

REALITY OF DEATH: REPRESENTATION OF *cakkaravāḍakkōḥcam* in *maḍimēkalai*

K.N.Ganesh*

ABSTRACT

This paper is an attempt at understanding the representations of death in early Tamil texts. The *kātai* on *cakkaravāḍakkōḥcam* in *maḍimēkalai*, along with the story narrated in the text, is analysed to bring forth the patterns of disposing of the dead and the meanings attached by early Tamils to the burial grounds. It is argued that at least by the period of composition of *maḍimēkalai*, such meanings were mediated by the Sramanic sects, Buddhism and Jainism, who attempted to incorporate and interpret the burial practices of the Tamils with the assistance of their own cosmology.

Keywords: *maḍimēkalai*, Tamil Literature, South India, Megalithic Burials, Archaeology

Introduction

maḍimēkalai is one of the major Buddhist texts that have appeared from tamiḥakam. A number of studies have already appeared on the literary, religious and social features of this text.¹ As is well known, the text was purportedly composed by cāṭṭa ,ār who was a grain merchant (*kūlavāḍika*,) of Madurai,² and tells the story of *maḍimēkalai*, the daughter of māṭavi, who already appears in another epic, *cilappatikāram* as the *parattaiyar* and lover of kōvala , , the hero. The text by cāṭṭa ,ār narrates the career of māṭavi and *maḍimēkalai* as Buddhist nuns, and includes stories of other monks and initiates who come into contact with *maḍimēkalai*. It is generally agreed that the date of composition of *maḍimēkalai* is in the early medieval period (9th-10th centuries CE)[†], when Buddhism was already declining in Tamilnadu.

The present exercise concentrates on one of the stories in *maḍimēkalai*, the episode of *cakkaravāḍakkōḥcam*. The story appears as a parable, demonstrating the inevitability of death. The story has been commented in detail by Japanese scholar Shu Hikusoka, who has sought to demonstrate that the story was an indigenous adaptation of the Buddhist parables in *piḥakas* on the same theme.³ We seek to extend the hypothesis by Hikusoka, linking the parable with the mortuary practices of the early Tamils.

The narrative⁴

The narrative appears as a part of the conversation between cutamati, friend and teacher of *dharma* (Buddhism) to *maḍimēkalai*, and the deity also called *maḍimēkalai*. The duo discusses the love that utayakumāra , has towards *maḍimēkalai*. cutamati says that utayakumāra , hopes to win the love of *maḍimēkalai* with the assistance of goddess campāpati. The deity suggests that utayakumāra , should be initiated into the path of *dharma*, for which he had to be sent to the west, towards *cakkaravāḍakkōḥcam*. cutamati asks the deity why she calls the place as *cakkaravāḍakkōḥcam*, while others call the place as *cuḥukāḥcuḥukōḥcam* (funeral ground). The deity says that the place has been existing from the inception of *kāvēripūmpaḥḥi* , am. It is the place where the people were buried in terms of their worldly deeds. The deity describes the pillars where the deities of the burials were given their offerings, verandahs (*tiḍḍai*) built of stones, pavilions, arches and other edifices, as well as the huts where the guardians of the place reside. She discusses in detail the various types of burials, the types of memorials including trees,

* Department of History, University of Calicut, Kozhikodu, Kerala.

† Editors' Note: This is author's view and it may not be acceptable to some researchers.

the types of demons, apparitions, voices, animals and birds that inhabited the *kōççam* and finally narrates the reason for it being called *cakkaravāḍakkōççam* in terms of a parable.⁵

