Definitions of Kaḷavu in the Old Tamil Poetological Tradition.

The Convergence of Interests

Eva Wilden

The present paper is a study of the development of a concept that is a constitutive part of the division of Classical Tamil poetics concerned with the themes of Akam, love poetry. In the two poetological treatises belonging to the first millennium, the Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram and the Iraiyanār Akapporuḷ, we find four different definitions of what kaḷavu is, a term denoting the phase of secret love for the poetic couple, in contradistinction to karpu, the phase of publicly known or post-marital love. Considerations of structural plausibility as well as phrasal and stylistic analysis provide arguments for the systematic and temporal interrelation of sources.

If we want to understand the development of concepts in the poetological tradition of Old Tamil, we have to renounce the idea of neatly distinguishable schools of thought, conveniently associated with particular texts. Instead, we have to accept a multi-vocality connecting and dividing all of our basic sources, transmitted in the shape of phrasal parallels and significant deviations from phrases in the two earliest treatises, the Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram (TP) and the Iraiyanār Akapporuḷ (IA), as well as in the miniature commentaries attached to the poetry, the so-called kilavis. The aim of this paper is to trace one basic concept of Tamil poetics, that of kaḷavu,¹ the

1. The necessity for a detailed investigation of this term has arisen from the discussion of poetological concepts coming up in the Workshop on Tamil Poetics concerned with the translation of the IA (where the first sūtra defines kaḷavu). My thanks are due to all members of the group (Sascha Ebeling, Thomas Lehman, Takanobu Takahashi), and especially to Jean-Luc Chevillard with whom I had the pleasure of discussing repeatedly the contents of this article. For an annotated joint translation of the IA see Chevillard et al. (forthcoming).
term for the phase of secrecy in the love affair of the poetic couple (and thus usually translated by “secret love”). The purport will be threefold, namely a) outlining the origin of a concept that has remained constitutive for Tamil love poetry until well into the 19th century, b) scrutinising the motivation that might have oriented different approaches to the same question, and c) gaining a clearer picture of the interrelation of sources.

The starting point of the investigation will be a set of 4 parallel sūtras, defining kalavu (that is, in one case, defining something else in terms used elsewhere to define kalavu), distributed over different parts of the TPi (89, 97, 487) and IA 1. Before looking at them, it might however be useful to give a briefing about the form and function of a definition sūtra, and about the position the term to be defined, i.e. kalavu, holds in the system of Tamil poetics.

PRELIMINARIES

The structure of the poetological sūtras in TP and IA is basically not different from the one to be found in the grammatical parts of the Tolkāppiyam. In addition to the poetological terminology there is a sort of sūtra idiom, which pertains to vocabulary, syntax and organisation. A definition sūtra generally takes the form of a nominal sentence, in which the term to be defined can (but need not) be marked either by ena/enapaṭuvatu or by a

2. One line of investigation is, obviously, the quest for the meaning of the word itself, and I for one feel fairly comfortable in this particular case. Etymology has never been contested; kalavu is generally analysed as an abstract noun of the verbal root kal “to rob, steal, deceive” (see DEDR 1372). While an implicit notion of something like “deceit” is easily explicable, the actual usage we find attested seems already somewhat remote from the etymological meaning. We can detect a fairly rare pre-poetological usage in the old poetry, where the word refers to the secret meeting of lovers (cf. fn. 13). Moreover we get an implicit gloss in one of the poetological treatises in the form of a terminological equivalent, which is marai, “secret” (for discussion see below). So, what is deceitful — from the point of view of the families, that is to say — is the illicit relationship between the two lovers. The term can accordingly be rendered by “secret love” in a poetic context, and by “[phase of] secret love” in a poetological context. (In German I would explain the difference between marai and kalavu as that between “Geheimnis” and “Heimlichkeiten”; in fact the plural of the latter might come close to rendering the Tamil’s slightly circumvential way of reference.)

3. Worded differently, one might ask: “what is the status and function of a definition sūtra in a poetological treatise?”

4. My numbering of TP sūtras follows the one to be found in Iḷampūraṇar’s commentary (which is marked by an “i” behind the reference). For a synopsis of the different ways of counting see Takahashi (1991).

