Book Review

Whitney Cox and Vincenzo Vergiani (eds.). *Bilingual discourse and Cross-Cultural Fertilization: Sanskrit and Tamil in Medieval India.* (Collection Indologie 121). Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry, École Français d'Extrême-Orient, 2013. x, 466 pp. ISBN 978-81-8470-194-4. ₹900/€38.

Reviewed by **Alexander Dubyanskiy,** Department of Indian Philology, Institute of Asian and African Countries, Moscow State University, Mokhovaya str., 11, 125009 Moscow, Russia, E-mail: dubian@yandex.ru

The initial idea of this volume, as the editors admit in the Preface, was modest – to discuss the inter-translatability of technical terms between Sanskrit and Tamil. But in the course of debates and discussions they had with colleagues (among them Eva Wilden and Jean-Luc Chevillard should be mentioned first participating extensively in such discussions), they realized a wider range of problems and formed a much broader perspective of the interactions between the Sanskrit and Tamil traditions. The attention of the authors of the research papers included in the volume is concentrated mostly on the medieval period but some of them have touched on the earlier period and texts. The contributors of the volume do not claim to solve all numerous problems they discuss, and agree that many of them are still subjects for further investigation.

A general overview of the issues under discussion is given by Dominic Goodall in his introduction to the volume (p. 1–11). In the very beginning he remarks that "the nature of linguistic and literary contacts with Sanskrit differed hugely in different places and at different times" (p. 1). This is due first of all to the obvious fact that vernacular languages and their development were different in every part of the subcontinent. Then he makes an important observation about the correlation between Sanskrit and Dravidian languages, and stresses the fact that insisting on a too direct and often hostile opposition between them is wrong and counterproductive. That said, sometimes it is indeed difficult to point out the exact contribution of Sanskrit versus Dravidian languages to the development of Indian culture.

The present work is, as Dominic Goodall reminds the reader, not the first volume of essays devoted to this general topic. He mentions several other publications as well as a number of workshops (in New York, Cambridge and Pondicherry), devoted to this topic. As he further notes, the authors and editors consider the present volume as a sort of a tribute to the memory of two brothers who devoted their lives to developing Tamil scholarship in Pondicherry, namely T.V. Gopal Aiyar and T.S. Gangadharan.

The main body of the book consists of three sections, titled as follows: 1. "Literary audience and religious community"; 2. "Regulating language: grammars and literary theories"; 3. "Written in stone? Shifting registers of inscriptional discourse". These three main blocks of contributions to the volume correspond to the three aspects of the main topic, that is, literature, theoretical studies and inscriptions.

The first section starts with an article by Charlotte Schmid, "The Contribution of Tamil literature to the Kṛṣṇa figure of the Sanskrit texts: the case of the *kaṉṟu* in Cilappatikāram 17" (pp. 15–52). The author follows the development of the Kṛṣṇa legend in early Tamil literature, concentrating on the songs of shepherd girls in chapter 17 of the poem, especially on their features that can be considered as emerging within the South Indian tradition. These include: Kṛṣṇa's spouse Piṉṉai, Kṛṣṇa's fight with seven bulls, the theft of *gopīs*'clothes and hiding them on branches of the *kuruntu* tree. These features, states the author, originated from a Tamil folk tradition and were accumulated by the Tamil poetry of *āḻvārs* and by the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa.

