

**A
CRITICAL
STUDY
OF**

Naccinārkkiniyar

K.ARUMUGHAM



UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

A CRITICAL STUDY OF NACCINĀRKKINIYAR

By
Dr. K. ARUMUGHAM

Editor

Dr. C. BALASUBRAMANIAN
Professor & Head Dept. of Tamil Language
University of Madras

Assistance

Dr. E. SUNDARAMOORTHY

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

1981

Madras University Tamil Department Series No. 46

A CRITICAL STUDY OF NACCINĀRKKINĪYAR

Thesis submitted for the Ph. D. Degree

University of Madras

January, 1965

**A CRITICAL STUDY
OF
NACCINĀRKKINIYAR**

By
Dr. K. ARUMUGHAM
Dept. of Tamil, University of Delhi



UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

1981

© University of Madras 1981

Price Rs. 16/-

PRINTED IN INDIA
AT AVVAI ACHUKKODAM, 17, P. V. KOIL STREET, MADRAS-600013.

CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER-1 Introduction	1-23
1.1 <i>Naccinārkkiniyar as a commentator</i> - Earlier works and their commentaries - Iḷampūraṇar and his successors- A critical study of Naccinārkkiniyar.	
1.2 <i>The history of Naccinārkkiniyar</i> - Naccinārkkiniyar's religion etc. - The religious tolerance of Naccinārkkiniyar - The period of Naccinārkkiniyar.	
1.3 <i>The works of Naccinārkkiniyar</i> - Has he written a commentary on Tirukkōvaiyār - His earliest commentary that on Tolkāppiyam - The commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi - The commentaries on Pattuppāṭṭu and Kalittokai - The commentaries on Pattuppāṭṭu and Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi - The commentaries on Kalittokai and Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.	
1.4 <i>Naccinārkkiniyar's scholarship in Sanskrit</i> - Sanskrit derivations - Sanskrit explanations - Forced interpretations- Sanskrit traditions.	
1.5 <i>Naccinārkkiniyar's knowledge in other fields</i> - Political knowledge - Knowledge of society - Religious knowledge - Knowledge of natural and physical sciences.	
1.6 <i>The works on Naccinārkkiniyar</i> - Dr. U.V.S. Iyer's references - S. S. W. P. Society's 'Lecture compilations' - Other research studies - Criticism.	
1.7 <i>The main approach and contribution of the Thesis</i> - Inductive criticism followed - Partly judicial criticism - Some of the important original contributions of the thesis.	

PART I

NACCINĀRKKINIYAR AS A LITERARY CRITIC

CHAPTER-2 Appreciation of poetry	24-52
2.1 <i>The emphasis on the highest ideals</i> - Chastity lights up the world - Contradiction to Dharma - Chastity for men.	

- 2.2 *Resolving contradictions* - Implied contradiction - Explicit contradiction - oxymoron - Idiomatic contradiction - Contradicting nature.
- 2.3 *The function of ambiguous verbs* - Vēynalam ilanta tōḷ - Puṇ tavaḷ vēḷ kaṇ pāvai - Mai paṭu perum tōḷ maḷavar - Uṇṇunar-t-taṭutta nuvaṇai - Pūṇ aṇi mārpa - Mulai vaitta taṭam.
- 2.4 *The importance of poetic names* - Vaḷḷal - Puravalaṅ - Cilaivalāy - Cilaivittakaṅē - Makkaḷ and Mākkaḷ - Maṭam.
- 2.5 *The significance of attributes* - Same attribute with different meanings - Attribute with special significance - Words with and without attributes-Contradictory attributes - Ill placed attributes - Attributes with different meanings.
- 2.6 *Demonstratives and interrogatives* - The demonstrative 'a' - The demonstratives 'aṅṅa', 'iṅṅa', - The demonstrative 'īṅku' - The interrogative 'eṅ' - Demonstrative with interrogative.
- 2.7 *Singular plural mixture* - Singular for plural - Plural for singular.
- 2.8 *The scope of compound words* - Kaṭuntiraḷ nōykaḷum - Kaṭṭil - Kāvalaṅ - Muṇivarum - Niṅaintirukkum - Uyttiṭṭaṅar - Maṅantiruntār.
- 2.9 *The splitting of sentences* - Inyāḷ itu uyttukkoṭumō - Cunantai nī avvai allai.
- 2.10 *Humour* - Rotating the hot mutton between the cheeks - New man is really the old man - Kingdom of rags - The old buffalo - Satire : The swan and the conch - Smiling - Tāṅam - Tirunakar-c-celva.

CHAPTER-3 Similes and Metaphors

...

53-78

- 3.1 *Simile; its origin, base etc.* - The origin of simile - Viravivarutal (multiple simile) - Uvamai nilaikkaḷaṅ (The basis of simile) - Comparison of various things to one thing specific - Comparison of several actions to a specific action.
- 3.2 *Some kinds of simile* - Similes of impossible - Simile of proverbs - Cilēṭai-(Pun)-uvamai.
- 3.3 *Iraṭṭai uvamai (Two fold similes)* - The thing and comparison with attributes - The epithets of the upamāṅgam applied to the upamēyam also - The attribute of the

upamēyam applied to the upamāṇam - The attribute of the upamāṇam taken to upamēyam and the attribute of the upamēyam taken to upamāṇam in one and the same simile.

- 3.4 *Inferred similes* - Upamēyam inferred from upamāṇam - Upamāṇam inferred from upamēyam - Upamāṇam and upamēyam both inferred from the context.
- 3.5 *Similes of suggestion* - More ideas suggested by a simile - Subtle points of similarity - A striking point of similarity.
- 3.6 *Making the dead similes alive* - Reference to what follows - Reference to what precedes.
- 3.7 *Different suggestions for the same simile according to the context* - The sun - Similes with alternate suggestions - Refusing to read a simile.
- 3.8 *An assessment of some interpretations* - Interpretation of similes on the basis of culture - Prosaic interpretation of simile.
- 3.9 *Metaphor : its origin, base etc.* - The distinction between metaphor and simile - The usage of metaphor and the duty of the commentator - Metaphor (Nouns) - Ekatēsa uruvakam (Partial metaphor) - Metaphor - Verbs - Clarification of points of similarity - Metaphor on the basis of the ideal.

CHAPTER-4 Synonymy and Polysemy

... 79-102

- 4.1 *Synonyms* - Synonyms not repetitions - Synonyms not substitutes - Methods of interpreting synonyms.
- 4.2 *Different but allied meanings* - Paṇḍu-p-peyar (nouns of quality) - The words denoting 'beauty' - The words denoting 'childhood' - Two kinds of 'words' - The words denoting 'anger' - The words denoting 'enmity' - The words denoting 'misery' - The words denoting 'strong' - The words denoting 'victory' - The words denoting 'sound' - The words denoting 'attachment' - The words denoting 'poverty'.

Nouns other than paṇḍu - Malar and Mālai - Nouns of places - Nouns - mountain - Other nouns.

Verbs with allied meanings - Some other methods for differentiating the words with allied meanings - One as the attribute of the other - Differentiation of repeated nouns - Differentiation of repeated verbs.

- 4.3 *Different meanings but not allied - Nouns of quality* - Various nouns differentiated - Making one of the Paṅḡpu a verb - Making one of the Paṅḡpu, the thing possessing the Paṅḡpu.
Nouns other than Paṅḡpu - Interpreting different meanings - Making one of the two nouns, a quality - Making one of the two nouns, an attribute - Making one of the nouns, a verb.
Verbs - Interpretation of different meanings - Making one of the two verbs an uri-c-col - Other reasons.
- 4.4 *Avoidance of repetition of meanings by taking the sentence as elliptical* - The subject of one of the two verbs - The Subjects of both the verbs - The object of the one of the two verbs - The objects of both the verbs - The special noun for a general word - The things referred to by the demonstratives derived - Cause and effect—derived.
- 4.5 *Dislodgement of synonymous words or 'Poetic inversion'* - Nouns of quality - The nouns other than paṅḡpu - The verbs - Noun and verb - Iṭai-c-col.
- 4.6 *Non differentiation of apparent synonyms* - Repetition denoting intensity - Repetition denoting continuity - Repetition showing emotion - Superlative degree - Emphasis with a purpose - Is differentiation obvious? - Difference not pointed out.
- 4.7 *Polysemy* - Ambiguity avoided - Pointing out the various meanings - Various meanings not mentioned.

PART—II

NACCINĀRKKINIYAR AS A CRITICAL GRAMMARIAN

CHAPTER-5 Traditional methods of Criticism ... 103-128

- 5.1 *Objections and clarifications* - Conflict with grammar - Conflict with literary usage - The statement seemingly self-contradictory - Circumlocutory or complex statement - The statement being seemingly not comprehensive - The statement being seemingly superfluous.
- 5.2 *Doubts and clarifications* - Ambiguities cleared by the author himself - Vēṙṙumai-t-tokai or ummai-t-tokai? - Vēṙṙumai-t-tokai or uvamai-t-tokai? - Address to the guardsman or to the patron? - Whether ōmpaṭai can come under pāṭāṅ? - Āṅpāṙkāñci or Peṅpāṙkāñci? - Doubts that could not be cleared.

- 5.3 *Refutation of misinterpretations* - Kūrīyatu kūṛal (Tautology) - Mārukoḷakkūrāḷ (contradictory statements) - Mayaṅka-k-kūrāḷ (obscurity in literary composition) - In contradiction to the authors idea-contradiction to human nature.
- 5.4 *A discussion of differences* - Difference of letters (Homophones) - Technical terms defined and differentiated - Ākupeyar and aṅmoli-t-tokai - Peyar and uri - Uraiyacai and acainilai - Differentiation of allomorphs - Homonyms of ambiguity resolved by grammatical category - The word 'yār' - The words 'uṅṅu' and 'iṅṅu' - Paṅai and uṅaimai - Poruḷ and poruṅmai - Homonyms of ambiguity resolved by sandhi rules - Uḷakkiṅ kuṅai and uḷakkiṅkuṅai - Irāa-k-kākkai and irā-k-kākkai - Āyiṅai - Root morphemes differentiated-Suffix morphemes differentiated.
- 5.5 *Superfluity or other sources for more ideas* - The importance of superfluity - Superfluity- a fiction - The terms like "Niṅaiyuṅkālai" ('as considered') - The terms like "Iṅaiṅaiya" ('there are places') - The terms like "Teḷlitu" ('clear') - The phrases like "Iṅṅaiṅai" ('such like) ~ Superfluity from previous sūtram - Repetition as superfluity - Synonyms as superfluity.

CHAPTER-6 Conventional Devices of Interpretation ... 129-151

- 6.1 *Paṅmai kūṛal (Implication of the Plural Form)* -Agreement with his predecessors - Further implications suggested - Different implications suggested - Naccinārkkīṅiyar's original implications - Interpretation in terms of literary usage - Plural denoting the fore fathers - Unwarranted interpretation.
- 6.2 *Kūrīyatu kūṛal (Repetition)* - No repetition - Repetition for emphasis - Repetition for clarification - Repetition with a purpose - Repetition differing from others - Repetition in a single line.
- 6.3 *Etirmaṅuttu-k-kūrāḷ (artāpātti)*-Independent observations-Differs from Iṅampūraṅar - Differing from Cēṅāvaraiyar - Natural and artificial regions and seasons - Interpretation on literary basis.
- 6.4 *Uyttukoṅṅuṅartal (Interpretation by extension or inference)* - Second idea derived - Differing from Cēṅāvaraiyar - Explicit meaning derived.

- 6.5 *Iraṭṭura moḷittal* (Statement which is capable of two different meanings) - The method referred to - The method not referred to.
- 6.6 *Onṛeṇa muḷittal* (Mentioning of similarities) - New ideas added.
- 6.7 *Tanṇiṇa muḷittal* (Including others of the same category) - Related points covered - Differing from Iḷampūraṇar.
- 6.8 *Vēṇtātu kūṛal* (Superfluous statements) - Agreement with the predecessors - Original suggestions.
- 6.9 *Varaiyātu kūṛal* (unrestricted statements) - Agreement with the predecessors - Original additions.
- 6.10 *Potuppaṭa-k-kūṛal* (Generalisation) - Uṛalum Kiḷavi (refutation or retort) - Tiṇaimayakkūṛtal (mingling of tiṇais).
- 6.11 *Moḷiyātatu muḷittal* (Mentioning what is not mentioned) - Importance of both the views.
- 6.12 *Oppakkūṛal* (Mentioning of parallels) - Alar kūṛtal between kaḷavu and kaṇṇu.

CHAPTER-7 A Critical review of Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar's views

... 152-184

- 7.1 *A study of ākupeyar* - Ākupeyar with an attribute - Interpretation of aṭai aṭutta ākupeyar - Ākupeyar occurring as an attribute - Ākupeyar-from the point of view of synonymy - Ākupeyar-from the point of view of polysemy - Ākupeyar-is it traditional? - Ākupeyar-a forced interpretation - Iyaṛpeyar or ākupeyar - Participial nouns or ākupeyar - Are numerals ākupeyar? - Is there any basis for ākupeyar?
- 7.2 *A note on tense* - Ceyteṇ eccam and its tense - ceyteṇ eccam denoting present-Ceyteṇ eccam denoting future-Tense of 'Ceya' type of participles - Literary evidence for 'ceya' type in present - Literary evidence for 'ceya' type in future - A subtle point in the tense of 'ceya' type - Conclusions.
- 7.3 *A study of 'um'* - Eccam ummai ('um' denoting incompleteness) - Different interpretations for 'um' - 'Um' denoting muṛṇu and eccam (completion and incompleteness) - 'Um' denoting eccam and ilivucirappu (incompleteness and meanness) - 'Um' taken to other place or places - Displacement of 'um' - 'Um' denoting etirmaṇai (negation) - Frequency and non frequency - Balance.

- 7.4 *The significance of 'māṭṭēru' (application)* Application - similarity of the rules : limited - Application - similarity of the rules : extended-Application: regular-Application: irregular : Application - proximate.
- 7.5 *The order of placing - The various kinds of order* - Arrangement of similar things together - Arrangement of similar things at different places - Occurrence of a similar thing between the sequence - Occurrence of a different thing between the sequence - Arrangement of a thing at the end of a category or at the beginning of the next category.
- The reasons for the order of placing* - Importance - The importance of what is stated first - The importance of what is stated at the end - The importance of what is stated in the middle - Affinity - Tokai and viri (summing up and elaboration) - Frequency and non-frequency - Cause and effect.
- Seemingly irrelevant order* - Chapter affinity - Māṭṭēru or Application - Statement in one place - Frequency and non-frequency - Other suggestions.

PART—III

NACCINĀRKKINIYAR AS A LINGUIST

- CHAPTER-8. Phonology ... 185-203
- 8.1 *A few ancient conceptions* - Vaḷiyum icaiyum (Breath and sound) - Place of origin of sounds - The form of sounds - The importance of 'a' sound - The sound system of syllabic sounds (uyirmey).
- 8.2 *Intonation* - Phonemes and allophones in Tamil - Several kinds of intonation - Contrast - due to eṭuttal and paṭuttal ōcai - Imperative verbs and verbal nouns - Quantity of length system of some roots - Finite verbs and participial nouns - Transitive and intransitive verbs - Second personal verb and imperative - Affirmative and negative second personal verbs - Finite and non-finite verbs - Some verbal forms common to many parts of speech.
- 8.3 *Juncture* - The two major groups of juncture - Juncture as a phoneme - Meanings understood through intonation - Is there any pitch difference? - Meanings understood by context - Oṭṭimuṭital (Close juncture) Piḷantu muṭital (Open Juncture) - The Juncture of

the phrases where the suffixes are not elided - Two kinds of compound.

CHAPTER-9 Syntax

... 204-232

- 9.1 *Sentences* - Morphology and Syntax - Word Definition : Sentence : Definition - Taḷuvu toṭor (Phrase in which a word qualifies the word immediately following it) - Taḷāttoṭar (Phrase in which a word does not qualify the word immediately following it) : Constituents in verses - Māṭṭu - Proximate māṭṭu - Distant māṭṭu.
- 9.2 *Major types of sentences* - Taṅi moḷi (sentence words) - Toṭar moḷi (Sentences of more than one word).
- 9.3 *Eḷuvāy- Payaṅilai-t-toṭar (Subject-predicate construction)* - Different kinds of grammatical predicates - Additional varieties of predicates - Types of subjects - Commander actor - Noun occurring as predicate.
- 9.4 *Attribute construction* - Ambiguities removed - The homophonous construction resolved - A series of attributes - nonambiguous - Ambiguous interpretation - The attribute of the part as the attribute of the whole - An idiom (a) Attribute with a latent and not patent significance - The attributes merely suggestive of the pun - An idiom (b) Attribute and Head as a common noun - Relative participle+Noun as Attribute and Head - Cause and effect construction - Effect and cause construction.
- 9.5 *Concordance or Agreement* - Tiṅai, Pāl, eṅ. iṅam - Vaḷāṅilai, vaḷu, vaḷuvamaiti - Akṛiṅai viravu-p-peyar - Cāti orumai (species-singular) - Cāti-p-paṅmai (more than one species) - Cross reference : number - Cross reference: tiṅai and number - Cross reference - tiṅai. number - ambiguous.
- 9.6 *Change of order of words in poetry* - Ordinary and literary usages - Classification of syntax in poetry - Āṅṅoḷukku (the natural order) - Niralnirai - Moḷimāṅṅu and māṭṭu.

Displacement of the order - To emphasize the 'Topic' - To emphasize the logical order - cause and effect - To avoid irrelevance of similies - To conform to history.

CHAPTER-10 Semantic Changes

... 233-254

- 10.1 *Words and their meanings* - All words have meanings - The way in which words convey their meanings :

words referring to their meanings - Words referring to their forms - Classification of meaning.

10.2 *Changes of meaning* - The subjective for the objective - The objective for the subjective - Wearing out of a hyperbole - Its opposite - an euphemism - General for the specific (Restriction or narrowing) - Specific for the general (Expansion or widening) - The whole for the part - The part for the whole - Activity attributed to inactive things - An activity not its own attributed to a thing - Another variety of this attribution - The cause for the effect - The effect for the cause - Affirmative for negative - Negative for affirmative - The place used for the time - The place for the thing in the place - A thing in a place for its abstract quality.

10.3 *Grammatical changes* - Exclusive and inclusive First person - Third person used for the other persons - *Taṇmai-p-paṭarkkai* (first personal third person) - *Muṇṇilai-p-paṭarkkai* (second personal third person) - First person in the third personal verbs - Third person in the first and second - Reconciliation with *Tolkāppiyam sūtram* - Non-ergative for the ergative - The ergative for the non-ergative - Another change - *Ceyyum* - as *viyaṅkōl* - *Ceyyum* - as second person plural.

ABBREVIATIONS

1. Aiñk	Aiñkuṛunūru
2. Akam	Akanānūru
3. Cañkara	Cañkaranamaccivāyar commentary
4. Cēnā	Cēnāvaraiyar commentary
5. Ciṛupāṇ	Ciṛupāṇārṛuppaṭai
6. Civa	Civañānamunivar commentary
7. Col	Collatikāram
8. Eluttu	Eluttatikāram
9. Iḷam	Iḷampūraṇar commentary
10. Iṛaiyaṇār	Iṛaiyaṇār Kaḷaviyal
11. Jīvaka	Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi
12. Kali	Kalittokai
13. Kampar	Kamparāmāyaṇam
14. Kuṛaḷ	Tirukkuṛaḷ
15. Kuṛiñci	Kuṛiñci-p-pāṭṭu
16. Malai	Malaipaṭukaṭām
17. Maturai	Maturai-k-kāñci
18. Mullai	Mullai-p-pāṭṭu
19. Muruku	Tirumurukārṛuppaṭai
20. Nac	Naccinārkkiniyar commentary
21. Neṭu	Neṭunalvāṭai
22. Pari	Parimèlalar commentary
23. Paṭṭiṇam	Paṭṭiṇappālai
24. Pērā	Pērāciriya commentary
25. Perumpāṇ	Perumpāṇārṛuppaṭai
26. Poruḷ	Poruḷatikāram
27. Porunar	Porunarārṛuppaṭai
28. Puṛam	Puṛanānūru
29. Teyva	Teyvaccilaiyār commentary
30. The Tamil concept of love	The Tamil concept of love in Ahatti-ṇai.
31. Tol	Tolkāppiyam

TRANSLITERATION

Vowels

அ	—	a	எ	—	e
ஆ	—	ā	ஏ	—	eā
இ	—	i	ஐ	—	ai
ஈ	—	ī	ஓ	—	oi
உ	—	u	ஔ	—	ou
ஊ	—	ū	ஒள	—	oū
		ஃ	க		au

Consonants

க	—	k	ம்	—	m
ங	—	ñ	ய்	—	y
ச	—	c	ர்	—	r
ஞ	—	ñ	ல்	—	l
ட	—	t	வ்	—	v
ண	—	ṇ	ழ்	—	ḷ
த	—	t	ள்	—	ḷ
ந	—	n	ற்	—	r
ப	—	p	ன்	—	n

Sanskrit

ஜ	—	j
ஸ	—	s
ஷ்	—	ṣ
க்ஷ	—	kṣh
ஹ	—	h

A NOTE ON REFERENCES

1. References to Tolkāppiyam and other works and wherever necessary, to the commentaries on them, are made under the number of the sūtram, verse or line as given in the respective commentaries.

2. Where the name of the commentator is not mentioned, the reference to sūtram, verse or line follows the numbering as found in the commentary of Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar.

3. Where the sūtram or verse contains many lines, the lines, the line number is also given ; e.g. 14 : 7, 15 : 3-9.

4. Where the sūtram or the verse and the commentary thereon are at different places, the sūtram or verse number is given along with the page number where the commentary is found.

5. References to passages in the thesis are given under the numbers of chapter, section and paragraph (e.g. 2. 3. 5 means Chapter - 2, Section - 3, Paragraph - 5).

6. In the chapter on phonology, superior figures indicating pitch levels are found before and after the word or phrase, while superior figures as reference numbers are found only at the end.

7. The following abbreviations are used in this thesis :—

- | | | | |
|----|-----|---|----------------------|
| l. | ll. | — | for line, lines. |
| p. | pp. | — | for page, pages. |
| s. | ss. | — | for sūtram, sūtrams. |
| v. | vv. | — | for verses. |

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER—1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. *Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar as a Commentator*

1.1.1. *Earlier works and their Commentaries*

“A critical study of Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar” is the subject chosen for treatment in this thesis. He has written commentaries on Tolkāppiyam, Pattuppāṭṭu, Kalittokai and Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. Tolkāppiyam is the earliest grammatical work extant in Tamil. Pattuppāṭṭu and Eṭṭuttokai, which are anthologies, are the earliest literary works now extant. Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, Cilappatikāram, Maṇimēkalai, Vaḷaiyāpati and Kuṇṭalakēci, the five major Kāvyaas or the aimperuṅkāpiyam as they are known now, succeeded the Saṅgam works. The language of all these works differs from the language of the later period, in the same way that old English does from modern English. A knowledge of modern or even medieval Tamil will not suffice to understand the ancient works. But we are fortunate in our commentators who have explored these dark obscure regions with the torch of traditional wisdom. To vary the metaphor, their commentaries serve as telescopes bringing remote centuries within our vision and understanding.

1.1.2. *Iḷampūraṅar and his successors*

Iḷampūraṅar is the earliest known commentator on Tolkāppiyam. It is significant that he is known as Uraiyācīriyar (“The Commentator”)¹. The rich mine of Tolkāppiyam, hidden beneath the sands of Time, was revealed by the magic touch of Iḷampūraṅar and he was followed by Pērācīriyar, Cēṅāvaraiyar, Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar, Kallāṭar and Teyvaccilaiyār. Of these Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar is the only scholar who has written commentaries on both literature and grammar, and the present study concerns itself with an investigation of his commentaries.

1. Tol. Poru]. Iḷam; Introduction; p. 12.
Tol. Col. Iḷam. Introduction; p. iii.
Tol. Eḷuttu. Iḷam. Introduction; p. 2.

1.1.3. *A critical study of Naccinārkkiniyar*

Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary on Pattuppāṭṭu was studied to some extent in another thesis on Pattuppāṭṭu for M.Litt. Degree. This led the present writer to a detailed study of the commentaries of Naccinārkkiniyar on other works. Professor T. P. Mcenakshisundaram who went through the thesis for M.Litt. Degree and Dr. M. Varadarajan who assessed it, suggested a full length study of Naccinārkkiniyar and hence this present thesis "A critical study of Naccinārkkiniyar".

1.2. *The History of Naccinārkkiniyar*

Though the life history of Naccinārkkiniyar has never been separately written, yet the scholars who have edited Pattuppāṭṭu, Kalittokai, Jivaka Cintāmaṇi and Tolkāppiyam with his commentaries, have given short biographical sketches of this great commentator. As this thesis confines itself to a study of his commentaries, only a short resume of his biography as far as it is-known now, is given below.

1.2.1. *Naccinārkkiniyar's religion etc.*

Naccinārkkiniyar, a Brahmin by birth, belonging to Bhāradvāja gōtra, was born in Maturai. He was a learned scholar, well-versed in the grammatical and literary works in Tamil. He described himself at the end of his commentaries thus: "Maturai Āciriyaṅ Bhāradvāci Naccinārkkiniyaṅ ceyta urai".¹ "He is a Saivite. He gives Tirucciṅṅampalam and Perumpaṅṅapuliyūr as instances of six lettered and seven lettered words in his commentary on Tolkāppiyam. His quoting extensively from Tiruvācakam, Tirucciṅṅampalakkōvaiyār, Tiruvulāppuṅgam, etc. to explain certain philosophical truths, and his special notes on the poem (362, 1141) in Jivaka Cintāmaṇi and certain observations in Tirumurukāṅṅupāṭai, prove that he was a Saivite".² Also whenever there is a reference to Lord Siva in Jivaka Cintāmaṇi and other works, he refers to Him as 'Iraivaṅ' ('The Supreme Lord').³ "In the Tolkāppiyam sūtram, specifying 'separation for the sake of learning', the commentary of Naccinārkkiniyar refers to 'Tatvamaci' which indicates 'Advaita', and the Advaitists are Siva worshippers".⁴ But 'Tatvam aci' occurs in the upanishad and this is accepted as authoritative by all the Hindu schools of thought. There are various schools of advaita - Suddhadvaita,

1. Pattuppāṭṭu; pp. 79, 128, 178, 262, 287, 433, 465, 512, 563, 663.

2. Pattuppāṭṭu; pp. IX, IXI.

3. Kali; vv. 101 : 8, 103:15, Jivaka; v. 1488.

4. Naccinārkkiniyar; pp. 6-8.

Kēvalādvita etc. It cannot be said that even all kēvalādvitas are Siva worshippers. But Nacciṅārkkiniyar was certainly a worshipper of Siva.

1.2.2. *The religious tolerance of Nacciṅārkkiniyar*

The religious tolerance of Nacciṅārkkiniyar is really admirable. The very fact that one of his commentaries is on a Jain work shows his broad outlook. Also so fully does he identify himself with the work that it looks as though he agrees with the Jain poet in the view that "music and dance induce passion".¹ His references to certain Jain beliefs in his commentary prove his erudite scholarship and appreciation of things not belonging to his own religion.² "For the Tolkāppiyam sūtram 'aruḷoṭu puṇarnta akaṇci', he gives the meaning 'renunciation' and says it is like the renunciation of Buddha and quotes Buddha Jātaka stories"³. These things show not mere religious tolerance but keen admiration of sister religions.

1.2.3. *The period of Nacciṅārkkiniyar*

Nacciṅārkkiniyar refers at certain places to the commentaries by Pērācīriyar, Cēṅāvaraiyar and Iḷampūraṇar⁴ and thus he belongs to a period later than theirs. Cēṅāvaraiyar flourished in the 13th and 14th centuries, during the reign of Māravarman Kulasēkara Paṇḍiyan.⁵ So Nacciṅārkkiniyar's period must be some time after the 14th century A.D.⁶

1.3. *The works of Nacciṅārkkiniyar*

Nacciṅārkkiniyar was well-versed both in grammar and literature. From a verse eulogising his commentary, it is clear that he wrote commentaries on the following works :-⁷

- | | |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| 1. Tolkāppiyam | 4. Kuṟuntokai. |
| 2. Pattuppāṭṭu. | (20 verses only) |
| 3. Kalittokai. | 5. Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi |

The fact that he wrote commentaries only on 20 verses in Kuṟuntokai is evident from the line

"ārakuṟuntokaiyuḷ ainnāṅkum"⁸

1. Jīvaka; vv. 2597, 2598, 2718.
 2. Infra; pp. 19-20
 3. Nacciṅārkkiniyar; pp. 8-9.
 4. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 10, 27, 50, etc. Tol. Col; ss. 1, 25, 35, etc.
 5. Cācaṅattamiḷkavi caritam; p. 113. Ilakkīyavarālāṅṅu; p. 36.
 6. A history of Tamil Literature; p. 216.
 7. Pattuppāṭṭu; p. Iix.
 8. Ibid, p. Iviii.

All his commentaries, except the one on Kuṅuntokai, have been published. We do not have the whole of his commentary on Tolkāppiyam. We have only his commentaries on Eḷuttu, Col and six chapters in Poruḷ. The last chapter in Tolkāppiyam is 'Marapiyal'. Naccinārkkiniyar refers elsewhere to his commentary on 'Marapiyal' and this shows that his commentary was on the whole work.¹

1.3.1. *Has Naccinārkkiniyar written a commentary on Tirukkōvaiyar ?*

Some scholars hold that Naccinārkkiniyar has written a commentary on Tirukkōvaiyār. He gives quotations from Tirukkōvaiyār in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.² But he does not refer to any commentary of his on that work, as he does, to his commentary on Tolkāppiyam. Also the verses that eulogise his commentaries do not mention his commentary on Tirukkōvaiyār.³ The commentary now available on Tirukkōvaiyār has been proved to be by Pēraciriyar.⁴

1.3.2. *His earliest commentary : that on Tolkāppiyam*

It is very difficult to find out the chronological order of these commentaries. But it can be fairly surmised that his commentary on Tolkāppiyam was the earliest among his commentaries. It is evident from his own commentaries, since he quotes his commentary on Tolkāppiyam in his commentaries on other works.⁵

1.3.3. *The commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi*

In his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, Naccinārkkiniyar quotes his own commentary on Tolkāppiyam.⁶ But occasionally in his commentary on Tolkāppiyam he quotes his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.⁷ Our earlier conclusion is therefore disturbed. But Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Iyer has suggested an explanation of this

1. Porunar; 11. 139, 143, 159.,
Perumpān; 1. 183.
Jīvaka; v. 2690.

2. Jīvaka; vv. 31, 50, 148, 1487, 1749, 1791, 2476.

3. Pattuppāṭṭu; pp. Iviii-Ix.

4. Jīvaka; p. 28.

5. Porunar; 1. 139, 143, 159.,
Cīrupān; 11. 11, 28-30, 143.,

Perumpān; 1.183., Maturai; 11.468, 725-726, 764-765.

Kali; vv. 1:1., 6:8-11, 23:8-13, 32:16-17, 39:44, 60:23, 67:5, 88:11-14, 93:
29-36, 96:22-31, 96:32-39; 109:21-26, 114:13-14, 119, 127:7

Jīvaka; 72, 892-893, 1913, 2690.

6. Jīvaka; 72, 892-893, 1913, 2690.

7. Tol. Ceyyūḷiyal; ss. 210, 211, 238.

anomaly. The story has it that Naccinārkkīṇiyar wrote a commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi and showed it to the Jain scholars for approval. But they rejected it on the ground that it did not conform to their understanding of their religion. And Naccinārkkīṇiyar wrote another commentary which was accepted by the Jains. Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Iyer suggests that the statements found in the Tolkāppiyam commentary referring to his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, must have actually related to his earlier commentary on the epic.¹ To some extent this solves the problem, but not fully.

1.3.4. *The commentaries on Pattuppāṭṭu and Kalittokai*

It is also impossible to fix the chronological order of his commentaries on Pattuppāṭṭu and Kalittokai. There are indications here and there, but one can not reach a definite conclusion. Naccinārkkīṇiyar quotes Pattuppāṭṭu in his commentary on Kalittokai.

“ Akan nālam viḷakkum taṇ pal katir vāyāka-p-
Pakal nuṅkiyatu pōla-p-paṭu cuṭar kal cēra ”.²

Here the sun-set is described. It means that the sun, with the rays as his mouth, swallows the day and sets in the west. But Naccinārkkīṇiyar adds “ what he spat earlier, the day ” —. The addition is Naccinārkkīṇiyar’s own, and for this he quotes from Perumpāṇāṅṅuppaṭai.

“ Pakal kāṅṅu ēḷutarum pal katir-p-paruti ”.³

Here he quotes Pattuppāṭṭu in his commentary on Kalittokai, but does not quote this Kalittokai passage while commenting on Perumpāṇāṅṅuppaṭai.

There is however a quotation from another part of Kallittokai in his commentary on Pattuppāṭṭu. “ Paṇikkum Pācaṇai ”.⁴ It is like ‘ nōy tīru maruntu ’.⁵ Naccinārkkīṇiyar had in his mind the full view of all the literary works he had read and hence it is difficult to determine the chronological order of his commentaries.

1.3.5. *The commentaries on Pattuppāṭṭu and Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi*

There are many places where he quotes Pattuppāṭṭu in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. But half of them relate to

-
1. Jīvaka; p. 29 Pattuppāṭṭu; p. Ixii.
 2. Kali; v. 119: 1-2.
 3. Perumpāṇ; 1.2.
 4. Mullai; 1. 79.
 5. Kali; v. 60:18.

similarity of ideas only.¹ There are places where he quotes from Pattuppāṭṭu in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, relating to the special meaning of certain words that attain significance theory.

Ōṭutal	—	to destroy. ²
Puḷ	—	bangles. ³
Matalai	—	support. ⁴
Maṇṇu	—	to make. ⁵
Akam	—	agricultural tract. ⁶
Tēmputal	—	suffering. ⁷
Māytal	—	vanish. ⁸

Though Naccinārkkiniyar thus quotes from Pattuppāṭṭu in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi to justify his stand, he does not quote from Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi in his commentary on Pattuppāṭṭu. Perhaps it may be argued that, since Pattuppāṭṭu precedes Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi in age, he might have done so. But this is not decisive.

'Nāḷku' is a corruption of the word 'nāṅku' meaning four. This word occurs both in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi and Pattuppāṭṭu, but Naccinārkkiniyar quotes from Pattuppāṭṭu while writing the commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.⁹ The word 'tam' occurs with the meaning 'tārum' (give) and in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi he quotes such an occurrence from Pattuppāṭṭu.¹⁰ The word 'niḷal' (shade), a noun is used as a verb in the form of 'niḷaṅṅu' (to offer shade) and this is used both in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi and Pattuppāṭṭu.¹¹ Naccinārkkiniyar quotes only Pattuppāṭṭu in his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi and not vice-versa.

It is true there are places where he quotes Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi in his commentary on Pattuppāṭṭu, but it is only to emphasise and elucidate the similarity of ideas. He does not quote Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi from the point of view of syntax or meaning in his commentary on Pattuppāṭṭu.

-
1. Jīvaka; vv. 31, 51, 275, 559, 698, 882, 1158, 1416, 1462, 1713, 1996, 2328.
 2. Jīvaka; 2382, Ciṅupāṇ; 1. 214.
 3. Ibid; v. 2591, Malai; 1. 253.
 4. Ibid; v. 1895, Perumpāṇ; 1. 346.
 5. Ibid; vv. 735, 1808, Maturai, 1. 494.
 6. Ibid; v. 1613 Maturai; 1.149.
 7. Ibid; v. 232, Paṭṭiṅam; 1.4.
 8. Ibid; v. 453, Maturai; 1. 247.
 9. Jīvaka; v. 1774., Porunar; 1. 165.
 10. Ibid; v. 906., Maturai; 1. 731.
 11. Ibid; v. 1270., Ciṅupāṇ; 1. 233.

To sing like playing on *Vīṇai*.¹

Nectar-like voice.²

To fight according to the priority of heroism.³

There are also other places where he quotes not only from *Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi* in his commentary on *Pattuppāṭṭu*, and also from *Pattuppāṭṭu* in his commentary on *Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi* for the sole purpose of emphasising similar ideas.⁴ That there are 'three lines in the chest of *Muruka*' has been quoted in his commentary on *Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi* whilst the same lines from *Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi* are quoted in his commentary on *Pattuppāṭṭu*.⁵ All this makes it difficult to decide the chronological order of his commentaries on *Pattuppāṭṭu* and *Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi*.

But we saw earlier what Dr. U.N. Swaminatha Iyer has stated in his biographical sketch of *Nacciṅārkkīyār* that *Nacciṅārkkīyār* wrote two commentaries on *Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi*.⁶ If it is so, we can consider that the quotation in *Pattuppāṭṭu* from *Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi* perhaps pertains to his earlier commentary on that great epic. After its rejection he might have written his commentary on *Pattuppāṭṭu*, and from his later experience and deeper study, he might have written the commentary on *Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi* which is available now and hence his detailed references therein to morphology and special meanings of words.

1.3.6. *The commentaries on Kalittokai and Jivaka Cintāmaṇi*

Nacciṅārkkīyār quotes from *Kalittokai* in his commentary on *Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi* for elucidating points relating to (1) the meanings, (2) the forms and (3) other grammatical significance of words. Some of them are :

1. *Meanings of words*

Kalai	—	sugarcane. ⁷
Ambi	—	to forsake. ⁸
Yāmam	—	night. ⁹

-
1. *Jivaka*; v. 658; *Maturai*; 1.217.
 2. *Ibid*; v. 722, *Cirupāṇ* 1. 226.
 3. *Ibid*; v. 2265, *Maturai*, 11. 53-54.
 4. *Jivaka*; v. 2265, *Cirupāṇ*; 1.232.
Ibid; v. 189., *Neṭu*; 11.131-133.
Ibid; v. 2473, *Maturai*; 11.400-401.
Ibid; v. 285., *Ibid*; 1. 598.
 5. *Ibid*; 1462., *Muruku*; 1. 104.
 6. *Supra*; p.6., 1.3.3.
 7. *Jivaka*; v. 1064., *Kali* v.40:28
 8. *Ibid*; v. 982., *Ibid*; v.82:35
 9. *Ibid* v. 135., *Ibid*; v.139:14

2. *Forms of words*

'Kaṇṇīrkal' occurring in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi is like 'pāl cila' in Kalittokai.¹

"Vaḷarntatai" a verbal form occurring in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi is like 'uraittatai' in Kalittokai.²

3. *Grammatical Significance*

'Nūṛṛulām maṇṭapam'. 'Nūṛu' meaning 'hundred', here stands as āku peyar, in the sense of a hundred feet. This is like 'āru' meaning six standing as 'āku peyar' to denote the six divisions of vedas.³

This evidence suggests that his commentary on Kalittokai was earlier than his commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.

Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi has not been quoted to this extent in the commentary on Kalittokai. But in one place where he changes the order of words in his own manner, he justifies it by quoting Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.⁴ The lines in Kalittokai can be directly interpreted to mean that the impression left by the crab on the sandy shore are similar to the impression left by the dice on the gambling ground.⁵ But Naccinarkkiṇiyar states that the crabs with stripes look like the dice that leave impression on the gambling ground. In this connection he quotes Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi "the dice rolled like the moving crab".

Because he has quoted Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi in Kalittokai it cannot be held that the Cintāmaṇi commentary is earlier than his commentary on Kalittokai. To bring out a far-fetched meaning in Kalittokai, he has quoted a line from Cintāmaṇi, which directly means the same thing as he wants to attribute to the passage in Kalittokai. It means perhaps he has in mind what he has read in Cintāmaṇi at the time he wrote his commentary on Kalittokai, but it must be remembered that he does not quote in Kalittokai, any of his 'favourite ingenious interpretations' from Cintāmaṇi, but only a passage that directly refers to the meaning which he attributes to the lines in Kalittokai when he indulges in such ingenuity.

1. Jīvaka; v.2087., Kali; v.76:32-33.

2. Ibid; v.223., Ibid; v.76:9.

3. Jīvaka; v.2734., Kali; v.1:1.

4. Ibid; v. 927.

5. Kali; v.136: 1-4.

1.4. *Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar's Scholarship in Sanskrit*

In addition to his vast scholarship in Tamil language and literature, Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar has profound scholarship in Sanskrit. He brings this to bear upon the commentaries he wrote on the grammatical and literary works in Tamil. He makes use of his Sanskrit scholarship to indicate the derivations of Tamil words, to explain the Tamil words and phrases and to compare Tamil traditions with Sanskrit traditions.

1.4.1 *Sanskrit derivations*

The words of Sanskrit, as they are used in Tamil, undergo a change and Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar explains them wherever necessary. Some of them are :-

<i>Derivations in Tamil</i>	<i>Sanskrit words</i>
Tampalam.	Tāmpūlam ¹
Cācaran̄.	Sahasrāran̄. ²
Cēṅikaṅ.	Srēṅikaṅ. ³
Uvā.	Yuvā ⁴

Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar also holds that some of the fancied Sanskritic corruptions in Tamil are not so, but are genuine Tamil words, for example :

“Viyamamē vāḷi kutirai”⁵

Here some scholars consider that ‘viyamam’ is an altered form of the Sanskrit word ‘viṣamam’. But, ‘viṣamam’ can become in Tamil only ‘viṭamam’ and not ‘viyamam’. So Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar argues that it is not a Sanskrit word but a Tamil word where the root is ‘viya’—‘to wonder’ and this ‘viyamam’ is another form of ‘viyappu’ in Tamil.

1.4.2. *Sanskritic explanations*

Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar uses the Sanskrit words in his explanation of certain Tamil words.

<i>Tamil words</i>	<i>Sanskrit explanations</i>
Kaviṅ	— Samudāya sōbai. ⁶
Verukkai	— Pākuṭam ⁷

-
1. Kali; v. 65:13.
 2. Jivaka; v. 2889.
 3. Ibid; v. 3044.
 4. Kali v. 97:25.
 5. Ibid; v. 96: 31.
 6. Jivaka; v. 1357.
 7. Ibid; v. 2708.

Mukil vītal	—	Mēka viṇācam. ¹
Kaṇṇanār	—	Upatiruṣṭā. ²
Kaṭikai	—	Mahūrta vitaṇi ³
Kānattinēkukinrān.	—	Vaṇa caritaṇ. ⁴

Naccinārkkiniyar explains certain Tamil ideas in the light of Sanskrit thought. 'Tavir veyya kāmam'—This is like 'vītarākar'.⁵ He also classifies women into three categories as, (1) women in whom the feeling of sex is absent. (2) women in whom the feeling of sex is just sprouting and (3) women in whom the feeling of sex is well developed.⁶ This classification of women seems to follow Sanskrit model.⁷ He interprets the phrase 'perumaṇa-k-kiḷamai' (the right for marriage) as "camāvarttaṇam".⁸ When he interprets the five kinds of war in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi he calls it 'pañca kiruttiam' as it is in Sanskrit.⁹

1.4.3 Forced interpretations

He also gives forced interpretations to certain Tamil words so as to make them equivalents of Sanskrit terms.

<i>Tamil words</i>		<i>Forced interpretations</i>
Tiru	—	Vīra sri. ¹⁰
Tēṇ ūta.	—	Tēṇiṇam cattikka. ¹¹
Pukar paṭa	—	Kāma taṇmam kuṟappaṭa. ¹²
Ciṟiya ayinrār	—	aṟpākarikaḷ. ¹³
Mai	—	Maṣi. ¹⁴
Cēru.	—	puṭpatūji. ¹⁵

It is difficult to understand why Naccinārkkiniyar uses these Sanskrit words while he usually writes in lucid and sweet Tamil. Perhaps, they are later additions interpolated in his commentary.

-
1. Ibid; v. 2833.
 2. Ibid; v. 2362.
 3. Ibid;
 4. Jīvaka; v. 1567.
 5. Ibid; v. 2542.
 6. Ibid; p. 2529.
 7. Ibid; p. 1248. Foot notes.
 8. Ibid; v. 822-823.
 9. Ibid; v. 1676.
 10. Jīvaka; v. 771.
 11. Kali; v. 36:6.
 12. Ibid; v. 12:16-17.
 13. Jīvaka; v. 2033.
 14. Ibid; v. 1767.
 15. Jīvaka; v. 2019.

1.4.4. *Sanskritic traditions*

In Tolkāppiyam Eḷuttatikāram commentary, Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar holds that the author follows only the Tamil tradition in the use of the language and interprets the sūtrams in the same manner.¹ Tolkāppiyar has classified all those letters that occur initially in words and Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar gives examples of Tamil words only for this, and refuses Sanskrit words, slang etc.² Tolkāppiyar's classification of mono-syllabic words, two syllabic words, and multi-syllabic words, according to Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar, does not follow the Sanskrit pattern, but the Tamil usage oṇṇu, cila and pala (one, some and many).³ Thus Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar establishes that Tolkāppiyar follows only the Tamil tradition.

In Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram also, Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar interprets Tolkāppiyam, following the Tamil tradition, where he refers to the relationship of words in sequence in a sentence : payaṇilai, Tokainilai and eṇṇunilai. But he also mentions the Sanskrit theories i.e. avāyṇilai, aṇmai and takuti.⁴ In Collatikāram, his interpretation thus introduces to some extent the Sanskritic line of thinking, perhaps following Cēṇāvaiyār's analysis which refers to the common aspects of language in general.

In Tolkāppiyam—Poruḷatikāram, there are many places where Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar departs from his own assertion that Tolkāppiyar follows the Tamil tradition. Some of them are:—

1. "Here 'eṇpa' does not refer to the original Tamil authors but the Sanskrit authors".⁵
2. "The hero is well-versed in Vedās and Dharma Sāstrās. When Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaisayas perform yagnas' they give preference only to such of their many wives who belong to their respective caste".⁶
3. "The marriage ceremony is celebrated by the chanting of mantras and performance of Vēdic rites".⁷

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; pp. 12-13.

2. Ibid; ss. 62, 64, 65, 75.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 45.

4. Tol. Col; s. 1, pp. 3-4.

5. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 145, p. 545.

6. Ibid; s. 147: 1-2, pp. 577-579.

7. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 150, p. 612-613.

There are also other such references in *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram* commentary¹. In some places, *Naccinārkkiniyar* introduces Sanskrit ideas too freely.² Perhaps these are due to the age in which he lived, when people in Tamil land believed that all the rituals and practices of their own age went back to very early times to the age of *Tolkāppiyar*. This is what happens when one tries to interpret earlier works according to the conditions one knows. It requires a historical perspective, as in the modern age, to get rid of this pitfall in interpreting older texts. Anyhow all the examples mentioned above show the great scholarship of *Naccinārkkiniyar* in Sanskrit.

1.5. *Naccinārkkiniyar's Knowledge in other Fields*

Naccinārkkiniyar displays also knowledge of political, social and religious history. To explain the religious faiths he quotes from *Vēdās*, *Ākamās*, *Purāṇās* and other *Sāstrās*. He is familiar with the traditional knowledge of natural and physical sciences.

1.5.1. *Political knowledge*

Naccinārkkiniyar faithfully follows legends and tradition and records certain points of apparent political significance. He does not discriminate between fact and fiction, but that some of his statements contain history, cannot be denied. He mentions some princely families as "aim peruvēḷir and Paratavar."³ He establishes that the latter ruled over the southern region of Tamilnad, by quoting from *Purānānūru*.⁴ According to him *Neṭiyōṇ* is another name for *Vaṭimpalampa ninra Pāṇḍiyāṇ*, and the later king, the hero of *Maturaikkāñci*, belonged to his dynasty.⁵ He identifies *Māraṇ* as a chieftain in the *Pāṇḍyā* kingdom who belonged to the family of the hero of *Maturaikkāñci*.⁶ It must be conceded that *Naccinārkkiniyar* is able to a fair extent to relate history and literature.

According to *Naccinārkkiniyar*, *Karikālan* did not succeed to the kingship by virtue of his birth, but acquired it by conquest as a youth and this helps to reconcile the anomalies in the conflicting versions of the history of *Tirumāvaḷavaṇ* in *Paṭṭinappālai* and *Karikālan* in *Porunarāruppaṭai*, as in the opinion of *Naccinārkkiniyar* *Tirumāvaḷavaṇ* is *Karikālan*.⁷ But there is also a view that the hero of *Paṭṭinappālai* is not the same *Karikālan* mentioned in *Porunarāru*-

1. Ibid; ss. 172, 188, 192, 217, etc.

2. Ibid; s.146:10-11, p. 553.

3. *Paṭṭinam*; l. 282, *Maturai*; 11. 128-129.

4. *Maturai*; 1.144. *Puṇam*; v. 378: 1-2.

5. Ibid; l. 61.

6. Ibid; 11. 771-772.

7. *Porunar*; 11. 137-140.

uppaṭai.¹ There is a popular legend that Karikālan, to dispel the doubts of two elders whether he could deliver the right judgement over some dispute between them, dressed himself up as an old man and gave his verdict — that satisfied them both. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar, bearing in mind this legend, interprets a line in Pattuppāṭṭu as referring to that incident.² His interpretation seems to be a little far-fetched at this place, but it cannot be denied that Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar weaves history, legends, proverbs etc., into a coherent whole to give continuity to the narrative.

Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar is carried away by the sheer romantic possibilities of the popular legends current during his period and he records them with a relish as if they are facts of history. The origin of the name 'Vēlūr' (that flowers became javelins by the grace of Lord Muruka),³ the story of Toṅṭaimān Iṅantiraiyaṅ's birth (Tiraiyaṅ, one nursed by the waves of the sea as he was laid bound by a toṅṭai creeper in the high seas by the Nāgā maiden who married a Cōlā king)⁴ etc.

1.5.2. *Knowledge of society*

We understand from Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar the type of society that should have existed during his period. There were four castes, Brahmīns, Kshatriyas, Vaisyas and Veḷḷāḷas. There were other castes arising from the mingling of these main four. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar explaining the phrase 'kuṭṭiccelvar' refers to the four main groups of 'Piṅṅar' (others) as indicating the other castes that originated from them.⁵ The Brahmīns could marry from all the four castes, Kshatriyas from the other three save the Brahmāns, the Vaisyas from the two excepting the Brahmīns and Kshatriyas.⁶ A man belonging to the lower caste could not marry a woman belonging to the higher caste.⁷

There were several sub—castes in the Vaisya group, as Vēdā-vāṅṅikar, Ippar, Kavippar, Peruṅkuṭṭiyar, etc.⁸ Titles with special ornaments were presented by the kings to the merchant community in accordance with their rank in the social hierarchy.⁹ There were two

1. Karikālar mūvar, pp. 77-81.

2. Porunar; 11. 187-188.

3. Ciṅṅupāṅ; 11. 172-173.

4. Perumpāṅ; 11. 29-37.

5. Maturai; 11. 577-578.

6. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 75, p. 247.

7. Jīvaka; v. 742.

8. Paṭṭīnam; 11. 205-207.,
Jīvaka; v. 1756.

9. Jīvaka; v. 112.

main sub divisions in the Veļļāḷa group namely Uḷutuṅṅpōr (Veļļāḷas who themselves cultivate the land) and Uḷuvittuṅṅpōr (Veļļāḷas who are the owners of the land but who cause it to be cultivated by others) according to Naccinārkkiniyar.¹ Kalittokai refers to three groups in the the Āyar community (the people in the forest region) as Kōṭṭinattāyar, Kōviṅnattāyar and Pullinattāyar. According to Naccinārkkiniyar these were different sub classes who looked after the buffalos, cows and sheep, respectively.² Also he refers to a kind of community that determined the capacity of milk production of cows, which shows that castes sprang up with reference to the ability of the cowherds too.³

There were certain habits prevalent in these days which the commentator refers to in his work. The people who swear, do so by touching the body of the ladies.⁴ The women blessed others to live up to a hundred.⁵ The mothers used to put up the lamps to safeguard their children.⁶ A person was introduced to women as the son of such and such a woman, and without any reference to his father.⁷ The women who some time after child-birth never wore bangles.⁸ The mothers sent their children to welcome guests calling them as their uncles or brothers.⁹ The guests were entertained with milk and rice kept for the hosts in case there was no time to cook fresh meals for the guests.¹⁰ The hosts walk seven feet following the musicians, when they bid farewell to them.¹¹ There are also many other references to the dress, ornaments etc., in the commentary of Naccinārkkiniyar all of which are very useful to understand the cultural history of the people in those days.

1.5.3 *Religious knowledge*

Naccinārkkiniyar had to acquaint himself with all the different schools of religious thought as he wrote commentaries on works belonging to different religions. Tirumurukāṅruppaṭai is a Saivite work and Jivaka Cintāmaṇi propagates the teachings of Jainism.

-
1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 29, p. 78-79.
 2. Kali; v. 103: 33-47.
 3. Ibid; v. 107:2.
 4. Jivaka; v. 2045.
 5. Jivaka; v. 2043.
 6. Ibid; v. 1367.
 7. Ibid; vv. 1789-1792.
 8. Malai; 1. 253.
 9. Malai; 1. 185.
 10. Ibid; 1. 417.
 11. Porunar; 1-166.

Naccinārkkīyār, although he belonged to the Saiva cult, has done full justice to Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi in annotating the Jain thoughts underlying that work.

Naccinārkkīyār's knowledge in Saivism is seen in his works. He explains some of the passages in Tirumurukāṟruppaṭai with reference from Tiruvācakam. One of the six faces of Lord Muruka enjoys the company of Valli and this is explained by Naccinārkkīyār referring to a portion in Tiruvācakam where Lord Siva, even though he has no human feeling or passion, is in the company of Pārvati, to set an example for the world to follow.¹ The line "Pulam pirintu uṟaiyum aṭi" occurring in Tirumurukāṟruppaṭai is also explained by a reference in Tiruvācakam that the feet of the Lord mean Mōksha.² The figure of Lord Muruka with one hand on his chest and another on the garland adorning the chest is explained by the commentator as referring to Mōṇa muttirai full of Eternal Bliss.³ Perhaps among the four stages explained in religious experience as cālōkam, cāmīpam, cārūpam and cāyuciyam he is referring here to 'cārūpam'. Naccinārkkīyār also quotes extensively the Purāṇic stories in Tirumurukāṟruppaṭai which shows how he is steeped in religious tradition.⁴

Naccinārkkīyār has profound scholarship in various religious works. A statement of Naccinārkkīyār—"as they are mentioned in religious works...they may be realised as Gods", shows his erudition in various religious works.⁵ The nature of the three worlds is well explained by the ākamas namely 'Aṅgam', Pūrvam and Āti according to Naccinārkkīyār.⁶ He annotates many Jain ideas with the help of Paramākamam, one of the greatest Jain works. Paṇimukam is one of the destinations of life, according to Paramākamam as explained by the commentator.⁷ He says that in olden days there were other Vēdas preceding the four now known as Rig, Yajur, Gāmam and Atharvaṇam. Those Vēdas according to him belonged to Jainism and they never prescribed Himsa (violence).⁸ Perhaps he considered that the present four Vēdas Rig etc. as classified by Vyāsa, belonged to a later date than Tolkāppiyam, but the

-
1. Muruku; 11. 100-102.
Tiruvācakam. Tiruccāḷai; v. 9.
 2. Muruku; 11.62-63.,
Tiruvācakam. Tiruvammānai; v.6.
 3. Muruku; 11.111-113.
 4. Muruku; 11.58, 163-165, 253-255.
 5. Jīvaka; v. 1045.
 6. Ibid; v. 1246.
 7. Ibid; v. 948.
 8. Ibid; v. 1242.

original four Vēdās according to him were Taittiriyam, pauṭikam, Talavakāram and Cāma Vēdam.¹

His knowledge of Jainism is really profound. He mentions and explains the Ratnatrayam or the three Jems—Right Faith, Right Knowledge and Right Conduct which sum up the tenets of Jain cult,² the four Katis, the stages of existence, through which the soul may pass namely—Dēva Kati, Makkaḷ Kati, Vilaṅku Kati and Naraka Kati,³ the Āṇma which is interested in Mukti, namely Bavyajīvaṇ,⁴ the four Caraṇams known as Aruka caraṇam, citta caraṇam, cātu caraṇam and Taṇma Caraṇam,⁵ various ṇāṇams such as Curuta ṇāṇam, Avatiṇāṇam, etc.⁶ Mantrams like Pañca namaskāram, Kāmiṇi, Matimukam, Kāṇṭha Mantiram, etc.⁷ Jaina temples like Araṇapātam, Camava Caraṇam, etc.⁸ various natures, of God such as the possession of 'Ananta Viriyam', the possession of 'Cukkila-t-tiyāṇam', becoming great by the eight qualities, free from the eight Kaṇmas⁹ and many other philosophical aspects of Jainism—are explained by Nacciṇārkkiniyar.

1.5.4. *Knowledge of natural and Physical sciences*

Nacciṇārkkiniyar classifies many kinds of plants, flowers, etc. and refers to their particular species.¹⁰ He says that the moonlight encourages the growth of food contents in the crops.¹¹ Sun light reaches places where moonlight cannot go.¹² That the earth is constituted of atoms,¹³ that several planets exist,¹⁴ that the soil came after the rock,¹⁵ that the four elements have their origin in the sky,¹⁶ etc.,—all this is mentioned by Nacciṇārkkiniyar. He gives the indications of pregnancy and describes the growth of the foetus

-
1. Tol. Eḷuttu; p.11
 2. Jīvaka; vv. 374.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Ibid; vv. 374-382.
 6. Jīvakā; vv.951, 3038, 3039.
 7. Ibid; 273, 793, 933, 1289, 1459, 1708, 1713.
 8. Jīvaka; vv. 1177, 3000.
 9. Ibid; vv. 2562, 2600
 10. Muruku; 11-190, 236, 190, 236, 192, Malai; 11.219, 133, 121, Porunar; 11.190-200, 234, Maturai; 1.172, Kuṇṭi; 11. 61-95, etc.
 11. Kali; v. 31:11,
 - 12, Ibid; v.144: 39-42.
 13. Jīvaka; v.345.
 14. Ibid; v. 3003.
 15. Maturai; 11.3-4.
 16. Perumpān; L.I.

inside the womb of the mother.¹ He also mentions the names of some animals,² refers to kinds of bees,³ the nature of the snake's poisonous teeth⁴ and so on. But it is the traditional knowledge of his times that he makes use of in interpreting these texts which were equally products of such traditional knowledge. It may be that the texts may reveal some truths to modern scientists if they were read freed from the trammals of this kind of tradition.

1.6. *The Works on Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar*

No single book covering all the works of Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar and assessing their merits has appeared so far. But some scholars have estimated some of the aspects of his works here and there, and they are of very great help to a student of Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar.

1.6.1. *Dr. U.V.S. Iyer's references*

The pioneer of modern Tamil scholars, 'whose name shall last as long as the language lasts' (in the words of Bhārathi),⁵ Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Iyer has given a brief history of Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar and his works, in all the works of this commentator which he has edited. He has given some of the salient points of Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar's commentary. "Giving the significance of the words in poems, quotations from some of the early works in prose order, quotations from Vedas and related works, quotations from other literary works sometimes without mentioning the authors, subtle explanations of the context of the various events, interpretations generally conforming to the ideas of the author of the poem or epic"—are some of the aspects he has mentioned as the general characteristics of Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar's commentary,⁶ They are of immense help to a research student.

1.6.2. *S. S. W. P. Society's 'Lecture compilations'*

The Saiva Siddānta Works Publishing Society has brought out two books, Lectures on Pattuppāṭṭu and Kalittokai respectively and they are valuable as they introduce these great Sangam works to the public. General Statements regarding Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar's syntax are

-
1. Jīvaka; vv. 231, 305, 2754-2760.
 2. Malai; 141, 292, Kuṅiñci; 1.257.
Muruku; 302-303. Jīvaka; vv. 1250, 1893 etc.
 3. Jīvaka; 897, Perumpāṇ; 1.183.
 4. Muruku; 1.148.
 5. Bhārathiyār kavitaikal. p.
 6. Pattuppāṭṭu; pp. Ixi-Ixii.,
Jīvaka, p. 28-33.

found in the books,¹ but a real assessment of his work is not traceable except at certain places.²

1.6.3. *Other research studies*

Professor Avvai Doraiswamy Pillai has written a book "Jivaka Cintāmaṇi āraycci" which is one of the best critical works of recent times. But the author has devoted more attention to the epic than to the commentary of Naccinārkkiniyar. Though the book is useful for a study of the epic, it is not equally helpful for study of its great commentator. But his brief chapter dealing with certain points regarding the characteristic features of Naccinārkkiniyar is of great help to a student of Naccinārkkiniyar with reference to Jivaka Cintāmaṇi.³ There are some good research studies of some of the works in Pattuppāṭṭu such as Maṟaimalai Aṭikal's "Mullai-p-pāṭṭu āraycci urai" and "Paṭṭinappālai āraycci urai". But the author has made it clear, even at outset, that he has written those books only to show the great Saṅgam works in their proper light, and to remove the confusion which Naccinārkkiniyar has caused by the manner of his interpretation.⁴ Professor T. P. Meenakshisundaranar has written critical essays on some of the idylls in Pattuppāṭṭu, especially on Tirumurukāṇṟuppaṭai and Mullai—p—pāṭṭu. He has, in his critical study of those works, assessed the merits of Naccinārkkiniyar in many places. They are of immense help for a student of the great commentator. The book "Perumpāṇṟuppaṭai āraycciyum uraiyum" of Mahāvidvān R. Raghava Iyengar is a good work but more helpful to a student of history than to a student of literature.

1.6.4. *Criticism*

Professor Ilakkuvanār in his "Tolkāppiya āraycci" has assessed the merits of Naccinārkkiniyar with reference to Tolkāppiyam commentary.⁵ Dr. V.S.P. Māṇikkam in his thesis, "The Tamil concept of love", has raised some points for discussion regarding the views of Naccinārkkiniyar.⁶ Dr. Somasundara Bhārathiyār and Dr. P. S. Subramaniya Sastriyar have written new commentaries on Tolkāppiyam and they are helpful for a study of Naccinārkkiniyar to the extent of their criticism. Professor Iḷavaḷakanār has given a short note

1. Pattuppāṭṭu-c-corpoḷivukaḷ; pp. 63, 81-82, 126, etc.
2. Pattuppāṭṭu-c-corpoḷivukaḷ; pp. 3, 34, 37, 42, 153-154, 158, 210, 286, etc. Kalittokai-c-corpoḷivukaḷ; pp. 7,9, 16-17, 42, 45, 53, 83, etc.
3. Jivaka Cintāmaṇi āraycci; pp. 225-237.
4. Mullai-p-pāṭṭu āraycciyurai; Introduction; pp. 13-14, 18-19.
5. Tolkāppiya āraycci; pp. 99, 144, 146, 157-158, 161-163, 176, 181-186, 194-195, etc.
6. The Tamil Concept of Love; pp. 71-72, 140, 267-269 etc.

on Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar to explain his commentary, in the edition of Kalittokai, and it is useful with reference to that work. He has critically investigated the commentary of Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar and assessed his merits to a great extent. Mr. M. Anṇāmalai has written a book recently "Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar". He has taken for consideration mainly Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar's commentary on Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. As the work is intended for the common man, he limits himself only to a few remarks that may appeal to a popular audience. It is a good work in as much as the author tries to remove the natural prejudices of modern Tamil scholars against Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar.¹ The present thesis is indebted to all the works mentioned above and to a number of essays on Cintāmaṇi which has been published in various journals of Tamil Nad.

1.7. *The main approach and Contribution of the thesis*

Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar is a great critic. He is steeped in the traditions of Tamil grammar, literature and culture. He has critically studied all the earlier major works in Tamil and this thesis is engaged in studying critically his commentaries. Walter Peter lays down three functions for a critic :²

1. To feel the virtue of the poet.
2. To disengage it.
3. To set it forth.

This thesis tries to perform these functions by seeking to realise certain important features of Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar's commentary, disengage them under various headings and to set them forth with their individual beauty and merit.

1.7.1. *Inductive criticism followed*

There are two main kinds of criticism—(1) inductive and (2) judicial. Judicial criticism stands in judgment of things, but inductive criticism engages itself in an analysis of what already exists, and is more derivative in purpose than arrogating authority to pronounce judgment. "An inductive critic analyses only the works of the poet. He finds the general aspects of them all from various angles. He formulates certain rules and regulations to appreciate the poet derived from a close study of his works. It must be emphasised once again that the methods of appreciation are derived from within and not from without. The external yardstick is invalid with reference to inductive criticism".³

1. Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar; pp. 18-19, 21, 42-43, 49-51, etc.
 2. Introduction to the study of Literature; p. 268.
 3. Ilakkīyakkalai; pp. 43-49.

1.7.2. *Partly judicial criticism*

This thesis follows mainly the methods of inductive criticism rather than those of judicial criticism. There are however, a few places where one cannot but pronounce one's own literary or grammatical judgment. There are some instances where Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar's interpretations may be different from the literal interpretation of the poet's idea. At such places it is impossible to avoid judgment about the appropriateness or otherwise of Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar's interpretation.

1.7.3. *Some of the important original contributions of the thesis*

This thesis consists of three parts: (1) Literature, (2) Grammar, (3) Linguistics. The first part concerns itself with a study of Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar's methods of literary appreciation, his appreciation of similes and metaphors and his interpretation of synonymy and polysemy. The second part confines itself to an analysis of Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar's scholarship in grammar. The methodology of Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar's grammatical criticism is explained and this attempt is made for the first time in a systematic manner only here. The third and the last part deals with his views on phonology, morphology, and syntax and semantics, and a comparison of the same with the modern opinions of the linguistic scholars, are dealt with in this part.

(1) In poetry, where it is possible to interpret lines in a literal manner without any strain, Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar interprets in a manner that comes for criticism by modern scholars. Such places have been critically investigated and it has been pointed out that he does so for some good reason. His abundant confidence in literary tradition and his magic touch which, creating a beauty out of recalcitrant material, conforms to tradition—have been examined.

(2) At times, Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar's interpretation though it might conform to grammar and tradition, might be lacking in content and depart from a normal, and natural interpretation. This work has pointed out such places.

(3) Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar does not, in some places, scrupulously follow his own dictum that the liberty of a poet must be within the bounds of grammar, and at such places his own interpretation exceeds the limits of grammar also. These points have been referred to in this thesis.

(4) Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar's commentary is mostly based upon refinement and culture. At places where the poet helps himself to the luxury of an image but at the cost of refinement and culture, he tries

to reconcile the passage, to the extent possible with the same. He succeeds in many places, but even his magic touch could not save some of the poems, especially in *Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi*, from such contradictions of traditional culture.