5. For a description of the sūtra style of the Tolkāppiyam see Wilden (2004).
copula (like ākum). Apart from sūtras that define key terms, we find sūtras of application, those of extension (or restriction), as well as prohibitions. If we want to express this in terms of poetological systematics, the course of the argument is determined by application sūtras, which state the rules to be followed (in our case the enumeration of poetic situations going along with particular themes, speakers and listeners). The extension/restriction sūtras and the prohibitions add specifications and exceptions. This means that the definition sūtras somehow interrupt the flow of the discourse in order to state what one is actually going to talk about. They give explanations of the terminology employed. This, however, can be done, as we shall see, in several different ways. The three basic types to be distinguished are a) giving a frame of reference within the poetic universe, b) establishing relations with other terms within the system of poetics, and c) explaining an abstract concept.6

As for the term kaḷavu, it is related to one of the basic distinctions of poetic themes within Tamil poetics.7 It is part of a pair, namely kaḷavu and kaṟpu, where the former is supposed to denote the state of “secret love” and the latter that of “married love”. Some treatises insert a third stage in the love relationship in between these two, namely varaivu, “marriage”. Poetry, then, is supposed to deal with a certain number of themes within these two (or three) phases. While the classical (Caṅkam) poetry and the older part of poetics are concerned with incidents from the love life of an imaginary couple, later development serialises events into a kind of story beginning

6. This brief explanation remains rather abstract, and it might be of help to give an example for each of these three types: a) IA 18 defines kuri as the appointed meeting place of the two lovers. b) TPI 491 defines kaikoḷ as consisting of kaḷavu and kaṟpu. c) TPI 507 defines meyppāṭṭu as meaning “transmitted by gesture”.

7. As is well-known, Tamil distinguishes the two genres akam, love lyrics, and Puṟam, heroic lyrics. Of these two, Akam has received much more attention — by poets, poeticians and scholars alike —, and so it is possible to reproduce a kind of vulgata opinion as to its conceptions, an opinion often not based on a detailed analysis of all the different sources spanning a period of almost two millennia. In the case of kaḷavu, this does not seem to be a major problem, because this is one of the few terms that are apparently used in an unequivocal way (though there are differences in the scope of the period in the poetic love life to which it is supposed to refer). Matters are, however, less straightforward with respect to its counterpart kaṟpu, which has meant quite different things in different sources, but this is a problem that will require its own investigation.

8. For the IA as a special case where varaivu is not seen as the transitional phase between kaḷavu and kaṟpu, but as the culminating point of both, see Chevillard et al. forthcoming, introduction.
with the first encounter and ending with the highs and lows of married life. A tendency in that direction can already be observed in the latest parts of the Caṅkam corpus (i.e. in the Kalittokai) and in the IA, the first poetic works overtly organised in such a way dating back perhaps to the 8th or 9th century (the Tirukkōvaiyār), while the first treatise to state this explicitly is the Akapporul Viḷakkam of (perhaps) the 13th century.

How exactly, now, do the old treatises understand the term? The IA begins the whole discourse with its definition as an equivalent to a Gandharva marriage. The rough structure of the TP presents the following picture: the first section of the book (the Akattinai-iyal), dealing with the famous poetic landscapes, but also with the speakers and their situations of speech, does not make the distinction between kaḷavu and karpu at all. The third and fourth sections (the Kaḷavu-iyal and the Karpu-iyal), dealing with the speakers and their situations of speech in a pre-married and post-married phase respectively, seem to subscribe to a twofold division. Inserted into the eighth section finally, the one dealing with metrics (as is seen from its name, the Ceyyuḷ-iyal), we find a brief outline of a twofold division and the respective speakers. The historical relations between these three different approaches are not yet settled with certainty, but if we make a structural comparison of the number of speakers concerned in each case, we gain a surprisingly clear picture: the first section enumerates 5 speakers (one of whom is a shibboleth, plus one who has to be taken for granted) without any distinction between the various phases, the eighth section gives 6 speakers for kaḷavu plus an additional 6 for karpu, and the third and fourth sections mention 6 speakers for kaḷavu and 24 for karpu. This state of affairs seems to betray a steady growth in the number of people to be involved in poetic situations — in other words we would expect the Akattinai-iyal to represent the earliest stage, to be followed by the Ceyyuḷ-iyal, while the development would culminate in the Kaḷavu- and Karpu-iyal.

As far as kaḷavu is concerned, this means there is no mention of the term in the first section of the TP, but we find definitions in the third and in the eighth section. If we take a look at these passages, we encounter two different kinds of parallels. There are, firstly, two alternative definitions of the term kaḷavu (TPi 487 + 97). The one to be found in the Ceyyuḷ-iyal actu-

9. The following brief summary is somewhat simplified and does not refer to the differences among the persons enumerated in the various lists. For a more substantial account see Wilden (2006, 139ff.).
ally defines the term marai by enumerating some basic situations that are familiar from the treatises and (partly) from the kilavis, but on the basis of the contents (the familiar kalavu situations) as well as the context (directly followed by a definition of karpu) we are justified in concluding that this simply represents an earlier stage in the development of terminology. The alternative definition in the Kaḷavu-iyal, in this section’s ninth sūtra, enumerates situations parts of which are not at all familiar from either Caṅkam poetry or its kilavis. Secondly, there is a close phrasal correspondence to the first IA sūtra at the very beginning of the TP’s Kaḷavu-iyal, i.e. the natural place where to find a definition of kaḷavu, but instead of this we are confronted with a definition of kāma kūṭtam, presumably as an equivalent of puṇarcci (see below for discussion).