Special attention is paid to the motive of *kaṉṟu* (a calf) thrown up into the palm-tree, represented in the songs of shepherd girls in Cilappatikāram and also attested in the Sanskrit purāṇic tradition. The author claims that the study of *kaṉṟu* "brings to light the mechanism of literary transposition from Sanskrit to Tamil and then back to Sanskrit in the legend of Kṛṣṇa" (p. 25). In Sanskrit sources this calf corresponds to a demonical ass, Dhenuka, who is killed by Balarāma or Kṛṣṇa or by both of them. The development of this story in Tamil sources leads to the identification of *kaṉṟu* with a calf in Cilappatikāram and with an ass in the poetry of the *āḻvārs* (in Periyāḻvār in particular). Furthermore, Charlotte Schmid points out an interesting passage in Periyāḻvār's Tirumoḻi (1.5.4) where the calf and Dhenuka appear separately, one after another. Though she states with caution (p. 33) that their names "might not have been dissociated" (there is a formal possibility to read the word *dhenukā*, with a long *ā*, as 'a young cow') it seems more correct to regard the animals as distinct. In this case we can suggest that Periyāḻvār indeed had in mind two mythological events, one of which (with a calf mentioned in Cilappatikāram) can be interpreted in terms of the heroic sports of the child Kṛṣṇa (characteristically, the text does not contain any reference to the demonic nature of the calf). The enigmatic passage in Tirumoḻi 2.4.8, about tying a palm-tree leaf (*ōlai*, not *ōḻai*) to the tail of a calf, probably hints at the playful nature of Kṛṣṇa's deed (this is confirmed in footnote 31). In any case, this detail needs a more articulated explanation.

The analysis of the situation leads the author to conclude that a definite shift towards another type of struggle takes place in Tamil texts, that is towards Kṛṣṇa's fight against a demon tree: the wood-apple tree, *viḷavu* or, as

in Cilappatikāram, *kuruntu,* a lemon-tree. The model for this might be the fight of Murukaṉ against the demon Cūr in the form of a mango-tree. This conclusion agrees with the opinions of medieval commentators and of the modern Vaiṣṇava translator of the *āḻvārs*' works, for whom it was natural to interpret any conflict as a war between gods and asuras. Nevertheless, some questions remain unanswered, in particular: why is the *viḷavu*-tree a demonic tree? Putting aside the commentators' interpretations, let us look at the texts provided by the author, first of all the verse by the Vaiṣṇava poet Pūtattāḻvār: "he has swirled a *kaṉṟu* as a stick at the unripe fruits of the poisonous wood-apple tree" (Tivviyappirapantam, 2200). The Tamil Lexicon (1936–1938) mentions the meaning 'poison' for the lexical entry *tī*, but only as the seventh meaning listed for this entry, illustrated by the expression *tī nākam* lit. 'fire snake', or 'evil snake', and it does not clarify why the phrase *tī viḷavu* is translated as 'a poisonous tree'. The clue can probably be found in the Harivaṁśa-Purāṇa, of which some fragments are quoted in the article. In this text, the tree is explicitly described as poisonous (*viṣadruma*), and, more interesting, a Śaiva Brahmin appears, haunted by a Śaiva *bhuta* and advising the herdsmen to destroy the *kapittha* tree (p. 39). In this connection it is appropriate to remind that the wood-apple tree (*viḷavu*, *bilva*) is a tree of Śiva, and one might suggest that the fight against the Śiva-tree could refer to or hint at Śaiva-Vaiṣṇava controversies.

Two other "shadow-motives" (as the author calls them) discussed at the end of the article include Kṛṣṇa's fights against a demonic bird and the uprooting of two Arjuna trees. The latter motive is replaced in Cilappatikāram by Kṛṣṇa's deed against the *kuruntu* tree. This episode, described with the verb *oci* (*ocittāṉ*), which can be translated as 'break' or 'bend', allows for different interpretations. Hardy (1983: 194) believes that Kṛṣṇa is said to bend the tree in order to pluck the leaves and make garments for girls – a well-known motive in Tamil *akam* poetry. By contrast, the author of the article comes to the conclusion that "the breaking of the *kuruntu* in Cilappatikāram should be understood as another transposition of the breaking of the Arjuna trees" (p. 45), further claiming that "[e]ach of the supposed folk-motives of this text [Cilappatikaram 17 – A.D.] has a very literary and more ancient equivalent in the northern Sanskrit texts and a kind of a counterpart in the oldest known southern Indian literature" (p. 47). Neither conclusion appears convincing, given, in particular, that there are many features of the Tamil text that are very difficult to trace back to an original Sanskrit source (p. 23). Nevertheless, the process of interaction of the two traditions is shown, by and large, quite clearly and in detail. In this paper it is also richly illustrated by numerous rare images of bas-reliefs (pp. 43–45), depicting the two motives discussed above.