cārōkalan, a Brāhmaṇa boy reaches the place along with his old mother. While crossing the place he is accosted by an apparition (*pēy*) that terrifies him. He ran to his mother yelling 'I have given my life to the apparition in the funeral pyre' and fell dead. *kōtamai*, his mother wanted to know who had taken the life of her only son, who was to be the support of his old, invalid (blind) parents, whether it is a god or a demon. The woman carried the child to the gates of the walls surrounding the funeral ground and yelled to *campāpati* why the deity who had been residing in waterfronts, foot of old trees, *kōççams* and other places and protecting people has not bothered to save the life of her son. *campāpati* appeared and asked the old woman why she is crying and shouting in a place infested by demons. When *kōtamai* told about the death of her son, *campāpati* replied that the life of her child has not been taken away by gods or demons, he had been the victim of his own ignorance and his past deeds. *kōtamai* pleads with *campāpati* to exchange her own life for the life of her son, so that he will be of assistance to his (blind) father. *campāpati* replied that it was impossible for her to bring a dead person back to life, and that in any case the dead person will be born again, it would be better to allow things to be that way. *kōtamai* again pleads that gods do give boons to the devotees and she was requesting for the life of her son as a boon. If the boon was not given then she would give up her own life. In response to this, *campāpati* then suggests that she could summon various types of deities, the brahmas with and without form, fires, *dēvās* and *asurās* who inhabit the *cakkaravāḍam* and if any of them said that they could revive a dead person, she would be glad to grant her the boon. The gods who assembled at the behest of *campāpati*, however, expressed their inability and finally, *kōtamai* disposed of the body of her dead son and returned. Since the gods mentioned by *campāpati* inhabited the entire world with *mēru* mountain at the centre and surrounded by seven mountains, a similar edifice to ensure the assembly of all gods was caused to be made by the architect *mayan*, and this was called *cakkaravāḍakkōççam* and its earthly site inside the stone walls was called by ordinary people as *cuçukāççukkōççam*.

Explaining the Narrative

This narrative is clearly a re-rendering of the Buddhist canonical narrative regarding a woman who requested Buddha to revive her dead son. Buddha replied that if she was able to bring a small amount of sugar from any house in the village where no one has died, then he would be able to revive her son. The woman naturally failed in her quest and thus Buddha was able to convince her that death is inevitable. In the present narrative goes one step further, and states that death is not only inevitable, and also that no god or spirit can avert the possibility of death. *campāpati* also states that death is caused by ignorance and past deeds and the only alternative for dead person is to be born again and lead another life. Here the allusion is clearly to the Buddhist theory of *pratitya-samdupada*, the wheel of life, where death is only a stage of material existence. The name of the old woman, *kōtamai*, again reminds of *mahāprajāpati gōtami*, the foster-mother of Buddha, who was transformed into a nun after an initial reluctance on the part of Buddha.⁶

The most interesting feature of the present narrative is the identification of the earthly *cuçukāççukkōççam* with the more celestial *cakkaravāḍakkōççam*. According to the Buddhist geography, the universe itself is encircled by a string of hills, *cakkaravāḍam* signified the edges of the universe bound by these hills. The narrative discusses gods as inhabiting *mēru* mountain, seven smaller hills, four large islands, two thousand smaller

islands, of which the replica was made by mayan.⁷ However, the original *cuṣukāṣṣukkōṣṣam* was simply a funeral ground surrounded by walls; the identification indicated that the celestial beings were also believed to have occupied the same space as that of earthly beings. Thus the funeral ground consisting of numerous burials, surrounded by walls and believed to have been inhabited by numerous spirits and demons was being transmuted to become the universe surrounded by mountains and inhabited by celestial beings with or without form.

This identification also becomes clear through the invocations in the narrative. *cārōkalan*, the boy who dies, only says that he has given his life to the demon from the burning ground.⁸ *campāpati* is addressed by *kōtamai* only as the protector of the places on earth where gods or demons were believed to have resided. *campāpati* tries to convince her by using the standard Buddhist logical argument. Only when *kōtamai* threatens to give up her life if her son's life is not given as a boon,⁹ received only from celestial entities that *cakkaravāḍakkōṣṣam* is invoked. *cakkaravāḍakkōṣṣam* being the replica of the universe itself only confirms the inevitability of the birth and death cycle, which is demonstrated by the existence of the *cuṣukāṣṣukkōṣṣam*. In other words, *cuṣukāṣṣukkōṣṣam* also becomes the earthly form of the *cakkaravāḍakkōṣṣam* constructed by mayan.