In what follows I will give the texts and translations of these four sūtras and point out their peculiarities. Afterwards there will be a discussion of what could be the rationale in the development of the concept of kaḷavu, in other words, I will propose an interpretation of the textual findings in terms of a historical development of poetics as a system of ideas and the textual development of two treatises that have to be seen as basic exponents of this system of ideas.

THE SOURCES

The first sūtra to be considered is TPI 487:

kāmap puṇarcciyum iṭan talaippaṭalum
pāṅk'oṭu talaālam tōliyin puṇarvum eṟu
āṅka nāl vakaiyinum aṭainta cārv'oṭu
marai eṇa mōṭital maraiyōr ārē.

[It is] the way of those, who [are familiar with the stage of] secrecy, to call the following four situations, along with [their] approximates, ‘[the stage of] secrecy’ — (1) union out of passion and (2) meeting at the [same] place and (3) embracing with [the help of] the friend and (4) uniting [with the help] of the confidante.

So, arguably the oldest definition of kaḷavu is to be found in the Ceyyuḷ-iyal, and it belongs to the definitions of the aforementioned type b): establishing relations to other terms within the system of poetics. It explains the term by enumerating four basic situations of poetic themes that fall under this heading. Before taking a look at these four, however, we have to settle
another intriguing problem. A crucial and quite astonishing point about this sūtra is the fact that instead of the word kaḷavu we find another definieendum, namely maṟai, which is literally “secret” (and as such to be found in the poems).10

That this sūtra is supposed to be defining what we know of as kaḷavu is unequivocally clear by virtue of two indications, firstly its enumerating familiar situations, and secondly its being directly followed by a definition of kaṟpu.11 Now, it is not difficult to give a historical explanation for the replacement of maṟai with kaḷavu if we consider one important fact: there is a shift, or rather a restriction, in the meaning of maṟai, which comes to denote the Vedas as a particular kind of secret knowledge.12 Whether this shift alone is a sufficient explanation to account for the replacement of the term maṟai with kaḷavu is an open question. One may speculate that the Ceyyul-iyal simply represents another strand of the poetological tradition and that elsewhere the classical pair kaḷavu/kaṟpu was already in use, although, as has been pointed out, as far as our extant sources are concerned, TP viii seems to contain the oldest surviving definition. The one place where there is an arguably older version of the sūtras about the speakers, namely TP 1 (the Akattiṇai-iyal) such a distinction is not yet made. So it would appear at least plausible that kaḷavu was first introduced as a gloss — the common denominator between the two terms being the

10. See for example KT 97 which is gratifyingly clear: yāṉē inṭaiyēṉē en nalaṉē | āṉā noyōtu kāṉal aktē | turaiṉ tam īṟaṉē | maṟai alar āki maṟatt’ aktē, “I, I am here. My innocence / with endless pain in the seashore grove. / The man from the ghat in his village. / ‘The secret become gossip of public places’.

11. TPi 488: maṟai velippaṭutalum tamariṉ perutalum | ivai mutal ākiya viyal-neṉi tiriyātū | malivum pulaviyum ūṭalum unarvum | pirivoṭu punarntatu karp’ enappatuṅmē. “What is called ‘kaṟpu’ is what is connected with (1) the revelation of the secret and (2) [HIS] obtaining [HER] from her people and, without deviating from the natural course that has these as its beginning, (3) rejoicing and (4) quarrelling and (5) reconciliation, along with (6) separation.” This sūtra is built along the same lines as TPi 487, that is, it enumerates six basic situations of kaṟpu. What is remarkable about it is its choice of situations, which begin with two (the revelation of the secret and obtaining the woman from her relatives) that would, from the vulgar point of view, belong under kaḷavu, but that is a problem that will have to be discussed on its own.

12. In fact already in the TP itself we find a definition of the term mantiram, “mantra” (a problematic term in itself, but here most probably referring to a certain type of verse employed in Vedic ritual), which indicates this shift — arguably a later insertion, but nevertheless it makes the problem tangible. It is also to be found in the Ceyyul-iyal, namely TPi 480: [...] maṟai moli tāṅē mantiram evpa, “A mantra, they say, [is] nothing but a secret / Vedic word [...]”.
idea of secrecy — and then as a replacement that was adopted as a technical term by the whole tradition of poetics.\textsuperscript{13}

The conflict of meanings for \textit{mara\textordmasculine{i}} must have been particularly salient with reference to \textit{mara\textordmasculine{i}yōr}, literally “the ones connected with the secret” — which in TPi 487 quite obviously means those who are acquainted with \textit{mara\textordmasculine{i}} as a particular stage in the love relationship as it is sung in poetry. Later on it takes the meaning “brahmins” (as those who know the Veda), and we do actually find it as such in one of the definition sūtras to be analysed here, namely in TPi 89. So it is hardly surprising that TPi 487 was misunderstood or rather re-interpreted by the commentators. Both Iľ. and Nacc. gloss \textit{mara\textordmasculine{i}yōr} here with “brahmin”, and I will argue later on that the choice of the term \textit{mara\textordmasculine{i}yōr} in TPi 89 mirrors this re-interpretation of the earlier definition in TPi 487.

