Giovanni Ciotti and Marco Franceschini

Certain Times in Uncertain Places: A Study on Scribal Colophons of Manuscripts Written in Tamil and TAMILIAN Grantha Scripts

1 Introduction

In this article, we present the initial results of our ongoing collaborative research, which aims to produce a comprehensive study of colophons found in manuscripts written in TAMILIAN Grantha and/or Tamil scripts.¹ In keeping with the theme of the present volume, we have focused our investigation on the temporal and spatial data that are found in such colophons.

The premises of our project are rooted in Marco Franceschini's preparatory work for his forthcoming monograph on the evolution of TAMILIAN Grantha script as found in manuscripts from Tamil Nadu and neighbouring areas. It is evident that the results of this palaeographical research should be combined with other manuscript-related investigations, such as those conducted on colophons, in order to reach a thorough understanding of the features of the manuscript culture of that region – or, indeed, of any other regions.

Before continuing, it is necessary to specify what we mean here by the term 'colophon'. In our understanding, this is a short paratext containing information about the production, internal organisation and storage of a particular manuscript. In this respect, one could name a colophon of this type a 'scribal colophon', since it is composed by scribes and generally relates to the material aspects of a specific

The research for this article was carried out within the scope of the work conducted by (1) the SFB 950 'Manuskriptkulturen in Asien, Afrika und Europa' / Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures (CSMC), Hamburg, funded by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG) and (2) NETamil 'Going From Hand to Hand: Networks of Intellectual Exchange in the Tamil Learned Traditions', Hamburg / Pondicherry, founded by the European Research Council (ERC). Although this article is the result of a collaboration, and would not otherwise have existed in its present form, the authorship of sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and Appendix 2 should be attributed to Giovanni Ciotti and that of section 4 and Appendix 1 to Marco Franceschini.

1 TAMILIAN Grantha is sometimes referred to as Grantha Tamil in the secondary literature.

manuscript.² Being a text in itself, a colophon is composed according to a set of more or less fixed conventions, which translate, for instance, into a formulaic use of the language (e.g. use of a specific lexicon, fixed invocations, etc.) and a number of graphic devices (e.g. *puṣpikās* and *piḷḷaiyār culis*³). Colophons are among the main means by which scholars can outline the aspects characterising a manuscript culture – in the present case that of Tamil Nadu. In fact, they are the sources of a wide variety of data that are not only of a temporal and spatial nature, but which also pertain to the identities of the scribes and owners of manuscripts; the religious environment in which manuscripts were produced, the features of the language – or languages – used by the scribes (Wagner *et al.* 2013) and the categories into which literature was organised (e.g. colophons may contain labels used to name literary genres), etc.⁴ As for the manuscript material under consideration here, colophons are quite rare. In the absence of an exhaustive statistical study, it is possible to estimate that only one manuscript in five to ten contains colophonic material (see also Wilden 2014: 363 for a similarly impressionistic account).

2 The corpus

The corpus that we decided to examine here is limited in extent, numbering a total of 45 colophons found in 28 manuscripts (see Appendix 2 for their transcriptions and translations). The discrepancy between the number of colophons and

² In the manuscript culture under investigation here, it is difficult to ascertain whether scribes used to reproduce colophons along with the texts of the manuscripts they were copying. In fact, we generally do not possess antigraphs. As far as dates are concerned, it seems that colophons were not copied very often.

³ *Puṣpikās* ('small flowers') are floreal signs that are variously used in South Asian manuscripts, in order to mark sections of a text, such as its beginning, end and its subdivisions. On the other hand, *piḷḷaiyār culis* ('Ganeśa's trunk') are peculiar to the manuscript culture of southern India, and are used both as section markers and as auspicious signs.

⁴ Ever since we began our research, it has been clear to us that manuscripts written in other scripts such as Telugu and Grantha Malayalam should also be taken into account if we are to examine the manuscript culture of Tamil Nadu properly, if only for the reason that quite a number of manuscripts written in Tamilian Grantha and/or Tamil scripts also contain short colophons written in the Telugu language and in Telugu script, e.g. RE45807 (see fn. 55). This means that in future we will welcome the collaboration of colleagues whose expertise can help us to enlarge the scope of our investigation towards a broader understanding of the manuscript culture of Tamil Nadu and, indeed, of South India in general.

manuscripts stems from the fact that some of the latter are multiple-text manuscripts, whereas others contain colophons that mark both the dates when the scribal activity began and when it ended. By building an ad hoc repertoire we intend to offer a first systematisation of the wide typological variety we have so far encountered. As a consequence, at present, we do not claim any statistical value for the results of our study, although this is, of course, a further aim that we will pursue in our ongoing investigation once we are able to deal properly with larger amounts of data. It goes without saying that adding more and more cases to our repertoire will challenge our first systematisation, possibly by revealing new typologies of colophons. Thus, allowance must be made for a certain degree of flexibility in our ongoing research.

Furthermore, one should note that the size of our corpus has been affected by the nature of the extant catalogues of manuscript collections preserved in various libraries in Tamil Nadu. Unfortunately, they rarely record colophons in their entirety. The catalogues of the two main manuscript collections in Pondicherry are exceptions to this rule: the catalogue of the Institut français de Pondichéry (IFP) in four volumes (Varadachari 1986, 1987, 1990; Grimal and Ganesan 2002), a remarkable piece of scholarship, indeed, which, however, does not encompass the whole collection; and the catalogue of the École française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO) in Pondicherry, which at present mainly consists of the unprinted sheets prepared by Pandit R. Varadadesikan and, again, does not feature the whole collection. We selected the majority of the colophons in our corpus from these two collections. Furthermore, we took the manuscripts written in Tamiian Grantha into consideration that belong to the collection held at the University Library of Cambridge (Marco Franceschini has recently compiled the first catalogue of these items for the Cambridge Sanskrit Manuscripts Project). As for manuscripts written in Tamil script, we were able to access images of palm-leaf manuscripts collected by the Caṅkam Project (EFEO, Pondicherry), including, in particular, the poems of the *Caṅkam* and *Kīlkaṇakku* corpora. Finally, we also included one manuscript written in Tamiian Grantha held at the Leiden University Library (formerly the Van Manen Collectie).

In the following article, manuscripts are referred to by their accession numbers. Each of them bears a siglum that indicates the library in which they are held: RE for IFP, EO for EFEO, OR for Cambridge University Library, UVSL for U.V. Swāmināthaiyar Library (Makāmakōpātyāya Ṭākṭar U. Vē. Cāminātaiyar Nūlnilai) in Chennai, and MS for Leiden University Library.

Despite the usefulness of catalogues, for our study it has been necessary to check each manuscript in order to confirm (and not seldom amend) the recorded

data and to account for all the elements that we intend to study, given our definition of a colophon. Catalogues, for instance, do not always regard invocations as part of colophons. This examination was possible thanks to the fact that most of the manuscripts studied here are available in digital form. In particular, the fact that both the IFP and the EFEO collections have been digitised in line with very high standards has given us the possibility of engaging extensively with such valuable material. Bearing this in mind, the present article intends to show – to the best of the abilities of its authors – how important digitising collections is in furthering our understanding of manuscript cultures.

3 Linguistic considerations

From the linguistic point of view, the manuscripts we deal with contain text written in Sanskrit, Tamil and Manipravalam. The latter is a mix of the previous two, mostly blending the Sanskrit lexicon with Tamil morpho-syntax.⁵ In this respect, Manipravalam could be considered as a highly Sanskritised register of Tamil, where the frequency of Sanskrit lexemes depends on the style of each author (see Venkatachari 1978).

In order to write these languages, two scripts are generally used, namely Tamil script for the Tamil language and TAMILIAN Grantha for Sanskrit. When it comes to Manipravalam, the latter is mostly employed, but cases in which a combination of both scripts are used are relatively frequent. A deeper investigation of this phenomenon is still a desideratum.⁶

A question that immediately arises is whether any differences in terms of language choice occur between colophons found in manuscripts containing Sanskrit, Tamil or Manipravalam texts (the same question is also asked by Wilden 2014: 363, fn. 323). Given the geographical connotations of the manuscript culture under investigation here, one might intuitively expect Tamil to be the mother tongue of scribes and owners (Telugu being an alternative) and hence a viable option for writing the colophon(s) of any manuscripts, regardless of the language of the texts they carry. The data emerging from our corpus confirm such intuition. Tamil colophons are found in manuscripts containing Sanskrit texts (e.g.

5 The spelling ‘Manipravalam’ is based on the transliteration from the Sanskrit version of the word, i.e. *maṇi-pravāla*, meaning ‘pearl and coral’. Its Tamil version is *maṇi-p-piravāḷam*.

6 Additionally, as far as the manuscript culture of nineteenth century Tamil Nadu is concerned, Telugu script can also be used to write both Sanskrit and Manipravalam.

RE08256), Tamil texts (e.g. UVSL511) and Manipravalam texts (e.g. EO0583a). A blending of Tamil and Sanskrit is also not uncommon, ranging from colophons in which the two languages are clearly kept separated (e.g. EO0069), to colophons composed in Manipravalam alone (e.g. EO0583b). Finally, the distribution of colophons written exclusively in Sanskrit is limited to manuscripts only containing Sanskrit texts (e.g. EO0002a).

Often, no matter what language the text contained in the manuscript is composed in, colophons can contain invocations in Sanskrit (e.g. EO0009a [14v3] *hariḥ om – śubham astu – avighnam astu* ‘Hariḥ om. May there be prosperity. May there be no obstacle’), in Tamil (e.g. UVSL1080c [25r5] *naṇṇāka* ‘May there be prosperity’) or in both Sanskrit and Tamil together (e.g. EO0003c [18(148)v3-4] *hariḥ om – śubham astu [...] yemperumāṇār tīruvaṭikaḷe caraṇam* ‘Hariḥ om, May there be prosperity. The holy feet of Emperumāṇār (= Rāmānuja) are the refuge’). The only case that is not attested in our corpus is that of a manuscript containing a Sanskrit text with invocations exclusively written in Tamil.⁷

Religion also affects the linguistic features of the manuscript culture of Tamil Nadu. Many of the manuscripts under investigation originated in a milieu in which the combination of Sanskrit and Tamil was programmatically intended. In particular, this is the case for manuscripts containing Manipravalam texts, which generally belong to a śrī-vaiṣṇava context, where the coexistence of the two languages conforms to theological requirements.⁸ Therefore, it is not surprising that in many manuscripts the two languages blend at various degrees, such as in the use of a highly Sanskritised register of Tamil, or in the occurrence of one Tamil invocation in a colophon otherwise fully composed in Sanskrit.

4 Time

This section is devoted to the analysis of the dates given in the colophons analysed here. They span more than two centuries, from 1675 (UVSL511) to 1908 (OR2344b). Dates may vary significantly in many respects: the amount of calendar information they include; the system of chronology they use to number the years (or to name them); the sets of names used to indicate months, weekdays

⁷ The rather limited variety of invocations recurring in our colophons suggests that scribes could draw from a fixed repertoire of formulaic expressions, according to the circumstances. This colophonic feature awaits further investigation.

⁸ Śrī-vaiṣṇavism is a form of Viṣṇu’s cult in which Sanskrit and Tamil scriptures are given the same importance (see Venkatachari 1978).

and constellations; the language in which they are composed; the script in which they are written; as well as other minor aspects. Yet a certain degree of consistency may be observed, especially with reference to the order in which the elements of time reckoning are arranged in the dates.

As mentioned previously, the amount of information included in the dates varies considerably. At the very least, they are generally made up of three fundamental elements: the year, which is given according either to the Kollam era (see section 4.1.1) or, alternatively, the Jovian sixty-year cycle (see section 4.1.2), the solar month, and the solar day. At their most comprehensive, they include eight different pieces of calendar information: the year according to both the Kollam era and the Jovian cycle, the solar month, the solar day, the weekday, the fortnight, the lunar day (Skt. *tithi*, Tam. *titi*) and the constellation or lunar mansion (Skt. *nakṣatra*, Tam. *naṭcattiram*). Of these eight elements, the first five are ‘solar’, since they are calculated on the basis of the (apparent) course of the sun, whilst the last three are ‘lunar’, that is to say, based on the lunar phases.

In the following sub-sections, each of these eight calendar elements is examined in detail with respect to their meaning, the way in which they are presented in the colophons, the symbols or words that accompany them and so forth. Finally, some conclusions will be drawn, especially about the order of the calendar information included in the dates and the attendant symbols employed.

4.1 Year

All the dates under scrutiny are given according to either one or both of the following two systems of annual reckoning: the Kollam era and the Jovian sixty-year cycle.

4.1.1 The Kollam era

The Kollam era (Skt. *kolamba*, Tam. *kollamāṇṭu*), also known as the Malabar era, is named after the coastal city of present-day Kerala, where it was introduced on 15 August 824 CE (Gregorian dating).⁹ It was, and still is, prevalent in Malabar and in the past was also in use in some southern districts of present-day Tamil Nadu,

⁹ For a concise but valuable introduction to the Kollam year see Sarma 1996.

namely Tirunelvēli *māvaṭṭam* (Tirunelveli district) and Maturai *māvaṭṭam* (Madurai district), as well as in part of Sri Lanka (Sarma 1996, 93).¹⁰

The Kollam era is based on a calendar that is solar (or solar-sidereal), current and *siṃhādi* (or *kanyādi*). It is solar, or solar-sidereal, since it is reckoned on the basis of the course of the sun in relation to the position of the ‘fixed stars’, i.e. the constellations of the zodiac. In this respect, it is contrary to lunar and luni-solar calendars in use all over northern and central India, with the exceptions of Bānlā/Baṅga (Bengal) and Oṛiśā (Odisha/Orissa), which are based on the lunar phases. It is current in that the year is reckoned in reference to ongoing years, as opposed to so-called ‘expired’-year calendars (e.g. Śaka, Vikrama, Kaliyuga and Bengali San), in which year-numbers refer to the elapsed year, since the first year is counted as ‘year zero’. Finally, it is *siṃhādi* (‘beginning with *siṃha* [= Leo]’) since the start of the Kollam year coincides with that of the month of *Siṃha*, i.e. when the sun enters the zodiacal sign of *Siṃha* (‘Leo’) in mid-August,¹¹ as opposed to *meṣādi* calendars in which the beginning of the year corresponds to the month of *Meṣa* (‘Aries’), when the sun enters the homonymous zodiacal sign.

In respect of the colophons under investigation, the Kollam year is characterised by three quasi-regular features: it appears as the first element of a date,¹² it is written in numerical form,¹³ and its year number is preceded and/or followed by a symbol or word specifying that it refers to the Kollam year.¹⁴ With respect to

10 Geographical names are given in transliterated form followed by their most common English renderings in round brackets.

11 In the northern provinces of present-day Kerala, the Kollam year is *kanyādi*: it commences one month later than the *siṃhādi*, in mid-September, when the sun enters the zodiacal sign of *Kanyā* (‘Virgo’) and the month named after it begins. It is only possible to ascertain whether a date is given in accordance with the *siṃhādi* or the *kanyādi* Kollam year if it falls on a day in the month of *Siṃha* and if it includes ‘additional’ elements such as the weekday or the *nakṣatra*, which are necessary for cross-checking. In our corpus only two dates meet these requirements (EO0003a and EO0006 [6v1–2]), both following the *siṃhādi* reckoning.

12 The date in EO0001 [GL3v1] is the only exception: in fact, it consists of the month, day and Kollam year in this order.

13 The Kollam year is given in words only in RE05920, namely as *sahasrādhikaṣaṭpañcaḥ* (‘1056’). However, it is worth noting that the compound is incorrect: *°ṣaṭpañcaḥ* stands erroneously for *°ṣaṭpañcāśaḥ*, and *°adhika*° should follow the smaller number, not the larger one. The compound was probably modelled on the version written in numerals: ‘thousand plus 56’.

14 Contrary to all other occurrences, in OR2355d the year number is written without any ‘identification mark’. In this particular colophon we also find one of two cases (the other is in UVSL1080c) of a Kollam year given in ‘abbreviated form’, i.e. made up of just the tens and units, and lacking the numerals referring to the century and the millennium: in OR2355d the number ‘78’ stands for ‘1078’, in UVSL1080c ‘48’ stands for ‘1048’. It may be noted, however, that both

the last feature, the following cases are attested in the dates of our corpus: the year number is preceded by the word *kollam* (see OR2344b), it is followed by a Tamil ordinal marker,¹⁵ it is both preceded by the word *kollam* and followed by an ordinal marker,¹⁶ and it is followed by a symbol (or an abbreviation) for ‘year’. In our dates, the symbol for the Kollam year is written in three different styles: an ‘accurate form’, shaped like a Grantha ligature *ṇṇa* with an added curved line forming a semicircle below it (e.g. E00003a) or a circle around it (e.g. E00069 [63v5]); a soft cursive style (e.g. E00002a); and an extreme cursive and rounded form very similar to the Tamil/Grantha number ‘5’ (e.g. E00001, both at [GL3v1] and [140r5])¹⁷ or to the Grantha sign for the inherent vowel *-e* (e.g. in E00006 [GL3v1]). In the appendices to this article, these three forms of the symbol are labelled respectively as {YK1}, {YK2} and {YK3}. None of these three is found in the lists of symbols and abbreviations available to us,¹⁸ although the cursive forms {YK2} and {YK3} bear a certain similarity with the second abbreviation for ‘until’ (Tam. *varaikkum*) given by Pope (1859: 18).

dates appear in multi-text manuscripts in which the complete year number is given in other colophons (namely, OR2355c, OR2355g and UVSL1080a).

15 See 1039 *āmta* (OR2345) and 1078 *mta* (OR2355c). The term *āmta* is not recorded in the Tamil grammars and dictionaries available to us. However, *āmta* is clearly used as a marker in websites /1/, /2/, and /3/ (see webography) to indicate ordinal numbers. Since all three occurrences deal with Tamil matters in Sri Lanka, *āmta* is possibly a localism. The form *mta* can be understood as a variant of *āmta*.

16 See *kollam* 1066 *mtu* (OR2340j) and *kollam* 1078 *āmta* (OR2355g). The form *mtu*, which appears to be otherwise unattested, should possibly read *mta*; for *āmta* and *mta*, see the preceding note.

17 This similarity must have confused the compiler of the cataloguing sheet of E00001; he actually misinterpreted the Kollam year symbol occurring in both dates ([GL3v1] and [14r5]) as a number ‘5’, with the result that he dated the manuscript to Kollam year 1045 (mistakenly reading ‘1000’, ‘4’, ‘5’) instead of 1004 (‘1000’, ‘4’, ‘[symbol]’). There is no doubt that the character under discussion represents the Kollam year symbol, as it is demonstrated both by internal and external evidences. On the one hand, it clearly differs from the number ‘5’ as it is written by the same scribe elsewhere in the manuscript; on the other hand, it is almost identical graphically to the ‘5’-ish symbol occurring twice in analogous contexts within dates found in E00006 [GL1r1] and [GL3v1]. In fact, in the case of E00006, such a symbol certainly stands for the Kollam year symbol, at least in the latter date, i.e. [GL3v1], where all the calendar elements consistently point to Kollam year 1006 (‘1000’, ‘6’, ‘[symbol]’), and not to 1065 (as it would if we were to read the disputed character as ‘5’: ‘1000’, ‘6’, ‘5’).