The link between the two forms is provided by *campāpati*. There is reference to a *campāpati* shrine in the later part of *maḍimēkalai* narrating the circumstances leading to the death of *utayakumāra*.¹⁰ Whether there was a real temple addressed to a goddess of the same name is far from certain. Interestingly, in the present narrative, *campāpati* is addressed not inside any temple, but at the gates of the *cuṣukāṣṣukkōṣṣam* itself,¹¹ meaning that *campāpati* is the spirit of the *kōṣṣam* rather than any separate goddess. *campāpati* is also called *mutumūtāṣṣi*,¹² showing the ancestral character of the deity. *campāpati* was probably a derivative of the Pāli term *chambheti*, or dread,¹³ and if so, it corresponds to the protective spirit of the burial ground. This again shows that *cakkaravāḍakkōṣṣam* is the celestial expression of the burial ground itself.

Mortuary ground and forms

Description of the *cuṣukāṣṣukkōṣṣam* that precedes the parable of the Brāhmaḍa boy provides further insights into the nature of the funerary space. According to the description, *utayakumāra* has to proceed to the funerary space (*Āmappēruḍkāṣṣu*), where renouncers of virtue¹⁴ reside. There he will see large trees from the heads of persons who lost their lives are hanging.¹⁵ Large stone platform (*pāṣṣikai*) over which sacrifices were made could also be seen.¹⁶ There is reference to the *kōṣṣam* (shrine of forest goddess)¹⁷ and also reference to memorials of women who performed *sati*.¹⁸ Mortuaries included those belonging to four *varḍās*. The *kōṣṣam* included spaces of the dead of the respected people including several 'hills', big and small.¹⁹ There were also spaces for offering sacrifices to gods. There is also reference to stone slabs (*tiḍḍai*) placed on the top of erected stones (*ni°aikka°°e°i*), probably indicating cists. There are also references to the arrangement of stones in a curved space (*mi°aikkaḍaccanti*) that may indicate a stone circle.²⁰ There is reference to earthen pots (*maḍṣai*) in which food is kept and chambers (*u°aiyuḍkuṣṣikai*) where the guardians eat the food offered and lie down.²¹ The internment in burial ground is equated to a divine abode. There is also mention pavilion on the grave (*Āmappantar*).²²

It is in this context that the famous reference in *maḍimēkalai* to five types of burial, *iṣuvōr* (exposure), *cuṣuvōr* (cremation), *toṣukuṣippaṣuppōr* (pit burial), *tāṣvayi*, *aṣaiippōr* (chamber burial), and *tāṣiyil kavippōr* (urn burial) appears.²³ The text goes on to refer to people that come to the burial ground day and night, besides living

things that announce the existence of a graveyard. These include a number of voices, including the sounds of birds, such as owl and eagle, howling of wolves and various kinds of chanting and lamenting (*toḤuviḍi* and *aḤuviḍi*).²⁴ A number of graveyard trees are mentioned, including *tā, °i, oḤuvai, uḤiḍci, kā, °ai, cūrai* and *kaḍḍi*.²⁵ The *kōḤḤam* also contains a number of *ma, °ams* (indicating foot of trees, as commented by Nacci, ārkki, iyar), including *vākaima, °am* (infested with spirits), *veḍḍi, ma, °am* (where various predatory birds eat from the dead bodies), *va, , ima, °am* (where graveyard scavengers cook their food), *irattima, °am* (where bodies and heads are assembled into a heap), *veḍḍiḤaima, °am* (where blood flowing from the dead bodies are collected in a vessel and feasted upon).²⁶ Various vessels and articles like *kuḤici* (for liquids), *maḍḤai* (for solids such as grain and meat), *veḍḍiḍpāḤai* (paste), *uḍḍāḤḤaḍuvai* (vessel for keeping ornaments or bundle of cloth), garlands thrown as a bundle and broken bowls paddy, grain, and rice offered as *pali* are mentioned as lying around in the graveyard.²⁷