The article by Takanobu Takahashi, "Is clearing or plowing equal to killing? Tamil culture and the spread of Jainism in Tamilnadu" (pp. 53–67), presupposes the tentative character of the solution of the problem under discussion. The author argues that the semantics of the verb *kol* 'kill, destroy, liquidate' and its derivative *kollai* 'field, dry land' is not due to the influence of Jainas, who equated plowing with killing. In order to prove this assumption, he gives a number of quotations from *caṅkam* poetry, where the words *kolcey* and *kollai* can indeed denote a part of the *mullai* landscape, meaning 'dry field', 'field prepared for plowing'. However, it seems more proper to understand *kollai* as a territory where cattle graze and tread upon the vegetation and kill it, thus turning the place into a waste-land. As for the explanation in terms of the Jaina teaching, the belief that plowing kills living creatures has no specific trace in old Tamil poetry, although this issue deserves further investigation.

Herman Tieken in his article "Early Tamil poetics between Nāṭyaśāstra and Rāgamālā" (pp. 69–91) tries to show that the part of Tamil literary theory connected with what is called the "*tiṇai*-system" (often considered an indigenous invention) was much influenced by the North Indian theory of music (as described in the Nāṭyaśāstra, the earliest attested text within this tradition, which can approximately be dated to the last centuries BCE – first centuries CE). Accordingly, the paper opens with an outline of Tamil literary theory as it appears in the Tamil treatise Tolkāppiyam (hereafter abbreviated as Tol.).[1]

The starting point of the discussion is that the names of the seven *akam* types are also found in poetry (foremost in Cilappatikāram) as technical musical terms (p. 74). The author notes that that the word *tiṇai* in *caṅkam* poetry has nothing to do with music, but the names of *tiṇais* refer to melodies reflecting certain moods (p. 78). He further suggests that one should "connect these *paṇs*, or melodic types, with the North Indian *rāgas*. The Cilappatikāram however uses the term *jāti*, which, while not the direct precursor of the *rāga*, refers to an earlier, closely related concept." (p. 77). The next section of the article is devoted to the fundamentals of North Indian musical theory as reflected in the Nāṭyaśāstra. The author rightly claims that "notes and scales have served as focal points around which are brought together all kinds of situations which contributed to the production of the different moods" (p. 80).

---

[1] Tieken's description is quite accurate, but a few minor remarks are in order. First, the situation of waiting (*iruttal*) is shown not in spring (p. 73), but in the beginning of the season of rains; second, the flower of *neytal* is not white (p. 73), but blue (cf. Naṟṟiṇai 382, 2 *nīl niṟa neytal*); third, the elephant certainly should be added to the typical animals of the *kuṟiñci* region (p. 72).

The author further states that " ... the key word of the literary theory, namely, *tiṇai*, "class, type" is a loan translation of the term for the melody types, *jāti*" (p. 83). These claim, however, contradict what the author said earlier, namely, that the term *tiṇai* has nothing to do with music either in *caṅkam* poetry or even in Cilappatikāram (p. 79). The direct statement that "The term *tiṇai* suggests that the musical theory concerned was formulated in Sanskrit or goes back to one formulated in that language" (p. 83) seems to me an oversimplification of the matter, because the obvious folk roots of Tamil *tiṇai*-songs have not been taken into consideration.

The influence of the North Indian theoretical tradition on its Tamil counterpart is the main topic of the article by Eva Wilden "The ten stages of passion (*daśa kāmavastāh*) and eight types of marriage (*aṣṭavivāha*) in the Tolkāppiyam" (pp. 95–114). The author aims to outline a relationship between some parts of Tamil treatises (Tol. with Iḷampūraṇār's comments and Kaḷaviyal akapporuḷ) and corresponding fragments from Sanskrit sources (Nāṭyaśāstra and Kāmasūtra). First of all, Eva Wilden pays attention to the fact that seven points of the definition of *kaḷavu* in Tol. represent series of emotional states and/or related acts, but only four of them are found in poetry. In a table on p. 101 the author establishes the correspondences between two Sanskrit texts and Tol. Subsequently, she offers a minute analysis of the lists, noting some discrepancies and differences between them. The main conclusions of the author is that the source of the Tamil text definitely goes back to some Sanskrit sources, but we do not know what texts, recensions or redactions were available to Tamil authors.

