SOME MANUSCRIPTS IN GRANTHA SCRIPT
IN BANGKOK—II

by J.R. Marr

In a previous paper which appeared in 1969, I discussed a set of manuscripts in the National Library in Bangkok which, through the kindness of Acharn Choosri, to whom I am ever indebted, I was allowed to examine and to photograph in December 1967. These MSS, written in orpiment on black paper in two forms of Grantha script which I term OG (ordinary Grantha) and DG (decorative Grantha), were sufficiently numerous to warrant more than a single paper; they are moreover of great interest being based on both Tamil and Sanskrit originals. Accordingly I first attempted a discussion of the scripts involved and examined most of the texts that are Tamil in origin. They are Śaiva, and are versions of hymns in Tevāram and Tiruvācakam.

It seems unnecessary therefore further to discuss the script, save where new features have been noticed, or where preferable readings have suggested themselves. Principal among these latter is the character in the OG texts which, on the basis of the one or two instances of it in the Tamil texts I tentatively read as (ch), aspirate, since there are already two characters for unaspirated e in this script, one originating in Grantha, the other in Tamil.

1) After some reflection, I decided to use the same title as that of my previous article, which appeared in BSOAS XXXII, ii (1969) pp. 281-322 and plates 1-61, since this is a continuation of the examination of these MSS. There may indeed be a third offering. Those who were baffled by the Tamil quotation at the head of the previous paper, see BSOAS, ibid., p. 281, might be helped by the fact that the text originates in a non-Indian language and, romanized, runs: antyayānmai leṣi naṃ vinā kevalīṇa eva.

2) See BSOAS, ibid., pp. 283-303. I would like here to record my thanks to Professor E.H.S. Simmonds, Professor of Languages and Literatures of South East Asia in the University of London, and to Mrs. Judith Jacob and Mr. Peter Bee, the lecturers in Cambodian and Tai respectively in the School of Oriental and African Studies, for their continuing interest and encouragement in this project.

3) See BSOAS, ibid., pp. 287, 302, and text (b) 1.3, on p. 313. The group herein should now read vāmāndraśvyā for Ta.... tta and ḍy.... admittedly further removed. But the Skt. evidence is more compelling.
read as (ch), but it should be noted that the DG MSS do not show a Tamil-based character for e.1 It now seems much better to read this character as dra, as it occurs in three places in the Sanskrit portion of the OG MS catalogued XVII 37 (i) where it is quite unambiguous: fol. 249, line 5 has harapucacra2 swarendra, clearly haraputraswendra; f. 250 has swarendra; f. 251, l. 1 has madamasta-gajendra for madamasta-ka)gajendra.

In this paper will be presented two of the texts in the Sanskrit portion of the OG MS XVII 37 (i), including a puzzling passage that also occurs in the DG MS catalogued XVII 37 (v) on fol. 165; the two versions will be shown in parallel. There will also be included an interesting text from the DG MS XVII 37 (iii). In addition, the second part of the DG version of the Tamil text Tiruvempavai will be included. It will be recalled that the first part only of this text was given in the previous article,3 and that Tiruvempavai occurs in the DG MS in two successive texts. Entitled Pujamuraiy potaya4 and Pujamuraiy potakalai,5 these run from fols. 127-135 and 136-142 of the DG MS catalogued in the National Library, Bangkok, under XVII 37 (v). The former text represents vv. 1-11 of Tiruvempavai, the latter the remaining nine verses.

Still outstanding are the two baffling Tamil texts in DG in the same MS, fols. 143-148, i.e. running straight on after the second part of Tiruvempavai, and fols. 179-185. The former, entitled Śvamuraiyṣatānaghra: nārāy, is unusual in being a Vaiṣṇava text, and it embodies two lines of Anūlī's Tiruppavai, v. 1, as a repeating-unit, six times.6 The second text so far defies identification. It is entitled in DG Grantha script Pitpācīvālaīśa, but it is very different from the Ta. OG text under this name in the MS XVII 37 (i) that consists of excerpts from Tevāram IV and VII.7

1) The resemblance between Ta. ca, used as a sibilant, and 5, to, may throw fresh light upon the interplay of sibilant and dentals in loanwords in Tamil: e.g. tātı or tāti for Skt dātī.
2) See BSOAS, ibid., pp. 307-8 and 315-319, also plates IV-VI.
3) By an oversight, this was transliterated as . . . potaya; but see BSOAS, ibid., p. 295.
4) For part of this text, see BSOAS, ibid., pp. 309-10.
5) For contents of these MSS, catalogued XVII 37 (i), (iii) and (v), see BSOAS, ibid., pp. 303-4.
The DG Pitpratāśīvalaiy is in 15 'verses' numerated successively, and not in repeating blocks of 4 as are the Tiruvempāvai-text and the Vaiṣṇava one that follows it using two lines of Tiruppavai as refrain. Two ‘verses’ of the DG Pitpratāśīvalaiy are here given, and a solution to their source and meaning invited:

