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A Note on the Transliteration, Presentation and Citation of Primary Texts

In transliterating Sanskrit, I have used the system that is now almost universally adopted in Indological scholarship (that of, e.g., Apte’s dictionary); the same system underlies the presentation of Prakrit, with the addition of the signs for the short vowels ē and ō and the independent short i and u vowel (e.g. uvadisaī), to eliminate potential confusion with the Sanskrit complex vowels.

For Tamil, I depart from the system used in the Madras Tamil Lexicon in favor of the alternative used in, for instance, John Marr’s The Eight Anthologies (Madras: Institute of Asian Studies, 1985) or David Shulman’s The Wisdom of Poets (Delhi: Oxford, 2001). That is, I distinguish the short vowels ē and ō instead of their long counterparts, and I give metrical Tamil texts with divisions corresponding to their word boundaries, not their prosodic units, marking the hyper-short u vowels that are deleted through sandhi by a single inverted comma. This scheme of transliteration is consistent with that used for Sanskrit and other Indic languages, and, although the Tamil of premodern times did not generally graphically distinguish the long and short e/o pairs, when necessary its users did so through the addition of a diacritical mark (the puḷḷi) added to the short vowels. The word division here adopted is also congruent with that used for Sanskrit; as there is no standard yet commonly accepted among Tamilists for the marking of significant boundaries in a line of verse—and since the habit of marking cīr boundaries appears to have only been introduced as a pedagogical aid in Tamil editions of the nineteenth century—it seems better to me to be consistent.

As befits a book on philological scholarship, much of the argument that follows depends on the more or less lengthy unpacking of texts composed in these three languages. In order to avoid trying the patience or the endurance of the non-specialist reader, most of the primary source citations have been reported in the footnotes. I have adopted a somewhat subjective judgement about when to introduce transliterated text into the body of the book and when to consign it to the notes. Generally speaking, when the argument directly addresses itself to features of the language of a primary source—whether these be grammatical, stylistic, phonaesthetic, rhetorical, or otherwise—I have included the original text in the body.

When documenting citations in primary-language sources, I cite the work by title as it appears in the first section of the bibliography; if more than one edition is cited there, it is the first mentioned text that is the edition of reference.
for this study. For verse texts, or for texts with commonly recognized section divisions, I cite them as such; thus Kāvyādāraśa 1.9 refers to the ninth verse of the first chapter (there called a pariccheda) of Thakur and Jha’s edition. Individual quarters of such verses are identified by the serial letters a, b, c, and d, as is Indological practice; ‘Kāvyādāraśa 1.9c’ would then refer to that verse’s third quarter, while ‘1.9cd’ would refer to its second half. For verse texts without chapter divisions, the verses are cited by number following ‘v.’ or ‘vv.’; ‘Pēriyapurāṇam vv. 47–49’ therefore refers to the running verse numbering of Mutaliyar’s edition of that work (in which its individual constituent purāṇams are also independently numbered; I ignore these). The same holds true for works divided by line number; here the reference is preceded by ‘l.’ or ‘ll.’ All other primary sources are cited by the page number of the edition of reference, with a shortened title given for works after their first mention; thus ‘Mañjarī, 98’ refers to a citation from page 98 of Vrajavallabha Dviveda’s edition of the Mahārthamañjarīparimala.