

Volume XIX

Part II

ANNALS OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS



1964

NOTICE

Subscriptions, books for review, exchanges etc.
may be sent to

M. MARIAPPA BHAT,
Editor-in-chief.

UNIVERSITY BUILDINGS,
MADRAS-5.

© University of Madras, 1964.

ANNALS

25-38

OF

ORIENTAL RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

Editor-in-chief

Prof. M. MARIAPPA BHAT

Editorial Board

DR. M. VARADARAJAN

DR. S. K. NAYAR

DR. S. SHANKAR RAJU NAIDU

DR. V. RAGHAVAN

SRI MOHAMMAD YOUSUF KOKAN



Annals of Oriental Research

EDITORIAL BOARD

PROF. M. MARIAPPA BHAT (Editor-in-Chief)	<i>Head of the Dept. of Kannada</i>
DR. M. VARADARAJAN	„ <i>Tamil</i>
DR. S. K. NAYAR	„ <i>Malayalam</i>
DR. V. RAGHAVAN	„ <i>Sanskrit</i>
SRI S. SHANKAR RAJU NAIDU	„ <i>Hindi</i>
SRI MOHAMMAD YOUSUF KOKAN	„ <i>Arabic</i> <i>Persian and Urdu</i>

Published by the University of Madras
Twice a Year

Annual Subscription : Rs. Four

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Tamil	
Adjectives in Tamil—Old & New <i>Prof. M. Varadarajan</i>	1— 8
Tiruvalluvartham Daiva Kolgai <i>By Sri B. R. Purushothama Naidu</i>	1— 40
The Date of Tolkappiyam <i>By Dr. M. Rajamanikkam</i>	1— 17
Nepaliyil Tamil— <i>By Sri N. Sanjeevi</i>	1— 15
Indian Words in English Dictionary <i>By Prof. A. Chidambaranatha Chettiar, M.A., Ph.D.</i>	1— 11
Telugu	
Neti Andhra Nataka Rangasamasya <i>By Sri S. Ramakrishna Sastry, M.A., B.O.L.</i>	379—426
Kannada	
Sabdamanidarpana <i>By Dr. A. Shanker Kedilaya, M.A., B.T., Ph.D.</i>	40— 55
Malayalam	
Lilātilakam <i>By Dr. K. N. Ezhuthachan</i>	1— 10
Sanskrit	
Samkarashakanda Bhashyam <i>By Sri S. Subramania Sastry</i>	81—160
Hindi	
Towards Modern Indian Phonology <i>By Dr. S. Shankar Raju Naidu</i>	1—12
Hindi Upanyas-ki Vyaktivadi aur Samajikdharayen <i>By Dr. S. N. Ganesan</i>	1— 12
Urdu	
Hafiz Ahamed Khan <i>By Afzal-UL-Ulama Mohammed Yousuf Khokan Umari, M.A.,</i>	1— 19
National Trends in Urdu Literature <i>By Sri Hyder Ali Khan, M.A., L.T.</i>	1— 21
Reviews	
Philosophy of Tiruvalluvar <i>By Prof. T. P. Meenakshisundaram</i>	1— 9 61—106
Silappathikaram <i>By Prof. A. Chidambaranatha Chettiar, M.A., Ph.D.,</i>	1— 57

LIST OF EXCHANGES

ENGLISH

1. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona*
2. *The Journal of Sri Venkateswar Oriental Institute, Tirupati*
3. *The Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda*
4. *The Journal of the Uttar Pradesh Historical Society, Lucknow*
5. *The Journal of Oriental Research, Madras*
6. *The Journal of the Madras University, Madras*
7. *The Journal of the Osmania University, Hyderabad (Deccan)*
8. *The Journal of the Gauhati University, Gauhati (Assam)*
9. *The Journal of the Bombay University, Bombay*
10. *Half-yearly Journal of the Mysore University, Mysore*
11. *Bulletin of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras*
12. *Tamil Culture, Madras*
13. *The Vikram, Vikram University, Ujjain*
14. *Indian Philosophy and Culture*
15. *Brahma Vidya, Advaita Sabha, Kumbhakonam*
16. *Journal of the Karnatak University, Dharwar*

TAMIL

17. *Tamil Pozhil*

TELUGU

18. *Andhra Sahitya Parishat Patrika, Kakinada, East Godavary Dt.*

KANNADA

19. *Kannada Sahitya Parishat Patrika, Chamarajpet, Bangalore-18.*
20. *Prabuddha Karnataka, University of Mysore, Mysore.*

MALAYALAM

21. *The S. P. Traimasikam*

HINDI

22. *The Nagari Pracharini Sabha Journal, Benares*

ADJECTIVES IN TAMIL - OLD AND NEW

PROF. M. VARADARAJAN

1. Tolkappiyānar, the earliest grammarian in Tamil (3rd century B.C.) gives two forms of relative participles, viz., *ceyta* and *ceyyum* (past tense and non-past respectively).¹ The later grammarians² add to them *ceykiṅṛa* or *ceykiṛa* of the present tense, which is evidently a later development in the language.

