Vol. XII, p. 265).

“GÖVINDA”, THE GREATEST MUSICAL THEORIST OF SOUTH INDIA.

V. K. R. MENON, & V. K. RAGHAVAN (*Saṅgētha-bhāṣaṇan*)

South Indian music of the present day is based on the 72 Mēla-karta Rāgās. The common characteristic of these Rāgās is that each of them traverse the whole gamut both in ascent and in descent. Each of these Rāgās may be said to be homologous to a musical mode so that there are 72 Musical modes in South Indian music. The artistic exploitation of each Mode in its fullest melodic sense gives rise to the corresponding Mēla-karta Rāgā, while elaborations, in certain specified directions only, produce the various Janya Rāgās associated with it.

An erroneous impression has gained currency that we owe this system of classification and definition of the Rāgās to Venkatamaghi of Vijayanagar (1620 A. D.) Mr. N. S. Ramachandran has shown that the present system differs radically in many vital respects from that of Venkatamaghi. The genius that evolved this system was an unknown individual called “Gōvinda”. In simplicity and scientific exactitude his system is head and shoulders above that of all similar attempts made from the time of Bharata (5th Cy: A. D.) to that of Venkatamaghi. Mr. T. R. Srinivasa Iyer in his excellent introduction to Gōvinda’s Sanskrit treatise on music called “Samgraha Chūḍāmaṇi”, recently brought to light by the Adayar Library, reveals for the first time that the immediate disciples of the great Tyāgarajā (19th Cy: A. D.) followed Gōvinda’s nomenclature and that both Mahā Vaidyanatha Sivan and Paṭṭaṇam Subramanya Iyer were ardent advocates of it.

Gōvinda’s system of classification, which he claims to be perfect both from the *Lakṣaṇa* and the *Lakṣya* stand-points, is

statistically convincing. Thus if we conceive his 72 chief Rāgās and their Janya Rāgās to constitute an 'Order', we notice that they are divided into 2 sub-orders—the (F) group and the F (sharp) group,—each sub-order being divided into 6 'Families' or 'Cakras'. Each 'Cakra' comprises 6 'General' or 6 Mēḷa-karta Rāgās, each of these being characterised by the same arrangement of 'intervals' from C to G. (*Sa* to *Pa*). Each Mēḷa-karta Rāga gives rise to numerous 'Species' or 'Janya' Rāgās.

Unlike that of Venkatamaghi, Gōvinda's classification can legitimately claim to include all conceivable forms of Rāgās or *Svara* combinations. It is the brilliant outcome of a perfect synthesis of the fundamental axioms of Indian musical science which had come to be universally accepted in South India at that time. The chief among them were as follows:—

(1) For all practical purposes (e.g. construction of the Vēṇa), the chromatic Scale of 12 notes to the octave was accepted.

(2) The Mēḷa-karta Rāgās were evolved from this fundamental scale, each Rāga having 7 notes to the octave.

(3) The notes C, c, and G, and one of the two varieties of F, [F or F sharp] were the common characteristics of all these Rāgās. *

It can easily be shown that Govinda's classification is statistically perfect. Conceiving the Chromatic Scale as a ladder of 12 steps, we may for simplicity assume that all the steps are equal, each step corresponding to an 'interval' whose *logarithmic* value may be taken as unity. (The octave of 12 steps is thus equal to 12 units. The *logarithmic* values are taken because they can be *added* just as the heights of the steps of a ladder, while the '*frequency ratios*' can only be *multiplied*.) In

* C=Sa, c'=Sa', G=Pa, F=Ma, F (sharp)=*prati* Ma, D=Ri, E=Ga, A=Dha, and B=Ni.

any Rāga, F (Ma) corresponds to the 5th step, G (Pa) to the 7th, and c' (Sa') to the 12th. Thus the height from C to F is the same as that from G to c', being equal to the height of 5 steps. Since a Mēḷa-karta Rāga traversing an octave has only 7 notes in it, we may from analogy state that the ladder has to be ascended in 7 'hops', 3 hops taking the singer from C to F, the next one from F to G, and the last three from G to c'. Thus the height from C to F, equal to 5 units, has to be covered in 3 hops. But the range of a step has to be equal to an integral number of units, and it follows that the 3 types of hops possible will each cover heights equal to 1, 2, or 3 units. If then the height from C to F, equal to 5 units has to be covered in 3 hops there are 6 and only 6 alternative ways of doing so. They are tabulated below:

TABLE.

Type	Range of Steps			Sum
	1st (C to D)	2nd (D to E)	3rd (E to F)	C to F
(a)	1	1	3	5
(b)	1	2	2	5
(c)	1	3	1	5
(d)	2	1	2	5
(e)	2	2	1	5
(f)	3	1	1	5

Each type goes to form a 'Cakra', the characteristic Rāga of the 'Cakra' having the 'intervals' from C to F identical in values with those from G to C. Taking the 1st 'Cakra' as an example, it will include 6 Rāgās all of which have the same arrangement (a) from C to F and the arrangements a, b, c, d, e, or f, from G to c'. The 6 types produce six 'Cakras' which together form the sub-order (F) comprising 36 Rāgās, while the sub-order (F) sharp) contributes another 36 Rāgās, the total coming up to 72 Rāgās. This result which is obtained on purely mathematical lines is thus identical with Gōvinda's classification. The perfection claimed by Gōvinda for his system is therefore no empty boast; and in spite of occasional vitriolic attacks against it by the modern purists of South Indian music, the system is bound to form the starting point of any further improvement in the theory of South Indian music.

In the light of these facts it becomes all the more surprising that the career of this brilliant genius is shrouded in obscurity. We may safely assume that he was a contemporary of Tyāgarāja. We know that his genius was recognised and his theories accepted not only by Tyagaraja's disciples but also by the two most brilliant musicians of the next generation. His classification and nomenclature are now universally accepted. Had he belonged either to the Tanjore or the Trivandrum Schools, further evidence of his career would undoubtedly have been forthcoming. Ṣaḍkāla Gōvinda Mārār, whose greatness has been perpetuated by Tyāgarāja in one of his '*kīrtanams*' is the only other South Indian musician of note we come across in this epoch. He was a favourite of the Raja of Cochin, and anecdotes about his ubiquity and eccentricity are still found floating about the palaces in Tripunittura. It is quite possible that he is identical with 'Gōvinda' the greatest musical theorist that South India has ever produced.

TIRUKKURAL IN MALAYALAM.

[A 16th century Ms. containing the Tamil text and the
Malayalam translation].

Edited by L. V. RAMASWAMI AIYAR, M. A., B. L.

ഇൽ വാഴ്¹കൈ.

അത തന്റെ പത്നിയോടുള്ള ഇരിക്ക.

41. ഇൽ വാഴ്²വന്നെൻപാനിയൽപടയ³ മൂവക്കം നല്ലാറിനിൻ തുണെ—
ഗ്രഹത്തിൽ ധർമ്മമാചാരത്തോടുള്ള ഇരിക്കിൻറവന
ശ്രീമൂർത്തികൾപോലും തുണ.

42. തുറന്താക്കം⁴ തുവാതവക്കം ഇറന്താക്കം ഇൽവാഴ്⁵വാൻഎൻപാൻ
തുണെ —

തപോധന⁵ക്കും ഇല്ലാത്തവക്കും മരിച്ചവക്കും ഗ്രഹ[ത്രി]ത്ത
രക്ഷിച്ച ഇരിക്കിൻറവനേ തുണ.

43. തെൻപുലത്താൻ⁶ തൈവം⁷ വിരിഞ്ഞാക്കൽ⁸ താനെൻറാ⁹കൈപുല
ത്താറോംപാറലൈ¹⁰—

ചിതുകളേയും ദൈത്യത്തേയും വിരിനും ചുറ്റത്താരേയും
തന്നെയും രക്ഷിപ്പവനേ ധർമ്മവാൻ.

1. ഴ് is represented in the ms. as a conjunct ligature. The second constituent is represented in the ms. as ക്ക or ക; it is uniformly printed here as ക്ക.

2. ഇയൽപുടൈയ.

3. This is ശ്രീമൂർത്തികൾപോലും തുണ; and the whole is a wrong translation. The correct translation is that the virtuous householder is a support to the three other orders, viz. the ബ്രഹ്മചര്യം, the life of the വാനപ്രസ്ഥ, and സന്യാസ.

4. തുവാതവക്കം.

5. പരിമേലഴകർ explains തുറന്താക്കം as കളൈകണാവരാൽ തുറക്കപ്പട്ടാക്കം, while the older commentarian explains it as വരണത്തിനെയും നാമത്തിനെയും തുറന്താക്കം. The Malayalam rendering agrees with the latter.—ഇല്ലാത്തവക്കം stands for തുവാതവക്കം.