DG: XVII 37 (v) fol. 179. Excerpt from text of Tamil origin, entitled Pitpratāśīvalaiy

dēvaruddināne tarumum mikuttaruvo
mikvuraṇṇarumum murumuraiyguvin dāsisaiyṭhā?
di adinatiye yapbulomū silaiyādanan
yedalandum ṛanattalumvāyālum vanrunavuru
voravaiynum nimiṣatāraiyyelan daranye
ranattā lummedum gudaiyvileniṃ bhanlavò
bhan pādaṅkanlayā mujaivyabhatdatin

1) Possible Tamil word herein: ... tarumum mika ttarmay
2) " " " " " " " ... majumara ... 
3) " " " " " " ... cilaiyētaṇū 
4) " " " " " " ... nimiṣattaralvānilam ... 
5) " " " " " " ... kūtai vil ēnumu ...
Viewed as a whole, the OG MS XVII 37 (i) that includes Tevāram is a Śaiva collection, and its opening texts, in Sanskrit, are further evidence of this. From a reference to their contents, it is clear that most of these MSS are handbooks or paddhatis of Śaiva brahman priests, and are thus comparable to the much wider corpus of material from Bali discussed by Dr Hooykaas.¹

The first text in MS XVII 37 (i) is an instance of digbandhana, propitiation of the gods at the eight points of the compass, a widely-attested Hindu invocation that has been fully discussed by Hooykaas² with reference to Balinese texts, and by others.³ The Bangkok text runs from fol. 241, 1.1 to 1.8, and appears to be in prose. Each dikpāla mentioned is bracketed by the Śaiva pancekārā formula namaḥ śivāya, and the use in this throughout of a double sibilant representing namas śivāya, suggests a South Indian origin for this text, which is hardly surprising. It is of interest that not all the protectors' names agree with the usual list and that, while the East is mentioned first as customary, enumeration is not of all eight in succession clockwise. Those at the four cardinal points are mentioned first, and then those of the half-cardinals, starting with Indra in the NE; the protector for NW is unintelligible. Of the three points in the vertical plane, only adhah, 'below', is mentioned, and no protector is named. These features are shown in fig. 1:⁴

² See, for example, T. Goudriaan and C. Hooykaas: Stati and stava, p. 17 and text 157, pp. 102-3; also Hooykaas: Surya-sevana, p. 143.
³ e.g. S. Kramrisch: The Hindu temple, p. 40.
⁴ For circular versus square ground-plans see Alice Boner & Sadasiva Rath Sarma: Silpa pratāki, Leiden, 1966, Intro., p. xxxix, and, more fully, S. Kramrisch: The Hindu temple, pp. 21 & seqq.
Fig. 1 The eight directions and nadir according to Bkk. OG MS XVII 37(i) text 1 (f. 242)

Now follows the text upon which the accompanying diagram is based. The following symbols have been used in all the text-transcriptions that follow:

- ( ) conjecture
- [ ] suggested reading; character blurred or erased.
- ☐ initial vowel-character follows without space in group; use of a capital letter indicates initial vowel-character subscribed beneath a consonant.

\[1\), \(�) \] \(dang\); half-\(dang\)

\[\text{visarga} \] character used in text for reasons that are not clear.¹

¹) See BSOAS, ibid., p. 284.
Text:

@prā: rājabhī ḍīkhinpramahamsamuca ⊂ tāntaipūṇa ⊂ dīta omkānyakabra:
pyaihā ⊂ triyambhāvīy

@ṇa: massivāya: pūrā: pramēsthāsvivāya: prasiddimenama: lṇa:
namaḥ sīvāya pūrva paramēsthāsvivāya prasiddhayena mahā
massivāya: daksinabrahmadēhāya pra: sitdimenama: lṇamassivāya:
mahāśivāya daksinabrahmadēvāya prasiddhayena mahā
nāmaḥ sīvāya

pacimavandīṇaprasiddimenama: lṇa: massivāya: utavisput [ā] dhāyya:
pascima (varuṇa) prasiddhayena mahā nāmaḥ sīvāya uttaraśīṇu ?