(5) *Nacciṅārkkīyār* does not interpret passages piecemeal. He has a thorough understanding of the whole epic, and so even apparently insignificant words open a vista of visions for him and his is a complete picture that sets the epic in proper light. The ordinary epithets, demonstratives, interrogatives, etc. are charged with splendid meanings, in conformity with the sequence of incidents in the epic.

(6) *Nacciṅārkkīyār* exploits some of the ordinary similes and metaphors in the poems or epic, to literary advantages. He extends their scope and holds that they are used to refer to past or future incidents. Even the conventional vocative epithets, used by the characters to one another, appear to him to be filled with meaning or significance. The attributes of the *upamānam* and *upamēyam* become separate similes in the hands of *Nacciṅārkkīyār*. The various stages of evolution that simile undergoes to blossom into metaphor are discussed with reference to *Nacciṅārkkīyār's* interpretation of both (simile and metaphor).

(7) Synonymy and polysemy are not mere physical forms of poetic acrobatics to him, but essential mediums that convey a world of meanings colourful in their variety and deep in their significance and he enlivens every such word with his own scholarship.

(8) The later developments in language have been reconciled to the grammatical sanctions given by *Tolkāppiyam* and for this purpose the commentator extends the scope of the sutrams by various methods of interpretation. Such methods have been critically examined in this work.

(9) *Nacciṅārkkīyār's* conceptions of 'ākupeyar' as against the traditional views have been investigated thoroughly. According to him ākupeyar is not based upon tradition and can be created as and when one desires, like *aṇmoḷittokai*. He gets confused with ākupeyar, participial nouns and metaphors.

(10) From *Nacciṅārkkīyār's* commentary it has been brought out that every tense contains the three sub-tense indications. There are nine tenses actually as derived from his work. All these tenses have been discussed with appropriate illustrations.

(11) The kinds of conjunctive suffix 'um' and the subtle variations in its meanings and conventional positions have been well brought out from the commentary of Naccinārkkiniyar. The 'um' in the negative sense has been classified into several sub-divisions and discussed in detail.

(12) The various subtle points derived by Naccinārkkiniyar's understanding of 'māṭṭēru' (application) have been analysed and dealt with in detail. It is to be understood from his commentary that the māṭṭēru plays an important role in reducing or increasing the scope of the meaning of one sutra and applying it to another.

(13) The order of placing ideas or things or the violation of it has various implications. All these implications, and various reasons for the order and its violation, have been investigated and classified.

(14) Naccinārkkiniyar uses the stress levels namely eṭuttal, paṭuttal, etc. junctures and pitch as phonemes differentiating the meanings of words and sentences and this is in conformity with the opinion of modern linguistic scholars to some extent.

(15) To the various types of sentences mentioned by Tolkāppiyar, Naccinārkkiniyar adds some more varieties which have been investigated and classified properly. The arrangement of subject, predicate, object, etc. in poetry is quite different from that in prose and the reasons for this have been studied and analysed as understood from Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary.

(16) The knowledge of semantic changes is important for the study of a language and literature and this is brought out with illustrations from Naccinārkkiniyar.

(17) The akṛṇai nouns with no gender indication (Pālpakā akṛṇai-p-peyar) is quite different from the nouns indicating 'Cāti orumai' and 'cāti-p-panmai' and this distinction has been pointed out with literary examples.

(18) It appears that the scope of two kinds of the first personal plural pronouns, one excluding and the other including the second person addressed have not been defined clearly by grammarians. Of the first personal pronouns, the 'yām' series excludes the second person and includes the third person, and the 'nām' series includes the second person—and this is understood from Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretations. There are also some other peculiarities with reference to the second personal pronouns and they are brought out with appropriate illustrations from Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary.

(19) Naccinārkkiniyar's scholarship in Sanskrit language and literature, his knowledge in Political, Social and religious history, his acquaintance with Vēdās, ākamās, purāṇās, ithikāsās etc., his familiarity with the traditional knowledge of natural and physical sciences etc., have been discussed briefly in the previous pages of this chapter. All these subjects can be studied in detail in future. This thesis attempts and the following nine chapters will provide a critical study of Naccinārkkiniyar's erudite scholarship in the Tamil language and literature alone.

PART I

NACCINĀRKKINIYAR AS A LITERARY CRITIC

CHAPTER 2

APPRECIATION OF POETRY

2.1. *The emphasis on the highest Ideals*

The literature of a language reflects the culture of the people who speak it. It reveals the tradition and social history and any work of a great poet should be studied in this light. In Tamil the poets aim at suggesting the highest ideals, but sometimes, these highest ideals may not be visible on the surface. Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar like other great commentators is never satisfied with the surface meaning. He dives deeper and succeeds in bringing out the real impact of the poets who are realistic in a sense emphasise the ideals to be always held in view by a society and culture on their march towards perfection.

2.1.1. *Chastity lights up the world*

In Maturaikkāñci there is a passage where the poet Marutaṅ Iṅāṅkaṅār describes the beauty of the women who live happily with their husbands.

“Tamaṅiyam vaḷayia tāvil viḷaṅkiḷai
Nilam viḷakku uḷuppa mētaka-p-polintu”¹

If we interpret the passage in a literal manner, it means that the women shone with the brightness of their golden ornaments lighting up the ground. But Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar is not satisfied with the literal-meaning of this passage. He cannot reconcile himself to the idea that all the good epithets should go to mere inanimate objects like ornaments. So he does not say that the brightness of their golden ornaments lights up the ground but instead he interprets it to mean that the greatest quality of the women, their chastity, lights up the world (not merely the ground, it should be noted) and he arrives at this meaning by interpreting the word ‘mētaka’ as ‘endowed with the greatest quality of chastity’. This explanation is daringly original and reflects the tradition of Tamil history.

2.1.2. *Contradiction to Dharma*

There is a passage in Kuṟiṅcikkali. The two young lovers have decided that each is born for the other and ‘Gandharva Marriage’ has

1. Maturai, 11, 704-705.

taken place. But the parents of the beloved decided to marry the heroine to somebody-else. At that time the lady companion of the heroine addresses the 'Cevili' (the foster mother):

“Cīru kuṭṭiyīrē cīrukuṭṭiyīrē
 Vaḷḷi kiḷ vīla varaimicai-t-tēṇ toṭā
 Kollai kural vāṅki iṇā malai vāḷnar
 Alla purintu oḷukalāṇ”.¹

She says that if the parents of the heroine decide to marry her to someone other than her lover, things, that are not good for the community, will take place. Here 'alla' means 'things that stand in contradiction to Dharma. Naccinārkkīṇiyar says that if things that stand in contradiction to Dharma are 'desired'—(interpreting the word 'purintu' as 'desired') then these bad things will occur. The main thing that stands in contradiction to Dharma is ignoring the lover who had saved the life of the girl when she was about to be drowned and to whom, because of his touching her in that act of saving, the girl had dedicated herself. This drawing out of the implication of 'alla' from the context is in accordance with the highest ideals. Naccinārkkīṇiyar's interpretation of 'purital' (to desire) is also important here. Though the word 'purital' has another meaning 'to do', Naccinārkkīṇiyar interprets it to mean 'to desire' because he is confident that even thinking of a bad thing amounts to the performance of it. In this connection one may cite Parimēlaḷakar's comment that 'thinking is doing'.²

2.1.3. Chastity for men

Chastity is the sterling quality prescribed not only for women but for men as well. Vaḷḷuvar calls this the real heroism in man. Naccinārkkīṇiyar is well aware of this dictum of Vaḷḷuvar, and he bears this in mind when he annotates a passage in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. Jīvaka's brother Nantaṭṭaṇ meets Kaṇakamālai, the wife of the former. Her body is wasting away because of the separation from Jīvakaṇ. This scene is described by Tēvar as follows :

“Tiṅkaḷ vāṇ mukamum nōkkāṇ
 Tiru mulai-ttaṭamum nōkkāṇ
 Aṅkatir-k-kalāpa miṇṇum
 Aṇi alkul parappum nōkkāṇ
 Ceṅkayal kaṇṇiṇāḷ taṇ
 Cīraṭi-c-cilampu nōkki

1. Kali; v. 39; 11-14

2. Kural; Pari; preface to Chapter 29.

Eñkuḷār aṭikaḷ enṇā
Inṇaṇṇam iyampinānē'.¹

The direct interpretation of this stanza would be that Nantaṭṭan does not look at the moon like face of Kaṇakamālai, does not look at the beautiful breasts; does not look at the 'alkul' (waist), but looks at the 'cilambu' on her feet and speaks, The poem, as interpreted thus, does not do credit to the poet. Here the reference to the face, breasts and waist seems to be unwarranted and such romantic imagery at a place where the woman in grief-stricken is repulsive.

The poet says that Nantaṭṭan does not look at these things, and it is difficult to understand why the poet should have mentioned these things at all. "In fine, then, the power to appeal to the emotions is always combined in literature with other qualities. When this appeal is the chief purpose of a work, then we have poetry".² When the poet describes such a situation, poignant with grief and distress, such descriptions are extravagant and unnatural. "And when the moment of intense feeling comes, fine phrasing is out of question."³

But here Naccinārkkiniyar comes to the rescue of the poet and interprets it in a way, that, instead of doing injustice to the poet, heightens the beauty of the poem. His interpretation is as follows :

"Nantaṭṭan does not look at the present paleness of the face that once looked like the moon; does not look at the present anaemic paleness that has come to stay in her once beautiful breasts; does not look at the dirty clothes that cover her once lovely waist (alkul) etc. But as he was standing with his head held down, he looks at her feet".

Here the grief of Kaṇakamālai and Nantaṭṭan is beautifully portrayed. The state in which Kaṇakamālai was living after her separation from Jivakan is dramatically presented. Her once beautiful looks are contrasted with her present grief-stricken condition, and this makes us feel sorry for her plight. The portrayal of Nantaṭṭan, standing with his head hung down, heightens the picture of sorrow and this becomes one of the most picturesque situations described in poetry - and this is achieved, one should remember, by the remarkable presentation of Naccinārkkiniyar.

2.2. *Resolving Contradictions*

A superficial study of the great poets may sometimes make one feel that some parts of a particular poem contradict each other. But

1. Jivaka; v. 1705.

2. Some principles of Literary Criticism; pp. 50-55.

3. The Discovery of Poetry; p. 184.

this is only apparent, and it becomes the duty of great commentators like Naccinārkkīṇiyar to reconcile this apparent contradiction.

2.2.1 *Implied contradiction*

Two ideas inconsistent with each other expressed in a poem, might be classified as a shortcoming, namely 'Māṟukoḷakkūṟal' in literary traditions,¹ if not properly understood.

"Iruvēm āynta maṇṇal itu"²

This line occurs in Kuṟiñci-p-pāṭṭu as a statement by the heroine. She is referring to the marriage that was solemnised earlier by the mutual consent of both the hero and the heroine. 'Āynta' normally means 'after deliberations'. So the line means, 'This is a marriage that has taken place after much deliberations'. There is a contradiction here, as the friend of the heroine refers to this consummation as something that has happened without any deliberation and without any reference to parental consent.³ So the word 'āynta' cannot be interpreted to mean 'deliberation.' The genius of Naccinārkkīṇiyar has not failed him. The Akam tradition would have it that the vulnerable obstacles of dignity (Perumai) and determination (uraṇ) in the hero and fear (accam) and shyness (nāṇam) in the heroine, will gradually diminish as the mutual love for each other is on the increase; and the consummation takes place only when both these aspects reach their respective limits.⁴ So Naccinārkkīṇiyar interprets this line to mean, "This is a marriage that has materialised after the respective aspects of dignity and determination, fear and shyness of the hero and heroine diminished". The word 'āynta' means diminished.⁵

2.2.2 *Explicit contradiction - oxymoron*

In Kalittokai there occurs a line,

"Nalkūrntār celvamakaḷ"⁶

'Nalkūrntār' means 'impoverished', and 'celvam' means 'rich', and so a superficial reading of the line would be, 'the rich daughter of the impoverished parents'. This is a fundamental contradiction even in the sequence of ideas. If one does not have children, that itself is considered as 'poverty'. So Naccinārkkīṇiyar interprets this line as

1. Tol. Poruḷ; Pēṟā; s. 663.

2. Kuṟiñci; 1. 21.

3. Kuṟiñci; 11. 30-32.

4. Iṟaiyaṇār; s. 9. p. 88.

5. Tol. Col. s. 330.

6. Kali; v. 50.

meaning, 'the rich daughter of the parents who suffered long the want of a child'.

2.2.3. *Idiomatic contradiction*

In Pattuppāṭṭu a line bearing a seeming contradiction in usage, occurs as follows :

“Karumpiṅ tīñcāṅu virumpiṅir micaimiṅ”¹

Here 'micaital' means 'to eat'.² The literal meaning of this line would be 'eat the juice of the sugarcane'.² The sugar-cane juice can only be drunk and not eaten. Naccinārkkiniyar reconciles this line to mean, 'after drinking the juice of the sugarcane, eat the sugar candy'.

Cāṅu virumpiṅir	-	juice drink (drink the juice)
(katti) micaimin	-	(sugar candy) eat (eat the sugar candy)

Thus by making tīñcāṅu (sweet juice) the object of 'virumpiṅir' (which means according to Naccinārkkiniyar, drink), he brings in 'kaṭṭi' meaning sugar candy as the object of 'micaimiṅ' (eat); sugar-candy is here understood. (But 'micaital' itself means eating, drinking, licking etc.³ If it is so, Naccinārkkiniyar's attempt to rationalise the usage of the word 'micaimiṅ' looks futile).

2.2.4. *Contradicting nature*

“In cāyal mārpan”⁴

is a line occurring in Kalittokai which refers to the hero. Here 'cāyal' means - delicate.⁵ This delicate trait is always attributed to women only. But here this line literally means 'the hero who possesses sweet and delicate chest', Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretation of this line is really something out of the ordinary. According to him, this line means to quote the words of the heroine, 'one who possesses my sweet and delicate chest'. (But "cāyal" meaning 'delicate' can be used in very few instances as a trait with reference to men. Puṇanāṅūru says Pāri is more sweet and delicate than water.⁶ Here "cāyal" means 'charity'. So, here this line "In cāyal mārpan" can also be interpreted as meaning 'one who has in abundance, the sweet quality of charity').

1. Perumpāṅ; 1. 262

2. Kali; v. 50: 2, Akam; v. 29: 3.

3. Tol. Col. Cāṅā; ss, 46, 47

4. Kali; v. 65:5

5. Tol. Col, s, 325

6. Puṇam; v. 105.

2.3. *The Function of Ambiguous Verbs*

The Tamil grammarians refer to *Taṭumāṅgu toḷir peyar* (ambiguous verb).¹ For instance :

“*Mīn Viḷuñkiṇa paiyaṅ*”
(fish swallowed boy)

This can be interpreted either as ‘the fish that ate the boy’ or ‘the boy that ate the fish’. “*Viḷuñkiṇa*” (swallowed is an ambiguous verb that can be attributed as a predicate (here transformed into a relative participle) either to the fish or to the ‘boy’. *Nacciṅārkkīyār* uses his knowledge of such verbs to literary advantage.

2.3.1. *Vēy nalam iḷanta tōḷ*

In *Kalittokai* there is a passage - ‘*Vēy nalam iḷanta toḷ*’². ‘*Nilam iḷanta*’ means that which lost its ‘charm’. What has actually lost the charm? Is it referring to the shoulders or the bamboo? ‘*Nalam iḷanta*’ can be attributed either to the bamboo or to the shoulders. *Nacciṅārkkīyār* interprets the line thus: ‘the bamboo has lost its charm because it cannot stand in comparison to the beauty of the shoulders’.

2.3.2. *Puṅ tavaḷ vēḷ kaṅ pāvai*

“*Puṅ tavaḷ vēḷ kaṅ pāvai*”³ means ‘wound-smelling Javelin-like eyes’. The smell of the wound is due to incessant killing of the foes. This is a traditional attribute. But *Nacciṅārkkīyār* would not interpret this in this conventional manner. He says ‘the Javelin that has caused wounds on foes:—‘*Puṅ tavaḷ vēḷ*’—the Javelin that is responsible for the spread of wounds on enemies. This removes the odium on the javelin. Also when we compare the eyes to the javelin, the epithet, “wound smelling”, looks unromantic. But now it would mean, the eyes, like the Javelin, have caused wounds in the hearts (symbolically) of those who see her. This heightens the beauty of the poem.

2.3.3. *Mai paṭu perum tōḷ maḷavar*

‘*Mai paṭu perum tōḷ Maḷavar*’⁴ is a line that occurs in *Maturai-kāñci*, *Mai paṭutal-‘kuṅṅam paṭutal’* i.e. blemished. Which got blemished? Does ‘*maipaṭutal*’ refer to the shoulders of the valiant

1. Tol. Col, Nac; s. 96.

2. Kali; v. 99:16

3. Jīvaka; v. 239

4. Maturai; 1. 687.

heroes? No-Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this as referring to the shoulders of valiant heroes that are responsible for blemishing or creating a blot (symbolically meaning defeating)—the shoulders of the enemies. The word 'enemies' is understood as an object of 'paṭu' and 'maipaṭuta' becomes the verb attributing the agency to the tōḷ of maḷavar.

2.3.4. *Uṇṇunar-t-taṭutta-nuvaṇai*

There is a passage in Malaipaṭukatām "uṇṇunar taṭutta nuṇṇiṭi nuvaṇai"¹. It literally means that the 'millet flour forbids those who come to eat'. The meaning is rather ambiguous, and does not convey any sensible idea. But the genius of Naccinārkkiniyar is not content with a literal interpretation of this line. So he investigates the matter still further. His meaning for this line is "the millet flour that has stopped those people who eat it from eating anything-else because of its own intrinsic sweet and delicious taste". There is another line in Malaipaṭukaṭām "cēru ciṇantu uṇṇunar taṭuttana tēmā"². 'The fruits were so sweet that they did not allow the people to eat anything-else'. In Perumpāṇāruppaṭai there is a line

"Palaviṇ cūḷi cuḷai-p-perum paḷam."³

Here Naccinārkkiniyar, instead of making the word 'cūḷi' an attribute of the succeeding word 'cuḷai', which will mean 'crowded juice-contents'—makes the word an attribute for a word which is understood, 'those who eat' and interprets it as 'the juice contents that draw many people who get crowded and would not leave'. Thus the sweetness of the 'Palā' is heightened.

2.3.5. *Pūṇ aṇi mārpa*

A messenger goes to Caccantaṇ and informs him of the attack by Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṇ. It was a convention in those days that when one addressed a king one had to eulogise him, wish him well and then speak. Accordingly the messenger addresses:

"Pūṇ aṇi mārpa"⁴

This line in the context of the convention described, should normally mean 'you wearing jewels on your chest'. But Naccinārkkiniyar is not content with such a prosaic interpretation as it would not be

-
1. Malai; 1. 445.
 2. Malai; 1. 137-138
 3. Perumpāṇā; 1. 356.
 4. Jīvaka; v. 264.

suitable in this context of war in which Caccantaṅ is going to be involved. So, he feels when the messenger addresses him as "Pūṇaṇi Mārpa", perhaps he is reminding Caccantaṅ of his valour which is evident in the phrase—"Pūṇaṇi mārpa" which is interpreted to mean, 'The brave chest that is responsible for its enemies to wear the armour in self-defence'. This heightens the beauty of the poem as the phrase 'Pūṇaṇi' annotated thus conveys truly the spirit of the circumstances i.e. the impending war and Caccantaṅ's duty therein. This reminds us of a passage in Rāmāyaṇam where Hanumāṅ, after his successful mission to Laṅka, returns to Rāmā, conveys the message of Sītā and in doing so, addresses him :

"Viṛ perum taṭaṅ tōḷ vīra"¹.

It implies that everything is set now and only he had to provide food for his bow.

2.3.6. *Mulai vaitta taṭam*

Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar, who, thus following tradition, makes the chest of kings the seat of valour, makes in a similar way the chest of women the seat of beauty. Kēmacari's chest is described as :

"Mulai vaitta taṭattu"²

i.e. the place where the breasts are located. This looks rather absurd and by no stretch of imagination can be called poetry. But Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar's interpretation makes it a very beautiful concert. "Taṭam", he means a 'small place' and "Mulai vaitta taṭam" means 'the small place that is left by the breasts'. The breasts though full leave a small portion out of affection and sentiment for their birth place (the chest). Out of generosity, they refrain from occupying the whole area of their birth place.

2.4. *The Importance of Poetic Names*

When a poet refers to a certain character by certain attributes or one of his characters addresses another using some attributes, these attributes may for all outward appearances look as used in a generic way rather than out of any particular reason. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar would not consider these attributes as conventional poetic names, but would go deeper into their significance and find some rational explanation for them. When many attributes are available, he would put this question to himself, "why should that particular poetic name have been chosen in preference to others?" He would

1. Kampar; Suntara kāṇṭam; v. 1312

2. Jivaka; 1514.

analyse it and bring out its importance, and this is one of his methods of literary appreciation.

“May be the poet might have used those epithets in the same sense as Naccinārkkiniyar explains them to keep in conformity with his literary genius. Eventhough the poet might have used some epithets in a conventional way, if the literary critic is able to rationalise them and find some coherent beauty in the same, we cannot but appreciate it. Perhaps it is the duty of the literary critic to engage himself in such pursuits”¹.

2.4.1. *Vaḷḷal*

Tiruttakka Tēvar refers to Jivakan at two places, as ‘Vaḷḷal’, ‘Puravalan’ (Philanthropist, or patron). Since Jivakan is the hero of Jivaka Cintāmaṇi, it is but natural that he should have been so referred to, to befit his greatness. But Naccinārkkiniyar cannot reconcile himself to this kind of barren interpretation. He feels that there should be other reasons for this reference. He thinks that these words should have some special significance in the particular context.

The many kings who lost ‘Tattai’ to Jivakan, in the Viṇā(yā) competition, under the instigation of Kaṭṭiyaṅkaran, declare war against Jivakan. And he bends his bow, and shoots arrows that frighten away many kings and make them take to their heels. Their Royal umbrellas are broken, shields shattered etc. Here Jivakan is referred to by the poet as ‘Vaḷḷal’ (Philanthropist)². It looks rather ridiculous that Jivakan should be called a ‘Vaḷḷal’ when he has wrought a complete destruction of the possession of the other kings. So Naccinārkkiniyar pauses and thinks why the poet should have called Jivaka a ‘Vaḷḷal’. He argues that, as Jivakan while scaring them away by smashing their ‘Royal ‘Fans’ and ‘umbrellas’, has spared their lives by not killing them, he is called ‘Vaḷḷal’—here he has granted their lives to them, and has thus proved himself a generous giver.

2.4.2. *Puravalan*

There is yet another place where Jivakan is referred to as ‘Puravalan’ (patron or guardian). Kaṭṭiyaṅkaran’s soldiers arrest Jivakan and while he is taken prisoner, the poet uses this epithet—‘Puravalan’ while referring to him.³ “Puravalan” means ‘patron’

1. Ilakkiyakkalai; p. 41.

2. Jivaka; v. 797

3. Jivaka; v. 1096.

or 'guardian'. It is not very difficult for Jivakaṇ to set himself free from Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṇ's men by killing them all as that suits his skill, but he does not do it and hence, he is a custodian of their lives.

2.4.3. *Cilavalāy*

Anāṅkamālai is in love with Jivakaṇ, but she is kidnapped by Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṇ and he embraces her. But she is thinking only of Jivakaṇ and she cries in distress. "Cilai valāi Jivakasāmi come and embrace me"¹. "Cilavalāy" just means 'you, who are well versed in using the bow', but Naccinārkkiniyar says that this form of address is used deliberately and there is some special significance for the same. 'You who are well-versed in using the bow' please come and show your skill to defeat the designs of this villain.' Naccinārkkiniyar gives this interpretation for this way of addressing him and also it looks apt in this context.

2.4.4. *Cilavittakaṇē*

Kēmacari, after her separation from Jivakaṇ, thinks of him and pines away in grief. She thinks of the good old days of romantic thrill, quarrels etc. To pacify her, sometimes Jivakaṇ used to prostrate himself on the floor and caress her feet. She indulges in this sort of soliloquy addressing Jivakaṇ therein as

'Cilai vittakaṇē'²

which means literally, 'one who is well versed in using the bow'. But Naccinārkkiniyar is not satisfied with a literal interpretation of this line. So he says 'the bow as it bends more, causes greater harm, so also the more Jivakaṇ bends down before her, he has some ulterior aim that might cause her harm in the romantic sense. There are many other similar instances in Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary.'³

2.4.5. *Makkaḷ and Mākkaḷ*

The first 'a' in the former is a short vowel, and the same in the latter is a long one. Both words mean, 'people'. People endowed with only five senses are called "Mākkaḷ" (long) and people with six senses are called 'Makkaḷ' (short)⁴. But in actual usage in

1. Jivaka; v. 687.

2. Jivaka; v. 1514.

3. Porunar; l. 212, Kali; v. 114; B Jivaka; vv. 393, 1661, 2221 etc.

4. Tol. Porul Pērā; ss. 587, 588

literature, both of them are used without any discrimination but Naccinārkkiniyar following Tolkāppiyam always differentiates these two terms. In Porunarāruppaṭai there occurs a phrase :

“Tavam cey Mākkaḷ”¹

the second Mākkaḷ (long) is used here. Naccinārkkiniyar feels that there should be some reason for the poet to use this particular word in this context, and he is able to find one. The meaning of this line would be ‘those who by Tapas (Penance) are able to achieve all the material benefits of this life’. The ultimate goal is Mōksha and it should be the sole aim of Tapas. But the people referred to here do Tapas to enjoy only the material benefits and as such, Naccinārkkiniyar argues they do not deserve to be called ‘Mākkaḷ’ gifted with six senses, but must be only called as ‘Mākkaḷ’ (long) and hence the poet has used this word.

2.4.6. Maṭam

“Maṭavōr kāṭci nāṇi kata vaṭaittu” is another line in Pattup-pāṭṭu². The Pāṇar (Musicians) are having their humble gruel after shutting the doors of their house. They feel shy of others seeing their simple and humble food. Here on lookers are referred to as ‘Maṭavōr’ meaning ‘ignorant’. Naccinārkkiniyar attaches some importance to this word ‘Maṭavōr’. He feels that the poet should have used it for some specific reason. They are ignorant according to him, because they do not know that poverty is not a sin and one should not be blamed for the same. Fortune turns like a wheel and one who is rich today may become poor tomorrow and the one poor today may become rich tomorrow. So Naccinārkkiniyar says that they are ignorant as they do not know even this simple thing.

2.5. The Significance of Attributes

The poets employ attributes to glorify a thing or sometimes its action. The attributes not only have their natural meanings but have some extra significance as well which is well-understood only by great commentators. The commentator if he concerns himself only with the linguistic study, cannot conceive of the deep meaning inside, but would know its part of speech and linguistic associations. But, for a literary critic, it is a treasure house of information replete with literary possibilities.

1. Porunar; i. 91.

2. Ciṅupāṇ; 1. 138.

2. 5. 1. *Same attribute with different meanings*

The same epithet may mean differently at different places according to its association.

1. Kallā Ijaiñar collikkāṭṭa.
2. Kallā Ijaiyar mella-t-taivara.
3. Kallā Ijaiñar Kāvaṃam kaippa.
4. Kallā māntaroṭu nakuvaṇar tiṭaiṭṭa.
5. Aruvarai Viṭṭa taṇ kallā-p-pārppu.
6. Kallā-k-kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṇ.
7. Kallā māntiri viṭṭukappaṭṭāṇ.
8. Kallā Ijaiyar Kalaṅkā-c-cirippoliyum.

The same word 'kallā' is used in all these places. Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar finds different meanings for this word and selects them according to the situation. 'Kallā' according to Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar, means those who have not learnt anything-else except their own occupation. 'Kalla Ijaiñar' or 'Kallā Ijaiyar' are those youths who run on small errands ordered by their masters, and they do not know anything-else except this¹. In another place 'Kallā Ijaiñar' means those who attend to the elephant, and whose knowledge of things does not extend beyond this². 'Kallāmāntar' in Maturaiṅkāṅci refers to those people who are enjoying all the time with women and so according to Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar, they have not learnt anything beyond this³.

In some places, he does not hold 'Kallā' as a negative word, but considers this as an affirmative word. Kallā - 'who have learnt'. He says those youths who have fully learnt the art of eulogising the king⁴. In 'Kallā Ijaiñar' those youths who attend on elephants know some of the Sanskrit words used to tame the elephants. But their knowledge of Sanskrit is not fundamental. So Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar says these have not learnt Sanskrit basically but have learnt some of the words used to tame the elephants⁵.

The phrase Kallā-p-pārppu occurs in Malaipaṭukaṭām⁶. Here it refers to the little one of the monkey. As it has not learnt leaping, it has to hold to its mother. But, at one time it has forgotten to

-
1. Porunar; 1.100, Ciṅupāṇ; 1.33.
 2. Mullai; 1. 36.
 3. Maturai; 1. 420.
 4. Porunar; 1. 100.
 5. Mullai; 1. 36.
 6. Malai; 1. 312.

do so and it falls. So, naturally the poet says that 'Kallā' means 'that which has not learnt holding to its mother. It must be noted that the commentator has not brought out the meaning of this word in Jīvaka Cintāmañi, as he has scrupulously done in Sangam classics.¹

2.5.2. *Attribute with special significance*

The natural attributes in poetry have also some special significance for the commentator. When a poet describes the sea, we would naturally say, the sea with waves that are thrown on the shore. Such a thing occurs in Kalittokai:

“Kuṛiyiṅṛi-p-paṅṅāl niṅ,
Kaṭuṅ tiṅṅēr varu patam kaṅṅu
Eṅṅi tirai imiḷ kāṅṅal
Etir koṅṅāḷ”²

Here the heroine is looking forward to the arrival of the hero. She has been waiting for him, hoping to hear the sound of his chariot. She is waiting at the sea shore. The sea-shore is described “Eṅṅi tirai imiḷ kāṅṅal.” That the waves should roar is a natural description of the seashore. But, for Naccinārkkiniyar the description of the roaring of the sea, has a special meaning, in as much as in spite of the sea roaring, heroine has been keenly waiting to hear the sound of the chariot, and she could feel it too. Such is her love for the hero and only to describe this, the imagery of the roaring sea is described. The backdrop of the roaring sea, the picture of the heroine waiting at the sea-shore with her ears sharp to recognise the sound of the chariot of her lover, — all these create an atmosphere of absolute beauty and charm.

2.5.3. *Words with and without attributes*

Certain words by themselves have one meaning, and when used as attributes, have another. Naccinārkkiniyar discerns the meaning of both. The poet describes the Ēmāṅkata country :—

“Naṅṅravam ceyvārkkku iṅṅam;
Tavam ceyvārkkum aktu iṅṅam.
Naṅṅ poruḷ ceyvārkkku iṅṅam.
Poruḷ ceyvārkkum aktu itam”³

1. Jīvaka: vv. 385, 747, 2978.

2. Kali; v. 127: 10-11.

3. Jīvaka: v. 77.

Naccinārkkīṇiyar interprets the words in the following way :—

Tavam	—	A good domestic life on the foundation of Dharma having in view the life beyond
Nar̥ravam	—	Tavam done for attaining of Mōksha.
Poruḷ	—	Wealth that is not permanent.
Nar̥poruḷ	—	Education that teaches what is permanent

2.5.4. *Contradictory attributes*

The characteristic trait of a particular thing described as an attribute may precede as an adjective or succeed as a predicate such as ‘Nar̥ poruḷ nilai uṭaiyatu’. Sometimes there may be apparent contradiction in the description and Naccinārkkīṇiyar interprets them in his own way, relieving them of such contradiction.

“Cel icai nilaiiya paṇṇiṇ
Nalliyakkōṭaṇ”¹

Here ‘Icai’ meaning ‘fame’ which has been attributed by two words : cel (attribute word) and ‘nilaiiya’ (predicate word) ‘Cel, ‘means that which goes away’ and ‘nilaiiya’ means, ‘that which is permanent’. Both stand in contradiction to each other. So Naccinārkkīṇiyar explains them without contradiction, — the ‘fame’ that does not stand in others (that goes away) but which stands permanent with reference to the hero described (Nalliya-k-kōṭaṇ).

2.5.5. *Ill-placed attributes*

There are some attributes that appear ill-placed with reference to certain nouns. In Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi, there is a passage, which describes the marriage arranged by the parents for their girls. Even if the bridegrooms are as bad as monkeys, the brides have to take them as their husbands and worship them. Here referring to the monkey it is said

“Nan̥ kuranku”²

‘Nan̥’ means ‘good’. But here kuraṅku (monkey) occurs not in a good sense. The attribute ‘nan̥’ is ill-placed. So Naccinārkkīṇiyar interprets the attribute so as to avoid the want of propriety i.e. “the monkey which is good for bad things”. This relieves the passage of the contradiction and also indirectly suggests that those youths may be apparently good but their goodness is only for bad things.

1. Ciṅṅupāṇ; 11. 268-269.

2. Jīvaka; v. 1997.

2.5.6. *Attributes with different meanings*

Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary is great from another point of view. It consists in bringing out the full force and beauty of attributes or epithets when sometimes the seeming attribute is explained.

‘Nuṇ mati pōṇṇu tōṇṇā nuṇukiya nucuppiṇār’¹

Like the keen intellect of a learned person, the waist that is not obvious to our eyes. Caccantaṇ loses his kingdom because of his excessive love for women. Vijaiyai, his wife laments over his fate and mentions this in particular. Naccinārkkiniyar does not consider the attribute ‘Nuṇmati’, as describing the waist of a woman, as such comparisons in this context are extravagant. Therefore he contends that this particular line refers to the incident i.e. Caccantaṇ's handing over the administration to Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṇ which appeared to be an act of subtle intelligence. In other words this particular action of giving the administrative reins to his minister seems to the king as the only wise thing he could do. So the commentator is justified in explaining the passage in this way as the wife of the late lamented king would not with any propriety describe the waist of women so deliberately in such tragic circumstances especially when she is speaking of herself through that reference to women. Literature is that which describes right emotion at the right place.

2.6. *Demonstratives and Interrogatives*

Great poets, when they refer to a thing or an incident that has been described earlier would refer to the same by demonstratives, — atu, itu, aktu, iktu, aṇṇatu, iṇṇatu, aṇṇaṇ, iṇṇaṇ, aṇṇēṇ, āṅku, iṅku etc., and if they have to put it in the question form they use interrogatives: etu, yātu, eṇ, etc. Those things that are referred to, might precede the demonstratives or interrogatives or succeed them which are distant or proximate or that which is known only to one's ownself. Either the description consists of a single word or of many words, Naccinārkkiniyar finds special significance in all these things. He interprets them in a way that makes even these mechanical devices of demonstratives and interrogatives attain special meaning and beauty.

2.6.1. *The demonstrative ‘a’ that comes as an attribute*

The marriage of Jivakaṇ with Kuṇamālai is described by the poet. Jivakaṇ, who marries Kuṇamālai is here mentioned by a phrase.

1. Jivaka; v. 2611.

“A-v-vēnilān” (that Maṇmataṇ)¹

What does the demonstrative attribute ‘a’ (that) mean here? There is no previous reference to him at all in this poem. So, Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar obviously think it should be referring to something-else. He interprets the idea in a very ingenious way. Maṇmataṇ, the God of Love, has no physical form as he has been burnt down by ‘Lord Siva’. So, to compare Jivakaṇ to Maṇmataṇ, whose physical form had been destroyed, is not apt. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, therefore concludes that “a + vēnilān” i.e. “that Maṇmataṇ” refers to that Maṇmataṇ who had his physical form before Siva burnt him. So he says “a” refers to :

“Nutaḷ Viḷikku aḷiyāta kāmaṇ”

“that Maṇmataṇ not burnt by the eye on the forehead of Lord Siva.”

2.6.2, *The demonstratives ‘anna’, ‘inna’*

The Porunaṇ (musician) who is entertained by the king undergoes a metamorphosis. He says the physical form he had the previous evening (i.e. the impoverished state) before meeting Karikālā, and the physical form he has now (prosperous) after having been entertained by Karikālā, are so different that they have no relation to each other, and people who have seen him on both the occasions are surprised to see the change. Here the line that occurs :

“Mālai aṇṇatōr puṇamaiyum”²

It means, ‘that impoverished state in which he was the previous evening’. Here Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar investigates the use of the demonstrative ‘aṇṇatu’. He calls it :

“Neṅcari cuṭṭu”

It means, ‘that which he himself or his mind alone knows’ i.e. ‘the impoverished state which was well-known to him’. The big family that is always in a state of abject penury,³ the poverty that sends these people to seek their patrons like birds that would seek the trees with plenty of fruits,⁴ the famished bodies,⁵ the clothes that were

1. Jivaka; v. 1063.

2. Porunar; 1. 96.

3. *Ibid*; 11. 61-62.

4. Porunar; 11. 64-67.

5. Porunar; 1. 68.

ruled by lice and their eggs¹ — all these conditions are well described by that demonstrative “*aṅṅatu*”. So Naccinārkkiniyar says it is “*neñcari cuṭṭu*”. There are other passages also where Naccinārkkiniyar investigates and gives the meanings of the demonstratives used in this manner.²

2.6.3. *The demonstrative ‘iṅku’*

Jivakaṅ, after leaving his wife Kamacari, passes through a forest. There he stays in a beautiful garden and witnesses two scenes. Aṅaṅkamāvīṅai, a beautiful woman, falls in love with Vanacaritaṅ and tries to attract him. But he, controlling his own senses, spurns this offer, and attempts to make her understand the cheapness of lust.³ But at another place, Aṅaṅkamāvīṅai’s husband Bavadattaṅ thinks of her, and pines away in grief.⁴ Jivakaṅ, who is a witness to both scenes, smiles within himself. He goes to Vanacaritaṅ, and when he welcomes him, he tells :

“*Īṅkē iru nī*”⁵

This means normally “Here stay thou”. But in the hands of Naccinārkkiniyar, the demonstrative ‘*iṅkē*’ in this phrase develops a beautiful meaning which suits the context. Vanacaritaṅ rises in the esteem of Jivakaṅ, as he, controlling his own senses, advises her to vacate all such evil thoughts from her mind, emphasising the cheapness of lust. This attracts Jivakaṅ to a great extent, and so he says: “*Īṅkē iru nī*”. It means, ‘you continue to be like this in the same situation’ i.e. with such determination for ever — Naccinārkkiniyar interprets “*Īṅkē iru nī*” as meaning ‘hold your mind as you have done now without allowing it to go as it pleases’. This is more or less a quotation from Tirukkuraḷ.⁶ So he contends that ‘*iṅku*’ is an uvama urupu (a sign denoting the comparison) like “*āṅku*” (this is interpreted as an uvama urupu which has also the force of the proximate demonstrative suggested by the comparison). Naccinārkkiniyar’s interpretation for this demonstrative ‘*iṅku*’ heightens the beauty of the poem.

2.6.4. *The interrogative ‘en’*

Jivakaṅ tells Bavadattaṅ all the evils of lust, but he himself later on thinks of Tattai and feels for the separation. In spite of his

1. *Ibid*; 11. 79-81.

2. *Kali*; v. 140 : 12. *Jivaka*; vv. 1261, 1288, 1669.

3. *Jivaka*; vv. 1567-1585.

4. *Ibid*; vv. 1586-1592.

5. *Jivaka*; v. 1593.

6. *Kūraḷ*; v. 422.

efforts to control himself he could not and all his learning which primarily concerns itself in teaching a man how to control his senses and culture is of no avail before his love for the woman. When a man is in love, even his learning is of no use as it is not able to teach him self-control. Jivakaṇ thinks like this and says :

“Eṇṇum eṇ ne ṇcu”¹

It literally means “my mind thinks.” But Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar does not interpret this in this manner, but says : “Eṇṇum neṇcu eṇ” — my mind thinks’ and he finds a separate meaning for the word ‘eṇ’ which is according to him an interrogative. He says that Jivakaṇ is thinking aloud that what evil thing he could have done as even his education is of no avail at a time when it is very necessary that it should teach him self-control. ‘Eṇ neṇcu’ means ‘my mind’ literally. Also ‘neṇcu in this context should mean only “my mind.” So, the word ‘eṇ’ is superfluous. This is the reason why Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar interprets the word ‘eṇ’ as referring to the idea quoted above. What apparently seems to us as superfluous, in the hands of Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, attains special significance and deep meaning.

2.6.5. *Demonstrative with interrogative*

Jivakaṇ defeats Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṇ and this war is elaborately described by Tiruttakka dēvar. There is a particular incident where a warrior (belonging to the enemy) encounters Vipulaṇ (Jivakaṇ’s brother) and asks him to stab him, as both are equals. Vipulaṇ says :

“Atuvō”²

What does this demonstrative pronoun ‘atu’ (that) refer to? Is there any special significance for the interrogative suffix ‘ō’? There was a tradition in olden days to offer one’s chest for the enemy’s sword, and it was considered as the height of valour. Accordingly the warrior offers himself to Vipulaṇ for being stabbed. But Vipulaṇ, thinking of this tradition, does not want to offer this fame to the warrior so easily. So he says : “Do you want to achieve fame, like that? No I will not give you”. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar says that this is the meaning of “atu ō”. (Is it that?) ‘Atu ō’ is pregnant with the meaning according to Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar. Atu (it) refers to the fame mentioned above. ‘O’ occurs in the negative sense meaning “I shall

1. Jivaka; v. 1632.

2. Jivaka; v. 2263.

not give you that opportunity". This is evident from the fact that Vipulan laughed because he did it in a satirical way. Naccinārkkiniyar's splitting of the words as 'atu' and 'ō' and exploiting them to literary advantage is really remarkable and it reminds us of the statement of a great scholar". "When anyone wants to give vent to a strong feeling he does not stop to consider the logical analysis of his ideas, but language furnishes him with great many adequate means of bringing the state of his mind to the consciousness of his hearer or hearers"¹.

2.7. Singular Plural-Mixture

In the poetry of eminent poets, sometimes there might be a mixture of numbers-singular and plural, what might apparently seem a grammatical error. But great commentators explain this mixture in a satisfactory fashion. Tolkāppiyar has also sanctioned this mixture in his grammar.² So Naccinārkkiniyar follows the rules of Tolkāppiyar in this connection and also explains other places that occur in violation of Tolkāppiyam, where he brings out the literary advantage accruing through such mixture of numbers.

2.7.1. Singular for plural

The cowherds celebrate 'Ēru taḷuval'. It means that "he who would tame the wild bulls could marry the girl to whom they belong". The girl is praying that her lover should be able to tame the bulls. At this time her left eyelid throbs. This is a good omen for women. So she is happy that her lover would be able to tame the bulls. This occurs in Kalittokai.

"Vēḷāṇmai ceytaṇa kaṇ"³

'Vēḷāṇmai ceytaṇa' means 'indicated good'. 'Ceytaṇa' is a plural predicate; 'kaṇ' (meaning eye), though elsewhere it may be common to both the singular and plural is here singular as only the throbbing of the left eyelid indicates good. Here the poet has used a plural predicate for a singular subject. It is an error according to the rules of grammar. But Naccinārkkiniyar by his interpretation removes what apparently seems to us, a mistake. He says that 'Vēḷāṇmai ceytaṇa' means "indicated good" i.e. the right eyelid does not throb (that is also an indication of good) and the left eyelid throbs and in this way both the eyes have indicated good one by throbbing and the other by not throbbing. So 'kaṇ' according to him is plural and it justifies the predicate 'ceytaṇa'.

1. Essentials of English Grammar; p. 105.
2. Tol. Col. Nac; ss. 461, 462.
3. Kalī; v. 101 : 45-46.

2.7.2. *Plural for Singular*

There is another situation where plural subject and predicate have been used for singular subject and predicate. In Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi the maidens of Kuṣamālai and Curamañcari bring their respective 'cuṇṇam' to Jīvakaṇ and ask him which of them is better prepared. Jīvakaṇ, when they are brought to him, says 'Ivai nalla'.¹ It means 'These are good' since he is asked to state specifically which of them is good, his reply, 'these are good', which literally means 'both are good' is not an answer to the question put to him and we naturally think that a person of the ingenuity of Jīvakaṇ, would not commit such a blunder. 'Ivai nalla'—is grammatically correct but it is not an answer to the question asked. The maidens, who took the 'cuṇṇam' to him, think that he has not specifically answered the question and feel sorry for the same. But Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar states Jīvakaṇ has answered their question properly. According to him, Jīvakaṇ says that this 'cuṇṇam' prepared by Kuṣamālai is better than the one prepared by Curamañcari. If so why is he using 'ivai' (these) the plural instead of the singular 'itu' (this)? 'Cuṇṇam' however is prepared by a mixture of various things—and so, when Jīvakaṇ says 'Ivai nalla' (they are good), he has in mind the various good ingredients that have gone to make the good mixture of that 'cuṇṇam' and so the plural indicates only those things. In this way Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar's explanation brings out the subtlety of Jīvakaṇ's remark.

2.8. *The Scope of Compound Words*

There are phrases with close juncture that occur qualifying the succeeding nouns. They have the characteristic of a single word like Karuṅkutirai (Black horse).² But Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar does not interpret this as a phrase that qualifies the succeeding noun but treats the words separately which, as a matter of fact, is in the interests of the consistency of the passage. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar writes his commentary on a work, only after an exhaustive study of the whole work. So when he interprets an earlier passage he bears in mind that which succeeds much later. We have discussed elsewhere how Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar splits the words to grammatical advantage.³ Now we are concerned with the same from a literary point of view.

2.8.1. *Katuntirai nōyakaṣum*

Cutanjaṇaṇ, a Dēvaṇ teaches Jeevaka three Mantras and their effects. The effect of one Mantra is described thus:-

-
1. Jīvaka; v. 884.
 2. Tol. Eḷuttu. Nac; ss. 24, 26 etc.
 3. Infra; p. 186, 6. 4. 2.

“Pāmpum allavum
Kaṭuntīral nōykaḷum keṭukkum”¹

“Kaṭuntīral nōykaḷ”—means literally, if one forgets for a moment how Naccinārkkiniyar has interpreted this, “serious diseases”. Kaṭuntīral normally qualifies nōykaḷ (diseases) but Naccinārkkiniyar does not interpret this like this. He says ‘Kaṭuntīrals and noykaḷ’—Here Kaṭuntīrals’ mean, according to him, air, fire and water. The Mantram that is taught by the Dēva will make the poisons, and snakes etc. and air, fire and water, and diseases ineffective. Why should this line be interpreted thus? When a forest fire surrounds a group of elephants, Jīvakaṇ pronounces the Mantra which brings rain and relief to the elephants.² He is able to do this because of the Mantra he learns from Gutañjaṇ. Naccinārkkiniyar’s anticipation of this passage coming much later is really remarkable. There is another line

“Kōpperuntēvi Koṟṟak kōmakaṇ”.³

Here Naccinārkkiniyar does not annotate the phrase Kōpperuntēvi’ directly as meaning, ‘the queen’ but split the word into two, ‘kō’ and ‘Peruntēvi’ meaning, the king and the queen. Koṟṟakkōmakaṇ here means the son of the king. The whole line means,

“King Daṇapati, Queen Tilōttamai, prince Ulōkapālan”

only these three people were concerned with the marriage of Patumai with Jīvakaṇ.

2.8 2. Kaṭṭil

Naccinārkkiniyar has another way of splitting i. e. he will split not a compound but a single word itself (that lends itself for such splitting) which may apparently seem unnecessary. Jīvakaṇ and Vimalai after their marriage are immersed in happiness.

“Kaṭṭil ēṟiya kāmāru kāḷaiyum
Maṭṭu vāy aviḷ māmalar-k-kōtaiyum”.⁴

Here the natural meaning of the word ‘kaṭṭil’ is ‘cot’. But Naccinārkkiniyar is not content with a prosaic and crude interpretation of the word, but he splits the word into ‘kaṭṭu + il’ meaning family life to which Jīvakaṇ is well and truly bound.

1. Jīvaka; v. 1218.

2. Jīvaka; v. 1237.

3. *Ibid*; v. 1343.

4. Jīvaka; v. 1981.

2.8.3. *Kāvalaṅ*

Vijayai, Jīvakaṅ's mother, when she meets her friends tells the story of Jīvakaṅ's father.

“Taraṅi kāvalaṅ Caccantaṅ eṅpavaṅ
Paraṅi nāḷ piṅantaṅ pakai yāvaiyum
Araṅilāṅ eṅkaṅ taṅkiya aṅpiṅāl
Iraṅiyaṅ paṅṅtatu emmiṅrai eytiṅāṅ”¹

Vijayai laments the loss of her husband Caccantaṅ who, because of his excessive love for her, suffered the same fate as Iraṅiyaṅ.

Taraṅi kāvalaṅ Caccantaṅ

Here this phrase means Caccantaṅ, the custodian of the earth i.e. King Caccantaṅ. But Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar splits the word as Taraṅi kāvalaṅ i.e. ka + alaṅ; “the king, because of his excessive love for her, was not a custodian as he should have been.” Here it gives entirely the opposite meaning. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar gives the reason why Caccantaṅ was defeated by Kaṅṅiyaṅkāraṅ. He did not do the normal function of a king i.e. giving protection and security for the people. He did not do this because of his excessive love for his wife and he was all the time engaged in seeking the pleasures of married life. This meaning reads better in the poem.

2.8.4. *Muṅivarum*

Kaluḷavēkaṅ addresses Cītattaṅ. He says that if women were to live alone without their husbands, theirs is a miserable life.

“Muṅivarum pōkapūmi-p-pōkam muṅṅātu peṅṅum
Taṅiyavarāki vāḷtal cātuyar ataṅiṅ illai”²

These lines mean that even if they were to be saints happily endowed with all the pleasures of the “Swarga pūmi” (heaven), if they were to live alone, sorrow is as great as death itself. Here it looks though the poet emphasises the importance of married life, he has apparently done injustice to the saints. But the author of Jīvaka Cintāmaṅi is himself a saint. Would he have brought down the prestige of the saints like this? So Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar interprets the line by splitting the word ‘Muṅivarum’—‘Muṅivu+arum’ i.e. the Swarga pūmi that cannot be disliked. Even if women were to have the pleasures of a

1. Jīvaka; 1813.

2. Jīvaka; v. 553.

Swarga pūmi, that cannot be disliked, where they were to live alone, the sorrow is as great as death itself.

2.8.5. *Niṇaintirukkum*

There are verbs which have the characteristic of a single word, which usually are not split into two. But according to Naccinārkkiniyar the poet would not use unnecessary particles in addition to the main verbs. In such places Naccinārkkiniyar interprets two different meanings and heightens the beauty of the poem.

The companion of the heroine wants to impress upon her the hero's pathetic plight, and his request. He comes, entreats and bows to her. But she is afraid that this action of his, should not draw any public attention as it might lead to criticism. So she prevents him from doing that and so she says:

“Pōkkuñkāḷ pōkku niṇaintirukkum”¹.

It means when he is asked to leave, he thinks of leaving. ‘Niṇaintirukkum’ means ‘thinks’—it is a single word used as such normally. But Naccinārkkiniyar splits the word into two ‘Niṇaintu’ (thinks) and ‘Irukkum’ (stays). When he is asked to leave he thinks of the distress that the separation is giving and hence he stays. If it is interpreted as to mean that he thinks of leaving and since thinking amounts to action, it will mean he would leave. But this will not bring home the persistent attitude of the hero in achieving his aim, and hence, the companion of the heroine cannot also convince herself of the true love he has for her. The persistence of the hero in staying there is very well brought out by Naccinārkkiniyar’s commentary. ‘Irukkum’ that appears as an unnecessary word, in the hands of Naccinārkkiniyar, becomes a useful vehicle that beautifully portrays the Akam traditions.

2.8.6. *Uyttiṭṭaṇar*

The people in the forest region go to the king and complain of their cattle (cows) being forcibly driven away by the hunters. It occurs thus :

“Iraiyaṇikkēṭka uyttiṭṭaṇar pūcal”²

It means that cowherds go very near the king and shout so that he can hear. ‘Iṭu’ is an auxiliary verb. But Naccinārkkiniyar splits the phrase as—

1. Kali; v. 63:3.
2. Jīvaka; v. 427.

“Pūcal uyttu iṭṭaṇar”

meaning, that the cowherds carried the blame and placed it on the shoulders of the king. It is the duty of the king to guarantee safety and security for the people. But here, he has failed in his duty. This is driven home by the cowherds and this is obvious only when it is interpreted as “uyttu iṭṭaṇar”. (Parimēlaḷakar also interprets the verb ‘uytturaittār’ like this).¹

2.8.7. *Maṇantiruntār*

Nacciṇārkkiniyar splits the verb in a different way also. There is a line in Kalittokai:

‘Maṇantiruntār enṇāy nī
Malaiyiṭtai vantakkāl’²

It means “without creating an impression that you have forgotten us, you are coming, crossing the mountains.” Here we anticipate that Nacciṇārkkiniyar will split the word ‘Maṇantiruntār’ into Maṇantu + iruntār’. But he does not do so, contrary to our expectations. But he splits the word as “Maṇam + Tiruntār” and again ‘tiruntār’ is used according to Nacciṇārkkiniyar as a positive word. The line means according to Nacciṇārkkiniyar that “you are coming crossing the mountains, not withstanding the people of the forest regions who are capable of killing you”. Here the hero’s adventurous mood is beautifully portrayed. Also in the earlier lines, the lady companion describes all the hazards, the hero is facing when he comes to the heroine, hazards like snake, darkness etc.³ So it is befitting that this also should be interpreted in this manner, and it has a continuity in thinking. Only the valour of the hero is aptly revealed if it is said that he, in spite of all these hazards, comes with a solitary determination to meet the heroine.

2.9. *The Splitting of Sentences*

Nacciṇārkkiniyar also splits the sentences to literary advantage.

2.9.1. *Inyāl itu uyttu-k-koṭumō*

During a yāl (Viṇā) competition, Tattai tells her friend Viṇāpati to give the yāl to Jīvakaṇ.

1. Kuṇal; v. 1076, Pari.

2. Kali; v. 38:18.

3. Kali; v. 38:10-17.

“Eliṟṟakai mārpaṟku inyāḷ
Itu uyttu-k-koṭumō eṇṟāḷ”¹

This literally means “you please give Jīvakaṇ, the beautiful and melodious yāḷ”—But Naccinārkkiniyar interprets the line as meaning “this melodious yāḷ is intended for Jīvakaṇ. But do not give it in the first instance. Give him many other yāḷs and finally this one”. In this sense he splits this sentence as follows:

“Eliṟṟakai mārpaṟku inyāḷ itu
uyttu koṭumō.”

‘uyttu’ is interpreted as meaning “give him, many other yāḷs” and “koṭumō” meaning ‘give him’ is in reference to the specific yāḷ. So, according to him, there are two objects for ‘uyttu’ and ‘koṭumō’ and this explanation has relevance. Not only he considers, two predicates for a single object are superfluous, but he bears in mind the succeeding context where, Jīvakaṇ’s scholarship of the instrument is put to test. He is asked to examine several yāḷs before he finally settles on the right one.² Jīvakaṇ remarks, after selecting the right yāḷ, that it has all the best qualities evident in the lady.³ So the very fact that Viṇāpati in the story gives Jīvakaṇ many other yāḷs makes it clear that—uyttu-k-koṭumō has the implication as interpreted by Naccinārkkiniyar. It is not a voluntary action on the part of Viṇāpati to have given many other yāḷs, but she carries out the order dictated by her mistress, Tattai, and this is evident by Naccinārkkiniyar’s explanation.

2.9.2. *Cunantai nī avvai allai*

Naccinārkkiniyar has yet another way of splitting sentences. Jīvakaṇ is brought up by Cunantai. She renounces the world and becomes a saint. Jīvakaṇ is immersed in a world of grief. His own mother Vijaiyai had already renounced the world and Jīvakaṇ accepts it for granted, as she has not brought him up, but when he finds the foster mother, who so far showered all her affection on him, renouncing the world, he laments,

“Cuṭu tuyar eṅkaṇ ceytāy;
Cunantai nī avvai allai;
Koṭiyai nī koṭiya ceytāy”⁴

-
1. Jīvaka; v. 715.
 2. Ibid; v. 716.
 3. Jīvaka; v. 719.
 4. Jīvaka; v. 2646.

It means "you have caused me great sorrow that burns me. So Cunantail You are not my mother. You are now separated from me. So you are cruel". But Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar feels, this meaning will do great injustice to Jīvakaṅ. To speak of a woman, who has brought him up, that she is not his mother, is unpardonable. So Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar gives a different meaning for the whole passage choosing and grouping the words as he pleased and he weaves a pattern of consistent interpretation, that, instead of doing injustice to his character, elevates him to a high pedestal.

"Cunantai nī avvai;
allai nī koṭiyai;
cuṭu tuyar eṅkaṅ ceytāy,
koṭiya ceytāy, koṭiyai nī"

Now it means, "Cunantail because you brought me up you are my mother. So far you have not been cruel. But now you have decided to get separated from me. So you are very cruel". Here Jīvakaṅ worships Cunantai as his mother which describes his sense of gratitude. So when he finds fault with her for her separation, it only portrays his great affection for her and prompted by a feeling of righteous indignation provoked by her sudden action, he calls her cruel. He takes the liberty of calling her cruel, the liberty sanctioned by his excessive devotion for his mother.

2.10. *Humour*

In the literary works of great poets, humour lies very subtle, and it becomes the duty of the commentators to bring it out for the understanding of the readers. Sometimes, the annotator by his magic touch will make even an apparently dry passage replete with wit and humour.

2.10.1. *Rotating the hot mutton between the cheeks*

King Karikālaṅ entertains the musicians. The musicians who have been starving all these days without even a morsel of food, in their spontaneous enthusiasm and delight in having sighted food, a rich one at that, swallow everything they come across. The mutton pieces suspended in an iron rod are very hot and when the musicians put them in their mouths, they feel the heat, but they do not want to spit them away, as they are very delicious, and excellently prepared. So with their mouths full of mutton pieces, which are very hot, they rotate them between the right and left cheeks to cool them and this

picture of their helplessness is graphically portrayed by Naccinārkkiniyar.¹

2.10.2. *New man is really the old man*

The musician with his rags, and famished looks, has attracted the attention of many people by presenting a picture of abject misery and pain. The same day he is entertained at the palace as ordered by Karikālaṅ and there happens a metamorphosis. The very realization he has reached the destination where poverty is banished, makes him swell with joy, and the incessant feeding effects such a physical change in him that he becomes entirely different the next day from what he was the previous day. He is in a state of semi-consciousness after having been entertained to a consistent flow of intoxicating drinks. His body is fragrant with the smell of many a flower, and so, bees are buzzing around his body. The people who have seen him the earlier day, are not able to recognise him now. They are surprised to see his physical stature now. Even the musician is not able to differentiate the present reality from a dream of his own. He presents himself before the king, and the king who has seen him earlier before the effects of feeding and drinking, is not able to recognise him and some of the servants by his side have to tell him that 'the new man' is really 'the old man' who had arrived the previous day in a state of penury and paid. This picture presents a humorous situation and Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary here is enjoyable.²

2.10.3. *Kingdom of rags*

The clothes of the musician in his famished state, are torn, and wet with perspiration. The rags have been stiched, and various kinds of different yarn have gone to stitch them to a shape. Also the lice and their eggs have claimed the kingdom of these rotten rags. Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretation of the phrase 'Irai kūṭi' as 'ruling over the kingdom' of rags, evidences his keen sense of humour.³

2.10.4. *The old buffalo*

In Kalittokai, the friend of the maiden goes to the place where the hero had said he would be waiting. But there she encounters an old Brahmin leper. He stands like an old buffalo near the hay stack. This passage itself is humorous. The old buffalo has reached such

1. Porunar; 11. 105-106.

2. Porunar; 11 96-102.

3. Porunar; 11. 78-81.

a stage that it cannot digest anything it eats. But it still has 'the residuary feelling', to eat, not in any way warranted by its physical ability to do so. The same way, the old man, by his disease and age, has reached the stage when it is physically impossible for him to do anything except keep alive. But 'the residuary feeling' of the senses is still there, and he looks at the girl in the same fashion as an old buffalo by the side of the hay stack. Naccinārkkiniyar makes the passage more humorous by interpreting the word 'Pakkattir pōkātu' as meaning, "does not leave from that side 'though apparently this phrase would mean, "does not go to that side". Naccinārkkiniyar heightens the humorous situation by stationing the buffalo by the side of the hay stack, which by revealing its incapacity, solicits our sympathy for the bull and so also for the poor old Brahmin leper.'

2.10.5. *Satire: The swan and the conch*

There are two types of humour; (1) that which does not cause injury to others and (2) that which indirectly points out the follies of others. The latter is called satire. There is a beautiful scene in Jivaka Cintāmaṇi. Calañcalam, the purest of conches, is grazing. The male swan, that comes there, mistakes the conch for its partner, and embraces it. It immediately realises its mistake and goes away. The poet describes the swan here as 'Aritu uṇar aṇṇam', it means 'that which can discern the impossible'. Naccinārkkiniyar explains it still further: "The swan is traditionally known to discriminate water and milk and the swan gifted likewise, is not able to distinguish the partner from the conch."² There is a subtle suggestion of satire here.

2.10.6. *Smiling - 'Tāṇam'*

Pērāciriyaṇ classifies humour into three kinds (1) smile, (2) laugh with restraint, (3) loud laughter.³ In the literary works of great poets, humour lies only in making people smile. Jivakaṇ after defeating the other kings, is about to marry Tattai. The defeated kings, instigated by Kaṭṭiyañkāraṇ declare war on Jivakaṇ. Jivakaṇ's friend 'Patumukaṇ' advises the foolish kings. This advice is classified by Naccinārkkiniyaṇ as advice given in four ways, Cāmaṇ, pētam, Tāṇam and Taṇṭam. One of his remarks runs like this 'even granting you are going to defeat us, Kaṭṭiyañkāraṇ will create hostility among you, and you will fight amongst yourselves and perish. This will leave Kaṭṭiyañkāraṇ open to claim all your kingdoms and he

1. Kali; v, 65.

2. Jivaka; v, 2103.

3. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s, 251.

will become the ruler. According to Naccinārkkiniyar this falls under Tāṇam. We are unable to understand this until Naccinārkkiniyar explains it still further. He says that since Patumukan has prevailed on them to understand the way of retaining their kingdoms instead of Kaṭṭiyaṅkaran claiming them all by fraudulent means; in fact Patumukan has offered them their kingdoms, and thus this falls under the classification of 'Tāṇam'.¹

2. 10. 7. *Tirunakar-c-celva*

There is another situation in Jivaka Cintāmaṇi. The hunters claim the cattle of the shepherds of Rajamāpuram. Kaṭṭiyaṅkaraṅ's sons, and Mataṅ fight with the hunters and get defeated. The shepherds run to report this matter to the king Kaṭṭiyaṅkaraṅ, and address him 'Tiru nakar celva'. It means "the leader of this beautiful city". Naccinārkkiniyar says that it implies that Kaṭṭiyaṅkaraṅ is not the chief of the country, but has confined himself by this defeat to be the leader of that town only.² The suggestion that Kaṭṭiyaṅkaraṅ is not able to hold his kingdom properly is apparently a satirical remark intended to go home.

1. Jivaka; v. 755.

2. Jivaka; v. 439.

CHAPTER—3

SIMILES AND METAPHORS

3.1. *Simile - Its Origin, Base, etc*

Simile is the basis of all figures of speech.¹ The poet employs this not only for clarification through comparison but also to heighten the beauty of a poem.² Metaphor and other figures of speech have their rudiment in simile only. The mind always engages itself in comparing or associating things, and this is the foundation of all the figures of speech. A thing or an incident is often compared with another thing or incident if they have basically similar traits. All the things in this world are connected with one another in some way or other. The vision of a poet sees such similarity everywhere. A poet has the ability to discover this unity among things - however small it may be.³ “Normally people are engaged in finding out the diversity of things, and this is the thing that interests them to a great extent. Even things that have similarity with each other appear to them to be different from each other. But poets, find unity even in diverse things and this gives them delight. This delight is the basis of similes and metaphors”.⁴ Sometimes the poet is content with just making a reference to the similarity without explaining it still further and it is the duty of the annotator to bring it out for the proper understanding of the readers.

3.1.1. *The Origin of Simile*

A thing can be compared with another for various reasons. Tolkāppiyar says that similarity of (1) action, (2) effect, (3) form and (4) colour are the four origins of similes.⁵ Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar, having in mind these ideas, explains various passages in literature wherever the reference is not obvious.

-
1. History of the Tamil Language: p. 49.
 2. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam. Preface to Uvamaiyiyal; p. 395.
 3. Ilakkiyakkalai; p. 170.
 4. Ilakkiyattiraṅṅ; pp. 228-9.
 5. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 272.

In Maturai-k-kāñci there is a simile with reference to prostitutes :

“Nuṇ tātu uṇṭu varum pū tuṇakkum
Meṇ ciṇai vaṇṭiṇam māṇa”¹

Here the prostitutes are compared to the bees. The two things in which the bees are occupied are also explained, to suck a flower and desert it. The poet has only suggested two ideas but there are things that follow by careful investigation of the passage. Naccinārkkiniyar analyses them. The bees engage themselves in :

1. knowing the time of a flower blossoming.
2. sucking its content (honey).
3. forgetting that flower.
4. deserting that flower.

Prostitutes can be compared to the bees, because of their four ‘actions’ mentioned below :

1. The prostitutes learn when a man gets wealth.
2. separate him from his riches.
3. forget him.
4. desert him.

So the simile of action is elaborately explained by Naccinārkkiniyar.

3.1.2. *Viravivarutal (Multiple simile)*

We saw earlier that two things can be compared with each other on account of only one of the following action, effect, form and colour. The bases for the simile in some place may be more than one of these. Such a simile may be called multiple simile.²

“Ulakam uvappa valaṇ ērputiritaru
Palar pukal ṅāyigu kaṇar kaṇāṅku
Ovaṇa imaikkum cēṇ viḷaṅku avir oḷi”³

The sun rising from the sea is compared to Lord Murukaṇ over the peacock. Naccinārkkiniyar analyses all the reasons for such comparison and explains them one by one. The sun destroys darkness, so also Murukaṇ drives away ‘Māyā’. Here there is the simile of action. The fresh blue colour of the sea, the glory of the rising red sun, all remind us of the beautiful colour pattern of the peacock

1. Maturai ; 11. 573-574.
2. Tol. Poruḷ. Pēra ; ss. 277.
3. Muruku ; 1. 1-3.

and the complexion of Lord Murukaṅ and hence here is also the simile of colour. "The poets who are able to find out the unity in diversity, and commentators who are quick to find them and explain them still further are no doubt geniuses of the highest order".¹

3.1.3. *Uvamai nilaikkaḷaṅ (The basis of simile)*

Tolkāppiyar has classified the main contexts or suggestions of similes as five and called them uvamai nilaikkaḷaṅ (The basis of simile).²

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| 1. Ciṟappu. | — | expression of a feeling of greatness for the thing. |
| 2. Nalaṅ. | — | expression of feeling of quality i.e. beauty etc. |
| 3. kātal. | — | expression of a feeling of love. |
| 4. vali. | — | expression of a feeling of appreciation of the strength. |
| 5. kiḷakkiṭu poruḷ | — | expressing a feeling of disgust at the meanness of the thing. |

The later commentators have pointed out the similes occurring in poetry analysing the categories to which they belong.