6. തെൻപുലത്താൻ 'He of the southern region' 'the Pitr'.

7. തെയ്യം is the Tam. form of തൈവം.

8. വിരിഞ്ഞാക്കൽ (വിതത്തു + കക്കൽ)

9. താൻ + എൻറു + ആങ്കു + എം + പുലത്തു + ആറു'.

10. കാമ്പൽ + തലൈ.

44. പഴിയഞ്ചി¹ൽ പാതു²ണ്മുടൈത്തായിൻ വാഴ്³കൈ വഴിയഞ്ചൽ യെ
ഞ്ചാൻറമിൽ—

പാപത്തെയഞ്ചി പകുത്തുണ്ട ഇഗ്രഹത്തിംകൾ പൂരിക്കിൻറ
വൻവാഴ്³കൈക്കു വഴിവില്ല.

45. അൻപുമാറുമുടൈത്തായിനിൽവാക്കൈ പൺപും പയനമതു—

അൻപും ധർമ്മവും പിഴയായതേ ഗ്രഹം വാഴുൻറവന
എല്ലാ ഫലവും തന്നാലേ ഉണ്ടാം.

46. അറത്താററിൻ ഇൽവാഴ്³കൈയാറി⁴ പുറത്താറിപ്പോയിപ്പുറവ
തെവൻ...

ധർമ്മം ചെയ്തിൽ തൻഗ്രഹത്തെടുക്കുകയല്ല; അത
ല്ലാതെ പുറമേ ചെയ്യാൽ ഫലമില്ല.

1. പഴിയഞ്ചിപ്പാതുണ്മുടൈത്തായിൻ (പഴി + അഞ്ചി + പാതു + ഉറുൻ + ഉ
ടൈത്തു + ആയിൻ).

2. പാതു² is derived from പകുത്തു².

3. വഴിയെഞ്ചൽ (വഴി + എഞ്ചൽ).

4. ഇൽവാഴ്³കൈ.

5. പരിമേലഴകർ explains അൻപു as തൻ തുണൈവിമേറ' ചെയ്ത
കം അൻപു, while മണക്കടവർ would explain it as യാവർമാട്ടം അൻപുചെയ്തൽ.—

6. ഇൽവാഴ്³കൈയാറി⁴ പുറത്താറി⁴ പോകയ് . . .

7. പോകയ്⁵പ്പുറവതു.— The അളവെടൈ is not shown anywhere in the
Tamil text as reproduced in this ms.

8. The translation പുറമേ ചെയ്യാൽ ഫലമില്ല conveys an idea which is
not in the original.

47. ഇയൽപിന്നാൻപാഴ്ക്കൈവാഴ് വ്വനെൻവാൻ മുയൽവാരുളെല്ലാൻ
 ലെ —

ആചാരനനിയോടുകൂടെ ഗ്രഹത്തെ പരിശീരിക്കിൻവാൻ
 തപസ്സുചെയ്തിൻവാൻകാലം മേൽ.

48. അററന്നൊഴക്കി യറനിഴക്കാവിൽവാഴ്ക്കൈ നോല്ലാരിനോമെയ്യ
 ടൈത്തു —

ഭൃ[8]ഖത്തെ നീക്കി ആചാരത്തോടുകൂടെ ഗ്രഹം വാഴിൻ
 വാൻ തപോതനരിലും ക്ഷമയുള്ളവൻ.

49 അറനിനപ്പെട്ടതേ ഇൽവാഴ്ക്കൈ തകളും പുറമ്പഴിപ്പതില്ലായിൻ
 നൻറ —

ഗ്രഹധർമ്മം രക്ഷിക്ക ധർമ്മമാവത; പുറത്തുള്ളവർ പഴി
 യാനേ ശുരിക്ക അതിലും നൻറ.

1. ഇയൽപിന്നാൻ.— പ and വ cannot be easily distinguished in the mss. In some instances the വ may have been due to the colloquial change of പ് to വ്.

2. വാഴ്വവൻ.

3 കാലം (for കായിലും) shows ല് which may have been current in the colloquials, since the form കാലം occurs several times in the Mal. renderings.

The proper translation would be "the foremost among the strivers."

4. നോറപാരിനോമെയ്യ (നോറപാരിൻ + നോമെയ്യ).

5. അറനെനപ്പെട്ടതേ (അറൻ + എൻ + പട്ടതേ).— ക്ഷമ in the translation brings out the force of നോമെയ്യ.— ഭുഖത്തെ നീക്കി in the Mal. rendering may be compared to പക്ഷി മുതലിയ ഇടയ്ക്കു നീക്കി of പരിമേലഴകർ.

6. അംംതം.—The Tam. ആയ്ക്കം is represented in this ms. either with ക as here or with the symbol for ആയ്ക്കം followed by ക. These methods of representing the ആയ്ക്കം appear to have been employed in east coast Tam. mss. also (see p. 13 of Dr. V. Swaminatha Iyer's Introduction to കറഞ്ഞാക്കൈ). The significance of these representations in the mss. for the history of the sound-value of the ആയ്ക്കം in comparatively late stages has already been adverted to by me.

7. ഇല്ലായിനൻറ (ഇൽ + ആയിൻ + നൻറ).

അംംതം is taken by പരിമേലഴകർ and the European translators as referring to ഇറവറം 'the virtue of renunciation'. മണക്കടവർ and the present Mal. rendering interpret അംംതം as referring to ഇൽവാഴ്ക്കൈ itself.

മണക്കടവർ explains പഴിക്കപ്പട്ടവതു as adverting to ഇഴികലത്താളാകിയ മന്നെയാളെ.

50. വൈയ്ക്കുതു വാഴ് വാഃകവാഴ് വവൻ² വാൻറെയും തെയ്ക്കുതു വൈ
ക്കുപ്പു⁴—

ഭൂമിംകൽ ധർമ്മം പിഴയായേ ഗ്രഹത്തിൽ പരീക്കിൻറവ
നെ ദേവകൾ [*പോല] സ്നേഹിക്കപ്പെട്ടു⁶
വാഴ് കെത്തുണൈ നലം.

51. മന്നൈത്തക്ക മാൺപുടൈയാളാകി തൻകൊണ്ടാൻ⁹ വളത്തക്കാൾ വാഴ്
ക്കെത്തുണൈ—

ഗ്രഹത്തിൽ കൃപയോടുകൂടെ ഇരിക്കിൻറവൾ തൻറെ
ഭർത്താവിനും മോക്ഷത്തിനും അവളേ തുണെ.

52. മന്നൈമാഴ്¹¹ച്ചി ഇല്ലാൾകണ്ണില്ലായിൽ¹² വാഴ്ക്കൈ യെന്നൈമാഴ്¹³ച്ചി
ത്തായിനമിൽ—

ഗ്രഹത്തിംകൽ ഇരിക്കിൻറവൾക്കു അൻപില്ലാത്താൽ
ബഹുവാഴ്വു ഉണ്ടാനാലും ഇല്ലാതതു ചരി.

1. വൈയ്ക്കുതു.

2. വാഴ് വവൻ.

3. വാൻറെയും.

4. വൈക്കുപ്പു.

5. The language of the Mal. renderings is, as in the present instance, syntactically faulty in several instances.

പരിമേലഴകർ says “ഇതനാൻ ഇനിലെയതുമുറൈപ്പെയൻ കൂറപ്പട്ടതു”. മണക്കടവർ has “ഉലകത്തിലേ തേവരൾ ഒരുവനാക മതിക്കുപ്പു”.— The Mal. rendering may be compared to the latter.

6. വാഴ് കെത്തുണൈ നലം.

7. മാൺപുടൈയാളാകി (മാൺപ് + ഉടൈയാൾ + ആകി).

8. തൻ കൊണ്ടാൻ (തൻ + കൊണ്ടാൻ).

9. തൻ കൊണ്ടാൻ വളത്തക്കാൾ “she who adjusts her expenses to the husband’s income.”

10. കൃപയോടുകൂടിയിരിക്കിൻറവൾ is not quite an adequate translation, since it refers only to one of those qualities which constitute മാൺപ.

മാൺപുടൈയാൾ is “she who is of excellent worth”.

11. മന്നൈമാഴ് ചി. — ഷ in consonant groups is represented (and evaluated) as ഴ; cf. മാഴ് ചിത്തായിനം below.

12. ഇല്ലായിൽ.

13. വാഴ് കൈ യെന്നൈമാഴ് ചിത്തായിനം.