The objective of providing such a gory description of the graveyard is also made clear. The first purpose is to present the lord of death (*koḤuntoḤilāḌan* also a great leveller, transforming the brahmanas and low-born to bundles of blood and meat to be devoured by hungry birds and animals and even by human beings (*cuḤalainō, pikaḍ*).²⁸ The second is to demonstrate the temporary character of the material body and the inevitability of death, which is also the objective of the entire narrative. The final objective is obviously to provide an effective basis the *cārōkalan* narrative that follows this description, which demonstrates that no one, including Brahmanas can escape this, and the concept of *cakkaravāḍakkōḤḤam* extends the argument to all forms of beings including the celestial beings. The Buddhist cosmology includes the abodes of gods, spirits and all beings tangible and intangible within the existing universe, subject the same laws as those governing human beings. Thus the graveyard explained as *cakkaravāḍakkōḤḤam* becomes the demonstration of the reality of death, and also points of contact with celestial beings, which are simply another phase of existence within the same world.

Indications of the graveyard in literary texts

Scholars like K.R.Srinivasan and R.Champakalakshmi have already analysed the evidence for megalithic burials in early Tamil texts,²⁹ which need not be repeated here. Recently Y.Subbarayalu has sought to connect the references to *patukkai* in *pālai* songs to megalithic burials.³⁰ There have also been attempts by archaeologists to relate the evidence of grave goods from archaeological sites to early historic literary references.³¹ The broad findings of these scholars can be summarised as follows:

- a) References in *maḍimēkalai* and other references to burials and graveyards, particularly from *puḍa, ānūḍu*, demonstrate the various burial types discovered by archaeologists, including urn burials, cists and various types of rock cut chamber tombs
- b) Sophistication of the burial type increases with the emergence of social differentiation and chiefdoms, and concentration of megalithic sites have been found in areas identified with *vēḍir* chiefs
- c) Grave goods, including iron tools, pottery and precious stones also are represented in the literary texts, either as ingredients of burials or as goods in circulation during early historic period
- d) Recent researches also indicate that construction of sophisticated graves such as rock cut chambers and urn burials require skilled craftsmanship and often

collective activity, which show the emergence of some form of organisation of labour.

Although a specific funerary space as *cuçukāççukkōççam* is not mentioned in the early Tamil texts, the term *peruðkāçcu* that indicated burial space occurs frequently in the texts. Thus a *pu^oaðkāçcu* is mentioned along with the U^oaiyūr (U^oantai) held by titta.³² In another place a *peruðkāçcu* with òmai tree had to be crossed by wayfarers.³³ *peruðkāçcu* is found with a *tāñi* (urn) also.³⁴ *peruðkāçcu* is also mentioned along with funeral fire.³⁵ In yet another place, *peruðkāçcu* is mentioned clearly as funerary place.³⁶ Yet another forest, called the old forest (*mutukāçcu*) is called *cuçukāçcu* that emitted smoke.³⁷ Perhaps the most interesting reference that comes closest to the present narrative appears in a song by *māmūla, ār* that describes the vast expanse of land that has been burnt down (*erikavarpu uðçu*) and blackened (*karipu^oap perunilam*)[†], where *utiyaðcēralāta*, conducted his grand feast (*peruðcō^ou*), which is now infested with spirits (*kūðī*). The place consisted of small and big 'hills'.³⁸ *cuçukāççukkōççam* of *maðimēkalai* presents a similar landscape. *māmūla, ār* only narrates a legend of the feast of *utiyaðcēral* to describe what in his time had become a *cuçukāçcu*.