prasiddimenama: lṇa: massivāya: isāṇindāyya: pra: siddimenama:
prasiddhayena mahā nāmaḥ śivāya isāṇendrāya prasiddhayena mahā

ṇamassivāya: āgapiṅkrasṇa: rāyyanāy: pra: siddimenama: lṇamassī
namaḥśivāya āgneyakṛṣṇa (rājne) prasiddhayena mahā nāmaḥ si-
vāya: nairtihmahāṅga: pātīne pra: siddimenama: lṇamassivāsyavāy
vāya nairtihmahāṅgaphataye prasiddhayena mahā nāmaḥ śivāya vā-
yu ? ? prasiddhayena mahā adhodiṣṭaṣṭaṃbhiṣṭipra-
sanambiṇiśanāṇīśittavā ghuruvantarunomam galanapi
cṣaṇaṃ ? ? maṅgalam
The rest of f. 242 of the same MS is interesting, if somewhat hard to decipher. Moreover, it has a close parallel on f. 165 of the DG MS XVII 37(v). It seems to consist of a possibly Sanskrit text in which is embedded part of a line from Appar’s first patikam in Tevaram IV,1 one of the Tamil texts used that appears in another place in the OG MS XVII 37(i), in fols. 270 1.5 to 275, 1.8.2 The two extracts are here shown together (a) being from f. 242 of XVII 37(i), and (b) from f. 165 of XVII 37(v). As with the Tamil excerpts given in the earlier paper, italicized are those portions of the Tamil that do not appear to be represented in the Bck. version:

(a) f. 242

@ omkära yamahatadarupratitrutagum | sadhānam tra : na : mate na : maça
(a) ohkānavmhabaidarūpratittatrum | śadānamtrapamateṇa f. 165

omkāra ? ?

(a) jre j da(j) : khetatapin la:vilatā nāturai anmāṭhadogun
(b) matjeu dajakgettaraṇiḷavililatānuray ammā [d] aļu

. . kēṭila vīraṭāṇatturai ammāne

(a) di ḍha : mudakakimudakagaytavā ghrāṇa : tīghri ḫasaviṇuturo
(b) gandi damudakki—muḍakgaytavā guṇatigri ḫasaviṇuturo

. . ṭukki muṭakkiyita ārtiṭā puṭāṭā atikaikketilā . . . .

(a) harriharvo .
(b) harihavaro .

1) Tev. IV, 1, verse 5, 11. 3-4. Also, part of the ending of most of its verses:

kēṭila vīraṭāṇatturai ammāne.

2) For an extract from this, see BSOAS, ibid., pp. 314-5, where it is shown in parallel with another version in Thai script.
One of the most interesting of the Sanskrit texts in the same MS is one which, without any title or preamble other than hari oṁ enumerates twelve names of Śiva. Commencing at 1.6 of f. 251, it finishes on f. 252, 1.8. It follows upon a text that is clearly addressed to Gaṇapati, but one that remains tantalizingly out of reach, despite the regularly repeated ‘refrain’ vādeviguna : vināyakāram, which could represent the Sanskrit vande’ham vighnavināyakam.¹

We are told that enumeration of these twelve names of Śiva will ensure release from sin and entry into Śiva’s kingdom:

mucyate sarva pāpebhya śivaloke sa gacchati.²

Its particular interest lies in the fact that it is an extremely close parallel to a text with the same object that is included by Goudriaan and Hooykaas in Stuti and stava.³ To make this point clear the Bangkok version is presented below, with the probable Sanskrit underneath, and beneath that the Balinese text, line by line. Again, italicized are those portions that are not reflected in the Bkk. text. The bracketed portions of the Bali text are those that differ from the Bkk. text, which is in any case defective in the middle: name 7 is followed by name 12, which pāda is repeated after name 9, so that names 8, 10 and 11 do not appear at all:

1) OG MS XVII 37(i) ff. 249 line 3 to 251, line 6.
2) MS XVII 37(i) f. 252, line 7.
3) pp. 418-9, hymn no. 694.
OG: XVII 37 (i) fols. 251 line 6-252 line 8. The 12 names of Śiva.