In Jivaka Cintāmaṇi Caccantaṅ is killed by his minister Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṅ. It is described thus: 'The sun-like king born of the sea-like - Kurukulam, is swallowed by the serpent-like Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṅ'.³ The king's greatness and the ingratitude of the villain Kāṭṭiyaṅkāraṅ are well portrayed here. The king belongs to a sea-like family tradition and it is his greatness. The minister is likened to a snake. The sea and the sun are all noble and great things whereas the snake is a mean one, and Naccinārkkiniyar points out the suggestions of these similes. The poet has employed these similes which express different tones and tenors, to use the phraseology of Richards, at the same place as revealed by the commentator.

3.1.4. *Comparison of various things to one thing specific*

In Kalittokai there occurs a line where the waist of a lady is compared to various things.

1. Ilakkiyakkalai ; p. 9.

2. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā ; ss, 279-280.

3. Jivaka ; v. 290.

“Koṭi eṇa, miṇ eṇa
Aṇaṅku eṇa yātonṇum
Terikallā iṭai.”¹

The waist is compared to a creeper, lightning, and aṇaṅku (‘harm’). Naccinārkkiniyar analyses these similes and clarifies them. He says because of delicacy the waist is compared to a creeper, because of its flash of beauty to the lightning, because of its imperceptibility to something causing suffering.

3.1.5. *Comparison of several actions to a specific action*

The poet compares the merger of Kāvīry with the sea in the following way.

“Māmalai aṇainta koṇmū pōlavum
Tāy mulai taḷuviya kuḷavi pōlavum
Tēru nīr puṇariyōṭu āru talai maṇakkum”²

“Like the red cloud reaching a black mountain, and like the baby reaching for its mother’s breast. the river Kāvīry is merging with the sea”. Here the two actions of the river Kāvīry are described in a beautiful manner by the commentator. One of them is: that keeping alive their respective identity Kāvīry and the sea have merged together i.e. Kāvīry retains its red colour and the sea its darkness. The second is seen at the next stage when the red colour merging with the black-sea-, disappears and becomes one with the colour of the sea, where the diversity becomes extinct, and unity becomes effective.. This is compared to the baby reaching for its mother’s breast, when the unity becomes absolute and complete.

3.2. *Some Kinds of Simile*

Naccinārkkiniyar, steeped well in Tolkāppiyam tradition, brings out the various similes in literature and classifies them. Also his experience as a literary commentator helps him feel aware of the new developments in the post Tolkāppiyam period, and his treatment of similes, as such, is a happy blend of the old and the new.

3.2.1. *Similes of Impossible*

In ancient Sangam classics, the poets never indulged in impossible conceits while they are common in literary works of the later age. “Imagination is that which conceives of an incident that happens

1. Kali; v. 57: 4-5.

2. Paṭṭiṇam; 11, 95-97.

at one place and at a time, to have happened at a different place and time, and also it is capable of creating something which never exists or happens, which in fact, it is a poetic twist of a particular thing, that could have happened, in a different way".¹ This kind of twist is called, 'Ilporuḷ Uvamai', ('simile of the impossible'). But in Pattuppāṭṭu, there occurs a line

" ciṟu kōṭṭu
 Kuḷavi-t-tiūkaḷ kōḷ nērntānku
 Cuṟavu vāy amaitta curumpu cūḷ cuṭar nutal"²

The women are wearing a jewel called 'Makaravāy'. It is worn on the head and is suspended on the forehead. It is made of solid, pure gold. The way it hangs on the forehead looks like a golden snake opening its mouth, and as the forehead resembles a half moon, it appears as though the snake in the mythology is swallowing the moon. This is a reference to the Purāṇic belief of "Rahu devouring the moon" - But such eclipses occur only when the moon is full, and the snake, swallowing a half moon is an impossibility³. So Naccinārkkīṇiyar calls this simile of a non-existing event (Ilporuḷ uvamai). But the mythology being familiar to the reasons the poet is justifying such modifications so as to make clear the beautiful appearance of the adornments in the particular context reminding something of a heavenly beauty. There are many other references to the simile of the non-existing as mentioned by Naccinārkkīṇiyar.⁴ But he has not mentioned some of the similes of this kind as belonging to this category.⁵

3.2.2 *Simile of Proverbs*

The poets also employ proverbs in the form of Simile. Such proverbs are common in the works of later poets more than in ancient poetry. Naccinārkkīṇiyar, in his commentaries, has investigated the origin of such proverbs and brought them to the understanding of the readers.

There is a proverb in Tamil "the tree felled by the cowherds".⁶ The cowherds, to provide food for the cattle, cut the branches of the

1. Ilakkīyattīṅaṅ ; p. 141.

2. Perumpāṇ ; 11. 383-585.

3. Nālaṭiyār ; v. 241.

4. Jīvaka ; vv. 191, 195, 261, 275, 290, 502, 938, 1012, 1170, 1314, 1385, 1408, 1691, 1798, 2076, 2368, 2597, 2729, 3143 etc. Kali; vv. 7:8; 43:21.

5. Jīvaka ; vv. 1009, 1168, 2298.

6. Palamoḷi; v. 314.

trees in such a way that the branches hang half dead and half alive. Those suspended between pain and progress are often compared to this state. The poet employs this in *Jivaka Cintāmaṇi*. When *Jivakaṇ* discovers his mother, he laments: "I was born to bring about the ruin of kingdom, the misery of friends, and mother. But having been born like this, now I have reached the stage of the "tree felled by the cowherds"¹. It means "I have no determination to die or to live, as the enemy *Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṇ* is still alive". *Jivakaṇ* is thinking of the plight of the tree with reference to his own uselessness. Even in ancient Sangam classics such similes are common as understood by the phrase "Oṭi eṛital". *Naccinārkkiniyar* says it is the corrupted form of 'oṭiya eṛital' which gives meaning according to the proverb under discussion.² There are also some other proverbs in the form of similes and *Naccinārkkiniyar* explains their origin in the same manner.³

3.2.3. *Cilētai* - (*pun*) - *uvamai*

The same word or sentence standing to mean more than one thing is called pun, or *cilētai* in Tamil. The simile also is exploited to a great extent in this word play. Only if this is consistent with the context, it can have a literary appeal; otherwise it will show only the verbal acrobatics of the poet. *Naccinārkkiniyar* mentions this 'pun' wherever it is employed and explains the significance in relation to the context where each one of them occurs.

Jivakaṇ decides to leave *Vimalai* as he has business on hand. But he is not in a position to inform her of this separation as this would make her miserable. But finally he determines to break the news to her. It is described thus:

'Kāviṇuḷ tōlarai kaṭṭu pōtarvēṇ
Eviṇuḷ tālcilai eyta kōlinē⁴

Jivakaṇ, who tells *Vimalai*, that he would return after seeing his friends, 'like an arrow shot by a weak bow'. The arrow would not go very far, but would return soon to the shooter. So also *Jivakaṇ* makes *Vimalai* feel that he is not going very far, and will be returning soon. But it also means a different thing, which *Jivakaṇ* has in his own mind only. The weak arrow may either return, or take a different direction. So also, *Jivakaṇ* implies that he might go elsewhere. As a matter of fact he has not uttered a falsehood by this

1. *Jivaka*; v. 1914.

2. *Kali*; v. 68:12.

3. *Jivaka*; vv. 232, 455. 1920, 2003, 2072, etc.

4. *Jivaka*; 1993.

remark, and Vimalai also reconciles herself to the fact that the return of Jivakaṇ is assured. But, the use of pun here creates a dramatic irony, as Jivakaṇ and the readers only know what Jivakaṇ has in his mind and this is well explained by Nacciṇārkkīyiar.

3.3. *Iraṭṭai Uvamai (Two fold similes)*

“ Though simile can be employed by all the poets, the beauty of it increases with the greatness of a poet who brings many a point of similarity between a thing and its comparison. Even the attributes used in this connection attain importance and usefulness”.¹ The poet need not explain everything and it is for the commentator to elucidate the details.

3.3.1. *The thing and comparison with attributes*

When a thing is compared with another, sometimes both are described with epithets which are suggestive of further comparisons.

‘ Aṭai maṭai āyitaḷ pōtu pōl koṭṭa
Kuṭai niḷal tōṅṅum niṅ cemmaḷ’.²

Here the maiden friend of the lady love praises the son of the hero. He, under the shadow of an umbrella, is compared to the lotus flower under the green leaf. The green leaf and umbrella are epithets, but, Nacciṇārkkīyiar explains the similarity between the epithets also, and says, ‘like the lotus flower under the green leaf, the son under the shadow of the green umbrella’.

<i>Things compared</i>	<i>Comparison</i>
Son	Lotus flower
Green umbrella	Green leaf

3.3.2. *The epithets of the upamānam applied to the upamāyam also*

In cases similar to the above, there are instances where the upamānam (comparison) occurs with an epithet whilst the upamāyam has no epithet. In Jivaka Cintāmaṇi, there occurs an incident. A dog is hit by a Brahmin and it falls in a tank and is in its death pangs. Jivakaṇ sees this, teaches the Pañca namaskāra mantram in its ears. Soon after, the dog leaves its body and reaches heaven as a Dēvā. The poet, in order to dispel the doubts of the people who are not convinced that a dog can become a dēvā, states that this happened even as a piece of iron when red-hot coming in contact with ‘Rasa’ (the philosopher’s stone) achieves the colour of gold.

1. Ilakkiyakalai; p. 178.

2. Kali; v. 84: 10-11.

“ Kol ulai akattiṭṭu ūti
 Kūr irumbu iratam kutta
 Ellaiyil cempon āki
 Eri niram peṭṭatanṭē ”¹

Here the iron has the attribute ‘kūr’. All pieces of red hot iron, when they come into contact with ‘Rasa’, do not become gold ; but only those which have the necessary conditions for becoming gold. Here ‘kūr’ (the attribute of the comparison) refers to such requisite perfection. So also, the dog has all the essential traits by birth to become Dēvā and this point is well-brought out by Naccinārkkiniyar’s commentary.

<i>Comparison</i>	<i>Thing</i>
Iron	Dog
kūr (pre-requisites) for becoming gold	Pre-requisites (for becoming Dēvā)

3.3.3. *The attribute of the upamēyam applied to the upamānam*

Sometimes the upamēyam (the thing compared) has an attribute whereas the upamānam (the comparison) has none. The commentator explains the attribute properly and this heightens the beauty of the poem. In Pattppāṭṭu it occurs as follows :

“ Paiṅkaṅ ūkam pāmpu piṭṭaṅṅa
 Aṅkōṭṭu-c-ceṭinta aviṅtu viṅku tivavu ”²

“ The strings hold on to the vīnā base like a snake in the hands of a monkey ”. The attribute of action for the strings are ‘aviṅtu’ and ‘viṅku’—i.e. loosened here and fastened there. Naccinārkkiniyar brings out the points of similarity inasmuch as the ‘snake’ in the hands of a monkey twists around the limb of the monkey sometimes loosening and sometimes tightening.

3.3.4. *The attribute of the upamānam taken to upamēyam and the attribute of the upamēyam taken to upamānam in one and the same simile*

The poet in certain places would give a single attribute for each (upamānam and upamēyam) and the commentator would find a justification for both and bring out all the latent points of similarity in an elaborate way. We are amazed by the manner in which the poet condenses many ideas in a single attribute and thank the commentator for the extensive survey of the areas of similarity between the thing compared and the comparison.

1. Jīvaka ; v. 960,

2. Ciṅupāṅ; 11. 221-222.

The fight between Matanaṅ and Vijayaṅ is described in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi. Matanaṅ dies in the battle field. It is like the moon after driving away darkness being swallowed by the snake and getting immersed in the sea. Matanaṅ fighting in the battle field, dashes against Vijayaṅ's elephant; and killed by the latter's sword.¹ This can be explained thus :

Upamāṅam (<i>comparison</i>)	Upamēyam (<i>thing compared</i>)
1. Moon	<u>Matanaṅ</u>
2. driving away darkness	Putting to flight the enemies on the battle field
3.	Dashing against the elephant
4. Swallowed by the snake.	Dying at the point of the enemy's sword
5. Sinking in the sea

On the face of it there is nothing corresponding to the third aspect of upamēyam in the upamāṅam and seemingly there is nothing corresponding to the 5th aspect of upamāṅam in the upamēyam. One has to infer these missing aspects by the suggestive force of others. Here Naccinārkkiniyar explains thus : The moon going up in the sky is the comparison for dashing against the elephant and sinking in the sea is for going into the enemy's front. The stanza achieves clarity and beauty by this commentary.

3.4. *Inferred Similes*

Inferred similes are those in which either of the things, the comparison or the thing compared is mentioned and the other thing inferred. Similes in which the comparison is mentioned and the thing compared is understood, are known as Oṭṭaṇi in Puṅam and Uḷḷurāi uvamam in Akam literature. As a matter of fact, this in a way heightens the beauty of the poem, as the reader is also activated to think and enjoy.

3.4.1. *Upamēyam inferred from upamāṅam*

In some of the literary works we see that the comparison is understood. In Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi there is a poem :

“Tūmam ārntaṅa tuppuravvukaḷ
Emam āyiṅa ēnti nirralāl

1. Jīvaka; v. 2245.

Nāma naṅṅagar naṅ poṅ kaṅpakam
Kāma valliyyum kalam koṅṅiṅṅatē”¹

Here the Kaṅpakam and Kāmavalli are comparisons, but it is not mentioned for which objects they stand as comparisons. The commentator makes it clear that the men and the women, who stand holding all these objects of fragrance and other things, are compared to Kaṅpakam and Kāmavalli respectively.

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| 1. Comparison | : | Kaṅpakam and Kāmavalli |
| 2. Things compared | : | Men and women |
| | | (understood - brought out by the commentator) |

3.4.2. *Upamānam inferred from upamēyam :*

In some poems the thing compared is mentioned and the comparison is understood. Jīvakaṅ is in Emamāpuram with Kaṅakamālai. His friends think of various designs to reach him. Then they decide to drive the cattle of the king away, which would necessarily bring Jivakan for the combat. The line that occurs here is,

“Porukku oṅi iṅa nirai kōṅum”²

According to Naccinārkkiniyar ‘Porukku is a corruption of ‘Poruvukku’ which means ‘that equals’. Naturally the question is what ‘equals’ what? Naccinārkkiniyar here reminds us of a Mahābāratha story, when Duryōtanaṅ, suspicious of the movements of Dharma and his brothers, orders the driving away of the cattle of a king, where the Pāṅṅavās stay, and gets confirmed of his doubts. So ‘that equals’ refer to that incident in the opinion of Naccinārkkiniyar. Here the story is not specifically mentioned but there is only a very vague suggestion which Naccinārkkiniyar exploits to his advantage. It means that Mahābāratha stories should have been very popular in Tamilnad during the period of Jīvaka Cintāmaṅi. But ‘Porukku’ a corruption form of ‘Poruvukku’, if it means ‘oppukku’, can also imply a false excuse for action taken without any seriousness. This meaning is popular in the common parlance.³ As the friends of Jīvakaṅ do not mean to fight with him, but as their intentions are only to reveal their identity, the word ‘Porukku’ could be taken to mean only oppukku (a false excuse for action). But the question is whether the meaning of oppukku was there in the age of Jīvaka Cintāmaṅi.

1 Jivaka; v. 2404

2. Jivaka; 1825.

3. Tamil Lexicon; Volume I. p. 595.

3.4.3. *Upamānam and upamēyam both inferred from context*

Rhetoricians speak of ekadesa uruvakam where some part of the event as upamēyam gets compared through rūpakam and some part has no comparison. Similar situation occurs in uvamai also. Sometimes the main part of the upamēyam itself is not mentioned but left to be understood.

In some of the stanzas both the thing compared and comparison are understood. Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar explains them clearly. In Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi Gōvindaṅ sets the target, a pig form which any prince succeeding to shoot sharp; will be able to get the hands of Ilakkaṇai. Many princes come and fail and they stand disheartened; some of them have come there only to watch this competition. At that time Jīvakaṅ comes there and aims an arrow to announce his arrival. The defeated princes are like blue lilies and those who came to which are like lotuses.¹ The poet has not explained how they equal these flowers. The commentator has explained them clearly. Jīvakaṅ is like the sun and 'the blue lilies', as is the tradition in Tamil poetry, fade out at the sight of the sun, and the lotuses blossom into fragrance at the sight. The significance of the similes is brought out well only if the simile, i.e. Jīvakaṅ looking like the sun, is justifiably explained. The ingenuity of the commentator in this connection is remarkable.

<i>Comparison</i>	<i>Thing compared</i>	<i>Similarity</i>
1. Sun	Jīvakaṅ	Glamour - brought out
2. Lilies	Defeated	fading referred
	princes	to in the
3. Lotuses	on lookers	blossoming verse

3.5. *Similes of Suggestion*

In the same comparison, sometimes there might be two ideas, one patent and the other latent. The commentator by bringing out the latent idea, stresses both points of comparison.

3.5.1. *More ideas suggested by a simile*

Jīvakaṅ who leaves Kēmacari meets - somebody on the way and emphasises to the other Dharma, renunciation etc. He compares an ascetic to a snake that sheds its skin. The snake, while doing so, becomes pure. So also, a man must purify himself by renouncing desires.² Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar here suggests another point which is not

1. Jīvaka; 2199.

2. Jīvaka; v. 1546.

patent in the simile. A snake, while shedding its skin, spits out poison and according to Naccinārkkīṇiyar a man should cleanse himself of all subjective dirt, even while becoming outwardly pure to become an ascetic. The snake spitting out poison, as clearly pointed out by the commentator, broadens the meaning of this simile and heightens its beauty.

Many a king assembled at the court to enter the yāl competition for winning the hand of Tattai. They are compared to the bees that buzz around a honeycomb. Here bees are the kings, the honey is Tattai, the desire for honey is the desire for Tattai.¹ So everything is clearly stated here, but Naccinārkkīṇiyar brings out another point that we least suspect, i.e. the honey being snatched away by a human being putting all the bees to grief. Here Jīvakaṇ wins the hand of Tattai, when all the kings are hoping against hope to win her hand. This is indeed an ingenious point.

'Valampuri' conch is considered to be the purest and the best of conches. Vijaiyai, like Valampuri conch yielding a pearl, brings forth Jīvakaṇ² Both the thing compared and the comparison are made clear in the poem, but Naccinārkkīṇiyar brings out another point, which we would have normally missed in the poem i.e. the conch is traditionally known to die after yielding the pearl. So also Vijaiyai, after being delivered of Jīvakaṇ goes into temporary oblivion.

3.5.2. *Subtle points of similarity*

Naccinārkkīṇiyar by his commentary elucidates certain points that are not apparently there but conveyed by his keen intellect. Jīvakaṇ's ability in riding on an elephant is described by the poet.³

1. Like the flying of the morning sun on a mountain.
2. Like a dēvā on a running cloud.

In the first simile, Jīvakaṇ makes the elephant fly i.e. all the action is his at the first instant and in the second one, the elephant has learnt to move as directed by him i.e. the action is in that of the elephant. One describes the action of Jīvakaṇ and the other his physical form. As Jīvakaṇ ascends on the wild elephant, his action, in driving the elephant, is described by the first simile. As the elephant after being

1. Jīvaka; 615.

2. Jīvaka; 386.

3. Jīvaka ; v. 1838.

successfully tamed starts flying by itself without actually being forced by Jivakaṅ after his initial control, it is described by the second simile. The two stages of movements are well brought out by these two similes as explained by the commentator.

1. Translation of his ability into dynamic activity
2. A fully controlled activity apparently static

3.5.3. *A striking point of similarity*

There may be some striking point of latent similarity between a thing compared and comparison, which once made clear become things of beauty. Naccinārkkīṅiyar gives us some instances of this kind of analysis of the simile.

Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṅ attacks Caccantaṅ. The king Caccantaṅ retaliates, provoked by the ingratitude of his minister. The poet describes the scene thus :

“Cīruṭai-k-kuricilum
Civantu aḷaṅṅru ōr tittiraḷ
Pāruṭai-p-paṅnikkaṭaḷ
Cuṭuvatu ottu ulampināṅ”¹

“Caccantaṅ, like the great fire at the end of the yuga, burning the seas retaliated” – this is the meaning of this poem. Naccinārkkīṅiyar brings out another point which we would have missed in our casual reading. The tradition has it that water came out of fire. So the forces which Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṅ employs to attack Caccantaṅ are naturally the king’s forces founded by him. But, now, he is forced to destroy his own forces as they attack him and so Naccinārkkīṅiyar says as water, created by fire, is destroyed by the same fire, Caccantaṅ, who founded the army, attacks the same sea-like forces.

There is another point which we wish Naccinārkkīṅiyar had mentioned. It is true that water is created out of fire, but when the question of mutual combat comes water will finally extinguish fire. So also, the king’s forces, founded by the same king, ultimately prevails over him and Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṅ vanquishing him in the battle, ascends the throne. The meaning of the simile can thus be extended. It is amazing why Naccinārkkīṅiyar has not investigated the significance of this simile thus far, as we know him

1. Jivaka ; v. 274.

to read the present incidents in the context of the future.¹ May be as the commentator has interpreted 'Fire' as the 'Great Fire' (at the end of the yuga) when water gets submerged in its origin, he has not extended the meaning of this simile.

3.6. *Making the dead similes alive*

A poet sometimes would refer to a character in the epic employing a comparison with reference to quality, action etc. The lion-like person, the elephant like prince etc. are the common usages, and they have become such a convention in epic poetry that no particular significance is attached to the similes as more or less they look like mechanical devices. But, for Naccinārkkiniyar, they are not mechanical but he would find some justifications for such usages bearing in mind the incidents to follow. He looks at the epic as an entity and does not annotate the poems as unconnected bits.

3.6.1. *Reference to what follows*

Caccantaṅ out of intense love for his queen forsakes the administration and decides to leave everything in the hands of his minister Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṅ. He summons Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṅ and tells him of his decision. Here Caccantaṅ is referred to as Kaḷiraṅāṅ (the elephant like person).² The simile apparently is conventional and does not show any purpose. But if we view at things that follow when Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṅ is going to overthrow Caccantaṅ and capture the kingdom, the simile attains some significance and this is well brought out by Naccinārkkiniyar. Nimmittikaṅ and Uruttiratattaṅ, two other Ministers, advise Caccantaṅ against this decision but this falls on deaf ears as Caccantaṅ is bent upon handing over the reins of government to Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṅ as he himself is after the pursuit of sensuous pleasures.³ Naccinārkkiniyar states that as the elephant becoming a rogue elephant knocks down its driver, so also Caccantaṅ becoming a sensuous person ignores the advice given by his two other ministers. This advice is to follow later. But Naccinārkkiniyar says that the poet has in mind this incident when he refers to the king as being elephant like in the poem. This justification is reasonable and gives us the whole picture.

1. Supra ; pp. 77 : 3.2.3., 85 : 3.5.1.
Infra ; p. 88 : 3.6.1.

2. Jivaka ; v. 200.

3. Jivaka ; vv. 204-214.

3.6.2. Reference to what precedes

Naccinārkkīṇiyar puts himself in the place of the character and interprets their words and thereby reveals what there is in their subconscious even when they use similes and metaphors. Curamañcari and Kuṇamālai request Jīvakaṇ to choose the better one of the 'cuṇṇam' they have prepared and his decision goes in favour of Kuṇamālai. Curamañcari takes a vow that she would make Jīvakaṇ touch her feet (in 'ūṭal' - anger feigned during nuptial nights). Here she refers to Jīvakaṇ as "Maḷai vaḷḷal". (philanthropist like a cloud)¹ Usually in Tamil poetry, the philanthropist is compared to the cloud, as the latter showers rain to the world without expecting any return, and this simile has become a literary convention, generally referring to the heroes of poetry.² But here Naccinārkkīṇiyar finds a new significance in this usage. He interprets the line as meaning, 'one who does not have a proper discriminating sense'. This he says with reference to what has been working in the mind of Curamañcari regarding the judgement of Jīvakaṇ in having chosen Kuṇamālai's cuṇṇam as the better one. Curamañcari feels that here is definitely better but Jīvakaṇ's verdict has gone against her. So according to Naccinārkkīṇiyar she might be referring to Jīvakaṇ who showers his munificent verdict but as one without the discriminating sense like the cloud. "The cloud does not choose where it should shower rains, and where it should not. The fields that require the rain most may go without it, and the dry land where nothing would grow may have plenty of rain"³ This is the reason why Curamañcari compares Jīvakaṇ with the cloud according to Naccinārkkīṇiyar.

3.7. Different Suggestions for the same simile according to the Context

A poet, who exploits the same simile at different places can be held to mean different things according to the context. The commentator, who has the point of view of the poet, does not fix the simile to mean one and the same thing in whichever context it may occur. He interprets it according to the place it appears and Naccinārkkīṇiyar reveals in this.

3.7.1. The Sun

The sun that rises in the morning over the sea attracted the attention of many poets, and Naccinārkkīṇiyar wherever it occurs,

1. Jīvaka ; v. 899.

2. Puṇam ; vv. 107, 397. Malai ; l. 580.

3. Puṇam ; v. 142.

refers to the action of the sun in dispelling darkness and its colour. But there occurs a line in *Tirumurukārūppaṭai* where Lord Muruka is likened to the sun. But here *Naccinārkkiniyar* investigates the matter still further and brings other points of similarity. It can be explained thus.¹

<i>Comparison</i>	<i>The thing compared</i>
1. Sun	Lord Muruka
2. Rising over the sea	Rising high on the peacock
3. The greenish freshness of the sea	The greenish freshness of the peacock
4. The redness of the sun	The fair complexion of Muruka
5. Dispelling darkness	Dispelling 'Māyā'

Here the commentator shows his ingenuity in extending the scope of the simile and interprets it in a manner appropriate to the occasion or context.

In another place *Toṇṭaimāṇ Iṭantiraiyaṇ* is compared to the Sun. *Naccinārkkiniyar* finds different reason for this comparison. Like the Sun over the sea *Iṭantiraiyaṇ* shines amidst his kinsmen. As the sun removes darkness, he removes the wants of those who seek at his hand justice and wealth.²

In *Malaipaṭu kaṭām*, *Nannan* is compared to the Sun. Here *Naccinārkkiniyar* says that *Nannan* dispels the darkness of hostility from without.³ He gives the same interpretation at other places also.⁴

In yet another place, *Jivakaṇ* is compared to the sun. *Cutañcaṇ*, a *Dēvā* pays his respects to *Jivakaṇ*. *Cutañcaṇ* is likened to the moon and *Jivakaṇ* to the sun. The moon does not have its own illumination, but it shines in the borrowed light of the sun, i.e. reflecting its glamour. *Jivakaṇ* taught the *Pañcanamaskāra* mantram to *Cutañcaṇ* during the time when he was about to die as a dog and so *Cutañcaṇ* owes his existence as a *Dēvā* to *Jivakaṇ*. Therefore the similes moon and sun are justified here.⁵

1. *Muruku* ; 11. 1-3.

2. *Perumpaṇ* ; 11. 441-447

3. *Malai* ; pp. 84-85.

4. *Kali* ; v. 100 : 1-2.

5. *Jivaka* ; v. 953.

There are other places where *Naccinārkkīṇiyar* interprets in the same manner with reference to Moon, *Kāmaṇ*, *Pāvai* etc.¹

3.7.2. *Similes with alternate suggestions*

Naccinārkkīṇiyar sometimes interprets the same simile in two ways and writes a critical appreciation. When the musicians return after getting plenty of presents from *Nannan*, it is described thus.

Mīmīcai nal yāṅu kaṭal paṭarntāṅku
yām avaṇ niṅṅum varutum.²

(i) like the river descending from the mountain top, proceeds towards the sea, we (the musicians) starting from our house towards the place of *Nannan* and returning from him (with gifts).

<i>Comparisons</i>	<i>The things compared</i>
1. Mountain top	Musician's house
2. River	Musicians
3. Descending from the top	going from their house
4. Sea	<i>Nannan</i>
5. Proceeding towards the sea	to go to <i>Nannan</i>

This is one way of interpretation and the act of getting presents from him is not properly fixed in the simile - according to this interpretation.

(2) Like the river that carries the wealth of a mountain and flows towards the sea, we (the musicians) are returning from *Nannan*'s home after receiving innumerable gifts from him.

<i>Comparisons</i>	<i>The things compared</i>
1. Mountain top	<i>Nannan</i> 's place
2. Mountain's wealth	<i>Nannan</i> 's wealth
3. River	Musicians
4. Sea	Musician's house

1. Moon.—Muruku; 11. 96-98; *Cirupāṇ*; 11. 219-220. *Jivaka*; vv. 362, 380, 454, 603, 1409.

Kāmaṇ :—Kali; v. 143, 33-35. *Jivaka*; vv. 607, 664, 674, 2038, 2282, 2730, etc.

Pāvai :—Kali; v. 22:56, *Jivaka*; vv. 197, 1573, 2542, 2651.

2. Malai; 11. 52-53.

5. The river carrying the wealth of the Mountain flows towards the sea. The musicians carrying the wealth of Nannan return home

Though Naccinārkkiniyar does not say so, the second interpretation is more natural and describes the true spirit of the poem. In the first interpretation, there is no comparison for the musicians returning from Nannan with gifts. Also it is unnecessary to describe the musician's starting from their home to reach the palace of Nannan and involve a comparison for it as it is understood.

3-7.3. *Refusing to read a simile*

There are places where Naccinārkkiniyar also points out the interpretation of other commentators where they read a simile therein. The lust of the prostitutes is described by the poet as.

‘Uppu amai kāma-t-tuppu’¹

Naccinārkkiniyar does not hold ‘amai’ as the sign of simile, but he interprets it in the negative sense i.e. ‘without’. He interprets lust that does not turn sour or stale. He gives the interpretation of other commentator also (i.e.) “the salt is used in measure according to the quantity of a thing to give taste to it. So also these women give pleasures according to the wealth they receive.”

3.8. *An Assessment of Some Interpretations*

Naccinārkkiniyar is conscious of the fact that he is a grammarian first and commentator next and as such, interprets certain lines within the boundary of grammar that sometimes does little justice to the beauty of the poem, but at places where he finds that a grammatical interpretation will be in conflict with the cherished culture of the country, he forsakes grammar and lays importance on culture.

3.8.1. *Interpretations of similes on the basis of culture*

We saw earlier how Naccinārkkiniyar interprets certain passages that are obviously in conflict with our ideals of culture in a way that lifts them out of such shortcomings. This can be seen even in his interpretation of similes. The women who had renounced earlier dress up Vijaiyai and Cunantai for the act of renunciation. They pass round their breasts a white cloth and tie them up and this is described by the poet.

1. Jivaka : v. 107.

“Pāliṅāḷ cīraṭi kaḷuvip-paintukil
 Nūliṅāḷ iyaṅṛaṅa nuṅitta nuṅmaiya
 Kālaṅai-k-kaṅ putaittāṅku vemmulai
 Mēlvaṅāi vīkkiṅār vitiyiṅ eṅpavē”¹

As the eyes of Yama are tied up, their breasts are tightly concealed by the white clothes. This is the direct meaning of this passage. But here the meaning is repulsive and against the spirit of the context. To talk of the breasts of old women, and in such context when they are to renounce the world, is far from being appropriate and it is evident if this is the meaning, this is one of the crudest pictures in the epic. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar offers an interpretation which removes our feeling of revulsion.

The women already renounced covered the breasts of Vijaiyai and Cunantai, which in their early days of youth, by torturing young men by the irteasing shape and form, made the occupation of Yama pāle into insignificance. Here according to Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar this ‘āṅku’ (kālaṅai kaṅ putaitt-āṅku) is not the sign of comparison referring to the simile of action, but indicates the previous history of their breasts. Though it might violate the rules of Tolkāppiyar who prescribes ‘āṅku’ as a symbol for the simile of action,² here Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar interprets ‘āṅku’ as a symbol for the simile of a noun and offers explanation this way, only to save the poem from a crude and unwarranted imagery. Even this refinery work does not save the poem from being crude, but it is evidence of the commentator’s ingenuity and his literary consciousness based on a solid foundation of culture and refinement.

3.8.2. *Prosaic interpretation of similes*

When a thing is compared with another, normally the comparison will be of a higher degree than the other.³ Leaping is a common trait between a tiger and a cat, but it is usual to say he leaped like a tiger and not like a cat.⁴ So it is likely the comparison tends to exaggerate the particular aspect of the thing compared. There are instances where the comparison and the thing compared are described as of equal status or degree. In Cīrupāṅṅīṅṛuppaṭai the poet describes the beauty of the wife of Pāṅaṅ thus :

1. Jīvaka ; v. 2634.
 2. Tol. Poruḷ. Pēṛā ; s. 287.
 3. Tol. Poruḷ. Pēṛā ; s. 278.
 4. Tol. Poruḷ. Pēṛā ; s. 283.

“Īrntu nilam tōyūm irum piṭi-t-taṭakkaiyiṅ
 Cērntuṭaṅ cēr̄inta kuṟaṅkiṅ kuṟankeṅa
 Mālvarai oḷukiya vālai vālai-p
 pūveṅa-p-polinta ōti”¹

It means that the thigh of the lady is as firm and well shaped as the trunk of an elephant, the banana tree in the mountain side is as shapely and rich in complexion as the thigh of the lady. The pig tail of the lady is as delicate and fragrant as the flower of the banana tree.

Here the poet without any discrimination alternates the thing compared and comparison in such a way that both of them heighten the beauty of the poem to a great extent. There is free mixing up of the natural and the artificial—and the artificial is elevated to the status of natural. For the poet, both of them appear beautiful, and it is not possible—for him to choose one from the other and hence the comparison of the thing compared are alternated, in such a telling fashion. Pērācīriyar explains such passages in the same manner as they occur, the natural alternating with the artificial.²

But Naccinārkkiniyar holds a different view. According to him perhaps such alternation are confusing and so he annotates the passage—of course, without offending the grammar of simile, in his opinion in such a prosaic way, that it robs the poem of its beauty and charm. He interprets it thus: ‘the thigh as thick as the trunk of an elephant, and also as rich in firmness as a banana tree—so he contends both the trunk and banana tree are comparisons. This is an offense to the aesthetic sense of the poet as well as that of the discriminating reader.

3.9. *Metaphor—its Origin Base Etc*

“The origin of the simile is to explain the unknown comparing it with the known. But later on the poet immersed in the beauty of such comparisons, exploited the similes to heighten the beauty of a poem”.¹ “Comparing the beauty of one thing with the beauty of another is simile. There are four parts in the simile. “Pearl like beautiful teeth”—Here ‘pearl’ is upamanam (the comparison), ‘teeth’ upameyam (the thing compared); ‘like’ is the sign of comparison and ‘beauty’ is the point of comparison. The poet, immersed in the beauty

1. Cīrupāṅ; 11. 19-31

2. Ibid; s. 311, p. 179.

3. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam, Preface to Uvamaiyiyal; p. 395.

of the simile, is likely to omit mentioning the sign of comparison and the common aspect and say 'pearl teeth'. This is classified as 'uvamattokai' in Tamil grammar (where the sign is latent).¹ 'Pearl teeth' is a better way of putting than 'pearl like beautiful teeth'; and shows the keen sense of beauty of the poet. In 'pearl like beautiful teeth' the sense of comparison is more emphasised than the description itself. In 'pearl teeth' the feeling of oneness (pearl and teeth) increases. This gives room to metaphor where we say 'teeth-pearl' the sense of discrimination between them is increasingly diminished to give way to the feeling of oneness and when we refer to the teeth as 'pearl' this is complete and this is the origin of metaphor.² "Metaphor is nothing but compressed simile".³ According to this origin it may be described thus :

1. Pearl-like beautiful teeth.
2. Pearl like teeth.
3. Pearl teeth.
4. Teeth-pearl.
5. Pearl.

3.9.1. *The distinction between metaphor and simile*

It is very difficult to determine the boundary between the simile and metaphor. As the upamānam and upamēyam merge with each other, metaphor takes its birth in this unity. Tolkāppiyar, therefore considers metaphor as one of the aspects of similes.⁴ 'Pearl-like beautiful teeth' and 'pearl-like teeth' are patent forms of similes. In the first stage we know pearl and teeth are two different things considered for comparison because of the common aspect of beauty. In the next stage, as we say, 'pearl-like teeth' the beauty is taken for granted, and understood. The last two stages, as we say, 'teeth pearl' and 'pearl' are patent forms of metaphor because they are not in the area of simile. There can be no doubt that these two teeth—pearl and pearl are metaphors as there is clear attribution of unity of ārōpam.

But the third and the middle stage "Pearl-teeth" is a difficult one to be determined whether it is simile or metaphor, or rather it shows the evolutionary stage between simile and metaphor, where metaphor becomes more predominant than simile.⁵ The vital link

1. Tol. Poruḷ, Pēra; s. 282. Foot note. p. 126.

2. Ilakkiyakalai; p. 197.

3. Poetry and the Ordinary Reader; p. 64.

4. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 280, p. 401.

5. Ilakkiyattiraṅ; p. 231.

between the thing compared and comparison 'the sign of comparison' or 'uvama urupu' as it vanishes it effects this change. Here, in 'pearl-teeth', the feeling of two different things decreases, as more and more we associate the pearl with the teeth.

There is a passage in Jivaka Cintāmaṇi, where the battle field is likened to the mirror.

“Āṭavar āṇmai tōṛṛum
Aṇi kiḷar pavaḷa-t-tiṇ kai
Nīṭeri nilai-k-kaṇṇāṭi-p-pōrkkaḷam”

'Mirror-battle-field'-this is how it is described here. It is something like saying 'pearl-teeth'-Nacciṇārkkiniyār interprets this as "the battle-field that is a mirror". He explains it further, 'as the mirror reflects beauty and ugliness alike, the battle-field is the ground where valour and cowardice both appear' and contends this is the reason for the comparison. First he refers to this as metaphor and later concludes this is a simile. It is clear he is not clear about this point. This shows that the border line of distinction between metaphor and simile is very thin, vague and ambiguous and the fact that it has landed such a commentator as Nacciṇārkkiniyār in confusion, strengthens this point of view.

3.9.2. *The usage of metaphor and the duty of the commentator*

The poet makes use of metaphor as and when he wants to emphasise a point with telling effect and the commentator has to engage himself in bringing out the points of comparison i.e. he has to dissolve the metaphor and bring out all the five things as stated earlier, as a mechanic disassemble the component parts of a motor-car. This needs great skill and the commentator is required to be of the calibre of the poet in doing his duty. The commentator first reduces the metaphor into a simile, carefully progressing through all the five stages and then investigates the simile in the same manner as mentioned in the chapter on Simile.

3.9.3. *Metaphor—(Nouns)*

In Tirumurukāṛruppaṭai, Lord Muruka is described thus.

“Palar pukaḷ naṇmoli-p-pulavar ēṛē”²

Here 'Pulavar ēṛē' is a metaphor. 'Ēṛu' means 'lion'. Suppose the poet has said 'lion like Muruka'—it will be a simile. But here it

1. Jivaka; v. 2299.

2. Muruku; l. 268.

means the lion to the poets. Here the 'poets' are not explicitly compared to anything, but Naccinārkkīṇiyar brings out the comparison taking it as an ēkatēsa uruvakam to make this metaphor more effective and beautiful. He interprets,

“the lion to the elephant-like poets”

The poets are intellectually arrogant, like haughty elephants and the lion-like Muruka puts them in their place. So this lion is not meaningless poetic jargon, but attains significance only when the comparison for the “poets” is investigated and brought out. But it has to be remarked that though one must feel thankful for this explanation, a metaphor through a simile can never kindle the same feeling and emotion as a metaphor.

3.9.4. *Ekatēsa uruvakam (Partial metaphor)*

The poet sometimes employs an action metaphor from which the rest of the ideas implied, are understood. The commentator draws the latent points from this metaphor after dissolving the whole picture in an explicit manner. Jīvakāṇ wins the hand of Tattai after defeating the other kings who have assembled there at the yāl competition. The kings declare war against him and before that, issue a warning to him without being aware of his prowess. They say : “you are being in the merchant community and you are not in the know of things regarding what makes a good merchant. If an acquisition of gains involve risks for the capital, a good merchant will forsake the gains and take care of his capital”.

“Cēṇikantu uyyappō niṇ ceṇi toṭi oḷiya eṇṇār”¹ Naccinārkkīṇiyar explains this metaphor in an ingenious way. He interprets that they tell Jīvakāṇ to forsake Tattai (gains) and take care of his life (capital). A good merchant takes his capital elsewhere to find a decent living and he would not be ready to loss the capital also in the pursuit of profits. This is because the poet speaks of Vāṇikam or trade. His coming to swayamvaram is explained in terms of it. But Tattai, Jīvakāṇ etc., are not correspondingly made metaphors. But by the suggestive force of the whole event as vāṇikam, the parts of it can be interpreted in terms of a metaphor as is here done by Naccinārkkīṇiyar. This kind of partial metaphor is called ēkatēsa uruvkam by rhetoricians.

The poet thus mixes up the comparison and the things compared alternating them in a series in a full picture of Metaphor. The commentator after a careful investigation, fills up the gaps in the picture as a complete metaphor.

1. Jīvakva. 770.

The heroine who pines away in grief prays to the sun, "Oh Sun, you know the place where my hero has gone. You please search for him and give him back to me. If I get him back, 'the fire', that burns my life which is like a wick in a lamp getting burnt, will leave". The lines are as under :

Tarukuvai āyīn tavirum en neñcattu
uyir tiriya māṭṭiya tī¹

As it is it can be presented thus :

<i>The things</i>	<i>Metaphor</i>
1. Heart
2. Life	wick in a lamp
3.	burning away
4.	fire
5. To leave

Here the picture of "life as the wick in a lamp" alone is given. There is no equivalent metaphors given for the noun 'heart' and the verb 'to leave'. Burning away and fire are two metaphors but for which the things that are compared are not given. Naccinārkkiniyar fills up these gaps and gives us the complete picture. "In the lamp of my heart, the feeling of separation for my hero which burns me like 'fire' will be put out". It can be described thus :

<i>The things</i>	<i>Metaphor</i>
1. Heart	lamp
2. Life	wick in the lamp
3. Pain	burning
4. The feeling of separation	fire
5. To leave	to be put out

3.9.5. *Metaphor—Verbs*

Metaphor can be indicated not only by the nouns but by the verbs as well. "When it is said, 'Maṇam iruṇṭatu' is 'the mind got darkened', it carries an emotional significance—like the sky getting dark. so also, the mind, losing hope, is darkened by worries. The word 'darkened' is replete with such metaphorical possibilities".² The alaṅkārikās call it 'Camāti'.³ Naccinārkkiniyar analyses such verbs and gives us the whole picture of a metaphor and we come to know

1. Kali; v. 142; 39-40.

2. Ilakkīyattiraṅ; p. 231.

3. Taṇṭi Alaṅkāram; pp. 26-27.

that a verb indicates all these things. There occurs a line in *Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi*.

“Tōkaiyan tukiliṇāḷ taṇ
Tuṇai mulai porutu cēnta”.¹

“The breasts of *Ilakkaṇai* fought and became red”—this is the meaning of the line. Here ‘fought’ the verb is a metaphor. The question arises against whom the breasts ‘fought’ and what exactly is meant by this metaphorical predicate. *Naccinārkkiniyar* analyses this word and creates a conceit of his own. The breasts are usually compared to the elephants, and elephant force is traditionally known to be the best in these four kinds of forces (chariots, elephants, horses, soldiers). That the elephants fought, is obvious but against whom is the question. *Jīvakaṇ*’s broad chest is usually symbolised as a mountain. Therefore, the elephants have to be taken to have dashed against this mountain to prove their strength—That is “the breasts (elephants) of —*Ilakkaṇai*, in a violent embrace with *Jīvakaṇ* are pictured as fighting against his chest of a mountain”—and they are supposed to be still in a state of anger in her hankering for his embrace and hence their redness (anger). So a particular verb charged with metaphorical possibilities makes the commentator give us a complete picture.

3.9.6. Clarification of points of similarity

When a thing is compared with another, and it becomes metaphor, the poet has in mind some basic similarities and features in both. We need not expect him to give us the points of similarity. The commentator offers the explanation.

Jīvakaṇ was taught the essential values of life by his teacher. *Accaṇanti*, stands in the path of virtue worshipping the feet of the Jain God (*Aruka*). This is symbolised by the poet thus :

The bliss (*Kāṭci*) is pictured as the gate, knowledge (*ñāṇam*) as door and good conduct (*Oḷukkam*) as the bolt.²

Naccinārkkiniyar analyses why these metaphors have been used. The gate is permanent, so also Bliss (*kāṭci*), knowledge as the door gives the protection and good conduct like the bolt is inseparable from Bliss and good Conduct. There are many other places in *Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi*, where *Naccinārkkiniyar*, after a skilful investigation points out the similarities between things and metaphors.³

1. *Jīvaka*; v. 2477.

2. *Jīvaka*; v. 381.

3. *Jīvaka*; vv. 843, 845, 2848, 2860, 3081, etc.

3.9.7. *Metaphor on the basis of the ideal*

Curamañcari falls in love with Jivakan and she tells her friend about this, and the poet gives a beautiful description of this theme. "She with her garland of chastity tries to drive away the bee of modesty.¹ The shedding of modesty has been described in other works also.² But Naccinārkkiniyar is not able to reconcile himself to the idea of women forsaking modesty absolutely. For women, modesty is more valuable than life and chastity is more valuable than modesty.³ So he says as Curamañcari drives away the bee of modesty with the garland of chastity, the bee has not completely left her ; as the fragrance of the garland itself draws it more and more to her proximity. So Naccinārkkiniyar contends that Curamañcari is not completely devoid of modesty.

1. Jivaka; v. 2073.

2. Iṅṅaiyañār; s. 23, pp. 137-138, s. 29, p. 157.

3. Tol. Foru; s. 113.

CHAPTER — 4

SYNONYMY AND POLYSEMY

4.1. *Synonyms*

4.1.1. *Synonyms – not repetitions*

A poem should be brief with every word in direct relation to the thing it portrays, or the emotion it conveys. Unnecessary words or repetitions only dilute the poetic essence. As a matter of fact, the grammarians have enumerated short-comings that should be avoided, such as exaggerations, emptiness, and uselessness.¹ But when a great poet employing two or more synonyms in a poem, he should have done it for a specific purpose and not for a mere repetition of the idea. It becomes the duty of the commentator to find out this purpose. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar often brings out of the subtle nuances of meaning differentiating apparent synonyms.

4.1.2. *Synonyms—not substitutes*

What at first look like synonyms are found to be different on a closer examination. Some authors go to the extent of denying the very existence of synonyms. 'Pōtu' and 'malar' mean flower in later usage. But they refer literally and strictly to different stages of the flower. Even as 'arumpu' refers to the earliest stage, pōtu refers to a stage when the flower is on the verge of blossoming, and 'malar' to the stage when the flower has blossomed. Therefore one of them cannot be substituted for the other. The difference is well brought out by Tiruvaḷḷuvar in one of his couplets.

“Kālai arumpi-p-pakal ellām pōtāki
mālai malarumin nōy”

which describes the various stages of love.²

4.1.3. *Methods of interpreting synonyms*

The methods adopted by Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar to explain the synonymy or polysemy may be classified under two main divisions.

1. Tōl. Poruḷ. Pōrā; s. 663.

2. Kuraḷ; v. 1227.

1. Differentiation.
2. Non-differentiation.

Differentiation can be explained under four heads as follows :-

1. Different but allied meanings.
2. Different meanings but not allied.
3. Avoidance of repetition of meaning by taking the sentence as elliptical.
4. Dislodgement of synonymous words or poetic inversion.

4.2. *Different but allied meanings*

In a poem, wherever there are nouns of quality apparently synonyms, Naccinārkkiniyar distinguishes them to prove they are not empty repetitions.

4.2.1. *Paṇṇu-p-peyar (nouns of quality)*

(1) *The synonyms of beauty* employed in the literary works are aḷaku, aṇi, āy, eḷil, ēr, kaviṇ, kōlam, takai, nalam, vaṇam, vaṇappu etc. The beauty of the Divine ladies on the mountain is described by Nakkīrar thus :

“kai puṇaintiyafrā-k-kaviṇ peru vaṇappu”¹

Naccinārkkiniyar explains ‘vaṇappu’ as the natural beauty as against ‘kaviṇ’ i.e. the artificial by beautifying one’s appearance so as to heighten their native charm. Here he distinguishes the words ‘kaviṇ’ and ‘vaṇappu’. Kaviṇ according to him is made up beauty, whereas ‘vaṇappu’ is natural beauty. In Kalittokai, the heroine after her separation from the hero is described as losing here kaviṇ.² It means here, she has no artificial make up or beauty or adornment. There is another line “āy nutal aṇi kūntal”³ - Naccinārkkiniyar explains the line as referring to the beautiful forehead and beautified hairlocks. ‘Āy according to him is natural beauty and ‘aṇi’ is artificial. There are various instances where Naccinārkkiniyar brings out such subtle nuances of meaning as may be seen from what follows.

1. Muruku; 1. 17.

2. Kali; v. 45:19.

3. Kali; v. 40:8.

a.	<u>Kaviṅ</u>	—	made up beauty
	<u>vaṅappu</u>	—	natural charm ¹
b.	<u>eḷil</u>	—	growing beauty
	<u>kaviṅ</u>	—	beauty ²
c.	<u>ēr</u>	—	growing beauty
	<u>vaṅam</u>	—	beauty ³
d.	<u>eḷil</u>	—	beauty of the various parts of the body
	<u>vaṅappu</u>	—	beauty of the appearance ⁴
e.	<u>aṅi</u>	—	beauty
	<u>ēr</u>	—	growing beauty ⁵
f.	<u>āy</u>	—	natural charm
	<u>aṅi</u>	—	beautified ⁶
g.	<u>tonṅalam</u>	—	natural beauty (because of the preceding word <i>tol</i>)
	<u>aṅivaṅappu</u>	—	artificial beauty (because of the preceding word <i>aṅi</i> ⁷)
h.	<u>puṅai nalam</u>	—	artificial beauty (because of the preceding word <i>puṅai</i>)
	<u>aḷaku</u>	—	natural charm ⁸
i.	<u>nalam</u>	—	beauty of the various parts of the body
	<u>kaviṅ</u>	—	total personality ⁹
j.	<u>aḷaku</u>	—	personality
	<u>kōlam</u>	—	the beautiful pattern of adornment etc ¹⁰
k.	<u>eḷil</u>	—	artificial beauty ¹¹

1. Muruku; l. 17.

2. Kali; v. 45:19.

3. Porunar; l. 35.

4. Kali; v. 17:13-14.

5. Jīvaka; v. 2100.

6. Kali; v. 40:8.

7. Ibid; v. 124:11-12.

8. Jīvaka; v. 1108.

9. Ibid; v. 1357.

10. Jīvaka; v. 2839.

11. Malai; l. 57.

So it is clear that the words *aḷaku*, *vaṇappu*, *āy*, and *nalām* pertain to natural beauty. *Alaku* denotes the personality; *vaṇappu* beauty of appearance; *āy*, the beauty of the individual parts of the body; *nalām*, the beauty of the limbs; - these are subtle variations. *Alaku*, *vaṇappu*, *nalām* are words of quality. *Āy* occurs as an attribute for the noun of quality. *Alaku*, *nalām vaṇappu* with attributes denote the artificial beauty also. For instances - *Puṇainālam*, *aṇivaṇappu*, *Kaviṇ*, *aṇi*, *kōlam* denote artificial beauty. *Ēr* perhaps refers to the growing charm of the body and 'Eḷi' to the grace one develops after consummation and this we can make but from *Naccinārkkiniyar's* commentary.¹ *Vaṇam* looks like the root of the word *vaṇappu*, hence it has the same meaning as *vaṇappu*. There are a few more nouns of quality contrasted by *Nāccinārkiṇiyar* as under.

(2) There are two words in Tamil denoting stage of being young. *Kuḷavi* and *Iḷam*.

"*Kuḷavi-k-kōṭṭu iḷam piṇai*"²

Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this as the moon born after the new-moon day (childhood) evolving gradually into youth. Here *kuḷavi*, according to him is infancy and *Iḷam* refers to a later stage of childhood.

(3) "*Inṇiṇkiḷaviyāy*" is a line occurring in 'Kalittokai'.³ Here two words denoting sweetness, occur 'in' and 'tīm'. According to *Naccinārkkiniyar* they mean :

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| a. <i>Inkiḷavi</i> | — | sweet after it is heard
i.e. because of its effect |
| b. <i>Tīmkiḷavi</i> | — | sweet at the time of hearing
itself |
| (4) a. <i>kōpam</i> | — | anger that vanishes just
after its occurrence |
| b. <i>Cinam</i> | — | anger that stays a little
while and then vanishes ⁴ |

1. *Kali*, vv. 17:13-14; 45:19.

Porunar; 1. 35

2. *Jīvaka*; v. 165.

3. *Kali*; v. 24:3.

4. *Muruku*; 11. 134-135.

Cirupān; 1. 210.

- (5) a. Ikal — temporary hostility
 b. Cerram — long-standing hostility¹
- (6) a. Varuttam — Physical misery
 b. Iṭumpai — mental misery
 c. Aṅar — mental misery
 d. Tuṅi — to dislike
 e. Evvam — misery
 f. Tuyar — poverty
 g. vāṭṭam — physical exhaustion
 h. parivu — Mental exhaustion²
- (7) a. Paru — Stout
 b. Eruḷ — Strength
 c. Tiṅi — tight and not loose
 (muscles etc.)
 d. Muṭalai — hard and well twisted
 e. vali — physical strength
 f. Āṅmai — masculine strength³
- (8) a. Verri — victory in war
 b. Viral — triumph over senses⁴
- (9) a. Uyir — sound
 b. Viṅi — the word conveyed by the
 sound⁵

Naccinārkkīṅiyar has not conveyed the meaning of 'oli' and 'kural'
 But it occurs as :

'uyar kural oli oṭi'⁶

-
1. Muruku; 11. 131-133.
 2. Ibid; 11. 135-136.
 Porunar; 11. 87-88.
 Cigupān; 1. 39.
 Jivaka; v. 2382.
 3. Netu-1; 11.31-32. Jivaka; v. 1165.
 4. Malai; 1. 544.
 5. Kuṅinci; 1. 108.
 6. Kali; v. 45:5.

'Uyar kural' is the high pitch. 'Oli' because of the verb 'ōṭi', shows a loud sound.

(10) *Paṛru*, *ārvam*, *kātal*, *kaḷiṅṅu*, *kāmam* all these words denote desire. Naccinārkkiniyar finds fine distinctions amongst all these words.

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| a. <i>Paṛru</i> | — | attachment to the acquired object |
| b. <i>Ārvam</i> | — | a want or hankering after the unacquired object ¹ |
| b. <i>kātal</i> | — | love for the beauty of the woman. |
| <i>kāmam</i> | — | the range for immediate satisfaction of lust. ² |

(11) *Inmai* means that which is not. There are three words which denote this: *Tolaival*, *illāmai* and *iṭṭam illāmai*. *Kalittokai* describes the poverty in this way and Naccinārkkiniyar distinguishes all these words.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| a. <i>Tolaivu</i> | — | implies an earlier prosperous stage which has later disappeared leaving one in poverty. |
| b. <i>Iṅmai</i> | — | implies no such change but a continuous poverty. |
| c. <i>Iṭṭam iṅmai</i> | — | implies not absolute poverty but the state when one is not in a position to maintain his family completely. ³ |

Tolkāppiyar refers to the words *ī*, *tā* and *koṭu* as asking for a thing.⁴ Naccinārkkiniyar says that they denote giving wealth to the three kinds of people stated earlier.

4.2.2. *Nouns other than paṅṅu*

So far had been described the different meanings of words based on the different force of the roots. But there are other words which have become synonymous in a later age which has forgotten the differentiations recognised by an earlier generation which made use of

1. *Jivaka*; vv. 946, 3039, 3105.

2. *Ibid*; vv. 1596, 1633.

3. *Kali*; v. 2:11, 15, 19.

4. *Tol. Col*; ss. 444.448.

these distinctions in every day speech. Here the commentator understanding the earlier usage, makes clear the distinctions. Most of these are other than paṅṅpu-p-ṅcyar already mentioned.

(1) *Malar and mālai* : There are various words in Tamil referring to malar (flower) as already stated. There is a line in Jivaka Cintāmaṇi.

‘Paim pōtu alar cinti’¹

Nacciṅṅārkkiniyar explains—honey drops from pōtu and alar, there by implying that the two are different words. Pōtu has been already explained as the flower in bloom, whilst alar has to be equated with malar as a blossomed flower.

The different meanings for the apparently similar words referring to ‘mālai’ (garland) are as under :

- | | | |
|--------------|---|---|
| a. Kōtai | — | the garland on the forehead of women ² |
| b. Tār | — | the garland the men wear on the chest ³ |
| c. Mālai | — | the garland on the head or the forehead often as symbol ⁴ |
| d. Kāḷ | — | one string of flowers as against many string of flowers etc ⁵ |
| e. Kaṅṅi | — | a big garland made up of several strings of flowers worn on the head ⁶ |
| f. Piṅṅaiyal | — | a cluster of flowers made into a garland, worn on the chest ⁷ |
| g. cūṅṅtu | — | a string of flowers worn on the forehead ⁸ |
| h. Āram | — | garland of pearls ⁹ |

1. Jivaka; v. 1228.

2. Maturai; 11. 264-266.

3. Ibid; Jivaka; vv. 979, 2119, 3022.

4. Jivaka; v. 979, 3022.

5. Kali; v. 115:5.

6. Kali; v. 115:5 Jivaka; v. 193.

7. Jivaka; v. 193.

8. Ibid.

9. Kali; v. 135; 13.

(2) *Nouns of Places* : The differences between various nouns of places, according to Naccinārkkiṇiyar are as under :

- | | | | |
|----|---------|----|--|
| a. | Kōṇam | -- | narrow street |
| | Maruku | — | broad street ¹ |
| b. | Vāyil | — | big entrance (gate) |
| | Puḷai | — | smaller entrance (gate) ² |
| c. | Araṅkam | — | a place where dramas are staged |
| | Ampalam | — | a place where many witness he plays ³ |

(3) *Nouns mountain* : The difference amongst nouns referring to mountains according to Naccinārkkiṇiyar are as under :

- | | | | |
|----|---------|---|--|
| a. | Veṟpu | — | big mountain. ⁴ |
| b. | Malai | — | small hill ⁵ |
| c. | Varai | — | small hill or the top of the hill ⁶ |
| d. | Aṭukkal | — | the side of a hill ⁷ |
| e. | Aṭukkam | — | the side of a hill ⁸ |
| f. | Cilampu | — | the side of a hill ⁹ |

Naccinārkkiṇiyar says that Malai and Varai refer to small hills and aṭukkal, aṭukkam and cilampu refer to the side of a hill. The difference between these needs investigation. Aṭukkam and aṭukkal may be the same, one being the corrupt form of the other.

(4) *Other-nouns* : Difference between various other nouns are also explained by Naccinārkkiṇiyar.

- | | | | |
|----|--------|---|---|
| a. | Vāvi | — | the brook of a river |
| | Poykai | — | the natural tank not dug by men ¹⁰ |

1. Jīvaka; v. 615.
 2. Paṭṭiṇam; l. 287.
 3. Jīvaka; v. 2112.
 4. Kali; v. 41:16-17.
 5. Ibid.
 6. Kali; v.v. 41:16-17, 40:21.
 7. Ibid; v. 40:21.
 8. Ibid; v. 45: 16-17.
 9. Ibid; v. 46:25-26.
 10. Jīvaka; v. 337.

b.	Tēṅ	—	the honey in the honey comb
	Matu	—	the honey in the flower ; nectar ¹
c.	Makaḷir	—	common name for women
	Maṅkaiyar	—	married women ²
d.	Eyiṛu	—	permanent teeth
	Pal	—	milk teeth ³
e.	Paṭai	—	The army that has come from elsewhere
	Tāṅai	—	Stationary army ⁴
f.	Aravam	—	snake
	Pāntaḷ	—	big snake ⁵

4.2.3. Verbs

There are several verbs which have the same meaning occurring in literature. 'Ayilutal' means eating; uṇṇutal tiṅṅutal, parukutal, nakkutal—they all refer to different modes of eating. The commentators of Tolkāppiyam bring out these distinctions. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar who himself is a commentator of Tolkāppiyam brings out the distinctions between verbs at various places.

a.	Muṇvalittal	—	to smile
	Nakutal	—	to laugh ⁶
b.	Nāṅutal	—	artificial smell
	Kamaḷtal	—	natural fragrance ⁷
c.	Kāṅutal	—	seeing with eyes
	Nōkkutal	—	considering with the mind ⁸
d.	Ocital	—	droop down
	Olkutal	—	bending ⁹

1. Jīvaka; vv. 64, 1823.

2. Malai; 1. 58.

3. Kali; v. 58:4.

4. Ibid; v. 15:3.

5. Kuṅṅi; 11. 259, 255.

6. Jīvaka; v. 1228.

7. Ibid; v. 500.

8. Ibid; v. 1710. Kali; v. 37; 1-10.

9. Kali; v. 77: 5-6.

e.	Vemmai	—	liking of others for one
	vīḷtal	—	one's liking for the another ¹
f.	Tēṟram	—	consoling or creating a belief with one's own words
	Teḷivittal	—	consoling through swearing on God ²
g.	Māytal	—	non appearance
	Karattal	—	hiding ³
h.	Kalattal	—	mere embracing
	Muyaṅkal	—	sexual act ⁴
i.	Piṇittal	—	stringing together
	yāttal	—	binding ⁵
j.	Nīṅkutaḷ	—	physical leaving
	kaṭattal	—	mental separation ⁶
k.	Akalal	—	leaving
	Tuṟattal	—	renunciation ⁷
l.	Aviḷtal	—	the blossoming of the bud
	Alarttal	—	blossoming ⁸
m.	Aṟital	—	knowing the situation
	Ōrtal	—	knowing the significance of the situation ⁹
n.	Olittal	—	the sound of a musical instrument made of leather.
	Ārttal	—	the sound of a wind instrument ¹⁰
o.	Ēttal	—	praising
	Vāḷttal	—	blessing ¹¹
p.	Cōrtal	—	getting tired
	Acaital	—	shivering ¹²

-
1. Kali; v. 78: 24-25.
 2. Ibid; v. 98: 31-32.
 3. Ibid; v. 142: 36.
 4. Ibid; v. 128: 12.
 5. Ibid; v. 138: 9.
 6. Kali; v. 79: 20-21.
 7. Jīvaka; v. 1177.
 8. Ibid; v. 1651.
 9. Ibid; v. 1726.
 10. Ibid; v. 1776.
 11. Jīvaka; v. 2128.
 12. Ibid v. 3143.

q. Pakartal	—	announcing to all
Aṛaital	—	-do-
Kūrūtal	—	informing one ¹

4.2.4. Some other methods for differentiating the words with allied meanings

(1) *One as the attribute of the other* : There is a line in Kalittokai “Koṅṛai alaṅkal am teriyalāṅ”² — here Naccinārkkiniyar explains—the God wearing the garland of well-blossomed flowers. Here alaṅkal is interpreted as blossoming like a garland or moving, whereas elsewhere it means garland. Alaṅkal here, according to Naccinārkkiniyar, becomes the attribute to the noun ‘teriyal’ which alone here means garland.

The line “Kaṅnai eri aḷal ampu” means the arrow that spits fire,³ Eri and aḷal mean fire. Naccinārkkiniyar takes eri as a participle and says ‘the arrow that spits burning fire’.

(2) *Differentiation of repeated words* : Sometimes the same word is repeated in a poem which one may explain as having been done for the sake of effect, but even here Naccinārkkiniyar gives two different but allied meanings for the word.

“Oruvir oruvir oṃpiṅir kaḷimīṅ”⁴

Here the journey of the tribe of dancers and musicians through the forest is described. Through the narrow way one should go holding one of the creepers clustering around. Even after crossing, he has to hold it hard lest, when released, it should hit the the face of the one that follows him. Every one has to cross in this way. Naccinārkkiniyar bears this in mind when he interprets this line. The line as such means ‘May you cross one by one’; ‘oruvir oruvir’ has the force of the distributive pronoun. But Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this “May you cross, the one preceding safe-guarding the one that follows”. The safe-guarding is that which was explained above. The first ‘oruvir’ refers to the one that is looked after and the second one refers to the one that looks after.

(3) Sometimes if the same verb gets repeated Naccinārkkiniyar interprets both the verbs, one differently from the other. Nōkki,

1. Jivaka; v. 2205.

2. Kali; v. 150:1.

3. Jivaka; v. 2249.

4. Malai; 1. 218.

nōkki—meaning 'seeing seeing'. But he says that the first seeing is seeing with the mind, and the other with the eyes.¹

4.3 *Different meanings but not Allied*

In all these pairs, the meanings are allied to each other. But there are other instances when the words which are interpreted alike by other commentators are interpreted in such a way that the two words refer to two different things.

4.3.1. *Nouns of quality:*

The Divine Feet of Lord Murukā are described by Nakkīrar as
 "Mataṅ uṭai nōn tāi"²

Mataṅ and nōṅ are apparently two words with the same meaning referring to strength. So others interpret the phrase to mean 'very strong Feet'. But Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar feels that a poet of the calibre of Nakkīrar could not have wasted words like this. There must be another meaning, according to him. Mataṅ also means ignorance. So Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar interprets "the strong Feet that kill the ignorance of his devotees". The Feet display their strength in this killing. The rock-like ignorance is broken by Murukā. Uṭai refers to 'this breaking'. This meaning makes the picture more beautiful. There are many places where Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar brings out the distinctions like this.

Irum pēr okkal³—here 'irum and 'pēr' apparently have the same meaning 'Big' but Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar says, the dark big family.