53. ഇല്ലത്തെ ഇല്ലവരമാഴ്ചാ¹നാൽ ഉള്ളത്തെ ഇല്ലവരമാണാ²ക്കടയി -

കരുത്തനക്ക സ്ത്രീയാനവര അമ്പുള്ളവളാകിൽ അവര⁴ക്കു സദ്യ ഭാഗ്യവും ഉണ്ടാം; അതു [ഇ]ല്ലാളാകിൽ ഉള്ള[*തു] മില്ല.

54. പെണ്ണി⁵ൽപ്പെരുത്തക്ക യാവുള കൽപ്പെന്നും തിഞ്ഞെയുണ്ടാകപ്പെരിൻ -

കല്പിച്ചതിനു നില പിഴയായതേ തന്നെക്കാത്ത ഇരിക്കിൻറ ത പെണ്ണിനു അഴകു.

55. തൈ പ⁶തൊഴാൾ⁹ കൊഴുന്നെറൊഴുതെഴുവാൾ പെയുന്ന¹¹ പ്പെയും മഴയെ -

ഇ¹²നിക്കു ദൈവമാകിൻറത എൻറൊ ഭർത്താവ എൻറ നീനെവോടുളുടെ ഇരിക്കിൻറവാൾ മഴ പെയിൻറാൽ പെയും.

1. മാൺപാനാൽ.

2. ഇല്ലവൺമാണാക്കടൈ (ഇല്ലവൾ + മാണാക്കടൈ).

മാഴ്ച for മാൺച and കടയി for കടൈ are noteworthy.

3. ന് for ന്പ in അമ്പുള്ളവളാകിൽ

4. The word അൻപ does not fully bring out the idea of മാൺച. - Again, അവരക്കു സദ്യഭാഗ്യവുമുണ്ടാം wrongly restricts the prosperity to her. The correct rendering would be "what indeed could be lacking in a house where the wife has worth? And what indeed could be said to exist in a house where the wife lacks worth?"

5. പെണ്ണിൻ പെരുത്തക്ക.

6. കറ്പെന്നം (കറ്പ് + എന്നം). കറ്പ is 'chastity'.

7. The Mal. rendering കല്പിച്ചതിനു നിലപിഴയായതേ interprets കറ്പ as ധർമ്മം കല്പിച്ചത് 'the injunctions of Dharma'.

8. തെയ്യം.

9. തൊഴാത്താൾ.

10. കൊഴുന്നെറൊഴുതെഴുവാൾ (കൊഴുന്നൻ + തൊഴുത്ത് + എഴുവാൾ)

11. പെയുന്ന.

12. Note the colloquial form ഇനിക്കു.

56. തൻകാ¹ത്തു തൻകൊണ്ടാൻ²പേണി തകൈവാൻ³ മൊൽക്കാ⁴ത്തു ജ്യോർ
വിലാ⁵ല പെൺ -

തന്നെക്കാത്ത തൻഭത്താ⁶വെ പേണി നല്ലവാക്കോടുകൂടെ
അഴിവുകൂടാതെ ഇരിക്കിൻ⁷ത പെണ്ണ.

57. ചിരെ കാക്ക⁸ കാപ്പവൻ⁹ മെയ്യം മകളിൽ¹⁰നിരൈകാക്കം കാപ്പേ
തലൈ -

അവളെ അവനാൽ കാത്തുകൂടാ; അവൾ മന¹¹തുകാവലേ
കാവല.

58. പെററാൻ¹² പെറി പെറവർ¹³ പെണ്ടിർ പെരി¹⁴ംചിറപ്പു പത്തേളിർ
വാഴമുലക -

തൻ¹⁵റെ ഭത്താ¹⁶വെ രക്ഷിച്ച അഴിവുകൂടാതെ ഇരിക്കിൻ¹⁷
വൾക്ക¹⁸ സ്വ¹⁹ഗ്ഗത്തെ അനുഭവിക്കും.

1. തൻകാത്തു (തൻ + കാത്തു) തൻ കൊണ്ടാൻ പേണി (തൻ + കൊണ്ടാൻ + പേണി)

2. മൊൻകാത്തു (മൊൽ + കാത്തു).

3. കാപ്പവൻ മെയ്യം (കാപ്പ് + എവൻ + മെയ്യം)

4. മകളിൽ

5. മനതുകാവൽ brings out the idea of നിരൈകാക്കം കാപ്പ. — നിരെ is explained by പരിമേലഴകർ as നെഞ്ചെക്കുറുപ്പു നെറിയിൽ നിറത്തൽ.

6. പെററാൻ പെറി പെറവർ... (പെററാൻ + പെറിൻ + പെറവർ)

7. പെണ്ടിർ, the plural of പെണ്ട which appears in Middle Mal. texts as പെണ്ടി (cf. അടക്കമില്ലാപ്പെണ്ടി).

പെരുഞ്ചിറപ്പുത്തേളിർ വാഴമുലക (പെരുഞ്ചിറപ്പ് + പത്തേളിർ + വാഴം + ഉലക).

8 "If women gain husbands and cherish them, they will gain the gods' world full of glory."

9. Syntactical mistakes as in the construction.....ഇരിക്കിൻവൾക്ക സ്വഗ്ഗത്തെ അനുഭവിക്കും occur in many Mal. renderings. I must say that not all these are merely scribal.

59. പുകഴ് പൂരിന്തില്ലിലോർക്കിയെ യികഴ് വാർ മുൻനേറുപോൽ പീടുന്നടൈ-

സ്രീയോടുക്കൂടെ കീർത്തിയിനാൽ വാഴാതവയ്ക്കിയെ പെരുമ.

60. മംകലമെൻപ മന്നൈമാഴ്ച്ചി മററതൻനങ്കലൻ നൻമക്കൾപ്പേർ -

തലത്തേക്കു ആഭരണം നല്ലസ്രീ; അമ്പൾക്കു ആഭരണം നല്ല മക്കൾ.

പുതലൈരെ പെരുതൽ

അത നല്ല മക്കളെ പെരുൻറ ഫലം.

61. പെരുവറുൾ യാമറിച്ചതില്ലെ അറിവറിന്ത മക്കൾപ്പേരല്ല പിറ -

പെരുൻറവയ്ക്കു ഗുണമാകിൻറത നല്ല അറിവുള്ള മക്കളെ പെരുൻറത.

62. എഴുപിറപ്പും തീയവൈ തീങ്ങ പഴിചിറംകാപ്പുണ്പുടൈമക്കൾ പ്പറിൻ -

പഴിയില്ലാത നല്ല മക്കളെ പെരുൻറവയ്ക്കു എഴു ജനനത്തും പാപങ്ങൾ ഇല്ല.

1. പുകഴ് + പൂരിന്ത + ഇൽ + ഇല്ലോർക്കു + ഇല്ലെ. - ഇൽ (in ഇല്ലിലോർക്കു) stands for the 'lady of the house' 'wife'.

2. ഏറുപോൽ പീടുന്നടൈ is "the proud gait of a male lion". - This comparison is not in the Mal. translation "പെരുമ"

3. മന്നൈമാഴ്ച്ചി. - The Malayalam rendering is not literal.

4. മററതൻകാലനന്മക്കുട് പേർ (മറു + അതൻ + നങ്കലൻ + നൻമക്കൾ + പേർ)

5. പുതൽവരൈപ്പേരുതൽ.

6. മക്കൾപ്പേരല്ല പിറ.

7. മക്കൾ പെറിൻ.

63. തംപൊരുളെൻപർ തമ്മക്കുളവർ¹പൊരുടന്തംവിനെയാൽ വരും —

തൻറെറ മക്കൾ അവനു ചെയ്തിൻറ വിനകളേ അവനു
കൊണ്ടുവരും.

64. അമൃതിനമാററവിനിതേ തമ്മക്കൾ ചെറുകൈ[*യ]ളാവിയ കൂൾ —

തൻറെറ മക്കൾക്കെയ്യാൽ കളിച്ച ഉണ്ണിൻറ ചോറ അത
അമൃതിനെക്കാട്ടിൽ രസമുണ്ടു.

1. അവർപൊരുൾ തന്തം വിനെയാൻ (തം + തം + വിനെയാൻ).

2. The general spirit of the interpretation of Tamil commentarians is that the wealth of men is their children in as much as these latter perform acts of piety which enure to the benefit of their parents.

The Malayalam rendering is, though a summary one, in keeping with the general tenor of the Tamil commentaries.

In the interpretation of തന്തംവിനെയാൻ, the earlier commentarian മണക്കുടവർ differs from പരിമേലഴകർ. The former takes it to mean തന്തം വിനെയോടെ "along with the fruits of their own actions," while പരിമേലഴകർ would connect it with the acts of the children തന്നെ നോക്കി അവർ ചെയ്ത നൽവിനെയാനേ.