18 Several of the abbreviations discussed in this article are to be found in the lists in Pope (1859: 18), Winslow (1862: 976), Arden (1942: 310) and Grünendahl (2001: 52–54).

4.1.2 The Jovian sixty-year cycle

A Jovian year corresponds to the period of time in which Jupiter travels through one sign of the zodiac (Skt. *rāṣi*, Tam. *rāci*). This corresponds to one twelfth of the planet's revolution around the sun. Since Jupiter completes its orbit in somewhat less than twelve solar years, one Jovian year is slightly shorter than one solar year.

Two distinct chronological systems based on a cycle of sixty Jovian years have been used in India, or rather in the northern and southern regions of the subcontinent (Pillai 1922 [I.I]: 50–52).¹⁹ In both systems, each year of the cycle is designated by a specific name. Although the names and their order are the same in both systems, the beginning of the cycle starts in different years in each list (Pillai 1922 [I.I]: 195–196). Furthermore, the definition of the Jovian year given at the beginning of this section applies only to the former (northern) chronological system, so it is not relevant to this particular study. The latter Jovian cycle (Skt. *Bṛhaspatīcakra*, Tamil *Pirakaspaticakkaram*) is still used in southern India today and simply consists of a series of sixty solar years (generally called Skt. [*bārhaspatya*]-*saṃvatsaras*, Tamil *camvaccarams*), each one given a Jovian year name.²⁰ In what follows, we only refer to the latter system, since it is the one used in the dates analysed in this article.

The Jovian years are solar and *meṣādi*, that is, they begin on the first day of the month of Meṣa, when the sun enters the zodiacal sign of Aries, usually around mid-April in the Gregorian calendar. Since the sixty-year cycle starts anew at the conclusion of the last year of the series, the same year name recurs every sixty years. As a consequence, a date consisting of just the Jovian year, the solar month and the day is ambiguous, in that it recurs every sixty years.²¹

In the colophons selected for this article, the Jovian year appears at the beginning of the date, preceded only by the Kollam year; the Jovian year is always stated by name, followed (but seldom preceded) by a word for 'year' or by a symbol representing it as a Jovian year. Three different words for 'year' are used within this context: *saṃvatsara*, *varṣa* and *abda*. Sometimes the adverb *nāma*

¹⁹ This work is a revised and expanded version of Pillai 1911, as stated by the author himself (Pillai 1922 [I.I]: iii).

²⁰ This convention was current in southern India starting from 907 CE, when the periodical suppression of one Jovian year, which was necessary to harmonise the Jovian cycle with the solar years, was abandoned (Renou and Filliozat 1953: 726–727).

²¹ Six dates of this kind are included in our corpus, i.e. OR2347.1, OR2348, OR2359, RE20020b, RE37121, RE45807.

(‘by name’) or the adjective *nāma* (‘named’, ‘bearing the name’) is inserted between the name of the Jovian year and the word for ‘year’.

As in the case of the symbol for the Kollam year, the symbol used to mark the Jovian year also occurs in three variant forms: an ‘accurate’ form (attested, for example, in RE08256), which is interpreted by Pope (1859: 18) as an abbreviation of the Tamil word *varuṣam* (‘year’); a slightly simplified version of it (found in RE45807 and EO0009b [94v4]); and a cursive style variant (as in EO0583a and EO0583b). In the appendices, these three abbreviated forms have been respectively labelled as {YJ1}, {YJ2} and {YJ3}. Besides these three, however, there are two more variants of the abbreviation as well, labelled {YJ4} and {YJ5} respectively,²² which are rather puzzling since they correspond to the ‘accurate’ and the ‘mild cursive’ forms of the symbol of the Kollam year, i.e. {YK1} and {YK2}, with the addition of just a single or double upward hook to the upper right. Thus, it appears that at least in some cases the two symbols tend to overlap; whereas the distinction between the symbols/abbreviations for Kollam and Jovian years is clear and unquestionable, when they are written in their respective ‘accurate’ forms and when they appear within the same date (e.g. EO0069 [GL2r5] and EO0009b [94v4]). Their distinctiveness becomes subtler when they are drawn in a cursive style, especially if only one of the two symbols occurs in a date and there is no need to distinguish it from the other year symbol. Generally speaking, the data in our corpus – despite its admittedly limited nature – seem to suggest that a (single or double) curl or knot at the top right of the symbol was characteristic of the Jovian year tags. In RE37121, though, a Jovian year name is followed by what is clearly a Kollam year symbol, whereas the opposite occurs in UVSL511.

As for the names of the Jovian years, they are expressed both in Sanskrit and in Tamil, the Tamil names being derived from their Sanskrit counterparts by being adapted to the Dravidian phonology (e.g. Tamil Piracōrpatti corresponds to Skt. Prajāpati, Cukkila to Śukla, Īccura to Īśvara, and so on). The Sanskrit names of the Jovian years are given by Pillai (1922 [I.I]: 195) and Grünendhal (2001: 217–218), and their Tamil counterparts by Pope (1859: 197) and Arden (1942: 317). In the dates under scrutiny, the Jovian years are given with their Sanskrit names (written in Grantha script) in all manuscripts containing Sanskrit texts and in a few containing Manipravalam and Tamil texts, whereas Tamil year names are found in most of the manuscripts containing Tamil texts and in some containing Manipravalam texts (UVSL1080a, UVSL1080c, RE45807 and RE37121).²³

²² The form labelled {YJ4} is given by Pope (1859: 18) as an alternative to {YJ1}.

²³ As noted by Arden (1942: 316), some Tamil Jovian year names are spelt in more than one way; see, for instance, the year name Tāraṇa, always spelt *tāruṇa*/*dāruṇa* in the dates in our corpus (EO0009b [94r3], [94v1], [94v4], and EO0069 [GL2r1 col1], [GL2r5]).

4.1.3 The solar (and the lunar) month

The month is the only chronological element appearing in all the dates under scrutiny, usually right after the information concerning the year(s):²⁴ since the Tamil calendar is basically solar, the month referred to in the dates is a solar month as a rule. In manuscripts from Tamil Nadu, solar months are designated either in Sanskrit or in Tamil. In the former, they are named after the signs of the zodiac through which the sun transits,²⁵ whereas in the latter case, each name is the (more or less straightforward) Tamil rendition of the Sanskrit name of the lunar month current when the solar month begins, i.e. of the lunar month that began during the preceding solar month (Pillai 1922 [I.I]: 7, 25).²⁶ Notably, however, in some of the dates in our corpus, the name of the lunar month is given instead of that of the solar one: Āṣāḍha (in OR2344b and EO0009b [94v1]), Caitra (in RE20020b), Phālguna (in EO0002a). Whenever the lunar month is followed by a number (as in OR2344b, RE20020b and EO0002a), the latter refers to the solar day and not to the so-called ‘lunar day’ (*tithi*).

Be they solar or lunar, the names of the months in our colophons are almost invariably followed by a label specifying that what precedes them is the name of a month;²⁷ it can be a word (Skt. *māsa*, Tam. *mātam* or *mācam*, ‘month’)²⁸ or an abbreviation, of which there are four different types in our corpus. The first one, which is transcribed in the appendices as {M1}, is represented by the Tamil syllable *ma* with one or more curls to its upper right; according to Pope (1859: 18), this is the abbreviation for Tamil *mācam*.²⁹ The second type, transcribed as {M2}, is

²⁴ EO0002 and EO0009b [94v1] are exceptions; here, indications of the fortnight and of the weekday respectively have been inserted between the year(s) and the names of the months (a lunar month in both cases; see below). EO0001 [GL3v1] is another such case, where the month precedes the day and the year (see fn. 12).

²⁵ From an astronomical point of view, the solar month begins at the *saṃkrānti* (‘entry into’), i.e. at the moment when the sun enters a new constellation of the zodiac.

²⁶ Lists of the three sets of names (Sanskrit and Tamil for solar months and Sanskrit for lunar months) are given by Pillai (1922 [I.I]: 198); for a more reliable spelling of the Tamil names of the solar months, see Pope 1859: 198 and Arden 1942: 316.

²⁷ Exceptions to this rule are found in EO0009b [94r3] and OR2355d, where the name of the month is not followed by any label whatsoever.

²⁸ In EO0069 [GL2r1 col1] the scribe writes *prāpte divākare* (‘when the sun has entered [the month/sign of the zodiac]’); the use of such an elaborate expression in place of a simple word is probably justified by the fact that the scribe composed the colophon in metre.

²⁹ In one instance (RE08256) this abbreviation is followed by the Grantha character *ma* with *virāma* (i.e. *m*, the *virāma* being the sign used for writing a consonant without its inherent short *a* vowel).

similar to the Tamil syllable *pu* (although with the wrong sign for the inherent vowel *u*). According to Pope (1859: 18), this is the abbreviation for the Tamil word *parru* ('received, receipt'), used as a debit sign.³⁰ The reason why this abbreviation was employed in manuscript colophons to mark the name of the months is obscure. The third type, transcribed as {M3}, resembles the Tamil ligature *ṭṭa* followed by the Grantha *ma* with *virāma*; it is possibly an abbreviation as well, although it is not clear which word it stands for.³¹ The fourth abbreviation, transcribed as {M4}, is represented by a Tamil syllable, *ma*, with a full-height '2'-shaped sign appended to the right. In both its attestations in our corpus (OR2345 and OR2348), it is followed by the Tamil element *cam*, forming the Tamil word **m(a)cam* (read *mācam*).

All four abbreviations described above only occur after the name of a solar month and, most notably, only when the solar month is mentioned by its Tamil name.³² Despite the limited size of our corpus, the regularity of this pattern is possibly not just a coincidence, but a conscious habit of the scribes, as the date in EO0003c seems to suggest. In this colophon, the name of the same month is given twice, with its Sanskrit name (*kanyā*) specified by the Sanskrit word *māsam* (written in Grantha script), and with its Tamil name (*poṭṭāci*, written in Tamil script) specified by the *ṭṭam*-type abbreviation, i.e. {M3}.³³

Finally, a remark concerning spelling is occasioned by the data at our disposal. Whilst the Sanskrit names of the months are usually written uniformly and correctly,³⁴ Tamil names show a considerable amount of deviation from their standard spelling (as given in Arden 1942: 316): thus, the name of the month *Puraṭṭāci* (corresponding to Skt. *Kanyā*) is variously spelt as *pīraṭṭāci* (EO003b), *pīraṭṭaci* (RE45807), *per²aṭṭāci* (EO003c) and *poṭṭāci* (EO003d, OR2359); Aippaci,

³⁰ 'Tamil debit sign (= *patru*)' is also the definition of the Unicode character U+0BF6, corresponding to this abbreviation (see website /4/).

³¹ The abbreviations for month in UVSL511 and RE10829 [134v1] are hardly legible, the former due to the poor quality of the digital image, the latter because the writing is uninked. All the same, both of them have been transcribed as {M3} in the appendices to this article because their first element is a Tamil ligature *ṭṭa*, despite the fact that the following sign is unreadable in both dates.

³² It may be also noted that the Tamil names of months (over thirty in number), which occur in our dates, are followed by an abbreviation for 'month', with only two exceptions: *āvaṇi māsaṃ* (EO0003a) and *kārttikai māta* (UVSL107).

³³ Similarly, in EO0069 and EO0009b, where the date is stated two and three times respectively in a row, the abbreviation for 'month' only appears where the name of the month is written in Tamil (the last date in both colophons).

³⁴ The only exception is *kaṭaka* (EO0009b) for Karkaṭaka (also known as Karka or Karkaṭa).

or Arpaci, is spelt *ar²ppaci* (EO0583a, EO0583b) and *ar²paci* (EO0069 [GL2r5]); Mārkaḷi is spelt *mār²kaḷi* (RE37121); Cittirai, Āṇi and Kārttikai, despite being written correctly in most of their occurrences, are also spelt as *cittira* (EO0001 [GL3v1]), *āṇi* (EO0001 [140r5]) and *kārttika* (OR2345) or *kārti*³⁵ (EO0006 [GL1r1]) respectively. It is most probable that what might first seem like idiosyncratic spelling actually reflects the high level of variability that Tamil dialects (or registers) exhibit (see section 4.1.5).

4.1.4 The solar day

The solar day, or day of the solar month, is given in most of the dates under scrutiny and always comes right after the name of the solar month (sometimes after a lunar month; see section 4.1.3). Since the solar day is designated by a number, it is in most cases written in numerals. With just a few exceptions, the numerals are followed by a symbol or a word for ‘day’, by an ordinal marker or by a locative suffix.³⁶

The symbol found in our dates stands for the Tamil word *tiyati* (also *tēti* or *tiṇam*), meaning ‘date’, ‘day of the month’ (Arden 1942: 310). In the appendices, it has been transcribed either as {D1}, when it is written in the form given by Arden (very similar to the Tamil number ‘2’, sometimes with its horizontal stroke elongated), or as {D2}, where the final horizontal stroke runs along the top-line of the character. A third symbol for ‘day’ (transcribed as {D3}) that seems to be mainly used in manuscripts written in Malayalam script, is found once in our corpus (OR2355c). In place of the symbol for day, in some dates the numeral(s) are followed by the Tamil ordinal marker *ām* or *ā*, which may be followed in turn by the word *tiy(y)ati* (‘date’, ‘day of the month’) (OR2355d, OR2344b twice).³⁷ In one case, the number is simply followed by *tiyati* (OR2355g), with no ordinal marker interposed. Incidentally, it is worth noting that in some dates (OR2345, OR2348, RE37121) the number of the solar day is followed by the Tamil locative suffix *-t(t)il*, written in an abbreviated form and characterised by a hook or a ‘2’-shaped sign added to the upper right of the syllable *ti* (or, perhaps, *tṭi*).³⁸

35 In shortened form, with the abbreviation being marked with a ‘2’-shaped curl added at the end of the *-i*.

36 Only the dates of three colophons (UVSL511, RE10829 [134v1] and EO0007a) do not present any ‘specifying element’ after the number that refers to the solar day.

37 The form *tiyyati* (also spelt *tiyati*) is the Malayalam counterpart of Tamil *tiyati* (‘date’).

38 In OR2355d and OR2355g the sign for the vowel *i* in the last syllable of *tiyati* is followed by an ambiguous short horizontal stroke. This may be understood either as an abbreviation for the locative suffix or as some sort of punctuation mark.

In some dates, the number of the solar day is written out in letters (in the Sanskrit language and using Grantha script); these numbers³⁹ are always followed by a Sanskrit noun for ‘day’: *divasa* (EO0002a, RE05920), *dina* (RE10829 [134r5]) or *ahan* (EO0009b [94r3]).

4.1.5 The days of the week

In Indian calendars, the weekdays (Skt. *vāra*, Tam. *kiḷamai*) are named – as in the European tradition – after the sun, the moon and the five main planets: Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Venus and Saturn. Since they are systematically consistent in both traditions, ‘the weekday is the meeting ground of the Indian and European calendars’ (Pillai 1922 [I.I]: 14). The names of the weekdays are formed by compounding the name of the relevant ‘planet’ with a word denoting ‘weekday’; in the dates in our corpus, these compounds are either entirely in Sanskrit (written in Grantha script) or in Tamil (written in Tamil script), with two interesting exceptions (see below).

In Sanskrit each of the seven planets is designated by several different names, and so is the weekday associated with it; a useful – although admittedly not exhaustive – list of Sanskrit names of the planets is provided by Sewell (1896: 2).⁴⁰ In our dates, the Sanskrit name of a planet is always compounded with a Sanskrit word for ‘day’: *vāra* (EO0006 [GL3v1], MS2.40, RE08256), *vāsara* (EO0002a, EO0009b [94r3], EO0069 [GL2r1 col1], EO0583b, RE05920) or *dina* (EO0009b [94v1]). It may be noted that *dina* is also used to mark the day of the month (see section 4.1.4).

In Tamil the names of the planets are followed by the word *kiḷamai* (‘weekday’). This is only spelt in its standard form in two colophons (RE10829 [134v1] and EO0583a); in its other occurrences, it is variously written as *keḷamai* (EO0003a,b,c,d and EO0069 [GL2r5]), *keḷamai* (EO0009b [94v4]) or *keḷame* (EO0069 [63v5]). Furthermore, the names of the planets also exhibit some variant spellings. Thus, in place of *viyāla[-k-kiḷamai]*, ‘Thursday’, we have *vyāla°* (EO0003b and EO0003c), and instead of *ñāyirru[-k-kiḷamai]*, ‘Sunday’, we have the colloquial form *nātti°* (EO0003a and EO0069 [63v5]). A list of the Tamil names

³⁹ Numbers are doubtlessly ordinals in a couple of cases (*daśama*, EO0009b [94r3], and *pañcadaśama*, RE10829 [134r5]), while in other cases they may ambiguously represent either cardinal or ordinal numbers (*saptadaśa*, RE05920, and *ekādaśa*, EO0002a).

⁴⁰ The list does not include, for example, the term *sthira* (‘fixed’, ‘immovable’) as a name for Saturn, and consequently for Saturday (occurring in EO0583b).

for the weekdays is provided by Arden (1942: 315) and Pope (1859: 198).⁴¹ As is the case with names of months (see section 4.1.3), also these variants can be understood as being due to the different Tamil dialects (or registers) used by scribes.

Finally, it is worth noting the two Manipravalam compounds *śanikkīlamai*, ‘Saturday’ (RE10829 [134v1]), and *budhanñikīlamai*, ‘Wednesday’ (EO0583a). They are constructed by appending the Tamil word *kīlamai*, written in Tamil script, to the Sanskrit names of the planets, written in Grantha script: *śani*, ‘Saturn’, and *budhan* (incorrect for *budha*), ‘Mercury’, respectively.

4.1.6 The lunar chronological elements in dates: *pakṣa*, *tithi*, *nakṣatra*

Many of the dates in our corpus include references to the *pakṣa*, the *tithi* and the *nakṣatra*, which are elements of time division based on lunation, or lunar months. In northern India, the lunar month extends between two successive full moons (Skt. *pūrṇimā*, Tam. *pūraṇami*), whilst in southern India it ends with the new moon (Skt. *amāvāsyā*, Tam. *amāvācai*).⁴² These two systems are called *pūrṇimānta* (‘ending with the full moon’) and *amānta* (‘ending with the new moon’) respectively in Sanskrit, and all the dates in our corpus adhere to the latter.