Now the time has come to take a closer look at the situations enumerated by our sūtra. First of all they give clear testimony for the text-historical relation of TPi 487 with the beginning of the IA, since at least two of the terms employed here have parallels nowhere else in the early poetological treatises but in IA 2 and 3. \textit{kāmap puṇarcci}, “the union out of passion”, is certainly one of the terms for the so-called first union, the traditional beginning of the secret connection between the two lovers. The only parallel is to be found in IA 2.\textsuperscript{14} \textit{iṭan talai\textordfeminine{p}aṭa}, “the meeting at the [same] place”, again is a formulation peculiar to this passage and IA 3.\textsuperscript{15} It is traditionally understood to refer to the second meeting, that is, HE is returning to the place where he united with HER the other day. Probably the point is simply that it is another meeting not (yet) arranged with the help of third persons.

The other two situations, \textit{pāṅk'oṭu talai\textordfeminine{v}aḷum tuḻiyiṉ puṇarvum}, “embracing with [the help of HIS] companion and uniting [with the help] of [HER] confidante”, have no direct phrasal counterpart anywhere, but still they correspond to the development further outlined by the IA.\textsuperscript{16} What is quite

\textsuperscript{13} In the case of \textit{kaḷavu} this seems to have meant an extension of the original meaning: the word is rare in the poetry, but a very clear passage where it is used is KT 47.3f.: \textit{elli varunar kaḷaviṟku | nallai allai neṭu ven nilavē}, “for seccaries with the one who is coming by night you are no good, long white moonlight”.

\textsuperscript{14} The specification of \textit{puṇarcci} employed elsewhere in the treatises is \textit{muṉṉu puṇarcci}, “the previous union”, that is, the union taking place before anybody else is informed (cf. TPi 112.11, IA 12.4), while the \textit{kiḷavi} use \textit{iyaṟkai puṇarcci}, “the natural union” (cf. AN 140, NA 7, 13, KT 120.2, 137, 300, 142.1, 116, 119).

\textsuperscript{15} This one is taken up in a single \textit{kiḷavi}, namely that on KT 62.

\textsuperscript{16} IA 3 uses the formulation \textit{pāṅkanoṟiṇ kuri talaippeyal}, “reaching the meeting
remarkable about the first, i.e. the union arranged with the help of his friend, is that it is unanimously taught by the treatises but not to be found anywhere in Caṅkam poetry. The poems just know of endless negotiations of him with the confidante in order to arrange more meetings.

To sum up, the definition of TP VIII corresponds to the beginning of the development of the secret love affair outlined in the IA too. What is problematic is the point of transition into the karpu stage. As mentioned before, TPI 488 appears to subscribe to the opinion that the affair is called karpu from the time of discovery onwards (that is, when it is no longer secret). If we take a look at IA 15, the definition of karpu, this attitude seems to be corroborated by the second treatise, but that is a problem in need of special investigation.\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{quote}
\textit{aṉpiṉ aintiṇai kalav' eṉappaṭuvat' antanar arumaṟai maṉṟal eṭṭiṉu! kantaruva vaḻakkam eṉmaṉār pulavar.}
\end{quote}

What is called kalavu [in the context of the] five settings of love\textsuperscript{18} is the Gandharva custom among the eight [kinds of] marriage [according to] the Vedas of the brahmins, the scholars say (IA 1).

After the close phrasal and conceptual relationship between TP VIII and the IA have been pointed out, the obvious next step is to look at the opening of the IA. The wording is, upon the whole, clear, though what is conspicuous is the amount of Sanskritisation. We find maṟai again, but here it is aru maṟai, clearly already in its secondary meaning as Veda. aru maṟai would place with [the help of] the companion”, while several subsequent sūtras (IA 5-13) deal with various aspects of the dialogues, which are held between him, or respectively her, and the confidante, leading up to further, arranged meetings.

17. IA 15: \textit{murpāṭa punarāṭa col iṉmaṭiṉ | karpu eṉappaṭuvatu kalavu valitē. “What is called karpu is the course of kalavu in case of the absence of words of uniting previously.”} Actually the precise meaning of this sūtra is controversial. For alternative translations and interpretations see Chevillard et al. forthcoming.