Beschi gives a novel interpretation. "Wise men call their children their "fruits" because the disposition of the children depends upon the actions of their parents" [Sapientes suos filios suos fructus vocabunt, quia eorum qualitas ex ipsorum, nempe parentum, operibus pendet.]

3. അമിഴ് തിന്നം

4. ചെറുകൈയളാവിയകൂഴ് (ചെറുകൈ + അളാവിയ + കൂഴ്).

65. മക്കൾ¹മെയ്തീണ്ടലടൽക്കിൻപം മറവർ ചൊൽക്കേട്ടൽ ഇംപം
ചെവിക്ക--

കരുത്തന ദേഹത്തിന ഇമ്പമാകിൻറ[*ത] തൻറെ മക്കളെ³
തഴുകിൻറ[*ത]; അവരുടെ വാക്കു കേൾക്ക ചെവിക്ക ഇമ്പം.⁴

66. കഴലിനിതു യാഴിനിതെൻപർ തമ്മക്കൾമഴലൈച്ചൊൽക്കേട്ടതാ⁵
വർ --

കഴലിൻറെ സൂര്യം വീണുടെ സ്വരവും നൻറെ⁶
തൻറെ മക്കളുടെ മഴലവാക്കു കേളാത്തവർ.

67. തന്നെ മകെക്കാറുനൻറി യവയതു മുന്തിയിരിപ്പച്ചെയൽ --

അച്ചൻ മകന ചെയ്യിൻ നന്മെയാകിൻറത കുറവർ
സഭയിൻകൽ ഇരിക്ക മുമ്പനാക്കുക.

1. മക്കൾമെയ്തീണ്ടലടൽക്കിൻപം (മക്കൾ + മെയ് + തീണ്ടൽ + ഉടൽ + ക് + ഇൻപം).--The practice of representing *ey* as *ai* was frequent in old mss. Perhaps it represents a dialectal pronunciation. Cf. ഐയം for എയ്യം, ചൈയ for ചെയ്യം, etc. in this ms.

2. ചൊൽക്കേട്ടൽ.

3. The Mal. rendering agrees with പരിമേലഴകർ who interprets മക്കൾമെയ്തീണ്ടൽ as മക്കളതു മെന്മൈത്തീണ്ടൽ.-- The older commentarian has തമ്മക്കൾ തമ്മടമ്പിന്നൈച്ചാർതൽ.

4. Note how ഇൻപം is represented also as ഇംപം and ഇമ്പം.-- Colloquial varieties which involve the assimilation of the alveolar nasal to a bilabial exist even today.

5. മഴലൈച്ചൊൽക്കേളാത്തവർ.

6. എന്തർ is the Old Mal. form corresponding to Tam. എൻപർ.

7. മകൻ കാറു നൻറി. (മകൻക + ആറും + നൻറി)

68. തമ്മിത്തമ്മക്കളരിവുടൈമൈ മാനിലത്തു മന്നയിർക്കല്ലാമിനിതു -

തന്നെക്കാൽ തൻറെ മകനത്രേ അറിവുള്ളവനാകിൽ അ
വനെ എല്ലാവൊക്കും പ്രിയ[ം]ഉണ്ട.

69. ഹരൻപൊഴുതിൻപെരിതുവക്കം തന്മകനെച്ചാൻറാനെന്നക്കേട്ട

തായി -

തായെക്കു പിറന്ന നേരത്തേ സന്തോഷത്തിലും അതികം
ഉണ്ടാം കുൽവി ഉള്ളോർ നൻറ എൻറപറെഞ്ഞ കൾക്കുൻറത.

70. മകൻറതെക്കാറുമുതവി യിവൻറനൈയെന്നോറാൻകൊല്ലനും
ചൊൽ -

മകൻറെ അറിയും വിദ്യയും കണ്ടു നല്ല ജനങ്ങൾ ഇവൻ
ഇങ്ങനേ വരുവാൻ ഇവൻറെ അച്ഛൻ എന്തൊരു തപസ്സു
ചെയ്യാന [* എൻറ ചൊൽവർ]

1. തമ്മിത്തമ്മക്കളരിവുടൈമൈ (തമ്മിൻ + തം + മക്കൾ + അറിവുടൈമൈ)

2. The form തമ്മിൻ (=തമ്മൈക്കാട്ടിൽ) is regarded by both the indigenous commentarians പരിമേലഴകർ and മണക്കുടവർ as governing ഇനിതു; and they would interpret the couplet as meaning "the people of the world would feel greater pleasure than the parents when their children are wise".

Beschi and Pope would regard തമ്മിൻ as governing അറിവുടൈമൈ, and interpret the couplet as signifying "all people will be pleased if their sons are wiser than themselves". Beschi has "Omnibus hominibus in hac vasta terra existentibus, dulce est habere filios, qui se sapientiores sint". Pope gives a similar interpretation — The Mal. rendering here makes തമ്മിൻ govern അറിവുടൈമൈ.

കാൽ again.— see supra.

3. ഇഴൻറപൊഴുതിൻ പെരിതുവക്കം (ഇഴൻറ + പൊഴുതിൻ + പെരിതു + ഉവക്കം)

4. തായ്.— Final consonantal യ് is represented in the ms. usually as യി.

5. മകൻറനൈക്കാറുമുതവി (മകൻ + തന്നൈക്കു + ആറും + ഉതവി).

6. കൊല്ലനും (കൊൽ + എനും)

അമ്പുടമൈ,
സ്റ്റേഹമുളു...

71. അൻപുക്കുണ്ടോവടൈക്കന്താഴ് ആർവലർ പുൻകണീർ പൂചതരം ..
അൻപുളുവക് അടക്കിയാലും നില്ലാ; അൻപിനാലേ ആ
നന്ദാശ്രുക്കൾ കാട്ടും.

72. അൻപിലാറെല്ലാം തമക്കരിയർ അൻപുടയർ യെമ്പുമരിയർ പിറക് -
അമ്പിലാതവർ തനിക്ക് നൻറ; അൻപുളുവർ തനിക്കും
മറുളുവകും നൻറ.

73. അൻപോടിയെന്തവഴക്കെൻപതാ⁷യിർക്കൻപോടിയെന്ത⁸തൂട—
അൻപിനോടുകൂടെ ഇരിക്കിൻറതേ ഉയിർക്കു നല്ല; അത
ല്ലാത ദേഹം എല്ലാ തോലും.

74. അൻപിനമാരുവമുടൈമൈ യതുവീനും നണ്ണനും നാടാച്ചിറപ്പു -
അൻപു സ്റ്റേഹത്തെ കൊടുക്കും; സ്റ്റേഹം അളവില്ലാ¹²തെ വാഴ്[*വു]
കൊടുക്കും.

1. അൻപുടൈമൈ. - The marginal note has അൻപുടൈമൈ.

2. അൻപിറുകും.

3. പൂചതരം (പൂചൽ + തരം).

4. ആനന്ദാശ്രുക്കൾ in the Mal. translation here is hardly justified. പരി
മേലഴകർ explains പുൻകണീർ as തുൻപത്തിനാലുണ്ടാകും പുൻകണീർ; - Pope's
translation 'tiny tear-drop' for പുൻകണീർ is unsatisfactory.

5. അൻപുടൈയർ.

6. എൻപുമരിയർ (എൻപും + ഉരിയർ) - The use of the colloquial on-glide
is noteworthy.

7. എൻപവാരുയിർക്ക (. . . എൻപ + ആരുയിർക്ക' . . .)

8 തൊടർപ്പു.

9. The Mal. translation is a summary one. -മണക്കടവർ refers to മുറു
ചിറപ്പു and ഇപ്പിറപ്പു in his explanation.

10. ആർവമുടൈമൈ (ആർവം + ഉടൈമൈ)

11. നൻപെനും.

12. അളവില്ലാതെ stands for അളവില്ലാത; the a of the relative participle
has changed to a frontalized sound here.

75. അൻപുറമാന്തർവഴക്കെൻപ വൈയകത്തിൻപുറാരയിതും ചിറപ്പു-
 അൻപിനെ വഴക്കം ചെയ്യിരിക്കിൻറവട്ക് ഭൂമീംകലേയ്ക്കും
 സ്വഗ്ഗത്തിംകലേക്കും നല്ലെൻ.

76. അറത്തുകേ യൻപുമാർപെൻപ യറിയാർ മറത്തിക്കമകതേ തുണൈ...
 ധർമ്മത്തിനും വലിമെക്കും അൻപേ തുണ.