The lunar month is divided in two *pakṣas* (‘wings, sides’, i.e. ‘fortnights [of the lunar month]’): the first fortnight, during which the moon is waxing, is usually called ‘bright’ since after sunset the moon is above the horizon and illuminates the night; the second fortnight, when the moon is waning, is commonly called ‘dark’, since after sunset the moon is below the horizon and the night is dark (Sewell 1896: 4). In our corpus, the first fortnight is called *śukla*, ‘bright, white’ (EO0003c, EO0003d, EO0069 [GL2r1 col1], EO0069 [GL2r5]) or *pūrva*, ‘first, former’ (RE05920, EO0583a); the dark fortnight is termed *kṛṣṇa*, ‘black’ (EO0003b, EO0069 [63v5]) or *apara*, ‘latter’ (EO0583b).⁴³ All these adjectives are compounded with, or accompanied by the noun *pakṣa*, which they qualify; in some cases, the Sanskrit compound thus formed is declined by appending to it the Tamil suffixes *-(t)il* (EO0069 [GL2r5], EO0069 [63v5]) or *-(t)tu* (EO0003b, EO0003c, EO0003d).

⁴¹ In addition to the Tamil names of the weekdays, Pope also provides the Tamil version of the Sanskrit names.

⁴² Epigraphical evidence suggests that the *pūrṇimānta* scheme was also used in (at least some regions of) southern India until the ninth century CE (Sewell 1896: 4–5).

⁴³ Possibly *metri causa* (see similarly fn. 28), in EO0009b [94v1] the scribe ingeniously employs the compound *vaḷakṣetara* (for *valakṣa-* or *balakṣa-itarā*), ‘the other-than-white’.

A *tithi* (sometimes called a ‘lunar day’) corresponds to the time it takes for the moon to move away from the sun by twelve degrees. The starting point of the *tithi* cycle is the new moon, when the sun and the moon ‘dwell together’ (this is the literal meaning of the expression *amā-vāsyā*, otherwise ‘night of new moon’), i.e. when they have the same longitude measured from Earth. As the complete cycle extends through 360 degrees, there are thirty *tithis* in one lunar month. Thus, the lunar month is divided in thirty *tithis*, fifteen *tithis* for each *pakṣa*: since the lunar month is a little shorter than thirty days (about 29.5 days), a *tithi* is a little shorter than a solar day.

As a rule, in our dates *tithis* are designated by a Sanskrit ordinal number inflected in the feminine gender. Often the Sanskrit feminine endings are replaced by their Tamil counterparts, with a final short *-i* in place of *-ī* (*pañcami* in EO0583b and EO0069 [63v5], *daśami* in EO0003b, *dvādaśi* in EO0009b [94v4], *caturdāśi* in EO0069 [GL2r5], etc.) and *-ai* (written in Tamil or Grantha script) instead of *-ā* (*prathamai* in EO0003c, *dvitiyai* in EO0003d, *tritikai* in EO0583a – probably for *tritiyai*, in turn from Sanskrit *ṭṛtīyā*). Sometimes the ordinal is accompanied by, or compounded with the word *tithi*.

Traditionally, three particular *tithis* are given special names rather than an ordinal number: the first *tithi* of the lunar month (called *pratipad* or *pratipadā*), the full moon *tithi* (called *pūrṇimā*, *paurṇimā* or *pūrṇamāsi*), the new moon *tithi* (called *amāvāsyā* or *darśa*) (Sewell 1896: 13; Pillai 1922 [I.I]: 198). Of these three, only the name of the full moon *tithi* is attested in our corpus, in the Sanskritised Tamil form *paurṇamāvāsai*, ‘the full moon [*tithi*]’ (EO0003a). The *tithis* from the second to the fourteenth, identified just by their ordinal number, bear the same name regardless of which of the two *pakṣas* they belong to. In order to avoid confusion, these *tithis* are always mentioned together with the *pakṣa* and/or the *nakṣatra*.

A *nakṣatra* (lit. ‘star’, by extension ‘constellation’ or ‘lunar mansion’) is the twenty-seventh part of the ecliptic and, as an element of time reckoning, it represents the time required for the moon to move through one of the constellations, or lunar mansions. Since it takes slightly more than 27 days for the moon to travel through the whole ecliptic, one *nakṣatra* is a few minutes longer than one day. Each *nakṣatra* is identified by a special name, either in Sanskrit or in Tamil: lists of these names are provided by Sewell (1896: cxiii [table VIII]) and Pillai (1922 [I.I]: 199).⁴⁴

⁴⁴ The former gives only the Sanskrit names, whereas the latter also gives the Tamil names, although unfortunately transliterated into Roman script according to an unsatisfactory method of conversion.

In the dates in our corpus, the great majority of the names of the constellations are given in Sanskrit and are generally spelt correctly.⁴⁵ They are mostly compounded with the word *nakṣatra*, sometimes written as *nakṣattira* with an epenthesis induced by Dravidian phonology (EO0003b, EO0009b [94v4], EO0069 [GL2r5]); occasionally they are compounded with *tāraka* (EO0009b [94r3]) or *tāra* (EO0009b [94v1]), and, in one single case, the name of the *nakṣatra* alone is given in the locative case (*aśvinyām*, EO0069 [GL2r1 col1]). In a small number of dates the *nakṣatra* is mentioned by its Tamil name, always in a non-standard spelling: *āyilliya* for Āyiliya (RE10829 [134v1]), *anuṣam* for Aṇuṣam (EO0006 [GL3v1]), *avuṭṭa* for Aviṭṭa (EO0003a). The last two names are followed by the word *nakṣatra/nakṣattira*.

4.1.7 Other elements of time reckoning

In addition to the principal elements of time reckoning surveyed in the preceding sections, a small number of other time-related terms are mentioned in our colophons.

The colophon at the end of OR2347.1 states that the copying of the text was completed *udiccu 13 nāḷikaiyār tpoṭtu*, ‘once [the sun] has risen, at the time of the thirteenth *nāḷikai*’. A *nāḷikai* (Skt. *ghaṭikā* or *ghaṭī*), sometimes called the ‘Indian hour’, is the sixtieth part of a day, corresponding to 24 minutes. As a rule, *ghaṭikās/nāḷikais* are counted from sunrise to sunrise, as is clearly the case in this colophon (‘once [the sun] has risen...’).

In the date in EO0002a, mention is made of *uttarāyaṇa*, the ‘northward path [of the sun]’, which begins with the Makara *saṃkrānti* (mid-January) and ends with the Karka[ṭaka] *saṃkrānti* (mid-July), when the *dakṣiṇāyaṇa* (‘southward path [of the sun]’) begins (Sewell 1896: 9).

Finally, words or expressions with broader temporal meanings occasionally occur in our colophons – e.g. *utaiyattil*, ‘at dawn’ (EO0004), *udiccu*, ‘[the sun] being risen’ (OR2347.1) –, most notably when they are prompted by metrical ingenuity: *tāruṇābde gate bhānau*, ‘when the sun has entered the [Jovian] year Tāruṇa [= Tāraṇa]’ (EO0009b [94r3]), and *tulāṃ prāpte divākare*, ‘when the sun has entered the [Jovian] year Tulā’ (EO0069 [GL2r1 col1]).⁴⁶

⁴⁵ The only exceptions are *aśvanī* (MS2.40) and *aśvatī* (EO0069 [GL2r5]), both incorrect for Aśvinī.

⁴⁶ Both examples are lines of eight syllables from *anuṣṭubh* stanzas.

4.1.8 Some observations on the dates

Some general findings concerning dates can be drawn from an examination of the data collected for this article. It seems clear that the year (Kollam and/or Jovian), the solar month and the solar day are core elements of the dates in our corpus insofar as they appear in almost all of them, whereas the other chronological elements are only given occasionally.

As for the order of the elements in the dates, there are evidently some consistencies. Generally speaking, the data based on solar reckoning come first, followed by information based on the lunar cycle (*pakṣa*, *nakṣatra* and *tithi*). This order is followed in all but four of our dates. In all the exceptions, the anomaly is represented by the position of the weekday, which is either centrally positioned (EO0009b [94r3] and [94v4], EO0583b) or placed after (EO0069 [GL2r1 col1]) the lunar calendar elements. However, it should be noted that the weekday appears together with four lunar elements of time division (*tithi*, *nakṣatra*, *yoga* and *karaṇa*)⁴⁷ in the *pañcāṅgas* ('[consisting of] five parts'), i.e. the traditional Indian calendars that are widely used for astrological purposes and for calculating the exact timing of religious festivals, rites and observances (Sewell 1896: 2, 13–18; Renou and Filliozat 1953: 727). Therefore, despite being based on solar calculations, weekdays may perhaps be traditionally perceived as being closely related to chronological lunar elements and for this reason interspersed with them in the dates of the manuscripts.

When examined in further detail, it is clear that in most of the cases, the order of the elements in the dates corresponds to that followed in the previous subsections (see sections 4.1.1–6): Kollam year, Jovian year, solar month, day of the month, weekday, *pakṣa*, *tithi*, *nakṣatra*. However, variations to this arrangement do occur; some of them can be accounted for,⁴⁸ whereas others cannot.⁴⁹ On the

⁴⁷ Unlike *tithis* and *nakṣatras*, *yogas* and *karaṇas* are units of time based on discretionary mathematical calculations. A *yoga* corresponds to the period of time during which the sum of the motion in longitude of the sun and the moon is increased by 13° 20' (i.e. a twenty-seventh part of the ecliptic). A *karaṇa* is a subdivision of a *tithi*; each *tithi* being divided in two *karaṇas*, there are 60 *karaṇas* in one lunar month.

⁴⁸ For example, the irregular position in the sequence of the month in EO0009b [94v1], which is placed after the weekday and immediately before the lunar elements, is probably the consequence of metrical requirements; the same holds true for the jumbled sequences of the lunar elements in EO0009b [94r3] and [94v1].

⁴⁹ At the moment, we are not able to adduce any explanation for the odd sequence in EO0001 [GL3v1] (month, solar day, year).

whole, although this sequence does not represent a pattern without exceptions, at this point in our study we will consider it the standard.

In some of our manuscripts, scribes have recorded either the dates when they began and concluded their work or, in multiple-text manuscripts, the date when each text was finished. We are thus able to calculate how long it took them to copy a whole manuscript or a section of it.⁵⁰ Thus, EO0001, which consists of 140 folios, was completed in less than two months (from 4 May to 30 June 1829). EO0006, consisting of 52 folios, was written in thirteen days (from 26 August to 7 September 1830).⁵¹ The fourth text of OR2355 (that is, OR2355d), in thirteen folios, was completed within a day (and on the same day the preceding text was also completed), whilst it took three days (from 12–15 November 1902) to complete the following three texts, sixteen folios in all. Similarly, it took one and a half months (from 17 August to 3 October 1845) to write the 92 folios needed for the second, third and fourth texts that were included in EO0003 (EO0003b,c,d).⁵² Finally, it took a remarkable period of five entire years (from 5 November 1824 to 15 November 1829) to complete the copy of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in EO0069.⁵³ It is not possible at this stage of research to draw conclusions about the average time employed by scribes to write a given number of folios. However, it is worth pointing out that once a larger amount of similar data has been gathered, these pieces of information may help us understand the temporal features of manuscript production more fully.

The conversion of the dates found in the scrutinised manuscripts into their equivalents in the Gregorian calendar is based on Pillai's *Indian Ephemeris* (1922 [VI] and 1923). As already noticed (see section 4.1.2), dates consisting of just the Jovian year, the solar month and the day of the month do not point to a unique day, since they recur every sixty years. Among their possible equivalents in the Gregorian calendar, only the more plausible are given in the table in Appendix. The date in UVSL107 is not precise to the day, since it only consists of the Kollam year and the solar month. Among the other dates, three contain contradictory

⁵⁰ Although bearing two dates each, the manuscripts EO0007, EO0583 and RE10829 are not relevant here, because their dates were written by different scribes.

⁵¹ The scribe also kept a record of the day on which the manuscript was entrusted to the person who had commissioned it, on 26 November 1830.

⁵² More specifically, it took forty, eight and two days to write 61, 19 and 12 folios respectively.

⁵³ It appears that the scribe who copied this manuscript (Veṅkaṭācārya, son of Raṅgācārya) was very active: he wrote four of the manuscripts included in the present study (EO0002, EO0003, EO0007, EO0009), each of them consisting of over one hundred folios. In the same period of time when he was writing the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in EO0069, he completed a copy of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in about 300 folios, the colophon of which is not included in this article (EO0083, completed in 1828 CE).

data. In EO0009b [94v4] the year Kollam 1000 is at odds with the other chronological data in the date (Jovian year, solar month and day, weekday, *tithi* and *nakṣatra*), which consistently point to the tenth day of the month Karkaṭaka in the Kollam year 999;⁵⁴ in RE05920, the solar day, *tithi* and *nakṣatra* point to 30 December (1880), whereas the weekday and the *pakṣa* indicate the day after that, 31 December (the day of the new moon); in EO0583a, the solar day, weekday and *nakṣatra* point consistently to 4 October (1738), but the *tithi* given in the date (i.e. the third) instead indicates 5 October. If the discrepancies in the former two cases remain unclear, in the latter case, we can reasonably assume that the date corresponds to 4 October, since it is most probable that the *tithi* mentioned by the scribe is what Pillai (1922 [I.I]: 5) calls ‘the following day’s *tithi*’. In fact, we can assume that the scribe completed the manuscript after 11am on 4 October, i.e. after the end of the second *tithi*. Conventionally, in colophons one finds the *tithi* current at the sunrise of the day on which the manuscript was composed – the second *tithi* in this case. However, here the scribe recorded the *tithi* current at the very moment in which he completed his work, i.e. during the third *tithi*.

5 Space

In this section we will consider how fraught it is to establish the geographical coordinates of a manuscript based on the information found in its colophon alone, since this can at times put the whole process of location in jeopardy. Explicit mentions of place names are generally lacking in colophons, and, in almost all cases, these should not be related to the manuscripts themselves, but rather to their scribe, their owner or the divinity praised in their invocations.

5.1 Explicit and loose references to place names

There are, of course, rare, exceptional manuscripts, in which place names are explicitly mentioned. For instance, UVSL1080a and UVSL1080c respectively state *tirunelveliḃ eḷuti muṭittatu* [30v6] (‘It was fully written in Tirunelvēli’) and *kumāreṭṭu tirunelvēliḃ eḷutiyatu* [25r4] (‘Kumāreṭṭu wrote in Tirunelvēli’). Here, it

⁵⁴ The Kollam year 1000 begun either 22 days later than that, if this date follows the *siṃhādi* reckoning (see section 4.1.1), or 53 days later, if it is given according to the *kanyādi* reckoning.

is evident that the place where the manuscript was written – or at least finalised – was Tirunelvēli (Tirunelveli).

However, one can also find random occurrences of place names, the relevance of which is rather difficult to evaluate in terms of establishing a manuscript's provenance. For instance, RE10829 mentions the name *tiruvaiyāru* [134v1], which corresponds to a town located in the Tañcāvūr *māvaṭṭam* (Thanjavur district), approx. 13 km North of Tañcāvūr. It seems plausible that there might be a direct link between the manuscript and that location. But what kind of link? Can we assume that Tiruvaiyāru (Thiruvaiyaru) was the place where the manuscript was produced? Or the place where it was stored? Moreover, how can we ascertain that the manuscript was not moved from one place to another over the course of time? In this particular case, the position of the name *tiruvaiyāru* in the colophon might be of assistance. In fact, it was incised, presumably in the same hand, immediately after the date of production of the manuscript. One might then assume that Tiruvaiyāru was the place where the scribe was writing, or at least completed, the manuscript. However, such a reconstruction of the whereabouts of the manuscript should only be taken as an educated guess.

5.2 Places of scribes and owners

In most of the colophons, place names accompany the names of scribes and owners. Therefore, they could varyingly refer either to their birthplace, the place from which their family (supposedly) originates or their place of residence at the time of writing. Which one is meant is not easily ascertainable. As a consequence, it is rather difficult to establish whether these locations have anything to do with the place of production or storage of the manuscripts.

One striking case is that of RE05920, which gives the name of its scribe as *cucindiraṃ nārāyaṇar putran senāpati* [89v1], 'Senāpati from Cucindiram son of Nārāyaṇar'. As reported by Varadachari (1986: 201), Cucintiram (Sucindiram) is a town in the Kaṇṇiyākumari *māvaṭṭam* (Kanyakumari district) with an important temple. However, Varadachari also reports, without further explanation, that the manuscript is from Tirunelvēli (Tirunelveli). If the latter information is correct, one must draw the conclusion that the place of origin of the scribe had no connection with the location in which the manuscript was produced and/or stored. Such a discrepancy clearly shows the limits of our present enquiry.

An important consideration to keep in mind when trying to locate any of the places mentioned in colophons on a map is that the available information about them can sometimes be ambiguous; the same name can refer to more than one

place. The graphic representation of the same toponym is liable to significant variations, not to mention that place names can change over the course of time. In this respect, the case of RE45807 is complicated, since it states that *icalimaṭai kopālakṣṇaṇ eḷutiṇatu* [36r2], ‘Kopālakṣṇaṇ from Icalimaṭai wrote [the first chapter of the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*]’. There are two villages in the Virutunakar *māvaṭṭam* (Virudhunagar district) that could correspond to Icalimaṭai: one is actually called Icalimaṭai (Isalimadaṭai) and is found in the Kāriyāpaṭṭi *vaṭṭam* (Kariapatti taluk), while the other is called Icali (Isali) and is found approx. 5 km to the East in the Tiruccuḷi *vaṭṭam* (Tiruchuli taluk). Both are found approx. 40-45 kms Northeast of Virutunakar, the district headquarters.⁵⁵ The former village would be the best candidate if it were not for the fact that the latter village is also sometimes called Icalimaṭai (Isalimadaṭai) in some official documents recently issued by various Indian national authorities (see websites /5/ and /6/). It is, therefore, difficult to establish which one of the two villages the scribe, Kopālakṣṇaṇ, was from.

Owners are rarely mentioned in our corpus when one compares them to scribes. The only case in which an owner’s name is accompanied by a place name is that of RE22704, where the relationship shared by the two is characterised rather precisely. In fact, a form of the verb *piṛa-ttal* (‘to be born’) is used to state that the town of Pālayaṅkoṭṭai (Palayamkottai), in the Tirunelvēli *māvaṭṭam* (Tirunelveli district), is the birthplace of the owner of the manuscript: *vellāṅkoḷli kurunāṭayyaṇ yelutiṇatu pālayaṅkoṭṭai piṛ³anda paṭṭaravarkaḷukku* [79r7-8], ‘Vellāṅkoḷli (?) Kurunāṭayyaṇ wrote [this manuscript] for Paṭṭaravarkaḷ, who was born in Pālayaṅkoṭṭai’.