"Vālitu kiḷanta veṅ kāl céy"⁴. It looks as though 'Vālitu' and 'veṅ' mean whiteness, but Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar interprets as 'wellgrown white-legged bull'. When vālitu means "well-grown".

"Vem vem celvaṅ"⁵—here celvaṅ, the sun, Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar interprets the line as "the sun, hot and liked by all." The first 'vem' means 'hot', the second 'liked by all'.

'Vaṅṅa vaṅṅatta malar'.⁶ Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar explains as flowers of different colours and kinds'. The first 'vaṅṅam' refers to the 'colour' and the second to the kinds.'

1. Jivaka; v. 1004.

2. Muruku; 1. 4.

3. Perumpāṅ; 1. 25; Cirupāṅ; 1. 139.

4. Kali v. 105:17-18.

5. Porunar; 1. 136.

6. Kuṅiñci; 1. 114.

(2) *Making one of the paṇḍus a verb*: “Cuṇaṅku aṇi vaṇa mulai”¹—here ‘aṇi’ and vaṇam both may mean ‘beauty’. Naccinārkkīṇiyar makes ‘aṇi’ as a relative participle, as the verbal root (aṇi) here having the force of a relative participle whereas vaṇa (vaṇam) is taken as a noun of quality used as an attribute to the noun ‘mulai.’ The beautiful breast wearing-cuṇaṅku.

‘Viraintu val eyti’²—here ‘Viraintu’, ‘Val’ mean ‘fast’. Naccinārkkīṇiyar holds ‘viraintu’ as a verbal participle, and the other a quality as he came running came fast. Viraintu has been interpreted to mean “having run”, val is uri-c-col used here to go with ‘eyti.’

‘Ton Mutu peṇṭir’³—Ton and mutu mean old. Naccinārkkīṇiyar considers the first ‘Ton’ as quality and the other as a verb. “Old aged woman”.

Tuvar-c-cev vāy.⁴ Both ‘tuvar’ and ‘cev’ mean the red colour of the lips. Naccinārkkīṇiyar makes the first a quality and the other a verb. ‘The natural fair and reddened mouth. Naccinārkkīṇiyar probably takes cev vāy as viṇai-t-tokai. In ‘cēnta’ we have the root ‘cē’ which here probably occurs shortened as ‘ce’.

(3) *Making one of the paṇḍus, the possessing the paṇḍu*: “Maṇam kamaḷ nāṅṅam”⁵—Maṇam and Nāṅṅam mean fragrance. But the commentator says the fragrance caused by objects of fragrance like pūṇuku. According to him ‘Maṇam’ means ‘fragrant objects’ and ‘nāṅṅam’ means the ‘fragrance.’

4.3.2. Nouns other than paṇḍu

(1) *Interpreting different meanings*: When two nouns other than paṇḍu are used, one is interpreted to mean something not allied to the other.

“Ceṅunar-t-tēyttu-c-cel camammurukki”⁶. Ceṅunar-t-tēyttal—to destroy the enemies. Celcamam murukkal—to destroy the battle field. Both of them apparently appear in the same meaning.

-
1. Kali; v. 60;1.
 2. Malai; 1. 281.
 3. Maturai; 1. 409.
 4. Kali; v. 55:4.
 5. Maturai; 1. 447.
 6. Mūruku; 11, 98-100.

Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this as 'banishing the non-prejudiced outlook suggesting equanimity or camam. If one has a non-prejudiced outlook he cannot kill people. So before starting the war, that outlook is thrust aside. Naccinārkkiniyar is entering into the realms of philosophy. It reminds us of Lord Krishna's teachings to Arjuna (Pārtha) in Mahābhāratha. There are other instances where Naccinārkkiniyar gives a similar interpretation.¹

(2) *Making one of the two nouns, a quality:* Tenvarai-p-potiyil²—Varai meaning a mountain is an attribute of potiyil which is a mountain of that name. So it seems that varai meaning a mountain is unnecessary as Potiyil itself is used in that sense. So Naccinārkkiniyar interprets 'varai' as a boundary. 'Ten varai potiyil' thus means 'the potiyil hill standing as a boundary in the south.' There are several other places-where he makes distinctions in the the same manner.

- a. Ēṭṭilai³
- b. Marutam cāṅṅa marutam⁴
- c. Marutam caṅṅa taṅ paṅai⁵
- d. Timpunai malku nīr vitaiyam⁶
- e. Pakatṭerutu⁷

(3) *Making one of the two nouns an attribute :* 'Cilai...vil'⁸ is a passage where both the words denote the same thing i.e. bow. But Naccinārkkiniyar says that this means the bow made of cilai tree. Of these two words, Naccinārkkiniyar makes the second the noun and the first an attribute with another sense i.e. made of cilai tree. There are many other instances where he interprets in this manner.⁹

(4) *Making one of the nouns a verb :* "Tiṅkal mati mukam"¹⁰—Tiṅkal and mati mean the moon and so Naccinārkkiniyar makes 'mati' a verbal root having the force of relative participle, as he says 'Tiṅkal matitta mukam'—The face that is held in esteem by the

-
1. Jivaka; vv. 1355, 2204, 2376, 2919.
 2. Ibid; v. 697.
 3. Perumpāṅ; 1. 59.
 4. Ciṅṅupāṅ; 1. 186.
 5. Maturai; 1. 270.
 6. Jivaka; v. 162.
 7. Ibid; v. 2775.
 8. Kali; v. 15:1.
 9. Kali; vv. 40:34, 49:10. Jivaka; vv. 58, 1358, 2386, 2898.
 10. Jivaka; v. 643

moon. There are many other instances for this kind of appreciation.¹

4.3.3. Verbs

(1) *Interpretation of different meanings*: Having dealt with (1) paṅṅpu, and (2) nouns other than paṅṅpu, one may go on to cases where Naccinārkkiniyar deals with two verbs interpreting them differently.

“Mārpaka malarntu akaṅṅra mārpiṅāṅ”²

Here ‘malarntu’ and ‘akaṅṅra’ mean ‘broad’. Naccinārkkiniyar does not consider ‘malarntu’ as an attribute for ‘mārpiṅāṅ’. He makes the ‘malarntu’ the predicate of ‘mal’ (wrestling). He says that the skill of the hero in wrestling separated from others (paka) blossoms to its fullest extent (malarntu) and he has a broad chest. If the same is repeated twice he thus gives two different meanings for the same.

(2) *Making one of the two verbs an uri-c-col*: ‘Cuṅṅar uṅṅa uṅṅa nīṅṅa’ varai³ - here the poet describes a mountain. ‘uṅṅa’ meaning ‘to contact’ occurs twice in the line. But the commentator gives different meanings. The hill is so high that it comes in contact with the sun. The first ‘uṅṅa’ denotes the contact of the mountain with the sun and the second ‘uṅṅa’ has been made an attribute to nīṅṅa (high) so that both mean “so high”.

(3) *Other reasons*: “Vaṅṅai akavuvam vā ikuṅṅai nām, Vaṅṅai akavuvam vā”⁴ Vaṅṅai-p-pāṅṅu is a kind of musical dialogue. “Vaṅṅai akavuvam vā” occurs twice. Naccinārkkiniyar says that the first one is spoken by the maid calling the heroine to sing about the cruelty of the hero. The heroine refuses and says that they can sing about the good qualities of the hero. ‘Vaṅṅai akavuvam vā’ means - ‘please come, let us sing vaṅṅai song.’ Naccinārkkiniyar interprets the repetition as two independent statements made by two persons - the first by the maid, and the second by the heroine - both in different senses - one - singing the bad qualities of the hero and the other singing the good qualities. This interpretation of the commentator is in conformity with the musical dialogue. There are other instances where Naccinārkkiniyar interprets in this manner.⁵

1. Ibid; vv. 1587, 2749, etc.

2. Ibid; v. 2424.

3. Kali; v. 45: 16-17

4. Ibid; v. 42 : 6-9.

5. Kali; vv. 41 : 18-20, 41: 21-22.

4.4. *Avoidance of repetition of meaning by taking the sentence as elliptical*

If one of the two words occurring with the same meaning has no subject or object etc., Naccinārkkiniyar takes it as having suffered an ellipsis of the same. Sometimes both the words have no subject or object etc., and he takes them also as having suffered an ellipsis of the subject etc. Thus he differentiates the synonyms by giving them different subjects or objects etc. This can be classified under several heads with reference to the subject etc. since one or more of the synonyms suffer an ellipsis.

1. the subject of one of the two verbs.
2. the subjects of both the verbs.
3. the object of one of the two verbs.
4. the objects of both the verbs.
5. the special noun for a general word denoting place etc.
6. the things referred to by the demonstratives.
7. cause and effect.

4.4.1. *The subject of one of the two verbs*

“Nāṇam mika nāṇu kamaḷ kuñci”

Here two verbs of the same meaning occur - Nāṇu and Kamaḷ - meaning ‘the spread of fragrance’. Nāṇum - the subject of this is nāṇam (kastūri). Nāṇam mika nāṇum kuñci- ‘the hair that is fragrant with the smell of kastūri. But there is another word ‘kamaḷum’ meaning fragrance. But there is no subject for this. Naccinārkkiniyar derives a subject for this word also. He says fragrant with natural smell. “Hair fragrant with the smell of kastūri, and fragrant with natural smell”. Naccinārkkiniyar says at a different place also that the hair is fragrant with natural smell.²

4.4.2. *The subject of both the verbs*

“Eri aṇu aṇu kālai tōṇu amaivarap paṇṇi.”³

Here the ‘aṇu’ is repeated (twice); it means “as and when it has the lack of it”, this occurs twice. Lack of what? The subject has not been explicitly stated, and so, two subjects have to be derived for both “aṇu, aṇu”. The first ‘aṇu’ refers to ‘the lack of oil’ in

1. Jivaka; v, 500.

2. Malai; l. 30.

3. Neṭu; 11. 103-104.

the lamps, the second, to its "extinguishing stage with its light about to go out". So two subjects have been derived, oil and light. 'Ammivarappaṇṇi' means oil has been poured" and "the light revived.

4.4.3. *The object of one of the two verbs*

"Kuṭi puṛaṇ kātṭōmpum ceṅkōlāṇ" is a line occurring in Kalittokai.¹ Here, 'Ceṅkōlāṇ', the king with the sceptre described, is Pāṇḍya. Puṛaṇkāttal and ṭōmpum are the two actions of Pāṇḍya. These two verbs kāttu and ṭōmpum have the same meaning. The 'verb' kāttu has its object 'kuṭi'. 'Kuṭipūṛaṇkāttu' means 'to protect his countrymen'. What is the object of the verb 'ṭōmpum'? Nacciṇārkkiniyar takes the object to have suffered ellipsis. The king, if he thinks of defending himself, would be considered selfish. So, 'pūṛaṇkāttu' is interpreted as "defending his countrymen". This is stated earlier and defending himself is mentioned later. ṭōmpum has the object himself which has suffered ellipsis. The protection of oneself is from passions. Here, the duty of the king is well brought out. This can be compared with Parinēlaḷkar's interpretation of a Tirukkuṛaḷ, 'to defend the citizens against the attacks of the enemies and his own self.'² There are other instances where Nacciṇārkkiniyar interprets like this.³

4.4.4. *The objects of both the verbs*

"Tinkaḷum maṟuvum enac cērntatu
Naṅkaḷ aṇpu eṇa nāṭṭi valippuṛi"⁴.

Here Jīvaka compares the love between him and his lady - to the moon and the black spot on it. 'Nāṭṭi' and 'valippuṛi' mean, the same thing, 'established'. As the moon starts waning, in that stage, the black spot leaves it altogether, but when the moon is full the black-spot again appears. By this comparison, Jīvakaṇ points out to his lady that there is bound to be separation (as the black-spot which vanishes) and even if they are separated for a short while, they are bound to meet again (as conveyed by the full moon and the black-spot). So 'Nāṭṭi' establishes the first truth 'separation' and 'Valippuṛi' establishes the second truth, that they would definitely meet again. Nacciṇārkkiniyar's interpretation here heightens the beauty of the poem. There are also other places like this.⁵

1. Kali; vi 130:19.

2. Kuṛaḷ; v. 549.

3. Kali; vv. 140:23-24, 27-28, 24:8-12, 75:14-15.

4. Jīvaka; v. 1334.

5. Ibid; vv 268, 1707, etc.

4.4.5. *The special noun for a general word*

“Vakai cāl ulakkai vayiṅ vayiṅ ōcci”¹

The pestle (ulakkai) is raised and it crushes grains. There are two words vayiṅ, vayiṅ now occurring as place nouns in the locative significance. The places are not specified, The persons who are pounding are the heroine and the maid. Naccinārkkiniyar says let us crush raising the pestle between ‘me’ (maid) and ‘you’ (heroine). The nouns derived for both the place nouns (viz., vayiṅ) are in my place and “in your place” (envayiṅ and ninvayiṅ).

4.4.6. *The things referred to by the demonstratives derived*

“Avai avai munikuvam eṅiṅē”.² It means ‘if we dislike those’. The word ‘avai’ (those) is repeated twice. The demonstrative “those”, occurring twice, does not explicitly point out to anything in particular. So Naccinārkkiniyar brings out those things referred to by the demonstratives, the things which the poet has already described in the previous lines. They are boiled mutton (puḷukkiṅa iṅai) and fried mutton (cūṭṭiṅai). “If we dislike those two, boiled mutton and fried mutton”—that is the meaning of the line. There are other passages where Naccinārkkiniyar exploits this method of criticism.

4.4.7 *Cause and effect-derived*

‘Akal iru vicumpu’³. It means ‘the broad big sky’. ‘Akal and Iru’ both ordinarily mean “broad” and “big” respectively. Naccinārkkiniyar does not want to waste both the adjectives for the same subject. Akal-means to spread. Naccinārkkiniyar says ‘that among the five elements, the other four elements spread within the boundary of the sky and the sky is the cause for their spreading out thus. The other four spreading out elements are the effects and the sky is the cause. Naccinārkkiniyar interprets “Akaliru vicumpu” whenever it occurs, like this.⁴

4.5. *Dislodgement of synonymous words or poetic Inversion*

There are places where Naccinārkkiniyar is not able to distinguish the meaning of words occurring in the same sense as he does at most other places. Naccinārkkiniyar tries to relieve the poem from repetition by taking one of the words to a different place so as to go with some other word when both the words become significant and also

1. Kali; v. 40;5.

2. Porunar; 1. 107.

3. Perumpāṇ; 1. 1.

4. Maturai; 1. 267, Kuṅiṅci; 1. 48., Malai 1. 100.

beautiful. Especially, if the words are nouns of quality or nouns of things, verbs etc., he prefers this method.

4.5.1 *Nouns of quality*

“*Kiṭi maḷalai meṇ cāyalōr*”¹ is a description of the women in *Pattuppāṭṭu*. ‘*Cāyalōr*’-‘delicate women’. *Cāyal*-delicacy.² But there is another noun of quality ‘*meṇmai*’ which means also ‘soft’ or ‘delicate’. *Tolkāppiyar*, says that ‘*cāyal*’ means ‘delicate’. *Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar* interprets the word as referring to delicate women, with delicacy in speech like that of a parrot ‘*meṇ*’ goes with ‘*maḷalai*’. Here the two words ‘*meṇ*’ and ‘*cāyal*’ are split and put at different places.

<i>Kiṭi meṇ maḷalai</i>	—	delicacy in speech like parrot.
<i>Cāyalōr</i>	—	delicate women.

There are many instances where *Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar* employs this method of appreciation.³

4.5.2 *The nouns other than paṇṇu*

“*Collaiyā-p-pētai maṭavai maṭṭellā*”⁴

This is addressed by the heroine to the maid. ‘*Pētai*’ and ‘*maṭavai*’ are forms of address generally referring to one who is ignorant. The maid as if she does not know what to tell the hero, is asking the heroine-what to tell him, and hence she is addressed as one who is ignorant and this is the interpretation given by *Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar*. Then, the other word, ‘*maṭavai*’ is superfluous. But *Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar* takes it as a form of address to the hero, to be spoken by the maid. “You, who are ignorant! go and tell the hero, “you are ignorant and you do not know how to tell your parents that you want to marry the heroine...,” Here ‘*Pētai*’ refers to the hero. Thus the two words become independent in the hands of *Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar* and the beauty of the poem increases.⁵ There are many other places where *Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar* employs this method.⁶

1. *Paṭṭiṇam*; 11. 149-150.

2. *Tol. Col*; s, 325,

3. *Muruku*; 11. 100-102, *Kali*; vv. 56:16, 60:2, 67:6-8. 77:5-7, 101:27-29, 117:2-4.

4. *Kali*; v. 114:8.

5. *Tolkāppiyar* mentions these words as referring to different meanings. (*Tol. Porul. Pērā*; s. 252). According to Prof. *Sōmasundara Bhārathiyār* ‘*Pētai*’ means innocence and ‘*maṭam*’ means stupidity. (*Tol. Meypṭāṭṭiyal. S.S. Bhārathiyār*; s. 4.)

6. *Kali*; vv. 58:2, 75:1-2, *Jīvaka*; vv. 1344, 2439.

4.5.3 *The verbs*

“Olku paci uḷanta oṭuṅku nuṭ maruṅkul”¹

Here the waist of a lady is described ‘maruṅkul’ means ‘waist’. There are two attributes, oṭuṅku and olku, both meaning generally ‘little and thin’. So two words are unnecessary. Naccinārkkiniyar makes the word oṭuṅku as an attribute for ‘paci’ (hunger), and ‘olku’ as an attribute for the iṭai (waist). He effects a mutual change—

“Oṭuṅku paci uḷanta olku nuṭ maruṅkul”.

‘Oṭuṅku paci’ means ‘hunger which is the reason for the body being thin.’ ‘Olku’ means ‘to move as a helpless creeper’ (nuṭaṅku) and it is a voluntary action, not necessitated by external reasons, to heighten the grace of personality. Oṭuṅku (thinning) is not so aesthetic as the word ‘olku’. In relation to the prosaic and practical state of hunger, this ‘oṭuṅku’ is appropriate and in relation to poetic and romantic imagery, ‘olku’ is apt.² Naccinārkkiniyar’s keen sense of beauty is evident. There are other instances where Naccinārkkiniyar interprets like this.³

4.5.4. *Noun and verb*

“Oppiṇai taṇakkilātān”⁴. ‘Oppu’ and ‘iṇai’ are synonyms meaning ‘equal’. It means, ‘he has no equal’. But two words are unnecessary. So Naccinārkkiniyar makes one word a verb i. e. ‘iṇai’ and says ‘he has no equaling comparison’. Thus the repetition is avoided. There is also another instance in Kalittokai for this method of appreciation.⁵

4.5.5. *Iṭai-C-Col*

“Peruṅcaṇam aṇaikataḷ tirai olittān keṇa ārttatē”⁶. It means ‘the people assembled there, shouted like a roaring sea. Here ānku, eṇa are both signs of comparison. One word is sufficient whereas the poet has employed two words to denote comparison. So Naccinārkkiniyar makes one of them viz., ‘ānku’ a demonstrative, meaning ‘there’. “The people shouted like a roaring sea at that place”. There are also other instances which come under this method.⁷

1. Ciṅupāṇ; 11. 135-136.

2. Jīvaka; v. 654.

3. Kali; vv. 14-14-15, 64:15-17. Jīvaka, vv. 134, 300, 1070, 2302, 2838.

4. Jīvaka; v. 1691.

5. Kali; v. 108:62.

6. Jīvaka; v. 1833

7. Jīvaka; vv. 2106, 2354.

4. 6. *Non-Differentiation of Apparent Synonyms*4. 6. 1. *Repetition denoting intensity*

“Viñkeruttu eṟuḷ munṭṭin irumpuli”¹ - here two words occur describing the strength of the tiger. Eṟuḷ and munṭṭin both mean ‘the strength’, Naccinārkkiniyar, who usually distinguishes such words that are apparently similar, is silent in this context, but just mentions “the very strong tiger”. Similarly at another place he says for ‘vāḷ oḷi’ very bright light,² though ‘vāḷ, oḷi’ mean one and the same thing, ‘bright or light’.

4. 6. 2. *Repetition denoting continuity*

“Oli koṇṭa cummai”³ - Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this as meaning “the sound that contains all the incessant noise”. Here he adds that oli (sound) is an attribute of ‘cummai’ (sound). What the commentator probably means is that the noise is continuous. There is also another instance, “Muḷaṅku iraṅku icai”⁴. Here Naccinārkkiniyar interprets “the sound that sounds without interruptions”. Here also he means the continuity of the sound.

4. 6. 3. *Repetition showing emotion*

“Ennē marrennē ni molintatu ennē”⁵ - here ‘ennē’ occurs thrice in interrogative sense. Jivakan has heard through his teacher that his mother is alive, but he asks this question ‘ennē, ennē, ennē’ thrice. Naccinārkkiniyar says this denotes his anxiety to know at once something regarding her existence. This is sanctioned by Grammar also.⁶

4. 6. 4. *Superlative degree*

Kaḷi peruṅ katalāḷ⁷ - there are two attributes kaḷi and perum for katal. These words can occur as separate bound forms. But when they come combined as here as ‘kāliperum’ they form one unit without being separated. Therefore one has to distinguish these as occurring together and as occurring separately. The combination has the meaning of “very great” thus filling up the lacuna created by the

1. Kali; v. 48:6-7.

2. Jivaka; v. 1192.

3. Kali; v. 68:18.

4. Malai, ll. 323-324.

5. Jivaka; v. 1883.

6. Tol. Col; s. 424.

7. Jivaka; v. 203.

absence of comparative degree etc. Naccinārkkiniyar therefore points out the Tolkāppiyam rule here, which mentions the occurrence of these words as one unit denoting the same meaning.

4. 6. 5. *Emphasis with a purpose*

Mācilāl̄ piranta nāṅṅē matiṅalāṅ vitiyiṅ eṅṅi
Kācilāl̄ kaṅṅa pōṭtē katumēṅa naṅappaṭṭāl̄.¹

Here Kēmacari is referred to as 'Mācilāl̄' and 'Kācilāl̄'. It means one without blemish. She has to look at many men before deciding on the person who is to be her husband. But the convention is that a woman should not look at other men save her own husband. Though Kēmacari sees many men, yet, her mind is pure, and without blemish. Naccinārkkiniyar says, only to emphasise this point the poet repeats 'kācilāl̄', mācilāl̄', which have the same meaning.

4. 6. 6. *Is differentiation obvious?*

'Kūviyar tūṅkuvanar uṅaṅka'. 'Kūviyar' means 'those who sell appam (a sweet dish). Here their sleeping is described. Tūṅkuvanar, uṅaṅka - both mean 'sleeping'. Naccinārkkiniyar says 'the appam sellers, as they sleep'. Here 'tūṅkuvanar' is used by him and he has not assigned any meaning for it. He simply interprets the repetition as 'tūṅkuvanarāy uṅaṅka' but 'tūṅku' also means 'to move'. The appam sellers are selling their dishes throughout the night, and they are sleeping in a sitting pose. They move from one side to the other as they sleep. So Tūṅkuvanar uṅaṅka" means "moving from one side to the other, they sleep". But Naccinārkkiniyar has not pointed out this, perhaps, according to him the meaning 'Tūṅkuvanar' is obvious.

"Eṅiyā vāḷum eṅṅā maḷuvum"³ - Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this as meaning the 'vāḷ' that does not cut, and the 'Maḷu' that does not cut. Here he does not distinguish between the words 'eṅiyā' and 'eṅṅā'. 'Eṅi' and 'eṅṅu' are two words which must denote slightly different actions. It is strange that Naccinārkkiniyar who distinguishes between words of more subtle difference, has not pointed out this. 'Eṅṅal' is a verb for the vāḷ (sword) and 'Eṅṅutal' is a verb for the 'Maḷu'. The very fact that two distinct words are employed denotes their difference. That is why he does not feel the necessity for distinguishing things which are well known. That in effect eṅi and eṅṅu

1. Jīvaka; v. 1451.

2. Maturai; 1. 627.

3. Kali; v. 84:8.

mean the same thing is alone pointed out so as not to be mistaken otherwise.

4.6.7 *Difference not pointed out*

There are places where Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar has not given any reasons for such occurrences, but just mentions them as they are and leaves them at that. They may be explained on the basis of the interpretations already given.

1. Vārātamaivāṅō vārātamaivāṅō.....¹
2. Maṅipōlattōṅṅum maṅipōlattōṅṅum.²
3. Tuṅrakkuvaṅallaṅ tuṅrakkuvaṅallaṅ.³
4. Iḷamaḷaiyāṅṅum iḷamaḷaiyāṅṅum.⁴
5. Īṅrai iṅrai pottirṅṅu-t-ti.⁵
6. Māṅṅu māṅṅu yāṅṅ peyarppa.⁶
7. Muyaṅṅkippotivēm muyaṅṅkippotivēm.⁷
8. Muṅṅṅōṅṅ muṅṅai muṅṅai kātṅṅa.⁸
9. Piṅra piṅravum naṅṅi viraii.⁹
10. Paiya mellavē.¹⁰

4.7. *Polysemy*

4.7.1. *Ambiguity avoided*

In literature or grammar there are places where one word with different meanings occurs and it is the duty of the commentators to point out the meaning of the word in the context.

“Ulakam uvappa¹¹”

is the first line in Tirumurukāṅṅruppaṅṅai. Here Nakkīrar says “as the living species became happy”. ‘Ulakam’ has many meanings as world, living species and conduct. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar points out though it has many meanings as stated earlier yet by the verb

-
1. Kali; v. 41:28-31.
 2. Ibid; v. 41:32-34.
 3. Ibid; v. 41:35-38.
 4. Ibid; v. 41:25-27.
 5. Ibid; v. 145:57-58.
 6. Kali; v. 111:20.
 7. Ibid; v. 106:34-35.
 8. Neṅṅu; l. 177.
 9. Paṅṅṅinam; ll. 180-181.
 10. Jivaka; v. 2999.
 11. Muruku; l.1.

'uvappa' (to become happy) it is evident that it refers only to the living-species. Tolkāppiyar calls such words, which may denote their specific meanings by the verb that follow, "Vinai vēru paṭūum palaporuḷ oru col".¹ Parimēlaḷakar also, whenever the word 'ulakam' occurs, points out the context in which it has occurred.²

4.7.2. *Pointing out the various meanings*

"Pū-v-unti amuta āru pūṅkoṭi nuṭaṅka-p-pōntu" is another line where Naccinārkkiniyar points out the various meanings denoted by the word 'unti' - navel, the extinct part of the river, the creeper like waist and the creeper.³

4.7.3. *Various meaning not mentioned*

"Konṅira-k-kaḷirriṅ ucci"⁴. Kon has several meanings. But Naccinārkkiniyar, who elsewhere points out several meanings for such words, does not here point out the various meanings, but simply says 'kon' means fear. Tolkāppiyar points out the different meanings of this word.⁵

1. Tol. Col. ss. 52-53.

2. Kuṟaḷ; vv. 1, 11; 20, 996; 280, 425; 140, 670; 841, 970, 994, 1025, 215. etc.

3. Jīvaka; v. 2460.

4. Jīvaka; v. 2257.

5. Tol. Col. s. 256.

PART II
NACCINĀRKKINIYAR AS A
CRITICAL GRAMMARIAN

TRADITIONAL METHODS OF CRITICISM

5.1. *Objections and clarifications*

There are many ways of appreciating a literary or grammatical work and one of them, as enunciated by Tolkāppiyam, is to raise a variety of questions viewing things from the stand-point of a discriminating reader and then effect a co-ordination.

“Marutalai-k-kaṭāa maṅṅam uṭaittāy”¹ is a line in Tolkāppiyam in this connection. All the commentators have applied this form of criticism and Naccinārkkiniyar excels in this. The questions he puts to himself can be classified thus :

1. The statement being seemingly in conflict with a grammatical generalisation made elsewhere.
2. The statement being seemingly in conflict with literary usage.
3. The statement being seemingly self-contradictory.
4. The statement being seemingly circumlocutory or unnecessarily complex.
5. The statement being seemingly not comprehensive.
6. The statement being seemingly superfluous.

5.1.1. *Conflict with grammar*

Tolkāppiyar refers to Viravuppeyar i.e. the nouns common to uyartiṇai and Akṛiṇai (superior and inferior categories) as,

“Akṛiṇai viravu-p-peyar”²

But in another place he has stated that these nouns are common to uyartiṇai and akṛiṇai. This raises a question, how he can mention these common nouns as ‘akṛiṇai viravuppeyar’ i.e. the nouns of

1. Tol. Poruḷ, Iḷam; s. 650

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 155.; Tol. Col; s. 152.

inferior category mixing up", when the mixing up is in respect of both, how can he mention akṛiṇai only? So is it not in conflict with the sūtra in Collatikāram where he refers to it as common to both uyartiṇai and akṛiṇai.¹ Naccinārkkiniyar raises this objection and he himself answers the question. Cāttaṅ, Cātti are common to both uyartiṇai and akṛiṇai. Their suffixes denote uyartiṇai, as these refer to masculine and feminine genders. Akṛiṇai has no gender indications. So, even in akṛiṇai, the gender suffixes prescribed for uyartiṇai denote their genders.

1. Cāttaṅ periyaṅ - Masculine.	}	uyartiṇai.
Cātti periyaḷ—Feminine.		
2. Cāttaṅ peritu—Masculine.	}	akṛiṇai.
Cātti peritu—Feminine		

Here it is evident that the gender suffixes 'aṅ' and 'i' in respect of uyartiṇai (in Example No. 1) occur for akṛiṇai also to denote gender. Tolkāppiyar, therefore, in Collatikāram calls these words, Cāttaṅ, Cātti etc. common to both uyartiṇai and akṛiṇai.² But here it is evident that akṛiṇai mixes up with uyartiṇai, to take to their gender indications. So Tolkāppiyar, here in Eḷuttatikāram, says "Akṛiṇai viravuppeyar" (akṛiṇai mixing up with uyartiṇai) and refers to akṛiṇai only, thereby explaining the real characteristic feature of these common nouns i.e. Cāttaṅ, Cātti, etc.³

5.1.2. Conflict with literary usage

Naccinārkkiniyar is not only a great grammarian but a great literary critic. He reconciles the literary application with grammar. In Tolkāppiyam it is stated that 'kaḷ' denotes the plural in the akṛiṇai.⁴

<i>Singular</i>	...	<i>Plural</i>
Malai	...	Malaikaḷ
Maram	...	Maraṅkaḷ
Kutirai	...	Kutiraikaḷ

But in literature the words belonging to uyartiṇai also take to 'kaḷ' for pluralisation.

1. Tol, Col.; s. 174.

2. Ibid; s. 174.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 155.

4. Tol, Col; 171.

Aiñkuṛunūṛu, Kali, and Akanānūṛu, describing elopement are included in pālaittiṅai.¹ There are other instances which he has justified in this manner.²

5. 1. 4. *Circumlocutory or complex statement*

The rules that Tolkāppiyar prescribes for the reflexive pronouns Tām, Nām, Nīr, etc, taking case suffixes strike one as peculiar. For example 'Tām' becomes 'Tamatu'. He says that the initial long vowel becomes short in the root word (Tām—Tam) and then it takes a vowel 'a' before it merges with the case suffix 'atu' (Tama). When it merges, the 'a' in the case suffix 'atu' vanishes and becomes thus:³

Tām + atu — Tam + atu—Tama + atu — Tama atu — Tamatu.

The rule strikes one as peculiar as it is natural to hold that in Tam + atu, the initial letter in the case suffix 'a' merges with the final consonant of 'Tam'.

1. Tam + atu — Tamatu

But Tolkāppiyar introduces a new vowel 'a' and then adds, that the 'a' in the case suffix 'atu' vanishes.

2. Tama tu — Tamatu

Naccinārkkiniyar raises the question can it not be similar to the first example i.e. Tam + atu Tamatu (where there is no need of bringing in a new 'a' for the preceding word and removing the old 'a' in the succeeding word 'atu').

His analysis is remarkable. There are words like 'niṅava' and 'eṅava' used in literature.⁴ Here the 'a' standing as the final letter is the 6th case suffix (plural). But there is another 'a' preceding it (niṅ+a+a). Naccinārkkiniyar holds that this middle 'a' is the one which Tolkāppiyar has prescribed earlier.⁵ In niṅava and eṅava both the vowels 'a' are intact. That is why Tolkāppiyar says that a vowel must be invariably be introduced and the 'a' that vanishes is that of the 6th case suffix.⁶

This reasoning of Naccinārkkiniyar looks logical with reference to niṅava and eṅava, but there is another sixth case suffix 'ātu'

1. Tol. Poru; s. 15, pp. 53-55.

2. Tol. Col; ss. 96, 440, etc.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 115.

4. Puṅam; v. 35:13.

5. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 161.

6. Ibid; s. 115.

occurring as 'Tāṇātu'.¹ According to Tolkāppiyar, if the 'ā' in the case suffix 'ātu' should vanish (as 'a' does in atu), it cannot become Taṇātu. If Taṇ + ātu should become Tāṇātu, there is no necessity for an introduction of the vowel 'a' with the reflexive pronoun.

But it can be argued that 'a' in the long vowel 'ā' vanishes and the 'a' prescribed by Tolkāppiyar merges to form the long vowel 'ā'.

(e.g.) Taṇ + ātu—taṇ a ātu — Taṇaatu—Tāṇātu

Here we must bear in mind that a long vowel constitutes two short vowels and in Sandhi, sometimes, one of them vanishes as is enunciated by Tolkāppiyar himself and illustrated by the commentators

Ira + u — Ira + u — Ira (v) u²

Anyway it must be said that Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar has not investigated this point.

5.1.5. *The statement being seemingly not comprehensive*

Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar lays down the definition of 'col' (word) in Collatikāram.³ 'Col' is an instrument or means for anyone understanding the characteristics of the things which are either uyartiṇai or akṛiṇai. It consists of letters, and though pronounced letter after letter in a sequence, exists as an entity to call up a meaning in the mind of the hearer instead of remaining independent entities as letters. Here Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar raises a question. Is not this definition defective as not covering all words? If the letters were to follow each other in a sequence, to convey a message to the hearer, what about words that consist of only one letter and how can they also be said to create a meaning? Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar answers it himself. The words pronounced letter after letter are first conveyed to the ears and as they constitute a pattern of meaningful or significant sounds, exist as such in the mind of a hearer and thereby convey the meaning. But even a word consisting only of a single letter, forms a pattern of familiar sounds to the ear and the mind, and as such evokes a meaning in the mind of a hearer. Thus Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar proves that the definition he gives for 'word' is not defective but applicable to all the words including those consisting of a single letter. Elsewhere also he has raised objections of this type and answered them with reference to his own interpretations.⁴

1. Tol. Col; s. 80, p. 99.

2. Tol, Eḷuttu; s. 234.

3. Tol. Col; s. 1.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 108.

5.1.6. *The statement being seemingly superfluous*

Tolkāppiyar says that the words (āṇ, peṇ) that are common both to uyartiṇai and akṛiṇai undergo no change in Sandhi.¹

āṇ + kai āṇkai

Peṇ + kai peṇkai

But elsewhere in Tokaimarapu, Tolkāppiyar has said that the words common to uyartiṇai and akṛiṇai in Sandhi suffer no change.² It can be asked naturally whether the first rule does not include the other also. Naccinārkkiniyar raises this question, and draws a distinction between these rules. The words common to both uyartiṇai and akṛiṇai discussed in the earlier sūtra are different from the words discussed later.

Cāttan̄ kuṛiyaṇ, Cāttan̄ kuṛitu.

Cātti kuṛiyaḷ, Cātti kuṛitu.

Here whether they belong to uyartiṇai or akṛiṇai is denoted by the verbs, but the word āṇ and peṇ, as such both in the senses of uyartiṇai and akṛiṇai have akṛiṇai endings. These words 'āṇ' and 'peṇ', as they are, indicate their identity as common nouns without the need for any suffix, whereas the words Cāttan̄ and Cātti indicate their identity as common nouns only by their concordance with the verbs belonging to both categories. Naccinārkkiniyar points out this subtle differentiation and justifies Tolkāppiyam.³

5.2. *Doubts and Clarifications*

Tolkāppiyar refers to the various aspects of commentaries and formulates rules for them and these are in fact our ancient methods of literary appreciation. The commentator has to raise some questions pertaining to the specific point and answer them. We discussed this earlier. There may be some ideas expressed in a work that may lead to doubts and need clarification. Tolkāppiyar has said that a commentator has to establish the true idea of a passage from among various possible interpretations.⁴

5.2.1. *Ambiguities cleared by the author himself*

Tolkāppiyar himself has cleared certain doubts in the minds of a reader regarding the interpretations of his Sūtras. As a matter of

1. Ibid; s 303.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 155.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 303.

4. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; 650.

fact Tolkāppiyar is in the true tradition of great grammarians, and so a critic as well. He is aware of the doubts that might arise in the minds of his readers regarding the explanation of some of his sūtras and he clears the doubts himself. For example:

1. K and ṅ, these letters are produced when the back part of the tongue and back part of the palate are in firm contact.¹
2. c and ṅ̄ — these letters are produced when the middle part of the tongue and middle part of the palate are in firm contact.²
3. ṭ and ṇ — these letters are produced when the front part of the tongue and front part of the palate are in firm contact.³

(1) It means that all the six consonants prescribed have three origins. k, ṅ by the firm contact of the back part of the tongue and palate, c, ṅ̄ by the middle and ṭ, ṇ by the front.

(2) But there can be another interpretation of this sūtra, k by the firm contact of the back part of the tongue, and 'ṅ' by the firm contact of the back palate and it means two origins and if such an interpretation is extended to the others, then it means six origins.⁴

Tolkāppiyar clears this doubt in the sūtra that follows immediately. He makes it clear that the origins are three. Naccinārkiṅṅiyar points out that Tolkāppiyar has stated the sūtra to clear the doubt that may have risen because of the previous sūtra. He points out such clarifications of Tolkāppiyam in many other places also.⁵ Naccinārkiṅṅiyar himself follows this method and has cleared the possible doubts of readers at many places.

5. 2. 2. *Vēṙṙumai - t - tokai or ummai - t - tokai?*

"Puli vil keṅṅai vaittāṅ" - here (ai) the sign of the accusative case and 'um' the sign of conjunction are understood. This construction can be expanded thus:

'Puliy-ai-yum Villaiyum keṅṅaiyaiyum vaittāṅ'

Here two things are understood, case sign and conjunctive sign, so is it vēṙṙumaittokai or ummai-t-tokai. Cēṅṅavaraiyar says that the conjunctive idea is upper most in this construction and so

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 89.

2. Tol-Eḷuttu; s. 90.

3. Ibid; s. 91

4. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 92.

5. Ibid; ss. 5, 50, 103, 104, 106, 136.

according to him it is *ummai-t-tokai*, where conjunctive sign 'um' is understood.¹ But *Nacciṅārkkiniyar* holds it as *Vēṅṅumaittokai* where 'ai' the accusative case sign is understood. According to him, here, the idea as soon as one reads the statement, that is uppermost in the mind of the reader is to know the object only.² The natural thing is to inquire not what are the things said in the list, but only what is the object of the verb. *Iḷampūraṅar* also has given the same interpretation.³

5. 2. 3. *Vēṅṅumai-t-tokai or uvamaittokai*

There is another place where *Nacciṅārkkiniyar* clears such doubts. *Matimukam* can be expanded thus:

'*Matiyai okkum Mukam*'.

It means the face that is like the moon. In this expansion 'ai' the accusative case sign and 'okkum' the sign of simile-both are explicit but in the compound '*Matimukam*' both are understood. Is this compound-*Vēṅṅumaittokai*, or *uvamaittokai*? When we say '*Mati-mukam*' the idea that strikes us immediately is comparison and the case sign occurs only to extend the meaning of the comparison and hence the comparison is primary and the case aspect is secondary. So it is *uvamaittokai* according to *Nacciṅārkkiniyar*.⁴ *Cēṅṅavaraiyar* has not cleared the doubt but mentions it and leaves it at that. If the case idea is in mind, it is *Vēṅṅumaittokai*, and if the idea of comparison is in mind, it is *uvamaittokai* according to him.⁵ This explanation looks tautologous or jejune and *Nacciṅārkkiniyar*'s interpretation is in conformity with psychological understanding. *Nacciṅārkkiniyar* at another place clears the doubt with reference to '*Uyartiṅai*' and says that it is not '*Paṅputtokai*' but '*Viṅṅaittokai*'.⁶

5. 2. 4. *Address to the guardsman or to the Patron*

Nacciṅārkkiniyar clears certain doubts regarding *Pāṅṅai tiṅai* (a *tiṅai* where a poet going to a patron, after praising him, narrates his conditions of poverty and requests him to give redress). *Kaṅṅai nilai* is one of the constituents of *pāṅṅai tiṅai*. It is the request to the guardsman to inform the patron of his arrival. So naturally the doubt arises how *kaṅṅai nilai* can come under '*pāṅṅai tiṅai*' when *pāṅṅai tiṅai* is in address to the patron and *kaṅṅai nilai* is an address to

1. Tol. Col. *Cēṅṅā*; s. 291.

2. Tol. Col. s. 293.

3. Tol. Col. *Iḷam*; s. 286.

4. Tol. Col. s. 414.

5. Tol. Col. *Cēṅṅā*; s. 414.

6. Tol. Col. s. 416, p. 404.

the guardsman. Naccinārkkīṇiyar clears this doubt by saying that the guardsman is only a medium and as a matter of fact the poet is addressing the patron through the guardsman and conveying to the patron his abject penury and expectation of relief. So naturally, according to Naccinārkkīṇiyar it must come under 'pāṭāṇ ṭiṇai'.¹

5. 2. 5. *Whether oṃpaṭai can come under pāṭāṇ?*

Oṃpaṭai belongs to pāṭāṇ ṭiṇai. The poet prays that his patron should live long without being exposed to the risks of ill omen. (inauspicious day, time or bird). There may arise a doubt whether it can come under pāṭāṇ. 'Pāṭāṇ is the counterpart of Kaikkiṭai in Akattiṇai.'² Kaikkiṭai involves the love of a man towards a girl who shows no response because of her immaturity.³ In pāṭāṇ also, the patron wants to be praised and the poet, by praising him, wants to gain wealth from him. Each has his own aim, and the patron giving wealth and the poet praising the patron are both incidental from their respective point of view. So, it is the counterpart of kaikkiṭai.⁴ But in oṃpaṭai the ultimate aim is that the patron should live long. How then can it come under pāṭāṇ ṭiṇai? Naccinārkkīṇiyar argues that the poet praises the patron who has been supporting him all along and who is now in trouble. So, though material gain may not be his immediate consideration he has in mind all the gifts given by the patron to him earlier. So even here the wealth is the consideration. 'He gave me wealth and he must live long' - and this is his view and hence it should come under 'pāṭāṇ'.⁵

5. 2. 6. *Āṇṇpār kāñci or Peṇṇpār kāñci?*

Naccinārkkīṇiyar, sometimes, interprets Tolkāppiyam bearing in mind the social conditions of people who lived at the time of Tolkāppiyar. Tolkāppiyar lists all kinds of transitoriness under Kāñcitiṇai. Naccinārkkīṇiyar classifies them as Āṇṇpār kāñci and Peṇṇpār kāñci (transitoriness prescribed for men and transitoriness prescribed for women). Tolkāppiyar mentions two constituents of kāñci ṭiṇai: (1) Taputāra nilai, (2) Tāpatanilai. The former refers to the loss of wife and the latter, the loss of husband.

Taputāra nilai: here the woman (wife) loses her life and body, and as it pertains to the loss of her life and body is it Peṇṇpār kāñci?;

1. Tol. Poru; s. 90:3-4.

2. Tol. Poru; s. 80.

3. Tol. Poru; s. 50,

4. Ibid; s. 80.

5. Tol. Poru; s. 93: 16-18, P. 331.

but as the husband loses the pleasures of married life, is it *Āṇpār-kāñci*? *Naccinārkkīyār* says as the loss of life and body with reference to the woman is permanent, but as the husband can remarry, it is not *Āṇpār-kāñci* but *peṇpār-kāñci*.¹

Tāpatanilai - loss of husband; the wife and the husband lived together like 'one life' and here the loss of life, body and its pleasures, and wealth is so keenly felt by the woman, that she is practically dead - it is also *Peṇpār-kāñci*. Here the importance of man in society is the basis of *Naccinārkkīyār's* interpretation.²

5. 2. 7. *Doubts that could not be cleared*

There are certain places which land *Naccinārkkīyār* himself in confusion and he is not able to clarify the doubts. *Toṭakkāñci*, *Talaiyoṭu muṭital*, *Āñci-k-kāñci* are some of the constituents of *kāñci-t-tiṇai*. In the battle-field where the husband lies dead, the heroine protects his body without being tortured by demons. This is *Toṭakkāñci*.

As the husband has lost his life, body and pleasure it can be called '*Āṇpār-kāñci*'. But as the woman loses her life (her husband) pleasures and wealth together it can be called *Peṇpār-kāñci* also. So a doubt arises regarding the classification.

Naccinārkkīyār says that when the hero was alive, the heroine — derived pleasures by embracing him, but now, though she stays protecting his body till dawn, she does not touch him. Even the devoted wife does not touch the body; it has reached such a state of transitoriness. So it is *Āṇpār-kāñci*. But it is evident that it involves to some extent '*peṇpār-kāñci* also'. *Naccinārkkīyār* admits this interpretation as well. Since these are common to *Āṇpār-kāñci* and *Peṇpār-kāñci*, it is mentioned by *Tolkāppiyār*, according to *Naccinārkkīyār*, after *Āṇpār-kāñci* and before *Peṇpār-kāñci* so as to be applicable to both, though included under the subdivisions coming under *Āṇpār-kāñci*.³

The husband and wife owed so much to each other and lived so like 'one life' that a classification is impossible. 'The merging of two into one' is the miracle of marriage in our ancient society. That is why *Tolkāppiyār* has also classified them under one heading, '*Kāñcittiṇai*'. Love means "mutual indispensableness".⁴ If the

1. Tol. Poru; s. 79:28.

2. Tol. Poru; s. 79:29.

3. Tol. Poru; s. 79: 10-11, p. 274.

4. *Iraiyānār*; s. 2, p. 31. *வேட்கை.... ஒருவர் ஒருவரை இன்றியமை யாமல்*

husband or wife dies, it is almost death for the other. Tolkāppiyar has classified transitoriness into ten ten each, but had not called them *Āppārkañci* and *peṇṇpārkañci*. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar has classified them this way and his attempts to bring them under each division does not succeed at all in some places. Iḷampūraṇar does not attempt such classifications.¹

5.3. Refutation Of Misinterpretations

One of the methods of critical assessment as established by Tolkāppiyar is to refute misinterpretations.² There were many commentators before Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, like Iḷampūraṇar, Cēṇāvairaiyar, Parimēlaḷakar, Pērācīriyar etc. and Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar generally agreed with them in their interpretation but wherever he differed from them he has established his points clearly. An interpretation according to Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar has to be declared false when it gives rise to one or more of the ten defects mentioned by Tolkāppiyar.

5.3.1. *Kūriyatu kūral* (Tautology)

We saw earlier how Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar establishes by his great ingenuity that Tolkāppiyar never repeats himself, and here we see him criticising the commentators whose interpretations are likely to make Tolkāppiyar subject to that charge of repetition. Tolkāppiyar states that one kind of medial clusters of two consonants consists of 'y' preceded by any one of the following viz: *ñ, n, m, v.*³ Iḷampūraṇar gives the following examples for these clusters.

e.g. *uriñyātu, porunyātu, tirumātu, tevyātu.*

Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar questions the appropriateness of these illustrations. According to him, these clusters should occur in individual words and not in phrases or sequences of words. Tolkāppiyar has laid down rules for the latter, in *Puṇariyal*, and if he were to be interpreted according to Iḷampūraṇar, he will be subject to the charge that he repeated the Sandhi here under clusters and again later under Sandhi in *Puṇariyal* etc. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar says that there must have been in existence such words as are indicated by Tolkāppiyar, but they have become obsolete later and hence the examples given by Iḷampūraṇar are wrong and unjustified.

1. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 77.

2. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 659.

3. Toḷ. Eḷuttu; s. 27.

5.3.2. *Māṅkoḷakkūṛal (contradictory statements)*

Two ideas stated, at different places in the same work should not contradict each other and if a commentator interprets it in a way that is likely to involve such contradiction, the interpretation has to be rejected.

Tolkāppiyar says that the letter 'au' will not occur as the final letter of a word by itself as a separate vowel without becoming a syllable along with a preceding consonant or even joined with other consonants except k and v i.e. 'kau' and 'vau' alone can occur as words with 'au' as their final letters. This is what the author says in Eḷuttatikāram.¹ In collatikāram he refers to this 'au' ending occurring as it is and as undergoing aḷapeṭai (i.e. lengthening of the vowel) implying thereby certain suggestions.² Cēṅāvaraiyar gives examples 'au' and "auu" respectively. As Tolkāppiyar has said that the letter 'au' cannot occur as word final individually, these examples in collatikāram will make Tolkāppiyar subject to the charge of contradiction with what he has mentioned in Eḷuttatikāram. So Naccinārkkiniyār says that as Tolkāppiyar only refers to 'kau' and 'vau' in Eḷuttatikāram, he must have pointed out only to that aḷapeṭai here in collatikāram as well i.e. he must refer to kau and vau and not to 'au' which as already stated will not occur as a word individually.

5.3.3. *Mayāṅkakkūṛal (obscurity in literary in composition)*

A grammarian who lays down the rules and regulations of a language must refer to them with clarity and should leave no ground for ambiguity or obscurity, so as to cause confusion. Tolkāppiyar in one of his sūtras refers to the amassing of wealth which is ordinarily attributed to the merchants of vaṅikās.³ The next sūtra is:

"Mēlōr muṛaimai nālvarkkum urittē"⁴

The word 'mēlōr' here as interpreted by Naccinārkkiniyār, refers to the Vaṅikās mentioned in the previous sūtra. The second sūtra states that this pursuit of wealth though characterising the Vaṅikās can be attributed to the four castes. An unknown commentator seems to have suggested not the general pursuit of wealth but specific methods of amassing wealth through trade as being applicable to the other four castes. This will lead to the confusion of the characteristic feature of the four castes, because, the ways in which the merchants earn wealth are different from the ways in which the

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 70

2. Tol. Col; s. 283.

3. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 28.

4. Ibid; s. 29.

other four castes (i.e. the kings, the Brahmins, the high class agriculturists and the tillers) earn their wealth. To avoid this confusion, Naccinārkkīṇiyar suggests that it is the general pursuit of wealth according to their respective profession which is intended here.

5. 3. 4. *In contradiction to the author's idea*

There is again criticism of a commentary as being in contradiction to the author's view. In criticising another commentator, Naccinārkkīṇiyar often points out the former is against the author since the latter does not contemplate the introduction of any word which the former introduces.

Tolkāppiyar says that the word 'īlam' with the word 'paṭu' in sandhi will not have any change.¹

e. g. 'īlampaṭu pulavar'.

Iḷampūraṇar and Naccinārkkīṇiyar agree to this extent, but Iḷampūraṇar explains the phrase 'īlampaṭu pulavar' as consisting of a word 'īlam' occurring in the meaning of ilattāl (āl-3rd case sign). The whole phrase, according to him will be expanded as "ilattāl paṭṭapaṭṭa pulavar" meaning "the scholars who have been afflicted by ilam (poverty)".

Naccinārkkīṇiyar interprets it as a subject predicate construction. According to him the phrase will expand as "illāmai uṇṭākiṇṇa pulavar" meaning the poets with reference to whom occurs illāmai (poverty). He states that the author does not use 'paṭṭu' while prescribing the Sandhi rule for 'īlam'; also 'paṭu' carries the tense suffix which has suffered an ellipsis here; therefore it is natural to expand it as 'paṭukiṇṇa'. So it is unnatural to expand the phrase as "ilattāl paṭṭapaṭṭa pulavar".

But Naccinārkkīṇiyar himself falls a prey to this defect. There are places where he assumes that the author's idea was such and such on that assumption contradicts other commentators. He says that 'māl' and 'kāl' are single lettered words. According to him Tolkāppiyar does not count the consonants, short 'u' and āytam as letters in a word.² But this applies only to poetry and not to prose. Tolkāppiyar calls nāku, āṭu, etc. as two lettered words. Kaṭṭu, kakcu, etc. are multi lettered words (toṭarmoli).³ So it is obvious he counts here

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 316.

2. Tol, Eḷuttu; s. 45,

3. Ibid; ss. 406, 409, 411, etc.

the consonants, short *u* and *āy* also as letters. So Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretation of Tolkāppiyam and the way he refutes the commentators are not always correct. There is a contradiction sometimes in his commentary itself. For instance, he refuses to admit that there are two letters in the word *kāl* (*ka*+*l*) whilst he himself states that '*kāy*' (*ka*+*y*) has two letters. This is contradicting himself and it is pointed out by Sri Gaṇeśa Iyer in his edition of Tolkāppiyam.¹

5.3.5 *Contradiction to Human nature*

Naccinārkkiniyar points out wherever the commentry of others is in conflict with human nature. Tolkāppiyar says :

"Epporuḷ āyinuṃ allatu illeniṅ
Apporuḷ allāp piṟitu poruḷ kūḷal"²

Here Tolkāppiyar explains one of the different kinds of answers. If a customer asks a merchant whether he has greengram and if the latter does not have it the merchant must answer if he has for instance black-gram which belongs to the category of gram, "I have nothing except black-gram". This is how Iḷampūraṇar interprets Tolkāppiyam sūtrā.

But Cēnāvaraiyar does not accept this. He states that, in giving a negative reply, the merchant need not restrict himself to speaking only about things related to the thing asked for. He may also say that he has nothing but pampunikkaruṅkal (a kind of stone) which is by no means related to the green-gram required by the customer.

But Naccinārkkiniyar criticises Cēnāvaraiyar. He points out that this is unnatural, because a buyer of green gram may be interested in buying blackgram if the green gram is not available, as he can replace the green gram by black gram, but he will not be interested in buying unrelated things which will not replace the thing he requires.

5.4 *A Discussion of Differences*

There are some grammatical points which seem apparently similar and it is very difficult to differentiate them one from another. Tolkāppiyar has laid down a sound principle in this connection. Two apparently similar things must be identified with their subtle

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 45, Foot-notes.

2. Tol. Col; s. 35.

differences distinctively shown, and individually determined.¹ Nacciṅṅārkkīṅṅiyar with his keen intellect is able to discriminate them in an ingenious manner. From the study of Nacciṅṅārkkīṅṅiyar we can bring them under the following heads:

1. Difference of letters (Homophones).
2. Technical terms differentiated.
3. Differentiation of allomorphs.
4. Homonyms of ambiguity resolved by grammatical category.
5. Homonyms of ambiguity resolved by Sandhi rules.
6. Root morphemes differentiated.
7. Suffix morphemes differentiated.

5. 4. 1. *Difference of letters (Homophones)*

In Dravidian dialects, especially in Tamil, they have defined the sound of the short vowel 'u'. It has one time unit (mātra) as full u (Muṅṅukaram), but in some words it has reduced time unit i.e. ½ mātra as short 'u', known as 'kuṅṅukaram'. The 'u' that succeeds the long vowel or any two and merged with the hard consonants in the vowel consonants is the short 'u' known as 'kuṅṅukaram'.² Tolkāṅṅiyar also says that 'u' in 'Nuntai' is also short 'u'.³ Nacciṅṅārkkīṅṅiyar analyses the subtle differences between short 'u' and 'u'.⁴ They are :-

(a) Difference in Sandhi: It is possible for a vowel to succeed the kuṅṅukaram without the loss of 'u'.

e. g. Nāku + aritu = Nākaritu ('u' and 'a' are both there) But it is not so in Muṅṅukaram.

e. g. pacu + itu = Pacuvitu ('u' is not merged with 'i')

(b) Difference in quantity: Kuṅṅukaram has reduced time-unit i. e. ½ mātra. Muṅṅukaram has one time unit i. e. 1 mātra.

(c) Difference in sound: Kuṅṅukaram is pronounced without the lips being rounded and Muṅṅukaram in a rounded fashion.

(d) Difference in meaning: Kātu, kaṅṅu, kattu, Murukku, Teruṅṅu, Tarukku, Aṅṅukku — if they are kuṅṅukaram they are — nouns, if they are Muṅṅukaram they are verbs.

1. Tol. Poruṅ. Pōrā; s. 659, p. 706.

2. Tol. Eṅṅuttu; s. 36.

3. Ibid; s. 67.

4. Tol. Eṅṅuttu; ss. 36, 68

5.4.2. *Technical terms defined and differentiated*

There are certain grammatical classifications that seem apparently similar, but they must be descriminated. Naccinārkkiniyar attempts this and has succeeded to some extent.

Ākupeyar x Anmoḷittokai

Uraiyacai x Acainilai

Peyar x uri

(1) *Ākupeyar and anmoḷittokai*: Cēnāvaraiyar holds that ākupeyar and anmoḷittokai are the same. Porroṭi, if considered as a noun, is 'ākupeyar' and if considered as a tokai (in the aspect when certain things are understood) it is anmoḷittokai.¹ 'Makkaṭcuṭṭu according to Cēnāvaraiyar is 'anmoḷittokai' and Naccinārkkiniyar holds it as ākupeyar. Cēnāvaraiyar extends this compound as anmoḷittokai based on paṇputtokai.² Naccinārkkiniyar extends this compound as paṇputtokai (Noun compound) which suggests the meaning people.'³

According to Naccinārkkiniyar in the compound "Makkaṭcuṭṭu" — cuṭṭu means, that which is valued and it stands as 'ākupeyar' referring to people and 'Makkaṭ' here does not stand as ākupeyar. It is only an attribute. But the compound — "vellātai" is anmoḷittokai, based on paṇputtokai. Here it refers to the person who is wearing a white dress and consists of two words — Veṇmai (white) and ātai (dress).⁴

(2) *Peyar and uri*: There are certain words about which it is difficult to say whether they are peyar (noun) or uri.

uru — fear.

kuru — colour.

Mallai — richness.

These words, though they seem as peyar (nouns) they are uri, different from peyar. Naccinārkkiniyar brings out their difference.⁵

1. Tol. Col. Cēnā; s. 114.

2. Ibid; s. 1.

3. Tol. Col; s. 1, pp. 5-6.

4. Ibid; s. 1, pp. 5-6.

5. Tol. Col; s. 299.

<i>Peyar (nouns)</i>	<i>uri.</i>
1. take final suffixes and mean many things	They are single units, and as they are, describe the quality of a thing.
2. take case signs	do not take suffixes etc.
3. Independent	attached to nouns and verbs thus depending for their existence on others
4. denoting the thing.	describing the quality of the thing.

(3) *Uraiyacai and acainilai*: Acainilai is mentioned by Naccinārkkīṇiyar as one of the various kinds of 'Iṭai-c-col' and he has not mentioned 'urai acai' there. So it is possible to consider that 'urai acai' is an aspect of 'acai-nilai', Tolkāppiyar refers to 'āṅka' (Iṭai-c-col) as 'urai acai'.¹ Naccinārkkīṇiyar extracts a meaning for this word.

Āṅka — aṅṅanē (like that)

So it is possible to differentiate between 'urai acai' and 'acai nilai' from a study of Naccinārkkīṇiyar. According to him urai 'acai' has the suggestion of a meaning.

e. g. 'āṅka-k-kuyilum mayilum kāṭṭi'

Acai nilai has no such suggestion of substantial meaning.

e.g. 'Iruṅkuyil ālum arō'²

5.4.3. *Differentiation of allomorphs*

If a word occurs in different meanings it is classified as 'pala poruḷ oru col' — a single word giving various meanings. This is so in grammar also, where a single word or morpheme refers to various grammatical points and Naccinārkkīṇiyar brings out their differences in a remarkable manner.

āṅ and iṅ: 'āṅ' is the third case suffix and 'iṅ' is the fifth case suffix. There are cariyai — 'āṅ' and 'iṅ' also. What is the difference between the case signs 'āṅ, iṅ' and cariyai āṅ, iṅ? Naccinārkkīṇiyar analyses this matter thoroughly³

'āṅ', and 'iṅ', if they are cariyai, will take case signs.

1. Tol. Col; s. 279.

2. Tol. Col; s. 281.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 119, p. 127.

oru pārku oru paktu + ān + ku. ān—cāriyai,
 ku — case sign.
 Viḷavirk viḷa + in + ku — in — cāriyai.
 ku — case sign,

But if they occur as case signs they will not take other case signs.

Ponnān iyanṛa kuṭam 'ān — case sign.

Pannin iyanṛa kuṭam. 'in — case sign.

5.4.4. Homonyms of ambiguity resolved by grammatical category

Naccinārkkiniyar also points out the differences in the word 'yār' standing at two grammatical situations.¹

(1) <i>I. yār.</i>	<i>II yār.</i>
1 Interrogative <u>n</u> oun.	Interrogative <u>v</u> erb (with the tense understood).
2. Corrupted form of yā <u>v</u> ar	It is a full word without any corruption.
3. Occurs for the palarpāl (uyar tiṇai plural gender only)	Occurs in all the three genders of uyartiṇai.
Avar yār?	Avan yār?
Avan yār?	Avaḷ yar?
Avaḷ yār?	Avaṛ yār ?

(2) *The words 'uṇṭu' and 'iṇṇu'*: Naccinārkkiniyar investigates the various forms of the words 'uṇṭu' and 'iṇṇu'. 'iṇṇu' is the opposite of 'uṇṭu'. 'uṇṭu' occurs as affirmative in various grammatical situations and 'iṇṇu' can also occur similarly but in the negative. This is understood from Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary.²

1. Uṇṭu refers to the existence of a thing.

Iṇṇu refers to the non-existence of a thing.

Kutirai-k-ku-k-kompu iṇṇu.

(The horse has no horns).

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 172

2. Tol. Col; s. 222, 2. 227.

2. Uṅṭu refers to quality and occurs in affirmative.
Inru refers to quality and occurs in negative.
e.g. Ik kutirai-k-ku ekkālamum naṭai inru.
3. Uṅṭu — suggestive in the affirmative.
Inru — suggestive in the negative.
e.g. Ik kutiraik-ku-iṅṭu naṭai inru.

(3) *Paṇai and uṭaimai*: There are other instances also where Naccinārkkiniyar finds out the meanings of words — varying with reference to their grammatical category.

1. Paṇai — to increase - uri-c-col (adjective)
Paṇai — bamboo - peyar (noun).¹
2. Uṭaimai— the quality of possession - paṇṇuppeyar.
uṭaimai— the thing one has.² - peyar (noun).

He has also pointed out 'the various places where Maṇṇumaṅkalam, kaikkijai etc., occur.'³

(4) *Poruḷ and Poruṇmai*: A single word in its natural form can refer to a particular grammatical idea and in its changed form can refer to something else. Poruḷ and Poruṇmai are two words to illustrate this and Naccinārkkiniyar interprets them in a different way, bringing out the subtle differences between them.⁴

<i>Poruḷ.</i>	<i>Poruṇmai.</i>
1. 'ā' (cow)	The quality of cow,
2. 'ā' (cow) is transitory	The quality of cow is permanent.
3. 'ā' (cow) is visible to the eyes.	The quality is not visible.

5.4.5. Homonyms of ambiguity resolved by Sandhi rules

The same word has different rules in Sandhi, according to the meaning it has in the context. This is laid down by Tolkāp-piyar in many places. For example

Cē + kōṭu = Cēnkoṭu (here cē means a tree)

Cē + kōṭu = Cē-v-in kōṭu (here cē means a cow).⁵

1. Tol. Col; s. 339.

2. Ibid; s. 215, p. 215.

3. Tol. Poruḷ; ss. 90: 10, 91:12, pp. 315, 325.

4. Tol. Col; s. 67.

5. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 278-279.

Naccinārkkiniyar on his own finds out other differences between words with reference to Sandhi, not referred to by Tolkāppiyar.

1. uḷakku + kuṟai
uḷakkin kuṟai — uḷakku and less (Alvaḷi)
uḷakkiṟ kuṟai — reduced from the measure (veṟṟumai).¹
2. Irā + kākkai
Irāa-k-kākkai — the crow that is not (Alvaḷi)
Irākkākkai — the crow that is in the night (Veṟṟumai).²
3. Ā + iṭai)
 Āyiṭai) — Literary usage.³

Āyiṭai, meaning 'in that place' or situation, occurs in prosody, but the change is not due to prosody and it is due to the Sandhi. The difference between these changes is investigated by Naccinārkkiniyar. According to him, the change due to Sandhi occurs in two words, and the change due to prosody occurs in a single word.

5.4.6. Root morphemes differentiated

Kariyaṅ and *Karumaiyaṅ*: The root morphemes for these words are kari and Karumai respectively. Naccinārkkiniyar differentiates these words in a very subtle way. When we say *Kariyaṅ* — we refer to the person himself as "he who is dark in complexion" and hence 'kari' here is paṅpu or quality (colour), but '*karumaiyaṅ*' we mean "he who has darkness as his complexion" (referring to his possession of the quality) and it takes the 2nd case sign (*karumaiyai uṭaiyavaṅ*) and so '*karumai*' here is a thing of possession.⁴ This is how Naccinārkkiniyar analyses the words and shows that what apparently seem similar are really not so.

5.4.7. Suffix morphemes differentiated

Perumai and *Peruppu*: Both these words are derived from the same root 'peru' meaning to grow thick or large, or big. But they have different morphemes, mai and Pu. According to Naccinārkkiniyar '*perumai*' refers to quality (greatness) whereas '*peruppu*' refers to the action of growing thick or large or big.⁵ From this we can understand that 'mai' is the suffix denoting the paṅpu (quality) and 'pu' is the suffix denoting the toḷil (action).

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 167.

2. Ibid; s. 227.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 208.

4. Tol. Col; s. 215, p. 216.

5. Tol. Col; s. 339.

5.5. *Superfluity or other sources for more ideas*

No grammar is final. Language has an infinity of constructions of sounds, morphemes and words all of which grammar tries to explain by its theory in a few finite generalisations taking into consideration only the forms available. Language is something growing from the point of view of time and extensive from the point of view of dialects and styles. Therefore the ancient grammarians never pretended to be extensive from these two points of view. They had said that new words with new forms of new meanings may gain almost universal currency and become approved as grammatical.¹ They had also stated that with the help of what they had stated as forms etc. One can explain with reference to the language of his times. This last statement is called "Puraṇaṭai" and occurs at the end of the chapter or the book.