18. \textit{aintiṇai:} the work group decided to use the general term ‘category’ to translate tinai, since it is not entirely clear what the term refers to in this sūtra. It could, of course, refer to the theory of the five tinais, but it could also refer to the title of a poetic anthology. I prefer “setting”, however, because the TP parallels (TPI 1, 488) that talk of elutinai, “the seven settings”, make it fairly clear that we have an allusion to the tinai theory here. That the concept must have been familiar also to the author of the IA can be seen from IA 56, where tinais are enumerated among the structural elements of poetry.
literally be the “rare secret”, but it stands to reason that the attribute here is a mere specifier activating the secondary meaning of the word. A second specification is given in *antaṇar*, “brahmins”. There is moreover one real Sanskritism. *kantaruvam* is the Tamilised version of Skt. *gandharva*-, and it is well-known that the Gandharva marriage — marriage by creating a *fait accompli* — is one of eight forms of marriages as defined in Sanskrit *smṛti* literature as early as the *Gṛhyasūtras*.

So here we find the first actual definition of the term *kaḷavu*. It is of a different type than the former, namely c) explaining an abstract concept. To be more precise, this ought to be described as a subtype of c), since the explanation given here is not a mere abstraction, but rather a cross-reference to a different system of knowledge. We do not get a poetological explanation, but a morally normative one from the Dharmaśāstra of the Sanskrit tradition. Two questions arise here immediately. The first is: why? Why would the readers of a poetological treatise want to know that the *kaḷavu* concept of Tamil poetics is an equivalent to the Sanskrit Gandharva marriage? Secondly, is such a cross-reference into another system comprehensible, unless the term to be defined is already familiar to the reader of poetics?

I would like to postpone the answer to the first question until the second sūtra that gives such a kind of definition (i.e. TPi 89) has been discussed too. My tentative answer to the second is that the reader must already know what is *kaḷavu* in Tamil poetics, and since we have the unequivocal phrasal relation between TPi 487 and IA 2+3, we are entitled to conclude that the reader, or at least the author of the IA, must have had the definition given by the *Ceyyul-iyal* of the TP in mind.

19. The term *antaṇar* in the sense of ‘brahmin’ seems to be frequent already in Caṅkam poetry, although among the old anthologies it is only attested in the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* and the *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu*.

20. Cf. Āśv. gs 1.6.5: *mithaḥ samayaṁ kṛtvopayaccheta sa gāndharvah* “He may marry her, after a mutual agreement has been made [between the lover and the damsel]: this [is the wedding called] Gandharva.” (tr. Oldenberg).
When looking at the coupling out of passion, [it is], among the eight [kinds of] marriage [to be found] with those familiar with the Vedas, of the nature [of the marriage] of those connected with the good lyre abiding by the ghat, inside the five settings connected with love, as [taught in(?)] “pleasure and wealth and duty…” (TPi 89).

TPi 89 is the beginning of the section on kaḷavu of the Poruḷatikāram. What one would expect here again is the definition of the term kaḷavu. That follows in sūtra 97. However, here the beginning is clearly modelled on IA 1 where kaḷavu is explained as a Gandharva marriage.

If we ignore the first line for a moment (which poses a separate problem), we find that the second and third line constitute a more elaborate version of the IA’s line 1, that is, a version that marks the grammatical relations. Instead of anṇiṇaṇiṇai, with the oblique mark on anṇpu, there is anṇpotu puṇarnta aṇtiṇai maruṅkin, i.e. a locative mark for aṁtiṇai and a phrase explaining the relation between anṇpu and aṁtiṇai. Line 3, then, substitutes the typical definition phrase enṇappatuvatu (“what is called”) by a slightly more ambiguous, but also familiar explanatory phrase kāṇum kālai (“when looking at X”). The definiendum is not, as to be expected, kaḷavu, but kāmapuṇarcci (“coupling out of passion”), a term used one more time in TPi 117, while kūṭṭam alone is occasionally to be found in the kilavis. It certainly looks like an equivalent to kāmapuṇarcci, but it clearly stems from a different stock of phrases and thus betrays another hand/another time of redaction for the sūtra. We will come back to this problem after seeing the fourth and last definition.

Moving on to lines 4 and 5, we find that they present an almost word-by-word transposition of the IA’s lines 2 and 3 into pure Tamil. maṟaiyōr-tēettu

21. Theoretically this phrase could also be understood as “where [people] come together with [mutual?] love”? puṇar-tal is used in the TP in a technical sense in the meaning of “being connected with”, but there is also the lyrical usage of uniting, clearly traceable in the term puṇarcci for the union of lovers. The IA parallel, however, makes plausible that what is meant here is the technical sense.

22. The few kilavis that make use of the word kūṭṭam seem all to be set in the period of meetings to be arranged with the help of the confidante (KT 13, 17, 81); twice it is explicitly referred to as the “second” (iraṇṭām) union (cf. NA 39, 155.1).