Text, Sanskrit equivalent, and closely parallel Indonesian text in Hooykaas: Stuti and stava, p. 418, no. 694.

\[ \text{hari om pradhamahādeva: dhitiyetu ma: hesavara: } \]
\[ \text{hari om prathamastu mahādevo dvitiyastu mahaśvaraḥ } \]
\[ \text{prathamastu Mahā-devo dvitiyastu Mahēśvaraḥ } \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{tratīṭamāṃ kharancalva: } & \text{caṇatadvṛtrasa gatadrayāṃ } \\
\text{tṛtiyāḥ śaṅ-karaṁ caiva } & \text{caturthāṃ vṛṣabhadvṛjām} \\
\text{tṛtiyāḥ Śaṅkaro jēyaś } & \text{caturtho Vṛṣabhadvṛjāḥ}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{panca: maṃ śulapāñataca: sattamaṃ kāmāṃ gaṇāṣṭaṃ } \\
\text{pañcamam śūlapāñīṣa ca sastham kāmāṅga nāsanaṃ } \\
\text{pañcamah Śūla-pāniś ca saṣṭhaḥ Kāmāṅga-nāsanaḥ }
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{saptamaṃ īṣva: raṃproktam daśasāṃ śiva: ru: taca: te } \\
\text{saptamaṃ īṣvaram proktam dvādaśāṃ śiva ucyate} \\
\text{saptamo (Devadevēśaḥ Śrīkaṭhaś caṣṭamo bhavet) } \\
\text{(Rudra ekādaśāḥ cālva,) dvādaśāḥ Śiva ucyate} \\
\text{nauva: maṃ īṣvaram proktam daśasāṃ śiva: rutaca: te } \\
\text{navama īṣvaram proktam dvādaśāṃ śiva ucyate} \\
\text{(Rudra ekādaśāḥ cālva,) dvādaśāḥ Śiva ucyate} \\
\text{1) Or possibly śivo rakṣate.}
\text{2) The pādas bracketed in the Hooykaas version do not appear in the Bkk. text.}
\text{3) Here in its correct place; appears twice in the Bkk. text, both times out of sequence, (7, 12, 9, 12) }\]
aiśāniśī dasamāṇī ērikatamayā patesavara
ete dvā-duśanāmāṇī kṛtamayaḥ patesvaram
ete dvādasa nāmāṇi (trisandhyāṁ yāh pāṭhena nāraḥ)
gahoranaçavā ha gahañca gurunāmruta tuṣā pa ka
ghoraś Caitvā kṛtāghnaś ca gurunām vratatalpakāḥ
gohnaś Caitvā kṛtāghnaś ca (brūṇa-hā) gurutālpaḥ

itrabhālahā lagācaiva sūrāpennyā na dhevaca
strībhālaghātakaś caiva surapā vīṣālepakāḥ
strībhālaghātakaś caitva, sura-po viṣā-lepakah

[n]ucā tuṣava pāpahayo śiva loke sa gatajati
mucyate sarvapāpebhyo sivaloka sa gacchati
mucyate sarva-pāpebhyo (Rudra)-lokaḥ ca gacchati.

1) Or goghnah, following Hooykaas; see S&S p. 418.
2) Following Hooykaas, S&S, ibid., though only same vowels in fact correspond.
The DG MSS XVII 37(iii) and (v) contain a number of Sanskrit texts in addition to those from Tamil sources noted above. For example immediately after the puzzling text in XVII 37(v) running from f. 179 to 183, there occurs a digbandhana that is essentially the same text as that noted above from the OG MS. In XVII 37(iii) there is included a DG version of the Mantraśāstram, the alliterative litany that provided the key for the OG script in the previous article; it proceeds the sheet containing the complete DG syllabary that was figured previously.

Another interesting Sanskrit text in DG script also occurs in XVII 37(iii). Unlike most of the Sanskrit and Tamil texts discussed so far, it does not seem to be connected with frequent or daily worship, for it sets out the padadevaīas connected with vāstupuruṣa, the ‘site-man’ as is envisaged in the ground plan of the Hindu temple according to the śīlpaśāstras.

The accompanying diagram, fig. 2, based on the vāstupuruṣamaṇḍala given by Stella Kramrisch, shows the padadevaīas as given in the Bangkok text which are enumerated clockwise starting south of south-east. It will be seen that not all the deities in the Bkk. text are in fact padadevaīas, following Kramrisch, some are inner devaīs. They are enumerated in clockwise direction as one would expect, until the NE corner is reached, when the list seems to go somewhat awry. But the list totals 32, the usual number for these deities.

Each devaī-name is prefixed by two syllabic mantras and followed by the formula vāstupuruṣabrahmaṇe svāhā. For reasons of space the full line is given only at the beginning and, for reference, wherever the fol. number appears on the MS.