No doubt there cannot be full agreement between the lists, and a certain variability was very likely. Yet some of the proposed correspondences are unclear or unlikely. Thus, I do not understand why the state of *tanuta* (emaciation) is compared with *ākkam ceppal* (speaking of increase) (p. 101), not with *melital* (becoming weak), while *melital* is compared with *guṇakirtana* (enumeration of [the lover's] qualities). Likewise, it is unclear to me why *lajjapranasa* (loss of shame) is connected with *nōkkuva ellām avaiye pōṟal* (likening those to all the things looked at) (p. 101), rather than with *nāṇuvarai iṟattal* (transgressing the boundary of shame); why *unmada* (madness) is compared to *maṟattal* (forgetting) (p. 101). These inaccuracies are partly explained on p. 103, but the proposed analysis requires a better substantiated argumentation.

Altogether, it is clear that Sanskrit sources undergo certain changes in Tamil texts, as, e. g. in the case of the category *aiyam* (doubt: for instance, the hero seems not to realize who is standing in front of him – a girl, a goddess, or a statue etc.), practically unknown in early Tamil poetry, as the author

convincingly shows.[2] However, at a later stage, it became an important element forming the medieval genre *kōvai* ('chain, garland'). Of special interest is a comparison of the sutras 488 and 140 of Tol., where understanding of *karpu* as a chain of love-events known from akam-poetry (Tol. 488), yields to a love-event which Tamil poetry practically ignores, that is a ceremonial marriage of the heroes (Tol. 140), while the original mythological meaning of the term disappears in the discourse (see Dubianski 2000: 128). The importance of Wilden's paper also lies in that this is one of the first studies addressing numerous text-critical issues of the opening section of the Tol., Kaḷaviyal (p. 111).

Whitney Cox in his paper "From source-criticism to intellectual history in the poetics of the medieval Tamil country" (pp. 115–160) deals with the system of *meyppāṭu* represented in Tol. and usually understood as corresponding to the Sanskrit system of eight rasas[3] borrowed from Nāṭyaśāstra. The Tamil term is often interpreted as "what occurs in the body", although, as the author notes, its original meaning is quite intricate, also being the subject of controversy for medieval commentators such as Iḷampūraṇār and Pērāciriyār (p. 121).

Analyzing the way in which the *meyppāṭu sutra* of Tol. is developed in the commentaries, the author offers a detailed scrutiny of several textual fragments (both Sanskrit and Tamil), explaining the meaning of Tamil *meyppāṭu* as "making them [that is, *cuvai*s or *rasa*s – A.D.] real". A still more precise rendering would be 'making them perceived [by *kāṇpōr* = those who see]', while Tol. has *kēṭpōr* (those who listen) and does not use the term *cuvai* 'taste' (corresponding to *rasa*). Thus the author shows the process of reworking Sanskrit terms connected with *rasa* and *bhava* (the emotional state that is reflected by rasa) by the compilers of Tol. and by Iḷampūraṇār. Altogether, this is an interesting, albeit somewhat awkward effort to connect two different poetics – that of Tamil poetry and Sanskrit drama.

The problem of borrowings within Indian grammatical tradition is discussed in the article "The adoption of Bhartṛhari's classification of the grammatical object in Cēṉāvaraiyar's commentary on the Tolkāppiyam" (pp. 161–197) by Vincenzo Vergiani. The author focuses on the category of *karman* 'object' as treated within the Pāṇinian grammatical system of *karaka*s (approximately corresponding to semantic roles in modern linguistics). He rightly notes that Pāṇinian grammar was adapted for Sanskrit only, and its application to typologically different languages results in "not so much an adaptation for the

---

2 With the exception of Naṟṟiṉai 155, to which I would add Tirukkuṟaḷ 1081 as well as fragments from *kāṉal vari*, Cilappatikāram, VII.