77. എൻപിലതന്നെ വെയിൽപ്പോല കായിമയൻപിലതന്നെ യറം...
 എല്ലില്ലാതെ ദേഹം വെയിലിൽ ക്കരിഞ്ഞത പോലെ അൻ
 പില്ലാതെ ദേഹത്തെ ധർമ്മം ചൂടും.

78. അൻപകത്തില്ലാവു⁸യിർവാഴ്ക്കെ വൻപാർക്കൺ വറന്തരം തളിത്തറു-
 അൻപില്ലാതേ വാഴുൻറ ദേഹം നിലയിൽ ഉണങ്ങിയ മരം
 തളിത്തരിന്ന സമം.

1. അൻപുറമാന്ത (അൻപു + ഉറ + അമാന്ത).

2 വൈയകത്തിൻപുറാരയ്ക്കും ചിറപ്പു (വൈയകത്തു + ഇൻപു + ഉറാർ + എയ്ക്കും + ചിറപ്പു) -- Here again, മണക്കടവർ would refer to മുൻചിറപ്പു and ഇപ്പിറപ്പു.

3. This Mal. sentence is wrongly constructed.

4. അറത്തിറുകേ.

5. അറത്തേ.

6. The Mal. rendering does not bring out the idea of മറത്തിറുകമറത്തേ തുണൈ; but വലിമെക്കും perhaps refers to the effect of മറത്തെ നീക്കൽ.

7. വെയിൽപോലക്കായ്മേ.

8. ഉയിർവാഴ്ക്കെ.

9. Another reading is വൻപാർക്കൺ 'barren soil', 'siccæ terra' (Beschi) -- മണക്കടവർ has വൻപാർ, and explains it as വലിയപാരിടത്തു.

10. നിലയിൽ conveys the idea of വൻപാർ.

79. പുറത്തു¹റപ്പുലാമവൻചെയ്യും യാക്കൈയകത്തുറപ്പൻ²റിപ്പ്വർക്ക. —
അകത്തമ്പി³ല്ലാതവകു പുറത്തേസൗന്ദര്യംകൊണ്ടു കണ
ക്കില്ല.

80. അൻപിൻവഴിയതുയിർനിലൈ യകുതി²ല്ലാക്കുൻപുതോൽപോത്തു
S. ൨൧ -

അൻപിനോടുകൂടെ ഉള്ളതേ ഉയിരുള്ളദേഹം; അല്ലാത ദേ
ഹം എല്ലുപൊതിഞ്ഞ ഉയിരില്ലാതദേഹം.

വിരുത്തു³പൽ.

വിരുന്ന കൊടു...

81. ഇരുന്നോംപി ഇൽവാഴ്വതെല്ലാം വിരുന്നോംപിവേളാ⁴ഞ്ചൈ ചൈതൽ
പൊരുട്ട. -

തൻററഗ്രഹത്തിലിരിക്കുന്ന പൊരുളെ രക്ഷിച്ചു വിരുന്ന സം
ശയോതേ കൊടുത്ത വാഴുക.

82. വിരുതു പുറത്താ താനുണ്ടു⁵ൽ ചുവാമരുന്തനിനും വേണ്ടൽപാ
റൻറ. -

തന്നടുത്തുവന്ന വിരുന്നേ പുറത്തിരിക്കെ താനുണ്ണുൻറത അ
മൃതാനാകിലും വിഷം.

1. പുറത്തുറപ്പ is explained by പരിമേലഴകർ as advantages arising from external circumstances like 'time', 'place', 'servants', 'wealth', etc - Pope following Beschi interprets it as 'members of the body'.

പരിമേലഴകർ refers also to this alternative interpretation. The Mal. rendering adverts to പുറത്തേ സൗന്ദര്യം.

2. അറുതു.

3. വിരുത്തോമ്പൽ (വിരുത്തു + കാമ്പൽ) The correct heading is given in the marginal note.

4. The translation is not a literal one; while the original is the statement of a truth, the Mal. rendering assumes the form of a direction.

5. പുറത്താത്താനുണ്ടൽ: - the geminated അൻ should be used.

6. ചാവാമരുന്തനിനും (ചാവാമരുതു + എനിനും). ച should not be gemi-
nated - The present translation follows പരിമേലഴകർ in interpreting ചാവാമ
രുതു as അമൃതം. മണക്കടവർ has ചാവാമൈക്കണ്ണമരുന്തായിനും.

7. അമൃതം ആകിലും.

83. വരുവിരുതുവൈകല്യമോപവാ¹വം²ക്കൈ പ്പുരുവു ചാഴ്വടുത
ലിൻറു—

തന്നെ നോക്കി വരുൻറ വിരുന്നെ നിത്യവും കൊടുക്കിൻ
റവന്നു ദുഃഖം വരികയില്ല.

84. അകനമർതു ചെയാളറെയും മുകനമർതു നൽവിരുത്തോപവാ⁴നിൽ—

സന്തോഷത്തോടുകൂടെ വിരുന്നെ കൊടുക്കിൽ അമ്പൻ ഗ്രഹ
ത്തിൽ ലക്ഷ്മീകടാക്ഷം ഉണ്ടാം.

85. വിതു⁵മിടവേണ്ടും കൊല്ലോ വിരുത്തോചി മിച്ചിൽമിമൈവാൻചുലം—

ഗ്രഹത്തിലിരുന്നു വിരുന്നെ കുറയാതെ വിളിച്ചു കൊടു
ക്കിൻറവന്ന തപസ്സിന്നു വിത്ത്⁶ വേർവേണ്ടോ.

86. ചെൽവിരുത്തോചി വരുവിരുതുപാത്തിരിപ്പാൻ നൽവിരുതു വാന
ത്തവകു—

ചെന്ന വിരിന്നിനെകൊടുത്ത വരിൻറചിരിന്നിനെ നോ
ക്കിയിരിക്കിൻറവനെ ദേവകൾ തങ്ങൾക്കു വിരിന്നാകെ നോ
ക്കി ഇരിപ്പർ.

1. കന്യവംശം.

2. പരുവതു.

3. ...ഉറൈയു മുകനമർതു - According to Tam. literary sandhi - മ്
before മ് - is elided.

4. ചെയാൾ is Lakshmi.

5. വിതു⁵മിടൽവേണ്ടുകൊല്ലോ (വിതു + ഇടൽവേണ്ടും + കൊല്ലോ).

6. The Mal. rendering, through the phrase തപസ്സിന്നു വിതുവേറവേണ്ടോ,
emphasizes a figurative meaning.- പരിമേലഴകർ and മണക്കടവർ refer to the
literal meanings. Pope also translates literally:

“Who first regales his guest, and then himself supplies,
O'er all his fields, unsown, shall plenteous harvests rise.”

7 വിരുന്നായിക്കരുതി.

87. ഇന്നെത്തുണൈത്തൈന്പാതാൻറിയൈ വിരുത്തിൻ തുണൈ¹ തുണൈ
വേരവിപ്പയൻ—

വിരുന്നിന സമം ചൊല്ലുവാനില്ല; ചൊല്ലുകിൽ യാഗം
ത്തിൻ ഫലമേ സമം ചൊല്ലാ²ർ.

88. പരിന്തോംപി പറ്റററേമെൻപർ വിരുന്തോംപി വേഴ്³ വി തലൈ
പ്പെടാതാർ—

വിരുന്ന കൊടുത്ത യാഗത്തിൻഫലം കിട്ടാതെവെർ എല്ലാ
പ്പെന്തളം കാത്ത കൊടാതേ കൊട്ടാ⁴ർ.

89. ഉടമയ്യളിന്തെവിരുന്തോംപൽകാംപാമടമൈ മടവാർകണ്ണനു—
അറിയുച്ചവർ ഉള്ളതിനെക്കൊണ്ടു വിരുന്ന കൊടുപ്പർ; അറി
വില്ലാത്തവർ ഉണ്ടെങ്കിലും കൊടുക്കു ചുല്ല.

90. മോപ്പക്കഴയുമനിച്ചും മുക്കുന്തിരിനോക്കക്കഴയു വിരുത്തു

വിരുന്നവന്നവൻ സന്തോഷത്തോടു കൂടെ നോക്കാത്താൽ
ദുഃഖം പെരികെ ഉണ്ടാം.

ഇനിയവൈ കൂതാൽ.

മനസ്സിൽ സന്തോഷം വരുമാറ രസവാക്യം പറക.

1. വിരുത്തിൻറുണൈത്തുണൈ (വിരുത്തിൻ + തുണൈ + തുണൈ.)

2. വേരവി in the original refers to വിരുന്തോമ്പൽ which is regarded as one of the five great offerings, according to പാരിമേലഴകർ, മണക്കടവർ, Beschi and Pope.