5.3 Gods, shrines and place names

A further category of place names found in colophons concerns particular divinities and the location of their shrines. In most cases, geographical information can be indirectly deduced from the name of the deity praised in the colophon. At times, gods and goddesses are, in fact, referred to by names corresponding to one of their particular forms, the veneration of whom revolves around a specific location, e.g. a temple. RE20020b, for instance, states *sahāyadāmnisametaśritanun-*

⁵⁵ The same manuscript also contains another colophon, composed in Telugu, where the same location is mentioned as Śalimada, and the name of another town is reported, i.e. Pālavanattam [205v2-4]. The latter is a village in the Virutunakar district, approx. 40 km Northeast of the district headquarters. Courtesy of R. Satyanarayan.

ātheśvarasvāmine namaḥ [6v3] ‘Honour to the image (*svamin*) of Lord Śritanunātha together with Sahāyadāmnī’. Tanunātha and Sahāyadāmnī, in Tamil Tanunātar and Cakāyavalli (‘She with a garland as companion’), are the names of the installations of Śiva and his wife as worshipped at the Tirumēṇinātar temple of Tiruccuḷi (see website /7/).⁵⁶

Therefore, it is possible to assume that mentioning the divinity venerated at a particular place was in keeping with the activity or devotional practice of the scribe or with that of the commissioner/owner, assuming that the latter had asked to have that specific invocation in the manuscript. In other words, locations and manuscripts might have been linked intellectually as well as devotionally (if one is to assume a difference between these two categories). What precisely does this mean? Were those manuscripts part of private collections belonging to specific individuals who resided in those places? Or did they belong to individuals who were simply devotees of the divinities worshipped there? Or did those manuscripts belong to local institutions? Unfortunately, at present, it is impossible to establish in any precise terms exactly what the link was between the manuscripts and the places mentioned in their colophons. One might, however, postulate that the references are not just random.

5.4 Some final remarks

Spatial data contained in colophons are generally characterised by a certain degree of ambiguity. In fact, as seen above, they usually do not allow researchers to ascertain where exactly a manuscript was produced and/or stored. There are, however, a number of alternative scenarios besides such a depressing impasse.

First of all, one should remember that a quantitatively meaningful database is yet to be built. If a particularly telling colophon were to be found, it could provide us with precise spatial data to be cross-checked with the partial information found in one or more other manuscripts, thus casting new light on the geographical coordinates of the manuscript(s). Furthermore, if cataloguing information were more easily searchable, i.e. digitised, it might be possible to cross-check the spatial information contained in, say, one colophon with a whole set of data

⁵⁶ Note that Tiru-mēṇi-nātar is the literal Tamil equivalent of the Sanskrit term Śri-tanu-nātha, whilst Cakāya-valli is the equivalent of Sahāya-dāmnī. Also note that Varadachari (1990: 312 and *passim*) still locates Tiruccuḷi in the Irāmanātapuram *māvaṭṭam* (Ramanathapuram district). In 1987 this was, however, split into several areas: its eastern part was joined to the then Karmavirer Kamarajar district in order to form the Virudhunagar district of today (see website /8/).

emerging from the material analysis of manuscripts. If we were to match the length of palm leaves, the number of lines per folio, etc. with one manuscript containing precise spatial information, we could potentially locate and characterise centres of manuscript production. Finally, one cannot forget that the institutions in which manuscripts are stored today can in certain cases hold records about where items were purchased or about their donors.

Another line of enquiry might be to make use of the linguistic data found in colophons. Data concerning features characteristic of peculiar dialects or registers of Tamil (such as those collected in sections 4.1.3 and 4.1.5) might prove to be particularly helpful in locating manuscripts. However, to the best of our knowledge, there are no publications in which those features of Tamil are dealt with comprehensively and exhaustively.⁵⁷

Knowing that these research strands must wait for the more or less foreseeable future, the attentive reader might ask what can be done with the available data at present. Our answer is that, owing to their nature, data found in colophons can be used to address a set of questions that does pertain to spatial localisation. For instance, colophons can inform us about the religious milieu in which a particular manuscript was produced. In some cases, one can directly link such a manuscript to a particular divinity, whose image is worshipped at a specific temple, hence at a specific location. Once again, this does not mean that the manuscript was necessarily produced or stored there, but that, for its producers and users, it bore an intellectual and devotional association to that particular place. This kind of perusal would help trace the distribution of particular texts within the territory under consideration and also help us understand the dynamics of knowledge exchange that occurred there.

Furthermore, colophons can inform us about the place to which scribes and owners associated themselves, i.e. either their birthplace or the place of origin of their families, or, indeed, the place where they resided. As mentioned previously, this sort of information does not automatically provide us with an exact map indicating the locations of activity of individuals who were interested in manuscripts. However, such information can be cross-checked with what is already known about the religious – and possibly also social and economic – geography of Tamil Nadu and the surrounding areas and, where available, with other spatial data contained in the colophon(s) of the same manuscript. This operation would

⁵⁷ Partial data can be found in a small number of publications. See, for instance, Burnell 1880: 132 for a list of publications on Tamil dialects from the same author, and Zvelebil 1959, 1960 and 1963.

help us to contextualise the places mentioned in the names of scribes and owners.

An example may help to clarify what might be the outcome of our proposed approach. EO0006 contains, as Varadadesikan noted in his cataloguing sheet, ‘The work ‘*Amalaṇṭātipirāṇ*’ [that] consists of ten hymns sung by Tiruppāṇālvār in praise of the Lord Ranganatha in Srīraṅgam. This work is a commentary on those hymns’. From the information found in the colophons of this manuscript, we can hypothesise about the dissemination of its text within a particular area of Tamil Nadu, namely the Tūttukkuṭi *māvaṭṭam* (Thoothukudi district). In fact, one of the colophons mentions the owner of the manuscript as Tirukkurukai Perumāḷ, where Kurukai is a variant name for Ālvārtirunakari. Furthermore, a certain Ālvārtirunakari Ciperiyanampi is also mentioned as the person who produced a new copy of EO0006. Ālvārtirunakari (*alias* Tirukkurukai), to which both the owner and copyist are linked either in terms of devotion or of family affiliation, has a temple called Ālvārtirunakari Perumāḷ (Alwarthirunagari Perumal), which is one of the Navatiruppati (Nava Thirupati), i.e. the nine temples dedicated to the cult of Viṣṇu found in the Tūttukkuṭi *māvaṭṭam*. Interestingly, a man named Critirukkumarar Kaḷḷappirāṇ Aiyyaṅkār is also mentioned as the person into whose custody the copy of EO0006 was given; it is possible that he was the owner himself. Kaḷḷappirāṇ (‘Lord of the Thieves’) is the form of Viṣṇu venerated in another one of the Navatiruppati temples, namely the Vaikuṇṭanātar (Srivaikuntanathan Perumal) temple, which is located in the town of Tiruvaikuṇṭam (Sri-vaikuntam). Thus, we can postulate that this latter individual had some sort of connection to that place, whether anagraphical or devotional. What emerges from these data is the milieu in which EO0006 and its text moved, i.e. a network of individuals and places, namely the Navattirupati temples, which were deeply connected to the *vaiṣṇava* cult.

Such an example shows the importance of asking the right questions of the available sources. It also challenges what one might intuitively understand in terms of locating. In fact, here the focus is not on spatial features concerning the production and storage of a particular manuscript, but on the intellectual and devotional context within which the manuscript and its text(s) were circulated and used. Even if collecting data from colophons is not sufficient to give a comprehensive picture of the spatial dimension of a manuscript, it might, however, represent an important step to take towards corroborating and contextualising other available data.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank R. Satyanarayan, R. Varadadesikan and G. Vijayavenugopal (EFEO, Pondicherry) for their help. We hope to be able to further our collaboration

with them in future. We would also like to acknowledge the help of Eva Wilden (EFEO/CSMC/NET-amil) in providing the images of the *Caṅkam* and *Kīlkkāṇakku* corpora, amassed by the Caṅkam Project (EFEO, Pondicherry), and also for reading an earlier draft of this article. We are also grateful to Jean-Luc Chevillard (CNRS/NETamil) for providing the images from Varadadesikan's cataloguing sheets of the EFEO manuscript collection, Jonas Buchholz (NETamil) for his help with interpreting the colophons of UVSL1080a and UVSL1080c, and Florinda De Simini (Università degli Studi di Napoli L'Orientale) for providing the image of MS2.40.

6 Abbreviations, symbols and conventions

Codicological/manuscriptological/palaeographical abbreviations and symbols

GL	guard leaf
Skt.	Sanskrit
Tam.	Tamil
{D1}, {D2}, {D3}	abbreviations for 'day'
{M1}, {M2}, {M3}, {M4}	abbreviations for 'month'
{Y1}, {Y2}, ... {Y5}	abbreviations for 'Jovian year'
{YK1}, {YK2}, {YK3}	abbreviations for 'Kollam year'
r^2a	variant of r (<i>periya ra</i> , 'big r ') with a single 'hook'
r^3a	variant of r (<i>periya ra</i> , 'big r ') similar to Tamilian Grantha <i>gra</i>
[']	Sanskrit <i>avagraha</i> not marked in the text
-	punctuation mark
---	<i>piḷḷaiyār cuḷi</i>
----~	<i>piḷḷaiyār cuḷi</i> with a final 'curl'
✱	<i>puṣṣikā</i> 1 (found inside the text block)
✳	<i>puṣṣikā</i> 2 (found on the margins of the folio)

Editorial symbols

°	abbreviation at the end of a word (e.g. t° = <i>ttil</i> , y° = <i>yam</i>)
[✕]	erased graph
[X]	inferred graph
†	<i>crux desperationis</i>

Brackets in manuscript transcriptions and translations

[] Square brackets are used to indicate the folio number of the manuscript, the folio side and the line number, as in RE05915 [41v3], which should be read as RE05915, folio 41, verso, line 3. If the manuscript has double folio numeration, the one that applies to the whole manuscript is indicated in round brackets, as in EO0003d [30(160)r4]. If the folio is not numbered in the manuscript, it is referred to as GL (= guard leaf), as in EO0001 [GL1r1]. If the folio is written over more

than one column, this is specified as OR2355g [65v1 col2]. Square brackets are also used to indicate: Sanskrit *avagraha* when not graphically represented, as in E00009b [94r3] *daśame* [']*hani*; a graph that has been cancelled but is still readable, as in E00009b [94v4] *1000* [1] {YK1}; and a graph that is unreadable (either because it was cancelled or because the folio is damaged). In the latter case, a crossed-out capital X is inserted in the brackets, as in E00009b [94v2] °*veṃkaṭāryyagu*[X]*ruṇā*. Finally, square brackets are used in transliteration to integrate graphs that are missing and/or omitted in the original, as in E00009b [94r3] *kaṭakam* given in translation as *ka[rka]ṭaka*.

{ } Curly brackets are used to indicate the symbols and the abbreviations for the Kollam year ({YK}), Jovian year ({YJ}), month ({M}), and day of the month ({D}), as in E00069 [GL2r5] *1000* {YK1} *tāruṇa* {YJ1} *aṛ²paci* {M3} 22 {D1}. The number included in the curly brackets specifies which variant of the symbol/abbreviation is used; for a description of these variants, see the section on Time above (section 4).

\ / A backslash and slash are used to indicate the portion of the text that the original scribe, or a later one, inserted interlinearly, as in E00009b [94r3] *veṃ/kaṭaguru*°. Sometimes, scribes wrote the sign ‘+’ in order to mark where the new portion of text should be inserted, as in E00002a [106v7] *kāverīmahimā+\t[?]tāt/*.

\\ // A double backslash and slash are used to indicate alternative readings pointed out by the scribe interlinearly, as in E00069 [GL2r3 col1] *śrīraṃgarājādāsa sva\\raṃgarājātmaja svena//kareṇa veṃkaṭāryyakah*, where *raṃgarājātmaja svena kareṇa veṃkaṭāryyakah* is given as an alternative to (and possibly as an improved version of) *śrīraṃgarājādāsa svakareṇa veṃkaṭāryyakah*.

7 Appendix 1: Table

All the pictures in the table are taken from digital images, with the exception of those excerpted from manuscripts OR2345, OR2348, RE10829 [134v1], RE20020b, RE37121 and UVSL (all), which have been digitally redrawn due to the poor quality of the original pictures; in particular, the reconstruction of the symbols and the abbreviations found in RE10829 [134v1], UVSL107 and UVSL511 is tentative.

In the table, the entries are given in chronological order. The abbreviations TA, GR and MP stand for ‘TAmil script’, ‘GRantha script’ and ‘ManiPravalam’ (i.e. a mixture of the two), respectively. The abbreviations O. and R. stand for Owner and Recipient, respectively.

Texts are presented in diplomatic transcription.

CAT. No. TITLE SCRIPT (text/colophon)	DATE	PLACE	SCRIBE	O. or R.	Kollam YEAR
UVSL511 <i>Kalittokai</i> TA / TA	1675 Feb				850 {Y}4}
UVSL107 <i>Akanāṇūru</i> TA / TA	1726 Nov				902 {YK2?}
E00583a [GL1v4] <i>Tirunakarippiḷḷai</i> <i>Rahasyam (?)</i> GR(?) / MP	1738 Oct 4				914 {YK2}
E00583b [95v8] <i>Ācāryabhakti</i> [from cat.] <i>Sārārttharatnamālai (?)</i> MP / MP	1738 Oct 21				914 {YK2}
RE10829 [134r5] <i>Vātulaśuddha</i> GR / GR	1797 Dec 26			Satvajñāni [from cat.]	

Jovian YEAR	MONTH	DAY	WEEKDAY	PAKṢA	TITHI	NAKṢATRA
	māci {M3?}
	kārttikai māta	mutal ('first?')				
kālayukti {YJ3}	ar ² ppaci {M3}	2 {D1}	budhanṇikāmai	pūrvapakṣa-	tritikai	viśākhānakṣatram
kālayukti {YJ3}	ar ² ppaci {M3}	19 {D1}	sthiravāsaram	aparapakṣa-	-pañcami	ārdrānakṣatram
piṅgala- saṃvassara	dhanurmmāsa	pañcdaśama- dinam				

CAT. No. TITLE SCRIPT (text/colophon)	DATE	PLACE	SCRIBE	O. or R.	Kollam YEAR
RE10829 [134v1] <i>Vātulaśuddha</i> GR / MP	1823 Apr 19	Tiruvaiyāru (Thanjavur dist.)			
EO0002a <i>Tulākāverī- māhātmya</i> GR / GR	1819 Mar 22	Śrīdhanvinūtanapurī (?)	narasiṃhāryapautreṇa śrīraṃgācāryyasūnūnā coranāthena [likhitā]		994 {YK2}
EO0009b [94r3] <i>Śrīguṇaratnakośa- vyākhyā</i> GR / GR	1824 Jul 23		[vilekhitā] veṅkaṭāryyābhi- dhānena śrīraṃga- gurusūnūnā		
EO0009b [94v1] <i>Śrīguṇaratnakośa- vyākhyā</i> GR / GR	1824 Jul 23		śrīraṃgāryyaja- veṅkaṭāryya- guruṇāpūrnāryya- vaṃśotbhavenā [...] ālikhyate		

Jovian YEAR	MONTH	DAY	WEEKDAY	PAKṢA	TITHI	NAKṢATRA
subhānu {YJ4}	cittirai {M3}	8	śanikilamai		8	āyiliya
bahudhānya nāma saṃvatsare	phālgunamāse	ekādaśa- divase	induvāse	utarāyaṇe	ekādaśyām	śravaṇanakṣatre
tāruṇābde gate bhānau	kaṭakam	daśame [']hani	bhṛguvāsare		dvādaśyām	migaśiṛśākhya- tāreke
abde tāruṇanāmake	āṣāḍhamāse		bhṛgudine	pakṣe vaḷakṣetare	tithau dvādaśyām	migaśiṛśatārasahite

CAT. No. TITLE SCRIPT (text/colophon)	DATE	PLACE	SCRIBE	O. or R.	Kollam YEAR
E00009b [94v4] <i>Śrīguṇaratnakośa- vyākhyā</i> GR / MP	1824 Jul 23		perīyanvikaḷ tirmāḷikai śrīreṅgācāryar dāsan veṃkaṭācāryar		1000 {YK1}
E00069 [GL2r1 col1] <i>Aṣṭādhyāyī</i> GR / GR	1824 Nov 5	Ālvārtirunakari (Thoothukudi dist.) [from cat.]	śrīraṃgarājādāsa svakareṇa [OR raṃgarājātmaja svena kareṇa] veṃkaṭāryakal		
E00069 [GL2r5] <i>Aṣṭādhyāyī</i> GR / MP	1824 Nov 5		perīyanvi śrīreṅgācāryar dāsan veṃkaṭācāryar		1000 {YK1}
E00069 [63v5] <i>Aṣṭādhyāyī</i> GR / MP	1829 Nov 15		perīyanampi śrīraṃ- gācāryar dāsan veṃkaṭācāryar śrīpūrṇaveṃ- kaṭāryeṇa śrīraṃga gurusūnā [... vilekhitam]		1005 {YK1}

Jovian YEAR	MONTH	DAY	WEEKDAY	PAKṢA	TITHI	NAKṢATRA
tāruṇa {Y}2	āṭi {M3}	10 {D1}	veṅṅikeḷamai		dvādaśi tithi	migaśīrṣanakṣattiram
dāruṇanāmābde	tulāṃ prāpte divākare		śukravāsare	śuklapakṣe	caturdāśyām	aśvinyām
tāruṇa {Y}1	ar ² paci {M3}	22 {D1}	veṅṅikeḷamai	śuklapakṣattil	caturdāśi	aśvatīnakṣattiram
virodhivarṣam	kārttikai {M3}	2 {D1}	nāttikkeḷamai	kṛṣṇapakṣaṭ ^o	pañcami	punarvasu- nakṣatram

CAT. No. TITLE SCRIPT (text/colophon)	DATE	PLACE	SCRIBE	O. or R.	Kollam YEAR
RE05915 <i>Jayantīpuramāhātmya</i> GR / GR (in TA only <i>āṇi</i> and <i>eḷuti mukiñcutu</i>)	1827 Jun 21	Thiruchendur (Thoothukudi dist.) [from cat.]			1002 {YK2}
EO0007a <i>Candrāvaloka</i> GR / GR (in TA only the word <i>āṭṭi</i>)	1827 Aug 10		mahāpūrṇaśrīraṃgācāryya- dāsavaṃkaṭācāryyaḥ		1002 {YK2}
EO0001 [GL3v1] <i>Tiruvāymoḷi Nālām Pattu Ṭṭu Vyākhyānam</i> GR / TA (mostly)	1829 May 4				1004 {YK3}
EO0001 [140r5] <i>Tiruvāymoḷi Nālām Pattu Ṭṭu Vyākhyānam</i> GR / TA	1829 Jun 30				1004 {YK3}