The relative participles of the past tense are formed by adding the suffix 'a' to the tense marker affixed to the verb roots (*ceytu + a > ceyta*; *āṭi + a > āṭiya*). In the same manner, the relative participles of the present tense are formed by suffixing 'a' to the present tense marker affixed to the verb roots (*cey + kiṅṛu + a > ceykiṅṛa*; *cey + kiṛu + a > ceykiṛa*).

2. Though this suffix 'a' plays such an important part in the formation of these relative participles, it is not found in the relative participles of the future tense.³ *Ceyyum* is the form of the relative participle of this tense. Besides functioning as the relative participle, it is also the finite verb of the third person masculine singular, feminine singular, neuter singular and neuter plural of the future tense. It has no suffix denoting person, gender or number as in the case of other finite verbs. The suffix 'um' in this form is only a future tense marker. Absence of the personal suffix enables it to serve two purposes, viz., that of the finite verb and the relative participle of the future tense.

These are the participles used in old Tamil as 'noun-qualifiers' syntactically in attributive construction with nouns which they precede.

1. Tolkappiyam, Collatikaram, 234.

2. Nāṅṅūl, 340.

3. It is in Kannada, one of the four major Dravidian Languages that we find the suffix 'a' added to the tense marker in the verbs of the future tense, e.g., *geyva*, *baruva*, *umba* (equivalent to Tamil *ceyyum*, *varum* and *unnum*).

3. But the roots of these relative participles are only verb-roots, not adjective roots. This led some linguists like Jules Bloch to arrive at the conclusion that Tamil has no adjectives proper. As Dr. Kamil Zvelebil points out in his learned article 'The Existence of Adverbs in Tamil', this opinion is incorrect.⁴ Tamil has true adjectives and they are frequently used in old Tamil as well as in modern Tamil, though there are some new trends in the development of adjectives in modern Tamil.

4. The suffix 'a' in the modern adjectives, *nalla*, *periya*, etc., has been used on the analogy of the relative participles *ceyta*, *āṭiya*, etc. This analogical formation seems to have taken place by the end of the Sangam period in the history of Tamil (i.e., 2nd century A.D.) or after that period. There are very few adjectives with this suffix 'a' in the eight anthologies and the ten idylls of that period, but the relative participles with this suffix are found to be numerous.

5. In ancient Tamil, adjectives are found to be in their root-forms or stem-forms, e.g., *nal*, *peru*, *pēr*, *ciṟu*, *ce*, *kār*, *karu*. There are some forms in which we find the suffix 'a' added to these roots or stems but investigation show that they are not adjectives but only nouns with the morpheme 'a' signifying third person neuter plural.

Let us take for our investigation here three ancient works in Tamil, viz., *Puranānūru*, *Naṟṟiṇai* and *Ainkurunūru*, anthologies of the first century or second century A.D. and *Tirukkural* written a little later or about the same time. In the 400 stanzas in *Puranānūru* there are only three adjectives, *ariya*, *iniya* and *uṭaiya* with this suffix 'a'; in the 400 stanzas of *Naṟṟiṇai* there is only one adjective of this type viz., *ariya*; the other words look like adjectives but they are all neuter plural nouns with the pronominal suffix 'a' agreeing with the nouns which they precede in number and gender.

4. Tamil Culture, Madras, Vol. VIII No. 1.

5. The definition of adjectives by M. B. Emeneau is acceptable: "An adjective is a word that syntactically is in attributive construction with a noun which it precedes, but that does not agree with the noun in gender or number". Kolami, p. 31.

There is one instance of the occurrence of such an adjective in Ainkurunuru viz., ceyya vāy⁶ (red mouth).

The former part of 'cīriya curukkam' in Tirukkuraḷ is generally taken to be the adjective with suffix 'a'. But there is no reason why one should not consider it as a noun of the neuter plural with the person marker 'a'. Placed before the plural 'curukkam' (adversities), it qualifies and agrees with it in gender and number. In Tamil the singular form of the neuter noun stands for the plural also with zero morpheme.⁶ Hence the neuter noun following may be taken either as singular or plural.

mīcāiya koṅrai⁹ (plural) - the koṅrai trees on the top

mīcāiyatu āṭu¹⁰ (singular) - the wild goat on the top

Here the number is denoted by the qualifier, not by the qualified. The preceding words are nouns with the pronominal suffixes 'a' for the neuter plural and 'tu' for the neuter singular. In the same manner, the qualifying nouns in the following cases should not be mistaken for the adjectives with the suffix 'a'.

aruviya malai¹¹ —the mountain with waterfalls

kōṭṭa kēlai¹² —the hogs with tusks

malara marutam¹³ —the marutam trees with blossoms

nuṅṅiya nūl¹⁴ —the books with subtle ideas.