The Mal. translation is inadequate and imperfect since it says, "the effect of hospitality is immeasurable; it is equal to that of a യാഗ or offering to the gods".

3. പരിന്തോമ്പിപ്പറ്റററേമെൻപർ (പരിന്ത് + കാമ്പി + പറ്റ + അറേ + എൻപർ). Note the ൾ ending in this ms. —

4. വേരവി തലൈപ്പെടാതാർ. — ൾ is very often used for റ and for other retroflex sounds in this ms. Cf. കേഴ്⁵മൈ, നഴ്⁶പ below.

5. The past finite കെട്ടാർ (instead of the future കെട്ടുപോവർ) is used for denoting 'certainty'.

6. ഉടൈമൈയുര.

7. മോപ്പക്കഴയുമനിച്ചും (മോപ്പ + കഴെയും + അനിച്ചും)

8. നോക്കക്കഴെയും — The idea in the first portion of the couplet is that the അനിച്ച flower would fade even as you inhale its fragrance — The contrast implied between the അനിച്ച flower which fades away only when its fragrance is inhaled, and the guests whose hearts will become sore even when a cold welcome is given to them is not brought out in the Mal. rendering.

9. നോക്ക is taken by പരിമേലഴകർ as വിരുത്തിൻ നോക്ക while മണക്കടവർ and the Mal. translation have വിരുത്തിനരെ നോക്ക.

91. ഇൻചൊല്ലാലീരിൽമളൈയി പടിറിലവാം ചൊപൊന്മാർ കണ്ടാർ വായിച്ചൊൽ—

അൻപോട്ടു വഞ്ചന ഇല്ലാതെ ധർമ്മത്തെ അറിഞ്ഞവർ ചൊല്ലുകളേ നല്ല ചൊല്ലു.

92. അകനമർന്തിതലിൻ നന്ദൻ മകനമർന്തിഞ്ചൊലനാകപ്പെരിൻ.—
അകം തെളിഞ്ഞ വളരെക്കാട്ടുകയേിലും മുഖം തെളിഞ്ഞു നല്ലവചനങ്ങൾ ചൊല്ലുക നന്ദൻ.

93. മകത്താന[*മർ]ത്തിനിയുടനാക്കി യകത്താനാമിഞ്ചൊല്ലിനകതേ യറം.

അകത്തേ സന്തോഷത്തോടും [മുഖപ്രസാദത്തോടും] കൂടെ ചൊല്ലിൻതേ ധർമ്മം.

1. ഇൻചൊല്ലാലീരിമളൈഇ പടിറിലവാം (ഇൻചൊൽ + ആൽ + ഇരം + അളൈഇ + പടിറ' + ഇലവാം . . .)

. വായ്ച്ചൊൽ.

3. പരിമേലഴകർ regards the couplet as the definition of the nature of ഇൻചൊൽ, and considers ആൽ as അചൈനിലൈ.— മണക്കടവർ construes the couplet in a different way taking പടിറിലവാം as the predicate, and interprets ഇൻചൊല്ലാൽ as “since such words are pleasant words”.— പരിമേലഴകർ is of the view that this couplet gives the ഇലക്കണം for ഇൻചൊൽ, while മണക്കടവർ observes “ഇത്ര ഒരുവനെ കടിഞ്ഞുചൊല്ലവേണ്ടമിടത്തും ഇൻചൊല്ലാലേ കടിയവേണ്ടമെൻതു”

പരിമേലഴകർ interprets പടിറു as വഞ്ചനൈ, ഇരം as അൻപു and ചൊപൊന്മാർ as അറഞ്ഞെ ഉണർന്മാർ. മണക്കടവർ gives other meanings.

The Mal. rendering agrees with that of പരിമേലഴകർ.—The expressions “അൻപു” “വഞ്ചന” “ധർമ്മത്തെ അറിഞ്ഞവർ” used in the Mal. rendering correspond to പരിമേലഴകർ's commentary.

4. ഇതലിനന്ദൻ.

5. ഇൻചൊലൻ.— The spelling ച്ച in the ms. is due to the influence of Mal. സചി.

6. മകത്താനമർതു (മകത്താൻ + അമർതു)

7. അകത്താൻ + ആം + ഇൻ + ചൊലിൻ + അറ്റത്തേ + അറം — The ആറ്റം does not exist in the Tam. editions.

8. പരിമേലഴകർ takes അറം as the subject and ഇൻചൊലിനതു (=ഇനിയ ചൊറുകളെച്ചൊല്ലതലിൻകണ്ണതേ) as the predicate.

മണക്കടവർ takes the whole portion ending with ഇൻചൊലിൻ as a subordinate clause of condition, and അതേയറം (=അതുതാനേയറമാകം) as the principal clause.

94. ഇൻപുരും തുവാമൈ ഇല്ലാകം യാർമാട്ടും ഇൻപുരും³മിരുഞ്ചാലവക -
എല്ലാരോടും നല്ലവചനത്തെ പറയിൻറവർക്കു ദുഃഖമില്ല.
95. പണിവുടൈയൻ ഇൻചൊല്ലുനാ⁵തെൽകുവർക്കു⁶ഞ്ഞി അല്ല മറുപ്പിറ—
എല്ലാരോടും താഴ്ച്ചെയും നല്ലവാക്കു പറയുകയും അത
കരുത്തു ആഭരണം.
96. അല്ലവൈ തേയ അറംപെരുകു⁷ [ന]ല്ലവൈനാടിയിനിയ ചൊലിൻ.—
നല്ലതെ നിരൂപിച്ച രസമായ വാക്കിനെ ചൊല്ലുകിൽ
പാപം തേയ ധർമ്മം വളരും.
97. നയനീൻറ നൻറി പയക്കം പയനീൻറ പണ്ണിററല്ലെപ്പിരിയാച്ചൊൽ—
പയം⁸ കെടാമെൽ ആചാരത്തെ പറയിൻറവർക്കു നയ
നേതാടും കൂടെ ധർമ്മത്തെ കൊടുക്കും.⁹

മണക്കുടവർ's construction is open to two objections viz., that ഇൻ ചൊലിൻ cannot be taken as a conditional verb-form, and further that അതേ is a form that does not occur as such in കറൾ (the actual forms being അതുവേ or അം⁰തേ.)

The Mal rendering appears to be in agreement with പരിമേലഴകർ's interpretation:

1. ഇൻപുരും (ഇൻപു + ഉരും)
2. തുവാമൈ.
3. ഇൻപുരുംമിൻചൊലവക (ഇൻപു + ഉരും + ഇൻചൊലവക)
4. പണിവുടൈയൻ.
5. ആതൽ.
6. കുവർകുനി (കുവൻ + ക' + അനി) — This is one of the rare instances where \bar{o} is shown in this ms. to represent the Tam. alveolar stop \bar{o} .
7. അറം + പെരുകും + നല്ലവൈ.....
8. പയം is the tadbhava of ഫലം, corresponding to Tam. പയൻ.
9. The translation, short and condensed as it is, more or less agrees with the interpretation of പരിമേലഴകർ.

മണക്കുടവർ takes പയനീൻറ as modifying പയക്കം; while പരിമേലഴകർ would take it as modifying തല്ലെപ്പിരിയാ

പരിമേലഴകർ explains നയൻ as ഇതൈക്കുനീതി, while മണക്കുടവർ would interpret it as ചൊരുൾ.

നൻറി is interpreted by മണക്കുടവർ as അറം, while പരിമേലഴകർ has മറുമൈക്കു അറം, in contradistinction with നയൻ (=ഇതൈക്കു നീതി.)

98. ചെറുമയ്യ¹ൻ നീംകിയയിൻചൊൽ മറുമയ്യ²മി[ഞ്ഞെയും ഇ]ൻപം തരം. —

പെരുമയ്യോടുള്ള രസമാന ചെവാക്കു പറകിൽ അവ
ന ഇജന്മവും പുനജ്ജന്മവും നല്ലത.

99. ഇഞ്ചോലിനിതിൻറൽ കാണുവാൻ യീവൻകൊലോ വൻചൊൽ വഴം
കവതു —

തനിക്കു രസമായി ഇരിക്കിൻറ ചൊല്ലു കുരുഞ്ഞൻ ചൊല്ലും
പോൾ ഉണ്ടായ സന്തോഷംപോലെ താനും ചൊല്ലുവതേ ഞ്റൻറ

100. ഇനിയവളവാക യിന്നാത കൂറൽ കനിയിരുപ്പുകായ്കവൻത്തറ. —

പട്ടാങ്ങ³യിരിക്കെ പൊളിപറയിൻറാത നല്ല പഴമിരിക്കെ
കട്ട പച്ച തിൻറതിന്ന സമം.