3 Ancient Indian aesthetic term, which literally means 'juice, essence' and refers to a concept fundamental to many forms of Indian art.

original model as the borrowings of selected terms and concepts ... " (p. 163). Accordingly, he correctly states that in the domain of cases as presented in Collatikāram (lit. 'chapter about words'), the grammatical part of the Tamil treatise Tol., "there is clearly no one-to-one correspondence between the list in Tol. and the six Pāṇinian *karakas*" (p. 170).

The author further describes the classification of grammatical object by Bhartṛhari and Cēṉāvaraiyar (13–14 c.), the commentator of Tol. Collatikāram, claiming that the latter is the first Tamil grammarian to mention this classification, and his grammatical analysis undoubtedly derives from Bhartṛhari's system (p. 177). The article concludes with an important discussion of the treatment of the category of *karman* (object) by Indian grammarians within Sanskrit, Pali and Tamil traditions in the period between Bhartṛhari and Cēṉāvaraiyar, using material from the Tamil treatises Vīracōḻiyam (11th c.) and Naṉṉūl (13th c.).

The article by Rich Freeman "Caught in Translation: Ideologies of literary language in Kerala's Maṇipravāḷam" (pp. 199–239) focuses on the treatise Līlātilakam (LT) composed in the 14th c. in Kēraḷa, which aims "to authorize and regularize literary efforts in a hybrid literature it called Maṇipravāḷam [lit. 'jewels and corals" – A.D.], based on the principle of amalgamation of its regional language, as a kind of 'Tamil', with the language and poetics of classical Sanskrit" (p. 199). According to the LT, "Maṇipravāḷam is the union (*yoga*) of Sanskrit and the vernacular (*bhāṣa*)" (p. 202). The article concentrates on a variety of problems caused by this approach, such as (i) the exact status of *bhāṣa*, the local language (Kēraḷa-*bhāṣa* or Tamil?) and (ii) numerous typological differences between Sanskrit and Dravidian, offering a detailed analysis of LT on phonological, lexical and poetic levels. The author comes to an important conclusion that "categorical notions of "Dravidian" were *not* a colonial invention,[4] and that certain Indian intellectuals in the fourteenth century had been argued for an even wider affiliation for Dravidian that would have included the *Andhras* and the *Karṇāṭakas*, marking all of what we call South India as Dravidian" (p. 209). The author convincingly shows a considerable role of Sanskrit in the formation of Maṇipravāḷam, providing interesting examples of how Sanskrit was adapted to the local language ("vernacularized") on many levels, including morphology. Thus, curiously enough, the formation of perfect is taught by the LT as derived by reduplication of Dravidian verbal roots: *pu-puk-*, *cu-cūṭ*, *ta-tal*, *ma-maṇṭ-* (p. 213) – a morphological process totally unknown to Tamil.

The process of intermingling of case systems of the two languages on practical and theoretical levels is analyzed in detail in Section 4 of the article, "Making the case for 'case'". It shows how the composer of LT was

---

4 This obviously refers to the seminal book by Robert Caldwell (1856).

maneuvering between the formal Pāṇinian *karaka* program and the case system of the Tamil treatise Tol. which was more oriented towards the semantics of the formants. Accordingly, as the author, explains, "while the terminology of *vibhakti* [case endings. – A.D.] in the LT was Sanskritic, I would argue that the more semiotically direct logic was in keeping with Tamil practice and understanding" (p. 218). The article perceives a similar strategy being adopted when the LT comes to poetics, to which five of its eight chapters are dedicated. It is nearly entirely Sanskritic in its organization and terminology, but in many respects it is oriented towards Tamil poetry. Thus, the treatment of *anuprāsa*, alliteration, heavily depends on Tamil "rhymes", *mōṉai* and *etukai*.

The final lines of the article deal with Maṇipravaḷam language and literature as reflected in LT. The author concludes that this treatise's "own cultural was explicitly one of intercultural translation, as it struggled to find its own ground worked out in Kerala society between the classical legacy of Sanskrit and Tamil" (p. 236).