Jovian YEAR	MONTH	DAY	WEEKDAY	PAKṢA	TITHI	NAKṢATRA
	āṇi {M2}	9 {D1}
	āṭi {M3}	27 				
	cittira {M2}	24 {D1}
	āṇi {M2}	19 {D1}

CAT. No. TITLE SCRIPT (text/colophon)	DATE	PLACE	SCRIBE	O. or R.	Kollam YEAR
MS2.40 <i>Śivadharmā</i> GR / MP	1830 Apr 22				
EO0006 [GL3v1] <i>Amalaṇātipirāṇ Vyākhyāṇam</i> GR / TA	1830 Aug 26 – 1830 Sep 7			critirukkumaṛar kaḷḷappirāṇ aiyyaṅkāṛ	1006 {YK3}
EO0006 [52r6] <i>Amalaṇātipirāṇ Vyākhyāṇam</i> MP / MP	1830 Aug 26 – 1830 Sep 7				1006 {YK3}
EO0006 [GL1r1] <i>Amalaṇātipirāṇ Vyākhyāṇam</i> GR / TA (mostly)	1830 Nov 26	Ālvārtirunakari / Tirunelvēli (?)			1006 {YK3}

Jovian YEAR	MONTH	DAY	WEEKDAY	PAKṢA	TITHI	NAKṢATRA
vikratināma- saṃvatsaram	cittirai { M2}	12 {D1}	guruvarāma			aśvanī- nakṣatram
	āvaṇi {M2} āvaṇi {M2}	12 {D1} 24 {D1}	guruvarāma			anuṣaṃ nakṣatram
	āvaṇi {M2}	12 { D1} 24 {D1}
	kār ² t° {M2}	13 {D1}

CAT. No. TITLE SCRIPT (text/colophon)	DATE	PLACE	SCRIBE	O. or R.	Kollam YEAR
RE08256 <i>Sakalāgamasarasamgraha</i> [from cat.] GR / MP	1834 Jan 24	Ramešvaram [from cat.]			
E00007b <i>Kuvalayānanda</i> GR / TA	1839 Nov 21				1015 {YK2}
E00003a <i>Triṃśatpraśnottara</i> MP / MP	1845 Aug 17		periyānampi veṅkaṭācāriyar		1021 {YK1}
E00003b <i>Triṃśatpraśnottarakhaṇḍana</i> MP / MP	1845 Sep 25		periyānampi veṅkaṭācāriyar		1021 {YK2}
E00003c <i>Īṭupāṭu of Jīyar</i> MP / MP	1845 Oct 2		periyānampi veṅkaṭācāriyar		1021 {YK1}

Jovian YEAR	MONTH	DAY	WEEKDAY	PAKṢA	TITHI	NAKṢATRA
vijaya {Y1}	tai {M1}	13 {D2}	śukravāraṃ			punarvasu- nakṣatram
	kār ² ttikai {M2}	7 {D1}
viśvāvasuvarṣam	āvaṇi māsam	3 {D1}	nāttikkelaṃmai		parṇamāvāsai	avutṭa nakṣattiram
viśvāvasuvarṣam	piratṭāci {M2}	11 {D1}	vyālakkelamai	kṛṣṇapakṣattu	daśami tithi	punarvasu nakṣattiram
viśvāvasu nāma saṃvatsaram	kanyā māsam per ² aṭṭāci {M3}	18 {D1}	vyālakkelamai	śuklapakṣattu	prathamai	citrānakṣatram

CAT. No. TITLE SCRIPT (text/colophon)	DATE	PLACE	SCRIBE	O. or R.	Kollam YEAR
EO0003d <i>Svarūpavijñānavikāsa- darppaṇam (or Īṭupāṭu) of Vedāntācāryar</i> MP / MP	1845 Oct 3		periyānampi venkātācāriyar		1021 {YK1}
EO0004 <i>Tīrumālai Pratipatavurai</i> MP / MP	1862 Apr 29				1037 {YK2}
OR2345 <i>Jaiminiya Āraṇyaka Gāna</i> GR / TA	1863 Nov 19		cuppaḷam (?) kecavaṇ		1039 āmta
UVSL1080a <i>Cīrupaṇcamūlam</i> TA / TA	1873 Apr 29	Tirunelvēli	ta (?) kumāreṭṭu		1048 {YK2}
UVSL1080c <i>Ācārakkōvai</i> TA / TA	1873 May 2	Tirunelvēli	mu (?) kumāreṭṭu		48 {YK2}

Jovian YEAR	MONTH	DAY	WEEKDAY	PAKṢA	TITHI	NAKṢATRA
viśvāvasu saṃvatsaram	poṭṭāci {M2}	19 {D1}	veṅṅikēlamai	śuklapakṣatu	dvitīyai	svātinakṣatram
duṇḍubhi nāma varṣam	cittirai {M2}	18 {D1} utaiyattil				
	kārttika {M4} cam	5 t°
śrīmuka {Y}2}	cittirai {M2}	18 {D1}
śrīmuka {Y}2}	cittirai {M2}	21 {D1}

CAT. No. TITLE SCRIPT (text/colophon)	DATE	PLACE	SCRIBE	O. or R.	Kollam YEAR
RE05920 <i>Śucīndrasthalamāhātmya</i> GR / GR (in TA only <i>sucīndiraṃ</i>)	1880 Dec 30 (or 31)	Sucīndiraṃ (Kanyākumārī dist.) [from cat.]	ejuśākhaddhyān śrīvatsagotrothave satyāśadaśūtraḥ cucīndiraṃ nārāyaṇar putran senāpati		sahasrādhika ṣaṭpañcaḥ
OR2340j <i>Ṣoḍaśīkalyāṇīstotra</i> GR / MP (invocations in GR, the rest all in TA but the word <i>śāstrī</i>)	1891 Jul 17	cantiracekapuram	cantiracekapuram kīrāmam ayyar śāstrikaḷ kumāraṇ tcrīt cuvāmi		kollam 1066 mtu
OR2355c <i>Pradoṣārccana</i> GR / MP	1902 Nov 12				1078 mta
OR2355d <i>Ṛṣipañcami-vratodyāpana</i> GR / MP	1902 Nov 12		rāmapaṭṭar	ve kīṣṇavāddhyār	78
OR2355g <i>Somavārārcana</i> GR / GR (in TA only <i>āmata</i>)	1902 Nov 15		nārāyaṇapaṭṭar puttran rāmayan	vekiṭṭīśvara vāddhyār puttiran kīṣṇavāddhyār	kollam 1078 āmata

Jovian YEAR	MONTH	DAY	WEEKDAY	PAKṢA	TITHI	NAKṢATRA
vikramanāma- saṃvatsare	dhanurmmāse	saptadaśa- divase	bhṛṅguvāsare	pūrvapakṣa-	-caturdadaśyām	jyēṣṭhānakṣatre divase
	āṭi {M1}	3 {D2}
	tulāmāsam	27 ā {D3}
	tulām	27 ā tiyati				
	tulāmāsam	30 tiyati				

CAT. No. TITLE SCRIPT (text/colophon)	DATE	PLACE	SCRIBE	O. or R.	Kollam YEAR
OR2355h <i>Nakṣatradevatā ṛk</i> GR / GR			rāman	kṛṣṇavāttiyār	
OR2344b <i>Devīmāhātmya</i> GR / MP	1908 Jul 25 – Aug 5		sundaran putran nārāyaṇan		kollam 1083
MANUSCRIPTS WITH AMBIGUOUS DATES					
OR2347.1 <i>Devīmāhātmya</i> GR / MP	1789 Nov 1 or 1849 Nov 2 or 1909 Nov 4				
RE45807 <i>Amarakośaḥ</i> <i>Drāviḍārthasahitaḥ</i> MP / MP	1796 Sep 14 or 1856 Sep 16 or 1916 Sep 17		icalimaṭai kpālakṛṣṇan		
RE37121 <i>Amarakośaḥ</i> (with Tamil meaning) MP / MP	1797 Jan 4 or 1857 Jan 5 or 1917 Jan 7		sadaśivan		

Jovian YEAR	MONTH	DAY	WEEKDAY	PAKṢA	TITHI	NAKṢATRA
	āṣāḍhamāsaṃ	10 āṃ tiyyati āraṃbhicca 21 āṃ tiyyati				
MANUSCRIPTS WITH AMBIGUOUS DATES						
saumyanāma- savatsaraṃ	tulāmāsaṃ	19 {D1} udiccu 13 ṇāḷikai				
naḷa {Y}2	piratṭaci {M1}	3 {D2}
naḷa {YK2}	mār ² kaḷi {M1}	24 t°

CAT. No. TITLE SCRIPT (text/colophon)	DATE	PLACE	SCRIBE	O. or R.	Kollam YEAR
RE20020b <i>Devīpratiṣṭhā</i> GR / GR	1799 Apr 12 or 1859 Apr 14 or 1919 Apr 15				
OR2348 <i>Lalitātriśatināmāvalī</i> GR / MP	1800 Jul 10 or 1860 Aug 11 or 1920 Aug 13		kecavapaṭṭar ṇālayanaḥ (?)		
OR2359 <i>Cakravidhi</i> GR / GR (n TA only <i>poṭṭāci</i>)	1803 Sep 28 or 1863 Sep 28 or 1923 Sep 30			ayyāsvāmidikṣitan	
COLOPHONS WITH ONLY PLACE NAMES					
RE22704 <i>Amarakośaḥ</i> <i>Drāviḍaṭṭikāśahitaḥ</i> MP / MP			veḷṇaṅkoḷḷi (?) kuruṇāṭayyan	pālayaṅkoṭṭai piṭṭanda paṭṭaravarkaḷ	

Jovian YEAR	MONTH	DAY	WEEKDAY	PAKṢA	TITHI	NAKṢATRA
siddhārtthi {Y}4	caitra māsaṃ	3 {D1}
raudri varṣaṃ	āṭi {M4} cam	29 t°
rudhirotgāri {Y}5	poṭṭāci {M1}	14 {D1}
COLOPHONS WITH ONLY PLACE NAMES						

8 Appendix 2: Corpus

Note: If not otherwise indicated, the date refers to when the manuscript was completed.

RE05915 – *Jayantīpurāmāhātmya* (21 July 1827)

[41v3] *hariḥ om śubham astu | śrīvallidevasenāsametaśrīsubrahmaṇyasvāmi*[X]*sahāyam |*
 --- 1002 {YK2} *āṇi* {M2} 9 {D1} *eḷuti mukiñcutu* ---

Hariḥ om, may there be prosperity. With the support of śrī Subrahmaṇya along with [his spouses] śrī Valli and Devasenā, [this manuscript] was fully written [in the] Kollam year 1002, month of Āṇi, 9th day.

Notes: (1) Varadachari (1986: 186-7) thinks that the manuscript looks much younger than the age indicated by the date in the colophon. (2) According to Varadachari (1986: 186-7), Jayantīpura is another name for the town of Tiruccentūr (Tiruchendur/Thiruchendur) in the Tūttukkuṭi *māvaṭṭam* (Thoothukudi district). In fact, the Tiruccentūr Cuppiramaṇiyacuvāmi Kōyil (Thiruchendur Murugan Temple), where Murukaṇ is venerated as Subrahmaṇya (Cuppiramaṇiya in Tam.), along with his two wives, is there.

RE05920 – *Śucīndrasthalamāhātmya* (30 or 31 December 1880)

[89r7] *hariḥ om | sahasrādhikaṣaṭpañcaḥ vikramaṇā*[89r7]*masaṇvatsare dhanurmmāse sap-*
tadaśa[te]*divase bhṛguvāsare pūrvapakṣacaturdāśyām jyeṣṭhā*[na]*kṣatre divase ejuśākhād-*
dhyāyān [89v1] *śrīvatsagotroṭbhave satyāśaḍasūtraḥ* [X] *cucīndiraṇ nārāyaṇar putran senāpati*
 [X] *likhitam | hari om* [89v2] *śubham astu gurubhyo namaḥ | sthāṇusahāyam*

Hariḥ om. [In the Kollam year] 1056, the [Jovian] year called Vikrama, month of Dhanu, the 17th day, a Friday, the 14th [*tithi*] of the bright fortnight, under the Jyeṣṭhā constellation, on [this] day Senāpati from Cucīndiram, reciter of the Yajurveda, born in the Śrīvatsa *gotra*, [belonging to the tradition] of the *Satyāśaḍ[h]asūtra*, son of Nārāyaṇar, wrote [this manuscript]. Hariḥ om. May there be prosperity. Honour to the teachers. With the support of Sthāṇu (i.e. Śiva).

Notes: (1) *Divase* has been translated as ‘on [this] day’ since it resembles the Tamil expression *inta śubhadinattil* found in the colophons of many other manuscripts, such as E00003a. (2) The locative form in *otbhave* seems to be a mistake. (3) The syntax seems to be rather loose, thus the passive verbal form *likhitam* has been translated as active.

RE08256 – *Sakalāgamasarasamgraha* (24 January 1834)

[162v2] *śubham astu śrīparvatavarddhanīsametaśrīrāmaṇāthāya namaḥ | aṃbāsahā*[yam]
 [162v3] *vijaya* {YJ1} *tai* {M1} 13 {D2} *śukravāraṇ punarvasunakṣatraṇ śubhadinattil*

*perivālakṣṇa kurukkaḷ uṭaiya pustakattaip pā²ttu yenakku yeḷutik koṇṇē ākamam pa[r]-
vatayyaṇ hastali[162v4]khikhitam [sic!] śubham astu śriam̐bāsahāy° dharmmadevataye sa-
hāya°*

May there be prosperity. Honour to śrī Rāmanātha together with [his spouse] śrī Parvatavardhanī. With the support of Ambā. In the Jovian year Vijaya, month of Tai, 13th day, a Friday, under the constellation of Punarvasu, on [this] auspicious day, having seen the book belonging to Perivāla Kṣṇa Kurukkaḷ, I, Ākamam Parvatayyaṇ, wrote [this manuscript] for myself. May there be prosperity, with the support of śrī Ambā [and] the God of Dharma.

RE10829 – *Vātulaśuddha* (26 December 1797; change of ownership (?) 9 April 1823)

[134r5] *piṅgalasaṁva*[134r6]*ssara dhanurmmāsa pañcadaśamadinam śubham astu satyajñāni*

[Jovian] year Piṅgala, month of Dhanur, 15th day. May there be prosperity. Satyajñāni.

[134v1] *subhānu* {YJ4} *cittirai* {M3} 8 | *śanikkīlamaiy 8 āyillīya* [one or more syllables missing] [134v2]*†tra† tiruvaiaṅṅū*

Jovian year Subhānu, month of Cittirai, 8th [day], Saturday, 8th [*tithi*], [constellation of] Āyillīya. Tiruvaiaṅṅū.

Notes: (1) The meaning of the word *satyajñāni* is not immediately clear. Most probably, it indicates the name of the scribe, since it is written by the same hand that copied the text of the whole manuscript. The same name, written by the same hand, is also found in RE10845 (manuscript not studied in this article). At present, it cannot be ascertained whether Satyajñāni was also the owner of the two manuscripts. (2) The second date, which was added by a second hand to the verso of the folio and left uninked, could be that of the first owner of the manuscript, or record the change of ownership of the manuscript, in case Satyajñāni were the first owner.

RE20020b – *Devīpratiṣṭhā* (12 April 1799, 14 April 1859, or 15 April 1919)

[6v3] *hariḥ om śubham astu śrīgurubhyo namaḥ || sahāyadāmnisametāśritanunāthe-
śvarasvāmine namaḥ | siddhārtthi* {YJ4} *caitra māsaṁ 3* {D1} ---

Hariḥ om. May there be prosperity. Honour to the teachers. Honour to the image (*svamin*) of Śritanunātha (i.e. Śiva) together with Sahāyadāmnī. Jovian year Siddhārtthi, month of Caitra, 3rd day.

Note: Śritanunātha and Sahāyadāmnī are the names of the installations of Śiva and his wife as worshipped at the Tirumēṅinātar temple of Tirucculī.

RE22704 – Amarakośaḥ Drāviḍaṭṭikāsahitaḥ (no date)

[79r4] *nāmaliṅgānuśāsana*[79r5] *ttile prathamakāṇḍaṁ saṃpūrṇaṁ āy mukintatu ||*
śrīrāmacandrāya paramagura[79r6] *ve namaḥ || rājagopālasvāmisahāyaṁ || --- ❀ ❀ ❀*
 [79r7] ❀ *veḷḷaṅkoḷḷi kuruṇātayaṇ yelutiṇatu pāḷayaṅkoṭṭai pir³anda paṭṭaravarka*[79r8] *lukku ||*
śrīsāmbasadāśivāya namaḥ || --- ❀ || --- ❀

The first chapter of the *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsanaṁ* has been fully completed. Honour to the supreme guru śrī Rāmacandra. With the support of Rājagopālasvāmin. Veḷḷaṅkoḷḷi (?) Kuruṇātayaṇ wrote [this manuscript] for Paṭṭaravarkaḷ, who was born in Pāḷayaṅkoṭṭai. Honour to śrī Sadāśiva along with Ambā.

Note: It is possible that Veḷḷaṅkoḷḷi corresponds to a town halfway between the cities of Kollam and Tiruvananthapuram (Thiruvananthapuram/Trivandrum), which are both found in present-day Kēraḷam (Kerala) (see website /9/).

RE37121 – Amarakośaḥ (with Tamil meaning) (4 January 1797, 5 January 1857, or 7 January 1917)

[27v5] *ity amarakośe prathamakāṇḍas samāptaḥ | --- hariḥ om | śubham astu avighnam*
astu
 [27v6] *bind[u]durlipivisargavīdhikāpaṅtībhedapadabhedadūṣaṇaṁ |*
hastavegaṁ abuddhipūrvakaṁ kṣantum arhatha samikṣya satjanāḥ |
 --- *ṇaḷa* {YK2} *mār²kaḷi* {M1} 24th [27v7] *eḷutiṇatu sadāśivaṇ pustakaṁ | svahastalikhitaṁ |*
asmatgurucaraṇāravindābhyo namaḥ | --- om

The first section of the *Amarakośa* is completed. Hariḥ om. May there be prosperity. May there be no obstacle.

O good people, once you have investigated [this manuscript], you may forgive [any] unintentional mistake[s] concerning nasal signs, bad writing, signs of aspiration at the end of words, a row, omission of a line (*paṅkti-bheda*) or word, which are born from a hasty hand.

Sadāśivaṇ wrote [this] book with his own hand in the Jovian year *Naḷa*, month of *Mārkaḷi*, 24th day. Honour to the lotus like feet of our guru. Om.