5.5.1. *The importance of superfluity*

But even when stating a generalisation or listing forms the ancient grammarians add the words *piṅa* etc. (and others). This provides for exceptions to such rules. From this the commentators have established a convention or fiction so as to bring other exceptions and other generalisations which are found in the language studies within the four walls of ancient grammatical texts. The basis of this convention is clarification. Its usefulness is evident. It is much more convenient to have the exceptions to the rules collected under the respective rules themselves instead of under the last *puraṇaṭai sūtra* at the end. Therefore the commentators hunt for some extra or superfluous words and explain that the extra word was used with the purpose of reminding the reader or commentator that the rule is not all comprehensive and that there may be exception following other rules. Thus the fiction.

5.5.2. *Superfluity — a fiction*

Phrases like "niṅaiyuṅkālai" (when one thinks) may suggest that the author wants us to think and hunt for exceptions. But there are other words which may not suggest any such meaning. That is why we call this a fiction of interpretation when any extra word is made to give this suggestion. According to this fiction the fact of an existing word is enough for the purpose. Therefore there is no necessity to go into the meaning of such words. The view of the Indian Grammarians is that there should be no superfluous word in a grammatical text. Therefore the seemingly superfluous words have

1. Tol. Col; s. 452.

to be interpreted in some such way. If this theory of interpretative fiction is understood, the attempts of the commentators to read their own generalisations and exceptions into the texts themselves, will not appear far-fetched or absurd.

5. 5. 3. Terms like "niṇaiyuṅkālai"

Suppose there are two or three ideas common about a particular thing, the author would take the most prominent and express it. Then he would use an expression "niṇaiyuṅkālai" ('as considered'). This might be apparently considered a superfluity but the commentator brings out the several meanings this word conveys. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar interprets such places with very great skill bringing out his extensive knowledge of literature. Tolkāppiyar says "as one considers, the verb conveys the distinction of uyartiṇai and akṛiṇai in a sentence." In the sūtra there is a word "niṇaiyuṅkālai" which seems to be an unwanted word.¹ But the meaning of this is, there are several ways of denoting the distinction and the 'verb' is one of them. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar analyses all these, and "niṇaiyuṅkālai" (as considered) is only to emphasise the best of the lot. Among common nouns not only the verbs but the nouns also convey the distinction, and there are places where the verbs do not convey this distinction.

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------|------------|
| (a) | Cāttāṇ vantāṇ. | uyartiṇai. |
| | Cāttāṇ vantatu. | akṛiṇai. |

Here 'vantāṇ and vantatu, the verbs convey the distinctions. This is explicit as stated by Tolkāppiyar.

- | | | |
|-----|---------------|------------|
| (b) | Cāttāṇ oruvaṇ | uyartiṇai. |
| | Cāttāṇ oṇṇu | akṛiṇai. |

Here the nouns oruvaṇ and oṇṇu convey the distinction.

- | | | |
|-----|------------------|-------------------------------|
| (c) | Mulai Eḷuntatu) | the distinction is not known. |
| | Mōvāy Eḷuntatu) | |

Here even the verb is not able to convey the distinction.

According to Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar. Tolkāppiyar considers all these things and has said that the verb, conveying the distinction is the best. All the other ideas, Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar derives from the word "niṇaiyuṅkālai" in Tol. sūtram, which seems to be superfluous.

1. Tol. Col. s. 174.

Wherever Tolkāppiyar has used the terms like “*niṇaiyuṅkālai*,” *teriyuṅkālai*, *tēruṅkālai*, *colluṅkālai*, etc., Naccinārkkīṇiyar has analysed them in this way.¹

5.5.4. *The terms like “Iṭaṇuṭaiya” (‘There are places’)*

Tolkāppiyar says “there are places (*Iṭaṇ uṭaiya*) where *i*, *tā*, *koṭu* mean requesting one to give”.² Cēnāvaraiyar analyses the word “*Iṭaṇuṭaiya*” (there are places) in the *sūtram* and says it means that there are other places where these words occur in different meanings. This is conveyed by the phrase “*Iṭaṇuṭaiya*”. And Naccinārkkīṇiyar mentions those places where they occur in different meanings.

Ī-c-ciṛaku	— the wings of bee (<i>ī</i> — bee)
Tā-v-il naṇ poṇ	— spotless (valuable) gold. (<i>tā</i> -defect).
koṭu-ṅ-kōl	— cruel rule. (<i>koṭu</i> — cruel).

There are many other words like *Iṭaṇuṭaittu*, *olvaḷi*, *takkavaḷi*, *celvaḷi*, *ākuvaḷi*, etc. where Naccinārkkīṇiyar gives such interpretations.³

5.5.5. *The terms like “Teḷḷitu” (clear)*

The grammarian mentions generally the most common, and accepted usages prevalent in his time, and the commentator has to incorporate other usages to make the *sūtra* give a complete picture. Tolkāppiyar mentions the mixing up of case signs in the whole and its part and mentions two usages only.⁴

1. If ‘*atu*’ occurs in the whole ‘*ai*’ occurs in the part.
e.g. *yāṇaiyatu kōṭṭai-k-kuṛaittāṇ*.
2. If ‘*ai*’ occurs in the whole ‘*kaṇ*’ occurs in the part.
e.g. *yāṇai-y-ai-kōṭṭiṇ kaṇ kuṛaittāṇ*.

The author uses the word ‘*teḷḷitu*’ (clear) in this connection. Naccinārkkīṇiyar says that there are other examples also.

- ‘*ai*’ occurring at both the whole and its part.
e.g. *yāṇaiyai-k-k-kōṭṭai-k-kuṛaittāṇ*.

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 169, 283, Col; s. 405, Poru; s. 227, etc. (‘*niṇaiyuṅkālai*’).
Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 22, 260 (‘*tēriyuṅkālai*’). Poru; s. 14 (‘*tēruṅkālai*’).
Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 199 (‘*colluṅkālai*’).
2. Tol. Col; s. 444.
3. Tol, Eḷuttu; ss. 232, 261, 300, 114, 246, 270, 311, 312, 372, 404, 457, etc.
Tol. Col; ss. 294, 444, 273, etc. Tol. Poru; ss. 75, 91, 102, etc.
4. Tol. Col; s. 89.

He also refers to another idea. This mixing up — occurs not only in the whole and its part, but in quality, action and continuity.

Naccinārkkiniyar brings out all these things from the word 'Teljitu in the sūtram. There are other words like Terṅanṅarṅē, cevvitu, māṅamillai, vaḷukkinṅu, nāṅṅalvaliya etc. where he has given such interpretations.¹

5.5.6. *The phrase like 'innapiṅa' (such like)*

The author, after mentioning one usage, may refer to the other kinds of usages by employing some phrases like "innapiṅa" meaning "such like as" etc. Tolkāppiyar, after listing all the suffixes of the seventh case, uses the phrase "and such like" (Innapiṅa).² Naccinārkkiniyar mentions them all

<i>Examples</i>	<i>other suffixes</i>
Kuṅattil viḷakku	il
Ūrilē iruntāṅ	ilē
kilavōḷ tēettu	tēem
kiḷavi māṅṅu	māṅṅu

He has thus analysed the word 'piṅa' (others) at other places.³

5.5.7. *Superfluity from previous sūtra*

Naccinārkkiniyar sometimes finds that there is no extra word in a particular sūtra to allow him to include further rules by suggestion, when necessary. But he finds an extra word in a previous sūtra relating to the same subject matter and the additional rules or exceptions which he wants to point out are implied in such extra word. In the words denoting numbers when they take the case signs, the short 'u' at the end will have an addition of 'aṅ' in between the noun and the case signs.

e.g. oṅṅu + ai = oṅṅaṅai
iraṅṅu + ai = iraṅṅaṅai

But Naccinārkkiniyar is aware of the currency oṅṅiṅai, iraṅṅiṅai (having an addition of 'iṅ' instead) etc. But Tolkāppiyar's sūtra explicitly says.

"Eṅṅin iṅuti aṅṅoṅu civaṅṅum"⁴

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 133, 295, 342; Tol. Col; ss. 141, 403.

2. Tol. Col; s. 83.

3. Tol. Col; ss. 62, 111, 176, 216, 284, 416. Tol. Poruḷ; ss. 18, 95, 102, 111, 150, 152, 212.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 198.

Here there is no superfluous word. But Naccinārkkīyiar brings the word, 'ceyar_kaiya' from the previous sūtra which is superfluous there and says that this superfluity in the previous sūtra suggests this point i.e. having instead of 'an' addition of 'in' as onrinai, irant-inai, mūrinai, etc.

5.5.8 Repetition as superfluity

Naccinārkkīyiar also investigates those places where Tolkāppiyar has apparently repeated himself. Whenever the common noun and demonstrative occur in a sentence with a common predicate, the common noun must come first to be followed by the demonstrative nouns. This is clearly enunciated by Tolkāppiyar.¹ Here Tolkāppiyar has said, "the demonstrative noun will not precede the common noun, but will succeed it". "Will not precede" is sufficient enough, and 'will succeed' is superfluous. But according to Naccinārkkīyiar, it is not superfluous. He derives one more interpretation out of this apparent superfluity. He adds this is applicable to both uyartiṇai and akriṇai.

- | | | |
|---|---|------------|
| 1. Nampi vantān, avaṛku-c-cōru koṭukka.
(Nampi came, give him food) | } | uyartiṇai. |
| Naṅkai vantāṅ, avaṭku-p-pū-k-koṭukka
(The lady came, give her flower). | | |
| 2. Erutu vantatu ataṛku-p-pul iṭuka.
(The bull came, give it grass). | } | akriṇai. |
| Kutirai vantatu ataṛku mutirai koṭukka.
(The horse came, give it grain.) | | |

5.5.9. Synonyms as superfluity

There are places where the author, instead of using one word to denote a thing, may employ two words with same meaning. Where one word is enough the second is a superfluity, but the commentator derives more ideas from the same. The words with vowel and consonantal endings in uyartiṇai, if they are succeeded by surds in alvaḷi and vēṛṛumai, will have no change.²

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| 1. Vowel ending. Nampī + kuṛiyān | Nampi kuṛiyān | Alvaḷi |
| Nampi + kai | Nampikai | Vēṛṛumai. |

1. Tol. Col; s. 38.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 153.

2. Consonant Avan + kuṛiyan Avan kuriyan. Alvaḷi.
ending.

Avan + Kai Avan Kai Verrumai

Tolkāppiyar uses the word 'uyir īru' and 'puḷḷi īruṭi'. (vowel ending and consonantal ending). Here he uses, two different words īru and īruṭi which mean the same thing and it leads to more ideas according to Naccinārkkiniyar, So, he says, sometimes they will have change also.

Kapilan + Paraṇan Kapilaparaṇar.

CHAPTER - 6

CONVENTIONAL DEVICES OF INTERPRETATION

6.1. *Paṇmai Kūral* : (Implication of the plural form)

The grammarian sometimes employs the plural form of predicate when the subject is apparently singular. This gives an opportunity for the commentator to include other forms etc. which are found in literature, though not mentioned in the sūtrams. As the grammar, written centuries earlier, does not cover the new forms that come to stay, the commentator exploits such plural forms of predicates to his advantage.

6.1.1. *Agreement with his predecessors*

Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar not only agrees with the additions mentioned by his predecessors in their commentaries, but, he on his own introduces other forms which he has noted. Let us see an instance where he first agrees with his predecessors in mentioning the changes. Tolkāppiyar referring to the eighth case, says, "Viḷi eṅappaṭupa".¹ This plural form is interpreted as including four kinds of viḷi forms.

1. Tḷ form where the final sound of the noun has changed.
2. Ṭe form where the penultimate sound is lengthened.
3. ṇe form with an emerging sound.
4. he form with no change.

ḷampūṅgar and Cēṅāvaraiyar mention all the four forms and Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar also gives the same list.

6.1.2. *Further implications suggested*

accīṅārkkīṇiyar, who mentions the listing of changes introduced by preceding commentators, also refers to others that have come to stay by his period. Tolkāppiyar mentions 'Atu' as the suffix for the ninth (genitive) case.

1. Tol. Col; s. 120

“.....itaṇatu itu eṇum
 Anna Kiḷavi-k-kiḷamaittu atuṅē”.¹

Here ‘Anna Kiḷavi’ means ‘those things’. ‘Anna’ is interpreted as a plural form. The case suffix mentioned is ‘atu’ which means ‘that which belongs to (this)’. The author mentions only one case sign, one grammatical meaning as exemplified by the one pattern of construction for the genitive. If so, how can the plural ‘anna kiḷavi’ be justified? There is another case sign for the genitive namely ‘a’; Iḷampūraṇar mentions this but states that though Tolkāppiyar has not specifically mentioned it, since he uses the plural ‘anna’, he according to the commentator, should be contemplating more than one case sign, and grammatical meanings. Therefore he must have been having in mind the case sign, ‘a’ and its grammatical meaning of plurality. The examples are ‘avaṇa, avaḷa’ where ‘a’ is the plural genitive case suffix.² Cēṇavaraiyar’s examples are ‘Itaṇa ivai’ (neuter gender).³ Naccinārkkiniyar not only mentions all these forms, but because of the plural ‘anna’, includes another singular suffix ‘ātu’ used by his time.

6.1.3. Different implications suggested

Naccinārkkiniyar sometimes differs from the view held by his predecessors as is evident from his interpretation of the sūtram:

“Nīṭṭam vēṇṭiṇ avvaḷapuṭaiya
 Kūṭṭi eḷūtal eṇmanār pulavar”.⁴

Here ‘avvaḷapuṭaiya’ is a plural form. According to Iḷampūraṇar the plural form is used to include the long vowel as well as the short one end ‘aa’ which should be pronounced with no strain, in between the sounds.⁵ There are other places where time-unit might exceed three mātrais, and to denote it, another short vowel also is written indicating the increase. For example “Ceṇāay vāliya neṅcu”. He also quotes another grammatical work (Māpurāṇam) to justify this usage. Naccinārkkiniyar therefore holds the view that the plural ‘avvaḷapuṭaiya’ refers also to plurality of the short vowels included to denote the time-units (mātrias). Such as ‘āaa’ etc. when required by metre. This explains the special feature of ‘aḷapeṭai’ - having more than three mātrais which had not been explained by Iḷampūraṇar as an implication of this sūtram.

1. Tol. Col; s. 80
2. Tol. Col. Iḷam; s. 76
3. Tol. Col. Cēṇā; s. 79
4. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 6
5. Tol. Eḷuttu. Iḷam; s. 6

6.1.4. *Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar's own original implications*

He also analyses the plural forms in the sūtrams, which have not been investigated by preceding commentators. Tolkāppiyar refers to the separation of the hero from the heroine to serve the state in times of political hostilities. The hero or the king sometimes goes alone on a warlike mission. At other times he is accompanied by others. The sūtram is,

“Tānē cēṅalum taṅṅoṭu civaṅiya
Eṅōr cēṅalum vēntaṅ mēṅṅē”.¹

Here ‘eṅōr’ is plural, meaning others. The king is usually accompanied by the chieftains and occasionally, as pointed out by Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar through literary usage, by kinds of equal status. He therefore says that this ‘eṅōr’ (others) refers to the chieftains, as well as to the kings of equal status.

6.1.5. *Interpretation in terms of literary usage*

There are other places where Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar analyses these plural forms in terms of the literary usage he has come across but not noted by others. Tolkāppiyar says ‘Aṅattoṭu niṅṅal’ is of seven kinds.² It means the companion of the heroine revealing to the foster mother (cēvili) the heroine’s premarital love towards the hero and it is of seven kinds i.e. the speech of the companion arises in seven different forms. The subject is “aṅattoṭu niṅṅal”, but the predicate is “eṅuvakaiya” which is in plural. Why should there be this plural, if the said speech can be of any one of these? Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar has found in Kalittokai an instance, where the speech seems to contain more than one of these. Because of this, according to him, Tolkāppiyar has used the plural “vakaiya” and not the singular vakaiyatu’.

6.1.6. *Plural denoting the forefathers*

Tolkāppiyar mentions the music sung by ‘cūtar’ to waken the king in the morning in the war camp. There, the king is referred to in the plural: ‘kiṅantōr’ (those who sleep)³. Here there is only one king sleeping but the plural form is used. Perhaps the other kings who have gone to assist the king in his mission are also referred to by “kiṅantōr”. But Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar feels that only the king could stay in his bed-room and he justifies the plural usage in a

1. Tol. Poru]; s. 27

2. Tol. Poru]; 207.

3. Tol. Poru]; s, 91: 1-2.

different way. The practice of awakening the kings by 'cūtar' has been taking place from time immemorial and so according to Naccinārkkiniyar, when Tolkāppiyar refers to 'kiṭantōr' he has in mind all those forefathers whom he represents. This is because the glories of the forefathers are usually attributed to the present king.

6.1.7. Unwarranted interpretation

Naccinārkkiniyar at times brings his literary scholarship to justify the plural usage, but sometimes we are hardly convinced. Tolkāppiyar sanctions the companion of the heroine referring to the various parts of the body of the lady as the former's own.

"Emmena varūum kiḷamait-tōṟṟam
allāvāyigum pulluva uḷavē".¹

Here 'tōṟṟam', means 'the parts of the lady' and it is a plural subject and 'uḷa' (are) is plural predicate. The commentator says, as the author has used "uḷa" a plural form, it means that not only the companion but the heroine can also occasionally speak in that fashion. It is difficult to understand how this plural form can mean the thing what Naccinārkkiniyar has in mind. The author refers to all the anomalies in Poruḷiyal and in this connection "this recognised anomaly aims at the identification by the maid with her own, the features or the different parts of the lady-love".² The reason which Naccinārkkiniyar gives for the usage of plural form is far-fetched. He, perhaps, derives a plural predicate 'kūṟuvana' (that are said) before 'uḷa' and this might justify his interpretation that the heroine can also occasionally speak in that fashion.

But this is hardly necessary. Tolkāppiyar does not refer either to the heroine or her companion apparently and hence it is possible to consider the sūtram as applicable to both. Naccinārkkiniyar himself interprets such sūtrams, where Tolkāppiyar has generalised certain things in this fashion.³

6.2. Kūṟiyatu Kūral (Repetitions)

If the same idea is repeated again and again, it is considered to be one of the ten defects mentioned by Tamil Grammarians.⁴ Tolkāppiyar, who prescribes the avoidance of such defects,

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 221.

2. Tol. Poruḷ. English Translation; Vol. I—Part II; p. 493.

3. Infra; pp. 196-197.

4. Tol. Poruḷ; Iḷam; s. 654. Nannūḷ; s. 12.

seemingly appears to have committed this defect of repetition at certain places. But the commentator points out that the sūtram has no such defect, by analysing the significance of such repetitions and bringing out the subtle differences between the first statement and the later ones. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar agrees mostly with his predecessors but often adds something of his own.

6.2.1. *No repetition*

Tolkāppiyar mentions that 'ṅ' is the last letter in the alphabetical system, at two places.¹ Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar explains that the first sūtram refers to 'ṅ' as the last letter among the thirty letters (vowels and consonants) and the second sūtram refers to 'ṅ' as the last letter among the eighteen consonants. So, according to him, there is no repetition, as the two sūtrams refer to different groups and not the same group.² There are other places also where Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar justifies the repetition in this manner :

Sūtrams.	Repetition	Distinction brought out by Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar
1.	2.	3.
Tol. Eḷuttu (1) 18, 106.	In uyirmey the consonant precedes the vowel.	S. 18 refers to uyirmey as a category. S. 106 refers to uyirmey as occurring in a word.
(2) 103, 108	In a word, only the two letters i.e. the consonant or the vowel can occur initially and finally.	S. 103 refers to words standing alone. S. 108 refers to words occurring in Sandhi.
(3) 82, 83.	The word 'kaṅ'.	S. 82 refers to the case sign. S. 83 refers to one of the varied grammatical meanings of that case sign.

6.2.2. *Repetition for emphasis*

Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar also proves that the repetition in some places is for emphasis. Tolkāppiyar, in one of his sūtrams, says that the

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 1,9.

2. Ibid; s. 9.

viṅaikkurippu actually by implication denotes tenses. He repeats the same in the succeeding sūtram also.

“Am mukkālam kuṛippoṭum koḷḷum”¹

“Kuṛippinūm Viṅaiyiṅum... ..

Kālamōṭu varūm viṅaiccol ellām”²

Naccinārkkiniyar justifies the repetition saying that this repetition is for emphasising the idea i.e. Viṅaikkurippu also denotes the tenses.³

6.2.3. Repetition for clarification

Naccinārkkiniyar gives another reason for this repetition to afford clarification if there are doubts. Tolkāppiyar says that the letters consonants have dots, and he mentions this in two places. In Sandhi the words are classified thus :-

1. Maram — consonant beginning, consonant ending.
2. Ilai — Vowel beginning, vowel ending.
3. Āl — Vowel beginning, consonant ending.
4. Viḷa — Consonant beginning, vowel ending.

This classification is necessary to understand Sandhi rules. But there may arise a doubt if in the word Maram (during Sandhi) the initial is a consonant; whether that letter is also denoted with a dot according to Tolkāppiyar's rule:

“Meyyiṅ iyaṅkai puḷḷiyoṭu nilaiyal”⁴

According to Naccinārkkiniyar, Tolkāppiyar clarifies that only the consonant ending has the dot and not the consonant beginning and this clarification is given in the other sūtram:

“Meyyīḷellām puḷḷiyoṭu nilaiyal”⁵

So the first sūtram refers to the form of the consonant occurring independently, and the next sūtram refers to the form of the consonant occurring in a word.

6.2.4. Repetition with a purpose

Naccinārkkiniyar finds another justification for 'repetition'. According to Tamil Grammarians, repetition, sometimes, will suggest

1. Tol. Col; s. 202.

2. Ibid; s. 203.

3. Tol. Col; s. 203.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu s. 15.

5. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 104

some other ideas in addition to the idea given by the author in his sūtram,¹ when it will be “anuvāda” and not repetition.² Nacciṅṅārkkīyār endorses this opinion and investigates some of the repetitions in Tolkāppiyam. For instance

Tolkāppiyār says that ‘Tokai’ is treated as a single word. He mentions this at two places. In the first instance he says that if two nouns in succession go to make a tokai (compound) which becomes like one word they have a predicate.³ He again states that the tokai behaves like a single word.⁴ This seems to be unnecessary repetition. According to Nacciṅṅārkkīyār this repetition suggests some other ideas in addition to the thing mentioned by Tolkāppiyār in the former sūtram. The first mention confines itself to its taking the predicate whereas the second one suggests various other features of this tokai.⁵ They are:-

- (1) Tokai formed of nouns will take the case sign.
Example: “yāṅṅai-k-kōṭṭai-k-kuṅṅaittāṅ”.
- (2) Tokai formed of noun and verb will have a noun predicate.
Example: “Nilaṅṅakaṅṅantāṅ Cāṅṅtan”.
- (3) Tokai occurring as verbal participle.
Example: “Mā ūṅṅntu pōyīṅṅāṅ”
- (4) Tokai occurring as a relative participle.
Example: “Mā ūṅṅnta Cāṅṅtan”.

6.2.5. Repetition-Nacciṅṅārkkīyār differing from others

The reasons for repetition are different according to the different commentators. Iṅṅampūṅṅar and Nacciṅṅārkkīyār do not have identical views regarding the repetitions found in Tolkāppiyam. Uṅṅiṅṅai-t-tiṅṅai (the attack of the fort) having its eight constituent kinds has been referred to by Tolkāppiyār twice.⁶ There are views that the constituents of uṅṅiṅṅai are eighteen and twenty nine and according to Iṅṅampūṅṅar, Tolkāppiyār repeats this to uphold and emphasise only his view.⁷ But Nacciṅṅārkkīyār holds a different

1. Tol. Poruṅ. Pōṅṅā; s. 663, p. 714:

2. Tol. Col. Cōṅṅā s. 10.

3. Tol. Col s. 68.

4. Tol. Col. s. 420.

5. Ibid.

6. Tol. Poruṅ; ss. 66, 67.

7. Tol. Poruṅ. Iṅṅam; s. 67, 68.

view. A king who attacks the fort of an enemy, sometimes, sends his associates viz. another king or his commander-in-chief to attack the fort of the enemy's associates. There also, the *uḷṇai* occurs in its eight different aspects. Tolkāppiyar in his first mention refers to the main war of *uḷṇai* and in the second, the second front of *uḷṇai* the king has formed.¹

6.2.6. *Repetition in a single line*

Sometimes the repetition may be found in the same line of the *sūtram*. Tolkāppiyar, when he classifies all the forms of loss indicating transitoriness of things, mentions the following :

“Kātali Iḷanta taputāra nilai”²

It means ‘the loss of wife known as the loss of wife condition’-the repetition is obvious. Naccinārkkiniyar investigates this and gives three reasons for this repetition:

1. A man who has no wife strictly satisfies the conditions of ‘taputāranilai’, yet it does not involve a specific loss (transitoriness).
2. Even after the loss of wife, a man may marry again, but this cannot fall under this category.
3. Taputāranilai is a technical term and “kātali iḷanta” is an explanation. In the explanation of technical terms tautology is inherent.

6.3. *Etiramaṟuttukkūṟal (arthāpatti)*

A *sūtram* in grammar should be brief, precise, intensive and offer wide scope for interpretation.³ The commentator not only brings out what is broadly outlined in the *sūtram*, but looks for what is not specifically stated in it. When a statement is made with reference to one of two possibilities it has to be inferred that the rule does not apply to the other possibility i.e. its opposite. Tol. Col. *Sūtram* 61 is interpreted as justifying such an interpretation. For example, when it stated that Karikāḷaṅ was the greatest among the early Cōḷās, it follows that none of the other cōḷās of that period was as great as Karikāḷaṅ. Tolkāppiyar also in giving the list of faultless features, simply states that all opposites of the faults enumerated are faultless features.⁴ Iḷampūraṅar exploits this method to

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 67, p. 205.

2. Tol. Poruḷ. ss. 79; 28, p. 277.

3. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 646.

4. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 655.

a greater extent in interpreting *Tolkāppiyam* and *Naccinārkkīṇiyar* follows broadly this commentator.¹

6.3.1. *Independent observations of Naccinārkkīṇiyar*

But there are places where *Naccinārkkīṇiyar* makes his own independent observations. *Tolkāppiyar* says that ‘y’ and ‘ñ’ as initial of verbs succeeding the final ‘ṇ’ or ‘ṅ’ of a previous word are in free variation.²

Maṇ yāṭta	—	Maṇ ñāṭta
Poṅ yāṭta	—	Poṅ ñāṭta

‘Yāṭta’, here, is a verb and it does not differ in its meaning even if it occurs as ñāṭta. *Naccinārkkīṇiyar* says that as they are similar in the verbal sense they are not so in the nominal sense. They do not occur as,

Maṇ yāmai	—	Maṇ ñāmai
Poṅ yāmai	—	Poṅ ñāmai

6.3.2. *Differs from Iḷampūraṇar*

There are instances where *Naccinārkkīṇiyar* differs from *Iḷampūraṇar*. *Tolkāppiyar* says that *Viyaṅkōḷ viṇai* (optative mood of verbs) occurs in the sense of command (*Ēval kaṇṇiya viyaṅkōḷ*).³ *Iḷampūraṇar* argues that since *Tolkāppiyar* says *Viyaṅkōḷ viṇai* occurs in the sense of command it can occur in other sense also (*val kaṇṇāta viyaṅkōḷ*) and *Naccinārkkīṇiyar* agrees with him, but the illustrations they give have different implications. *Iḷampūraṇar*’s example-

‘*Maṅṅiya Peruma-nī*’ ‘*May you live long! you great one*’.

Here ‘live’ occurs in the sense of optative mood but it is not a specific order. The poet does not imply that the king to whom he has addressed this remark to carry out the order, as this is different from saying ‘go there’ when the order is specific, asking the person to go, whereas ‘living long’ is a happening wished by the poet and delivered in the sense of optative mood. This is the interpretation of *Iḷampūraṇar* and he calls this kind of *viyaṅkōḷ* ‘*Ēval kaṇṇāta viyaṅkōḷ*’.

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 1, 49, 84.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 146.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 210.

Nacciṅārkkiniyar says that the command "go there" addressed to akṛiṅai (inferior category) is Viyaṅkōl viṅai not meant in the sense of command to be carried out (Ēval kaṅṅāta vīyaṅkōl). When one addresses a dog 'go there' neither one does not mean that the dog should immediately obey such an order nor does the dog think of carrying it out. So Nacciṅārkkiniyar says that though this is in a sense a command in form, it does not have that as its implication (Ēval kaṅṅāta vīyaṅkōl).¹

But this view of Nacciṅārkkiniyar is not correct. Though animals may otherwise understand their masters, they do not understand the language as such and therefore it is Viyaṅkōl implication, but the speaker uses the language even in such cases. If inanimate things are addressed as in the literary convention where the lady love speaks to the clouds, mountains, forests, etc. one has to admit the use of language and also the use of vīyaṅkōl. It is clear that Nacciṅārkkiniyār's explanation does not fully cover these cases of akṛiṅai (the inferior category) because in such cases the speaker does have in mind the vīyaṅkōl meaning.

6.3.3. Differing from Cēṅāvaraiyar

Nacciṅārkkiniyar almost quotes Cēṅāvaraiyar in his interpretation of Collatikāram sūtrams exploiting this method of drawing out meanings.² There are one or two places where he has differed from Cēṅāvaraiyar.

Iṭai-c-coṟ kiḷaviyum uri-c-coṟ kiḷaviyum

Avaṟṟu vaḷi maruṅkiṅ tōṅṟum eṅpa.³

Here Iḷampūraṅar and Cēṅāvaraiyar interpret that Iṭai-c-col and uri-c-col always stand adjacent to the nouns and verbs though standing separate from them i.e. as external parts of noun and verb. But Nacciṅārkkiniyar says that they stand as internal parts of nouns and verbs.

Noun: <i>Avaṅ</i> — a = demonstrative	}	Iṭai-c-col-
aṅ = suffix		
Verb: uṅtāṅ uṅ = root uri-c-col.		

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; p. 198.

2. Tol. Col. ss. 51, 69, 120, 189, 235, 239, 240, 286.

3. Ibid; s. 161.

‡ = tense suffix. Iṭai-c-col.
 āṅ = suffix — Iṭai-c-col.

Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar further investigates and interprets thus : As it is stated there are nouns and verbs where the iṭai or uri comes as internal parts, one has to assume that there are nouns and verbs without these iṭai and uri. He gives the following examples. maram, maṅ, etc. (nouns), uṅ, tiṅ, etc. (verbs) which do not have their basis on iṭai and uri as they are indivisible.

6.3.4. *Natural and artificial regions and seasons*

In Poruṭatikāram Tolkāppiyar investigates 'Akam' under three classifications Mutal, Karu and Uri. Mutal consists of geographical Region and Season. He mentions this as

Mutal eṅappaṭuvatu nilam poḷutu irañṭiṅ
 Iyalpu eṅa molīpa iyalpuṅarntōrē.¹

Here 'iyalpu' means 'nature'. What Tolkāppiyar calls 'nature' is interpreted by Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar as referring to the region and season (natural). Discovering by implication the opposite of this statement referring to natural regions he says there are places and seasons which are artificial, or conventional what is attributed as natural to some tiṅai is taken as applicable to other tiṅais by convention or otherwise. Mullai (forest), Kuṅiṅci (mountain), Marutam (agricultural tract,) and Neytal (Sea) are natural regions.² The seasons he has prescribed for all these four regions and Pālai are natural.³ But Pālai, Kaikkiṅai and Peruntiṅai do not have geographical regions of their own and the latter two (Kaikkiṅai and peruntiṅai) do not have seasons of their own, but are in a way variations of the four main tiṅais. Pālai, being dependent upon the four tiṅais, has the region of others as its own and in the same way the other two also (Kaikkiṅai and Peruntiṅai get the region and season of the other tiṅais, as their own). So, according to Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar, the region of Pālai, Kaikkiṅai and Peruntiṅai and the season of Kaikkiṅai and Peruntiṅai are all artificial.⁴ This classification is necessary, as the sūtram would be defective if it does not cover all the seven tiṅais.

6.3.5. *Interpretation on literary basis*

Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar sometimes investigates some of the sūtrams in Tolkāppiyam, bearing in mind literary references also. For example :

1. Tol. Poruḷ. s. 4.
2. Ibid; s. 2.
3. Tol. Poruḷ; ss. 6-11.
4. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 4 p. 16.

“Naṭuvu nilai-t-tiṇaiyē naṅpakal vēṇiloṭu
 Muṭivu nilai maruṅkiṇ muṇṇiya neṇittē”.¹

This is ‘time’ prescribed for Pālai i.e. — Summer and noon. The second line seems to be superfluous. But, for Naccinārkkiniyar this line does not seem to be unnecessary, and what is apparently superfluous, gains importance in his hands. According to him ‘nilai’ means ‘land’ and ‘maruṅku’ means ‘part’. ‘Nilai maruṅku’ means a part of the whole land, refers to Mullai (Forest) and Kuṇṇi (mountain). So he interprets the second line as meaning that the ‘separation’ prescribed for ‘pālai’ happens in Kuṇṇi and Pālai. Arguing through implication and negating the opposite, he holds that the separation does not happen in Neital and Marutam. This interpretation is necessitated by literary evidences. In literary works Pālai-t-tiṇai and its various aspects occur in Mullai and Kuṇṇi. The hero’s decision to leave, the heroine’s request to take her also with him and other aspects of Pālai or separation happen in Kuṇṇi and Mullai only and not in Marutam and Neytal. In Cilappatikāram there is a reference to Kuṇṇi and Mullai turning into Pālai² and hence Naccinārkkiniyar says that the separation occurs in Mullai and Kuṇṇi.

6.4. *Uyttukkoṇṇuṇṇartal (Interpretation by extension or Inference)*

Perhaps this is the best among the methods as enunciated by Tolkāppiyar. Here the commentator should stretch the scope of definition laid down by the grammarian, and fit in a new idea not specified by it. This is Pērāciriya’s interpretation of this method.³ Iḷampuraṇar says that if a particular sūtram shows no application—apparently, it should be interpreted in a way that confines it to the area of application.⁴ Naccinārkkiniyar follows the former interpretation of Pērāciriya in this respect regarding the interpretation of this method.

6.4.1. *Second idea derived*

Tolkāppiyar has defined ‘veṭci’ in the following way:

Vēntu viṭu muṇaiṇar vēṇṇu-p-pulak-kaḷaviṇ
 Ā tantu ōmpal mēvarṇākum.⁵

1. Ibid; s. 9.

2. Cilappatikāram. kāṭu-kāṇ-kātai; 11. 64-66.

3. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 665 : 23; p. 755.

4. Tol. Poruḷ Iḷam; s. 656: 23, p. 587.

5. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 57.

Naccinārkkīṇiyar interprets it as meaning the capture of cows (belonging to the enemy) by the king's commander and its protection. 'Veṭci in Tolkāppiyam includes both capture and retrieval. But the sūtram, as it is, contemplates those who capture the cows. Naccinārkkīṇiyar applying this method of interpretation makes it applicable to retrieval also: The phrase 'kaḷaviṇ ā tantu ōmpal'-is interpreted in two ways:

1. Driving away the cows belonging to the enemy and protecting them.
2. Retrieval of the cows and protecting them.

So this proves that if the author mentions only one idea, the commentator by employing this skill of interpretation derives another meaning that lies hidden within the scope of the sūtram.

6.4.2. Differing from Cēṇāvaraiyar

Cēṇāvaraiyar interprets a sūtram by adopting a method known as 'yōka vipākam'. By this he interprets a phrase by splitting in two different ways and on its strength offers explanation. But Naccinārkkīṇiyar applies this method (uyttukkoṇṭuṇartal) to draw the meaning. The sūtram is:

"Vinaiyirōṇṇum pālaṇi kiḷaviyūm

Peyariṇ rōṇṇum pālaṇi kiḷaviyūm

Mayaṅkal kūṭā tam marapiṇavē".¹

According to the sūtra, the verbs and nouns should agree in gender and number in a sentence. 'Mayaṅkal kūṭā' means "they (the verbs or nouns) should not be in disagreement with other words in the sentence". 'Tammarapiṇavē' means "they should be in agreement with other words". Both the phrases refer to the same idea in both the ways (i.e. negative and affirmative). But Cēṇāvaraiyar splits "tammarapiṇavē" separately from the other and gives interpretation of this method which is called in Sanskrit 'yōkavipākam'. Naccinārkkīṇiyar adopts Uyttukkoṇṭuṇartal i.e. links up the word 'Tammarapiṇavē' with the other statement, then converts it into a separate phrase. Naccinārkkīṇiyar does not want to multiply the 'uttis' and therefore brings in the 'yōkavipākam' also under 'uyttukkoṇṭuṇartal'.

1. Tol. Col; s. 11.

6.4.3. *Explicit meaning derived*

Normally the commentator, after explaining what the author has to say explicitly, would then try to bring out the implied meaning by adopting this method "uyttukkoṭṭuṇartal". But Naccinārkkiniyar sometimes interprets the sūtram in a way that makes the implied meaning itself the main and obvious meaning and therefore explains what to others is the explicit meaning as if it is the implied meaning. For example:

"Oru Poruḷ iru col Pirivila varaiyār"¹

"Scholars do not object to the use of the occurrence of two adjacent synonymous words". Cēnāvaraiyar, the predecessor and Teyvaccilaiyār the successor of Naccinārkkiniyar both interpret the sūtram only in this natural way.² Their examples are:-

1. Nivantu oṅku perumalai.
2. Mīmicai.

But Naccinārkkiniyar says that one word occurring with two meanings in a sentence can be sanctioned as it is beautiful (the phrase 'oru poruḷ iru col' is changed by him into "iru poruḷ oru col" to his advantage). His example is

"Kuḷal vaḷar mullai".

Here the words kuḷal and mullai give double meanings.

1. The '*mullai-p-paṇ*' played by Āyar on the *flute*.
2. The '*mullai flower*' in the long and rich *hair-tresses* of the Āyar.

But he brings out this implied meaning as if it is explicit. The explicit meaning given by other predecessors is given by him as the second meaning of the sūtram, the meaning he says, he has derived by employing the method "uyttukkoṭṭuṇartal".

6.5. *Iraṭṭura Moḷital (statement which is capable of two different meanings)*

Tolkāppiyar has not mentioned this method of literary appreciation as one of his 32 methods. But this method is found in later works on grammar.³ According to Pērāciriyaṅ, it seems, oppakkūral and Iraṭṭura moḷital are the same.⁴ Naccinārkkiniyar holds that

1. Tol. Col. s. 460.
 2. Tol. Col; Teyva; s. 449.
 3. Naṅṅū; s. 14:6.
 4. Tol. Poruḷ. Pērā; s. 665:9.

they are different. But he has not mentioned the difference between this method and the previous one i.e. *uyttukkoṇṭuṇartal*, as according to him, both are the methods through which two meanings are given for a *sūtram*. He approves of *ḷampūraṇar* in some places accepting his interpretation through this method.¹ But he gives his own meaning at other places.

6.5.1. *The method referred to*

Tolkāppiyar has enumerated places where *kāmakkiḷatti* of the hero can speak out. The first line of the *sūtram* is:

Pullutal mayakkum pulavi"²

Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar finds two meanings for this phrase. "Pulavi"-sulky mood or bouderie. "Pullutal mayakkum" is an attribute. His two meanings are:

1. "When the mistresses feel the divided affection in the hero with respect to them and the lady-love".
2. "When they feel aggrieved on hearing the covert or secret union of the hero with the prostitute or harlot, carried on stealthily without their knowledge".

Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar finds the second meaning through the method viz., "*Iraṭṭuṇa molital*" and gives literary evidences. As usual it is these literary evidences which drive him to introduce these *uttīs*.

6.5.2. *The method not referred to*

There are places where Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, though he draws two meanings from the same passage, does not mention that he has adopted "*Iraṭṭuṇa molital*" to draw the second inference. Tolkāppiyar enumerates the contexts where and when the companion of the heroine talks out. One of them is :

"Ompaṭaikkiḷavi"³

Here Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar interprets in two ways :

1. When the companion of the heroine tells the hero to take care of the heroine.
2. When the hero tells the companion of the heroine to take care of the heroine.

1. Tol. poruḷ; s. 103; p. 357.

2. Ibid; s. 151.

3. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 114: :25, pp. 478-479.

Here Nacciṅārkkiniyar does not mention specifically the method 'Iraṭṭura moḷital.

6.6. *Oṅṅena Muṭittal (Mentioning of Similarities)*

"Oṅṅena muṭittal taṅṅina muṭittal" is a method of literary appreciation mentioned in later works. This can be taken as a single method or as two.¹ Nacciṅārkkiniyar has the reading "oṅṅena muṭittal" instead of "oṅṅina muṭittal". He has exploited this method to interpret Tolkāppiyam at more than twenty places.² Oṅṅena muṭittal means bringing all the similar literary practices within the scope of a particular sūtram which lays down the general rule for all of them.

6.6.1. *New ideas added*

(1) In Tamil, the passive voice is rarely used. It is idiomatic to use the active form of verb in the passive sense. "The house cleaned" is used in the sense of "The house was cleaned" and this active form in the passive sense is called "Karuma karuttā" (object as agent).³ In this connection Nacciṅārkkiniyar mentions some other usages in vogue in Tamil. The instrument of execution and the author of command also occur as the doer (Karuttā).

This sword attacks - instrument as agent.

The king built the temple - the master as doer.

These two ideas are added by Nacciṅārkkiniyar who uses the method "oṅṅena muṭittal".

(2) Tirtal and Tirttal are used in the sense of 'viṭal' meaning 'separation', according to Tolkāppiyam.⁴ Among these the first is intransitive and the next is transitive. The word 'viṭal' therefore occurs in both the senses. There are also other words such as pilattal, aṅaṅkal, etc. which can be used in both the intransitive and transitive senses. Nacciṅārkkiniyar here derives this idea employing the method "oṅṅena muṭittal".

(3) In Tamil there are expressions where objects which cannot move are described as 'coming' and objects which do not have the capacity to think or speak are described as thinking and speaking⁵

1. Nannūl; s. 14:19. Civaṅāṅa Swāmika] commentary.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 138, 177, etc. Tol. Col. 175, 236, etc. Tol. Poru; 21, 68, etc.

3. Tol. Col; s. 248.

4. Ibid; s. 318.

5. Tol. Col; s. 422.

'The path comes here'.

'The crops have been asking for the rains'.

Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar, exploiting this method "oṅṅeṇa muṭittal", adds a list of phrases that come under this category.

1. Kavavu akattiṭum — Here the meaning of the word is treated as its action.
2. Āyiram kāṇam vantatu — It is brought by somebody but here it means as if it came of its own.
3. Nilam uṇṭa āṭai
4. Ipporuḷai iccol collum — and so on.

6.7. *Tannina muṭittal (Including others of the same category)*

Tannina muṭittal is "a mode of concise statement which, by implication, covers related points, one of 32 uttis".¹ If the author gives one definition, the commentator, exploiting this utti, applies the same to other things that can be affiliated to the main category enunciated by the author. What is mentioned is taken as illustrative and in that way all that belongs to that category can be included therein. Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar quotes his predecessor Iḷampūraṇar at many places.² But there are some places where he offers his own interpretations.

6.7.1. *Related points covered*

The consonant 'ṅ' preceding the consonant 'm' has reduced time-length i.e. shorter than its normal $\frac{1}{2}$ mātraī.³

Example: Pōṅm.

Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar, employing the above method, adds that the consonant 'ṅ' before the consonant 'm' will also have the same reduced time-length as in :

Example: Maruṅm,

Nouns of quality that have 'ar' 'ār' as suffixes take the vocative case signs 'ir' and 'ē'.⁴

Kariyar	—	Kariyīr	Kariyīrē
Iḷaiyār	—	Iḷaiyīr	Iḷaiyīrē

1. Tamil Lexicon; p. 1813.
 2. Tol. Col; ss. 16, 62, 215, etc.
 3. Tol. Eḷuttu s. 52.
 4. Tol. Col. s. 142.

Naccinārkkiniyar, using this principle, adds that attributive compounds of two nouns, which have other suffixes, also take the same vocative case signs, after having the 'ar' or 'ār' suffix.

Civakacāmi — Cīvaka cāmiyār — 'ār' suffix.

Civakacāmiyirē — ir and ē — vocative signs.

6.7.2. Differing from Iḷampūraṇar

Naccinārkkiniyar differs from Iḷampūraṇar at some places with reference to the — employment of this method. He includes the interrogative 'e' along with the demonstratives 'a', 'i', 'u', as Tolkāppiyar has not mentioned separately by this interrogative sign.¹ Iḷampūraṇar includes it with the other interrogatives 'ā, ē, ō.² Naccinārkkiniyar is of the opinion that as 'e' is a short vowel, it should be mentioned along with the demonstratives 'a' 'i' 'u' only; i.e. the iṭaiccol bases of short vowels, but according to Iḷampūraṇar as 'e.' is an interrogative he feels it should be mentioned with the other interrogatives and this seems more natural.

6.8. Venṭātu Kūṭal (Superfluous Statements of Phrases)

Sometimes the author may be guilty of making a statement which is unnecessary as it can be derived from his main statement. Repetition is repeating the same idea once more, whereas this involves an unnecessary remark. If one says, "I saw with my eyes" — those words succeeding 'saw' are unnecessary as it is possible to see only with the eyes. Parimēlaḷakar, the great commentator of Tirukkuṭal, investigates the superfluous phrases in Tirukkuṭal such as "words from the mouth" and gives reasons for them in a beautiful manner.³

6.8.1. Agreement with the predecessors

In Tolkāppiyam, there are places where some of his statements seem unnecessary. Iḷampūraṇar justifies these statements analysing them in an ingenious way and exploits what seems to be a defect to incorporate new generalisation till then unnoticed. In almost all places, Cēnāvaraiyar and Naccinārkkiniyar agree with Iḷampūraṇar. Tolkāppiyar says that words ending in 'i', 'u', 'ai', 'ō' take the vocative case suffix.⁴ It means that words with other vowel endings

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 31.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu. Iḷam; 32.

3. Kuṭal Pari; vv. 91, 139, 1100.

4. Tol. Col; s. 122.

(eight vowels) will not take the vocative case suffix. This need not be mentioned as the first statement itself suggests the succeeding idea. But still Tolkāppiyar mentions this in another sūtram.¹ Iḷampūraṇar says that what seems to be unnecessary occurs only to suggest that whilst words other than these endings in 'i', 'u', 'ai' and 'ō' will never take any vocative case sign, the words ending in 'i' etc. will take not only the prescribed case signs but may take other vocative case signs also.

Kaṇi — Kaṇi Tolkāppiyam.
Kaṇi — Kaṇiyē Iḷampūraṇar.

Short 'i' will become long 'ī' according to the vocative rule of Tolkāppiyar. According to the view of Iḷampūraṇar, which he derives from the superfluous statement of Tolkāppiyar, the short 'i' will also have 'ē' as the vocative suffix². Both Cēṇāvaraiyar and Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar agree with Iḷampūraṇar and give the same examples in their commentaries.³ There are many places in Tolkāppiyam where Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar agrees with Iḷampūraṇar, but gives more examples from his abundant literary experiences.⁴

6.8.2. *Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar's original suggestions*

Tolkāppiyar, in Poruḷatikāram, refers to 'Veṭci' a tiṇai which is the counterpart of Kuṇṇi in Akam.⁵ Kuṇṇi has Kaḷavu (clandestine love between the hero and the heroine before marriage) as the trait peculiar to this Akattiṇai and in Veṭchi the clandestine way by which the cattle of the enemy is driven away for protection is described. So, it is enough if the grammarian says that Veṭci in Puṇattiṇai is the counterpart of Kuṇṇi in Akattiṇai, but Tolkāppiyar explains this still further and uses the word 'Kaḷavu' once again,⁶ which can be derived from his first statement making veṭci correspond to Kuṇṇi. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar says this unnecessary statement suggests an important point. The trait of Kuṇṇi, Kaḷavu, the clandestine aspect, though peculiar to Kuṇṇi-tiṇai alone, does occur in all other tiṇais also, but the trait of Veṭci, Kaḷavu, the clandestine aspect, does not belong to other tiṇais in Puṇam like Vaṇci, tumpai, vākai, uḷiṇai, etc. To emphasise this

1. Tol. Col. s. 126.

2. Tol. Col. Iḷam; s. 121

3. Tol. Col; s. 126, Tol. Col. Cēṇā; s. 124.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 240, 320, 450.
Tol. Col; ss. 27, 31.

5. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 56.

6. Ibid; s. 57.

view, the author has used the word 'kaḷavu' once again, according to Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar.

6.9. *Varaiyātu Kūral (Unrestricted)*

The grammarian has to define clearly the area of application for all the sūtrams, or else it would lead to ambiguity. We see Tolkāppiyar almost scrupulously following this procedure of setting limits for many sūtrams.¹

6.9.1. *Agreement with predecessors*

But there are places where he has not clearly prescribed such limits. In such places Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar follows mainly his brilliant predecessor Iḷampūraṇar. Tolkāppiyar refers to the rule for sandhi of the word 'Maka' with another word and mentions the occurrence of the 'iṅ' cāriyai (augment used in combination as of nouns and case endings.)² He has not defined what sort of words should succeed 'Maka' for the transformation, Iḷampūraṇar says that since no restriction has been given all kinds of letters can come.

1. Maka + Kai = Makaviṅ kai — plosive.
2. Maka + ṅāṅ = Makaviṅ ṅāṅ — nasal.
3. Maka + yāḷ = Makaviṅ yāḷ — medials.
4. Māka + ātai = Makaviṅ ātai — vowel.

Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar also mentions this in this commentary.

6.9.2. *Original additions*

Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar not only quotes Iḷampūraṇar at many places, but adds a few more things, not mentioned by Iḷampūraṇar. 'cē' is a word meaning cow and tree, When it has the meaning 'tree', it gets the 'iṅ' cāriyai in Sandhi according to Tolkāppiyar, but he has not specified the succeeding word. Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar explains that it will get the 'iṅ' cāriyai in sandhi with all the four groups of letters, because Tolkāppiyar has not placed any restriction on the words succeeding 'cē' meaning cow.³

- | | |
|---------------------------|----------|
| 1. Cē + kōṭu = Cēviṅ kōṭu | plosive. |
| 2. Cē + maṅi = Cēviṅ maṅi | nasal. |
| 3. Cē + vāl = Cēviṅ vāl | medial. |
| 4. Cē + imil = Cēviṅ imil | vowel. |

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 128, 151, 296, 340, 357, 409, 414, 430, etc.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 218.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 279.

Naccinārkkiniyar's own interpretations, where Iḷampūraṇar has offered none are found in many places in his commentary.¹

6.10. *Potuppaṣakkūral (Generalization)*

If a particular definition is common to many categories, the author makes a general statement and from the generalization, the readers should conclude the area of its applicability. Naccinārkkiniyar is not only a critical grammarian, but has a rich literary background with wide reference. He excels himself when he brings out the area of applicability of such sūtrams.

6.10.1. *Uṛaḷum Kiḷavi*

Tolkāppiyar mentions two remarks relating to Akattiṇai.²

1. Uṛaḷum kiḷavi.
2. Aiya-k-kiḷavi.

Aiyakkiḷavi, "the words born of mental hesitation whether to speak or not to speak",³ belongs to the hero, as specifically mentioned by Tolkāppiyar. But the other one, uṛaḷum kiḷavi, has not been specified as being restricted to anyone. Uṛaḷum kiḷavi is refutation or retort - Naccinārkkiniyar says, that this can be spoken by the heroine, the hero and the companion of the heroine. The importance of Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary lies in his illustrations justifying this 'uṛaḷum kiḷavi' not being restricted to any one character as 'aiyakkiḷavi' and in his classification as under:

1. The retort of the lady when the maid speaks out noble words.
2. The retort of the maid when the hero speaks out noble words.
3. The retort of the lady when the hero speaks out noble words.
4. The retort of the maid when the heroine speaks out noble words.⁴

6.10.2. *Tiṇaimayakkūratal*

Let us give another example for this critical method of analysis. Tolkāppiyar says that the classification of 'Tiṇai' (Kuṛiñci, Mullai,

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 287, 324, 331, 375, 377, 402, etc.
 2. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 238.
 3. Tol. Poruḷ. English Translation; Vol. I. Part II, p. 536.
 4. Tol. Poruḷ. Translation; Vol. I, Part-II; p. 536.

Marutam, Neytal and Pālai) is not water-tight, but there might be mingling of one with the other.¹ *Tiṇai* includes three constituents:

1. Mutal or the basic things - place and time.
2. Karu - the products of the particular place.
3. Uri - the aspect of love peculiar to each place.

Tolkāppiyar mentions the mingling of *tiṇai* and *Naccinārkkiniyar* includes there the mingling of the three above mentioned constituents, as *tiṇai* includes all these three. Here also this justification for the use of the general term is based on literary interpretation of Caṅkam literature and his classification of the commingling of *tiṇai* is also based on such interpretation.

6.11. *Moḷiyātutu Muḷittal* (Mentioning what is not mentioned)

The grammarian cannot list all the usages in vogue in his time, as that would make his work unduly long. But the commentator summarizes from the main instances given by the author and amplifies the scope of the work. Tolkāppiyar himself has sanctioned this as one of the methods of interpretation.² *Naccinārkkiniyar* broadly follows his predecessor at many places³ but he has something to say of his own at one or two places.

6.11.1. *Importance of both the views*

If the word 'anru' succeeds the demonstratives *atu*, *itu*, *utu* - the vowel 'u' in the last syllable in the demonstratives, changes into long vowel 'ā'.⁴

$$atu + anru = atānru.$$

Here *Naccinārkkiniyar* also mentions another practice prevalent in his period i.e. the vowel in the vowel consonant goes and the vowel 'a' in the succeeding word merges with the consonant as the following:

$$atu + anru = atanru$$

This is brought out by *Naccinārkkiniyar*. Tolkāppiyar has given one behaviour and left it to the commentator to complete the list by exploiting this method '*Moḷiyātutu muḷittal*'. "Both the views of the author and the commentator are equally important, and if

1. Tol. Poru]; s. 12.

2. Tol. Poru] Ijam; s. 656; 5.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 32, 101; Tol. Poru]; ss. 76; 7, p. 254.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 258.

the commentator has not completed the list, the sūtram will be defective or incomplete,¹ as applicable to the other usages quoted by Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar.

6.12. *Oppakkūṅṅal (Mentioning of Parallels)*

This is also one of the methods which Tolkāppiyar has mentioned.² Iḷampūraṅṅar interprets this as codifying similar things though occurring in different contexts, under one heading. Pēṅācīriyār differs from Iḷampūraṅṅar and says that "what suggests two ideas is 'oppakkūṅṅal'.³ Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar follows Iḷampūraṅṅar and this is evident from the explanation he offers for a Tolkāppiyam sūtram.

6.12.1. *Alar Kūṅṅṅal between kaḷavu and kaṅṅpu*

'Alar kūṅṅṅal' is common to both kaḷavu and kaṅṅpu and it is but natural to expect that they should be mentioned at both places as they occur in different contexts. But Tolkāppiyar has mentioned this in 'Kaṅṅṅal' only.⁴ Here Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar says that Tolkāppiyar has mentioned this in Kaṅṅṅal only, to avoid repetition and has codified similar ideas under one heading. Iḷampūraṅṅar calls this as 'Tokuttukkūṅṅal' (Summarization and generalisation) whereas it also needs classification and specification.⁵ It is clear that the same idea has been investigated by two different methods.

1. Tol. Poruḷ, Pēṅā; s. 665: 4-5, p. 733.

2. Tol. Poruḷ, Iḷam; s. 656: 9.

3. Tol. Poruḷ, Pēṅā; s. 665: 9. p. 739.

4. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 162.

5. Tol. Poruḷ; Iḷam; s. 160.

CHAPTER - 7

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF NACCINĀRKKINIYAR'S VIEWS

7.1 *A Study of Ākupeyar*

There are certain points elucidated perhaps for the first time by Naccinārkkiniyar with regard to Ākupeyar. Ākupeyar is "a name of word, which, by long usage, is secondarily applied to denote something connected with the thing originally denoted by it".¹ So ākupeyar has two meanings.

1. Original or primary meaning.
2. Applied or secondary meaning.

7.1.1 *Ākupeyar with an attribute*

Sometimes an attribute precedes the ākupeyar. Here it is important to determine whether it is an attribute for the original meaning of the word or for the applied meaning of the word. Naccinārkkiniyar investigates this function of the attribute and explains in a remarkable manner.

"Tūvi aṇṇa meṇ cēkkai"²

Here 'aṇṇam' is a noun with an attribute 'tūvi'. It (aṇṇam) is an ākupeyar, because it refers to the bird (the whole) first and to the feathers (part) secondly. Anyhow, in this context, 'aṇṇam' has its secondary meaning i.e. the feathers of the bird, because the poet here refers to the bed made of the feathers of a swan. Tūvi is the attribute which also means "the feathers." It is, therefore, clear that this attribute tūvi meaning 'feathers' cannot qualify the secondary meaning of 'aṇṇam', i.e. the feathers. So Naccinārkkiniyar investigates this point and explains that the attribute 'tūvi' meaning feathers, does not go to describe the part i.e. the feathers, the secondary meaning of the word 'aṇṇam', but it goes to describe the whole i.e. the bird 'swan', the primary or original meaning of the word 'aṇṇam'.

1. Tamil Lexicon; p. 207

2. Kālī; v. 13: 15.

'Veṅṭirai' is also another ākupeyar in which, according to Naccinārkkiniyar, the attribute qualifies the original meaning of the word 'tirai' (waves).¹

7.1.2 Interpretation of aṭai aṭutta ākupeyar

Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretation of this-'aṭai aṭutta ākupeyar' (Ākupeyar occurring with an attribute), is original. Vakarakkiḷavi is an ākupeyar with attribute, as kiḷavi is the ākupeyar and vakaram is its attribute. The original meaning of 'kiḷavi' is 'word'. Here as ākupeyar it 'refers' to the letter. The word 'vakaram', does not stand as an attribute to the "word" (the original meaning of 'kiḷavi'). The attribute does not go to describe the original meaning of the noun, but goes to describe its ākupeyar meaning i.e. the secondary meaning. Civañāṇamuṇivar says that this is the trait of ākupeyar with an attribute.² Though Naccinārkkiniyar and Civañāṇamuṇivar differ in their interpretations, they have referred to the two kinds of aṭai aṭutta ākupeyar.

1. attribute goes to the original meaning.
2. attribute goes to the secondary meaning.

7.1.3 Ākupeyar occurring as an attribute

The word that stands occurring as ākupeyar not only does so with an attribute preceding it, but it occurs as an attribute as well. For example.

"Koḷuvalci"³

Koḷu is an agricultural weapon made of iron but here it refers to agriculture. So it is 'ākupeyar'. 'Koḷuvalci' means rice, the product of agriculture. So Koḷu, in its ākupeyar (secondary) meaning and not in its original meaning stands as an attribute to 'Valci'. This, according to Naccinārkkiniyar, can also be one of the aspects of ākupeyar.

7.1.4 ākupeyar and its results (a) from the point of view of synonymy

The various words that denote the same meaning have been classified in grammar as 'oru poruḷ paṇ moli' (synonyms). But because of the shifts in meanings of ākupeyar, which have also been well established, so many words look like synonymous, as understood from Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary.

1. Kali; v. 124; 2-3.
2. Tol. Cūttira virutti; p. 44.
3. Maturai; 1. 141.

Word.	Original meaning.	Ākupeyar (secondary) meaning.
1. Pālai	Pālai melody.	Pālai yā ¹
2. Kē _l vi	hearing.	yā ²
3. Toṭai	string of yā _l .	yā ³ .
4. Kural.	sound, a melody.	yā _l . ⁴

Here according to later interpretations Pālai, Kē_lvi, and Kural, referring to the effect of yā_l, stand for yā_l the cause, and hence 'kāriya ākupeyar', Toṭai, referring to the part of the yā_l, stands for yā_l, the whole, and hence Ciṅai ākupeyar.

7.1.5. *Ākupeyar and its results: (b) from the point of view of polysemy*

The various meanings that one word denotes as in its condition of ākupeyar have been also referred to by Nāccinārkkiniyar which we are able to understand from his commentary. The words, poṅ, poṭi, etc. as ākupeyar denote many meanings as under:-

Word	Original meaning	Ākupeyar (secondary) meanings
1. Poṅ.	gold.	1. jewels. ⁵ 2. Mēkalai. ⁶ 3. Pot. ⁷
2. Poṭi.	engrave.	1. Wings of a peacock. ⁸ 2. honour. ⁹

7.1.6. *Ākupeyar-is it traditional?*

The commentator of Nānūl distinguishes ākupeyar and aṅmoji -t-tokai, by referring to the fact that aṅmoji can be created as and when the occasion demands, but ākupeyar conforms to a traditional usage.¹⁰ But it is clear, from his commentary, Nāccinārkkiniyar

-
1. Porunar; 1. 22.
 2. Perumpāṅ; 11. 15-16.
 3. Paṭṭiṅam; 1. 254.
 4. Malai; 1. 358.
 5. Jīvaka; vv. 2295, 2598
 6. Ibid; v. 67.
 7. Ibid; v. 97.
 8. Muruku; 1. 122.
 9. Jīvaka; v. 1792.
 10. Nānūl; s. 290.

does not hold the same view, Any shift in meaning, whether it is new or old would be ākupeyar according to him.

<i>Words</i>	<i>Original meaning</i>	<i>Ākupeyar meaning</i>
1. Inṭam.	pleasure.	good smell ¹
2. Kuṇam.	quality.	action. ²
3. Tēr.	chariot.	charioteer. ³
4. Nīlam.	blue colour.	sacred grass (Tarup-pai). ⁴
5. Viraku.	skill.	cakes. ⁵
6. umiḷ.	spitting.	sound. ⁶
7. Cuṭar.	shining.	weapons. ⁷
8. Anpu.	love.	Jīvakan. ⁸

These words occur as ākupeyar according to Naccinārkkiniyar only, and it is difficult to find out instances elsewhere in the literary works. But there are words as viḷakku, meaning light, referring to the base of lamp,⁹ kaḷal, meaning anklet, referring to the feet,¹⁰ varai, meaning border, referring to bamboo¹¹-etc., coming in the traditional usage as 'ākupeyar'. But the words mentioned above have no traditional sanction. So Naccinārkkiniyar presumably holds that ākupeyar need not occur in a traditional way, but can be created as and when it is necessary like aṇmoḷi-t-tokai. "A single noun occurring as various ākupeyar" referred to in the previous page, also, proves this view of Naccinārkkiniyar.

7.1.7. *Ākupeyar-a forced interpretation*

Because he has left it to be assumed that any shift in meaning, understood in the context, can be ākupeyar, Naccinārkkiniyar strains

-
1. Jivaka; v. 1980.
 2. Ibid; v. 2462.
 3. Kali; v. 74:16.
 4. Muruku; 1.253.
 5. Porunar; 11, 107-108.
 6. Muruku; 1. 310.
 7. Muruku; 1. 105.
 8. Jivaka; v. 2176.
 9. Neṭu; 11. 42, 175, Mullai; 1.85.
 10. Jivaka; vv. 2135, 2970.
 11. Muruku; 1. 12.

to interpret forcedly the nouns as ākupeyar, which are so well established only in that of primary sense.

“Nāḷum kōḷmīṇ takaittalum takaimē”¹

It means ‘stars and planets’ in its original meaning. But Nacciṇārkkiniyar says ‘kōḷ’ means that which is held by the mind, and according to him it refers to the birds of ill omen and hence ākupeyar. This is far fetched. Nāḷ and kōḷ, occur as such, in literary works, meaning ‘the stars and planets’. For example:

“Nāḷmīṇ Virāya kōḷmīṇ pōla”²

In this line, Nacciṇārkkiniyar himself interprets the phrase Nāḷ mīṇ and kōḷmīṇ as meaning the “stars and planets”. But he interprets the same phrase in the former example, otherwise. This phrase (nāḷ and kōḷ) like the phrase ‘day and night’, has become well-established as referring to things of the same order. In the phrase “day and night”, the word ‘day’ cannot be separated from night and interpreted in a different way. Nacciṇārkkiniyar’s interpretation is not in conformity with the spirit of the passages in devotional poems as

“Nāḷ eṇ ceyum.....kōḷ eṇ ceyum”³

7.1.8. *Iyaṟ peyar or ākupeyar?*

Iyaṟpeyar means the nouns with their primary sense and ākupeyar means the nouns suffering shift in meanings. Nacciṇārkkiniyar sometimes gets confused regarding the iyaṟ peyar and ākupeyar.

“Nakāār aṇṇa muttam”⁴

It means teeth-like pearls. Nakāār means teeth and it is a natural noun. The pearls are compared to the teeth of women here. Nacciṇārkkiniyar also does not refer to this as ‘ākupeyar’ at this place, but elsewhere in Kali-t-tokai he refers to ‘nakāār’ referring to the teeth of women as ‘ākupeyar’.⁵ It does not seem to be correct. It cannot be a natural noun at one place and ‘ākupeyar’ at another. When referring to ‘pearls’ perhaps ‘nakāār’ can occur as ākupeyar.

7.1.9. *Participial nouns or ākupeyar?*

Nacciṇārkkiniyar sometimes calls even the participial nouns as ākupeyar. In Jīvakacintāmaṇi, there occurs a phrase:

-
1. Kali; v. 5:9.
 2. Paṭṭiṇam; l. 68.
 3. Kantaralaṅkāram; v. 38., p.11.
 4. Cigupāṇ; 11. 56-57.
 5. Kali; v. 93:18.

“Atar pōkkuva”¹

It means “those which show the way”, meaning, the lights. It occurs as a participial noun, those which show the way. Naccinārkkiniyar says that this, as it stands as a participial noun, is ākupeyar.

The verb, as it refers to the one engaged in that action, is a participial noun and it is a personal noun in the form of a finite verb.

Rāman̄ vantān̄ — Rama came.

Vantān̄ pāṭinān̄ — He who came, sang.

Here ‘Vantān̄’ (came) is a verb in the first sentence. In the second sentence ‘vantān̄’ (he who came) refers to Rāman̄ as it denotes the one in that action of coming. Here ‘vantān̄’ is not ākupeyar because Vantān̄ Pāṭinān̄, as such is a common participial noun referring to nobody in particular, unless the specific person it denotes is understood by the situation.