Early Tamil songs indicate burials. As mentioned earlier, *pālai* songs refer to *patukkai*. It is mentioned that *patukkai* are setup after the destruction of people. It is possible that *patukkai* was the form used disposing the dead after warfare along with exposure.³⁹ *tāñi* was referred to several times.⁴⁰ In one interesting song cremation is discussed and this relates to *atiyamā*.⁴¹ In the next poem the memorial stone of *atiyamā*, *neçumā*, *aðci* decked with peacock plume, where a vessel of toddy and plume were offered is mentioned.⁴² *pati^ouppattu* mentions *tāñi* burials being used by chiefs.⁴³

Reference to memorial stones is more frequent in Tamil songs. There are a number of references to *naçukal*. *naçukal* is mentioned as being on the wayside and trampled by elephants.⁴⁴ However, in several places *naçukals* are mentioned as being painted and peacock plume (*pāli*) attached and engraved (*eñuttu*).⁴⁵ There are references to offering made before *naçukal* and also there is mention of a woman standing with folded hands before a *naçukal*.⁴⁶ Obviously *naçukals* were acquiring the status of the object of worship. There are also references to *mutukal*, *kalmutir* (old stones)⁴⁷ and *peruðkal* that were mentioned in the places of worship or divine spaces. In one interesting reference, *kōpperuðcōḇa*, , who died in a *sallēkhana* (*vaçakkirittal*) form of self-sacrifice, is mentioned as being installed in a stone as a spirit.⁴⁸

References to deities and spirits appear in several songs. *aðaðku* is referred to in various contexts. *aðaðku* is associated with high fortifications (*neçuðkōçcu*), soldier battalions (*tāðai*), protective walls, protection of *pu, am* lands and even in roasted meat, showing that the concept is associated with protection, or alternatively, destruction.⁴⁹ The other concept of the deity *kaçavuð* appears in a wide variety of contexts. *kaçavuð* appears as a standard deity receiving offerings.⁵⁰ *kaçavuð* in a fierce form appears along with *aðaðku* (*kalikeñu kaçavuð*).⁵¹ The same form (*kaçavuð pēðī*) appears as receiving sacrificial offerings.⁵² *kaçavuð* is also mentioned as associated with pipal tree.⁵³ *kaçavuð* is also said to be residing in the foot of the Palmyra tree.⁵⁴ *kaçavuð* also appears the deity being offered sacrifice in the *potiyil*.⁵⁵ Apart from these we find some references to *pēy* and *kuliyar* (forms of demons) also.⁵⁶

[†] Editors' note: This passage can be interpreted as the dark landscape created by the highly dry and sunny weather.

Sites of the deities are also important. The most important deity identified through the site is muruku. muruku (otherwise called muruka.) is a spirit which possesses *vēla*, and *pulaitti*, who appear (perform) in *ma, °ams* where sacrifices and offerings to the deity are conducted.⁵⁷ *pati °uppattu* refers to *va, i ma, °am*, which also appears in the *maḍimēkalai* description.⁵⁸ Another term sometimes identified with *ma, °am* is *potiyil*. *potiyil* has been identified by Hikusoka as a Buddhist site⁵⁹. *potiyil* appears in several songs as the site of the deity either in a flourishing or dilapidated condition.⁶⁰ Foot (*pararai*) of the trees like *āl*, *vēḍkai* and *ōmai* were also sites of the deities or spirits.⁶¹ Trees also appear to lay a protective, as divine spaces defending (*kaḥi*) settlements.⁶² There are references to figurines (*pāvai*) freestanding like *kollippāvai*,⁶³ or engraved into any other object (*cuvarpāvai* or figurine on the wall).⁶⁴ There is also reference to a metallic figurine (*pon cey pāvai*)⁶⁵ and terracotta figurine (*vi, ai māḍpāvai*).⁶⁶

All these allusions in the literary texts are not always related to a graveyard. However, the narrative of *cakkaravāḍakkōḥḥam* refers to most of these features in relation with the *kōḥḥam*. It refers to *kōḥḥam* as having the space for making sacrificial offerings to *kaḥavuḍ*. It also indicates megaliths and probably includes stone circles and chambers, including possible laterite caves, apart from various types of burials.⁶⁷ It also refers to ashes that remained after cremation, on which a demoness is dancing,⁶⁸ a scene that is reminiscent of *ma, °am* where *vi °aliyar* perform. While seeking the cause of her son's death, *kōtamai* asks whether it was done by *aḍaḍku* or *pēy*. The text also refers to large trees from which heads were hanging and the entire graveyard as protected space (*aruḍkaḥi nakar*).⁶⁹ Thus almost all the images related to divine spaces are repeated in the description of *cakkaravāḍakkōḥḥam*, as their mirror images.