Notes: (1) The stanza is in *rathoddhatā* metre. (2) °*vīdhikā*° should be read as °*vīthikā*° (‘row’), and °*paṅti*° should be read as °*paṅkti*° (‘line’). It is not clear to what exactly the former refers, since the latter seems to indicate the same phenomenon, i.e. the ‘omission of a line’ or ‘aplography’. (3) *Naḷa* should be read as *Naḷa*, and *Mār²kaḷi* as *Mārkaḷi*. (4) Note that the name of the Jovian year is followed by a symbol for the Kollam year.

RE45807 – Amarakośaḥ Drāviḍārthasahitaḥ (14 September 1796, 16 September 1856, or 17 September 1916)

[36r1] śubham astu --- || kumāragurave namaḥ --- [36r2] icalimaṭai kopālakṛṣṇaṇ eḷutiṇatu naḷa {Y}2 piṛaṭṭaci {M1} 3 {D2} amaraṇ – prathamakāṇṭam – eḷuti mukintatu ---

May there be prosperity. Honour to Kumāraguru. Kopālakṛṣṇaṇ from Icalimaṭai wrote in the Jovian year Naḷa, month of Piṛaṭṭaci, 2nd day. He finished writing the first chapter of the *Amara*[kośa].

E00001 – Tiruvāymoḷi Nālām Pattu Īṭu Vyākhyānam (30 June 1829) (the date 4 May 1829 is also recorded)

[GL1r1] śrimate rāmānujāya namaḥ tiruvāymoḷi nālā\m/ pattu yiṭu vyākhyānam jiyar tiruvaṭikaḷe caraṇam --- tirukkurukaip perumāḷ ---

Honour to śrīmat Rāmānuja, *Tiruvāymoḷi Nālām Pattu Īṭu Vyākhyānam*, the holy feet of Jiyar are the refuge. Tirukkurukai Perumāḷ.

[GL2r1] śrimate rāmānujāya namaḥ tiruvāymoḷi nālām pattu yiṭu vyākhyānam jiyar tiruvaṭikaḷe śaraṇam tirukkurukaipperumāḷ dāsan ---

Honour to śrīmat Rāmānuja, *Tiruvāymoḷi Nālām Pattu Īṭu Vyākhyānam*, the holy feet of Jiyar are the refuge. Devotee of Tirukkurukai Perumāḷ.

[GL3r1] śrī[ma]d varavaramunaye namaḥ tiruvāymoḷi nālām pattu yiṭu vyākhyānam --- jiyar tiruvaṭikaḷe caraṇam ---

Honour to śrīmat Varavaramuni, *Tiruvāymoḷi Nālām Pattu Īṭu Vyākhyānam*, the holy feet of Jiyar are the refuge.

[GL3v1] gopālapillai kuṭṭa rāmānu[ja]nūntantāti urai [GL3v2] jñānasāram prameyasāra vyākhyānam periyatirumuṭi[GL3v3]yaṭaivu dinacari vāḷi tirunāmaṇkaḷ yivaḷavu munnamum kuṭutt°kutu [GL3v4] cittira {M2} 24 {D1} 1004 {YK3} kuṭutt°kutu

The *Rāmānu[ja]nūntantāti Urai*, the *Jñānasāram*, the *Prameyasāravvyākhyānam*, the *Periyatirumuṭiyaṭaivu* were given by Gopālapillai. Having praised the holy names every day, so much [i.e. so many manuscripts] is already given. It is given on the month of Cittira, 24th day, Kollam year 1004.

[140r5] ālvār tiruvaṭikaḷe caraṇam | emperumāṇār tiruvaṭikaḷe caraṇam --- maṇavāḷa māmuṇikaḷ tiruvaṭikaḷe caraṇam --- śrīmad varavaramunaye namaḥ [140r6] rāmānuja-dāsan caramāvadhidāsan dāsānudāsan tirukkurukaip perumāḷ ācāryyan tiruvaṭikaḷe tañcam jiyar tiruvaṭikaḷe tañcam --- [140r7] 1004 {YK3} āṇi {M2} 19 {D1} samāptam ---

The holy feet of the Ālvār are the refuge. The holy feet of Emperumāṇār (= Rāmānuja) are the refuge. The holy feet of Maṇavāla, the great sage, are the refuge. Honour to śrīmat Varavaramuni. The holy feet of master Tirukkurukai Perumāḷ, devotee of Rāmānuja, last (*caramāvadhi*) of the servants, servant of servants, are the refuge. The holy feet of Jiyar are the refuge. [The manuscript] was finished in the Kollam year 1004, month of Āṇi, 19th day.

Notes: (1) Since this colophon presents a list of many *śrīvaiṣṇava* teachers, such as Emperumāṇār/Rāmānuja, Maṇavāla, etc., one cannot exclude the possibility that Tirukkurukai Perumāḷ corresponds to Tirukkurukaippirāṇṇiḷḷāṇ here, a *śrīvaiṣṇava* master of the twelfth century, who was a pupil of Rāmānuja (Venkatachari 1978: 61-64). Alternatively, the expression *tirukkurukaipperumāḷ dāsan* could be interpreted as ‘Tirukkurukai Perumāḷ, devotee [of Rāmānuja]’ in the light of EO0006 [GL1r2] and [52r7]. (2) The colophon found in [GL3] presents a rather colloquial style. In particular, one should note the form *kuṭṭa* for *kuṭutta*, and the expression *kuṭutt°kutu*, which seems to mark a contracted form of the standard *kuṭutt° irukkīratu* with a symbol for abbreviation (Vijayavenugopal personal communication). If its interpretation is correct, this colophon does not pertain to the production of EO0001, but refers to the date of donation of three other manuscripts.

EO0002a – *Tulākāverīmāhātmyam (Āgneyapurāṇa) (22 March 1819)*

[106v4] *āgneyapurāṇe kāverīmāhātmya samāptam* | [106v5] *hariḥ om --- kāveryyai namaḥ ---* | *śrīmate rāmānujāya namaḥ --- śrīmahāpūrnagurave namaḥ* | --- *śrīvaikuṇṭhanāthasvāmine namaḥ ---* [106v6] 994 {YK2} *bahudhānya \nāma/ saṃvatsare uttarāyaṇe phālgunamāse ekādaśadvise induvāsare ekādaśyām śravaṇanakṣatre nara-simhāryyapautreṇa* [106v7] *śrīraṃgācāryyasūnūnā | coranāthe\ṇa/ likhit[✕]\ā/ kāverīmāhimā+\{[?]\tā/[XXX]\} --- śrīdhanvinū[✕]tanapurīgurave namaḥ | śrīraṃgavallyai namaḥ ---* |

The *Kāverīmāhātmya* in the *Āgneyapurāṇa* is completed. Hariḥ om. Honour to the Kāveri. Honour to śrīmat Rāmānuja. Honour to the guru śrī Mahāpūrṇa. Honour to śrī Vaikuṇṭhanāthasvāmin. In the Kollam year 994, Jovian year called Bahudhānya, in the second fortnight, month of Phālguna, 11th day, on Monday, 11th [*tithi*], under the Śravaṇa constellation, Coranātha grandson of Narasimhāyya and son of Śrīraṃgācāryya wrote the *Kāverīmāhimā* (?). Honour to the guru of Śrīdhanvinūtanapurī (?). Honour to Śrīraṃgavalli.

Notes: (1) The scribe, Coranātha, is the son of Śrīraṃgācāryya and grandson of Narasimhā[ca]ryya. Veṃkaṭācāryyar (the scribe of EO0002, EO0007 and EO0069) is also the son of a man called Śrīraṃgācāryya. Since the two scribes were active in the same period, they may have been brothers. Unfortunately, we cannot confirm this hypothesis since we do not (yet) know the name of Veṃkaṭācāryyar’s grandfather. (2) The form *°āryya°* could be a contraction of *°ācāryya°*. (3) The identification of both the guru of Śrīdhanvinūtanapurī (?) and Śrīraṃgavalli has not yet been made.

E00003a,b,c,d

E00003a – *Triṃśatpraśnottara* (17 August 1845)

[68v3] hariḥ om – śubham astu – ---- || śrīmatbhyo parāṃkuśaparakālayativarādibhyo
 namaḥ – śrīmahāpūrṇagurave namaḥ – ---- || [68v4] 1021 {YK1} viśvāvasuvarṣam āvaṇi
 māsaṃ 3 {D1} nāttikkeḷamai paurnamāvāsai – avuṭṭa nakṣattiram – yinta śubhadinattil
 [68v5] triṃśatpraśnottara[~~khaṇḍana~~]\ṃ eḷuti/ mukintatu – perīyanampi veṇkaṭācāriyar sva-
 hastalikihitam – muḷuvatum – perīyanampikaḷ tiruvaṭikaḷe caraṇ° ----

Hariḥ om. May there be prosperity. Honour to śrīmat Parāṃkuśa, Parakāla and Yativara. Honour to guru śrī Mahāpūrṇa. In the Kollam year 1021, Jovian year Viśvāvasu, month of Āvaṇi, 3rd day, on Sunday, under the full moon, under the constellation of Avuṭṭa, on this auspicious day, the *Triṃśatpraśnottara* was fully written. Perīyanampi Veṇkaṭācāriyar completed [it], writing with his own hand. The holy feet of Perīyanampikaḷ are the refuge.

E00003b – *Triṃśatpraśnottarakhaṇḍana* (25 September 1845)

[129v6] śrīmate rājāya namaḥ – śrīmahāpūrṇagurave namaḥ – – hariḥ om śubham astu – ---- ||
 1021 {YK2} \+ viśvāvasuvarṣam/ pīraṭṭāci {M2} 11 {D1} vyāḷakkeḷa[129v7]mai \+
 kṛṣṇapakṣattu/ daśami tithi punarvasu nakṣattiram inta śubhadinattil triṃśatpraśnottara-
 khaṇḍanaṃ eḷuti mukiñcatu – perīyanampi veṇkaṭācāriyar svahastalikihitam ----

Honour to śrīmat Rā[mānu]ja. Honour to guru śrī Mahāpūrṇa. Hariḥ om, may there be prosperity. In the Kollam year 1021, Jovian year Viśvāvasu, month of Pīraṭṭāci, 11th day, on Thursday, 10th [tithi] of the dark fortnight, under the constellation of Punarvasu, on this auspicious day, the *Triṃśatpraśnottarakhaṇḍana* was fully written by Perīyanampi Veṇkaṭācāriyar with his own hand.

E00003c – *Īṭupāṭu* of Jīyar (2 October 1845)

[18(148)v3] – ---- || hariḥ om – śubham astu – ---- || [18(148)v4] yemperumāṇār tiru-
 vaṭikaḷe caraṇam – maṇavāḷa māmuṇikaḷ tiruvaṭikaḷe caraṇam – ---- – śrīmahāpūrṇa
 gurave namaḥ – ---- || [18(148)v5] 1021 {YK1} viśvāvasu nāma saṃvatsaram kanyāmāsam
 \peṇṇaṭṭāci {M3}/ 18 {D1} vyāḷakkeḷamai śuklapakṣattu prathamai citrānakṣatram yinta śubhadinattil
 [18(148)v6] jīyar īṭupāṭu – eḷuti mukintatu – ---- – perīyanampi veṇkaṭācāriyar svahas-
 talikihitam – muḷuvatum – ---- || ❄ – ---- ||

Hariḥ om. May there be prosperity. The holy feet of Emperumāṇār (= Rāmānuja) are the refuge. The holy feet of the great sage Maṇavāḷa are the refuge. Honour to guru śrī Mahāpūrṇa. In the Kollam year 1021, the Jovian year called Viśvāvasu, month of Kanyā

[*alias*] Perattāci, 18th day, on Thursday, 1st [*tithi*] of the bright fortnight, under the constellation of Citrā, on this auspicious day, the *Īṭupātu* of Jiyar was fully written. Periyānampi Veṅkaṭācāriyar completed [it], writing with his own hand.

Note: *Muḷuvatum* should be read as *muḷuvatum* (see EO0003d [30(160)r6]).

EO0003d – *Svarūpavijñānavikāśadarppaṇam* (or *Īṭupātu*) of Vedāntācāryyar (3 October 1845)

[30(160)r4] – ---- || *iti vedāntācāryyasvarūpavijñā[Ṭ]na/vikāśada[Ṭ]rppaṇam saṃpūrṇam*
 || ---- [30(160)r5] 1021 {YK1} *viśvāvasu saṃvatsaraṃ poṭṭāci* {M2} 19 {D1} *veḷḷikkeḷamai*
śuklapakṣattu dvitīyai – svātinakṣatraṃ – yinta śubha[30(160)r6]*dinattil vedāntācāryyar*
īṭupātu e\lu/ti mukiñcu\nta/tu – ---- || *periyānampi veṅkaṭācāriyar svahastalikihitam –*
muḷuvatum – ---- ||

The *Svarūpavijñānavikāśadarppaṇam* of Vedāntācāryya is completed. In the Kollam year 1021, Jovian year Viśvāvasu, month of Poṭṭāci, 19th day, on Friday, 2nd [*tithi*] of the bright fortnight, under the constellation of Svāti, on this auspicious day, the *Īṭupātu* of Vedāntācāryyar was fully written. Periyānampi Veṅkaṭācāriyar completed [it], writing with his own hand.

Note: The word *mukintatu* (see, for instance, EO0003c [18(148)v6]) can be colloquially rendered as *mukiñcatu* or *mukiñcutu* (see EO0004 [36v8], for example). Here, it seems that the scribe accounted for both possibilities by writing *mukiñcu\nta/tu*.

EO0004 – *Tirumālai Pratipatavurai* (29 April 1862)

(Fig.1) [36v7] || *tonṭaṭartippotiṭi ālvār tiruvaṭikaḷe caraṇam* || --- || *hariḥ om śubham astu* ||
 [36v8] 1037 {YK2} *duṇḍubhi nāma varṣaṃ cittirai* {M2} 18 {D1} *utaiyattil eḷu\ti/ mukiñcutu* ||
periyānampiṭaḷ tiruvaṭikaḷe caraṇam || *śrīmahāpūṇṇagurave namaḥ* ---

The holy feet of the ālvār Tonṭaṭartippoti are the refuge. Hariḥ om, may there be prosperity. In the Kollam year 1037, Jovian year Duṇḍubhi, month of Cittirai, 18th day, at dawn, [this manuscript] was fully written. The holy feet of Periyānampiṭaḷ are the refuge. Honour to the guru śrī Mahāpūṇṇa.

Note: The scribe of this manuscript is most probably that of EO0003.

EO0006 – *Amalaṇātipirāṇ Vyākhyāṇam* (from 26 August to 7 September 1830; entrustment of a copy based on this manuscript on 26 November 1830)

[GL1r1] *śrīmate rāmānujāya namaḥ amalaṇātipirāṇ vyākhyāṇam* --- *jīyar tiruvaṭikaḷe*
caraṇam --- [GL1r2] *rāmānuja dāsan tirukkurukaip perumāḷ śrīkośam* --- *śrīmad vara-*

varamunaye namaḥ [GL1r3] *itaṛ²ku mel prati ālvārtirunakari criperiyānampi criśrikośam pārtt[']* *er²iyaruḷappaṇṇinatu anta mel pratiyai critirukkumaṛ²ar kaḷḷappirāṇ aiyyaṅkāṛ vacat-til* [GL1r4] 1006 {YK3} *kāṛ²t^o* {M2} 13 {D1} *nelveliyil kkoṭuttuvitṭeṇ* ---

Honour to śrīmat Rāmānuja, *Amalaṇātipirāṇ Vyākhyānam*. The holy feet of Jiyar are the refuge. The book (*śrikośam*) [of] Tirukkuruḷai perumāl devotee (*dāsan*) of Rāmānuja. Honour to śrīmad Varavaramuni. Having Ālvārtirunakari Criperiyānampi seen the book (*criśrikośam*), its copy was produced (*eriyaruḷappaṇṇinatu*); I gave that copy into the custody (*vacam*) of Critirukkumaṛar Kaḷḷappirāṇ Aiyyaṅkāṛ in [Tiru]nelveli in the Kollam year 1006, month of Kāṛṭtikai, 13th day.

[GL3v1] 1006 {YK3} *ā\va\ṇi* {M2} 12 {D1} *gurvāram a[XX]\nuṣam/ nakṣatram* [GL3v2] *āram-pam \tliṭ/ āvaṇi* {M2} 24 {D1} *utaiyam samāptaḥ*

Beginning in the Kollam year 1006, month of Āvaṇi, 12th day, Thursday, under the constellation of Anuṣam; [the manuscript] was finished at dawn on the 24th day.

(Fig.2) [52r6] *hariḥ om* --- *aḷakiyamaṇavāḷapperumālṇaiyīṇār tiruvaṭikaḷe caraṇam* --- *ramyājāmāṭṭmunaye namaḥ* --- [52r7] *tirukkuruḷai perumāl dāsan śrikośam ācāryyan tiruvaṭikaḷe taṅcam* --- 1006 {YK3} *āvaṇi* {M2} 12 {D1} *ārampaṇ ceytu* 24 {D1} *utaiyam samāptaḥ* ---

Hariḥ om. The holy feet of Aḷakiyamaṇavāḷapperumālṇaiyīṇār are the refuge. Honour to the sage Ramyājāmāṭṭ. The book of Tirukkuruḷai Perumāl, devotee. The holy feet of the teacher are the refuge. Kollam year 1006, month of Āvaṇi; [the manuscript] was begun on the 12th day, and finished at dawn on the 24th day.

Notes: (1) The term *śrikośam* is translated as ‘manuscript/book’ (see *Glossary of Historical Tamil Vaishnava Prose* 2001 and EO0583a). (2) *Prati* (‘copy’) is the Sanskritised spelling of the Tamil *pirati*. (3) *Pārtt[']* (from *pārttu*, absolutive form of the verb *pār-ttal*, ‘to see’), which literally means ‘having seen’, could mean ‘having checked’ or ‘having proofread’ here. (4) *Vacattil* (locative form of *vacam*) could mean either ‘in the custody’ or ‘in the possession’. (5) The syllable *cri^o* in both *criperiyānampi* and *criśrikośam* is just a tentative reading of the character found in the manuscript. It is understood as a Tamil version of the Sanskrit *śrī* here.

EO0007a,b

EO0007a – *Candrāvaloka* (10 August 1827)

[11v6] --- *candrāvalokas samāptaḥ* | --- *hariḥ om śubham astu* [11v7] *mahāpūrṇa-śrīraṅgācāryyadāsaveṇkaṭācāryyaḥ svakiyakaravegena samāptavān* | --- 1002 {YK2} *āṭi* {M3} 27 --- ~ ❄ --- ~ - - - - - ~ - - - - -

The *Candrāvaloka* has been completed. Hariḥ om, may there be prosperity. Veṃkaṭācāryya son of Mahāpūrṇa Śrīraṃgācāryya completed [it] by the swiftness of his own hand. Kollam year 1002, month of Āṭi, 27th [day].