Perhaps Naccinārkkiniyar has in mind, ‘vantān̄’ is ‘toḷil ākupeyar’ where the action refers to the doer. Varṅgal, cuṅṅal etc. are treated as ākupeyar. Here also these words, meaning the action, refer to specific things, whereas vantān̄, pāṭinān̄, oṭṭinān̄, etc. - do not have a specific scope. That which occurs generally cannot be called by a specific name. If it is so, all participial nouns are ākupeyar. Demonstrative nouns also, according to this, can be called ākupeyar. Also Naccinārkkiniyar should have scrupulously followed this, at other places, where he should have claimed participial nouns as ākupeyar.

Kaviḷtta — the ornaments that were thrown.²

Kāṅpa — the cranes that are seeing.³

Ularṭtuvār — the women who were drying ..⁴

Tērṅāḷ — one who is not consoled.⁵

Ākeṅṅān̄ — one who said he will become that.⁶

1. Jīvaka; v. 339.

2. Jīvaka; v. 35.

3. Jīvaka; v. 66.

4. Jīvaka; v. 127.

5. Ibid; v. 302.

6. Ibid; v. 1043.

Ēriṇāṇ — one who ascended or mounted.¹

Vaṭiya — The eyes which liken the mango.²

Here is a list of participial nouns which Nacciṇārkkiniyar has not classified as ākupeyar and refers to as participial nouns. So his reference to 'atarpōkkuva' as ākupeyar seems to be incorrect.

7.1.10. *Are numerals ākupeyar?*

Wherever Nacciṇārkkiniyar refers to 'ākupeyar', we see that he quotes either Tolkāppiyam Sūtram or other literary occurrences.

“Āṟu aṟi antaṇar”³

This is a line in Kali-t-tokai. It means “The Brahmins who know the six”. Nacciṇārkkiniyar says that the 'six' here refers to the 'six parts of the Vēdās', and hence 'ākupeyar'. In this connection he quotes a Tolkāppiyam sūtram, reminding us of what he interpreted there. He has interpreted there that numerals, as ākupeyar, denote the things.

“Nūṟṟulām maṇṭapam”⁴

This is a line in Jīvaka cintāmaṇi, Here also 'Nūṟu' (hundred) refers to 'hundred feet' and hence ākupeyar according to Nacciṇārkkiniyar. Here he quotes the above mentioned line in Kalittokai and does not refer to Tolkāppiyam.

Tolkāppiyar classifies some ākupeyar and also quotes some exceptions.⁵ It can be inferred that the ākupeyar of numerical variety that Nacciṇārkkiniyar refers to is included by him in the category of exceptions mentioned by Tolkāppiyar. But Cēṇāvaraiyar is against this view, as he thinks that Tolkāppiyar, who has mentioned ākupeyar of measure and quantity, has specifically omitted this ākupeyar of numerical variety. According to him the numerals one, two, three etc. will also mean the things that are counted and so they are not ākupeyar.⁶

7.1.11. *Is there any basis for ākupeyar?*

There is another place where Nacciṇārkkiniyar refers to a kind of ākupeyar that is “ākupeyar on the basis of uvama-t-tokai”.

1. Ibid; v. 2522.

2. Kali; v. 140:9.

3. Ibid; v. 1:1.

4. Jīvaka; v. 2734.

5. Tol. Col; s. 119.

6. Tol. Col. Cēṇā; s. 116.

‘Nittila-p-pantu’.¹

pearl-ball is its meaning. Naccinārkkiniyar says it is like ‘Gandharva Vaḷakkam’. There is another word ‘mayil’ (peacock) he calls-uvamattokaiyiṅ vanta ākupeyar i.e. ākupeyar on the basis of uvamattokai.² It is difficult to understand how these words could be called ‘tokai’ (compound). Pearl-ball is the comparison for the egg of the snail, but even then it will be pearl ball-like egg’ and not ‘pearl-like ball’, but Naccinārkkiniyar calls this ‘uvamattokai’.

These words, pearl-ball, peacock, and Gandharva vaḷakkam, as they refer respectively to egg, women and clandestine love can be called ‘uvama ākupeyar’. Perhaps Naccinārkkiniyar holds that ‘mayil’ (peacock) can be extended as ‘mayil pōṅṅa makaḷir’ (peacock like women) and as the sign of comparison and the thing compared are understood, he calls it ‘uvama-t-tokai’. But even granting this, there is no reason why it should be called “ākupeyar on the basis of uvamattokai” as there is no such usage, since ākupeyar is based on a single word and not on a tokai, compound word.

The later grammarians refer to such occurrences as ‘metaphors’. They can also be called ‘uvama ākupeyar’. Also, the meaning of every Tokai except ‘anmoli-t-tokai’ is patent within the tokai itself, whereas anmoli-t-tokai refers to a thing which is not within the tokai itself and so also ākupeyar.³ Cēṅāvaraiyar brings the uvama ākupeyar under the exceptions mentioned by Tolkāppiyam sūtram.⁴ So it can be held that these words-nittilappantu, mayil, Gandharva vaḷakkam mentioned by Naccinārkkiniyar, lie outside the class of ākupeyar, and can be better classified as metaphor’ where the signs of comparison and the things compared are understood.

There are some other places where Naccinārkkiniyar has not pointed out the ākupeyar specifically, but refers to similar examples in literature. Some of them are the following:—

“Katir-p-paruti”⁵

“Kaḷ cey kaḷal”⁶

Here also ‘Paruti’ and ‘Kaḷal’ are mentioned by Naccinārkkiniyar as ākupeyar and not as “ākupeyar on the basis of uvamattokai”.

1. Jīvaka; v. 52.
2. Jīvaka; v. 79.
3. Tol. Cūttiravirutti; p. 44.
4. Tol. Col. Cēṅā; s. 117.
5. Jīvaka; v. 527.
6. *Ibid*; v. 929.

7.2 *A note on tense*

Naccinārkkiniyar shows his mettle as a great grammarian in the true tradition of reputed commentators, by his subtle analysis of tenses in respect of Tolkappiyam sūtrams.

7.2.1 *Ceyten eccam*

Ceyten eccam is one of the nine types of verbal participles referred to in Tolkappiyam.¹ According to the grammarians this verbal participle denotes the past tense.² Tolkappiyar says that this can refer to the future tense also.

“Ceyten eccat-tiṟanta kālam
Eytiṟaṅ uṟaittē vārākkālam”³

Here ‘Vārākkālam’ is interpreted as referring to both present and future tenses by Iḷampūraṇar and Naccinārkkiniyar follows him.⁴

Cāttan uṅṟu vantān	—	past.
Cāttan uṅṟu varuvān	—	future.
koṭi āṭi-t-tōṅṟum	—	present.

7.2.2 *Ceyten eccam denoting present*

Ceyten eccam denotes past tense. Tolkappiyar says that it can show future also. Iḷampūraṇar interprets that it can occur in the present too. Naccinārkkiniyar bearing in mind, gives illustrations from literature for such occurrences. The beauty of the forest is described by the poet.

“Taḷipeṟu taṅpulattu-t-talai-p-peyārku arumpiṅṟu
Muḷimutaṅ potuḷiya muḷpura-p-piṭavamum”⁵

Here ‘iṅṟu’ is the verbal participle, belonging to the “ceytu type”. Piṭavam (a kind of tree), giving birth to buds, -clustering blossoms. Here the act of giving birth to buds (iṅṟu’ and clustering (potuḷu)

1. Tol. Col. s. 230.
2. Tol. Col. Iḷam; s. 223.
3. Tol. Col. Cāṅṅā; s. 228.
Tol. Col; s. 230,
Naṅṅūl. Caṅkara; s. 343
Tol. Col. s. 241
4. Tol. Col. Iḷam; s. 234.
Tol. Col; s. 241.
5. Kāli; v. 101:1.2.

are simultaneous. So Naccinārkkiniyar interprets¹ that *inru* and the present tense here and so he writes '*ināniru*' (*āniru*-present suffix) for '*inru*'. There are also other places where this participle denotes present tense according to Naccinārkkiniyar.

"*Ṇaimalarttārinān itari ēkinān*"²

"*Maṇṇaṇ ētti toḷutān*"³

7.2.3 *Ceyten eccam denoting future*

There is another place where Naccinārkkiniyar has interpreted the participles of *ceytu* type (with the physical form of past tense) as referring to future in a sequence where the previous one refers to the past, and the succeeding to the future.

"*Por pūṇ cumantu poru kōṭṭai aḷittu vempōr*

kaṛpān eḷunta mulaiyār"⁴

Here the breasts adorned with jewels destroying the tusks of elephants, rose, to learn the methods of war. Here '*cumantu*', *aḷittu*, *kaṛpān* are verbal participles among which '*cumantu*' and '*aḷittu*' are *ceytu* type. Naccinārkkiniyar says that '*the breasts were adorned*' and so *cumantu* refers to the past. In the remaining part "*aḷittu pōr kaṛpān eḷuntana*", '*aḷittu*' (destroying) is a thing they are to learn as they study the methods of war and refers to the future. So Naccinārkkiniyar, as he interprets the line, says that "*aḷittu* is a word in the physical form of past tense but refers to the future".

7.2.4 *Tense of 'Ceya' type of participles*

'*Ceya*' is another pattern of participles occurring in all the three tenses according to Cēṇāvaraiyar.⁴ But Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this as occurring in the three tenses with three subtle variations.⁵

1. *Maḷai peyya kuḷam niṛaintatu.* past. cause.
2. *Kuḷam niṛaiya maḷai peytatu.* future. effect.
3. *Ṇāyiṛu paṭa vantān.* present, simultaneous occurrence.

1. *Jīvaka*; v. 1621.

2. *Ibid*; v. 2560.

3. *Jīvaka*; v. 2340.

4. *Tol. Col. Cēṇā*; s. 228.

5. *Tol. Col*; s. 230.

7.2 5. *Literary evidence for 'ceya type' in present*

Naccinārkkiniyar brings this application even in his interpretations of literary works, e.g.

“Painnaṅṅai avarai pavaḷam kōppavum
 Karunaṅṅai-k-kāyā kaṇa mayil aviḷavum
 Koḷuṅkoṭi mucuṅṅai koṭṭam koḷḷavum
 Ceḷuṅkulai kāntaḷ kaiviral pūppavum
 Kollai neṭu vaḷi-k-kōpam ūravum
 Mullai cāṅṅa mullai neṭu vaḷi”¹

Here the Mullai land (forest region) is beautifully portrayed. Kōppavum, aviḷavum, koḷḷavum, pūppavum, ūravum—here all these are simultaneous occurrences, as the heroine bears her husband's separation according to his dictates. So these “ceya type” of participles are referred to as denoting present tense. Naccinārkkiniyar illustrates that it is like ‘ñāyiru paṭa vantāṅṅ’ (as the sun set he came). The sun setting and his coming are simultaneous occurrences. So also, kōppavum, aviḷavum etc. and the patient waiting of the heroine are contemporaneous incidents—denoting the present tense.

7.2.6. *Literary evidence for 'ceya type' in future*

Naccinārkkiniyar has shown how “ceya type of participles” refers to the future tense.

“Maḷai . tuvalai kaṅṅa . kūtir niṅṅaṅṅu”²

Here ‘winter’ is beautifully described by the poet. This line means “For the cloud to learn drizzling, the winter stood” (Tuvalai) kaṅṅa’, meaning “to learn (drizzling)” is “ceya type of participle”. (kūtir) niṅṅatu, meaning (winter) stood is the finite verb, succeeding the participle. Here the incident that precedes is the ‘winter’s standing and that which succeeds is the cloud’s learning to drizzle, and this construction is like “Nelviḷaiya maḷai peytatu”. Only after it rained there could be a rich harvest of paddy crops and ‘viḷaiya, refers to the future tense. So also, the ‘cloud learning to drizzle’ occurs in the future, after ‘the winter having stood’. This is Naccinārkkiniyar’s interpretation. He says ‘kaṅṅa’ the ceya type of participle, refers to the future too and this is in the sense of ‘Effect and

1. Ciṅṅupāṅ; 11. 164-169.

2. Neṭu; 11. 19, 20, 72.

cause' as we saw earlier.¹ He interprets this 'ceya type of participles' as referring to future in other literary works also.²

7.2.7. A subtle point in the tense of 'ceya type of participle'

Naccinārkkiniyar points out certain things in respect of "ceya type of participle" which reveal his subtle intellect. The heroine refers to the outlook of grace or charity (aruḷ) on the part of the hero, and because of that, the feeling of love she develops. She says:-

"Tāṇ, yāṇ niṟainta aṇṇuṭaiyēṇ āka aruḷākkum"³

Tāṇ-hero. yāṇ-heroine. āka (to become)-ceya type of participle. Aruḷākkum (to have an outlook of charity) refers to the future. Naccinārkkiniyar interprets as:

"Tāṇ, yāṇ āka aruḷ ākkum".

"He will show his charity, so that I can develop love". The outlook of charity on the part of the hero and the execution of the same feeling in action pertains to the future as well as the heroine, developing a feeling of love. So, 'āka' refers to the future. One is "that causes" (aruḷākkum) and the other is "that is caused" (āka). Here both occur in the future, but in their simultaneous present. So Naccinārkkiniyar says that "Tāṇ yāṇ āka aruḷākkum" occurs as present in the future.

7.2.8. Conclusions

We can derive certain conclusions from Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretations of tenses:-

(1) We saw earlier that according to him kōppavum, aviḷavum etc. refer to the present as their occurrences are simultaneous. But they all occurred in the past as is evident from the poem.⁴ So we can surmise, following his interpretation earlier with reference to 'āka'⁵ that these kōppavum aviḷavum etc. are denoting the present in the past.

(2) Earlier we saw that 'kaṟpa' (in the line Maḷai tuvalai kaṟpa kūtir niṇṇaṇṇu) refers to the future.⁶ But the cloud learning to

1. Supra; pp. 211-212:7. 2. 4.

2. Kuṟiñci; 11. 217-230. Jivaka; v. 2310.

3. Kali; v. 46: 18-21.

4. Supra; p. 212:7. 2. 5.

5. Ibid; pp. 213-214:7. 2. 7.

6. Supra; pp. 212-213:7. 2. 6.

drizzle and the winter having stood are incidents of the past. So deriving from Naccinārkkiniyar's clarification with reference to 'āka', we can say that 'kaṛpa' (as it is denoting future) is future in the past.

(3) We can now fairly understand some of the qualities of the verbal participles in respect of their tenses by our understanding of Naccinārkkiniyar, in addition to their natural tenses denoted by the tense suffixes.

- (a) The tense of the verbal participle understood by the tense of the finite verb, it takes to.
- (b) The tense can also be made out by its occurrence as such in a common manner.

(4) According to these qualities mentioned above, all the three tenses can be subdivided as under:—

Present tense,

1. Cāttan̄ n̄āyīṟu paṭa vantān̄ — Present in the past,
2. Cāttan̄ n̄āyīṟu paṭa varukin̄rān̄ — Present in the present.
3. Cāttan̄ n̄āyīṟu paṭa varuvān̄ — Present in the future.

In the first, the setting of the sun is past, in the second, present and in the last, future. But in all the three, the setting of the sun and the arrival of Cāttan̄ are simultaneous. So they refer to the present. So here we find that the present can be the broad classification of the tense-sense, in respect of simultaneous action and all the three can occur under this distinction. The tenses of the verbal participle can be understood by the finite verbs it takes to, so 'present' is the general classification and it can occur in any tense with reference to the finite verbs it takes to.

past tense

1. Maḷai peyya nel viḷaintatu — past in the past.
2. Maḷai peyya nel viḷaikkin̄ratu — past in the present,
3. Maḷai peyya nel viḷaiyum — past in the future.

Peytal (raining) occurs in all the three tenses, but with references to the growing of paddy, it (raining) occurs in the past. Thus past tense can be classified into three subdivisions.

Future tense

1. Nel viḷaiya maḷai peytatu — Future in the past.
2. Nel viḷaiya maḷai peykiṅṅatu— Future in the present.
3. Nel Viḷaiya maḷai peyyum — Future in the future.

Viḷaital (growing paddy) occurs in all the three tenses, but with reference to the raining, it (growing paddy or harvest) occurs in the future. Thus the future tense can come under three subdivisions.

7.3 *A Study of 'UM'*

'UM' is a conjunctive participle. It is made to suggest often various other interpretations, Tolkāppiyar has classified the implications of 'um' in several sūtrams.¹ Naccinārkkiniyar follows the lead given by Tolkāppiyar and offers many more interpretations than any other commentator has done.

7.3.1 *Ecce ummai (um denoting incompleteness)*

This is perhaps the most frequent and Tolkāppiyar mentions this as the first among various kinds of 'um'.² Naccinārkkiniyar, wherever Tolkāppiyar uses this 'um', interprets it to offer various other ideas that this 'um' implies, which according to him, Tolkāppiyar has suggested by using this participle. For example:—

Uyirmey (syllabic letter in Tamil which is considered as one unit) when occurring as the final syllable of a word is usually treated as a vowel ending in matters of Sandhi. In the word 'Viḷa' the uyirmey ja is divided as | + a, and 'a' is the vowel and so it is considered that the vowel is the final sound in the word. This is all what Tolkāppiyar says. His sūtram is this':

“Uyir meyyiṅṅum uyir iṅṅu iyaiṅṅē”³

The 'um' in “uyirmeyyiṅṅum”, as interpreted by Naccinārkkiniyar, implies the idea that this way of treating it, is applicable even to the uyirmey in the middle of a word. In the word 'Varaku'. 'ra' forms the middle syllable and it is taken as 'r + a'. Even the author, classifying the words ending with kuṅṅiyalukaram (short 'u') on the basis of the sounds, preceding the final syllable, referring to 'varaku'

1. Tol. Col. ss. 257, 285-287, 289, 291-295 etc.

2. Tol. Col; s. 257.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu. s. 106.

instead of calling it 'uyir mey-t-toṭar' calls it 'uyir-t-toṭar', treating the uyirmey 'ra' in the middle of the word as an uyir (vowel) i.e. 'a'.¹

7.3.2 Different interpretations for 'um'

The different interpretations that 'um' can suggest, on the basis of Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary, can be classified as under:—

1. 'um' suggesting different meanings.
2. 'um' taken to stand at a place or places different from where it actually occurs.

7.3.3 'Um' denoting *muru* (completion) and *eccam* (incompletion)

The commentator stretches the particle 'um' so as to mean different things also.

"Iru tiṇai-p-piṇinta aimpārkiṭavikkum

Uriyavai uriya peyar vayiṇāṇa"²

Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this sūtra thus: The statement made with a finite verb with a particular gender applies sometimes to all the five genders. For instance if one says "nañcuṇṭāṇ cām" (he who swallows poison dies), it may also be applicable for other genders also as under.

(a) Nañcuṇṭāṇ cām.	āppāl. (masculine).
Nañcuṇṭāḷ cām.	peṇpāl (feminine).
Nañcuṇṭār cāvar.	palarpāl. (epicene plural).
Nañcuṇṭatu cām.	onṇaṇpāl. (neuter singular).
Nañcuṇṭaṇa cām.	palaviṇpāl. (neuter plural).

(akṇinai = non human is here denoted as neuter)

The 'um' in the phrase 'aimpārkiṭavikkum' has suggested this idea according to Naccinārkkiniyar. Here 'um' implies that the statement applies individually to all the five genders and so he calls this 'um' as murummai ('um' denoting completion).

But in a few instances this 'um' may suggest that what is referred to in the statement, may be applicable to anyone or more of these five genders. This 'um' is called eccavummai ('um' denoting incompletion). For example:

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 406.

2. Tol. Col; s. 163,

(b) Pārppān kaḷ uṇṇān — The Brahmin man will not drink toddy.

Pārppāni kaḷ uṇṇāḷ — The Brahmin woman will not drink toddy.

Pārppār kaḷ uṇṇār — The Brahmins will not drink toddy. Here there is no question of the neuters being considered to be applicable.

7.3.4. 'Um' denoting *eccam* (incomplete) and *iḷivu ciṟappu* (meanness)

'Um' has other meanings as well such as 'iḷivu ciṟappu'. Ordinarily the 'um' occurs with one specific grammatical meaning only. But Naccinārkkiniyar some times interprets one particular 'um' as implying the grammatical meaning of a different 'um'. Sūtram 427 of Tol. Eḷuttu states that certain words including the interrogative beginning with 'yā' when followed by the plosives, get that plosives doubled. For example:

Yāṅku + koṇṭān = yāṅku-k-koṇṭān.

Sūtram 428 states that the interrogative beginning with 'yā' follows the 'no change' rule i.e. the doubling of the plosive will not apply. e.g. yāṅku + koṇṭān = yāṅku koṇṭān. The phrase here is

'Iyalpum ākum'.

This 'um' is *eccavummai* with retrospective reference, because it implies that the no change rule here mentioned operates optionally with the doubling rule mentioned earlier.

There is also another variety of 'um' which specifies the meanness or greatness of the noun to which it is attached. "Aracarum virumpum" "even the king will like". Here 'um' after the word aracar (king) shows his superiority and the superiority of thing desired. 'Nāyum tiṇṇātu' - Even the dog will not eat". Here the 'um' attached to 'nāy' (dog) implies the inferiority of the dog or rather the thing rejected. This is called "Iḷivu ciṟappu ummai" (the 'um' of meanness).¹

In 'iyalpum ākum' the 'um' alternatively may be interpreted as *iḷivu ciṟappu ummai* when the implication will be that this 'no change rule' in this instance does not show any greater validity when compared to the doubling rule mentioned earlier. The greater validity of the doubling is based on its greater frequency than the rule of no change in this case.

1. Tol. Col. s. 257.

7.3.5. 'Um' taken to other place or places'

Tolkāppiyar prescribes a sandhi rule for the word 'pū' (flower) followed by a plosive.

"Pūven̄ oru peyar āyial piṅṅē
 Āvayin valleḷuttu mikutalum urittē"¹

The natural sequence of the second line is this:

Valleḷuttu mikutalum urittē.

Here the 'um' is attached to the verbal noun 'mikutaḷ' (doubling of the plosive). The meaning is then that the doubling of the plosive also is valid.

e.g. Pū + koṭi = pūkkōṭi.

What is the force of this 'um'? It may mean in some places that this change rule will also apply; that is this will apply in addition to the no change rule. Taken in that sense, this will lead to an absurdity; for there is no case of the no change rule in this case. If the emphasis is not on 'mikutaḷ' but on 'Valleḷuttu', it will mean that with reference to the change rule, even a plosive will come in i.e. in addition, the same rule, prescribing the coming in of some of the consonants- i.e. in this case the rule of the nasal coming in:

e.g. Pū + koṭi = Pūnkoṭi.

This may be clearly explained by taking the 'um' to be attached to 'Velleḷuttu' from its present place after 'mikutaḷ'.

7.3.6. Displacement of 'um'

Sometimes Naccinārkkiniyar displaces or dislodges the 'um' and interprets it as occurring in some other place, in a far fetched way to bring out his own views.

"Puḷḷi iṅṅu muṅ uyir taṅṅittu iyalātu
 Meyyoṭum civaṇum avviyal keṭuttē"²

Here this obviously means that the vowel, succeeding a word ending with a consonant, gets attached to the consonant.

e.g. Pāl + aritu = Pālaritu.

But Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this in another way. The 'um' in the sūtram is attached to 'meyyoṭu' as 'meyyoṭum' meaning "along

1. Tol. Eḷuttu s. 268.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 138.

with the consonant". But Naccinārkkiniyar dislodges the 'um' and makes it attached to 'puḷḷi irru muṇ' as "Puḷḷi irru muṇum". This means "before the consonant ending also". Then he interprets the sūtram like this. This 'um' therefore contemplates some environment other than the consonantal ending viz., the kuṛṇiyalukaram (short 'u') ending. Not only before kuṛṇiyalukaram but before consonant also, the vowel gets merged as :

Nāku + aritu = Nākaritu

According to Naccinārkkiniyar the 'u' in Nāku is not lost, but retains its identity. This is the point he makes elsewhere also which we have analysed.¹ There are other instances where Naccinārkkiniyar dislodges 'um' in his own way for emphasising some of his grammatical views.²

7.3.7. 'Um' denoting *etirmarai* (negation)

Negative 'um' — The 'um' sometimes gives the opposite idea of what has been already said and Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this with great ingenuity. His analysis of this 'um' in negation can be classified thus: (1) Frequency (2) balance.

(1) *Frequency and non frequency (rare)*: Sometimes the 'um' that is used, includes the opposite idea that is more common than the natural idea. There is the sūtra :

Vaṇpuṛa varūum viṇā-v-uṭai viṇai-c-col
Etir-maru-t-tuṇarttutark-urimai-y-um uṭaittē.³

Here it means that the interrogative verb used to denote certainty can denote the negative idea also. Suppose a man, under the effects of drinking, abuses another and he is questioned later (in his sober mood) about that, he might say 'Vaitēṇē' i.e. "Did I abuse, did I?" Here this interrogative verb can express two ideas: one negative (I did not) and the other affirmative (I did). But the 'um' in the sūtram (urimaiym), according to Naccinārkkiniyar, suggests the idea that the negative meaning is more common than the affirmative. By putting this question 'Vaitēṇē' one expresses more often that he did not abuse. The occurrence of affirmative is also (I did abuse) there.

The Urimaiyum (also being valid), 'um' is taken as having a negative significance "not being valid": The negative meaning has

1. Infra; 7.4.4. pp. 227-228.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu ss. 384, 418. Tol. Poru; s. 43, p. 117.

3. Tol. Col. s. 246.

a peculiar significance ; ordinarily when one uses 'um' (even if) in Tamil this means that "the action will not take place but if it were to take place, as a rare event". The commentator states the 'um' has that kind of significance. That is in this case the meaning of negative is much more frequent than the affirmation implied by such word as "vaitēṇē ?". There are many places where Naccinārkkiniyar investigates this 'um' in negation and explains the 'frequency point' suggested by the 'um'.

(2) *Balance* : We saw earlier that 'um' includes the affirmative and negative ideas and sometimes it emphasises the frequent usage. There are places where the affirmative and negative usages are equal.

"Mullai kuṛiñci marutam ney_{al} eṇa-c
Colliya muṛaiyāl collav-um paṭumē"

Here Tolkāppiyar refers to forest, mountain, agricultural tract, sea-board and says they are also known as mullai, kuṛiñci, marutam and ney_{al} respectively. According to Naccinārkkiniyar the 'um' in the sūtram (collavum paṭumē) denotes the sense of negation. It means that these four regions can also be listed in a different order. He points out in the anthologies and in the eighteen kīlkaṇakku works in Tamil that this order is sometimes observed and at other times not observed. So the 'um' refers to the other order of classification also. But which is more common? Tolkāppiyar does not say definitely. Therefore Naccinārkkiniyar holds that both are equally common. He has equal proficiency in both grammar and literature. He is perhaps the only grammarian who has written commentaries on both grammatical and literary works. His extensive references bear evidence to this. It is clear from his commentary that literature and grammar are complementary to each other in helping our understanding of one by the other.

7.4. *The significance of Māṭṭēru or application*

If the author is to apply the rule he has laid down earlier, with reference to something else, he would mention it "like the one said before" – and this is called 'Māṭṭēru' (application). In other words 'Māṭṭēru' is the emphasis of the similarity of rules for different categories. This method is exploited by the grammarians for the sake of brevity. From Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary on Tolkāppiyam we find various kinds of māṭṭēru.

7.4.1. *Application - Similarity of the rules - limited*

When the rules of one category are applied to another, all the rules may not be applied, for only some of the rules will fit in with the other. The verbal nouns ending in 'ñ', when succeeded by a plosive in *alvaḷi* and *vēṟṟumai*, should have that plosive doubled and should have an 'u' before the plosive and after 'ñ'. This is *sūtram* 296 (Tol. Eḷuttu). The next states that even if this 'ñ' is succeeded by 'ñ', 'n', 'm' and 'v', it would get an addition of 'u' in both kinds of Sandhi i.e. *Alvaḷi* and *Vēṟṟumai*.

1.	uriñ + kaṭitu	uriñu-k-kaṭitu	vallinam	Alvaḷi.
	uriñ + kaṭumai	uriñu-k-kaṭumai	,,	Vēṟṟumai.
2.	uriñ + ñāṅṟatu	uriñu ñāṅṟatu	mellinam	Alvaḷi.
	uriñ + ñāṅci	uriñu ñāṅci	,,	Vēṟṟumai.
3.	uriñ + valitu	uriñu valitu	iṭaiyinam	Alvaḷi.
	uriñ + valimai	uriñu valimai	,,	Vēṟṟumai.

Tolkāppiyar next in his *sūtram* 298 says that this rule is applicable when the ending is 'n'. This may appear to mean that 'n' should have all the changes prescribed for 'ñ' both in '*alvaḷi*' and '*vēṟṟumai*'. But Naccinārkkiniyar states that this application is valid in a limited way only i.e. the change prescribed for 'ñ' do not occur in both *alvaḷi* and *vēṟṟumai* for 'n' and they apply to '*Alvaḷi*' only.

1.	Porun + kaṭitu	porunu-k-kaṭitu.	vallinam. }
2.	Porun + ñāṅṟatu	porunu ñāṅṟatu.	mellinam. Al-
3.	Porun + valitu	porunu valitu.	iṭaiyinam. } vaḷi.

So this type of *māṭṭēru* (a part and not the whole of one being applied to another) can be brought under "application limited". This is because the next *sūtram* prescribes a different rule for *vēṟṟumai*.¹

7.4.2. *Application-similarity of the rule-extended*

When a rule applicable to one category is applied to another, sometimes the scope of the application is increased and additions are made. This is evident from Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary. Tolkāppiyar explains the overlapping of case signs with reference to *Mutal* (the whole) and *Cinai* (the part). They are two in number.²

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 299.

2. Tol. Col; ss. 88, 89.

(a) If 'atu' is the case sign suffixed to the whole, 'ai' is the case sign suffixed to its part

e.g. "yānai atu kōṭṭai-k-kuṛāittān̄".

(He cut down the tusk of the elephant)

yānai "elephant", the whole, takes the 'atu' and kōṭu "tusk", its part, takes the case sign 'ai'.

(b) If 'ai' is the case sign suffixed to the whole (i.e. the elephant) 'kaṇ' is the sign suffixed to its part (i.e. tusk).

e.g. yānaiyai-k-kōttin̄kaṇ kuṛāittān̄.

(He cut the elephant at the tusk)

In the sūtram, there is a word 'teḷḷitu' which the commentator stretches to imply another thing also. He refers to another kind of overlapping of case signs.

(c) 'ai' occurring both in the whole (i.e. elephant) and its 'part' (i.e. tusk).

e.g. yānai yai-k-kōṭṭai-k-kuṛāittān̄.

(He cut the elephant, the tusk).

Tolkāppiyar says that the rules he has laid down for the whole and part apply to Piṇṭappayar (non-organic collective nouns) also, thereby making his rules applicable to both the kinds of overlapping mentioned above in the sūtram.¹ But the commentator has already added one more to the two mentioned by Tolkāppiyar. All the three apply to non-organic collective nouns as well and he gives examples for all the three, "ā-iyal" "that nature" is thus extended to cover cases not mentioned specifically by Tol-kāppiyar though this implication is held to be in the mind of Tolkāppiyar.

1. Kuppaiyatu talaiyai-c-citaṛin̄ān̄.
2. Kuppaiyai-t-talaiyin̄ kaṇ citaṛin̄ān̄.
3. Kuppaiyai-t-talaiyai-c-citaṛin̄ān̄.

The commentator extends the scope of application like this in various other places also.²

7.4.3. Application (Regular)

As the son inherits the father's property the affirmation of the identity of the rule descends direct to another category and this is natural. For example:

1. Tol. Col; s. 91.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 318, 319, 324, etc.

"Meyyīṅ iyaṅkai puḷḷi yoṭu nilaiyal".

"Ekara okara-t-tiyaṅkaiyum arṅṅē".¹

Tolkāppiyar, in his first sūtram here, says that the consonants have dots. In the next one he says that 'e' and 'o' are also similar.² It means 'e' and 'o' also have dots and this application is direct and natural. Iḷampūraṅar also interprets like this.³

7.4.4. Application (Irregular)

Tolkāppiyar says that the consonants have dots and referring to kuṅṅukaram (short 'u') he states that it is also similar.⁴ It means kuṅṅukaram also has a dot. The reference to consonants is in the second sūtram of 'Puṅariyal', and the reference to kuṅṅukaram is in the third sūtram. So it will be natural if it is interpreted to mean that the rule for consonants in the second sūtram (having dot) alone is applied to kuṅṅukaram (in the third sūtram). This is the natural and direct way of interpreting the assertion of similarity. But Naccinārkkiniyar goes further. According to him what is said in the 36th sūtram applies to the 3rd sūtram of Puṅariyal. This is application in anticipation. The 36th sūtram says that in Sandhi, if a vowel succeeds a consonant, it will become one with the consonant. Naccinārkkiniyar states that kuṅṅukaram (short 'u') also, like the consonant, will allow the vowel to become one with it. This is his interpretation for the 3rd sūtram. The examples are:

Maram + aritu = Maramaritu. m + a = ma.

Nāku + aritu = Nākaritu. ku + a = ka.

Here in the second example we should not hold according to him that the 'u' vanishes and the succeeding vowel has become one with the remaining consonant. The other commentators hold that two vowels cannot become one as do a consonant and a vowel (in a syllable).⁵ But here according to Naccinārkkiniyar, in 'Nākaritu' the short 'u' as well as the vowel 'a' that succeeds it exist together. We have to point out that he does not contemplate, like Iḷampūraṅar, the dot on the kuṅṅiyalukaram. Though this assertion of similarity of a thing with reference to something that succeeds much later, is unnatural, yet Naccinārkkiniyar attempts to prove a point.

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 15, 16.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 16.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; Iḷam; ss. 15, 16.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 104, 105.

5. Tol. Cūttira viruttī; p. 40.

The commentator differentiates between the consonant + vowel and *kuṟṟiyalukaram* + vowel. But in Tamil there is no contrast possible like *Nāku* + *aritu* versus *nāk* + *aritu*. All these attempts are for filling up a lacuna in *Tolkāppiyam* which does not lay down any rule for the disappearance of *kuṟṟiyalukaram* when followed by a vowel. *Iḷampūraṇar* has stated that the consonant not only stands at the end but also gives room for a vowel following to become one syllable along with it. Then he explains the *sūtram* stating that *kuṟṟiyalukaram* is similar; by stating that similarity applies only to *kuṟṟiyalukaram* being one with the succeeding vowel. He does not contemplate the dot over the *kuṟṟiyalukaram*. In this way he provides for the loss of *kuṟṟiyalukaram*.¹ But the question is why this is not mentioned in *uyirmayaṅkiyal*. If this is a rule of no change and if the *kuṟṟiyalukaram* is still there this need not be stated in *uyirmayaṅkiyal*. That is why probably *Naccinārkkiniyar* states that the *kuṟṟiyalukaram* is still there when a vowel follows.

7.4.5. *Application - proximate*

The separation from the heroine as laid down in *Akattiṇai* may be due (1) to defend the country or (2) to earn wealth, according to *Tolkāppiyar*.² He enunciates by the next *sūtra* that this is applicable to all the four castes. It is clear that when *Tolkāppiyar* says this is applicable, he means that the meaning of the preceding *sūtram* is applicable. But there are two ideas expressed in the first *sūtram*.

1. Separation of the hero from the heroine to defend the country.
2. Separation to earn wealth.

Here *Naccinārkkiniyar* interprets that the *sūtram* is applicable to the second idea formulated by *Tolkāppiyam* i.e. the earning of wealth is intended for the merchant community and this is applicable to all the four castes. The second idea in the preceding *sūtram* lies proximate to the succeeding *sūtram*. Hence this is his reason for limiting the application to the last one alone being bound as the commentator by the caste rules of his age.

7.5. *The order of placing*

The author normally emphasises the importance of things through epithets, figures of speech etc. but, sometimes his order of

1. Tol. Eḷuttu s. 105.

2. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 28.

placing things also reveals a special significance. The grammarians consider this as one of the ten good qualities of a literary work viz., Muṛaiyīṅ vaippu.¹ The topics should not be heaped up. There must be an order. If a thing which must be said at one place is said elsewhere it is considered as a literary shortcoming known as "mayaṅkakkūṛal".² Tolkāppiyar's list of uttis contains Tokuttuk-kūṛal, vakuttu meynṇiṛuttal, Tokutta moliyāṅ vakuttanar kōṭal etc. which also explain the basis in some cases of arranging the topics.³

7.5.1. *The various kinds of order*

It is an interesting study to investigate the various kinds of order in the arrangement of things, from the commentary of Naccinārkkiniyar. There may be (1) an order in the arrangement or (2) no order in the arrangement of topics or things. These two can be further subdivided according to their importance.

1. Arrangement of similar things together.
2. Arrangement of similar things at different places.
3. Occurrence of a similar thing between the sequence.
4. Occurrence of a different thing between the sequence.
5. Arrangement of a thing in the end of a category and at the beginning of another category.

(1) *Arrangement of similar things together*

The author classifies all similar and consistent ideas in one place. Karam, kāram and kāṅ are Eḷuttu-c-cāriyai (term used in designating a letter of the alphabet) according to Tolkāppiyar. He has mentioned kāram and karam together for which Naccinārkkiniyar gives three reasons.⁴

1. Rhythmic reason i.e. they sound well when said together.
2. Their greater frequency.
3. Their occurrence both in Sanskrit and Tamil.

Naccinārkkiniyar further analyses the reasons for the occurrence of sūtrams one after another at many places.⁵

1. Nanṅū; s. 13.

2. Tol. Poruḷ. Pēṛā; s. 663.

3. Tol. Poruḷ. Pēṛā; s. 665.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu. s. 134.

5. Tol. Col. ss. 450-451, 456-457, pp. 445, 455.

(2) *Arrangement of similar things at different places*

Here two similar things which could be said at one place are said at different places. Naccinārkkiniyar investigates how this may not be creating a disorder and why they are said at different places. Tolkāppiyar says that there are eight things that precede an action—the act, doer, object of a verb, place of action, time of action, instrument therefor, the recipient of the benefit of the act, and the purpose of that act.¹ As this sūtram gives the concomitant precedents to a verb, this sūtram should have been said in 'viṇaiyiyal', which deals with verbs. But this is said in "vēṛṛumai mayaṅkiyal" dealing with cases. Therefore this apparent disorder should be explained. Naccinārkkiniyar analyses the reason therefor.

"The potter made one pot". Here "made" (vaṇaintāṇ) is the verb which has all the eight above mentioned and Naccinārkkiniyar proves that all these eight are the origin of the cases. In this verb-

1. The doer (potter) is denoted by the first case.
2. The object of the verb (pot) and the root-action of the verb are denoted by the second case.
3. The instruments for making the pot are denoted by the third case.
4. The recipient and the purpose of the action are denoted by the fourth case.
5. The place and time of the action are denoted by the seventh case.
6. As the potter gives, one receives the pot and so the pot leaves the potter—this act of leaving involves 5th case.

So, as it involves, in fact only, the vērrumai or the cases, Naccinārkkiniyar states that this sūtram, though it deals with the things preceding the verb, is placed in vēṛṛumai mayaṅkiyal which deals with the overlapping of the cases. There are many other places where Naccinārkkiniyar investigates and explains the order of placing which may come under this category.²

(3) *Occurrence of a similar thing between the sequence*

The grammarian calls this kind of order 'Ciṅka nōkku' (Lion's survey).³ A lion looks ahead and backwards and determines its

1. Tol. Col. s. 113.

2. Tol. Col; ss. 83, 119, 173, 212, 214, 215, 274, 282, 288, 462.

Tol. Poru]; ss. 90:10, p. 315.. 90:11, p. 316., 193, p. 685.. 194, p. 686

3. Tol. Eṭuttu; p. 13. Naṅṅūl; s. 19.

course of action. So also a sūtram should incorporate the preceding and succeeding ideas to avoid contradiction. Naccinārkkiniyar exploits this method to interpret some of the sūtrams. Tolkāppiyar lays it down that the heroine should conduct herself in such a way that her premarital love does not become public before-time. The qualities needed for this are self-control, mentality that can preserve a secret, absence of perversion etc.¹ If she were to reveal the affair earlier it becomes a fault and hence related to the preceding and succeeding sūtrams where such things are described. So Naccinārkkiniyar calls this Ciñkanōkku (lion gaze).

(4) *Occurrence of a different thing between the sequence*

If the author speaks of a different idea in a sequence, it becomes the duty of a commentator to connect them and justify the order of such placement. It is compared to the flying eagle suddenly coming down to carry away the chickens and so this order of placing is called 'Paruntiṅ vīlvu' (eagle landing).² Tolkāppiyar defines the 'Finite verb' by two sūtrams (427, 429) in Collatikāram. But there is an interlying sūtram (428) describing the peyareccam and viṅaieccam that denote three tenses and are used accordingly. Here it is evident that the author has mentioned the "eccam" in between his comments on finite verbs.³ Naccinārkkiniyar investigates the matter and classifies this intrusion under the category of 'Paruntiṅ vīlvu'. The purpose is to incorporate the relevant definition of finite verb in to 'eccam' as well. There are many other instances in Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary, which come under this category.⁴

(5) *Arrangement of a thing at the end of a category or at the beginning of the next category*

When there are certain categories or rules which may be classified equally with one set or the other set, the author sometimes places them at the end of the first set or at the beginning of the other set, suggesting thereby that there is an overlapping where a few may be taken either with what precedes or with what follows. This is separate from the third (7.5.3.), where the rules are grouped as separate from the former and the latter though placed between those two. The clandestine affair between the hero and the heroine becomes explicit (Veḷippaṭai). Does this exposure of the premarital love

1. Tol. Poru; s. 209.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; p. 13, Naṅṅū; s. 19.

3. Tol. Col. ss. 427, 429.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 83, Tol. Col; s. 87.
Tol. Poru; ss. 9, 25.

come under kaḷavu or kaṟpu? Tolkāppiyar says it is similar to 'kāṟpu.'¹ The very fact that it is described as similar to kaṟpu shows that it is not kaṟpu pure and simple. But in ceyyuḷiyal he says it is kaṟpu.² This is the reason why Tolkāppiyar has placed this sūtram, referring to the exposure of the premarital love, at the end of the chapter on kaḷavu. So Naccinārkkiniyar holds this placement of this sūtram between kaḷavu and kaṟpu i.e. to show that it may overlap both with kaḷavu which precedes and kaṟpu which follows. There are many other instances under this category.³

7.5.2. *The reasons for the order of placing*

Naccinārkkiniyar gives various reasons for the order of placing and they can be classified under five heads.

1. Importance.
2. Affinity.
3. Summing up and elaboration.
4. Frequency and non-frequency.
5. Order of cause and effect.

(1) *Importance*

Pavaṇanti, the author of Naṅṅūl, says that importance and affinity are good reasons for establishing an order.⁴ From the study of Naccinārkkiniyar this basis of importance can be grouped under three headings. They are:

- (a) Importance of what is stated first.
- (b) Importance of what is stated at the end.
- (c) Importance of what is stated in the middle.

(a) *Importance of what is stated first*

It is usual that when things are classified they are listed according to their order of importance. Tolkāppiyar refers to the three forces viz., infantry, elephant force and cavalry⁵-and Naccinārkkiniyar holds they are mentioned in the order of their decreasing

1. Tol. Poru; s. 141.

2. Tol. Poru]. Pērā; s. 141.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 31, 194, 243, 262, Tol. Col; ss. 205, 391, Tol. Poru; ss. 79: 16-18., 102:7., 141., 79: 3-4.

4. Naṅṅūl; s. 78.

5. Tol. Poru; s. 72:1-2.

importance. The soldiers (infantry) stand ready to fight and reach Heaven and hence they are mentioned first. The elephants, with their instinct to kill when enraged, follow them—the horses unless driven cannot feel enraged of their own accord. Therefore they are mentioned last. There are many other places which can be brought under this order or placing, according to Naccinārkkiniyar.¹

(b) *The importance of what is stated at the end*

Some times the author arranges the things mentioned in the order of their increasing importance. The thing that is said finally will be the most important in this grouping. Tolkāppiyar classifies Akattiṇai, as

1. Mutal: the basic things viz., place and time.
2. Karu: the product of particular place.
3. Uri: the real theme of poetry viz., the aspect of love peculiar to each place.²

Naccinārkkiniyar investigates this order of placing with his usual references to literature. Most of the poems in Akam words, though constituted of mutal, and karu, gain importance and significance through 'uri'. Also there are poems without mutal, but karu and uri only and poems without mutal and karu, but uri only. In mutal and karu, karu is of greater importance and as between karu and uri, uri is of greater importance. The three main categories of Tumpai-t-ṇai also come under this type of order according to Naccinārkkiniyar.³

(c) *The importance of what is stated in the middle*

Sometimes the middle is more important than the preceding and the succeeding, being as it were the central light illuminating the rest. Tolkāppiyar enunciates how the maid comes to know of the premarital love affair between the hero and the heroine.

1. Kuṭaiyuṛa uṇartal.
2. Munṇuṛa uṇartal.
3. Iruvarum uḷvaḷi avaṇ vara uṇartal.⁴

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 7, 210., Tol. Col; ss. 13, 66, 113. Tol. Poru; ss. 1, p. 6, 14, p. 48., 100:1, p. 350., 130, p. 527., 243, p. 759., 60:6; p. 165

2. Tol. Poru; s. 3.

3. Tol. Poru; s. 71.

4. Ibid; s. 127.

Firstly the lady companion comes to know of this love affair through the hero's request to her to convey to the heroine his passion for the latter and to arrange a meeting. Secondly she comes to know through undertaking the suggestions and indications, and thirdly by his arrival when the heroine and her companion are together. Here among the three, the second one, i.e. the suggestions and indications are very important as they play an important part in the other two, and as without this the interpretation of the other may not be correct. Naccinārkkiniyar says this is the reason why it is stated in the middle and it is an example for the importance of what occurs in the middle (like Aṛam, poruḷ and Inṇam, where poruḷ is more important than Aṛam and Inṇam).¹

(2) *Affinity*

Naccinārkkiniyar investigates the order of the vowels a, ā, i, ī, u, ū, etc. First the short vowels, — every short vowel succeeded by its long vowel in the order of affinity.² The affinity here is that they have the same place of origin, effort, quantity, meaning and form.³ Naccinārkkiniyar, bearing in mind all these points of affinity in birth, quantity and meaning. 'e' and 'o' succeed a, i, u satisfying the same reasons, and also 'ai' after them to be followed by 'o' 'ō' and 'au'. Naccinārkkiniyar employs the same arguments for the order of placing of the consonants also.⁴

(3) *Tokai and viri (Summing up and elaboration)*

This is another kind of arrangement i.e. mentioning in a summary way, classifying it further and elaborating it later on.

According to Naccinārkkiniyar this is one of the bases for the arrangement of the rules. Grammarians employ these methods for the proper arrangement of rules and they call them Tokai, Vakai and Viri.⁵ There is a chapter called 'Tokai marapu' in Tolkāppiyam. Here, what had been later discussed at length by individual sūtras are summed up.⁶ This is followed by 'urupiyal'. Tokai Marapu thus sums up the Sandhi rules whilst urupiyal extensively discusses at length all that have been summed up in Tokaimarapu. So Urupiyal

1. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 92, p. 340.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 1, p. 30.

3. Naṇṇū; s. 72.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 1, pp. 31-32.

5. Naṇṇū. Ciṛappuppāyiram.

6. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 143.

succeeds Tokai marapu.¹ Uyir mayaṅkiyal etc. follow urupiyal, which go to form 'Sandhi' in an extensive manner.²

(4) *Frequency and non-frequency*

Words used in verses are of four kinds according to Tolkāppiyar.³

- | | |
|-------------|-----------------|
| 1. Iyaṛcol. | 3. Ticai-c-col. |
| 2. Tiricol. | 4. Vaṭacol. |

Iyaṛcol and Tiricol belong to Tamil language. Ticai-c-col, dialectic words, and Vaṭacol, Northern or Sanskrit words, are words that have come to stay in Tamil from different regions. Naccinārkkiniyar says, as their occurrence is not frequent, they are mentioned after Iyaṛcol and Tiri col. Iyaṛcol and Tiricol are mentioned first according to their importance in Tamil and their frequent occurrence. The reason he gives therefore, is frequency and non-frequency. The order of consonants as vallinam, melliṅam and iṭaiyiṅam is also investigated by the commentators. Their reason is that, among vallinam, four occur at the initial of words whilst only three amongst the melliṅam and two amongst the iṭaiyiṅam.⁴

There is another method by which Tolkāppiyar emphasises, according to Naccinārkkiniyar, the importance of the middle one. He places the most frequent in the middle whilst the less frequent precede and follow it.

- | | | |
|------------|---|--------------------------|
| kaikkiṭai | — | (minority) |
| Aintiṅai | — | (majority) |
| Peruntiṅai | — | (minority). ⁵ |

In Akam works, the main treatment is given only for Aintiṅai and very few poems deal with kaikkiṭai and peruntiṅai.

(5) *Cause and effect*

One thing or one rule leads to another, that is one may discover the pattern of 'Cause and Effect'. Tolkāppiyar classifies the words as Peyar, Viṅai, Iṭai and Uri.⁶ Viṅai (verb) is the activity of the Peyar (noun). So 'Peyar' is placed first followed by 'Viṅai'. Rather

1. Tol. Eḷuttu s. 173.
 2. Ibid; s. 203.
 3. Tol. Col; s. 397.
 4. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 19-21.
 5. Tol. Poru; s. 54, p. 143.
 6. Tol. Col; s. 160.

'Viṇai' is the effect or activity of the 'noun'. Even in Akattiṇai, the aspects of love prescribed for 'Aintiṇai' are Puṇartal, Piritāl, Iruttal Iraṅkal, and ūṭal. The course of sex life follow these five phases or stages — and it is cyclic — Naccinārkkiniyar explains this arrangement as being based on their being Cause and effect.¹

There is 'Effect and Cause' classification also as analysed by Naccinārkkiniyar. This is the reverse of the other. Tolkāppiyar classifies the three permanent values as Inṇam, Poruḷ, Aṇam, though they are popularly known as Aṇam, Poruḷ and Inṇam.² Naccinārkkiniyar justifies Tolkāppiyar inasmuch as the 'Poruḷ' must be earned by Aṇam and effect of Poruḷ is Inṇam. Aṇam, Poruḷ, Inṇam is an arrangement according to the order of 'Cause and effect' whilst Inṇam, Poruḷ, Aṇam is an arrangement of the order of 'effect and cause'. We can understand this from Iḷampūraṇar also.³ If the cause is emphasised in the particular situation the 'cause and effect order' is followed, whilst when the effect is emphasised the effect and cause order is followed. According to Naccinārkkiniyar, since Inṇam the effect is emphasised in akattiṇai, the 'effect and cause order' is followed.

7.5.3. *Seemingly Irrelevant order*

The author sometimes introduces in an otherwise orderly sequence i.e. a thing or rule which on the face of it appears irrelevant. But the commentator finds justification for this arrangement. The reasons for following an order different from the ordinary one can be classified thus :

1. Chapter or context affinity.
2. Māṭṭēru (Application).
3. A statement at one place that satisfies more than one place (to avoid repetition).
4. Greater frequency.
5. Suggestion beyond specification.

(1) *Chapter affinity*

Tolkāppiyar deals with the Pōli eḷuttu or the free variation or the seemingly similar pronunciation of sounds in sūtrams 54-58 (Tol. Eḷuttu). According to him a + i or a + y will pronounce 'ai' and

1 Tol. Poruḷ; s. 14, p. 48.

2. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 92, p. 340.

3. Tol. Poruḷ; Iḷam; s. 89, p. 160.

a + u or a + v will pronounce 'au'. He then in the next sūtram prescribes the reduction of the prescribed quantity or mātras for 'ai' and 'au'. But the reduction of time unit for 'ai' and 'au' occurs only in poetry and so it may be argued that this should have been stated in the chapter dealing with verses i.e. Ceyyūḷiyal. The first sūtram deals with the Pōli eḷuttu of ai and au and the next sūtram deals with the same letters i.e. ai, au-with reference to the reduction of their prescribed mātras. So both the sūtram deal with the same letters. Naccinārkkiniyar therefore states that the reduction in their mātras is relevant as occurring in the same context or Atikāra. There are many other places where Naccinārkkiniyar emphasises this order of Chapter (context) affinity.

(2) *Māṭṭēru or Application*

According to Naccinārkkiniyar, māṭṭēru is also one of the reasons for disturbing the ordinary order. The 15th sūtram in Eḷuttatikāram refers to the dotting of the consonants and the 16th refers to the dotting of 'e' and 'o'. So the discussion of vowels i.e. 'e' and 'o' in between the discussion of consonants may seem out of place. The sūtram about consonants states that they have dots. The next sūtram states only that 'e' and 'o' are similar, without repeating that they will have dots. This way of stating the rule for 'e' and 'o' in a summary way by using the word derived from the demonstrative (aṟru) basis would not be available if this statement were stated elsewhere.¹

(3) *Statement in one Place*

A thing that needs discussion at two places is stated only once and in one chapter for the purpose of avoiding repetition and the reader has to take it to the other relevant place. This is called "orutalai molital".² 'a', 'i', 'u' are demonstratives. They consist of single letters and as such need mentioning in Eḷuttatikāram. But they are also demonstratives, and have meanings and as such they are words. So they have to be referred to in Collatikāram. Thus they have to be treated as 'letters' as well as 'words'. To avoid repetition, Tolkāppiyar has analysed them only in Eḷuttatikāram according to Naccinārkkiniyar.³

(4) *Frequency and non-frequency*

Among the eighteen consonants, only eleven can occur as word final. Tolkāppiyar mentions them as :

-
1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 16.
 2. Tol. Poruḷ. Pōrā; s. 665:9, p. 739.
 3. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 31.

ñ, ṇ, n, m, ṅ, y, r, l, v, ḷ, ḻ,¹

Here according to the alphabetical order, 'ṅ' should occur at the end. But here it is mentioned in the middle. Naccinārkkiniyar says this is placed in the middle because of the greater frequency of its occurrence as word final than y, r, l, v, ḷ, ḻ. In another place, it is stated that the words beginning with a consonant or vowel occurring after the words do not undergo any change. The usual order is to mention the vowel first and consonant next.² Here the 'consonant' precedes the vowel in the sūtram. Naccinārkkiniyar says this is because the "No change rule" in Sandhi occurs more often with reference to consonants than with reference to vowels.

(5) *Other suggestions*

The author may specify things in an inconsistent order. According to the commentator, this inconsistency is to suggest a thing beyond specification, and Naccinārkkiniyar exploits this method in his interpretations of Tolkāppiyam. For example: y and ñ occur one for the other i.e. are similar as initials of a verb when following a word ending in ṇ or ṅ.³

Maṇ yātta Maṇ ñātta
Poṇ yātta Poṇ ñātta.

Here yātta and ñātta have the same meaning. The usual order is that n precedes y as in the alphabet. According to Naccinārkkiniyar the original is y and not ñ which latter occurs as a variant of y in that particular environment.

Maṇ ñāṅṅa — will not vary as Maṇ yāṅṅa.

Poṇ ñāṅṅa — will not vary as Poṇ yāṅṅa.

Only maṇ yātta and poṇ yātta will vary as maṇ ñātta and poṇ ñātta respectively. There are other places in Eḷuttatikāram where Naccinārkkiniyar has applied this principle in interpreting the other sūtrams.⁴

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 78.

2. Ibid; s. 144.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 146.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 103, 114, 123, 131, 133, 145, 146, 147, 160, 164, 168, 191, 194, 206, 209, 210, 226, 230, 239, 240, 286, 309, 333, 372, 317, 433, 445.

Tol. Poruḷ; s. 246, p. 756.

PART III

NACCINĀRKKINIYAR AS A
LINGUIST

CHAPTER - 8

PHONOLOGY

8.1. *A few ancient conceptions*

8.1.1. *Vaṭiyum icaiyum (Breath and sound)*

That the speech sounds are the effects of air impinging finally on the organs of articulation is the opinion of Tolkāppiyar as claimed by Naccinārkkīṇiyar.¹ Breath in a sense is life and hence the ancient Tamil works used the word 'uyir' (life) to mean air, as well as sound.² Tolkāppiyar refers to the speech-sounds as the air coming out of the chest that go to make the various sounds.³

Akattu vaṭi — The air coming out of the chest.

Eḷu Icai — that which makes the articulated speech sounds.

The 'air' becomes meaningful and significant only when it undergoes the metamorphosis of sound and then later, distinct sounds, and it is evident that all the sounds of a language have their origin in the 'air'-we breathe. The sound sense stage is preceded by a stage of mere 'air'.⁴

8.1.2. *Place of origin of sounds*

The speech sounds can be divided into four categories according to the Tamil grammarians.

1. Uyirkkaṇam — life i.e. the vowels.
2. Vaṅkaṇam — the hard group i.e. the stops.
3. Meṇ kaṇam — the soft group i.e. the nasals.
4. Iṭai-k-kaṇam — the medial group i.e. the semi vowels and laterals etc.

1. Tol. Eḷuttu, Ciṅappuppāyiram; p. 9.

2. Kuṟiñci; l. 100, Puṅam; v. 138, Aiñ; v. 377, Akam; v. 111, Malai; 11. 6, 35-37.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu. Iṅam; s. 102.

4. Ibid; ss. 83, 102.

According to Tolkāppiyar the vowels have their origin in the larynx, the 'meṅkaṇam' in addition in the nasal.¹ Tolkāppiyar has not referred to the origin of the other two categories. But his commentators Iḷampūraṇar and Nacciṅārkkiniyar are at pains to interpret Tolkāppiyam as referring to the origin of the other two categories also.²

<i>Sounds</i>	<i>Origin</i>
Vaṅkaṇam	head (Iḷam and Nac.)
Meṅkaṇam	nose (Tol.)
Iṭaikkaṇam	throat (Iḷam and Nac.)
Uyirkkaṇam	throat (Tol.)

Nacciṅārkkiniyar says that 'āytam' has its origin in the chest and he has also referred to the opinion of some other scholars that 'āytam' has its origin in the head or in the larynx.³ The author of Naṅṅūl says that 'āytam' has its origin in the head and that vallinaṁ (plosives) in the chest.⁴

8.1.3. *The form of sounds*

The things that are visible to our eyes have material forms (vaṭivam) and those that are not visible physically but exist conceptually are called 'uru'. Nacciṅārkkiniyar says that a letter is a sound, characteristic of air, and this sound has a conceptual shape. This has all the qualities of a material form though not visible and therefore considered by using conceptually. His reasons are:⁵

(1) Ceṛippaccēral: When we blow through a flute all the sounds get concentrated inside.

(2) Ceṛippavarutal: When we blow through a vessel with a small mouth, they reappear again after agitating inside.

(3) Iṭaiyeriyappaṭatal: When we make sounds in the open space they get scattered like water waves to reassemble again.

(4) Inṅpa tuṅpam ākkal: The hard sounds denote pain and the soft sounds pleasure.

(5) Uruvum uruvum kūṭip-piṭattal: The conceptual amalgamation of vowel sounds and consonantal sounds to form a syllable.

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 84, 100.

2. Ibid; s. 100.

3. Ibid; s. 101.

4. Naṅṅūl; ss. 75, 87.

5. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 1, p. 32.

(6) Piṛappum ūrum uṭaimai: The air originating from the navel and other such parts of the body go to make the sounds, perceptible to the ears only. So things that have their origin in the substantial forms must have a shape, though not physical, but conceptual.

(7) Vicumpiṛ piṛantiyaṅkal: The sound like the air has its origin and movement in space (Vicumpu).

(8) The sounds have hard, soft and medium forms. Modern Science supports this statement about the subtle forms because the sounds are differentiated by their wave lengths.

8.1.4. *The importance of the 'A' sound*

Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar says that the 'a' is the basis of all sounds. The consonants cannot exist on their own. They can exist only with the sound 'a'. It is difficult to say k, c, ṭ. So they exist only with the sound 'a' as ka, ca, ṭa, etc. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar says that sound 'a' exists in the other eleven vowels also. As one opens the mouth, the sound that is produced naturally is 'a' and all the sounds can be pronounced only when we open the mouth. So all the sounds are in a way the derivatives or developments of the basic sound 'a'. This is Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar's contention.¹ It is important to note that the basic 'a' is equated with the 'nāda,' the basis for all sabdas, the rudimentary form of all the sounds. Unless this 'nāda' is active, no sound will be produced. Therefore even when there are other vowel sounds behind them all contain this nāda 'a'.

When we open the mouth the natural sound that is produced is 'a'. The edge of the tongue as it comes close to the palate, and teeth, after the opening of the mouth, produces the letters i, ī, e, ē and ai. As we open the mouth by a slight adjustment of the lip movements (rounding) we pronounce the letters u, ū, o, ō, au.² So it is evident, for any sound, it is essential we have to open the mouth. This goes to show that all the other vowels are only the extensions and developments of the sound 'a'.

The sound 'a', though the basis of all other vowel sounds as pronounced with the rest of them, exists in their respective forms. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar quotes in this connection Tirukkuṛaḷ and Gīta. Tiruvaḷḷuvar says that the sound 'a' preceding all other sounds, stands as a basis for the rest of them, and in Gīta, Lord Krishna

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 46.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 85-87.

says that He is the sound 'a' amongst the letters of the alphabet which also means the same thing as above.¹

8.1.5. *The sound system of syllabic sounds (uyirmey)*

The twelve vowels and the eighteen consonants combine to make up two hundred and sixteen syllabic sounds (12x18). These could be viewed from two different points of view (1) as one integral whole where both consonant and the vowel together get only one mātraī or two mātraīs viz, the mātraī of the vowel. This is the part of the syllable, (2) as an aggregate of the two i.e. the consonant and vowel from the point of view of the alphabet.

Naccinārkkiniyār is not able to explain why the quantity (mātraī) of the syllable consisting of a consonant and a vowel does not become $1 + \frac{1}{2} = 1\frac{1}{2}$, but just one. But he gives an illustration. One measure of water plus half measure of salt (if it could be completely dissolved therein) do not make one and half measures of water, but make only one measure.² In another place he gives two illustrations. One, the mixture of salt and water, when the addition of salt does not increase the quantity of water, which means, the syllable retains the quantity (mātraī) of the vowel only is from the integral point of view and the other like the two fingers that stand to make two-which means, the sound of the vowel and the sound of the consonant are separate and distinctive from the alphabetic or the additive point of view. Even as the water to which salt is added gets the quality of the salt and becomes saltish, so also, the vowel gets the characteristics of the consonants as hard, soft and medium sounds. The vowels as such do not have these qualities but the vowels in the syllabic sound because of their association with the consonants acquire these consonantal qualities.³

k + a ka vaṅkaṇam
 ñ + a ña meṅkaṇam
 y + a ya iṭaikkaṇam

8.2. *Intonation*

8.2.1. *Phonemes and allophones in Tamil*

The linguists classify the speech sounds as phonemes which are basic and a change of phoneme will change the meaning of the word

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 46.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 10.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 18.

in which they occur. The concrete speech sounds may be allophones of these phonemes. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar in his commentary on sūtram 88 (Tol. Eḷuttu) seems to contemplate such allophones. Tolkāppiyar in his first sūtram says that starting from the sound 'a' and ending with 'ṅ' there are thirty and these are called 'Eḷuttu'. These thirty are the phonemes in Tamil. These eḷuttu with their natural sounds convey sense to the hearer.¹ These are segmental phonemes which occur in linear succession. But along with this there are the supra-segmental phonemes or prosodies.

8.2.2 Several kinds of intonation

Every sentence has an intonation pattern in Tamil as in other languages. It is very doubtful whether there is any stress in modern Tamil except in certain dialects like that of Jaffna. It is very difficult to say whether there was any stress in the Tamil of Tolkāppiyar or in the Tamil of the age of Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar. The words Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar uses are 'eṭuttal' (rising) and 'paṭuttal' (falling). These seem to correspond to the udātta, anudātta of the Sanskrit where they denote only pitch. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar speaks of 'nalital' (neither rising nor falling i.e. medial), 'vilaṅkal' (as in the diphthong where the rising is followed by falling pitch). He also speaks of 'urappal' and 'kāṅaittal'.

8.2.3 Contrast due to eṭuttal and paṭuttal ṓcai

It is not clear in what sense Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar used these terms. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar elsewhere uses only the 'eṭuttal' and 'paṭuttal'. Though under sūtra 88 (Tol. Eḷuttu) he speaks of these with reference to individual sounds, later he applies these terms to words which have the same phonemes but contrasting in meaning, which contrast he explains as being due to 'eṭuttal' or 'paṭuttal'.² It looks as though these references are due to intonation patterns. Though in the absence of further evidence one cannot arrive at their exact phonetic significance, the terms used by Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar are used in this essay.

8.2.4 Imperative verbs and verbal nouns differentiated by 'ōcai'

The words naṭa, vā, cey, etc. are roots. They are roots from which are formed vinai muṭṭu (finite verbs), vinai eccam (verbal participle) peyareccam (relative participle), toḷiṅ peyar (verbal nouns) viṅayāḷaṅaiyum peyar (participial nouns). The ancient Tamil Grammarians argued at length how the same roots could be the bases

1. T.P.M. Maṅgiḷāṁālar; p. 364.

2. Infra; 8.2.4., 8.2.5., 8.2.6. etc.

for different kinds of verbs and nouns especially the imperatives and the verbal nouns. Cēṇāvaraiyar thinks the words uṇ (eat), tiṇ (chew), col (tell), kol (kill) the roots, are bases for verbs as well as nouns. Sanskrit scholars would refer to these as "Dātu".¹ Naccinārkkiniyar feels that words 'naṭa', vā, cey, etc. pronounced as eṭuttal (rising) ōcai denote the verb i.e. the imperative and when pronounced as paṭuttal (falling) ōcai denote the noun. He contemplates the difference between the root forms occurring in fully formed words and the imperative verbs which also have the same forms. Can we identify the root and the imperative mood which have the same phonemes? Naccinārkkiniyar states they contrast and that in one case, the imperative is pronounced as eṭuttal (perhaps 1-3) while the root in the noun sense is pronounced as paṭuttal (perhaps 1-1).²

The word 'alar' means both 'blossom', an imperative and a 'flower', a noun. Both are differentiated probably 'alar² and 'alar¹ respectively. As made clear by Civañāṇa cuvāmikaḷ, the root occurs in the fully formed words. For instance in 'alarntaṇa', the root according to the convention of the grammarians is a verbal noun, the finite verbal meaning that they (the buds) did the blossoming. Therefore here also the root 'alar' is a noun and therefore, according to Civañāṇa cuvāmikaḷ, it is pronounced with paṭuttal ōcai 'alar¹ (ntaṇa).³

It is difficult to say when such words occur in poetry whether they nouns or verbs, since they are the same in orthography, but commentators like Naccinārkkiniyar explain and differentiate them on the basis of eṭuttal (rising) and paṭuttal (falling) ōcai.

peruṇ cey āṭavar = the valiant with great and noble action.⁴

Here Naccinārkkiniyar interprets the word 'cey' as action. He explains that it is a root standing as a verbal noun. Here therefore is paṭuttal ōcai though he does not specifically say so at this place.