What is *cakkaravāḍakkōḥḥam* ?

Is *cakkaravāḍakkōḥḥam* a myth narrated to bring out Buddhist conception of the reality of death and the plight of human beings trapped in the wheel of life and death? Obviously it is. At the same time, it draws upon the already existing funerary practices that were prevalent in *tamiḥakam* at the time of its composition and before. The description of funerary practices cover all forms of burial by all sections of population and thus it represents the death practices of the entire population familiar to the poet. The description also includes different kinds of offerings to spirit from rice to blood and meat, the inhabitants of the *kōḥḥam* includes all forms of spirits, and once extended to the *cakkaravāḍakkōḥḥam* it covers the entire Buddhist cosmos. *cakkaravāḍam* is compared to an urn (*tāḥi*) in one place, and the hills surrounding the *kōḥḥam* are compared to the walls of the graveyard. All the living things, gods and spirits are moving around within the *tāḥi*.⁷⁰ The description of the *kōḥḥam* as protected space, also would present the space the dead bodies are interred as the mirror image of the cosmos itself. All forms of living things, spirits and gods would exist in the cosmos and so would they be within the graveyard in dead or immaterial (*arūpa*) state. Hence there was every reason where such spirits of the dead persons should be worshipped and offerings be made within the burial site itself, as indicated in the description of the *cuḥukāḥḥukkōḥḥam*. Thus grave goods including pottery, ornaments, weapons, implements and even food grains were interred in such spaces. It is also not surprising that stones erected over the graves, or even the trees growing in the area would be considered as the abodes of such spirits, as seen in the worship of *naḥukals* and trees in the early Tamil texts.

Thus, by the time of the composition of *maḍimēkalai*, the megalithic burial sites had come to acquire the status of the divine spaces, where offerings were made to the ancestors and spirit deities, where *aḍaḍku* and *pēy* were supposed be dwelling. Probably they existed even before Buddhism made its appearance in *tamiḥakam*. At the same time

the Buddhist text makes a bold attempt to teach the principles of *dharma* demonstrating the reality and inevitability of death for all mortal beings by making use of the same burial sites. This would mean that graveyards would acquire a social and cultural significance far more than their being simple graveyards or cremation grounds, they become imaginary cultural spaces where dead persons are allowed to lead their afterlives, before they inevitably return to their next life. *maḍimēkalai* itself demonstrates the belief in such afterlife, when mentions the previous births of utayakumāra , and maḍimēkalai, and similar stories are found in other epics also. Such a belief has a definite space in the Buddhist cosmos, and it is not surprising that grave yards acquired credibility and more elaborate such as rock cut chambers, urn burials, and cist burials were constructed, memorial stones erected, and circles of large stones, resembling *cakkaravālam* began to be erected around burial sites in the Iron Age and Early Historic period.

It should be noted that Buddhism had already started using funerary sites such as the *stūpas* as centres of their congregations from the Mauryan times. We find *stūpas* up to Deccan, but they are missing from tamīḥakam although relics of *vihārās*, such as the one at kāḍci have been discovered. Does it mean that megalithic burials so popular in tamīḥakam were utilised by the Buddhists, and Sramanas in general to propagate their cosmological vision? The text of *maḍimēkalai* points to such a possibility. Probably the transformation of the megaliths into elaborate burials began from the prehistoric and continued during the early historic period. Early Tamil texts refer to at least two burials of chiefs who were interred in such graves after their death, *kōpperuḍcōḥa* , and *atiyamā* , *neḥumā* , *aḍci*.⁷¹ Both these chiefs lived only during or after the coming of Buddhism and Jainism, which also was the period when elaborate burial structures were built. *cakkaravāḍakkōḥam*, in all probability symbolises the Buddhist conception of the reality of life and death as embodied by the emerging burial sites.