EO0007b – *Kuvalayānanda* (21 November 1839)

[119v1] 1015 {YK2} *kār²ttikai* {M2} 7 {D1}

Kollam year 1015, month of Kārttikai, 7th day.

Note: This colophon was inserted on the verso of the last folio in a different hand from the one that wrote the text contained in the manuscript. Possibly, it was written by the same scribe of EO0003 and EO0069, namely Veṃkaṭācāryyar.

EO0009b – *Śrīguṇaratnakośavyākhyā* (or *Lakṣmīsatguṇamāṇikkakośavyākhyā*) (23 July 1824)

(Fig. 3) [94r3] *hariḥ om iti yativaracaraṇāṃburuhabhṛṅgāyamāṇāc c[hr]ive\ṇi/kaṭagurukṛ* [93r4]*pālābdhaśrībhāṣyānvayena śrībhāṣyanārāyaṇagunūṇā vira*[94r5]*citeṣu śrīguṇaratnakośa-*
vyākhyā samāptā | --- *hariḥ om śubham astu* [94r6]

tāruṇābde gate bhānu kaṭakaṃ daśame [']hani |

dvādaśyām mṛgaśiṣākhyatāra [94r7] *bhṛguvāsare* |

lakṣmīsatguṇamāṇikkakośavyākhyā vilekhitā |

veṃka[94v8]*ṭāryyābhidhānena śrīraṃgagurusūnūṇā* |

--- *mahāpūrṇagurave namaḥ* ---

[94v1] *abde tāruṇāmake bhṛgudine* [']py *āṣāḍhamāse tithau*

dvādaśyām mṛgaśiṣatāra[94v2]*sahite pakṣe vaḷakṣetare* |

śrīraṃgāryyajaveṃkaṭāryyagu[X]*ruṇā pūrṇāryyavaṇi*[98v3]*śotbhave*

nāḍya śrīguṇaratnakośaparamavyākhyeyam ālikhyate | ---~ - ❀

(Fig. 4) [94v4] 1000 [1] {YK1} *tāruṇa* {YJ2} *āṭi* {M3} 10 {D1} *dvādaśi tithi veḷḷikeḷamai*
mṛgaśiṣānakṣattiram [94v5] *inta śubhadinattil periyānvikaḷ tirumālīkai śrīreṃgācāryyar*
dāsan veṃka[94v6]*ṭācāryyar svahastena eḷuti mu\ki/ttāṇ śrīguṇa*[X]*ratnakośavyākhyānam*
muḷuvatum | ---~ |||

Hariḥ om. The *Śrīguṇaratnakośavyākhyā* has been completed, which is among the compositions (*viraciteṣu*) of guru Śrībhāṣyanārāyaṇa of the Śrībhāṣya lineage, for which he obtained the grace of śrī Veṃkaṭaguru by approaching (*ayamānāt*) the lotus-like feet of Yativara (= Rāmānuja) [as] a bee. Hariḥ om, may there be prosperity.

When the sun (*bhānu*) entered the Tāruṇa year, in [the month of] Ka[rka]ṭaka, on the 10th day,

on the 12th [*tithi*], under the constellation called Mṛgaśiṣa, on Friday,

the *Lakṣmīsatguṇamāṇikkakośavyākhyā* was written

by the one called Veṃkaṭāryya, son of the guru Śrīraṃga.

Honour to the guru Mahāpūrṇa.

In the year called Tāruṇa, on Friday, also in the [lunar] month of Āṣāḍha, on the 12th *tithi*, under the constellation of Mṛgaśīrṣa, in the other fortnight than the bright one (*pakṣe vaḷakṣa-itare*), today, this Śṛiṅṇaratnakoṣaparamavyākhyā has been written by the guru Veṃkaṭāryya, son of Śrīraṃgāryya, born in the Pūrṇāryya lineage.

In the Kollam year 1000, Jovian year Tāruṇa, month of Āṭi, 10th day, 12th *tithi*, Friday, under the constellation of Mṛgaśīrṣa, on this auspicious day, Veṃkaṭācāryyar, son of Śrīreṃgācāryyar, the vaiṣṇava teacher (*periyānvikaḷ*) of respectable family (*tīru-māḷikai*), has fully written (*eḷuti mukittāṇ* [...] *muḷuvatum*) the Śṛiṅṇaratnakoṣavyākhyāna with his own hand.

Notes: (1) The amending of *ayamānācciveṃkaṭaguru*° to *ayamānāc c[hr]iveṃkaṭaguru*° (i.e. *ayamānāt śrīveṃkaṭaguru*°) is somewhat tentative. (2) The two stanzas are in *anuṣṭubh* and *śārdūla-vikṛīḍita* metre respectively.

EO0069 – *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (or *Vvyākaraṇasūtram*) (from 5 November 1824 to 15 November 1829)

[GL1r1] *hariḥ om śubham astu - avighnam astu* | [GL1r2] *vyākaraṇasūtram aṣṭādhyāyī* | ---
~ || [GL1r3] (uninked and effaced line)

Hariḥ om, may there be prosperity. May there be no obstacle. *Vvyākaraṇasūtram Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

(Fig. 5) [GL2r1 col1] *asmin dāruṇanāmābde tulāṃ prāpte divākare* |
[GL2r2 col1] *śuklapakṣe caturdāśyām āsvinyāṃ śukravāsare* |
[GL2r3 col1] *śrīraṃgarājādāsa sva\raṃgarājātmaja svena//kareṇa*
veṃkaṭāryyakāḥ |
[GL2r4 col1] *premayārabdhavān aṣṭādhyāyīsūtram vilekhituṃ* |

In this [Jovian] year named Dāruṇa, when the sun has entered the [month of] Tulā, in the bright fortnight, on the 14th [*tithi*], under the [constellation] of Āsvini, on Friday, the pitiful Veṃkaṭāryya, son of Śrīraṃgarāja, with his own hand, began to write the *Aṣṭādhyāyīsūtra*, out of affection [for that work] (?).

Notes: (1) As suggested by Varadadesikan (personal communication), the suffix *-ka* in *veṃkaṭāryyakāḥ* could indicate humbleness. In fact, rule 5.3.78 of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* prescribes [*anukampāyāṃ* (5.3.77)] *bahvaco manuṣyanāmnaṣ ṭhaj vā* ('Optionally, the suffix *-ka* (*ṭhac*) [can be used] after a polysyllabic personal name [to express compassion]') (see, for instance, Katre 1987: 603). (2) Possibly, *premayā* is an ungrammatical variant of *premnā*, the instrumental of *preman* ('affection'). (3) The two stanzas are in *anuṣṭubh* metre. The interlinear insertion *\raṃgarājātmaja svena/* seems to be a later attempt by the scribe to compose a verse in which the *caesura* does not fall in the middle of a word or a compound, as is customary in Sanskrit metrics. In fact, *raṃgarājātmaja svena* | *kareṇa veṃkaṭāryyakāḥ* would be considered to be a

better verse than *śrīraṅgarājadāsa sva|kareṇa veṃkaṭāryyakaḥ*. The same solution is not attempted in the following verse, where the *caesura* splits the compound as follows: *aṣṭā/ddhyāyīsūtram*.

[GL2r5] 1000 {YK1} *tāruṇa* {YJ1} *ar²paci* {M3} 22 {D1} *ve||likke|amai śuklapakṣattil caturddaśi aśvatīnakṣattiram yinta* [GL2r6] *śubhadinattil perīyanvi śrīraṅgācāryar dāsan veṃkaṭācāryar vyākaraṇasūtram aṣṭāddhyāyīm* [GL2r7] *svahastena e|uta ā\\ā//raṃbhiccān*

In the Kollam year 1000, Jovian year Tāruṇa, month of Arpaci, 22nd day, on Friday, in the bright fortnight, 14th [*tithi*], under the constellation of Aśvati (= Aśvini), on this auspicious day, Veṃkaṭācāryya, son of the vaiṣṇava teacher (*perīyanvi*) Raṅgācāryya, began to write the *Vyākaraṇasūtram Aṣṭāddhyāyī* with his own hand.

Notes: (1) In the manuscript, the initial *ā*° in *āraṃbhiccān* is written twice, above in Tamil and below in Grantha. (2) *Perīyanvi* is an abbreviated form of *perīyanampi*; see below [63v8].

(Fig. 6) [63v5] *hariḥ om śubham astu - addhyāyo* ['] *pi samāptaḥ | śāstram api parisamāptaḥ* ---- [63v6] *namaḥ pāṇinikātyāyanipatañjalibhyaḥ |* ---- 1005 {YK1} *virodhivarṣam kārttikai* {M3} 2 {D1} *nāttikkela*[63v7] *mai kṛṣṇapakṣat° pañcami punarvasunakṣatram inta śubhadinat° vyākaraṇasūtram e|uti mukiñcatu mu|uvatum* ---- [63v8] *idaṃ vyākaraṇasūtram perīyanampi śrīraṅgācāryar dāsan veṃkaṭācāryar svahastalikhitan nikhilam* ---- [63v9] *śrīpūrṇaveṃkaṭāryyeṇa śrīraṅgagurusūnūnā | svakīyena kareṇāṣṭāddhyāyīsūtram vilekhitam |* ---- ||||

Hariḥ om, may there be prosperity. [This] section is also completed. And the treatise is also fully completed. Honour to Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali. In the Kollam year 1005, Jovian year Virodhi, month of Kārttikai, 2nd day, on Sunday, in the dark fortnight, on the 5th [*tithi*], under the constellation of Punarvasu, on this auspicious day, the *Vyākaraṇasūtram* has been fully written (*e|uti mukiñcatu mu|uvatum*). This *Vyākaraṇasūtram* has been entirely written with his own hand by Veṃkaṭācāryyar, son of the vaiṣṇava teacher (*perīyanampi*) Śrīraṅgācāryyar.

With his own hand the *Aṣṭāddhyāyīsūtra* was written,
by Śrīpūrṇaveṃkaṭāryya, son of Śrīraṅgaguru.

Notes: (1) The final *-ttil* is written in this manuscript in four different ways: *-ttil* (as in *kṛṣṇapakṣattil* and *śubhadinattil* [63v7]), *-tti-l* (as in *śuklapakṣattil* [GL2r5]), and *-t-ti-l* (as in *śubhadinattil* [GL2r6]). (2) The stanza is in *anuṣṭubh* metre.

EO0583a,b

Preliminary notes: (1) Both colophons present some rather obscure passages. For instance, the expressions *tiruvāymoliṇṇai* *enru mālaipillai* *aikumārār* (EO0583a [GL1v7-8]) and *tiruvāymoliṇṇai* *mālaipillai* (EO0583b [95v10-11]), the latter apparently a reduced version of the former, are particularly difficult to account for. Furthermore, despite the fact that, if our interpretation is correct, EO0583a and EO0583b were written by two different scribes, the hand of both manu-

scripts looks very similar. (2) In his cataloguing sheets for this manuscript, Varadadesikan described only what we call E00583b here, labelling it *Ācāryabhakti*, which seems to be the name of the literary genre rather than the text itself. Here we tentatively propose two different titles on the basis of our reading of the colophons. In fact, neither of them seems to be recorded in the secondary literature.

E00583a – *Tirunakaripillai Rahasyam* (?) (4 October 1738)

(Fig. 7) [GL1v4] --- śrimate rāmānujāyaya namaḥ | ---~ | [GL1v5] 914 {YK2} kālayukti {YJ3} ar²ppaci {M3} 2 {D1} budhanṇi[GL1v6]l²amaiyum pūrvapakṣatritikaiyum viśākhānakṣatramum pe[GL1v7]r²a nāl melait tiruvāymoḷipillai² en²u mālaipillai[GL1v8]kumārar cuntararācapillai² en²ut tirunakaripillai raha[GL1v9]syam śrīnivāsarāmānujadāsan svahastattiṇāle eḷuti ni[GL1v10]r²avettiṇāṇ cuntararācapillai śrīkoṣam - ----~

Honour to śrīmat Rāmānuja. On the day on which the Kollam year 914, the Jovian year Kālayukti, the month of Arppaci, the 2nd day, Thursday, the 3rd [*tithi*] of the bright fortnight, and the constellation of Viśākhā all fall (*peṇṇa-nāl-melai*), Śrīnivāsarāmānujadāsan finished writing the *Tirunakaripillai Rahasyam* (?) with his own hand exclusively (*en²ru*) for Mālaipillai²aikumārar Cuntararācapillai, *tiruvāymoḷipillai² en²ru* (?). The book (*śrīkoṣam*) of Cuntararācapillai.

Notes: (1) Although marked as GL here, this is probably the only surviving folio of a manuscript with no page numbers. Presumably, the manuscript was lost or destroyed. (2) *Tiritikai* (also spelt *tiritiyai*) is the Tamil name of the 3rd *tithi* (see Skt. *ṭṭīyā*).

E00583b: *Sārārttharatnamālai* (?) (21 October 1738)

(Fig. 8) [95v8] ----~ hariḥ om śubham astu ----~ [95v9] 914 {YK2} kālayukti {YJ3} ar²ppaci {M3} 19 {D1} aparapakṣapañcamiyum sthīravāsa[95v10]ramum ārdṛānakṣatramum petta nāl melait tiruvāymoḷiv en²u mālaipillai[95v11]tai taṇakku e²iyaruḷappaṇṇiṇa sārārttharatnamālai sampūrṇam āka t²river²u[95v12]ttu⁺ - śrīśailanāthagurave namaḥ - pillai tiruvaṭikaḷe caraṇam

Hariḥ om, may there be prosperity. On the day on which the Kollam year 914, the Jovian year Kālayukti, the month of Arppaci, the 19th day, the 5th [*tithi*] of the dark fortnight, Saturday, and the constellation of Ārdṛā all fall (*petta-nāl-melai*), having fully completed the *Sārārttharatnamālai*, which Mālaipillai, *tiruvāymoḷiv en²ru* (?), copied for himself (?). Honour to the guru śrī Śailanātha. The holy feet of Pillai are the refuge.

Notes: (1) *Tiruvaṭikaḷe* should be read as *tiruvaṭikaḷe*. (2) *Riveruttu* could be read as *niraiverurru*, which would resemble an irregular absolutive form of the root *niraiveru* ('to complete'). (3) Both Śailanātha and Pillai could be tentatively understood as appellatives of Tiruvāymoḷipillai, a śrīvaiṣṇava master of the fourteenth century, also known as Śaileśa (see Śailanātha in [95v12]) (Venkatachari 1978: 86–87).

UVSL107 – *Akanāṇūru* (November 1726)

[GL?4] *veṇ tamaraiyāḷ viḷaṅku maṇi nūpuraṇ cūḷ taṇ tamaraiye caraṇa[m] --- ālvār tiruvaṭikaḷe caraṇam ---* [GL?5] 902 {YK2(?)} *kārttikai māta mutal reikanātaṇ eḷuti varuki²atu ---* [GL?6] *vaṇaca maṇṭapattil aracu vīr²r²irukkum vakuḷa mālikaic ceṇpakac caṭakopak kārīmā²avar taṇ r²iruvaṭikaḷe caraṇam --- paṭcirācak kaṭavuḷ pātāravinta keti ---* [GL?7] *caṅkattār pāṭiya neṇtokaiyun tur²aiyuṇ kavi pāṭiṇ per\†per†/kaḷum eḷuti²irukkutu --- makil²mā²avar taṇ malar aṭiye taṅcam --- śubham astu śrī rāma jayam --- keruṭāya namaḥ ---*

The cool lotus surrounding the shining jewel anklet of the female one on the white lotus is the refuge. The holy feet of the Ālvār are the refuge. [This manuscript] is being written by Reikanātaṇ and was begun in the month of Kārttikai in the Kollam year 902. The holy feet of Caṭakōpaṇ Kārīmā²avar (= Nāmaḷvār) with *campakam* for a garland [along with] *vakuḷam*, who sits in distinction as king of the lotus temple hall are the refuge. The lotus-like feet of the god [seated] on the king of birds are the refuge. The *Neṇtokai* ('Long Collection') sung by those of the academy and the miniature commentaries and the names of the songs' poets have been written. The flower feet of joyful Mā²avar are the refuge. May there be prosperity. Victory to śrī Rāma. Honour to Garuḍa.

Note: The translation is a slightly modified version of the one in Wilden 2014: 129.

UVSL511 – *Kalittokai* (February 1675)

[last folio damaged, v2] 850 {YJ4} *māci* {M3} [part of the folio missing] [v3] *tiruvarūril irukkum ceṅkamala por²patam ma²aiṇāṇa paṇṭarattiṇ puttiraṇ civakuruṇātaṇ eḷuttu* [v4 contains 12 illegible characters]

Kollam year 850, month of Māci, the script of Civakuruṇātaṇ, son of Ceṅkamala Porpatam Ma²aiṇāṇa Paṇṭaram, who is in Tiruvarūr.

Notes: (1) The UVSL catalogue (Ramanuja Aiyangar 1956: 249–250) interprets the day as the 29th. It is possible that the folio was in better condition at the time the catalogue was prepared. (2) Tiruvarūr is more often spelled Tiruvārūr (Thiruvavarur). (3) The translation is a slightly modified version of the one given in Wilden 2014: 132.

UVSL1080a,c⁵⁸

[GL2r1 col2] *eṭṭaiyapuram* [GL2r2 col2] *araṇamaṇai* [GL2r3 col2] *jēyam*

The palace of Eṭṭaiyapuram. Victory.

⁵⁸ In connection with the interpretation of the colophons of UVSL1080a,c we would like to acknowledge the collaboration of Jonas Buchholz.

UVSL1080a – *Ćirupañcamūlam* (29 April 1873)

[30v4] [...] *kāriyācāṇ* [30v5] *ci²upañcamūlañ ceytāṇ* --- *ci²upañcamūla mu²r²um* --- 1048 {YK2} *śrīmuka* {YJ2} *cittirai* {M2} 18 {D1} [30v6] *tirunelveliyl eḷuti muḻittatu* - *civacuyam-pirakāca muṇṇi²r²ka* [30v7] *ta kumāreṭṭu cakkatēvi muṇṇi²r²ka vēṇṭiyatu*

[...] Kāriyācāṇ composed the *Ćirupañcamūlam*. The *Ćirupañcamūlam* is finished. In the Kollam year 1048, Jovian year Śrīmuka, month of Cittirai, 18th day, it was fully written in Tirunelveli. May Civacuyampirakāca stand in front [of me]. Cakkatēvi [worshipped by] Ta Kumāreṭṭu should stand in front [of me] (?).