23. There is a certain similarity in the explanations given in connection with both terms in the TP and the IA. Compare IA 2: atuvē | tāṇe avālē tamiyar kāṇa | kāmapuṇarcci iruvayiṉ ottal. “That [is to say], when HE and SHE see each other alone, union out of passion is suitable on the part of both of them.” with TPi 117: kāmak kūṭṭam taṇimaiyin politaliy | tāmek tēttuvar ākalum urittē. “Since coupling out of passion blooms in privacy, their (i.e. HIS and HER) becoming their own messengers is appropriate”.
can be regarded as an abbreviation of *antaṇar aru maṟai*, while it gives, at the same time, the missing case specification, namely locative. Here *maṟaiyōr* clearly refers to brahmins as those who are familiar with the Veda, and this choice of word can be explained as a reminiscence of TPi 487, going back to a period when the original meaning of the term (“those [who are familiar with the phase] of secrecy”) was no longer understood. *manṟal eṭṭanul* and *manṟal eṭṭinul*, then, are just morphological variations. The next line would hardly be comprehensible without its parallel in the IA. The legitimating phrase in the IA (*eṉmaṉār pulavar “say the scholars”) is shortened down to *iyalpē*, “[has] the nature”. The rest of the line, *tuṟai amai nalyāl tuṇaimaiyōr*, surely must be (as is understood by the commentators) a Tamilised paraphrase for the Gandharvas — who are, according to the Sanskrit tradition, a class of semi-divine celestial musicians closely associated with their female counterparts, the Apsaras, who dwell in water, so that the ghat is supposedly mentioned as the borderline between land and water, where the former stay. What is the rationale of using such a metaphor? Is it simply to avoid a Sanskrit term — in contradistinction to what is found in IA 1?

This question brings us finally back to the first line, where we observe the same tendency. *inpamum poruḷum araṉum* (note even the use of *inpam* instead of *kāmam*) constitute the unequivocal counterpart to the Sanskrit triad of *kāma-, artha- and dharma-* (the three goals of human life: pleasure, wealth and duty). But what is the relation between these three and the rest of the sentence? What is the meaning of *eṉṟ’āṅku* here? Rendering it as a quotation seems to be quite adequate to the wording, but what does that mean? Quotation of what and to which purpose? If we take the whole sūtra to be the scope of this line, we might take the quotation as a reference to a source where to find a definition of the Gandharva marriage — a Tamil version of some *dharma* manual beginning with these three words? Be that as it may, Takahashi (oral communication in 2002) thinks that the point of mentioning them is a justification of *kalavu* as being not only related to *kāma*, but also to the other (more respectable) aims of life.24

If this holds good, it might help us answer another question left open in the discussion of IA 1. Why would the readers of a poetological treatise want to know that the *kalavu* concept of Tamil poetics is an equivalent to the

24. An alternative interpretation would see the scope of the line restricted to the second line alone, that is, a quotation of a source where the *aинтерi* would be described. It seems less plausible, however, that a treatise on the five settings of love poetry should have had a title or a first sūtra beginning with *inpamum poruḷum araṉum.*
Sanskrit Gandharva marriage? IA 1 and TPi 89 might go back to a period when the impact of Northern culture and cultural values had become so strong that a need of justification for the pure worldliness of Tamil literature was felt. Let us not forget that the major genres emerging after the times of the Caṅkam (or even in late Caṅkam times, if we consider the Paripāṭal) were Bhakti poetry and epics, both of which have a more or less obvious religious affiliation. kaḷavu seems to have been in need of moral sanctioning, a tendency clearer then ever with the uprise of the commentaries. Half of Nakkiran’s explications are a remodelling of the poetic universe along the lines of moral (and utterly unpoetic) concerns.

1. Longing, 2. one-sidedly remembering 3. becoming weak, 4. speaking of increase(?) 5. transgressing the boundary of shame, 6. likening those(?) to all the things looked at, 7. forgetting, 8. confusion, 9. death — those, according to eminent usage, [make up] kaḷavu, they say (TPi 97).

Here finally we have the definition of kaḷavu for the Kaḷavu-iyal, that is, in its ninth sūtra. In this case, however, it is a little difficult to establish the type of definition. At first glance it looks like one of type b): establishing relations to other terms within the system of poetics, similar to the one in TPi 487 enlisting basic kaḷavu situations we have already seen. However, the things enumerated here are mostly not familiar from other places, in other words they are not part of the phrasal inventory shared by the old treatises and the kiḷavis.

Some of the words are familiar. vēṭkai is found as a term denoting a later stage of kaḷavu, namely as a desire for reunion or marriage (“varaital vēṭkai” as attested in TPi 207, IA 30). melital as a term denoting her growing weakness is fairly frequent in the kiḷavis. nāṉ, “shame”, and its being

25. avai is here an anaphoric pronoun lacking context. This is a feature especially typical of the TP, as has been pointed out by Takahashi (2002).