1) See BSOAS, ibid., p. 283 & plate I opp. p. 306.
2) See BSOAS, ibid., plate II.
3) See Kramrisch, op. cit., pp. 29 & seqq.: she draws particularly upon the Brhad-śamhitā.
4) op. cit., fig. on p. 32.
![Diagram of Devatas and padadevatās]

Fig. 2 Devatās and padadevatās in order of enumeration in Bangkok MS XVII 37 (iii), and in their locations on the Viśṇupurāṇamandala ace, to S. Kramrisch, *Hindu temple*, p. 32. Locations for Nos. 27, 29 and 32 uncertain. Names in lower case are those given by Kramrisch, where these differ.
DG: XVII 37(iii) fols. 47-50. No heading; consists of salutations to the Padadevās.

[εο dhAm]¹

οmhabmvantathāya vāstupurāṣa brahmanesvāhā
οmhabm vitathāya vāstupurāṣabrahmane svāhā

οmhabmgračakṣyā etc. oµhabm bhṛkṣatāya ... 
οmhabmyāmāya etc. oµhabm yamāya ... (South)

οmhabmganṭhavāya etc. " gandharvāya ... 

f. 47

οmhabh [ra] garājyāya vāstupurāṣa brahmanesvāhā²
οmhabh bhṛṅgarājyāya vāstupurāṣabrahmane svāhā

οmhabmunragyāya etc. oµhabh mrgāya ... 

οmhabmpityā etc. oµhabh pitṛbhyo ... (SW)

οmhabmdeṇa3vārikāya etc. oµhabh dauvārikāya ...

1) Suggested reading; this note is in very small characters at the head.
2) Clearly a scribe’s error for dau
3) Notice that, as with the paiicahāra namahēśṭya and the repeating portions of the Tamil texts, the repeating-unit here is much less corrupted, having been all the oftener repeated!
ophāṃsvatrīvāya etc. ophāṃ sugrīvāya....
ophāṃpupadantāya etc. ophāṃ puspadantāya....
ophāṃ etc. ophāṃ puspadantāya....

ophāṃjā(th)ipāya etc. ophāṃ ? ? ? (West)

ophāṃāsurāya etc. ophāṃāsurāya....

ophāṃroga vaṣṭupurasa brahmanesvāhā
ophāṃ rogāva vaṣṭupurasa brahmane svāhā
ophāṃvāyyarave etc. ophāṃ ? vāyavāya....
ophāṃnāgāya etc. ophāṃ nāgāya.... (NW)
ophāṃmuvāya etc. ophāṃ mukhāya....
ophāṃbhallakatakāya etc. ophāṃ bhallātāya....

---

1) SK gives kusumadanda here, p. 32.
3) SK gives vārṇa here, ibid.
4) Initial vowel a- after aṇuṇāvāya.
5) SK gives loka at this point, and roga in the NW corner-box.
6) papaṭakṣapun here, SK. This deva is in the box adjacent to the NW, hence the reading suggested here.
7) roga, SK. See note 5 also.
8) SK has ahi here. This has apparently been omitted, for the evening order along the N side mukhāya to diti is correctly maintained in the Bkk. text.
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omhāṃhamāya etc. omhāṃ somāya ... (North)

omhāṃprasacane etc. omhāṃ ? rājñē ...

omhāṃśaditate etc. omhāṃmaditaye ...

f. 49

omhāṃśuvciditye vāstupuraṣa brahmanesvāhā
omhāṃ ditaye vāstupurusabrahmaṇe svāhā

omhāṃ apāya² etc. omhāṃapāya³ ... (NE)

omhāṃ apavasya etc. omhāṃapavatsaya⁴ ...

omhāṃmarisavanē etc. omhāṃ ? parjanyāya⁵ ...

omhāṃsaṁvitatre etc. omhāṃ savitrē⁶ ...

omhāṃśāvitraṇa etc. omhāṃ sāvitraṇa⁷ ... (East)

1) bhūjāga, SK, p. 32. Rājñē tentatively suggested as based on Rājayaksāman; see SK, ibid.
3) After dītī, the sequence in the Bkk. alters; āpā and āpavatsā are inner devatās acc. SK, ibid., of the NE.
4) āpavatsa: an inner devatā of the N.E.
5) Conjecture. Parjanya is the padadevata adjacent to Agni of the NE corner-box, reading clockwise.
6) Again apparently a return to the inner devatā.
7) Inner devatā, but also—Sūrya, so appropriate for The East box; see SK, p. 32 diagram.
omḥāṃvissavate etc. omḥāṃ ? viṣva . . . . .

omḥāṃjayyandrāya etc. omḥāṃ jayantāya?

f. 50

omḥāṃjandrajāya vastupuraṣa brahmanesvāhā
omḥāṃ ? ? vastupuruṣabrahmane svāhā

omḥāṃmitadrāya etc. omḥāṃ mitrāya?