1. ചിറുമൈയുണികിയ

2. ഇൻചൊൽ മറുമൈയുമിഞ്ഞെയുമിൻപം തരം (ഇൻ + ചൊൽ + മറുമൈയം
+ ഇഞ്ഞെയും + ഇൻപം + തരം.)

പരിമേലുകർ explains ചിറുമൈയുണികിയ as നോയ് ചെയ്യാത.

3. The Mal. rendering പെരുമയ്യോടുള്ള brings out the idea of “what is
away from, or devoid of, meanness or pettiness.”

ഇൻചൊൽ is well rendered in Mal. as രസമാന ചെവാക്കു.

4. ഇൻചൊൽ.

5. എവൻ കൊലോ. — The introduction of the on-glide after a consonant
preceding is colloquial.

6. The Mal. version gives the substance of the couplet instead of
literally translating വൻചൊൽ വഴുവതെവൻ കൊലോ “Why indeed should
be make use of harsh words?”

7. The Mal. translation പട്ടാങ്ങയിരിക്കെ പൊളിപറയിൻറാത is wrong.
The idea is that to use unpleasant words when pleasant words are so easily
available is like choosing unripe fruits when ripe ones are to be had.

8. The use of പട്ടാങ്ങ with final -a (in the form പട്ടാങ്ങയിരിക്കെ) is
noteworthy.

ചെയ്യ നൻറി അറിതൽ

തനിക്കു ചെയ്യ ഉപകാരം മറവാതേ.

101. ചെയ്യാമൈച്ചെതവുതവിക വയ്കവും വാനകുമാരലരിതു -
താൻ ചെയ്യാമേ ചെയ്യ ഉപകാരങ്ങൾ മണ്ണും വീണ്ണും
കൊടുത്താലും കൂട്ടാ.

102. കാലത്തിനാൽ⁴ചെയ്ത നൻറി ചിരിതെന്നിനും⁵ ഞാലത്തിനാണപ്പെരിതു -
ഒരു നന്തൻറെ ആവശ്യം അറിഞ്ഞ ചെയ്യ ഉപകാരം ചെറു
താകിലും ഭൂമിയിലും പെരുത.

103. പയൻറുക്കാ⁶ച്ചെതവുതവിനയൻറുക്കിൻ നന്തെ കടലിൽ⁷പ്പെരിതു -
ഒരുത്തന ഇത ചെയ്യാൽ ഇന്നത ചെയ്യും എൻറ നിരൂ
പിയാതേ ചെയ്യിൻറ ഉപകാരം കടലിലും പെരുത.

104 തിന്നെത്തുണൈ നൻറി ചൈ⁸നും പന്നെത്തുണൈയായി കൊൾവർ
പയൻററിവർ -

നല്ലവന തിന്നമണിയളവും ഉപകാരം ചെയ്യാൽ പന്നെ
അളവും വലുതായിക്കൊള്ളും.

1. The marginal heading appears as ചെന്നൻറി. The symbol ന is the long dental nasal lengthened here after യ് of a monosyllabic base preceding.

2. ചെയ്യാമൈച്ചെതവുതവിക (ചെയ്യാമൈ + ചെയ്ത + ഉതവിക.)

പരിമേലഴകർ has ചെയ്യാമറ് ചെയ്ത. മണക്കടവർ adopts the reading ചെയ്യാതാർ ചെയ്ത, but the meaning is the same as that of പരിമേലഴകർ.

The Mal. rendering appears to be in agreement with the interpretation of the Tam commentarians, though the reading is ചെയ്യാമൈ in the original as given in this ms.

പരിമേലഴകർ mentions the reading: ചെയ്യാമൈച്ചെതവി, and gives it the meaning "മറിത്തു ഉതവമാട്ടാമൈയുള്ള ഇടത്തുച്ചെയ്ത ഉതവി."

3. വൈയകും.

4. കാലത്തിനാറ് ചെയ്ത.

5. എനിനു ഞാലത്തിൻ . . .

6. പയൻറുക്കാർ (പയൻ + തുക്കാർ) ചെയ്ത വുതവി നയൻറുക്കിനന്തെക്കടലി
റു (നയൻ + തുക്കിൻ + നന്തെ.)

7. കടലിറ്റ് പെരിതു.

8. ചെയിനും.

9. പന്നെത്തുണൈയാക്കൊൾവർ.

105 ഉതവിവരൈത്തൻറുതവി ഉതവിചെയ്പ്പട്ടാർചാറുവിൻവരത്തു —
ഉപകാരം മുൻപിൽ ചെയ്യീൻപതിന്ന [നമ്പ] അളവീല്ല
നൻമൈക്ക.

106. മറവൾക്കു മാചറാർകേഴ്ചൈ തുറവൾക്കു തമ്പത്തുപ്പായാർ
നടപ്പു —

നല്ലചരടെ സ്നേഹത്തെ അവർക്കു ദുഃഖംവന്നാലും മറവായ്ക്കു.

107. എഴുമയഴുപിറപ്പമുള്ളവർ തംകൾ വിഴുതും തുടൈത്തവർ നർപ്പു.—
തൻറൊ ദുഃഖം നീക്കിൻറവരടെ സ്നേഹത്തെ എഴുഴു പിറ
പ്പിലും നല്ലവർ നിന്റൊപ്പർ.

108. നൻറി മറപ്പതു നൻറൻറു നൻറല്ലാത[ത്വന്റേറ മറപ്പതു നൻറ —
നല്ലത ചൈതതിനെ മറവായികു; ദോഷം ചെയ്യുത അല്ലൊ
ഴേ മറക്ക.

1. ഉതവിവരൈത്തൻറുതവി (ഉതവിവരൈത്തു' + അൻറു' + ഉതവി.)

2. ചാൽപിൻവരൈത്തു.

3. The construction of the Mal. sentence is confused; the meaning is not made clear.

പരിമേലഴകർ gives a very clear interpretation of ഉതവിവരൈത്തൻറു:—
കാരണത്താനും പൊരുളാനും കാലത്താനും ആകിയ മുവകൈയാനും മുൻചെയ്ത ഉതവി
യളവിറൻറു.

4. മറവൾക്ക.

5. മാചറാർ കേഴ്ചൈ.

6. തുറവൾക്ക.

7. തമ്പത്തുപ്പായാർ നടപ്പു (തമ്പത്തു + തുപ്പായാർ + നടപ്പു.)

8. The phrase അവർക്കു ദുഃഖം വന്നാലും in the Mal. translation is a mistake.

The Mal. translation ignores the second portion of the couplet which signifies "Never give up the friendship of those who were friends in need."

പരിമേലഴകർ observes in his commentary: "ഇടൈക്കു ഉറതി കൂറുവാർ മറമൈക്കു ഉറതി ഉടൻ കൂറിനാർ." മണക്കുടവർ's explanation does not suggest any such inference.

Pope's translation of കേഴ്ചൈ into "kindness" is not adequate.

9. എഴുമയെഴുപിറപ്പിലും (എഴുമൈ + എഴു + പിറപ്പിലും.)

10. വിഴുതം is തുൻപം; Pope suggests വിഴുതം + അം 'the tears that fall.'

11. നടപ്പു.

109. കൊൻറന്ന ഇന്നാ ചെയിനും¹ അവർ ചെയത ഒൻറ നൻറുള്ളക്കടും.—
ഒരുവെൻ ഗുണവും ദോഷവും ചെയ്യാൽ ഗുണത്തെ നിരൂപിക്കു; ദോഷമില്ലാതേ പോം.

110. എന്നൻറി കൊൻറാക്കും ഉയീവുണ്ടാം³ ഉയീവില്ലെല്ലെ ചെയ്നൻറി കൊൻറ മകറും⁶.—

ധർമ്മമില്ലാതേ ആക്കിൻറവക്കും പാപം നീങ്ങിയാലും ഒരുവൻ ചെയ്ത നല്ലതിനെ മറന്നവക്കു ഒരു കാലവും പാപം നീങ്ങ.

നടുവുനിലമൈ
ഇത നടുവാജാരം

111. തകുതിയെന്ന ഒൻറ നൻറ പകുതിയാൽപ്പാൽപ്പെട്ടുകഴുകവെറിൻ —

നടുവായി നിക്കിൻറ നിലകൾ നൻറ; അതല്ലാതേ നില്ക്കിൻറ[*ത] ആകാ.

1. ഇന്നാ ചെയിനും.

2. അവർ ചെയ്ത.

3. ഉയീവുണ്ടാം (ഉയീവ് + ഉണ്ടാം.)

4. ഉയീവില്ലെല്ലെ.

5. ചെയ്നൻറി.

6. മകറും (മകൻ + ക).