26. As the kiḷavi counterpart of this theme we might count the extremely frequent varaivu kaṭatāl.
lost, is a standard topos in the poetry itself, the same is of course true for uḷḷūtal and maṟattal. ākkam ceppal might refer to the topos of HER or HIM speaking about the increase of their desire. But as for the rest, especially number 6, 8 and 9 in the list seem to have neither a terminological nor a poetic counterpart.

The basic difference between this list and the other one, however, is something else. What we get in TPi 97 is not an enumeration of basic speech situations, but rather an obviously climactic list of psychological stages of being in love. In other words, this betrays a completely different approach to the problem of systematizing poetics. The attitude in dealing with poetic themes of TP VIII — and this is shared by TP I and huge parts of TP III + IV — could be termed a rhetoric approach: enumerating speech situations as distributed among the different speakers.27 Seen against that, TPi 97 rather seems to adhere to what we might call a dramatic approach. There are a few more sūtras in the Kaḷavu- and the Karpū-iyal of the TP that fall under the same category, but the most notorious exponent of such an approach is actually TP vi, the Meyppāṭṭu-iyal, the section on the “physical expression [of emotions]”. This section belongs, according to Takahashi’s rough chronology of the TP, to the late and very Sanskritised parts, cf. Takahashi (1995, 20ff.), and indeed it is replete with repercussions of Sanskrit rasa theory.

To sum up, this sūtra, in all appearance, gives the impression of stemming from a much later stage of poetological development. It is a highly unlikely candidate for the original definition sūtra of the TP’s Kaḷavu-iyal (which follows, upon the whole, quite a different strategy of presentation).28 This suspicion is corroborated by the problem of position and the unexplained similarity between the first sūtra of the Kaḷavu-iyal (TPi 89) and IA 1. My conjecture at what has happened is that TPi 89 was the original definition sūtra of the Kaḷavu-iyal, and that it defined kaḷavu.29 At a later

27. It is shared by the IA too, although the realisation is slightly different, as has been pointed out by Takahashi (1995, 36), where he coins the term “speaker-based analysis” for the TP and “theme-based analysis” for the IA.

28. Things are not easy with the Kaḷavu- and Karpū-iyal. Both are highly convoluted with disparate materials, and it might never be possible to give a satisfactory analysis of their original intent and structure. What can be done, however, is to extract and highlight those materials that have phrasal counterparts elsewhere, that is, in the IA and in the kīlavis.

29. It might even be possible to get an idea about the original wording of that definition; in fact it would need no more than a phrasal exchange of the third line like: kaḷav eṇa paṭuvat’ eṇmaṉār pulavar. Of course this will have to remain mere speculation.
stage TPi 97 was inserted, which made an exchange of the *definiendum* in TPi 89 necessary. The choice fell on *kāmakkūṭṭam*, perhaps because this is the basic event that constitutes the Gandharva marriage: consummation of the marriage without ritual preliminaries.

**DISCUSSION**

To summarise, in this group of four related sūtras, we have seen one that defines *maṟai* alias *kaḷavu* by giving a set of four basic situations (TPi 487), a second that defines *kaḷavu* as Gandharva marriage (IA 1), a third that defines *kāmakkūṭṭam* as Gandharva marriage (TPi 89), and a fourth one that defines *kaḷavu* by giving a set of the manifestation of nine emotive states (TPi 97). Needless to say that, as usual, while there is a marked affinity between the IA and part of the TP, the TP in itself appears to amalgamate quite different notions. What has happened and how are these four sūtras interrelated?

If we look at the matter from the point of view of poetological systematics, only two sūtras out of four meet the requirements of a systematic definition, namely TPi 487 and TPi 97. If we look at these from a historical perspective, there are several reasons to suppose that TPi 487 is older than TPi 97. Firstly, the former participates rather obviously in the phrasal inventory shared between the TP, the IA and the *kiḷavi*s. Secondly, it contains the probably archaic term *maṟai* instead of the “classical” *kaḷavu*. Thirdly, the situations it enumerates (the union out of passion, the meeting at a particular place, the meeting arranged with the help of his friend and the meeting arranged with the help of the confidante) are familiar from the treatises, the *kiḷavi*s and the poetry itself (with the exception of the third one, as has already been pointed out). The latter definition does participate in the said phrasal inventory as far as the term to be defined and the idiom of definition are concerned. But that is, for the greater part, not true of the items enumerated. More significantly, the series betrays an approach to the poetological task which is quite different from that taken in much of the TP and in the IA: not a rhetorical concern with situations (be it situations of speech or of speakers), but a dramatic concern with the emotions of the dramatis personae, as is typical of the *Mēyppâṭṭu-iyal*.