(?SE)

omḥāṃrutadrāya etc. omḥāṃ rudrāya

omḥāṃrutadradesāya etc. omḥāṃ ? rudradesāya . . . .

1) Next but one box to Agni on the east side, reading clockwise; the last pādadvata-nāme recognizable in this list.

2) An inner devatā, acc. SK, p. 32, diagram, but of the West.

3) Also a West inner devatā, acc. SK, ibid.
At the beginning of this paper, mention was made of the fact that the DG manuscripts XVII 37 (v) includes under two headings the text of Tiruvempāvai, the Tamil Saivite poem by Māṇīkkaṇaṭēr. To conclude this paper, the portion that contains vv.12-20 of the poem will be given. It is arranged in exactly the same way as the first part, each 8-line verse of the original being treated as four ‘verses’ numbered 1 to 4 in Thai script, the next verse being a fresh cycle of four, and so on. Only in the last verse is the text nearly hopelessly corrupt, lines 1 to 3 of the original being omitted altogether. Moreover, this 8-line verse is represented as a cycle of 5 ‘verses’ although less of the original verse in fact appears. Its ‘verses’ for the most part represent but one line of the original. The fact that the Tamil word pōṭṭi, ‘praise’, commences each line seems to have proved too much for the memorizers in Thailand; four ‘verses’ have bāṭṭi at the end as well as bāṭṭi at the beginning, both being clearly representations of Ta. pōṭṭi, and the occurrence of Ta. ēllum in three of Māṇīkkaṇaṭēr’s lines has led to a jump-line situation whereby ēllum for ēllum appears four times although the first line of the original that includes this word is absent altogether and 1.4 of the original is repeated twice. Unlike the other ‘verses’ of the Bkk. recension, these, save the 5th., are co-terminous with one line of the original plus the extra pōṭṭi, only the fifth being co-terminous with two lines, the last two, of the original.

A concordance with the original Tamil text will make this clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>Tiruvempāvai, v. 20</th>
<th>Bkk, ‘verse’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>poriy aruluka nīru uūti ampatamalar</td>
<td>= 1 &amp; 4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>poriy aruluka nīru antamāṇ ēntālirkal</td>
<td>= 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>poriy ēllum uyirkkum toramān pōṟpūtam</td>
<td>= 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>poriy (ēllum uyirkkum)† pokamām pūnkalaikal</td>
<td>= poriy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>poriy ēllum uyirkkum ērum ēntāyalikal</td>
<td>= poriy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>poriy (mā puppiesanam kanata) puntarikam</td>
<td>= poriy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>poriyam uyyavāt kōntarulam puṇamalarkal</td>
<td>= 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>poriyam mārkaṭī nīr āṭet or ēmāppāvāy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bracketed are those portions of the original that seem not at all to be represented in the Bangkok version. The text of this, running from f.136 to f.142, line 5, is here given in full:

1) It is in fact vv.155-174 of his Tirumāṇam and, like the Tirumāṇamūlaya that follows it, is in praise of Śiva at Tiruvāṇamalai, the hill of Fire, referring to the fire-linga, the embodiment of the god as a pillar of fire the top and bottom of which could not be observed by Brahmā and Viṣṇu, since it was unending.

2) See B.S.O.A.S., ibid., pp. 315-319 and plates IV-VI for the text and romanization of the first part of the Bkk. Tiruvempāvai.
DG: XXVII 37(v) fols. 136-142. Title: pājumuraiypotakalay.

Contains verses 12-20 of Māṅikkavaēkār's Tiruvēmpōrai.¹

(12) vātt(a)bharuvibhurugamayānā māttālimdāvittīnyai

thinlaicittumalaya dāiyādiṁ guttanivaniyavālaivy mun
rrillaieicirramalatte tiyātuṁ kūttanivaṇukkavalaayaya—mum

menlo muvāttumganettumagāram dimmanlayādi vāttana
mēlo mūkkāttumpaśaittun karu—tumviyāliyāti vātti

yimbheśivandralām pavanrigalagam gātganvātpravaraj ciy
yum pecivalaicitum-pa vārkalaika | āṟṟparavaṇ ēyya

nigulau devānakadatpA bhuttikamamamaiygaṇṭųyān ba
va niṟkula melvāṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟ্

ruṭṭābhāthām nethOrēnndē laṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟṟнная

1) For the first part of this text, see J.S.O.S. XXXI, ii (1969) text (c), pp. 315-319, and plates IV-VI of DG: XXVII 37(v) fols. 127-135.