UVSL1080c – *Ācārakkōvai* (2 May 1873)

[25r3] *ācārakkōvaiy urai muṇṇi²r²ru* --- [25r4] *k[ā]ntimati nellaiyappar muṇṇi²r²ka* --- 48 {YK2} *śrīmuka* {YJ2} *cittirai* {M2} 21 {D1} --- *makārācā avarka*[25r5][*luṭaiya ūḷiyam*][*×*] *mu* - *kumāreṭṭu tirunelveliyl eḷutiyatu* --- *naṇṇāka tēvituṇaica* [25r6] *ceyya vēṇṭiyatu* --- *tavacittam-pirāṇ riruvaruḷē caraṇam* ---

The commentary on the *Ācārakkōvai* is completed. May I stand in front of Nellaiyappar (= Śiva) [together with] Kāntimati. In the Kollam year [10]48, Jovian year Śrīmuka, month of Cittirai, 21st day, in service of the great king, Mu (?) Kumāreṭṭu wrote in Tirunelveli. May there be prosperity, [he] desired to serve the Goddess. The holy grace of Tavaci Tampirāṇ is [our] refuge.

Notes: (1) The town of Eṭṭaiyapuram (Ettayapuram) used to be in Tirunelveli *māvaṭṭam* (Tirunelveli district); today it is part of Tūttukkuṭi *māvaṭṭam* (Thoothukudi district). (2) The colophons of UVSL1080a and UVSL1080c are different palaeographically: the latter employs the so-called *puḷḷi*, a symbol used to mark a consonant without a vowel, and shows a more modern form of the consonant *r*. In this respect, one should note that the two colophons were probably written by two different scribes, namely Ta. Kumāreṭṭu and Mu. Kumāreṭṭu. (3) The name Kumāreṭṭu may correspond to the title held by various zamindars of Eṭṭaiyapuram (see Vadivelu 1903: 129–52, who writes ‘Kumara Ettappa’). In particular, Mu. Kumāreṭṭu may correspond to Jagavira Rama Kumara Ettappa Nayakar Aiyan, the 36th zamindar of Eṭṭaiyapuram (see Vadivelu 1903: 138–45, where various events that happened to the zamindar are reported from 1875 until his death in 1890): the syllable ‘Mu’ may, in fact, be understood as an abbreviation of the name of his father, namely Muthuswami Jagavira Rama Ettappa Nayakar Aiyan (see Vadivelu 1903: 138). However, the syllables ‘Ta’ of UVSL1080a would still remain problematic. (3) Nellaiyappar and Kāntimati are the names of the god and goddess venerated in the *śaiva* temple of Tirunelveli called Nellaiyappar Tirukkōyil (Nellaiyappar Temple).

OR2340j – *Ṣoḍaśikalyāṇīstotra* (17 July 1891)

[59r3] *hariḥ | om | - śubham astu - devi | ślokaṃ 16 || śrīmahādev*[3 syllables lost] [59r4] *kollam 1066mtu āṭi* {M1} 3 {D2} *cantiracekapuram kiṛāmam ayyar śāstrikaḷ kumāraṇ* †*crī*† *cuvāmi* †*kay yeṭuttu*† - *gaṇ*[3 syllables lost]

Hariḥ om. May there be prosperity. The 16 verses for the Goddess. Śrī Mahādev... In the Kollam year 1066, month of Āṭi, 3rd day, śrī (?) Cuvāmi son of Ayyar Śāstrikaḷ from the village of Cantiracekapuram wrote [3 syllables lost].

Notes: (1) Possibly, °*mtu* should be amended to °*mta* (see section 4.1.1, fn. 16). (2) The expression †*kay yeṭuttu†* could mean ‘having held in the hand’, thus possibly ‘wrote’ or ‘copied’. However, in order for this reading to be possible, one should accept the presence of an odd graph used to write the syllable *ṭu* and that the word for ‘hand’ is spelled *kay* instead of *kai*.

OR2344b – *Devīmāhātmya* (from 25 July to 5 August 1908)

[46v2] *śrīmahādevyai namaḥ | śrīmatsarasvatyai namaḥ | śrīgurubhyo namaḥ | śrīrā[mā]ya namaḥ |* [46v3] *kollaṁ 1083 āṣāḍhamāsaṁ - 10 - āṁ tiyyati āraṁbhicca - 21 - āṁ tiyyati dev[46v4]mahātmyaṁ mukiñcutu | śrīmahāde[46v5]vyai namaḥ | śrī | śubhaṁ |* [46v6 this line contains decorative signs only] [46v7] *sundaran putran nārāyaṇan sva[46v8] hasthalikhitaṁ | śrīkṛṣṇāya namaḥ |*

Honour to śrī Mahādevī. Honour to śrīmat Sarasvatī. Honour to the śrī gurus. Honour to śrī Rā[mā]. The *Devīmāhātmya*, which was begun in the Kollam [year] 1083, month of Āṣāḍha, 10th day, was completed on the 21st day. Honour to śrī Mahādevī. Śrī. Prosperity. Nārāyaṇan son of Sundaran wrote [it] with his own hand. Honour to śrī Kṛṣṇa.

OR2345 – *Jaiminīya Āraṇyaka Gāna* (19 November 1863)

[66v1] | *hari om |* [66v2] *ity āraṇapāṭhasamāptaḥ | śubham astu śrīgurubhyo namaḥ | cuppaḷam kecavaṇ āraṇakurantam 1039[66v3]āmta kārṭtika {M4}cam 5 t° eḷuti mukuñcatu*

Hari[h] om. The *Āraṇapāṭha* is completed. May there be prosperity, honour to the śrī gurus. Cuppaḷam (?) Kecavaṇ finished writing the *Āraṇakurantam* in the Kollam year 1039, month of Kārṭtika, 5th day.

Notes: (1) The term *cuppaḷam* is rather unclear. It could be a variant spelling of either *cuppaḷam* or *cuppalam*, both meaning ‘good merit’. (2) The word *kecavaṇ* is also found scratched over the wooden cover as *keṣavaṇ*. (3) The way in which the vowel *u* is attached to the consonant *l* in *eḷuti* is graphically unconventional.

OR2347.1 – *Devīmāhātmya* (1 November 1789, 2 November 1849, or 4 November 1909)

[77v1] *śubham astu | śrīmahādevyai namaḥ | --- [77v2] saumyanāmasa[ṁ]vatsaram tulāmāsaṁ 19 {D1} udiccu 13 nālīkaiyār †po+tu devīmāhātmyaṁ [77v3] samāptaṁ --- śrīmahādevyai namaḥ | --- hariḥ om | ---*

May there be prosperity. Honour to śrī Mahādevī. In the [Jovian] year Saumya, month of Tulā, 19th day, once [the sun] has risen (*udiccu*), at the time of the 13th *nāḷikai*, the *Devimāhātmya* was completed. Honour to śrī Mahādevī. Hariḥ om.

Note: The expression *nāḷikaiyār* †*po*†*tu* is not completely clear. *Nāḷikaiyār* probably means ‘at the *nāḷikai*’, with the term *nāḷikai* (a measure of time of 24 minutes; see section 4.1.7) marked with the locative ending *-āṇ*, which becomes *-ār* because of *sandhi*. On the other hand, †*po*†*tu* can either be read as *potu* (i.e. *pōtu*), meaning ‘when’ or ‘at the time’, or as *śetu* (possibly a variant of *śeytu*/*ceytu*, i.e. the absolutive form of the root *cey-* ‘to make’), meaning ‘having been made’. The former reading seems to be more consistent with the style of colophons, such as those of EO0583a and EO0583b, where the verbal form *per²r²a*/*petta* is employed.

OR2348 – *Lalitātriśatīnāmāvalī* (10 July 1800, 11 August 1860, or 13 August 1920)

[10r6 col2] *hari om - raudri varṣam āṭi* {M4} *cam* [10r7 col2] *29t° kecavapaṭṭar* †*nā*‡*aya*‡*ṇa*‡*ḥ*†
triśati [10r8 col2] *arccaṇai mukiñcitu harihara* [10r9 col2] *virīñcebhyo namaḥ* |

Hariḥ om. In the [Jovian] year Raudri, month of Āṭi, 29th day, Kecavapaṭṭar Nāḷayaṇaḥ (?) completed the *Triśati Arccaṇai*. Honour to Hari, Hara and Viriñca.

Notes: (1) The word *nāḷayaṇaḥ* (read *nāḷayaṇaḥ*) is rather puzzling. It could either be part of the name of the scribe or part of the title of the work contained in the manuscript. In the former case, one might be at least tempted to amend it to Nārāyaṇaḥ, since it is an attested personal name. In the latter case, it would be the Tamil counterpart of Lalitā (see title): could Nāḷayaṇaḥ then be a (local) name for the goddess? (2) Note that the spelling of *arccaṇai* is in between the Sanskrit *arccanā* and the Tamil *aruccaṇai*. (3) Hari, Hara, and Viriñca are Viṣṇu, Śiva, and Brahmā respectively.

OR2355c,d,g,h

OR2355c – *Pradoṣārccana* (12 November 1902)

[36r2] *pradoṣārccanasamāptam* | [36r3] *1078 – mta tulāmāsam 27ā* {D3} *samāptam* ---

The *Pradoṣārccana* is completed. It is completed in the Kollam year 1078, month of Tulā, 27th [day (?)].

Note: Regarding the symbol written after 27ā, see section 4.1.4.

OR2355d – *Ṛṣipaṇcamivratodyāpana* (12 November 1902)

[49v3] *hari om śubham astu | ṛṣipaṇcamivratodyāpanasamāptam | 78 tulāṃ 27ā tiyati –*
 [49v4] *ve kṛṣṇavāddhyārka veṇṭi rāmapaṭṭar svahastalikhitam | ---*

Hariḥ om. May there be prosperity. The *Ṛṣipaṇcamivratodyāpana* is completed. [Kollam year 10]78, month of Tulā, 27th day. As desired by Kṛṣṇavāddhyār, [son of] Ve[kiṭiśvara-vāddhyār], Rāmapaṭṭar wrote [it] with his own hand.

Notes: (1) Read *kṛṣṇavāddhyārku* for *kṛṣṇavāddhyārka*. (2) Most probably, the syllable *ve* stands for Ve[kiṭiśvaravāddhyār], i.e. the name of Kṛṣṇavāddhyār's father as indicated in OR2355g.

OR2355g – *Somavārārcana* (15 November 1902)

[65v1 col2] *somavārārcanasamāptam śubham | [65v2 col2] kollaṃ 1078 – āmta tulāmāsam*
30 tiyati – [65v3 col2] vekīṭiśvaravāddhyār puttiran kṛ[65v4 col2]ṣṇavāddhyār grandham
nārāyaṇa[65v5]paṭṭar puttiran rāmayan svahastalikhitam ---

The *Somavārārcana* is completed. Prosperity. In the Kollam year 1087, month of Tulā, 30th day, the book of Kṛṣṇavāddhyār, son of Vekīṭiśvaravāddhyār, was copied by Rāmayan, son of Nārāyaṇapaṭṭar, with his own hand.

OR2355h – *Nakṣatradevatā Ṛk* (no date)

[73v6] *hariḥ – om kṛṣṇavāttiyār grandhaṃ | rāman svahastalikhitam |*

Hariḥ om. The book of Kṛṣṇavāttiyār. Rāman copied [it] with his own hand.

OR2359 – *Cakravādhī* (28 September 1803, 28 September 1863, or 30 September 1923)

[9r2] *śrīcakravādhī[9r3]dhiḥ | sampūrṇaṃ --- rudhirotgāri {YJ5} poṭṭāci {M1} 14 {D1} ayyā*
 [9r4] *svāmidikṣitan uṭaya grandhaṃ hariḥ om | ---*

The *Śrīcakravādhī* is completed. Jovian year Rudhirotgāri, month of Poṭṭāci, 14th day. The book belongs to A[r]jyāsvāmidikṣitan. Hariḥ om.

Note: *Poṭṭāci* is a contraction of *puratṭāci*.

MS2.40 – Śivadharmā (22 April 1830)

[167r6] vikratināmasaṃvatsaram ci[~~ṣ~~]ttirai {M2} 12 {D1} guruvāramu° aśvaninakṣatra[~~ṣ~~]mu°
kūṭṭuṇa cubhadinattil eḷuti muhiñcutu | śiva śiva ---

On the auspicious day on which the [Jovian] year called Vikṛti, month of Cittirai, 12th day, Thursday falls together with the constellation of Aśvani, [this manuscript] was fully written. Śiva, Śiva.

Notes: (1) *Vikrati*° should be read as *vikṛta*°, of which it might be thought to be a variant. (2) The syllable *mu*° should be read as *mum*.

References

- Arden, Albert Henry (1962 [1942]). *A Progressive Grammar of Common Tamil*. Madras: The Christian Literature Society.
- Burnell, A.C. (1880). *A Tentative List of Books and Some Mss. Relating to the History of the Portuguese in India Proper*. Mangalore: Basel Mission Press.
- Franceschini, Marco (forthcoming). *A Study on Grantha Script*. Pondichéry: IFP-EFEO.
- Grimal, François / Ganesan, T. (eds.) (2002). *Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the French Institute of Pondicherry*, vol. IV. mss. 376–475. Pondichéry: IFP-EFEO.
- Grünendahl, Reinhold (2001). *South Indian Scripts in Sanskrit Manuscripts and Prints*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Katre, Sumitra M. (1987). *Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Pillai, L.D. Swamikannu (1911). *Indian Chronology (Solar, Lunar and Planetary). A Practical Guide to the Interpretation and Verification of Tithis, Nakshatras, Horoscopes and Other Indian Time-records. B.C. 1 to A.D. 2000*. Madras: Grant & Co.
- Pillai, L.D. Swamikannu (1922). *An Indian Ephemeris, A.D. 700 to A.D. 1799. Vol. I.I: General principles and tables; Vol. VI: A.D. 1600 to A.D. 1799*. Madras: Government Press.
- Pillai, L.D. Swamikannu (1923). *An Indian Ephemeris, A.D. 1800 to A.D. 2000*. Madras: Government Press.
- Pope, George Uglow (1859). *A Tamil Handbook: or full introduction to the common dialect of that language, on the plan of Ollendorf and Arnold, for the use of foreigners learning Tamil, and of Tamilians learning English*, 2nd edition (1st ed. 1855). Madras: J. Higginbotham.
- Ramanuja Aiyangar, T. et al. (ed.) (1956). *A Descriptive Catalogue of Tamil Manuscripts in Makāmakōpātyāya Dr. V. Swāmināthaiyar Library (Makāmakōpātyāya Ṭākṭar U.Vē. Cāmināthaiyar Nūṇilaiyac Cuvaṭikaḷiṇ Viḷakkam)*, vol. I. Madras: Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. V. Swaminathaiyar Library.
- Renou, Louis / Filliozat, Jean (1953). *L'Inde classique. Manuel des études indiennes*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale / Hanoi: EFEO.
- Sarma, K.V. (1996). "Kollam Era," in: *Indian Journal of History of Science* 31(1): 93–99.
- Sewell, Robert (1896). *The Indian Calendar. With tables for conversion of Hindu and Muham-madan into A.D. dates, and vice versa*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

- Vadivelu, A. (1903). *The Aristocracy of Southern India*. Madras: Vest & Co.
- Varadachari, V. (ed.) (1986). *Catalogue descriptif des manuscrits*, vol. I. mss. 1–115. Pondichéry: IFP-EFEO.
- Varadachari, V. (ed.) (1987). *Catalogue descriptif des manuscrits*, vol. II. mss. 116–275. Pondichéry: IFP-EFEO.
- Varadachari, V. (ed.) (1990). *Catalogue descriptif des manuscrits*, vol. III. mss. 276–375. Pondichéry: IFP-EFEO.
- Venkatachari, K.K.A. (1978). *The Maṇipravāḷa Literature of the Śrīvaiṣṇava Ācāryas: 12th to 15th Century A.D.* Bombay: Ananthacharya Research Institute.
- Wagner, Esther-Miriam / Outhwaite, Ben / Beinhoff, Bettina (eds.) (2013). *Scribes as Agents of Language Change*. Boston / Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Wilden, Eva (2014). *Manuscript, Print and Memory: Relics of the Caṅkam in Tamil Nadu*. Berlin / Munich / Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Winslow, Miron (1862). *A Comprehensive Tamil and English Dictionary of High and Low Tamil*. Madras: P.R. Hunt.
- Zvelebil, Kamil (1959). “Dialects in Tamil, I-II,” in: *Archiv Orientální* 27, 272–317, 572–603.
- Zvelebil, Kamil (1960). “Dialects in Tamil, III: Madurai,” in: *Archiv Orientální* 28, 414–56.
- Zvelebil, Kamil (1963). “Dialects in Tamil, IV: Erode, Tuticorin, Ramnad,” in: *Archiv Orientální* 31, 635–68.

Dictionaries

- Glossary of Historical Tamil Vaishnava Prose (Vaiṇava Uraīṇaṭai Varalāṟru Muṟait Tamilḷ Pērakarāṭi)* (2001). 3 vols. Cennai: Cānti Cāṇṇā.
- Tamil Lexicon* (1924-39). 7 vols. Madras: Diocesan Press.
- Monier-Williams, Monier (1899). *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Webography

(Links were last checked on 23 September 2015)

On the suffix *-āmta*:

- /1/ <http://negombotamilweb.blogspot.de/2012/05/blog-post_10.html>
- /2/ <<http://www.tamilmirror.lk/2010-07-14-09-13-23/2010-08-12-10-11-54/2010-08-12-10-14-24/82057.html>>
- /3/ <<http://www.globaltamilnews.net/GTMNEditorial/tabid/71/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/24990/language/ta-IN/--27--.aspx>>

Unicode:

- /4/ <<http://www.unicode.org/charts/PDF/U0B80.pdf>>

Isalimadai:

/5/ <usof.gov.in/usof-cms/state/tamilnadu.xls>

/6/ <<http://ccatn.gov.in/usofiles/infra/cluster69.pdf>>

<<http://ccatn.gov.in/usofiles/infra/cluster69.pdf>>

Tirumēṇinātar temple:

/7/ <<http://temple.dinamalar.com/New.php?id=606>>

Tiruccuḷi:

/8/ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Virudhunagar_district>

Vellāṅkoḷli:

/9/ <<https://www.google.it/maps/place/Vellamkolli/@8.7146011,76.7597171,10z/data=!4m2!3m1!1s0x3b05c26650caaaa1:0xbc099ac68bd30861>>

Fig. 1: E00004 [36v] - © 2014 Pondicherry, École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Fig. 2: E00006 [52r] - © 2014 Pondicherry, École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Fig. 3: E00009b [94v] - © 2014 Pondicherry, École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Fig. 4: E00009b [94v] - © 2014 Pondicherry, École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Fig. 5: E00069 [GL2r] - © 2014 Pondicherry, École française d'Extrême-Orient.

Fig. 6: E00069 [63v] - © 2014 Pondicherry, École française d'Extrême-Orient.