What, then, do the other two definitions achieve? Both IA 1 and TPi 89 explain their respective *definienda* (*kaḷavu* in the one, *kāmakkūṭṭam* in the other case) as corresponding to one among eight types of marriage that are taught in Sanskrit Dharma literature. Actually, the reference to the Gandharva marriage is a kind of Sanskritism completely unexpected
in a poetological definition sūtra. It does not give us the value of the term within the system, but brings the system into relation with another system, namely one of moral regulations of social behaviour. An explanation of this feature can be only tentative, but what we can say for certain is that this trait does not stand isolated. For the TP we can observe at least two (and probably more) distinct phases of extension and/or reworking along the lines of Northern concepts and values.

The most obvious one is connected with the younger sections of the book as established by Takahashi (1995, 20ff.), the sections VI-IX. These sections are Sanskritic in so far as they make wide use of technical terminology developed in the Sanskrit Alakāra tradition (for example the rasa theory and designations for figures of speech such as uvamai/upamā), but also of Sanskrit philosophy of language (as for example the tantrayukti, the elements of a treatise). An infiltration with the former sort of technical vocabulary from Sanskrit can also be observed in the older parts of the TP, which is an indication that such passages have been interpolated. In both these cases, however, the motivation seems to be unlike the one outlined above, since they are conceptual borrowings.

But there is also a general tendency, perhaps in the whole of the TP, to introduce brahmins, Vedas and rituals and varṇas into the poetic discourse. A strikingly parallel example to TPi 89 in this respect is the definition of karpu to be found at the beginning of the Karpu-iyal, TPi 140. There karpu is defined as HIM and HER being married by the family and with proper ceremony. Apart from the problem that this seems a way to define varaivu rather than karpu, this explanation is obviously far off from any poetological (or, for that matter, poetic) concern. It is a perfect counterpart of what is said in TPi 89: marriage that does NOT take place in the Gandharva way,

---

30. One exception to this scheme has been pointed out by me several times, namely what I have termed the insertion in TP VIII, the Ceyyuḷ-iyal, where our first definition sūtra, TPi 487, is situated, cf. Wilden (2000, 27off.).
31. This whole area of conceptual influences is in dire need of detailed investigation; see Chevillard forthcoming.
32. For a brief account of the Sanskrit elements in the Akattinai-iyal see Wilden (2004, 180 et passim).
33. TPi 140: karp' evappatuva kaṇaṇamottu punara | kolaṅk' uri marapīṇ kilavaṇ kilattiyai | koṭaikk' uri marapiṇōr koṭuṇpa kolavatvē. "Karpu' is defined as HIM, who is traditionally entitled to take, taking HER, when those traditionally entitled to give, give [her], so that they unite along with ceremonies" (note the Sanskritism kaṇana-, "ritual action").
that is, simply by mutual agreement of the two lovers. Incidentally, this seems to me one further argument to regard TPi 89 as the original kalavu definition of the Kalavu-iyal.

Now we can outline a scenario for what might have happened in a development that must have probably taken centuries. Granted, this sort of exercise will always have to remain speculative to some extent, but it has the virtue of trying to give a plausible explanation for the polyphony of sources, where often the single voices seem completely unconnected or even contradictory. In the course of the first twofold classification of poetic themes into kalavu and karpu, in TPi 487 we meet a definition based on a short enumeration of basic situations, where karpu begins from the moment of the revelation of the secret. This served as the matrix of a somewhat later moralistic revision, which did not alter the concept, but set it into relation to another concept known from Sanskrit Dharma literature, thereby lending it a kind of moral justification. This probably took shape at first in the IA (since it is just about conceivable that kantaruvam would be replaced by turai amai nal yāl tuṇaimaiyōr, but hardly vice versa).34 That again was used in a broader outline of the themes connected with kalavu and karpu in sections III and IV of the TP, but this time including an explicit revision of the karpu concept as beginning from the day of official marriage onwards. The last stage is a rather punctual reworking of the beginning of the Kalavu section, TPi 89, where the original definition sūtra is left intact but for an exchange of its definendum (kāmakkūṭṭam instead of kalavu), while a new definition of kalavu is inserted in sūtra 97i. This definition in turn is indebted to a completely different view of the poetological task, namely a dramatic outlook on the set of emotions manifested in the different phases of a love relationship.

Granted, the older part of the textual tradition of Tamil poetics is a jungle. But by closely looking at all the different specimens to be found there we might one day be able to discern more than punctual interrelations, namely the patterns that guided the process of forestation, instead of claiming it to be just wild growth.

34. I am not at all certain about the validity of the argument. In fact, when we look at the further development of the poetic system in the IA, we find that both conceptions of karpu (beginning from the day of revelation — beginning from the day of marriage) are confounded there. This fact might either be used as an argument for a later revision of the IA (as would be my tendency) or for seeing the IA as a later effort at systematising different concepts, as would be done by Takahashi (2004).
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