2) Probably a scribe's error for ki, which would be closer to the Tamil original.
bhenkama: la'kaŋkamārāṇ cīṅkamalalakjakbhā-duṇ niśōnraṇ
(13) paṅkuvalaikkār malārār cēṅkamalappaim po'tāl ankaṇ

gurunatān virumviratgatpA ṛ̇ daṅhaṃmalāṅguruvāyvaṇ ki
kurukigattār marav-attāl taṅkaṇ malāṅkaluvumvārvantu

drākaṅliyāthiṇṇanbhirāntiyāṃ menkamubAṭhisāndi ṛ̇ yābhukāju
cārtalinā ēṅkaḷ pīrāṭṭiyum ēṅkonnampūrricinta pōṅku-

mvikbhaṅgābbādbādī ninaṇyeṇṇanjilam yiṅvA: matgatpA ṛ̇
maṭuvilmukappāyntuṇyata nahecaṅkaūcillamuccillampu ēṛppu
kalant'
gunghaigangumbugnayim bhupaibhumbhāṃṇaivy bhāṇayapbhūṃ
kōṅkaikalpoṅkakutāiyum pugal pōṅka pāṅkayapūṃn

bhunlabānde laṃpaṇaṃ ći gAgāṇṇapayādibem
punaḷ pāyntāṭetorēṃpaṇvāy (13) (14) kāṭrkuāiyūjapaim

puṅgaruṇaṇādi beḍaiyagununā vandinkunāmbādī ni
puṅkaḷuṇṭa kkotai kulalaṭa vaṅṭinkulāmā-ṭa

jAdidirambhādī ṣuṅgaṃnetsisavalāḍī cittambalambhādī viṃ
cēća puṅalāṭi cīṛrapalampāṭi ve-

1) Suggesting original Ta... paṅkamala... with similar meaning; probably a jingle with Ta.
cēṅkamala later in the same line.
2) Grantha initial a-, often used for Ta. -a-, perhaps charged to -ā- here by scribe's error.
3) This group is of unclear origin.
dapparuladi ṣarattanānambhādi ṭanabhādi a:
tappōṟukpāṭiyappōṟukkāmaḥ pāṭi ecotiṭiram pāṭi (a—
parulabhādi geṁmanagukkāva bhedināmaiy vataṭhuttābe
(pporukkāmaṭi) 1, 2 antamāpāṭi petittunamai vaḷartettuttāpēy

vaḷadaṁ tibhirappbirambhān ramkārabhādelArīṃpavāy
vaḷaitan pāṭa ttrimpāṭiy atelorēṃpavāy (14)
avāgāvayumhūrumān ongaṇbhūrumān ongaṇguruttān vi
(15) orūrikā ṇeṃṛumān . . . namṛumān cirōrukā* vāyovāl ci
rumbhiratdatāra neyarāvaydāngān tripatuṅkamān
maṅkalikūra nirōrukālovaṭantāraṅkāṇaṇippa

jiruṅvantaṇaṇān meṅnagṛettāṃbhaniyān be
(cirōrukā)*vanta-naiyāi vijnorai tāṇaṇiyyāl pera
raiyattāungiṇaṇa bheratuvandivāra vārimvāṇivāra
raiyār-kiṇāne pittoruvārāmu māruravivāṇaṇa

1) This should appear in the italicized position, but seems to be misplaced, being represented by "a: parulabhādi" in the next line; it is therefore placed there, but in brackets.
2) The repetitive use of Ta. pāṭi seems to have defeated the Bkk. text! A section is missing altogether: . . . eṅkkogīn Tārāpūṭikā ṇeṃṛpāṭi antam &c.
3) Ta. ḍarāṭa omitted; possibly Bkk. ongān stands for supposed onkāra.
vārimviratdatpA ॐ vannāyapbhummarayim vāmabhādi vara 
. . . vāru-ruva  (ivvanā)² . . ppūṇmulaiyir vāyāranāmpātiyervuru

yapbhuvinaṁbhān nibhirisede lArimpāvāy ॐ mu
appūmpunāl pāynt' ॐ ṛte-lorēmpāvāy (15) (16) mu-

nikāgatalaiy jakatirmagamaiyān gannippanaviṅlāṁ
māka- talai ecūrakkiyēlantuṭalaiyā] ėṃnattikālnt'ēmmāiyāl

f. 139

lutdaiyyāṅlutdaiyyām ॐ mīṅpinaptaṭimīṁ birāduvattade
ūtaiyā] īṭṭiṭaiyin minī ppōliat'ēm pīrāṭṭiṭiruvaṭi

me jilampatjīlāṁ pīm(th)irpararuvaṅ ॐ genaijuvinatamaiy
mer³ . . . cilampircitam-ī pī ttiruppu-ruvam ēn nakulvinantammai

yān gannikparanaṅḷāṁ gīṅkamananpakkīA ॐ muniśavaṇa ;
yaṭṭalaiyāṭanirpirivilāv īṅkōmāṅ anparkku munnīyaṇa

makki memuraṁmirula gannaibiriyanbīrisī lArimpā
makkā muncaṛakkumiggarułyeṇnappōliyāyāmalayāl-ōrēmpā--