The lengthy article by Jean-Luc Chevillard, "Enumeration technique in Tamil metrical treatises (Studies in Tamil metrics - 3)" (pp. 241–322), is one of the outputs of his major project devoted to the Tamil metrical system, its development and its reflection in special treatises, beginning with the Ceyyuḷiyal part of Tol., and also taking into consideration three major commentaries on this treatise (by Iḷampūraṇar, Pērāciriyar and Naccinārkkiṉiyar) as well as Yāpparuṅkalak Kārikai, Yāpparuṅkalam and some treatises. The article outlines the entire system of Tamil metrics in a comprehensive and exhaustive way, with a number of convenient charts. It is very rich in material and technical details pertaining to Tamil metrics, otherwise only accessible to specialists in this, quite peculiar, domain of Tamil philology, managing to take into consideration virtually all relevant secondary literature in the field. One part of the article (pp. 271–273) deals with the term *kaṭṭaḷai*, which is not found in Tol. but introduced by the commentator Pērāciriyar in his interpretation of Tol. 364. The author tentatively explains this term as "touchstone" (i. e. "an ideal form of poetry, which does not necessarily have a counterpart in existing literature") (p. 273), or, alternatively (p. 273, footnote 75), as deriving from *kaṭṭu taḷai* (with a haplology). So, *kaṭṭu taḷai aṭi* means 'connected lines' (?) (the author's translation is unfortunately not given), which seems to me a more plausible explanation.

Discussing further the changes in Tamil metrics in later periods, the author claims that "[a]ncient southern Tamil Nadu poets [...] may have been replaced in the dominant position by northern Tamil Nadu poets, who may have been unable to properly utter the ritually correct pronunciation of the *kuṟṟiyalukaram* while reciting poetry, which may have led to a catastrophic change in the poetical standard" (p. 276). He further convincingly elucidates the general process of simplification of metrics in the medieval treatises such as Yāpparuṅkalam,

Yāpparuṅkalak kārikkai, and Yāpparuṅkala Virutti, presumably due to the advent of Vedic Brahmins to the South of India (p. 298). The author rightly notes that a good deal of the Tamil technical terminology is likely to be based on loan translations from Sanskrit, particularly from the Ṛgveda-Prātiśākhya. Thus, Sanskrit *akṣara* (which can roughly be rendered as 'syllable') underlies Tamil *acai*. The author notices, however, that "[t]he difference between the two metrical systems (for Vedic Sanskrit and for Ancient Tamil) is seen in the counting strategies, because the first one relies on counting the *akṣaras*, whereas the second one does not rely on counting *acais*, but in counting the "countable" *eḻuttus* ["letters" – A.D.] ... and therefore a *nirai* (and a *niraipu*) normally counts for two units of measurement, which makes it into an untypical *akṣara*" (p. 300). This explanation does not seem fully clear but it certainly paves a way to solving the problem of the origin of Tamil metric system. At least, we can realize that it may have had its origin in Vedic rules, although the implementation of these notions as measure units of text counting is greatly affected by the differences between the Sanskrit and Classical Tamil linguistic systems and poetical practices. Altogether, Chevillard's scrupulous analytic work is a valuable contribution to the study of the history of Tamil metrics as well as Tamil scholastic thought in general.

Leslie C. Orr in her article "Words for Worship: Tamil and Sanskrit in medieval temple inscriptions" (pp. 325–357) analyzes South Indian inscriptions, primarily focusing on six texts, given in the Appendix with translations, from the period between the 8th and 20th c., as well as on Sanskrit Āgamas. She establishes the relationships and relative chronology of a number of technical terms used in the worshipping ritual in Tamil Hindu and Jaina temples, and the procedure of worshipping gods inside them. In particular, the author demonstrates that some Sanskrit terms are used in Tamil inscriptions in a Tamilized form, or are replaced by some other Sanskrit or Tamil terms. Thus, the Āgamic term *naivedya* (food offerings) is unattested in the inscriptions, being replaced by *avi* (← Sanskrit *havis-* 'offering, libation'), which, in turn, is replaced from the 8th c. onwards by *amutu*, *amirtu*, and *amirtam* (← Sanskrit *amṛta-* 'immortal (ity)'), which could refer not only to food, but to sacrificial oblations in general (p. 330).