Endnotes

- ¹ Mayilai S. Venkatasami.1976. *Pauttamum Tamilum*. Chennai; Kandasamy, S.N. 1978. *Buddhism as expounded in Manimekalai*. Annamalainagar: Annamalai University; S. Krishnaswami Iyengar, S. 1928. *Manimekalai in its Historical Setting*. London:Luzac &Co., London.
- ² The name appears in the patikam of *maḍimēkalai*.
- ³ Shu Hikosaka. 1989. *Buddhism in Tamilnadu: A new Perspective*, Chennai:Institute of Asian Studies.
- ⁴ We follow the text of *maḍimēkalai* with the commentary of Swaminatha Iyer, .U.V. 1998. Chennai:U.V. Swaminatha Iyer Nool Nilayam.
- ⁵ The story has also been narrated in Hikosaka, *Op. cit.*:114-115
- ⁶ E.Conze (ed.). 1954. *Buddhist Texts through the ages*. Oxford: Bruno Cassirer:23-26.
- ⁷ *cakkaravāḍakkōḥam uraitta kātai* (hereafter *kātai*), *maḍimēkalai* VI, Lines(LL):191-202
- ⁸ *venmmutu pēykke* , *uyir koḥuttē* , ; *kātai*, Line(L):130
- ⁹ *māperun teyva nāyaruḍāviḥi* , *yāḍō kāvē* , *e* , , *uyi rāḍke* , *a*; *kātai* LL:170-1
- ¹⁰ *campāpati* shrine appears in 'utayakumāra , ampalam pukka kātai'. In the text the deity is called 'kumari' that has been interpreted as *campāpati*. *maḍimēkalai* herself takes the form of *kumari* in the text.
- ¹¹ *āmap pu°aḍkaḥeyi° pu°avāyilil kōtamai ye* , *pāḍ koḥuntuyar cā°°a*, *kātai*, LL:140-1

- ¹² k̄atai, L:157
- ¹³ The entry is in T.W. Rhys Davids and William Stede (ed.). 1975. *Pāli-English Dictionary*, Indian Edition, Delhi:275.
- ¹⁴ a°attōr va , am; k̄atai, L:19
- ¹⁵ talai tūḍku neḥumaram; k̄atai L:51
- ¹⁶ pĀtikai yōḍkiya perumpali mu , °il; k̄atai L:52
- ¹⁷ k̄aḥamar celvi kaḥiperum kōḥḥam; k̄atai L:53
- ¹⁸ oruḍkuḥa , māynta peḍtirk kāyin; k̄atai L:55
- ¹⁹ nāl vē°u varuḍap pālvē°u k̄aḥḥi
i°antōr maruḍki° ci°antōr ceyta
ku°iyavu neḥiyavum ku , °u kaḍḥa , , a; k̄atai LL:56-58
- ²⁰ k̄atai L:61
- ²¹ k̄atai L:62-63
- ²² k̄atai L:65
- ²³ k̄atai LL:66-7. This was quoted by Srinivasan, K.R. 1946. Megalithic Burials and Urn fields in South India in the Light of Tamil Literature and Tradition. *Ancient India*, 2:9-16. It has been used a major literary corroboration for megalithic burials ever since.
- ²⁴ k̄atai LL:70-78
- ²⁵ k̄atai LL:80-81
- ²⁶ k̄atai LL:82-92
- ²⁷ k̄atai LL: 90-5
- ²⁸ k̄atai LL: 97-102, cuḥalai nō , pikaḍ L:86
- ²⁹ Srinivasan, K.R. *Op. cit.*; Champakalakshmi, R. 1975. Archaeology and Tamil Literary Tradition. *Purātatoa* VIII:110-22
- ³⁰ Subbarayulu, Y., 2005. Literature and Social History (with reference to Palai Tinai). Paper presented in the ICHR seminar on Literature and History, Mangalore University, Mangalore.
- ³¹ Selvakumar, V. 2005. Cognitive aspects of the iron Age, Some aspects of the early historic ('megalithic') Cultures of South India. Paper presented in the National seminar on Indian megaliths-Archaeological and Ethnographic Sources, Organised by Indira Gandhi Rashtra manava Sangrahalaya, 28-30 November 2005; Rajan, K. 2007. Situating the Beginning of Early Historic Times in Tamilnadu: Some issues and reflections. *Social Scientist*, 36:1-2
- ³² akanā , ū°u, 122
- ³³ akanā , ū°u, 191
- ³⁴ pu°ana , u°u, 364
- ³⁵ akanā , ū°u, 39
- ³⁶ pu°ana , u°u, 246
- ³⁷ pu°ana , u°u, 356