Vārtaru taṭam kaṇṇi.⁵

In this line, the word vār (to shed) is used in its noun form, meaning vārtal (shedding) as understood from Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary. Here also one has paṭuttal ōcai.

1. Tol. Col. Cēṇā; s. 415.

2. Tol. Col; s. 226, pp. 235-236.

3. Naṇṇūḷ, Civa; s. 132.

4. Neṭu; I. 171.

5. Jivaka; v. 302.

8.2.5. *Quantity or length system of some roots*

The time-unit (mātra) of 'u' suffix is one. The words ending with the full quantity (i.e. one mātra) of 'u' are said to end in muṛṛiyal ukaram. The words ending with the reduced quantity of 'u' (i.e. $\frac{1}{2}$ a mātra) are said to end in kuṛṛiyalukaram (short 'u'). In words of the pattern 1, (c) v p u (where c is consonant; v is long vowel; v is a short vowel; the c within brackets shows that it may occur or not occur; p is a plosive, u is the vowel u) or 2. (c) v (c) c v (c) p u; the u becomes uu in these patterns. The Tamil Grammarians call this the shortened 'u'.¹

kātu — c v p uu (Forest)

ātu — v p uu (goat)

cuṇṇāmpu — (c) v (c) c v (c) p u

Naccinārkkiniyar tells us that the shortened 'uu' has no lip-rounding.² That is 'uu' (inverted m). Elsewhere the final 'u' is the ordinary 'u'. This will suggest that u and uu are combinatorial variants of the same phoneme 'u'. But in the age of Naccinārkkiniyar they seem to contrast.

kātu (attack) — an imperative.

kātuu (an ear) — a noun.

Here as elsewhere the imperative has eṭuttal ōcai and the noun the paṭuttal ōcai. But Naccinārkkiniyar explains that the contrast is due to the u and uu. Therefore he points out that they are contrasting. According to him muṛṛiyal ukaram and kuṛṛiyal ukaram should be taken as two different phonemes.³ The question is whether one has to rely on the difference in the phonemes or the difference in eṭuttal paṭuttal ōcais. If one takes the eṭuttal ōcai as the basis then one has to explain the lengthening of the kuṛṛiyalukaram as due to ōcai. Here it is to be stated that kuṛṛiyalukaram and muṛṛiyalukaram were differentiated by putting a dot on the kuṛṛiyalukaram in the writing system of Tolkāppiyam,⁴ but this differentiation was lost even by the time of Rāja Rāja Cōla and hence the importance of Naccinārkkiniyar's remarks on the differentiation according to meaning.

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; 36.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 68.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 36, 68.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu s. 2.

Ibid; s. 105. Foot-notes, p. 112.

Let us now examine this in the light of Naccinārkkiniyar.¹

Full u with one mātraī	Meaning (verb)	Short u (uu) $\frac{1}{2}$ mātraī.	Meaning (noun)
1. Kaṭṭu	to bundle	kaṭṭu	a bundle
2. Kattu	to cry	kattuu	a cry
3. Murukku	to destroy	Murukku	destruction
4. Teruṭṭu	to clarify	Teruṭṭuu	a clarification
5. Tarukku	to pride	tarukkuu	pride

8 2.6. *Finite verbs and participial nouns*

The phrase “Eḷuttenappaṭupa” may be a participial noun and also a finite verb.

1. Verb: “Eḷuttenappaṭupa” — They will be known as alphabets.
2. Noun: “Eḷuttenappaṭupa” — Those which will be known as alphabets.

Here the first ‘paṭupa’ is a finite verb. The second one is ‘viṇaiyāḷaṇaiyum peyar’ (participial noun). If ‘paṭupa’ is a finite verb it needs a subject. If it is a participial noun it requires a predicate.

Eḷuttenappaṭupa

Akara mutal ṇakara iṇuvāy muppak tenpa.

Naccinārkkiniyar, interpreting the sūtram of Tolkāppiyar, takes ‘Eḷuttenappaṭupa’ as subject and ‘Akara mutal ṇakara iṇuvāy muppak-tu’ as predicate. So he interprets ‘paṭupa’ as denoting the ‘viṇaiyāḷaṇaiyum peyar’ (participial noun). It is very difficult to find out the part of speech of the word ‘paṭupa’ mainly on the basis of the written letters. He interprets as usual that ‘paṭupa’ as a noun here has paṭuttal ōcai perhaps ²paṭupa.^{1 2}

The words nallaṇ, tīyan, ciriyaṇ, periyaṇ, valiyaṇ, meliyaṇ, etc. may denote the finite verbs which denote tense by implication or the nouns derived from the noun roots like ‘nal’ etc., which are not predicates.

Nallaṇ vantāṇ — A good man came (noun)

Avaṇ nallaṇ — He is good (verb)

The finite verbs that are formed from the roots naṭa (walk), vā (come), ccy (do), etc. denote the tense in a clear way and so they are

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 36, 68, 76, 105.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 1.

called 'terinilai viṅai muṟṟu' (finite verbs where tense is explicit or shortly 'explicit verbs'). The finite verbs that are formed from the nominal roots like nal (good), tī (bad), peri (big), etc. denote the tense only by implication. They are 'kuṟṟippu viṅai muṟṟu' (i.e., finite verbs denoting tense by implication or shortly 'implicit verbs'). According to this definition the words like vantāṅ (he came) which denote the tense are 'terinilai viṅai muṟṟu' and the words like 'nallaṅ' (is good) in which the tense is understood are 'kuṟṟippu viṅai muṟṟu.' The same words like 'nallaṅ' in the noun form or noun sense (good man) are called 'kuṟṟippu viṅaiyālaṅaiyum peyar' meaning participial nouns with the tense understood. Here they are no better than pronouns. Naccinārkkiniyar differentiates these words by means of ōcai.¹

¹nallaṅ² — eṭuttal ōcai — a finite verb.

²nallaṅ¹ — paṭuttal ōcai — a participial noun.

So it is clear that only the ōcai is able to indicate the parts of speech of a word.

Some of the words denoting interrogation may either come as finite verbs or nouns. Naccinārkkiniyar indicates whether it is a noun or a verb only by differentiating the ōcais. The word 'evaṅ' could be either a verb or a noun. In the noun form it has paṭuttal ōcai.² In the verbal form it must have eṭuttal ōcai.

²evaṅ¹ — paṭuttal — noun

¹evaṅ² — eṭuttal — verb (predicate)

8.2.7. Transitive and intransitive differentiated by ōcai

Ōcai in the transitive and intransitive verbs has not been clearly defined. The same word can be used either as an intransitive or transitive verb.

kīṟu — to receive a bruise — to cause a bruise.

piḷa — to break one self — to break some other thing.

Citaṟu — to scatter oneself — to cause the scattering.

cintu — to spill oneself — to cause the spilling.

Naccinārkkiniyar says these roots are the same for both the intransitive and transitive verbs from the phonemic point of view.³

1. Tol. Col; s. 463, p. 469.

2. Tol. E[uttu]; s. 122.

3. Jivaka; v. 31.

naliyum — to cause suffering.

'Naliyum' normally has its meaning only in the intransitive form. But Naccinārkkiniyar uses it in the transitive sense meaning "to cause suffering"¹.

'tērrēn' — I do not know.

tēru-to know (intransitive). tērru-to let others know (transitive). But Naccinārkkiniyar interprets this word as meaning 'I do not know'.² (in the intransitive sense).

So it is evident that there is no clear cut indication to know whether a word is intransitive or transitive, from the way of writing. But there is a reference in the commentaries on Tolkāppiyam to the word 'tapu' which can be used both in the intransitive and in the transitive sense. The commentators, Naccinārkkiniyar and Iḷampūraṇar, explain that when the form (tapu) has the eṭuttal ōcai it is transitive and that when it has the paṭuttal ōcai it is intransitive.³ According to them:

'tapu' — eṭuttal — To cause one to die.

'tapu' — paṭuttal -- you die.

A doubt arises at this stage. Naccinārkkiniyar has stated that the verb in the imperative mood will be pronounced with eṭuttal ōcai.⁴ Tapu is also a verb in the imperative mood whether it has the transitive or intransitive sense. When therefore Naccinārkkiniyar states that the transitive 'tapu' will have an eṭuttal ōcai we are at a loss to know how the eṭuttal ōcai of the transitive imperative differs from the eṭuttal ōcai of the intransitive imperative. We have to assume that the transitive imperative will have a much more predominant eṭuttal ōcai than the eṭuttal ōcai of the intransitive imperative. For instance if the intonation for the intransitive imperative is from level 1 to level 2, the intonation of the transitive imperative may be from level 1 to level 3. There is also a statement which may be interpreted as reference to what modern Linguists like Hockett call 'Terminal contour'.⁵

With reference to naṭattuvi-the causal verb-it can occur as a verb in the imperative mood, when it is pronounced with an eṭuttal

1. Jīvaka; v. 641.

2. Ibid; v. 257.

3. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 76.

4. Tol. Col; s. 226, pp. 235-236.

5. A Course in Modern Linguistics; p. 34.

ōcai followed by a T. C. (Terminal contour) represented by inverted verticle arrow/↓/, but this form can also occur in a finite verb followed by other suffixes as *naṭattuvittāṇ*. In this case according to *Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar* the final 'i' of *naṭattuvi* is pronounced with *paṭuttal* ōcai.¹ But the finite verb as shown with reference to 'ceyyum' will have *eṭuttal* ōcai² - that means we have three levels starting from-for instance-2 falling down to 1 and then rising upto 2 or 3 followed by a T. C./↓/. Whether it is possible to assume the existence of pitch accent in Tamil instead of these pitch-levels is a matter for future research. The difference between *naṭattu* and *naṭattuvi* also should be explained by the pitch-levels being from 1 to 2 in *naṭattu* but 2-1-2 in *naṭattuvi*.

8.2.8. *Second personal verb and imperative differentiated*

When the verbal roots take the suffix of the second person verb and imperative and become finite, they have two meanings:-

1. *uṇṇpāy* — you will eat — II person singular finite verb,
2. *uṇṇpāy* — do eat — II person singular verb imperative.

The first one refers to the idea that the person addressed will be engaged in the action of eating. The second one, on the other hand, orders the person addressed to eat.

Though they have the same phonemes they convey different meanings only by the different ōcais. But both of them are finite verbs and therefore have only the *eṭuttal* ōcai. However, *Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar* states that when this form denotes a command it is pronounced with an *eṭuttal* ōcai.³ As already stated this must be an *eṭuttal* ōcai in comparison with the other *eṭuttal* ōcai of the verb in the indicative mood reaching a higher pitch level. If 'uṇṇpāy' as an indicative verb has the intonation rising from 1 to 2, 'uṇṇpāy' as an imperative verb will have the intonation rising from 1 to 3 or that the T. C. is a rising one represented by a vertically raised arrow.

¹*uṇṇpāy*³ — indicative verb

¹*uṇṇpāy*³ — imperative verb

8.2.9. *Affirmative and negative second personal verbs differentiated*

In the second personal finite verbs there are words which contain the same phoneme but they occur both in affirmative and negative

1. Tol. Col. s. 226, p. 237.

2. Tol. Col; 237, p. 265.

3. Tol. Col; s. 225.

sense. The word 'ceyyāy' with paṭuttal ōcai gives the affirmative sense. When this word occurs in the negative sense (you will not do), it has the eṭuttal ōcai.

¹uṇṇāy³ — you will not eat
2nd personal negative verb.

²uṇṇāy¹ — you will eat.
2nd personal affirmative verb.

Naccinārkkiniyar also holds the view that the word 'ceyyāy' usually occurs in the negative sense, though it occurs sometimes in the affirmative sense. He states that the word 'uṇṇāy' (you will eat) pronounced with paṭuttal ōcai occurs with reference to the idea of request and in the affirmative sense.¹ Also 'uṇṇāy' (you will not eat) is the negative form of the word uṇṇāy (you will eat). The differentiation is shown by the different intonation patterns. Here also as in the affirmative sense and the negative sense the finite verbs have eṭuttal ōcai, but comparatively speaking the negative word has a higher eṭuttal ōcai. For instance.

¹uṇṇāy² — affirmative.

¹uṇṇāy³ — negative.

8.2.10 *Finite and non-finite verbs differentiated*

In Tamil there is the word 'ceyyum' which may occur either as a finite verb or as an infinite verb known as 'peyar eccam'. Though they are the same in orthography, Naccinārkkiniyar analyses how by a difference in the ōcai it could mean either a finite verb or an infinite one.

1. Cāttan uṇṇum — Cāttan will eat. — finite.
2. Uṇṇum Cāttan pātuvān — Cāttan who eats — non-finite.
will sing.

The former is a finite verb. The later one is non-finite verb. The former one has the eṭuttal ōcai, and the later one has the paṭuttal ōcai. Naccinārkkiniyar is able to distinguish them by different ōcais. He says that a finite verb has the eṭuttal ōcai and does not contemplate any further word for completing its idea and stands as compact as a box well closed by a lid, whereas if a word occurs in non-finite sense just as 'Vālum il' (the house where we live), 'Vālum' has the paṭuttal ōcai and does not complete its sense by the proximate word but has to be completed by another word 'naṅgu'.

1. Tol. Col; ss. 450, 551.

Vāḷum il naṅṅu — (Living house (is) good)- The house where we live is good.

This is the definition of finite and infinite verbs.¹

The above statement of Nacciṅṅārkkīṅiyar with reference to the finite and non-finite verbs should be taken as referring to the Terminal contour (TC). So according to him the finite verb has the eṅuttal ōcai and not depending on another word for completing its sense it has a terminal contour like that of a verticle inverted arrow / ↓ /. Non-finite verb has the paṅuttal ōcai and depending upon another word for completing its sense it has a terminal contour like Hockett's vertical bar / † /.² The word 'vantāṅ' (he came) by its eṅuttal ōcai indicates the finite verb, by its paṅuttal ōcai shows this participial noun. In some cases the paṅuttal ōcai has the terminal contour / ↓ /, but not always, for instance the imperative positive 'uṅṅāy' though having comparatively a paṅuttal ōcai has only the Terminal contour / † /, because nothing follows thereafter.³

8.2.11. *Some verbal forms common to many parts of speech differentiated by ōcai*

There are certain other verbs which have the same phonemes, but in meaning are finite verbs or non-finite verbs. The word 'iyala' is an instance in particular.

- | | |
|---------|---|
| 'Iyala' | 1. '(they) were of that nature' — finite verb. |
| | 2. 'those that have that nature' — noun. |
| | 3. 'those which have the nature' — relative participle. |
| | 4. 'to move' — verbal participle. |

Nacciṅṅārkkīṅiyar interprets a Tolkāppiyam sūtram in Eṅuttatikāram, holding it as a 'viṅaieccam' or verbal participle.⁴ We are not concerned with the meaning of the word here, but we are investigating the way by which Nacciṅṅārkkīṅiyar interprets this word on the basis of the difference in ōcai.

Nacciṅṅārkkīṅiyar says, 'iyala', as a verbal participle, has paṅuttal ōcai. He also says that it should be considered here as 'ceyaven eccam', implying therefore that this word can occur also

1. Tol. Col; s. 237, p. 265

2. A Course in Modern Linguistics; p. 35.

3. Supra; 8. 2.9.

4. Tol. Eṅuttu; s. 50.

as a finite verb. As he says that in the non-finite sense it has the paṭuttal ōcai. So, from Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretation of the word 'iyala', again it becomes certain that non-finite verb has a paṭuttal ōcai and it depends upon another word for completing its sense. This will mean that the Terminal Contour as in non-finite, ceyyum has also the Terminal Contour / ʔ /.

8.3. *Juncture*

We have been so far dealing with homophonous words differing in meaning because of different ōcai. Naccinārkkiniyar also analyses homophonous phrases or constructions which because of the juncture occurring at different places give different meanings. Tolkāppiyar refers to these homophonous phrases or constructions as:

Eḷuttōraṅṅa poruḷ teri puṅarcci".¹

8.3.1. *The two major groups of Juncture*

The ancient grammarians have discussed at length the kinds of juncture or sandhi and classified them under two major groups.²

1. Oṭṭi muṭital — which may be compared with close juncture or Muddy Transition.
2. Piḷantu muṭital — which may be compared with open juncture or Sharp transition.

Oṭṭimuṭital (close juncture) means two or more words that are so proximately and homogeneously aligned together and have the characteristic of one word as in real compounds when we have root compounds. Piḷantu muṭital (open juncture) means two or more words that are heterogeneously aligned and retain their respective characteristics as in phrasal compounds or phrases. In the case of close or muddy juncture no symbol is used by modern linguists whilst for open juncture the symbol (+) is used.

8.3.2. *Juncture as a phoneme*

There are words that give meaning in (1) close juncture, (2) open juncture, (3) two different meanings if accented as close juncture or open juncture (4) accented in two different kinds of open juncture, give two different meanings, as understood from the following examples:

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 141.

2. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 110, 132; Tol. Col; s. 412.

- (1) Karuṅkūtirai — black horse is a case of close juncture.¹
- (2) Irā-p-pakal — 'night and day' is a case of open juncture.²
- (3) Uḷporuḷ
- (a) uḷporuḷ — the existence—thing—(close juncture).
- (b) uḷ + poruḷ — The thing exists—open juncture.³
- (4) Cempu + oṇpatinṛōṭi — copper nine palams.
Cempon + patinṛōṭi — gold ten palams.⁴
- (5) Pulikonṛa + yāṇai — the elephant killed by a tiger.
Puli + konṛayāṇai — the elephant which killed a tiger.⁵
- (6) uṇṭu + viruntoṭu vantāṇ — ate and came with a guest.
uṇṭu viruntoṭu + vantāṇ — ate with a guest and came.⁶

These could be discussed under the analysis of immediate constituents. There is no sandhi change. In 'cemponṛōṭi' sandhi changes by which 'u' of cempudisappears gives the homophonous phrase. This complication can be resolved by admitting the juncture phoneme as occurring in different phrases. In view of this, juncture may be taken as a phoneme.

8.3.3. Meanings understood through intonation

Naccinārkkīṇiyar analyses these various aspects of juncture and explains them at length. Tolkāppiyar says that one sentence could have different meaning only through 'icai-t-tiripu' (difference in *ōcai*) as the juncture or pause.⁷ According to Tolkāppiyar, in Tamil where there are changes due to rules of Sandhi, it is not the practice to break up the sentences to retain the individual physical form of each word, but the different meanings can be understood not through orthographic writing but through proper intonation only.⁸

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 110.

2. Ibid;

3. Ibid; s. 430.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu s. 141.

5. Tol. Col; ss. 96, 97.

6. Ibid; s. 239.

7. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 141.

8. Ibid; s. 142.

8.3.4. *Is there any pitch difference?*

It is for consideration whether the initial of a word has any other pitch difference since Naccinārkkiṇiyar speaks of eṭuttal, paṭuttal, nalital differences in this place.¹ It has been noted when explaining the *ōcai* or intonation of naṭattuvī and naṭattuvittāṇ, that in the former, the pitch level of 'i' is higher than the pitch level of 'i' in the latter. This is because the latter comes in the middle of a word. Similarly one may assume that in 'cemponpatinṛoṭi' the 'o' has a pitch level lower when it is part of cempon than when it is the beginning of a word onpatu. As already stated there is some connection between pitch and *ōcai* at least in some place wherein the paṭuttal and terminal contour will occur. But this has to be left to further research.

8.3.5. *Meanings understood by context*

Naccinārkkiṇiyar says that the different meanings of a construction can be best understood only by context. 'Cempon patinṛoṭi'—when we are discussing gold, the sentence has reference only to gold, but in a different context, when we are discussing copper it has reference only to copper.² "It is possible for a single sequence of segmental morphemes to have two alternative organisations, usually with a difference of meaning. Sometimes, but not always, the ambiguity is removed by intonation or other context...But in the sentence "He was dancing with the stout major's wife" (with certain of the possible distributions of stress and intonation) we cannot tell whether the man's dancing partner is stout or not ..Ambiguity is often eliminated by context. The stout major's wife is very thin. The stout major's wife has a very thin husband."³ The context helps the analysis of immediate constituents. See the case of 'puli konṛa yānai' and 'uṇṭu viruntoṭu vantāṇ' mentioned earlier.

8.3.6 *Oṭṭimuṭital (close juncture)*

There are six types of compounds where the case signs and other suffixes are understood (elided). They are called:

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Vēṛṛumai-t-tokai. | 4. Uvamai-t-tokai. |
| 2. Viṇai-t-tokai. | 5. Ummai-t-tokai. |
| 3. Paṇpu-t-tokai. | 6. Aṇmoḷi-t-tokai. |

1. Tol. Eṭuttu; s. 142.

2. Ibid; s. 142.

3. A Course in Modern Linguistics; pp. 152-153.

A tokai is evidently that which is made up of two or more words which functions together as one word.¹ Among these, *viṇai-t-tokai*, *paṇpu-t-tokai* and *aṇmoḷi-t-tokai* come under the first variety of juncture namely 'oṭṭi muṭital' (Close juncture). As Tolkāppiyar refers to *viṇai-t-tokai* (e.g. *kolyāṇai* meaning 'killing elephant'), and *paṇpu-t-tokai* (e.g. 'veḷyāru' meaning ('white river') as 'maruvṇ pāttiya' (inflexional types), Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar holds these compounds as single entities and treats them as a word. In the same way he considers *aṇmoḷi-t-tokai* as a single word.² There are instances where he treats these as single words.³ Civañāṇa muṇivar refuses to accept this theory and does not treat them as single words.⁴ But there are modern scholars who have held that such compounds can be treated as single words. "At the other extreme we find forms which lie on the border between words and phrases. A form like 'black bird' resembles a two word phrase—(black-bird), but we shall find that a consistent description of English is bound to class this form as a single (compound) word...ice cream, spoken with only one high stress, will be classified as a (compound) word".⁵ But it is not possible to speak of any stress unifying compound in Tamil. Further the analysis of compounds has taken a new trend in modern linguistics especially in its newly developed generative grammar.

- | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Kolyāṇai | — killing elephant | — viṇai-t-tokai. |
| 2. Karuṇ kutirai | — Black horse. | — paṇpu-t-tokai. |
| 3. Poṇṇōṭi. | — The lady with gold bangles. | — Aṇmoḷi-t-tokai. |

The first two are explained by Tolkāppiyar himself as indivisible compounds where the first parts appear only in their bound forms. But Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar adds *aṇmoḷi-t-tokai* (e.g. 3) also as oṭṭi muṭital but the basis for this is not clear. He states that *aṇmoḷi-t-tokai* has no other constituent.

8.3.7. Piḷantu muṭital (open juncture)

Vēṇṇumai-t-tokai, uvamai-t-tokai and ummai-t-tokai are piḷantu muṭital according to Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar.⁶ Perhaps one has to write as follows:

-
1. Tol. Col; s. 420.
 2. Tol. Eḷuttu; ss. 24, 110.
 3. Ibid; ss. 24, 26, 29.
 4. Naṇṇūl; s. 152, p. 116.
 5. Language; p. 180.
 6. Tol Eḷuttu; s. 110, Tol. Col; s. 421.

- | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Poṟ+roṭi | — gold bangles | — Vēṟṟumai-t-tokai |
| 2. Mati+mukam | — moon (like) face | — uvamai-t-tokai |
| 3. Irā-p+pakal | — night (and) day | — ummai-t-tokai |

8.3.8. *The juncture of the phrases where the suffixes are not elided*

The other important constructions are:

- | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Eļuvāy-t-toṭar | — Subject construction. |
| 2. Viṅai muṟṟu-t-toṭar | — Predicate Construction. |
| 3. Peyar ecca-t-toṭar | — Relative participle construction. |
| 4. Viṅai-ecca-t-toṭar | — Verbal participle construction. |

Naccinārkkiniyar says that peyar-ecca-t-toṭar and viṅai-ecca-t-toṭar each of them, behave like one word¹ or in modern linguistics, an immediate constituent. But these phrases, like some other compounds which we have already examined, have to be taken as piḷantu muṭital.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Uṅṭa + Cāttan + vantān — | Peyar ecca-t-toṭar. |
| (Cāttan who ate came) — | (nominal construction) ² |
| 2. Uṅṭu + vantān + Cāttan — | Viṅai ecca-t-toṭar. |
| (Cāttan ate and came) — | (verbal construction) ³ |
| 3. Vēy + niṅṭatu — | Eļuvāy-t-toṭar. |
| (Bamboo got elongated) — | Subject construction. ⁴ |
| 4. Vēy + yātu — | Subject construction. ⁵ |
| (Which is bamboo?) | |

8.3.9 *Two kinds of compound*

Tolkāppiyar says that aṅmoļi-t-tokai can be formed out of vēṟṟumai-t-tokai, paṅpu-t-tokai and ummai-t-tokai.⁶ Naccinārkkiniyar says that aṅmoļi-t-tokai can be formed out of viṅai-t-tokai and uvamai-t-tokai also.⁷ The juncture according to Naccinārkkiniyar is as follows:

-
- | |
|-------------------------------|
| 1. Tol. Eļuttu; s. 110. |
| 2. Tol. Eļuttu; s. 110. |
| 3. Ibid. |
| 4. Ibid; s. 29, p. 61. |
| 5. Tol. Eļuttu; s. 29, p. 61. |
| 6. Tol. Col; s. 448, p. 407. |
| 7. Ibid; s. 448, p. 408. |

- | | | |
|-------------|---|---------------------|
| 1. Poṛ+roṭi | — gold bangles | — veṛṛumai-t-tokai. |
| Poṛroṭi | — the lady wearing
gold bangles | — aṇmoḷi-t-tokai. |
| 2. Mati+ | — moon (like) face | — uvamai-t-tokai, |
| mukam | | |
| Matimukam | — the lady with
moon like face | — aṇmoḷi-t-tokai. |
| 3. Uyir+mey | — life (and) body
(vowel and con-
sonant) | — ummai-t-tokai. |
| Uyirmey | — the vowel con-
sonant | — aṇmoḷi-t-tokai. |

So it is obvious these tokais (veṛṛumai, uvamai and ummai) as above are piḷantumūṭital.¹ Aṇmoḷi-t-tokai even when born of veṛṛumai, etc. has oṭṭi muṭital.² So veṛṛumai-t-tokai, uvamai-t-tokai, and ummai-t-tokai when they occur as such have 'piḷantu muṭital' and when they occur as aṇmoḷi-t-tokai have 'oṭṭi miṭital'. This distinction with reference to aṇmoḷi is not clear.

- | | | |
|--------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| 4. Veḷḷāṭai | — white cloth | — Paṇṇu-t-tokai. |
| Veḷḷāṭai | — the person with
white cloth | — Aṇmoḷi-t-tokai. |
| 5. Tāḷkūntal | — the hair that is long— | Viṇai-t-tokai. |
| Tāḷkūntal | — the woman with
long hair. | — Aṇmoḷi-t-tokai. |

As far as these two (paṇṇu and viṇai-t-tokai) have oṭṭi muṭital we are not able to find out whether they occur as paṇṇu-tokai or aṇmoḷi-t-tokai because both are oṭṭi mutital.³ Naccinārkkiniyar has recourse to ōcai. He says that when the same form occurs as paṇṇu-t-tokai etc., it has a different ōcai whilst it has paṭuttal ōcai when occurring as aṇmoḷi-t-tokai.⁴ The first three can be distinguished from aṇmoḷi both by juncture and ōcai. The former have juncture whilst the latter (aṇmoḷi) has no juncture. It has only paṭuttal ōcai.

1. Supra; 8.3.7.

2. Ibid; 8.3.6.

3. Supra; 8.3.6.

4. Tol. Col; s. 418.

CHAPTER - 9

SYNTAX

9.1. *Sentences*

9.1.1. *Morphology and syntax*

“The details of Syntax are often complicated and hard to describe. On this point any fairly complete grammar of a language like English, German or Latin or French, will prove more enlightening than would an abstract discussion. Syntax is obscured, however, in most treatises by the use of philosophical instead of formal definitions of constructions and form classes.”¹ But Tolkāppiyar had enunciated the principles of morphology and syntax fairly clearly in his grammar. We are not concerned with the sūtrams of Tolkāppiyam as much as we are with Naccinārkkīniyar’s commentary on them. Naccinārkkīniyar has, at many places, dealt with the principles of syntax, basing his findings mainly on Tolkāppiyam and it is with these that we are concerned. This chapter does not attempt a study of Tamil syntax as a whole but deals only with Naccinārkkīniyar’s main observation on the subject.

9.1.2. *Word Definition*

The grammar of words is called ‘Morphology’ and the grammar of sentences is called Syntax. It is very difficult to draw the line of partition between the two. “The Morphology-Syntax Boundary. The line of demarcation between Morphology and Syntax is not always clear cut.....”² The word is formed by the sequence of letters. Naccinārkkīniyar says that though the words are pronounced letter by letter, yet they give at a glance the complete picture of meaning, the letters appearing simultaneously.³ Evidently he is against sphotavada.

1. Language; p. 201.

2. A course in Modern Linguistics; p, 178.

3. Tol. Col; s. 1.

9.1.3. *Sentence-Definition*

What Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar says of the 'word' applies to sentences also. All the words in a sentence cannot be pronounced simultaneously, but only one word after another, and yet the sentence gives meaning only when the words are understood simultaneously.¹ "The essential method of speech consists in presenting to the listener successive word signs each possessing a definite area of meaning. Employing these clues, the listener reconstructs the thing meant by an effort of his intelligence, using the situation as an additional inference".²

9.1.4. *Taḷuvu toṭar (Phrase in which a word qualifies the word immediately following it)*

The words in their meaningful sequence from a phrase, and the phrase in their significant continuity form a sentence. The words that form the meaningful sequence or continuity, by their occurrence in their order, provide or make up 'immediate constituent'. "A constituent is any word or construction (or morpheme) which enters into some larger construction. An immediate constituent is one, or two, or a few constituents of which any given construction is directly formed".³ The words or phrases that do not occur in their meaningful sequence are not constituents.

9.1.5. *Talāttoṭar (Phrase in which a word does not qualify or govern the word immediately following it)*

However 'a man are' occurring in "the sons and daughters of a man are his children" do not form immediate constituents. "The sons and daughters of a man" from one unit or constituent; "are his children" form another constituent. Then these constituents become two immediate constituents. We find a similar definition of a constituent in the commentary of Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar at many places.⁴

"Irumpu tirittanṇa māyiru maruppiṅ

Paral aval aṭaiya iralai teṭippa".

Here 'maruppiṅ paral' are two words that occur in a sequence. 'Maruppu' means 'horns', 'paral' means 'stones'. An interpretation of the same as such would mean "stones with horns", which is ridiculous. So it is clear that 'maruppu' becomes significant only if it is

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 108.

2. The Theory of Speech and Language; p. 195.

3. An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics; pp. 132-133.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu. s. 111.

read with 'iralai' (deer), that is 'the deer with horns', and this word 'iralai' occurs in the succeeding line "maruppiṅ iralai" form one immediate constituent.

"Karuṅkāḷ ōmai-k-kāṅpiṅ peruñcinai". Here 'ōmai-k-kāṅpiṅ' gives no meaning, but 'ōmai-c-ciṅai' (the branch of the ōmai tree) gives the relevant meaning. Therefore 'ōmai' is one constituent, 'kāṅpiṅ peruñcinai' is another constituent. Then both form one constituent. 'Ōmai' however is not an immediate constituent of 'kāṅpiṅ'.

"Teyva māḷ varai"-Here 'teyva' and 'māḷ' are not immediate constituents but only 'teyva' and 'varai' (divine mountain); 'māḷ' becomes a constituent with 'varai' and then 'māḷvarai' as a constituent, becomes one with the 'teyva', its other immediate constituent.

9.1.6. *Constituents in verses*

As against the ordinary usage, versification and poetic inversion require certain distant links not contemplated in prose or speech where words in one place become immediate constituents with words further removed. There are two kinds of constituents in verses according to Naccinārkkiniyar.¹

1. Moḷi māṅṅu.
2. Māṅṅu.

Moḷimāṅṅu occurs in two lines.

"Kuraṅkuḷai-p-polinta koy cuvaṅ puravi
Naram pārppaṅṅa vāṅku vaḷ pariya"

Here the word 'puravi' (horse) does not go in with the next word 'narampu' (strings), but with 'vaḷ' (reins) only. 'Puravi vaḷ' means the reins of the horse.

9.1.7. *Māṅṅu*

Māṅṅu also occurs only in a verse. Here a word goes and forms an immediate constituent with a word occurring several lines hence. This māṅṅu can be subdivided into two according to Naccinārkkiniyar.

1. Proximate māṅṅu.
2. Distant māṅṅu.

1. Tol. Col; s. 409, p. 387.

9.1.8. *Proximate māṭṭu*

Proximate māṭṭu is that which occurs in a verse consisting of several lines.

Ponṇōṭai-p-pukar aṇi nutal
 Tuṇṇarun tiṭal kamaḷ kaṭāattu
 Eyiṭu paṭaiyāka eyiṭ kataviṭāa-k-
 kayiṭu piṇi-k-koṇṭa kaviḷ maṇi maruṅkiṇ
 Peruṅkai yāṇai-y-irum piṭar-t-talai-y-iruntu
 Maruntil kūṇṇat tarun toḷil cāyā.

This is the description of an elephant. Here nutal, tiṭal, kaṭām, maruṅku, kai (forehead, strength, kaṭām, side, trunk) are all attributes for the word 'yāṇai' (elephant). As all the words occur proximately, Naccinārkkiniyar calls it 'proximate māṭṭu'. Nutal, kaṭām, kaḷuttu, maruṅkul, kai form a coordinate construction. All these then become one constituent to form an immediate constituent with yāṇai. What precedes each one of these viz., 'nutal, kaṭām, maruṅku, and kai are immediate constituents only respectively with 'nutal' etc. So much so 'nutal' does not form an immediate constituent with the next word.

9.1.9 *Distant māṭṭu*

Distant māṭṭu is that which occurs in a verse containing a sequence of hundred and more lines. Naccinārkkiniyar gives examples of this from Tirumurukāṇṇuppaṭai and other poems.¹ Naccinārkkiniyar analyses them bearing in mind the sutrams of Tolkāppiyam. Others condemn his examples here and elsewhere as unnatural. This does not form part of ordinary syntax and therefore this need not be discussed here.

9.2. *Major types of Sentences*

Sentences may be two in number. (1) Sentence consisting of only one word "taṇi moḷi" which may be called sentence word (2) Sentence consisting of more than one word-toṭar moḷi.² A sentence word according to convention (as found in a dictionary) gives meaning according to Cēṇāvaraiyar. Hockett speaks of favourite sentence

1. Pattu-p-pāṭṭu; p. 39.

Jīvaka; vv. 104, 1266-1273.

2. Tol. Col; s. 1, p. 3.

type and minor type (fragments).¹ The verbs of command like *naṭa* (walk), *vā* (comes), *pō* (go), *cey* (do) etc. the interrogatives, exclamations are all sentence words. The imperative verbs occurring as such give meanings and this is exemplified by Dr. M. Varadarajan with many illustrations.²

9.2.1 *Taṇi moḷi* (Sentence words)

The predicates without subjects can give meanings, as understood from Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary.³ This is contemplated by Tolkāppiyar himself in 69 (col). It is on this basis the *taṇi moḷi* and *toṭar moḷi* have been used in this essay in this peculiar sense.

Cāttan̄ eṇṇa ceykiṛāṇ?

(What does Cāttan̄ do?)

Pāṭukiṛāṇ.

(Sings)

'Pāṭukiṛāṇ'—Here in this word the III person singular suffix also occurs. Similarly in other languages also there are verbs occurring as sentence words, in which the actor and the action are denoted by bound forms which make up a single word, and these verbs, without apparent subjects are treated as favourite sentences.⁴

Not only affirmative but also negative predicates have the subjects 'understood', and occur as 'sentence words'. The morphemes referring to the negative sense come in that bound form in Tamil in which there is the unique negative mood or voice. *Vārāṇ* (He will not come). This is so in other languages also.⁵

9.2.2. *Toṭar moḷi* (sentence of more than one word)

Words more than one in succession are called "toṭar moḷi". There are two kinds of *Toṭar moḷi*-(1) Two word constructions and (2) multi-word constructions. All these constructions may be brought under three classifications according to the grammarians.⁶

1. A course in Modern Linguistics; pp. 200-201.

2. *Moḷinūḷi*; pp. 319-322.

3. Tol. col. s. 69.

4. A course in Modern Linguistics; pp. 202-203.

5. *Language*; p. 175.

6. Tol. Col; s. 1. p. 4.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Payanilaittoṭar
(Predicate construction) | — e.g. Cāttan̄ vantān̄
(Cāttan̄ came) |
| 2. Tokainilaittoṭar
(Attributive construction) | — e.g. Yān̄ai-k-kōṭu
(Elephant tusk) |
| 3. Eṇṇunilai-t-toṭar
(Coordinate construction) | — e.g. Nilam, nīr.
(Earth, water). |

They follow the variety of exocentric and endocentric types as enunciated by modern linguists. According to them predicative construction is exocentric and the attributive and coordinate constructions are endocentric.¹

9.3. *Eḷuvāy Payanilai-t-toṭar (Subject-Predicate construction)*

This is very important among the various sentence types. This consists of the subject and predicate. In Tamil the subject is considered as the most important among the cases and therefore it is designated the first case (Mutal or 'Eḷuvāy vēṙṙumai'). It has already been pointed out that the predicate construction can occur with the predicate alone without the subject.² Hence its importance in Tamil. "The kernel of an English sentence of the favorite sentence type is a predicative constitute. This is true also in most other languages and quite possibly in all, though there are subsidiary differences to be noted shortly".³

9.3.1. *Different kinds of grammatical predicates in Tamil*

Tolkāppiyar classifies the predicate words occurring in a Tamil sentence. In Tamil there is no copula. Tamil predicates not of the action type have to be translated with a copula in English. Leaving aside the predicate construction we may analyse the predicates and subjects.

1. word affirming merely the existence of a thing.
2. word expressing the implied command.
3. word expressing the action of the subject.
4. an interrogative word.
5. word expressing the characteristic feature of the subject.⁴

1. Language; pp. 194-195, A Course in Modern Linguistics; pp. 184-186.

2. Supra; 9.2.1.

3. A Course in Modern Linguistics; P.201

4. Tol; Col.s. 67.

9.3.2. *Additional varieties of predicates*

Naccinārkkiniyar adds a few more to the varieties mentioned by Tolkāppiyar.¹ For example:

(1) A noun which occurs as the predicate, whereas in the above mentioned cases there was only one subject Head word. This happens according to Naccinārkkiniyar, when two nouns occur in the subject spot and when they denote the same thing without the one becoming subordinate to the other.

Āyaṅ Cāttan vantāṅ.

Linguists call this 'Appositional type'. The term apposition is used when practically joined forms are grammatically, but not in meaning, equivalent, e.g. "John, the poor boy". When the appositional group appears in an included position, one of its members is equivalent to a parenthesis. "John, the poor boy, ran away". In English we have also close apposition without a pause pitch, as in King John, John Brown, Mount Everest, etc."² In the sentence "Āyaṅ Cāttan vantāṅ", the subject 'Āyaṅ Cāttan' is a close apposition.

(2) This is a variation of the appositional construction mentioned above. Here the two nouns do not come before the predicate; one comes before and the other comes after the predicate.

e.g. Āyaṅ vantāṅ Cāttan.

(3) This belongs to an important construction as in English sentences where the predicate is "became". Here the predicate (the word ā) takes an attribute.

e.g. Cāttan talaivaṅ āyiṅāṅ.

Talaivaṅ is attribute of a meaning 'to become'.

(4) This is peculiar to Tamil. When there is something to be predicated of a limb or part of a whole, Tamil idiom allows it to be predicated of the whole. When one wants to say "The eyes are good" in Tamil one can say "He is good (in the) eyes" To differentiate "Cāttan nallaṅ" "Cāttan is good", in cases under discussion we have "Cāttan kaṅ nallaṅ" when the part viz., the "Kaṅ" occurs as an attribute of the predicate 'nallaṅ'.

(5) The (a) thing and its quality (b) the thing and its action may be similarly treated.

1. Tol. Col; s. 67.

2. Language; P. 186.

'maṇi naṅṅu', "the gem is good"

'niṅam naṅṅu', "the colour is good"

One may have 'maṇi niṅam naṅṅu', "the gem is good in colour". This has to be distinguished. 'maṇi niṅam naṅṅu', "the colour of the gem is good" 'where maṇi and niṅam' become one constituent where the construction under discussion, 'niṅam' and 'naṅṅu' become one constituent.

(6) kutirai naṅṅu = The horse is good.

naṭai naṅṅu = The gait of walking is good.

kutirai naṭai = The horse is good in its gait.

naṅṅu

Again this is different from kutirai naṭai naṅṅu = The walk of the horse is good" where 'kutirai naṭai' form one constituent whereas in the example under discussion "naṭai naṅṅu" becomes one constituent as distinct from 'kutirai'.

(7) āṅṅu oḷukum = the river flows.

nīr oḷukum = the water flows.

āṅṅu nīr oḷukum = This river flows with water.

Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar takes the river to refer to the place whilst the flow is really of the water therein. Here also nīr and oḷukum form one constituent; āṅṅu and nīr if they were to become one constituent would take the form āṅṅu nīr, āṅṅu nīr oḷukum, "The water of the river flows".

(8) The subject itself may be a phrase with a subject and predicate. Then the whole as one constituent occupies the subject spot and takes another predicate as its immediate constituent, so as to form a constituent of a whole sentence.

'Iṅṅaiṅṅu aruḷiṅṅāṅ', "the Lord bestowed His Grace". This is nominalised as 'Iṅṅaiṅṅu aruḷal'. Iṅṅaiṅṅu is the subject of aruḷal. But Iṅṅaiṅṅu aruḷal has become one constituent to fill up the subject in the longer step and becomes a constituent to go with the immediate constituent, "em uyir kākkum", the predicate phrase, so as to form a more comprehensive sentence or immediate constituent.

(9) Since the phrase becomes one constituent and functions as a subject or noun, it can also be expected to take a case sign.

Iṅṅaiṅṅu aruḷiṅṅu yām uyir vāḷtum.

“If God blesses us, we can live our life”. The analysis is similar to (8), except for the fact the phrase there functioned like a noun in the nominative case, while here it functions like a noun in the third case. No further statement need be made.

(10) These relate to the fact that the predicate, which ordinarily follows a subject, can precede a subject. In the former case the grammarians call it ‘eļuvāy-t-toṭar’; in the latter it is called ‘viṇai muṟṟu-t-toṭar’.

- e.g. 1. ā celka — eļuvāy-t-toṭar. (Subject construction).
 2. celka ā — viṇai muṟṟu-t-toṭar. (Predicate construction).

9.3.3. *Types of subjects*

The subject in the “subject-predicate construction” is called ‘kartā’ (actor). The person who does a thing is usually called the doer or actor. But Tolkāppiyar says that sometimes the object or goal can also occur as ‘kartā.’ Here Naccinārkkiniyar adds that the instrument of the action and the commander of the action can also occur as ‘kartā’ (actor or doer).

1. Cāttan pāṭiṇāṇ — karuttākkaruttā (i.e. actor occurs as actor)
(Cāttan sang)
2. Illam meļukirru — karumakkaruttā (the object occurs (House (was) cleaned) ring as subject)
Arici aṭṭatu — karumakkaruttā (the object occurs (Rice (was) cooked) ring as subject)
3. Ivvāļ eṟiyum — karuvikkaruttā (instrument occurs (The sword cuts) ring as actor)
4. Aracan eṭutta
ālayam — ētukkaruttā (one who commands occurs as though he is the actor (king constructed temple) where one must have stated that the king has directed the construction of the temple)

Here we find a specific aspect of the Tamil language; when the objects and other things occur as ‘karuttā’, because in Tamil idiomatic usage generally, the verbs are used not in the passive sense, but in the active sense or rather in the pseudo active sense.

1. Tol. Col; s. 248.

9.3.4. *Commander actor*

Nacciṅṅārkkīṅiyar, bearing in mind all the points mentioned above, refers to the grammatical peculiarities and subtletics of words making a sentence in poetry. Vijayai, after being delivered of Jīva-kaṅ, reaches the Taṅṅakāraṅya forest and stays in the monastery of the Rishis. There the saintly women welcome her and the poet says "Nallaṅi nīkkukīṅṅār." meaning, as it is in the construction- "they removed her jewels". This does not sound well. Why should they remove her jewels instead of her removing them herself? Nacciṅṅārkkīṅiyar explains that here it means the saintly women directed the removal of the jewels and Vijayai removed them. This is like No.4 in the types of subjects above. Nacciṅṅārkkīṅiyar makes this clear by stating that it is like "Aracar eṅṅutta tēvakulam". i.e. the temple constructed by the king-in which the commander occurs as the doer.

9.3.5. *Noun occurring as predicate*

There is a line in Jīvaka Cintāmaṅi where the author describes the qualities of the women of chastity.

Kāmaṅai eṅṅuṅ collār
Kaṅavaṅ kai toṅutu vāṅvār
Tēmalar-tiruvōṅṅu oppār
Cērntavan cellal tīrppār.³

Here there are four predicative endings.

1. (they) will not mention the name of kāma.
2. will worship only the husband.
3. will be like Lakshmi for the husband.
4. will relieve the husband of his troubles.

But here the subject, 'the women of chastity' has not occurred. But Nacciṅṅārkkīṅiyar makes the two words "collār and vāṅvār" together as the subject and oppār and tīrppār as predicates. He justifies this by referring to Tolkāppiyam rules where Tolkāppiyar has mentioned "nouns occurring as predicates" ("peyar koṅa varutal").³

9.4. *Attribute construction*

9.4.1. *Ambiguities removed*

In Tamil the attribute precedes the 'head'. But there are places where the attribute succeeds the 'head' and Nacciṅṅārkkīṅiyar's

1. Jīvaka;348.

2. Jīvaka; v. 1598.

3. Tol. Col; s. 67.

interpretation shows how the displacement of the attribute heightens the significance of the passage.

A dog beaten by the Brahmins is having the death-pangs and *Jivakan* helps the dog. The poet describes this thus.

“*Ekinam maṛam illatu*
kāṇṭalum kaluṭintiṭṭān”¹

Here ‘*ekinam*’-dog-head word. *Maṛam illatu*-that which is harmless-attribute. It should be,

‘*Maṛam illātu ekinam*’

It means harmless dog. (But even here it has to be taken as subject and predicate or as they may be in appositional construction. The appositional construction has a tendency to become attribute construction). The Brahmins who beat it have done the harm. *Naccinārkkiniyar*, without interpreting it as ‘harmless dog’, explains this in the same fashion as the sentence is in the verse. “*Jivakan* seeing the dog in the harmless state” – This heightens the beauty of the line. The harmless state is the condition which evokes pity and the scene is very touching. So *Naccinārkkiniyar* does not change attributive phrase to suit the Syntax of Tamil Grammar, but sees beauty in this apparent violation (i.e. the attribute succeeding the head word). This type of attribute, which is more important than the head word, by its succession is found elsewhere in other works also.² But this is in accordance with the explanation (8) which he gives to the new kinds of occurrences of subject.

There is another place where *Naccinārkkiniyar* changes the position of the attribute bringing it to its natural place, and thus increases the beauty of the line.

“*Paṇṇār pāymā*
Iṇai yātum illāta, kaṇṇīr viṭtu
uṇṇā ninriṇiantatāmē”³

‘The horses shedding tears wept’. “*Iṇai yātum illāta*” means ‘having no equal’. But it occurs like this:

“Horses unequal shedding tears wept”.

Naccinārkkiniyar changes this as, ‘unequal horses shedding tears

1. *Jivaka*; v. 942.

2. *Puṇam*; v. 100. Commentator’s introduction.

3. *Jivaka*; v. 2968.

wept'. The phrase as it is (unequalled . . tears) looks ridiculous and Naccinārkkīṇiyar does not want to leave it at that, and the shifting of one of the attributes to its natural place in giving the implication of reason makes it charming, replete with sense.

'Paṇṇār pāymā' is the subject phrase; 'iṇai yātum illāta' is the predicate phrase. Then the whole becomes a constituent and occurs as the subject of 'iṇaintatāmē'. What is important is that the word 'illāta' cannot be the immediate constituent of 'kaṇṇīr'. What Naccinārkkīṇiyar says here can be explained in this way.

9.4.2. *The homophonous construction resolved*

Sometimes there may be words between the attribute and the head and this may create confusion in connecting the attribute with the head. But Naccinārkkīṇiyar explains with what other word a particular word phrase becomes a constituent.

Ilāṅku pūṇ alaṅkal māṛpiṇ
 Ceṇṇavar-c-cekutta vai vēl
 Cīvakacāmi.¹

Here 'Cīvakacāmi' - the head. Pūṇ (jewels), māṛpu (chest), and vēl (Javaline) are the attributes. There occurs a word 'ceṇṇavar' in the middle, meaning 'enemies'. The line, interpreted as it stands, may mean that the attributes 'pūṇ and māṛpu' go to describe the word 'ceṇṇavar' (enemies) of Jīvakaṇ. This passage is the statement of Vijaiyai in praise of her son Jīvakaṇ. In this context it looks absurd that she should praise the enemies of Jīvakaṇ, her son. So Naccinārkkīṇiyar explains here that the attributes have Jīvakaṇ as the head which forms a constituent with those immediate constituents "ceṇṇavar-c-cekutta vai vēl" forms one constituent. It is possible to interpret this to refer to the enemies of Jīvaka, endowed with jewels and grandlands i.e. making the first two attributes for 'ceṇṇavar' (enemies) - as this can also imply "endowed with jewels and garlands but not with courage". This will be ironical and may have some literary appeal. But, to say they have no courage does not do any justice to the valour of Jīvakaṇ, who defeats them all at the end. So Naccinārkkīṇiyar's interpretation seems to be the best under the circumstances.

9.4.3. *A Series of attributes - non-ambiguous*

In literary works sometimes the attributes occur in succession and describe the head which occurs at the end. Naccinārkkīṇiyar interprets such passages with great clarity.

I. Jīvaka; v. 2609.

“Maṇi muṇuval/murukkital koṭippavaḷa-t-taṅku kural vāy”.¹

Here ‘vāy’ (mouth) is the head. Three attributes have come to describe it. Naccinārkkiniyar explains each attribute independently as referring or applicable to the head.

Pearl like smiling mouth.
Murukku petal and coral-like mouth.
Melodious voiced mouth i.e. the
mouth with melodious voice.

The point is that for instance ‘muṇuval’ does not form one immediate constituent with the adjacent word ‘murukkital’ but only with ‘vāy’ similarly ‘pavaḷam’ not with ‘ta ṅku’ but with ‘vāy’. There are also other places like this.²

9.4.4. *Ambiguous interpretation*

There are other places where the attributes in succession directly describe the head. Naccinārkkiniyar takes the first of them as forming a constituent with one word, whilst others are taken to form a constituent with another word. This is rather curious because the attribute cannot jump over certain words like the verbal participle ‘parappi’ in Tamil to form such a constituent.

“Eḷāat-tōḷ imil muḷakkiṅ
Māa-t-tāḷ uyar maruppiṅ
Kaṭuṅciṅatta kaḷiṅu parappi
Virikaṭal viyaṅ tāṅaiyoṭu.”³

Here the fighting quality of the elephant is described.

1. The elephant with a trunk that knows no defeat.
2. The elephant shouting like thunder.
3. The elephant with feet that crush that heads of the enemies.
4. The elephant with tusks that attack the gates of fortresses.
5. The elephant with great fury.

1. Jivaka; v. 3088

2. Jivaka; v. 2918., Porunar; 11. 14-15.

3. Maturai; 11. 177-180.

But Naccinārkkīṇiyar interprets the first attribute, as occurring for the last thing i.e. 'the army of soliders'. Elattōḷ tānai—He says that it means the soldiers with shoulders that know no defeat. It is not clear why Naccinārkkīṇiyar does not want this attribute to go to the elephant. In fact, elsewhere he himself admits the great fighting quality of the elephant.¹

The real difficulty is that there is no literary usage justifying the use of the word *tol* in the sense of the trunk of the elephant though a connected word 'kai' or hand is usually found in that sense. This should not however lead us to invent a construction unknown to Tamil where an attribute of a noun like 'tānai', is made to go before a conjunctive participle like 'parappi'; and where the place of that attribute itself seems to suggest a pattern. A commentator in fairness states that the phrase is inexplicable or suggest an emendation 'eḷākkōḷ' might have been the original reading for 'ta' and 'ka' were liable to be compounded in manuscript writing, 'eḷakkōḷ' will mean with a conviction of conscience or determination not withdrawn. But in fairness to Naccinārkkīṇiyar it must be said that he had no such reading available.

9.4.5. *The attribute of the part as the attribute of the whole*

Sometimes an attribute occurring with the whole is interpreted as applicable to the part not mentioned and Naccinārkkīṇiyar explains such occurrences.

'Paiṅkoḷi' (green creeper)²

as 'the creeper with green leaves'. The attribute 'Pai' (green) does not go to the creeper occurring as such, but to the 'leaf' not described but understood. The attribute of the leaf (part) stands for the creeper (whole) according to Naccinārkkīṇiyar. This need not be taken as any variety of construction but as an instance of the application of the attribute of the part of the whole itself because as already explained under the varieties of subjects and predicates the quality and action of the part can be transferred to the whole. Even otherwise this will be a case of transferred epithet in rhetoric.

9.4.6. *An idiom (a) attribute with a latent and not patent significance*

There is also another subtle point described by Naccinārkkīṇiyar with reference to the attributes qualifying nouns. The mouths of beautiful women are described.

1. Jīvaka; v. 806.

2. Muruku; 1. 190.

“In kaṇi-t-toṇṭaiyan tuvar vāy”¹

The mouth as beautiful as ‘Kovvai fruit’. Here the word kaṇi (fruit) preceding another word ‘toṇṭai’ meaning itself a fruit is not understandable. So Naccinārkkiniyar says that ‘kaṇi’ (fruit) is not an attribute for the part “fruit” but a natural attribute for the whole; the toṇṭai creeper. “in kaṇi-toṇṭai” occurring as it were on its name where ‘toṇṭai’ need not mean any particular fruit it has, but only refers to the general character of this creeper being capable of bearing fruits. It means “the kovvai creeper with fruits”. So there are three stages.

1. the kovvai creeper with the inherent nature of bearing fruits-kaṇi-t-toṇṭai.
 2. ‘kovvai creeper’ here stands for fruits.
 3. kovvai fruit like mouth.
- toṇṭai vāy (toṇṭai here the constituent i.e. fruit).

9.4.7. *The attributes merely suggestive of the pun*

‘cīr taṅku cempoṛ koṭi
Mallikai mālai cōrṇṭu”²

Here cempoṛ koṭi (golden creeper) is a translation of the proper name Kaṇaka patākai and Mālai is another proper noun. Both are names of women who go together.

This suggests a sleṣa alaṅkāra or an interesting punning when apart from the coupling of the names, there can be an implied simile itself. ‘Cīrtaṅku’, (“in whom resides unique greatness”) is applicable to both the person who bears the name Kaṇak apatākai and golden creeper to whom she can be compared. It is not something natural to the creeper. Mallikai which occurs as the epithet for Mālai is applicable both to the proper name and the garland, the other meaning in the pun. Therefore the commentator states it is appropriate to the meaning garland. It may be that the woman with the name Mālai was adorned with mallikai as Dr. Swaminatha Iyer points out in the footnote of the verse, or that she was not. That is not important.

9.4.8 *Idiom (b) Attribute and Head as a common noun*

There are places where the attributes— occurring as such have no special significance.

1. Jivaka; v. 2107.
2. Jivaka; v. 881.

‘Naru meṇ kamaḷ tār’.¹

The garland with great fragrance. ‘Naruṃ’ means ‘fragrance’ and ‘kamaḷ’ also means the same thing. To employ two attributes seems to be unnecessary. Nacciṇārkkiniyar says that ‘kamaḷ tār’ occurs as a common noun for the garland where therefore kamaḷ + tār should not be separated and interrupted. To this inseparable unit the attribute ‘naruṃ’ is added.

9.4.9. *Relative Participle + Noun as Attribute and Head*

There might be some confusion regarding the relative participle constructions. ‘Naṭanta Cāttaṇ’—(Cāttaṇ who walked). Here there is no confusion. Tolkāppiyar mentions eight kinds of relative participle constructions.² The commentators explain them still further and mention, wherever necessary, kind of relative participle construction, as mentioned by Tolkāppiyar. Nacciṇārkkiniyar, wherever there is a confusion, instead of affecting to be very grammatical, quoting Tolkāppiyam for this purpose, usual points out similar usages of relative participles and compares them. It is clear he considers that usage gains precedence over grammar.

9.4.10 *Cause and effect construction*

The poet describes the desert as ‘a dry expanse with fire eaten coal’. ‘Venta kari’ means ‘the fire eaten charcoal.’ Here it is not like ‘uṇṭa Cāttaṇ’ (Cāttaṇ who ate)—where ‘uṇṭa’ is the action of Cāttaṇ. Here ‘Venta’ (meaning ‘fire-eaten’, according to Nacciṇārkkiniyar) is not the action of the coal but of the fire. He says it is like the well-known phrase ‘uṇṭa eccil’ (eaten left-overs). Here, the ‘eccil’ is formed because of eating. ‘Eating’ is the cause and the ‘eccil’ is the result. In the same way, because of fire the coal was formed. The fire that ate (spread) is the cause and the charcoal is its effect. Nacciṇārkkiniyar says this type of participle construction comes under Tolkāppiyar’s classification of ‘karuvi’. He makes this distinction at other places also.⁴

There is another description of the desert in Ciṇupāṇārrippaṭai.
‘Pālai niṇṇa pālai neṭu vaḷi’⁵

1. Jīvaka; v. 1516.

2. Tol. Col; s. 236.

3. Kali; v. 13:2.

4. Kali; v. 90:23. Jīvaka; v. 332.

5. Ciṇupāṇ; l. 11.

It means—"the desert way with the qualities of a desert"—Here the desert quality is the cause and the desert is the effect. Naccinārkkiniyar does not quote 'uṅṭa eccil' to explain this, but says it is like 'āru ceṅṅa viyar'. (Way crossed sweet; the sweet caused by crossing the distance).¹ Cēṅṅavaraiyar says it (sweet) is the object (ceyappaṭu-poru).² Anyhow it is clear that both the constructions 'venta kari' and uṅṭa eccil, though they belong to the same cause and effect construction, are different from each other, as Naccinārkkiniyar explains them quoting different usages. In the first case, the action of the fire operates on the other to effect the change of turning the wood into charcoal, whereas in āru ceṅṅa viyar, the action of the man viz., going, causes perspiration in himself. So the innate quality of pālai causes the manifestation of the outward signs of a desert.

9.4.11. *Effect and cause construction*

The war camp is described in Pattuppāṭṭu "aracu iruntu paṅikkum.. pācarai."³ The war camp that causes the trembling of the foes. Paṅittal-trembling. Naccinārkkiniyar says it is like "nōy tīru maruntu",⁴ 'The disease curing medicines'. The cure of the disease is the effect and the medicine is the cause. So also trembling of the foes is effect and war camp is the cause. Naccinārkkiniyar therefore holds that "paṅikkum pācarai" is like 'nōy tīru maruntu'. Cēṅṅavaraiyar classifies this under 'karuvi'.⁵

9.5. *Concordance or Agreement*

9.5.1. *Tiṅṅai, pāl, eṅ, iṅam*

Words in Tamil are divided into superior category words (or human) and non-superior category words (or inferior category words or non-human). This distinction is called 'tiṅṅai'. The superior category may be singular or plural. The singular under the superior category is either masculine or feminine. No such distinction is made grammatically in the plural of the superior. The non-superior category is divided into the singular and the plural. Here there is no distinction of gender in this category. This distinction into the masculine and feminine, epicene, neuter singular and neuter plural are called the five-fold 'pāl' distinction. All these in a sense relate to the third person though according to Tolkāppiyam the first person

1. Tol. Col; s. 236. p. 263.

2. Tol. Col. Cēṅṅā; s. 234.

3. Mullai; l. 79.

4. Kali; v. 60: 18.

5. Tol. Col. Cēṅṅā; s. 234.

belongs to the superior category.¹ In addition we have the first person and second person words. Each one of these is subdivided into the singular and the plural. The person is known in Tamil as 'iṭam' and the grammatical number is called 'eṇ'.

9.5.2. *Valānilai, vaḷu, vaḷuvamaiti*

In the Tamil subject predicate construction, the subject and predicate must agree in respect of *tiṇai pāl*, *eṇ*, and *iṭam*. The Tamil grammarians have recognised certain idiomatic usages where there is no such agreement. Agreement in all respects is called 'valānilai' (the grammatical usage), violation of grammatical usage (*Valu*) and *vaḷuvamaiti* is idiomatic usage.²

Avan vantān—valā nilai.

Avan vantāḷ—vaḷu.

Cāttaṇum pacuvum vantār—vaḷuvamaiti.

In English it is so in respect of number mainly. "A singular nominative expression is joined only with a singular finite verb expression and a plural nominative expression only with a plural finite verb expression."³ In Tamil as the subject often shows *tiṇai* etc., the reference to *tiṇai* etc., in the predicate is more a cross reference rather than concord.

9.5.3. *Akṛiṇai viravuppeyar*

The general rule that the singular noun should have singular predicate and the plural, plural predicate is there in Tamil, but with reference to *akṛiṇai* nouns (inferior category), there is no cross reference in a majority of cases. Its number is to be known only through the predicates.

1. Maram valarntatu — tree grows — singular.

2. Maram valarntaṇa — tree(s) grow — plural.

Tolkāppiyar calls this noun "akṛiṇai iyaṇpeyar" (a noun common to both singular and plural in *akṛiṇai*).⁴

9.5.4. *Cāti orumai (species—singular)*

Naccinārkkiniyar introduces another distinction *cāti orumai* and *cāti-p-paṇmai* which is known to other commentators all over India.

1. Tol. Col; s. 164, 204, 205.

2. Tol. Col. Cēṅā; s. 11

3. Language; p. 190.

4. Tol. Col. s. 171.

“Pollāmai itu”¹

Here ‘pollāmai’ refers to all the bad things, but the predicate is ‘itu’ (this) which is singular. As the word ‘pollāmai’ is singular, though it might be referring to many things, the singular predicate is employed. ‘Pollāmai’ is cāti orumai according to Naccinārkkiniyar. ‘Pollāmai’ is an abstract noun, but in this context it refers to concrete acts but all taken as coming under one head or class. Cāti orumai is something common to all belonging to a particular class name in singular. Similarly he mentions ‘pōkam’ as a class name referring to all the various pleasures of life.² The transitoriness of wealth and body is referred to in the singular form elsewhere also,³ because transitoriness as a class is singular. All these are referred to as cāti orumai by Naccinārkkiniyar.

9.5.5. Cati-p-paṇmai (more than one species)

It has been said that an akṛiṇai noun is generally common to both singular and plural. But when it takes the suffix ‘kaḷ’, it denotes the plural. Apart from the predicate and the ‘kaḷ’ suffix there may be lexical ways as different from grammatical means to show the number. When the class name is mentioned it may refer to the common class name for the whole genus or it may refer to the species. There may be cāti orumai when only one species is intended and cāti-p-paṇmai then all the species i.e. more than one species are intended. This is a logical distinction; akṛiṇai iyaṅpeyar is a grammatical conception where in Tamil the akṛiṇai nouns stand for both the singular and plural.

‘People’ refers to the citizens of a country, and peoples refers to the populations of different countries.

Arici naṇṇu — the rice is good — cāti orumai.

Aricikaḷ nallaṇa — the rices are good — cāti-p-paṇmai

The ‘arici’ refers to a particular variety of rice, but ‘aricikaḷ’, the different varieties of the same.⁴

In Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi when the poet says “peṇkaḷ” (women) Naccinārkkiniyar takes it as cāti-p-paṇmai.⁵ If the word ‘peṇ’ has

1. Jīvaka; v. 717.

2. Jīvaka; v. 206.

3. Jīvaka; v. 213.

4. An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics; pp. 145-146.

5. Jīvaka; v. 901.

occurred it might refer to women only, but the addition of 'kaḷ' (plural suffix) refers to the different kinds of women.

Sometimes even without the addition of the plural suffix, the *cāti orumai* (species-singular) will refer to the *cāti-p-paṇmai* (species-plural).

“Pal uṇavu”.¹

Here instead of 'kaḷ' (plural suffix), the plural attribute 'pal' is added, and it means varieties of dishes and so this *uṇavu* is referred to as *cāti-p-paṇmai* as it has to be interpreted as a plural because of 'pal'.

This classification of *cāti-orumai* and *cāti-p-paṇmai* is similar to the mass noun singular and plural in English. “The singular of a mass noun, in the simplest case, refers to some quantity, usually undefined and frequently not countable, of some substance. The plural of a mass noun usually refers to a number of kinds or species of the substance e.g. beauties of poetry”.²

9.5.6. Cross reference-number

In poetry sometimes it is likely that there is disagreement in number in respect of the subject and predicate. *Naccinārkkiniyar*, at such places, with his great skill as a literary critic, is able to bring about the correct cross reference. *Jivakan* meets *Nantaṭṭan* after a long time and he becomes sentimental and therefore eloquent over the values of brotherhood.

“Oṇ poruḷ āvatu aiyā uṭaṇ piṇappu ākkalākā”³

Here *uṭaṇ piṇappu* (co-birth) i.e. being brothers and sisters. It is an abstract noun though in form a verbal noun. It is here in the singular because it refers as a concrete word to the only brother who is addressed in this speech. ‘*Ākkalākā*’ (not to be made) is a plural predicate. Here there is disagreement in number in respect of subject and predicate. *Naccinārkkiniyar* instead of considering *ākkalākā* as a predicate of *uṭaṇ piṇappu*, makes it an attribute of *oṇporuḷ* (precious thing).

‘*ākkalākā oṇporuḷ uṭaṇ piṇappu*’

1. *Perumpāṇ;* 1. 246.

2. *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics;* pp. 145-146.

3. *Jivaka;* v. 1760.