Emmanuel Francis shows in his article "Praising the king in Tamil during the Pallava period" (pp. 359–409) that Pollock's (2006: 122) claim that during the six centuries of Pallava rule (end of the 3rd – end of the 9th c. CE) "not a single inscription was produced in which Tamil does any work beyond recording the everyday [life] ... " (p. 359) is not entirely correct: it highlights a number of inscriptions that contain specimens of literary Tamil composition. The author further offers a detailed etymological and historical analysis of some *birudas*

(panegyric royal titles), usually composed in a mixture of Sanskrit and Dravidian languages (most often Tamil and Telugu), and titles of Pallava kings. The author analyzes several Tamil and mixed (Sanskrit-Tamil) inscriptions. Thus, a part of an inscription from Taḷavānūr is written in the Sanskrit meter *anuṣṭubh* and further echoed by a Tamil verse composed in the *veṇpā* meter. The author comes to the conclusion that "Sanskrit surely played an important role in the rise of political Tamil,[5] but less as a formal or thematic model than as a paradigm to be adapted or translated into a specifically Tamil garb" (p. 385). The paper represents an important study of the connection of inscriptional Tamil with Tamil literary tradition, outlining a certain path of development within the epigraphic tradition, from early Pallava epigraphy (where "political" Tamil was influenced by "political" Sanskrit), to panegyric parts (*meykkīrttis*) of the medieval Cōḻa inscriptions with traces of heroic (*puṟam*) poetry of *caṅkam* origin.

This analysis substantiates the author's polemics against Sheldon Pollock's theory of "vernacularisation", which implies "the historical process to create a written literature, along with its complement, a political discourse, in local languages according to models supplied by a superordinate, usually cosmopolitan, literary culture" (Pollock 2006: 23, cited on p. 392). Without denying the prominent cultural role of Sanskrit and the complex character of its relationship with vernacular cultures and languages, Francis convincingly demonstrates that Pollock's theory fundamentally underestimates Tamil literature and Tamil cultural tradition in general.

The last article in the volume, Timothy Lubin's "Legal Diglossia: Modeling discursive practices in premodern Indian law" (pp. 411–455), focuses on the legal procedures reflected by inscriptions (in particular, South-East Asian inscriptions from Cambodia and Java) and shows a complex process of mixing Sanskrit and local languages in these texts. The author analyzes the "legal diglossia" resulting from the intermingling of more prestigious Brahmanic laws with local usage and practices, and the process of code-switching and code-mixing. Thus Sanskrit *viśeṣa* 'distinction, excellence' changes its meaning to 'power, authority' in Old Javanese (p. 423). The final part of Lubin's paper contains publication (with translations) of six inscriptions (dated from the 9th to 15th c.), which illustrate the intermingling of Sanskrit and Tamil. As the author notices in conclusion, further study is required, in order to corroborate the role of Indian terminology in local practice (p. 449).

This latter statement understood more widely holds, in fact, for all studies in the volume under review. This book is an important step to our better understanding of several difficult issues of Ancient Indian sociolinguistics, diglossia

---

5 The term "political Tamil" is likely to refer to the language of the official royal edicts.

and polyglossia, and a number of interaction phenomena of different linguistic systems, opening up new research perspectives in these domains and thus representing a valuable contribution to a variety of domains of Indology. The book is neatly printed and lacks almost any misprints and drawbacks. It is most notable for a high scientific level of works collected in the volume, which will undoubtedly be of great interest for all those interested in South Asian linguistics, philology and cultural studies.

References

Caldwell, Robert. 1856. *A comparative grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian family of languages*. London: Harrison.

Dubianski, Alexander M. 2000. *Ritual and mythological sources of the early Tamil poetry*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

Hardy, Friedhelm. 1983. *Viraha-bhakti: The early history of Kṛṣṇa devotion in South India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pollock, Sheldon. 2006. *The language of the gods in the world of men: Sanskrit, culture, and power in premodern India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tamil Lexicon. 1936–1938. In six volumes. Madras: Madras University.