1) The Ta. original runs : ( .. māraṇuva) ivvanā mūkīḷḷum vīṭākārat(ūm vāruruva ...)
2) Possibly represented here, out of place, by vamū. . .
3) As n does not normally carry a vowel in this script, there is no need to show the initial a- by a
capital letter.
4) Missing is Ta. . . pūngram . . .
vāy \[16\] jībhavaṃbhaṇaḍīraṇa muṇḍakabhāṅgaṃtiṃkanum
vāy \(16\) \(17\) cēkanaṇavaṇṇārāci mukapāra. . . .
ēkum

milantaṃ(t)inirṃ arjīḍāsāmā \(16\) guṇhaṃgarummarulē nāgadaṃ
ilā-tatorinpa nampālaṭā
kkōṅkūkarūṅkūlali nant'aṃ-

maiṃmatadāti jīlaṃgabhadā arjīṭurule \(17\)
mai kktāṭṭiy. . . .
īlaṅkotarūṭum ējuntarūṭi cēkāmalā
apbhakbhadām ēnturulime āṇaphanaikībhatdigaṃ hutta
ppōpātan tant'arulūn cev-a-kāṇai . . . 

1) Ta. tevarakālū . . . missing.
2) Ta. . . iśhu namb(ω) . . . . is missing.
3) Ta. . . anubhava(na). . . . is missing.
nariṇṇumāṇ gaiygangāṇnagamalā || bhunṇājyāṇāyCambalīṃ
malṇīkittārakaika-ṭāmaka-la pēṇākīyāṇī alīy-

yān pilāṅguruṣēt pailynattanatnādi vittagayamvin
āy ppirāṅkōḷicēr vinnākī2 maṇṇāki ittanāiyumve-

rāge || gunnāramumuyvāynīnān garalanbhādi bhīṅ
rūki kkanṇāramumumūṇnīnān kalal pāṭi pēṇ-

yapbhumbhunyan bhāide lArimpāvāy || uṇttagayitta
neyippunal pāyntāṭel orēmpāvāy (18) (19) uā-kaiyīr

bhilaiyunattakaṭi tataṅaṃnan qānībhālanjagata:
pillaiy unā kkey aṭaikkalam ēṇrāka pppaṅcoputukkum

naiyviratpa || naṇṇāṅbhīrīmāṅguralaippAṃ guralaippAṃ
ēmmaccaṭṭāl ēṅkaḷ pērumāṇ unakk’ōṅ’ uraippōṅ

naiṇīĀṇAhaṇīnāṇa vālagḷāmAjētakA || aimnāiyumā
keḻ koṅkai niṅnanpar allārtōl cerārka ēṅkaiy unā-

takāḷā diet 3 prapunjaivyēn qeṇṇuŋramdaṇiṇīnān
kkallāṭ eppaniyūṇēyyārka kaṅkūl pakal ēṅkāṇ

1) An interesting representation of Tamil -c- by a sibilant, -c-.
2) The noticeable head-rhyming scheme of Ta. -VmV- has been quite lost!
1) The most corrupted text in this poem. Ta. porri appears eight times in the original, as the first word in each line. Lines 1 and 2 of the original are omitted altogether; see p. . . . .
2) cp. Appar: Tev. VI, poem 5, passim. See p. . . . .
3) Ta. māgān mukanē kārēta . . . . is missing.
4) Ta. . . . ellāv uyirkkum . . . . missing. In both these 'verses' the text seems to be partially a re-working. See p. . . . .
The occurrence of the Digbandhana, the Śiva name-litany and the Vāstupuruṣa text among those that are in Sanskrit, written in Bangkok in the Grantha script, leads one to suspect that there are a large number of such texts, the padhātis of the brahman priests. One has but to recall the large amount of such material collected in Bali by Dr. Hooykaas. And one would still hope that a large amount of new Tamil material will yet come to hand.

25) opp. cit.
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