“that which cannot be made precious thing co-birth”. ‘ākā’ can be either a finite verb or an infinite verb in the sense of relative participle giving negative meaning. Naccinārkkiniyar considers it as the latter one, and reconciles the disagreement in number. But it is doubtful whether the peyar eccam (relative participle) can ever come after its own head. It is possible to interpret uṭaṅ piṟappu as cāti-p-paṅmai as referring to worthy brothers, worthless brothers and so on. The implication is that “even a worthless brother cannot be made to order.” “If so how impossible the attainment of a worthy brother like you”.

9.5.7. Cross reference (Tiṅai and number)

The subject and predicate should agree with each other in respect of tiṅai, pāl, eṇ and iṭam, as we saw earlier. There are places in literature where they do not agree and Naccinārkkiniyar, by his magic touch, relieves such passages of such seeming lapses.

Jivakaṅ renounces the world. The poet describes it as under.

Nāma vēl narapati nikki naṅkalam
Tāmamār mālaiyum tuṟakkiṅṟāṅarō
Kāmaṅṟār kalaṅ kalikkiṅṟa tottatē.¹

Jivakaṅ renounces jewels and garlands. It is like Maṅmata relieving himself of the jewels. Here it occurs like this:

‘Tuṟakkiṅṟāṅ ottatu’.

The subject and predicate do not agree with each other in respect of tiṅai and pāl. The comparison and the thing compared also do not agree.

Tuṟakkiṅṟāṅ — upamēyam — uyartiṅai masculine.
Kalikkiṅṟatu — upamāṅam — akriṅai singular.

Here the thing compared is Jivakaṅ and the word referring to him i.e. tuṟakkiṅṟāṅ is a noun (superior category). The comparison is a word i.e. Kalikkiṅṟatu referring to the action and it belongs to akriṅai (inferior category). So the simile looks absurd. The comparison between Jivakaṅ and Maṅmataṅ is appropriate. So Naccinārkkiniyar says that tuṟakkiṅṟāṅ refers only to the way Jivakaṅ renounces (i.e. tuṟakkiṅṟamai) the jewels and garlands, which is like the way Maṅmata relieves himself of the jewels. This actually

1. Jivaka; v. 3027.

saves the passage from a grammatical lapse and the poet owes it to the critic. But 'atu' is a demonstrative pronoun like 'that' and this (atu) can be understood after tuṛakkiṇṇāṇ.

9.5.8. Cross reference tiṇai, number-ambiguous

There are places where even Nacciṇṇārkkīṇiyar feels helpless to effect reconciliation. Tolkāppiyar himself has mentioned some of the sanctions for such violation and Nacciṇṇārkkīṇiyar simply refers to them.

Tollai nālvakai-t-tōḷarum tūmaṇi neṭuntēr
Mallal tampiyum māmaṇum matuviri kamaḷtār
Celvaṇ tātaiyum ceḷu nakaroṭu vaḷa nāṭum
Vallaī-t-tokkatu vaḷaṅkeḷu kōyiluḷ oruṅkē.¹

Here it occurs as:

Tōḷarum, tampium, māmaṇum
ūrum, nāṭum tokkatu

It means: 'friends, brother, uncle, father, the town and the country all collected together'. Here friends, brother, uncle and father belong to uyartiṇai (superior category) and the town and the country akṇiṇai (inferior category). The superior and inferior categories coming together become the subject and have the predicate of the inferior category (tokkatu-assembled).

Tolkāppiyar has mentioned that if the superior and inferior categories come together they have to have a predicate and as it can be only either the predicate of the 'superior' or the predicate of the inferior, it is better to employ the predicate of the inferior category.² Nacciṇṇārkkīṇiyar refers to the sanction of Tolkāppiyam in the passage quoted above.

But there is another disagreement here and Nacciṇṇārkkīṇiyar has not quoted any sanction. That is, the superior and inferior both have the singular predicate (tokkatu-assembled) of the inferior category, where the things mentioned are many. Nacciṇṇārkkīṇiyar simply says that it is 'orumai paṇmai mayakkam' (singular plural confusion). Probably the singular is used to denote the action of all these occurring automatically overpowered by the greatness of Jīva-kaṇ as though all these were only one thing.

1. Jīvaka; v. 2360.

2. Tol. Col; s. 51.

9.6. *Change of order of words in poetry*

Naccinārkkiniyar is often blamed by the scholars for his wrenching away words and phrases from the places of their occurrence to distant places in the same verse or other. There are many reasons for his peculiar method of syntax as understood from his commentary as we have noted already. In prose the traditional and natural order of words is the following:

Subject + object + predicate.

9.6.1. *Ordinary and literary usages*

In poetry, restriction in the order is impossible, as it has to conform to the system of sound and metre as well as to syntax. Tolkāppiyar mentions places where the syntax of poetry does not agree with ordinary usage in prose and this he does with a thorough understanding of the morphology and syntax of the Tamil Language. Some of them are the following:

	<i>Ordinary usage</i>		<i>Literary usage</i>
Form.	1. avviru	—	āyiru ¹
	2. pala cila	—	palāañcilāam. ²
	3. vēṭkai avā.	—	vēṇavā. ³
	4. poṟ paṭai.	—	polampaṭai. ⁴
	<i>Ordinary usage</i>		<i>Literary usage</i>
order.	1. Centāmarai (as against veṇṭāmarai)	—	Ceññāyiru (where there is no veṇ ñāyiru). ⁵
	2. Payir nalla āyina	—	majai peytamaiyāl payir nalla āyina. ⁶
	3. ceñkāl nārai	—	kāl cen nārai. ⁷
	4. demonstrative succeeds a noun	—	demonstrative precedes a noun. ⁸

1. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 208.

2. Ibid; s. 213.

3. Ibid; s. 288.

4. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 356.

5. Tol. Col; s. 18.

6. Ibid; ss. 21, 22.

7. Tol. Col; s. 26.

8. Ibid; ss. 38, 39.

5. 'therefore' succeeds the basis statement — 'therefore' precedes also.¹
6. The superior and inferior categories take the predicate of the inferior category — they may take a predicate of the superior category.²

9.6.2. *Classification of syntax in poetry*

Tolkāppiyar has classified the syntax of poetry under four heads and calls them "moḷi puṇar iyaḷpu".³

- | | |
|----------------|---------------|
| 1. Niral niṟai | 3. Aṭimarai |
| 2. Cuṇṇam | 4. Moḷimāṟṟu. |

He has fairly systemised the first three and those he could not bring under them, has brought under 'moḷimāṟṟu'

9.6.3. *Āṟṟoḷukku (the natural order)*

The author of Naṇṇūḷ has mentioned many more forms of syntax and what he could not classify, he too has brought them under 'koṇṭu kūṭṭu'.⁴ The first among his classes is āṟṟoḷukku, "the most natural order of words which clearly brings out the meaning". Nacciṇārkkiniyar, in many places, follows this natural order of syntax, known as āṟṟoḷukku.⁵ Sometimes he has to dislodge the words and phrases in verses mainly to arrange them in accordance with the traditional natural order. This proper arrangement for clarity is known as 'anvayam' (prose order).

Inversion in poetry

Nacciṇārkkiniyar's arrangement

1. ārtta vaḷai, kaṭukina ivuḷi — Vaḷai ārtta, ivuḷi kaṭukina.⁶

P S P S

2. kāvalaṇ ḑttināṇ mātavara pātam — kāvalaṇ mātavara pātam ḑttināṇ.⁷

S P O S O P

1. Tol. Col; s. 40.

2. Ibid; s. 51.

3. Tol. Col; ss. 404-409.

4. Naṇṇūḷ; s. 411.

5. Jīvaka; vv. 2528, 2581, 2619, 2620, 2641, 2856, etc. Kali; vv. 135: 6-8, 135: 9-11; 115:7, etc.

6. Jīvaka; v. 1850.

7. Ibid; v. 2892.

3. Palavuṭaṅ peruti nī muṅṅiya — nī muṅṅiya viṅai peruti.¹
 viṅai P S O S O P
 (S: Subject. P: Predicate. O: Object)

9.6.4. *Niralniṅai*

Niralniṅai is another kind of syntax in verse where the subjects are mentioned seriatim and then their corresponding predicates are also thus listed.² The intention is that the words in the one group and the words in the second should be taken together respectively in the order mentioned. In many places the commentator engages himself in putting the subjects and predicates together and later explains the meaning. But in some places there is chiasmus where the words in the first group and those in the second should be taken in the reverse order. For instance:

“Naṅ māṅikkam naku tāli
 Pēṅi nallār kaḷuttaṅintu”³

Here the action of the women putting on the jewels is described. There are two subjects, ‘māṅikkam’ and ‘tāli’ and normally in the order of predicates that occur, it should be ‘māṅikkam pēṅi’ and ‘tāli aṅintu’ i.e. protect the emerald by keeping it in its place and putting on the ‘tāli’ (the sacred thread indicating the married state). *Naccinārkkiniyar* finds a natural difficulty in explaining this as such. *Tāli* is a thing that is worn by women all the time and it cannot be removed at one’s will. So to say that ‘tāli is put on’ looks absurd. He therefore sees a chiasmus and interprets that ‘māṅikkam aṅintu’ and ‘tāli pēṅi’.

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Predicate</i>
Māṅikkam	aṅintu
Tāli	pēṅi.

The *tāli* is protected by being kept in its place and the emerald is put on. This type of syntax is called by grammarians as ‘*mayakka niralniṅai*’ i.e. chiasmus.⁴

9.6.5. *Moḷimārru and māṭṭu*

There are other kinds of syntax mentioned by *Tolkāppiyar* and we have discussed them earlier.⁵ *Naccinārkkiniyar* follows the

1. *Muruku*: 11. 64-66.

2. *Tol. Col*; s. 405.

3. *Jīvaka*; v, 2697.

4. *Tol. Col*; s. 405, p. 383.

5. *Supra*; 9.1,6 to 9.1,9.
pp. 270-271.

second type of syntax 'māṭṭu' for the proper arrangement of attributes and their heads. For instance: The poet describes the groves in Pukār city. 'Tāḷ kā' refers to the grove and occurs in line 53 in Paṭṭiṇa-p-pālai. What happened therein is described in lines 53 to 58. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar takes the verbs in these lines as adjectives qualifying the noun 'tāḷkā' or grove. Ordinarily the description precedes and does not follow the noun it qualifies. The verse describes the various beauty spots in Pukār and therefore all the nouns like grove have to be added on to the word 'Paṭṭiṇam'. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar therefore exploits 'māṭṭu' to his advantage and brings all the descriptions together in lines 53-58 to qualify the noun 'tāḷkā' in line 53. Thus he also takes all the nouns in various places in the poem as adjectives to qualify 'Paṭṭiṇam' the head word occurring at the end.

9.6.6. *Displacement of the order*

"To emphasise the topic".

(1) *For emphasis*: There are places where Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar voluntarily violates the order. Vilāci and Alaṅkāramālai, two maids, dress up their heroine Ilakkaṇai. Here in the verse, Ilakkaṇai, the object, occurs in the middle and the subjects Vilāci and Alaṅkāramālai initially and the predicate 'dress up' at the last.¹ But Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar changes the natural order while explaining thus:

Naṅkaiyai-t-tōḷiyar alaṅkarittaṇar.
O S P

The reason for this change is interesting to investigate. Here Ilakkaṇai is being dressed up by the maids. The syntax is changed for a specific purpose. Here the maids are not so important as Ilakkaṇai, the heroine, who is the main character there. The object Ilakkaṇai is therefore more important than the subject, the maids. This is the reason why he changes the order of words and this achieves a literary quality. This change of Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar indicates that if the object is more important than the subject it can precede the subject. According to him 'naṅkaiyai' is the topic and 'tōḷiyar alaṅkarittaṇar' forms the remark about the topic.

(2) *To emphasise the logical order-cause and effect*

In Tamil the cause is usually mentioned earlier and the effect later. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, wherever this order is violated in poetry, puts-them back in the natural order and explains the passage. For

1. Jīvaka; v. 2435.

example Kāri, a kind of bird, hovers around the cows and this is an ill-omen. The cowherds, seeing this, give warning to their kinsmen. They ask them to protect the cows:

“Kāniṭai iṅa nirai kāval pōrruṁiṅ
 Āniṭai aḷitta puḷ enṅu kūriṅār”¹

Here the order of cause and effect is changed. ‘Protect the cows in the forest’ — this is effect. The cause is the hovering around of kāri. Naccinārkkiniyar changes this to clarify the natural logical sequence: the cause and effect - order.

1. the hovering of kāri — cause.
2. protecting the cows — effect.

But in some places and certainly here it is evident that the effect is more important than the cause. Here the mention of ill-omen is not as important as what one has to do to avert what is portended by the ill-omen. Naccinārkkiniyar's conventional method of interpretation appears to be prosaic in this instance, when we compare this with his interpretation elsewhere.

(3) *To avoid irrelevance of similes*

If the words are interpreted in the order of their occurrence, sometimes the comparison and the thing compared in a simile may not agree with each other. In such places Naccinārkkiniyar changes the order and explains the meaning. Toṭṭaimāṅ Iṅantiraiyaṅ entertains the musicians and gives away golden flowers for their women. It is described as under:—

“Miṅ pūttāṅṅa vāṅ kalam parappi
 Maka muṅrai maka muṅrai nōkki mukaṅ amarntu
 Āṅā viruppiṅ tāṅ niṅṅu ūṭṭi”.

“Maṅkul vāṅattu-t-tiṅkaḷ ēykkum
 Āṭu vaṅtimirā aḷal avir tāmarai
 Niṅṅirum pittai poliya-c-cūṭṭi”.²

Two things are described here.

1. The musicians are served food on silver plates.
2. The golden lotuses are put on their tresses of hair.

Like the stars in the sky the silver plates are spread. The golden lotuses are compared to the moon, if interpreted in the order the

1. Jivaka; v. 1849.

2. Perumpāṅ; 11. 477-482.

words occur. But Nacciṅārkkīyār does not interpret the lines in this way. He changes the order of words and says that the silver plates are like the moon and his order is this,

Maṅkul vāṅattu
Mīṅ pūttanna vāṅkalam
Tiṅkaḷ ēykkum vāṅkalam

According to him the small silver plates are like the stars and the big ones are like the moon. He feels that the fancy gold lotuses, which he thinks must be red, cannot be compared to the moon which he thinks must be white. The gold is also yellow and the moon rising from the sea is not white. The golden lotus in the dark tresses are appropriately compared to the rising moon amidst clouds. Therefore he changes the order as shown above. But in all these cases, the question is whether even poetic exigencies will allow such alterations, can 'tiṅkaḷ ēykkum', if a peyar eccam (relative participle) take a leap to the front.

(4) *To conform to history*

Pattupāṭṭu, besides being literature, is a source of history. Karikālaṅ, Neṭuñceḷiyaṅ, Iṅantiraiyaṅ Naliyakkōṭaṅ Naṅṅaṅ, etc. are some of the kings mentioned in this work. Some of the references to their activities and history are found in Puṛaṅāṅūru also. The similarity of ideas in all these works, to some extent, show their authenticity. So Nacciṅārkkīyār wherever he finds that there might be historical contradictions in the narrative if a passage is interpreted in the order of words as occurring in poetry as such, changes them to conform to the historical facts known to him.

"Piṛantu tavaḷ kaṛṛataṛroṭṭu-c-ciṛanta naṅ
Nāṭu cekīṅ koṇṭu nāṭoṛum vaḷarppa"¹

Here the story of Karikālaṅ is narrated. If interpreted as it stands it means that Karikālaṅ was shouldering the responsibility of protecting the interests of his country, ever since he was born and learnt to crawl. But this is wrong from the current traditional history. Karikālaṅ did not rule the country from his childhood as he had a difficult and trying formative period when he was a boy. He was imprisoned by his enemies and he escaped from prison, defeated them all and secured his kingdom.² But the direct meaning of these lines is

1. Porunar; 11. 137-138.

2. Paṭṭiṅam; 11. 220-227.

in contradiction with those historical facts known to the commentator. So he says that since he was born and brought up, he was increasing in valour and strength.

Tavaḷ kaṟṟataṟṟoṭṭu (Por. 1. 137)

Mīḷi moympiṅṅ miku vali cerukki (Por. 1. 140)

Here Naccinārkkiniyar's syntax relieves the poem from the contradiction to history.

But unless one is sure of the history one should not take liberties with the natural order found in the poem. There is a view as we have mentioned in the first chapter, that Tirumāvaḷavan of Paṭṭinappālai is different from the Karikāḷaṅ of Porunarāruppaṭai, again there are scholars who hold that there were more than one Karikāḷaṅ.¹ But Naccinārkkiniyar's position is clear. It is one of the canons of criticism that a poem has to be interpreted so as to fit with the facts known about the period of history when it was written.

1. Karikāḷar mūvar; pp. 77-81.

CHAPTER - 10

SEMANTIC CHANGES

10. 1. *Words and their meanings*

10.1.1. *All words have meanings*

Semantics is the branch of linguistics that deals with the meanings of words. In Tolkāppiyam we find that the grammar of words and their meanings are discussed together. According to our grammarians, all words have meanings. Even the acainilai, expletive or pseud words, if one may use that term, are linked to full words as they are and in that way significant; in that they are restricted in their use, sometimes with reference to the person etc. the icainirai (expletive used to fill a gap in the metre) by completing the melody of words in poems, refer to their meanings because rhythm is one of the important aspects of the meaning of poetry suggested by symbolism of sound and meaning. Turning to phrases like 'muyaṅkōṭu' (hare's horn), though such objects do not exist, they occur as the subjects of 'illai' ('do not exist') and therefore they refer to imaginary things. Reference to an imaginary thing is also a meaning, according to Naccinārkkiniyar.¹

10.1.2. *The way in which words convey their meanings*

As we study the way in which words convey their meanings, we understand two things classified by Tolkāppiyar: (a) the words refer to their meanings, (b) the words refer to themselves.²

10.1.3. *Words referring to their meanings*

1. Cāttan̄ vantān̄ (Cāttan̄ came) — Here the first is a noun and the second, a verb.
2. Paṅṭu kāṭu maṅ (This was indeed a forest in old times) — Here the particle 'maṅ' emphasises the past tense.
3. Uṅu kāl (The strong wind) — Here 'uṅu' an uriccol, becomes one with the following noun, kāl, The Tamil

1. Tol. Col; s. 157

2. Tol. Col; 158.

grammarians divide the words into these four categories viz., noun, verb, particles or morphemes other than roots and uricol which is variously interpreted but which according to Teyvaccilaiyār are the root morphemes (similar to Sanskrit 'dātu').¹

10.1.4. *Words referring to their forms*

The words referring to their forms and not to their respective meanings are :

1. Ceyteṅ eccam (ceytu form of participle)
2. Tañca-k-kiḷavi (the word tañcam)
3. Ceyken kiḷavi (Ceyku form of verb)

10.1.5. *Classification of meaning*

The words, we are further told, convey their meanings in two ways and therefore the meaning is divided into two.²

1. Explicit meaning of the words.
2. Implicit or suggestive meaning of the words.

According to Pavaṇanti muṇivar, we must use words in the same way and in the same meanings as sanctioned and used by scholars, and this is called marapu or convention.³ But this convention itself is changing like every human institution through the passage of time and in the context of changing circumstances. Especially in poetry, the author creates new possibilities for the language. This change is also sanctioned by Tamil grammarians.⁴ It is from this point of view that the commentary of Naccinārkkiniyar will be studied in this chapter.

10.2. *Changes of meaning*

10-2.1. *The subjective for the objective*

The things can be classified as (1) Subjective and (2) Objective. The subjective things, according to Tolkāppiyar, are not visible to the naked eyes. They can be realised by the mind only,⁵ whereas

1. Tol. Col; Teyva; s. 292.

2. Tol. Col; s. 159.

3. Naṅṅūl; s. 388.

4. Tol. Col; s. 452; Naṅṅūl; s- 462.

5. Tol. Poruḷ. Iḷam; s. 243.

the objective things are seen with the eyes or perceived by direct contact with our physical senses. Sometimes subjective things can have objective references also, as stated in Nacciṅārkkīyār's commentary.

'Tuṇi' means 'to determine'. The mind seized with the problem of good and bad, at last takes a decision.¹ As this is the activity and nature of the mind, it is subjective. In literature it is used to refer to an objective state. The turbid water, after some confusion, settles down to a condition of mud at the bottom and clear water on the top. This clear water is called,

'Tuṇi nīr'.²

The subjective state of 'Tuṇital' is used to refer to an objective condition of clear water. Nacciṅārkkīyār reveals this meaning 'Tejintanīr' (clear water) by which we are able to arrive at this point of subjective for the objective. 'Tuṇi katir' also means clear light, as interpreted by Nacciṅārkkīyār.³

But it may be argued that the concrete or the objective has been applied to the subjective operation. Tuṇi means here (1) clarified stage (2) the mental process also; there are two stages—one, where there is merely an awareness of an object when the person does not know what it really is. This is considered to be the operation of mind (maṇam), then succeeds what is called determinate knowledge as a result of the operation of reason (buddhi). Here the object is perceived with its special characteristics when there is clear perception of the thing. These two stages might have been named 'Kalakam' and 'tuṇital', the words once used with reference to muddy water and clear water etc. Then this would be an example for the objective in sight used for the subjective. Therefore it is better to give another an unambiguous, example.

Uḷḷam is something inside—a mind. After it had signified a mind or a heart, it must be taken as referring to something subjective whatever its origin might be. Then this word denoting something subjective suffers another shift where it denotes the middle part of a road as the heart of the road. There is a line in Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi.

'Vīti uḷḷam kalittu'.⁴

It is interpreted by Nacciṅārkkīyār as meaning,

1. Kuṟaḷ; v. 467.
2. Maturai; 1. 283.
3. Jīvaka; v. 170.
4. Jīvaka; v. 2129.

“going in the middle of the street”.

uḷam—middle, and the middle of the street is an objective idea.

10.2.2 *Objective for the subjective*

We understand from Naccinārkkiniyar’s commentary that there are places where the objective things refer to the subjective things. If there is a thing which has eluded us for long and at last we are able to get hold of it, it is called ‘kaippaṭuttal’. The hero’s clandestine activity of visiting other women, one day becomes an open affair, when the heroine sees with her own eyes what he has been covering up so long. The heroine refers to it at that time.

‘Kaippaṭuttēṇ’.¹

Naccinārkkiniyar interprets it as “Now I am convinced in my mind” — ‘Kaippaṭuttēṇ’ an objective word referring to a subjective idea of being convinced. There are also other places where similarly the objective is used for the subjective.

<i>Objective</i>	—	<i>Subjective</i>
1. kaṇṭu (seen)	—	vicārittu (mental enquiry) ²
2. niṛuttu (weighed)	—	ārāyntu (investigating) ³
3. niḷal (shade)	—	aruḷ (grace) ⁴
4. naṭai (walking)	—	muṭai (method) ⁵

10.2.3. *Wearing out of a hyperbole*

For the sake of bringing out the great emotion surging within, sometimes exaggerated statements are made. Mere teasing may be spoken of as ‘killing’. But it is not literally true. In such cases, the hyperbolic expressions have to be taken as being justified only as an expression of the emotion. They cannot be interpreted literally. Sometimes by constant usage, such words develop the meaning which signifies no exaggeration; e.g. ‘kill’ comes to have the meaning of teasing alone. From Naccinārkkiniyar’s commentary we understand some of the words behave like this.

The similarity between the ‘karuṭaṇ’ (white headed kite) and peacock is referred to in literature.

-
1. Kali; v. 98:7.
 2. Jivaka; 1824.
 3. Kali; v. 31:23.
 4. Porunar; l. 149
 5. Jivaka; v. 399.

Añciṛai-k-kalāpa maññai
 aṇaṅkara vaṭṭatēnum
 Añciṛai-k-kaluḷanāku
 māṭciyon rānu miṇṇē¹

“The peacock is capable of getting hold of a snake and making it feel afraid of it, whereas the *karuṭaṇ* is able to create terror in the mind of a snake even when the latter thinks of the former. Here there is a word ‘aṭṭatu’. The root of this word is ‘aṭu’ to kill. Here the peacock is not described as having killed the snake but is shown as making the snake feel afraid of it. ‘aṭu’ is justified because of the emotion engendered in the mind of the snake. It is thus a justified exaggeration for ‘being afraid’.

Nacciṇārkkiniyar also quotes in this connection from *Tirukuṛaḷ* where there is a reference to killing the feeling of gratitude.² Both the killings (in *Jīvaka Cintāmaṇi* and *Tirukuṛaḷ*) are similar according to him. ‘Killing’ is justified here because its cruelty expresses the feeling of the author. ‘kātu’ is also a word meaning destruction but by constant use it has come to mean suffering some defects. So also, words like ‘ceku’. Here is an example for the former in the text and latter in the commentary. “*Uyir cekuttu*” (having killed) is a phrase interpreted by Nacciṇārkkiniyar as ‘having marred the beauty’.³

10.2.4. *Its opposite-an euphemism*

There is the opposite case as well illustrated by Nacciṇārkkiniyar’s commentary. This may be one variety of euphemism. The eyes of women separated from *Jīvakan* are compared to a pair of fish that run about (in a frightened state in troubled waters). Here the poet says:

“Vāṭ kaṅkaḷ pulampi ōṭiṇa”⁴

‘ōṭiṇa’ means (the eyes) ‘ran’, in its normal sense. But Nacciṇārkkiniyar interprets it as ‘eyes suffer’. He quotes from *Ciṛupāṇṇi* tu-p-ṭai:

Ōṭiyatu uṇartalum.⁵

-
1. *Jīvaka*; v. 1405.
 2. *Kuṛaḷ*; v. 110.
 3. *Jīvaka*; v. 168.
 4. *Jīvaka*; v. 2381.
 5. *Ciṛupāṇṇi*; 1. 214.

Here *ōṭiyatu* means suffering and this justifies his explanation. There it is said that *Nalliyakkōṭaṇ*, after realising the sufferings of the musicians gave them shelter and gifts. Here *ōṭiyatu* (running about or wandering) has occurred in the same sense 'suffering'.

There is another instance in *Tirumurukāṟṟuppaṭai* with reference to the victory of Lord Muruka:

“*Avuṇar naivalam aṭaṅka-k-kaviḷ inar*
Mā mutal taṭinta maruvil koṟṟam”¹

Here the mango tree is cut in a way that denied the victory to the 'Asuras'. 'Ataṅka' means to shorten. But here it means 'cut out of existence'. *Naccinārkkiniyar* quotes an usage like this in *Cirupañcamūlam*.²

Another instance. "Arum paṭar neṅcam aḷivoṭu kūmpum".³

"My mind, thinking of the hero, has no thought of itself and suffers" Here "arumpaṭar" means, normally, the thought of itself becoming rarer and rarer. 'Rarer means diminishing of thought—but it does not refer to the complete absence of thought. But *Naccinārkkiniyar* interprets this as meaning 'complete absence of thought'. So 'arum' a word which normally means 'rare' here means complete absence'. Similar usage is seen in *Parimēlaḷakar*'s commentary where 'arumai' (rare) means *iṅmai* (complete absence).⁴ This is therefore a case of euphemism where complete absence is expressed as a rarity.

Another kind of euphemism in Tamil is known as 'iṭakkraṭakkal', ("use or indirect or round about expressions to avoid indecent language").⁵ This can be illustrated by *Naccinārkkiniyar*'s commentary.

“*Nakku nalaṇum iḷantā*”⁶

The heroine lost her charm just after the sexual union. The word 'naku' normally means 'to be happy', but it is interpreted by the commentator as meaning 'the sexual union'.

1. *Muruku*; 11. 59-60

2. *Pattuppāṭṭu*; p. 42

3. *Kali*; v. 130:13.

4. *Kuṟai*, *Pari*; v. 7

5. *Tol. Col. Iḷam*; s. 17., *Nanṇū*; s. 267.

6. *Kali*; v. 146:18.

10.2.5. *General for the specific (Restriction or narrowing)*

The general words that cover many actions or things are interpreted as referring to the specific by Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar. Nakkīrar describes the divine radiance of Lord Murukā.

“ōvaḡa imaikkum cēṅ viḷaṅku avir oḷi”¹

‘Imaikkum oḷi’ is interpreted by Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar as meaning of ‘divine lustre; that makes one to shut one’s eyes. ‘Imaittal’ according to him means ‘closing the eye-lids’. But ‘Imaittal’ normally means ‘the closing and opening of the eye-lids’. The closing and opening of the eye-lids according to the grammarian takes one mātraī time and that process is described as ‘imaittal’.² But Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar contends it means closing the eye-lids. When we see the sun, we close our eyes automatically, because we cannot stand its powerful glare. So also, the divine radiance of Lord Murukā is so dazzling that we have to close our eye-lids, and Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar’s interpretation ascends to poetic heights. The specific part of closing the eyes, in a general process of opening and closing, has been taken by him. He justifies this meaning with reference to “nūtalatu imaiyā nāṭṭam”³ Here ‘imaiyā means that which does not close. The third eye on the forehead of Lord Shiva is referred to here. If Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar means that the word which elsewhere means both closing and opening of the eye-lids, signifies only closing here, it may be taken as a case of restriction.

The word ‘Poṅ’ (general name for metals) refers to the specific metal silver according to Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar in

“Poṅ paṭalikai”⁴

There is another instance for this in his commentary.

“Poruḷ ceyyumē”⁵

Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar interprets this as “The wealth sought after”. ‘Ceyyum’ is a general form of all actions. But Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar uses it in the specific sense of ‘seeking’ which is in conformity with

-
1. Muruku; 1. 3.
 2. Tol. Eḷuttu; s. 7.
 3. Pattuppāṭṭu; p. 33.
 4. Jīvaka; v. 3035.
 5. Jīvaka; v. 1922.

Parimēlaḷakar's commentary of "Ceyka Poruḷai" in Tirukkuḷai.¹ Of course it is said that every specific verb includes the common verb. Here 'cey' has the meaning of acquiring wealth.

10.2.6. *Specific for the general (Expansion or widening)*

Naccinārkkiniyar in his commentaries has sometimes interpreted the specific as giving a general meaning.

Kālam (time) a general thing referring to year, month, week and day, all specific things individually. Tattai is thinking to herself when that time of seeing Jīvaka will come.

"Kaṭ paṭu nāḷ enṇuṇṭām"²

This is the line in the poem. Naccinārkkiniyar says that nāḷ (day) here means 'time' "when will that time of seeing Jīvakaṇ come" is his interpretation. Nāḷ (day-specific) refers to kālam (time in general here).

Nāṭu, normally refers to the Marutam i.e. the agricultural tract only.³ But it occurs as referring to all the four kinds of tract⁴ and this is also a case of using the specific for the general and this usage has almost displaced the older meaning.

Thus the particular verb referring to a particular action undertaken before completing the whole action, is also interpreted as meaning the whole action.

<i>Specific action</i>	<i>General</i>
1. Muṭi tuḷakkiṇāṇ (moved the head)	— Vaṇaṅkiṇāṇ. ⁵ — (bowed)
2. Vēl ceṇṇittitṭāṇ. (put back the javelin in its place.)	— mīṇṭāṇ. ⁶ — (returned from war)
3. Kuṭumi koṇṭāṇ (captured the crowns)	— Verri koṇṭāṇ ⁷ — (achieved victory)

1. Kuḷai; v. 759.

2. Jīvaka; v. 1159.

3. Tol. Poruḷ; s. 2, p. 7. "Kāṭum malaiyum nāṭum Kataṅkaraiyum." Here 'nāṭu' means 'agricultural tract'.

4. Jīvaka; v. 1741.

Malai; 1.68.

5. Jīvaka; v. 2357.

6. Jīvaka; v. 2250.

7. Ibid; v. 2249.

Here, before bowing, one has to move his head, bend it, and raise the hands together—but the preliminary action of moving the head itself refers to bowing. Similarly the next two refer to returning from war and achieving victory respectively in the same fashion.

10.2.7. *The whole for the part*

Sometimes a word does not refer to the whole idea it is intended to convey, but a part of the meaning only.

When Jivakaṅ embraces Ilakkaṅai, the anklets make sound.

Anṛē.....pūcal iṭṭaṅa.¹

Here 'anṛē' means that day. But here the moment of time when Jivakaṅ is communing with Ilakkaṅai is referred to. So Nacciṅ-ārkkīṅiyar interprets this as meaning 'at that particular part of the day'. Though 'anṛē' means the whole day, a part of the day 'that time' is being referred to here:

10.2.8. *The part for the whole*

A word that normally has reference only to the part of a thing sometimes denotes the whole.

Cēṅai-k-kaṭaliṭai-c-celvaṅai-k-kaṅṭuvantu
Ēṅaiyāvarum eṭtturaikkiṅṛār.²

The people when they see Jivakaṅ amidst the sea of people praise him. Here the word that occurs 'ēṅaiyāvarum' means normally 'others also'. But Nacciṅ-ārkkīṅiyar interprets as 'all'. The part here refers to the whole.

10.2.9. *Activity attributed to inactive things*

One may turn to certain figures of speech which had become more or less a literary convention even in the age of Tolkāppiyar which may be brought under implied anthropomorphic metaphors, personifications, transferred epithets, upacara or samadhi. All these are explained here with reference to the verb. Tolkāppiyar has referred to this in his treatise on grammar.

“uṅṭar kuṅiya-v-allāpporuṭai
uṅṭaṅa pōla-k-kūṅalum marapē”

1. Jivaka: v. 2482.

2. Jivaka : v. 2120.

3. Tol. Poruṭ. s. 213.

'The thing that cannot eat is shown as eating and this is a literary tradition'. Naccinārkkiniyar, bearing in mind this convention, has brought out such places in the literary works in conformity with grammar.

For example:

"Taṅkoḷi nittila-t-tāmam cūṭiya
Veṅkaḷi iḷamulai"¹

Here the breasts of women are described. The breasts are shown as wearing the pearl-necklace. The breasts cannot wear of their own accord. It is the women who put on the necklace on the breasts. In this connection Naccinārkkiniyar reminds the readers of this convention and gives another illustration, which was in vogue perhaps during his period (Mulai muṭi cūṭiṟu-'the breasts wore the crown') to prove his point. There are other instances where Naccinārkkiniyar describes this literary convention.

1. The Royal Fans move.²
2. The waist kissed by Mēkalai.³
3. The monastery that wears the mountain.⁴
4. The two hills went.⁵
5. The sleeping tree.⁶

Tolkāppiyar has mentioned another literary convention.

'Vārā marapiṇa vara-k-kūṟuta'⁷

It means that the things that are static are said to move. The illustrations 3 and 4 above may also be classified under this convention.

10.2.10. *An activity not its own attributed to a thing*

This is different from the previous case where what cannot act is described as acting; here an action which is not natural to a thing is attributed to it.

-
1. Jīvaka; v. 94
 2. Ibid; v. 2521
 3. Ibid; v. 2312.
 4. Jīvaka; v. 1786.
 5. Ibid; v. 1181.
 6. Malai; 1. 261.
 7. Tol. Col; s. 422.

“Kalvi cēr māntariṇ iṛaiñci-k-kāyttavē”.¹

Here the growth of the paddy crops is described. Neṛpayir kāyttana^a—kāyttana means ‘bore fruit’, whereas the paddy crops are usually spoken of as ‘viḷaintana’ (produced). So it is obvious here, the poet has used a verb denoting an action different from that which belongs to the paddy crops. Naccinārkkiniyar gives an illustration for this: ‘tāṅu paṭu nel’—The paddy that has a cluster of fruits. Tāru is a cluster of banana fruits and it is not used for paddy. ‘Nel katir’ is the usual phrase. Naccinārkkiniyar refers to such instances in literature.

1. The ghee was so melted that the fire ate it.²
2. The flag that licks the sky.³
3. The fruit delivered by the neruñci.⁴
4. The lightning that bathed in the cloud.⁵

10.2.11. *Another variety of this attribution*

There is another variety of attribution where the action is attributed not to the subject, but to the object in a sentence. For instance:

“Varai uṭutta paḷḷiyiṭam”⁶

It means the monastery that wore the mountain. But the mountain is never worn as a cloth. From the point of the monastery it was explained that wearing a cloth of mountain is attributed to it; but here the other point emphasised is that the mountain is never worn, whereas in figurative usage it is spoken of as being so worn.

We saw earlier attribution of the different action of a thing as against its own native action and that was explained with reference to subject, but here we shall see the same is done with reference to object. For example:

“Nayaṇillān viṇai vāñka”.⁷

It means—‘the minister brought out the action from his mind’. The word ‘vāñka’ is a verb meaning to bring out or to draw out. The

1. Jīvaka; v. 53.
2. Jīvaka; v. 480.
3. Ibid; v. 1866.
4. Jīvaka; v. 341.
5. Ibid; v. 1335.
6. Ibid; v. 1786.
7. Kali; v. 8:1.

action in the mind becomes explicit by its materialisation, but here the minister is said to draw (*vāñka*) the action from his mind. Action in the mind is not anything to be drawn out literally. This is a metaphorical usage. Naccinārkkiniyar describes this convention illustrating another statement like this. 'Virutti vāñka'. There is also another instance for this in his commentary,

'Katir mukanteṇa'.¹

Here 'katir' means 'light' and 'mukattal'—to bale or to draw or to measure out like water. Water is to be drawn, but light is to be seen and not to be drawn. But here the light is said to be drawn and so this is also classified under the convention mentioned above, according to Naccinārkkiniyar.

10.2.12. *The cause for the effect*

There are places in Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary where the word denoting the cause is used in the sense of effect and vice versa. If nouns are used like this they are classified as Kāraṇa ākupeyar and Kāriya ākupeyar respectively. Here the verbs which denote the cause are used for denoting the effect. There is an instance for this in Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary.

'Pōltu uljār tuṅantār'²

Here Naccinārkkiniyar interprets the word 'tuṅantār' (separated) as 'maṅantār' (forgot). Forgetting occurs only during separation. Separation is the cause and forgetting is the effect and so cause denotes the effect here according to Naccinārkkiniyar. Because the separation has already occurred, there is no meaning in repeating it; therefore it has been interpreted as 'he forgot'. Since this will be clear from the context, the poet emphasises the cause even when referring to the effect. Other commentators, in such places, say that 'the cause is used figuratively as the effect' (*kāraṇam kāriyamāka upacarikka-p-paṭṭatu*).³

10.2.13. *The effect for the cause*

This is the opposite of the previous. The verb denoting the effect is used in the sense of cause.

"Viḷai puṇam niḷattaliṅ kējal"⁴

1. Jīvaka; v. 323.

2. Kali; v. 29:14.

3. Kuṟaḷ. Pari; v; 369.

4. Malai. 1. 193.

Here the boars are described as eating the millet crops. Niḷattal is interpreted by Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar as meaning 'eating'. Niḷattal normally means to decrease. Tolkāppiyar says it is 'uḷḷataṅ nuṅṅuk-kam'—the decrease of a thing.¹ So 'eating' is not a direct meaning of 'niḷattal'. But as the boars go on eating, the crops are decreasing. Eating is the cause and the decreasing is the effect. The verb denoting the effect is used to refer to the cause here. So this can be called 'the effect for the cause'. The poet wants to emphasise the destruction caused to the fields by the boars eating away the millet. Therefore, though he has to speak only of the eating, refers to it in terms of the effect caused by the boars i.e. by their eating. That is the feature for this figurative usage. Other commentators call this "the effect is used figurative as the cause" (kāriyam kāraṇamāka upacarikkapp-paṭṭatu).²

10.2.14. *Affirmative for negative*

There are places where the words sometimes refer to the opposite sense or negative meanings.

"aruvi āṅṅa ... malai"³

This Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar interprets as meaning "the hill without falls". *Āṅṅa* naturally means 'full of'. But here the word is given exactly the opposite meaning. There are also other instances for semantic change in the commentary of Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar.

<i>Word</i>	<i>Natural</i>	<i>Negative meaning.</i>
1. niḷal	shade	light. ⁴
2. tiruntu	good	bad. ⁵
3. amai	exist	not to exist. ⁶
4. aḷital	to decay	to multiply. ⁷
5. mēṅāḷ	the previous day	the future day. ⁸
6. uyttal	cause to reach	cause to leave. ⁹

-
1. Tol. Col; s. 330.
 2. Kuṅṅaḷ, Pari; v. 425.
 3. Maturai; 1. 306.
 4. Jīvaka; v. 2672.
 5. Jīvaka; v. 2535.
 6. Ibid, v. 1258;
Kali; v. 82:35.
 7. Jīvaka; v. 1193.
Maturai; 1. 544.
 8. Kali; v. 72:12.
 9. Jīvaka; v. 2481.

10.2.15 *Negative for affirmative*

This is the opposite of the previous. Here the negative gives the affirmative meaning.

“ceyyāy ennum munṅṅilai viṅai-c-col
cey en kiḷavi ākiṅṅ uṭaittē”¹

ceyyāy, a symbolic type of negative verb belonging to the second person, can give the affirmative meaning also. This is Naccinārkkiniyar's interpretation. According to this, the word ‘uṅṅāy’ can give two meanings. 1. Do not eat. 2. Do eat (negative as well as affirmative). Naccinārkkiniyar states that this word, by its suggestive accent, will give the affirmative meaning, the accentual system of which we have discussed elsewhere in this thesis. Sometimes, in lover's talk the words denote their opposite meanings as understood from Kaliṅkattu-p-paraṅi.²

10.2.16. *The place used for the time*

In Tamil, perhaps to start with, time and place were not differentiated. So much so same words may be interpreted as referring to time and place, muṅṅ, piṅṅ, etc. Even time words are interpreted as place words-vantakkāl as vanta iṭattu and vice versa. The locative case itself means not only the locative of place but also the locative of time.³ But in course of time, time and place become distinguished and the peculiar usage developed in Tamil with reference to these has to be examined in terms of semantic development.

Varumē tōḷi naṅ malai nāṅṅ
Vēṅṅkai viriviṅṅam nōḷḷi
Viṅṅkiṅṅai-p-paraṅai-t-tōḷi varaintanaṅ koḷarḷkē⁴

The maid tells the heroine that the hero would come and marry her, as is understood by the blossoming time of the Vēṅṅkai flowers. Here “Vēṅṅkai viriviṅṅam” means literally the place of the blossoming. But it is interpreted as the time of the blossoming tree.

There are a few more examples. The men and women go swimming. Their joyous and happy cry on this occasion is like the cheers of those who churn the sea with the Himalayas as the churningstuff, and Vāsuki as the rope, to extract nectar out of it.

1. Tol. Col.; s. 450.

2. Kaliṅkattupparaṅi; v. 25.

3. Tol. Col; s. 82.

4. Kali; v. 38: 24-26.

“attalai alara munṅṅir kaṭaintavar”¹

Here the poet says ‘attalai’. This literally means ‘at that place’. But Nacciṅṅārkkṅiṅiyar interprets attalai as ‘at that time’ i.e. ‘in those days’. The word denoting the place refers to the time here.

There is another instance. ‘Nuti’ means the front part of an implement. But Nacciṅṅārkkṅiṅiyar interprets the word as meaning just previously.

“Vēṅṅai vantaṅṅna nuti vemparaṅ kāṅam”²

‘The forest with hard stones of very sharp points’. Here ‘nuti’ naturally means sharp point’. But Nacciṅṅārkkṅiṅiyar separates ‘nuti’ from this and states ‘nuti’ means ‘just before’ i.e. ‘before Jīvakaṅ reached the place, Vijaiyai went to the forest’. Here also the word denoting the place (nuti) refers to the time. Nacciṅṅārkkṅiṅiyar illustrates this point quoting from Tiruṅṅṅṅampalakkōvaiyār where the same word ‘nuti’ occurs in the sense of time.

10.2.17. *The place for the thing in the place*

The name referring to the place sometimes is interpreted as meaning the thing in that place.

“Kōtai cintaiyṅ nṅṅṅiṅāṅē”³

The meaning of this passage as explained by Nacciṅṅārkkṅiṅiyar is that Tattai had a long mental suffering. ‘Cintai’ normally means ‘mind’. But according to Nacciṅṅārkkṅiṅiyar it denotes the activity of the mind, ‘the long suffering’. This shift in meaning has become so well established that ‘cintai’ means painful contemplation. The Tamil scholars call such occurrences as ‘Iṅṅavāku peyar’.

10.2.18. *A thing in a place for its abstract quality*

There are places where the thing in the place refers to its characteristic feature of the greatness by its very being there.

“Tilaka veṅ kuṅai”⁴

Nacciṅṅārkkṅiṅiyar interprets this as meaning ‘the great Royal umbrella’. ‘Tilakam’ is stretched to give the meaning ‘great’. Tilakam

1. Jīvaka; v. 963.
2. Jīvaka; v. 1933.
3. Jīvaka; v. 1701.
4. Jīvaka; v. 183.

is that which is put on the forehead, an important and conspicuous part in a human body. What occurs in a great place is also great, and hence Nacciṅārkkiniyar interprets this word 'tilakam' as 'great'. This is an implied metaphor. There is a distinction between ākupeyar and uvamai in Tolkāppiyam. The second relates to the shifts based on similarity where as the first denotes all other shifts which may be roughly stated to be on the basis of contiguity. Unfortunately this important distinction was lost sight of and people began to speak of 'uvama ākupeyar'. One will be tempted to call the 'tilakam' as poruḷ ākupeyar but it is really uvama ākupeyar, the common part of comparison is the height of glory.

10.3. Grammatical Changes

10.3.1. Exclusive and inclusive First person

'Yān' is the first person singular noun and 'yām' and 'nām' are the first person plural. "First person denoting the speaker alone should always be in the singular only. When it occurs as plural it has to include the second person or the third person or both together."¹ Tolkāppiyar has laid down the verb suffixes for the first person plural and the commentators have analysed them thoroughly with reference to their inclusiveness.²

The grammarians have clearly analysed the usage of 'yām' and 'nām' with reference to their inclusiveness till the nineteenth century. Nām and nānkaḷ are two words in common currency. Nām includes the second person or the second and third together. The real point is whether the first person plural includes the person spoken to i.e. the second person or not. 'Nānkaḷ' is used as an exclusive first person not including the second person, but sometimes including the third person with the speaker. But there should have been a time when nām and nānkaḷ could have been used in the same sense. 'Kaḷ' is a plural suffix for 'nām' in addition to the plural sense of the word (nām) denoted by the final 'm'.³ But today nām and nānkaḷ, differ as words and in their meanings with reference to their inclusiveness.

From a study of Nacciṅārkkiniyar, we are able to distinguish between yām and nām. The maid addresses the heroine,

1. Tol Col; Cēṅā; s. 202.

2. Tol. Col. Iḷam; s. 199.,
Tol. Col. Cēṅā; 202.,
Tol. Col; s. 204.

3. Jivaka; v. 1762.

“Teriyilāy nīyum niṅ kēḷum puṇara
 Varaiyurai teyvam uvappa uvantu
 kuravai taḷii yām āṭa-k-kuravaiyuṭ
 koṇṭu nilai pāṭi-k-kāṇ”,¹

“you sing the song for kuravai dance, so that you and your husband can join together, the God of the mountain be pleased and we (yām), happy as we are, will dance the kuravai”. Here the maid says “we (yām) will dance the kuravai”, yām means “she (maid) and the other girls, excluding the heroine (the second person)” and so Naccinārkkīṇiyar says that this ‘yām’ (I person plural pronoun) includes the ‘āyam’ (the other girls), the third person. The real point is not the inclusion so much as the exclusion. So it is clear that ‘yām’ was used once, including only the third person, excluding the person spoken to.

From the above investigation we can understand that the other word ‘nām’ includes the second person. We can prove this by illustrating a passage from Kalittokai where

1. the hero, when addressing the heroine, says ‘nām’.²
2. the heroine while addressing the maid, says ‘nām’.³

So yām is used as the first person exclusive plural pronoun excluding the second person and including the third person and nām is used as the first person inclusive plural pronoun including the second person and also the third person if necessary. Dr. P.S.S. Sastri would appear to be wrong in saying that there is no such difference between yām and nām.⁴

10.3.2. *Third person used for the other persons*

There are instances in the commentry of Naccinārkkīṇiyar where the third person is used for the first or second person. But it should be noted that the first and second personal pronouns are not used in the sense of third person. We can classify the third personal pronoun that occurs in the sense of first person as “first personal third person” (“taṅmai-p-paṭarkkai”) and the third person occurring in the sense of “second personal third person” (“muṇṇillai-p-paṭarkkai”). Naccinārkkīṇiyar refers to the latter at many places.

1. Kali; v. 39:26-29.

2. Kali. v. 93:11.

3. Ibid; v. 60:26.

4. Tol. Col. with an English commentary; s, 162, p. 149.

10.3.3. *Tanmai-p-paṭarkkai* (first personal third person)

The daughter of the cowherds says that she would definitely marry the hero, come what may.

Perrattār kavvai eṭuppa atu peritu

Uṟṟiyāḷ āyar makaḷ.¹

She says that “āyar makaḷ”, the daughter of the cowherd, would never feel afraid of the gossip in the town with reference to her love affair with the hero. She, referring to her own-self, first person, uses the third person “āyarmakaḷ” — “the daughter of the cowherds”. *Āyarmakaḷ*, the third personal subject is interpreted by *Naccinārkkiniyār* as ‘I’, first personal subject and *uṟṟiyāḷ*, third personal predicate as (I) would never feel,” first personal predicate. *Naccinārkkiniyār*’s commentary explains such usages. This is a usage still met with even in colloquial speech. What will be merely personal statement when the first person is used assumes the validity of a general statement where the act is taken as something natural of the noun replacing the first person. Here ‘āyar makaḷ’ implies that it is true of all āyar makaḷ or of the unique daughter of the shepherds.

10.3.4. *Munnilai-p-paṭarkkai* (second personal third person)

There are places in literary works where the second person also occurs in the third person. In other words the third person is used in the sense of second person.

“empiyai iṅku-p-perṟēṅ”.²

It means “I have got (you), my brother’ as interpreted by *Naccinārkkiniyār*. Here ‘empi’ (my brother) is the third person used in the second personal sense, as explained by *Naccinārkkiniyār*. The brother is there, and the speech is addressed to him. Instead of using the word ‘you’, the third person also raises the statement to a universal level from the merely personal level. Here the third personal word occurring in the first personal sense, shows some self-conscious greatness, but the third person used in the second personal sense, shows a high form of respect. This is understood from the common usage of these words,

1. ‘Ivar yārukkuṁ aṅcamāṭṭār’.
‘This person (referring to one’s own self)

1. Kali; v. 104: 67-68.

2. Jivaka; v. 1760.

is not afraid of anybody' — self-conscious greatness.

2. Tañkaḷukku vēṇṭuvatu yātu?

What is required by him?

Tañkaḷukku — refers to the second person here — a high form of respect.

The distinction is understood from the examples above mentioned. This case of third person for the second person has gained an important place in Tamil akam poetry. Such kinds of statements are called 'muṇṇilai-p-puṛa moḷi'.¹ The hero will be outside the house of the heroine. The companion of the heroine and the heroine will be conversing between themselves as though 'unaware of the hero's presence but with the intention of the hero's hearing this conversation. This gives an opportunity to express certain thoughts which they may not express in conversation with the hero addressing him in the second person.² This use of the third person for the second person has therefore poetic advantages as well.

10.3.5 First person in the third personal verbs

'Tarutal' (to give) and 'varutal' (to come) occur with reference to first and second persons, koṭuttal' (to give), and cellutal' (to go) occur with reference to third person — according to Tolkāppiyar.³ This restriction did not hold good in the post-Tolkāppiyam period where these words violate their prescribed boundary and Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar describes all these changes. There are certain other changes which have occurred with reference to the use of certain verbs.

The verbs 'koṭuttal' and 'cellutal' designated for the third person occur in the first personal sense.

"Vēṛu vēṛu uyarṇta mutu vāy okkal
Cāṛu ayar mūtūr ceṇṇu tokkāṇku"⁴

"The people belonging to various classes came here and settled down in this old town". 'Here' i. e. in this town' (i. e. where I am) is first person and 'ceṇṇu' (having gone) is third person as the predicate of 'okkal', the relatives. 'Gone here' is a wrong construction and so Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar interprets this word 'ceṇṇu'(gone) as 'vantu' (come). According to him 'ceṇṇu' the third personal verb occurs here in the first personal sense i. e. 'vantu' — 'having come' (and settled here).

1. Tol, Poruḷ s. 167.

2. Kali; v. 22, Kuṅuntokai; v. 47.

3. Tol. Col; ss. 29, 30.

4. Paṭṭiṇam; 11. 214-215, p. 551.

10.3.6 *Third person in the first and second*

The other two verbs 'tarutaḷ' and 'varutaḷ' designated for first person occur with reference to the third personal sense.

"Pāṇar uvappa-k-kaḷiru pala tarii"¹

Here it means that the king gave many elephants to the musicians so that they would feel happy. Here the verb used is 'tarutaḷ', a verb belonging to the first and second persons (i. e. their object will be first or second person) to be used as:

Eṇakku-t-tantāṇ — he gave me.

Niṇakku-t-tantāṇ — he gave you.

But 'tarii', the first or second personal verb is used in the sense of third person as it occurs as "Pāṇarkku-t-tantāṇ" and Pāṇar is the third person.

10.3.7. *Reconciliation with Tolkāppiyam sūtram*

Tolkāppiyar, on the basis of the currency of these words at his time, must have prescribed the rules, but if they violate his rules it could have happened only after his time. But it is strange that Tolkāppiyam is quoted to justify these changes. Tolkāppiyar has stated that all the four words occur in three persons and then specified their place of occurrence.² It is not that he has prescribed that all of them can occur in any of the three persons, because, if so, he need not have specified the restriction in the succeeding sūtrams. Instead of trying to speak of these altered usages as being prescribed by Tolkāppiyar, these must be explained as changes which have occurred in their meaning and usage in the post-Tolkāppiyam period.

10.3.8. *Non-ergative for the ergative*

There are places where the non-ergative verbs occur in the sense of ergative verbs. The fertile Emāṅkata country is described. 'As the coconut fruit fell and in its wake the honey comb in the kamuku flowers broke the petals and flowed the mangoes and banana got scattered all over'. Here the words 'kīri', 'pōḷntu', 'citaṇi', and 'cintum' are used and all of them are non-ergative verbs.³ But Naccinārkkiniyar says that they can be interpreted as ergative verbs also. The coconut fruit broke the honey comb, scattered the mangoes and so on. In the first interpretation 'kīrutaḷ', 'pōḷitaḷ' 'citaṇaḷ'.

1. Maturai; 1. 219.

2. Tol. Col; ss. 28-30.

3. Jivaka; v. 31.

etc. are all non-ergative and in the second interpretation they occur in the sense of ergatives. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar quotes another word in this connection from Tirucciṅampala-k-kōvaiyār where the word 'viṅṅu' meaning to blow, a non-ergative, occurs as meaning 'to make the other blowing' in the ergative sense.¹

10.3.9. *The ergative for the non-ergative*

There is another place where Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar gives non-ergative meaning for an ergative verb. The kings who are defeated in the yāl competition and failed to get the hand of Tattai, address Jivakan and say "you, being a merchant, do not know how to do business." The passage is this:

: 'vāṅikam oṅṅum tēṅṅāy'"²

Here the word that occurs meaning 'do not know' is 'tēṅṅāy'. Tēṅṅāy is the non-ergative and tēṅṅāy, the ergative. But here tēṅṅāy is used in the non-ergative sense. There is no sanction for this grammatically, but in literature such occurrences are common and Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar holds perhaps that literary usage has precedence over grammar. In this connection he quotes from Puṅṅāṅūṅu, 'tēṅṅāy peruma poyyē'"³ and justifies his interpretation. These may be looked upon as changes in grammatical usage, but they are treated here as changes in meaning which they are.

10.3.10 *Another change*

There is another grammatical change which can also be dealt with under Semantic change. The word ending in Kaḷ occurs, according to Tolkāppiyar, in akṅṅai,⁴ but this has changed in later times. 'Kaḷ' has come to occur even in the uyartiṅai plural. When we take the whole word into consideration there is a semantic change: For instance: The word 'Kuḷavi' meaning child (superior category) occurs with 'kaḷ' suffix as 'kuḷavikaḷ' meaning 'children', as against Tolkāppiyar.⁵ But Tolkāppiyar has sanctioned this kind of change in meaning and it shows his broad outlook. His sūtram is this:

"kaṅṅi col illai-k-kālattu-p-paṅṅē'"⁶

It means 'one cannot avoid words which become current'. Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar refers to this rule and justifies this semantic change.

1. Tirukkōvaiyār; v. 24.
2. Jivaka; v. 770.
3. Puṅṅam; v. 59.
4. Tol. Col; s. 171.
5. Jivaka; v. 2834.
6. Tol. Col; s. 452.

10.3.11. *Ceyyum — as viyaṅkōḷ*

The word *ceyyum* has also thus changed its meaning. *Nacciṅārkkiniyar* interprets the meaning of the 'ceyyum forms' in a way that delights an aesthetic critic as well as a grammarian. King *Caccantaṅ* tells *Kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṅ*,

“*Vaiyam icai paṭa-k-kāttal vēṅṭum*”¹

It means, 'be you the king and protect the country.' Here the word 'vēṅṭum' is *viyaṅkōḷ* (verb of the potential mood) according to *Nacciṅārkkiniyar*. The *viyaṅkōḷ* is of two kinds (1) *ēval kaṅṅiya viyaṅkōḷ*, (2) *ēval kaṅṅāta viyaṅkōḷ*. Here he calls this as *ēval kaṅṅiya viyaṅkōḷ* and quotes a similar usage in *Puraṅāṅūru* — “*Vāḷtal Vēṅṭum ivaṅ varainta vaikal*”². We have seen elsewhere the difference between these two varieties.³

10.3.12. *Ceyyum — as second person plural*

In *Kalittokai*, the early part of summer is described. Here the word used is 'koḷḷum' (please have them').⁴ *Nacciṅārkkiniyar* holds this 'ceyyum' as second personal plural and quotes his commentary on a *sūtram* in *Tolkāppiyam* where he says that 'um' can refer to second personal plural.⁵ But this is reading too much into *Tolkāppiyam*. This is really a change in meaning which had come into currency at a later time. *Nacciṅārkkiniyar* has however noted the change in the meaning. But the next question is whether this change had occurred in the age of *Kalittokai*. In the particular example given, it is possible to interpret the word as an *ēval kaṅṅiya viyaṅkōḷ* as he has interpreted *vēṅṭum*.

1. *Jīvaka*; v. 201.

2. *Puraṅam*; v. 367.

3. *Supra*: 6.3.2.

4. *Kali*: 32, 16-17.

5. *Tol. Colr* s. 226, p. 237.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A Course in Modern Linguistics* — Charles F. Hockett, The Macmillan Company, New York (1959).
- A History of Tamil Literature* — C. Jesudasan and Hephzibah Jesudasan, Y. M. C. A. Publishing House, Calcutta-16. First edition (1961).
- Aiṅkurunūru* — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society,¹ Madras (1961).
- Akanānūru* — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1961).
- An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics* — H. A. Gleason, Jr. — Henry Holt and Company, New York (1958).
- An Introduction to the Study of Literature* — William Henry Hudson-George G. Harrap & Co., Ltd., London (1954).
- Bhārathiyār Kavithaikal* — Subramaniya Bharathi — Srimakal Company III Edition (1962).
- Cāṣaṇa-t-tamiḷ-k-kavi Caritam* — Rev. Sahib — M. Ragavaiyengar — Second edition (1958).
- Cilappatikāram - Iḷaṅkōvaṭikaḷ* — Pakaneri T. V. I. Tamil Cankam² Publication, (1942).
- Cirupāṇār rupaṭai* -- Nattattanār — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattuppāṭṭu - Fourth Edition (1950).
- Essentials of English Grammar* — Otto Jespersen — London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., (1954).
- History of the Tamil Language* — V. G. Suryanarayana Sastriar (1927).
- Iḷakkiya-k-kalai* — A. S. Gnanasambandan — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1960).

1. S. I. S. S. W. P. Society — The South India Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society.

2. T. V. I. Tamil Caṅkam — Taṅa Vaisya Iḷaiṅar Caṅkam.

- Ilakkiya-t-tiṛan* — Dr. M. Varadarajan, Tayakam Publication (1959).
- Tamiḻ Ilakkiyavaralāru* — T. V. Sadasiva Pandaratthar — Annamalai University Publication (1963).
- Iraiyānār Kaḻaviyal* — K. Namasivaya Mudaliar — Edition — C. N. N. & Sons., Madras (1943).
- Jivaka Cintāmaṇi* — Tiruttakka Tevar — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's sixth edition.
- Jivaka Cintāmaṇi āraycci* — Avvai S. Doraiswami Pillai — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1943).
- Kaliṅkattu-p-paraṇi* — Jayaṅkoṅṭār — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1961).
- Kalittokai* — Pakaneri T. V. I. Tamil Cankam Publication (1938).
- Kalittokai-c-corpoḻivukaḻ* — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1940).
- Kamparāmāyaṇam* — Cuntarakāṅṭam — V. M. Gopalakrishnamachariyar Edition, Madras (1963).
- Kantaralaṅkāram* — Arunagirinathar, Vaṭakkuppaṭṭu, T. Subramaiya Pillai's Edition (1926).
- Karikālar mūvar* — V. S. Subramania achariyar — Avvainulakam, Madras, First Edition (1958).
- Kuṛiṅci-p-pāṭṭu* — *Kaḻilar* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattup-pāṭṭu — Fourth Edition (1950).
- Kuruntokai* — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1961).
- Language* — Leonard Bloomfield — Published by Sundarlal Jain, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi-6 (1963).
- Malaiṇṇaḻkaṅṭam* — *Peruṅkaucikaṅṭar* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattup-pāṭṭu Fourth Edition (1950).
- Maturai-k-kāṅci* — *Maṅkuṭi Marutaṅṭar* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattu-p-pāṭṭu Fourth Edition (1950).
- Moḻi nūl* — Dr. M. Varadarajan — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras. Revised Edition (1958).
- Mullai-p-pāṭṭu* — *Nappūtanār* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pāṭṭu-p-pattu Fourth Edition (1950).
- Mullai-p-pāṭṭu* — *Āraycciyurai* — *Maṛaimalai Aṭikaḻ* — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1958).
- Naccinārkkiniyar* — M. Annamalai — Tolkaḻpiyar Nulakam, Chidambaram — Second Edition (1963).

- Nālaṭiyār* — V. M. Gopalakrishnamachariyar's Edition (1946).
- Naṅṅūl* — *Arumuga Navalār's Edition* — Chidambaram (1957).
- Neṭṭunalvāṭai* — *Nakkīrar* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattu-p-pāṭṭu, Fourth Edition (1950).
- Pala molī* — *Munruṟai Araiyaṅār* — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1963).
- Paṭṭiṇa-p-pālai* — *Uruttiraṅkaṅṅaṅār* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattu-p-pāṭṭu Fourth Edition (1950).
- Pattu-p-pāṭṭu* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Fourth Edition (1950).
- Pattu-p-pāṭṭu-c-corpoḷivukaḷ* — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1957).
- Perumbāṅārṟruppaṭai* — *Uruttiraṅkaṅṅaṅār* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattu-p-pāṭṭu Fourth Edition (1950).
- Poetry and the Ordinary Reader* — M. R. Ridley — London, G. Bell and Sons Ltd., (1930).
- Porunarāṟruppaṭai* — *Muṭattāma-k-kaṅṅiyār* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattu-p-pāṭṭu, Fourth Edition (1950).
- Puṟaṅṅūṟu* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Edition.
- Some Principles of Literary Criticism* — C. T. Winchester.
- Tamil Lexicon* — Madras University Publication (1926).
- Taṅṅi Alaṅkāram* — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras, Second Edition (1943).
- The Discovery of Poetry* — P. H. B. Lyon.
- The Tamil concept of Love in Ahattiṅai* — Dr. V. SP. Manickam, S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1962).
- The Theory of Speech and Language* — Sir. Alan. Gardiner — Clarendon Press, Oxford, Second Edition (1951).
- Tirukkuraḷ* — *Tiruaḷḷuvar* — with Parimelalakar's Commentary S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras — Sixth Edition (1948).
- Tiru-k-kōvaiyār* — *Māṅikkavācakar* — Arumuga Navalār, Chidambaram Edition.
- Tirumurukūṟruppaṭai* — *Nakkīrar* — Dr. U. V. Swaminatha Aiyar's Pattu-p-pāṭṭu, Fourth Edition (1950).

- Tiruvācakam* — *Mānikkavācakar* — Tiruppanantal Kasi Mutt Edition (1950).
- Tolkāppiya āraycci* — C. Ilakkuvanar — Valluvar Patippakam, Pudukkotai (1961).
- Tolkāppiya-c-cūttira virutti* — Civananasuvamikal — Arumuga Navalar, Chidambaram, Fourth Edition.
- Tolkāppiyam Collatikāram* — *Cēnāvaraiyar Commentary* — Arumuga Navalar, Chidambaram, Second Edition (1934).
- Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram. Iḷampūraṇar Commentary* — K. Namasivaya Mudaliar, Madras-Edition (1927).
- Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram. Naccinārkkiniyar Commentary* — Tanjore Sarasvathi Mahal Publication (1962).
- Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram. Teyvaccilaiyār Commentary* — Karantai-tamil — Cankam — Edition (1929).
- Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram with an English Commentary* by Dr. P. S. Subramanya Sastri — Annamalai University Publication (1945).
- Tolkāppiyam* — *Eluttatikāram. Iḷampūraṇar Commentary* — Published by V. O. Chidambaram Pillai, Tuttukkuti (1941).
- Tolkāppiyam* — *Eluttatikāram. Naccinārkkiniyar Commentary* — Edited by C. Ganesa Aiyar, Ceylon (1937).
- Tolkāppiyam* — *Poruḷatikāram. English Translation* by E. S. Varadaraja Iyer — Published by the Annamalai University (1948).
- Tolkāppiyam* — *Poruḷatikāram. Iḷampūraṇar Commentary* — S. I. S. S. W. P. Society, Madras (1956).
- Tolkāppiyam* — *Poruḷatikāram, Naccinārkkiniyar commentary* — Edited by C. Ganesa Aiyar, Ceylon (1948).
- Tolkāppiyam* — *Poruḷatikāram, Pērāciriyaṅ Commentary*, Edited by C. Ganesa Aiyar, Ceylon (1943).
- Tolkāppiyam* — *Poruḷpaḷalam, Meyppāṭṭiyal* — Dr. S. Somasundara Bharathi Commentary, First Edition (1942).
- T. P. M. Maṇivilā malar* — *Kalaikkatir*, Coimbatore Publication (1961),