7. നൻറി കൊൻറാക്ക is well explained by പരിമേലഴകർ as അറക്കളെച്ചി തെത്താക്കു; cf. ധർമ്മമില്ലാതേ ആക്കിൻറവക്ക of the Mal. rendering

പരിമേലഴകർ further explains അറക്കളെച്ചിതെത്തൽ as ആൻമുലയെ യെ അറത്തലും, മകളിർകരു ചിതെത്തലും, പാർപ്പാർ തപ്പുതലും which correspond to ഗോഹൃത്യാ, ശിശുഹൃത്യാ and ബ്രഹ്മഹൃത്യാ

8. നടുവുനിലമൈ is explained by മണക്കടവർ as നട്ടാർമാട്ടും പകൈവർ മാട്ടും കക്ക നിറകുനിലമൈ. Beschi has "equitas" 'fairness.'

9. പകുതിയാൻ പാറപട്ടൊഴുകപ്പെറിൻ (=പകുതിയാൻ + പാൽ + പട്ട് + കഴുക + വെറിൻ)

10. നിക്കിൻറ is a colloquial form.

112. ചെപ്പമുടയവനാക്കം ചിതൈവിൻറിയെച്ചുതുകേമാപ്പുടൈത്തു.—
നടുവായിത്തന്നേ നിക്കിൻറവൻവാഴുവുക്ക് അഴിവില്ലെ.
113. നന്റേ തരിനം നടുവികന്താമാക്കത്തൈയന്റേയൊഴിയവിടൽ.—
നടുവല്ലാതേ പറഞ്ഞെ നല്ലത വരികിലും നടുക്കേടായി ഉള്ള
തു വേണ്ടാ.
114. തക്കാർതകവിലരെൻപതവർത്തവർഎച്ചുത്താൽ⁴ കാണപ്പെടും.—
നടുവായും നടുവല്ലാതേയും പറയിൻറവന പുത്രർ ഫലത്തിം
കലറിയാം.
115. കേടും പെരുക്കവുമിപ്പല്ലാ⁵ നെഞ്ചത്തു കോടാമൈ ചാൻറാർക്കണി —
കുറച്ചിലും പെരുമയും നിന്നെയതേ നടുവായെ നില്ക്കിൻറ
വന [അതുതന്നേ] ആഭരണം.

1. ചെപ്പമുടയവനാക്കം (ചെപ്പം + ഉടയവൻ + ആക്കം)

2. എച്ചുത്തിറുകേമാപ്പുടൈത്തു (എച്ചുത്തിറുക' + ഏമാപ്പു' + ഉടൈത്തു.)

3. The Mal. rendering is a summary. The full rendering would be: "The prosperity of the just man will never fade and will be a source of prosperity to his descendants."

എച്ചുത്തിറുകേമാപ്പു is explained by മണക്കടവർ ങ്ങ തൻവഴിയുള്ളാക്ക (=സന്തതികൾക്ക) കേടുപരാമറ' കാവലാതലെയുടൈത്തു. പരിമേലഴകർ ങ്ങ വഴിയിനുള്ളാക്ക വലിയാതലെയുടൈത്തു.

4 എച്ചുത്താറ' കാണപ്പെടും.

5. കേടും പെരുക്കവും ഇല്ലല്ല.— The long ആ in ഇല്ലല്ലാ is a Malayalamism.

6. നെഞ്ചത്തു കോടാമൈ:— The doubled ക്' in Tamil here is a feature which became largely out of vogue in very early Malayalam.

7. The phrase കുറച്ചിലും പെരുമയും നിന്നയാതേ of the Mal. translation expresses the gist of the first portion of the Tam. couplet and also indicates its connection with the second portion. "Adversity and prosperity are so common; but it is an ornament to the wise to remain uninfluenced by these."

116. കെടുവെ¹ൽ യാനെമ്പതരിക തൻനെഞ്ച²ം നടുവൊരീ അല്ല ചൈ³ചയിൻ. —

നടുവല്ലാതേ ചൈച്ചിൻറത നമുക്കു ദോഷം വരുമെൻററി
 ണ്ത ചൈച്ചാതേ ഇരിക്കിൻറത അറിവ.

117. കെടുവാക വൈയ്യൊതുലകം നടുവാക നൻറിക്കെട്ടുകിയാൻറാഴ്വ. —
 നടുവാകെ നിൻറവന താഴ്ച്ച വന്നാലും അവനെ ലോക
 അന്തർ പഴി പറെക ഇല്ല.

118. ചമംചൈ⁷തു ചീർ തുക്കം കോൽപോ [ൽ അ] മൈന്തൊരുചാൽക്കോ⁸
 ടാമൈ ചാൻറോക്കണി. —

നടുവാകിൻറ സമമായി തുങ്ങും നിറക്കാൽപോലെ ഇരി
 കിൻറത അഴുകേ.

119. ചൊൽക്കോട്ടമില്ല ചെപ്പും ഒരുതലെയവുടക്കോട്ടമിനെ പെറിൻ —
 വാക്കിൻററ നേരം മനസ്സിലേ നേരം കൂടെ പറെയിൻറ
 ത നടു.

1. കെടുവൽ യാനെമ്പതരിക (കെടുവൽ + യാൻ + എൻപതു + അരിക.)

2. നെഞ്ചനടുവൊരീ (നെഞ്ചം + നടു + ഒരീ).

3. അല്ല ചൈയിൻ.

4. The original has കെടുവൽ യാൻ "I shall certainly be ruined". — കെടുവൽ is a first person singular finite verb.

5. വൈയൊതുലകം (വൈയൊതു + ഉലകം)

6. നൻറിക്കെട്ടുകിയാൻറാഴ്വ (നൻറി + കൂട് + തകിയാൻ + താഴ്വ).

7. ചമൻ ചെപ്പും.

8. ഒരുവാറുകോടാമൈ.

9. ചൊറുകോട്ടം.

10. ഒരുതലെയവുടക്കോട്ടം (ഒരു + തലെയവ + ഉട + കോട്ടം).

120. വാണികം¹ ചൈവാക് വാണികം പേണിപ്പിറവും തമ പോൽച്ചെ²
യിൻ.
വാണിഭം ചെയ്യിൻറവക്³ ലാഭം ആകിൻറ [*തു] ആരാൻ
റെറ മുതലും തൻറെറ മുതലും സമമെൻറ കല്പിച്ചു നടുവാകിൻറത.

അടക്കമുടമൈ.

നറിയോടുംകൂടെ അടക്കമുള്ളവൻ.

121. അടക്കമരളികും⁵ അടംകാരൈ ആരിരുൾ ഉയ്⁶ത്തുവിടും—

അടക്കമുള്ളവൻ ദേവലോകത്തെ പ്രാപിക്കും; അടക്കമില്ലാ
തവൻ പാപം നീങ്ങാതേ നരകത്തെ പ്രാപിക്കും.

122. കാക്ക പൊരുളാവടക്കത്തെ യാക്കമതനിറുംകിലെയ്യയിടും—

ഉയിർക്ക രക്ഷയാകിൻറ അടക്കം പ്രധാന[*ം]; അതു നീങ്ങാ
തേ കാത്തുകൊൾക നൻറ.

123. ചെറിവരിതു ചീർമൈ പയക്കും അറിവറിത്താററിനടംകളപ്പറിൻ—
അറിവോടുംകൂടെ നമുക്കടക്കമത്രേ നല്ലതാകിൻറ[*തെന്ന]
റിഞ്ഞടങ്ങിൻറവന ആയടക്കം നന്മയെക്കൊടു ചമും.

1. ചൈവാക്.

2. പോറ്ചെയിൻ.

3. മണക്കടവർ gives the meaning of ലാഭം to the second-mentioned വാണികം.

4. അടക്കമുടമൈ - അടക്കം is translated as "sensuum fraenatio" by Beschi.

5. അടക്കമരളികും (അടക്കം + അമരൾ + ഉൾ + ഉയ്ക്കും).

6. ഉയ്ത്തുവിടും.

7. According to മണക്കടവർ, the portion ചെറിവരിതു modifies അടക്കളപ്പറിൻ, while പരിമേലഴകർ would make it modify the finite verb പയക്കും.

മണക്കടവർ explains അറിവരിതു as അറിയപ്പടുവന (viz. ചുവൈ, കളി, ഉഴവ, ഓവൈ, നാറം) അറിതു, while പരിമേലഴകർ interprets it as അടക്കവതേ നമക്ക അറിവാവതു എൻററിതു.

BULLETIN
OF THE
RAMA VARMA
RESEARCH INSTITUTE

VOL: VII PART II.

JULY 1939

**PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INSTITUTE,
TRICHUR, COCHIN STATE.**