-
- ³⁸ *akanā , ū ° u*, 233
- ³⁹ *akanā , ū ° u*, 215 (11-12), *āḍ aḥittu uyartta aḥcuvāru patukkai, kūr nutic ceṇvāy eruvaic cēval*
- ⁴⁰ *pu ° anā , u ° u*, 228, 238, 256,364; *na ° ° iḍai*, 271 ; *pati ° ° uppattu* 44
- ⁴¹ *pu ° anā , u ° u*, 231
- ⁴² *pu ° anā , u ° u*, 232
- ⁴³ *pati ° ° uppattu*, V, LL: 17-23
- ⁴⁴ *akanā , ū ° u*, 365
- ⁴⁵ *akanā , ū ° u*, 53, 131, 297
- ⁴⁶ *akanā , ū ° u*, 289
- ⁴⁷ *akanā , ū ° u*, 122
- ⁴⁸ *pu ° anā , u ° u*, 221
- ⁴⁹ *akanā , ū ° u*, 22, 99, 237
- ⁵⁰ *akanā , ū ° u*, 90, 167
- ⁵¹ *pu ° anā , u ° u*, 51
- ⁵² *akanā , ū ° u*, 36; *akanā , ū ° u*, 251
- ⁵³ *na ° ° iḍai*, 343
- ⁵⁴ *na ° ° iḍai*, 303
- ⁵⁵ *akanā , ū ° u*, 13
- ⁵⁶ *akanā , ū ° u*, 297, 377; *pu ° anā , u ° u*, 136
- ⁵⁷ *akanā , ū ° u*, 59, 67, 232
- ⁵⁸ *pati ° ° uppattu* V:44, *va , , i ma , ° attu viḍaḍkiya kāḥē*
- ⁵⁹ Shu Hikosoka. 1988. Potiyil Mountain in Tamilnadu and the Beginning of the Avalokiteswara Cult. In G.John Samuel (ed.), 1988. *Buddhism in Tamilnadu, Collected papers*. Chennai:Institute of Asian Studies.
- ⁶⁰ *akanā , ū ° u*, 25, 373, 377
- ⁶¹ *akanā , ū ° u*, 5,113, *akanā , ū ° u*, 309
- ⁶² *pu ° anā , u ° u*, 23:5-6, ...*ūr to ° um, kaḥimaram tuḍaḍkiya kāvum*; *pu ° anā , u ° u*, 181
- ⁶³ *na ° ° iḍai*, 301
- ⁶⁴ *na ° ° iḍai*, 252
- ⁶⁵ *akanā , ū ° u*, 127
- ⁶⁶ *na ° ° iḍai*, 185
- ⁶⁷ *kātai* L:59
- ⁶⁸ *kātai* LL:125-6
- ⁶⁹ *kātai* Line, 105
- ⁷⁰ *kātai* Line, 173, *āḥit tāḥi yakavarait tirivōr*.
- ⁷¹ *pu ° anā , u ° u*, 213, 214, 215, 216 (kōpperuḍcōḥa .); *pu ° anā , u ° u*, 231, 232 (atiyamā , neḥumā , aḍci)