6. Aīṅkuruṅūru, 255: There is one stanza in Aīṅkuruṅūru (293) in which the word māṭciya is used as adjective and placed before the singular noun maṭantai (māṭciya maṭantai-lady with excellent beauty). It is so rare an exception that it suggests some correct reading in the text itself; 'māṭciyai maṭantai' - (you young lady with excellent beauty) might have been the correct reading. If that be so, it solves the problem and make this agree with the paradigm of the neuter plural nouns with the pronominal suffix 'a' and then it is no more an exception.

7. Tirukkuraḷ, 963.

. Tolkaṭṭiyam, Collatikāram, 17.

9. Aīṅkuruṅūru, 430.

10. Ibid 287.

11. Ibid 228.

12. Ibid 264

13. Ibid 75

14. Tirukkuraḷ, 373.

6. On the analogy of the relative participles referred to above, the formation of the derived adjectives *nalla*, *periya*, etc. have increased in number in modern Tamil and these have replaced the old adjectives in stem-form, *nal*, *peru*, etc. So much so, the adjective-stems are not used as qualifiers in modern Tamil, except in the case of some compounds which, on account of frequent usage, have come to be treated like single words, e.g., *māru pēccu* (reply), *ciru piḷḷai* (small boy), *nal vaḷi* (good path), *perum pāṭu* (great suffering), *peru vayiru* (big belly), *iḷa nīr* (tender coconut), *vaṭa kilakku* (north east), *ten mēрку* (south west), *kiltteru* (east street), *mēḷkārru* (west wind).

7. So far, the influence of the analogy of the relative participles with the suffix 'a' has been considered. Now let us scrutinise the formation of adjectives on the analogy of the other relative participle i.e., the participle with the suffix 'um'. The significance of the suffix 'um' is different from that of 'a'. The significance of 'a' whether used in the relative participles or in the adjectives, is the same, as both kinds of words are used in attributive connection with the nouns following. In the case of the suffix 'um' in the participle of the *ceyyum*-form, it is quite different. It is a tense marker, and hence it has no place in adjectives. It is for this reason that this wrong formation has been resisted for a long time and segmentation of adjective-compounds has been done in the following manner:—

perumpukal (great fame) — *peru + pukal*, not as
per + um + pukal

karuṅkal (black stone)—*karu + kal*, not as *kar + um + kal*

peruntalai (big head) — *peru + talai*, not as
per + um + talai

aruñciṛappu (rare distinction) — *aru + ciṛappu*, not as
ar + um + ciṛappu

The consonants *m*, *ṅ*, *n* and *ñ* are explained to be the results of the phonological process of inserting homorganic nasals between adjective-stems and the following words beginning with plosives.

In spite of such resistance from grammarians, the analogy has proved itself to be stronger and adjectives with the suffix 'um' are found in modern spoken Tamil.¹⁵

e.g., *veṟum vayiṟu* (empty stomach) *veṟu + um + vayiṟu*

perum ēkkam (great anxiety) *peru + um + ēkkam*

Here the nasal m cannot be explained as a homorganic one inserted between, as there is no plosive in the beginning of the following words.

8. There are a third kind of words used as qualifiers, viz., noun roots or stems placed before nouns to qualify them.

e.g., *pon vaḷaiyal* (gold bangles)
 irumpu nāṟkkāli (steel chair)
 ēḷaikk uṭumpam (poor family)

In such cases, the distinction between the noun and the qualifying word is syntactical rather than morphemic. These words used to qualify nouns cannot be distinguished at morphological level.

9. A fourth kind of words used as qualifiers are the first parts of action-compounds :

e.g., *kolpuli* (killing tiger)
 uṅkaḷam (eating vessel)

They are verb-roots placed before the nouns which they qualify. In such cases also, the distinction between them is syntactical, not morphemic.

10. Besides these, the Tamil language possesses many adjective roots. They are capable of :

(i) serving as adjectives when placed before nouns, e.g.,
 nalvinai, *peruvayiru* ;

15. Some writers use such forms in their journalistic writings, but grammarians object to them.

- (ii) forming nouns by taking derivational suffixes, e.g., perumai (greatness), civappu (red colour), arumai (rarity);
- (iii) forming verbs by taking tense markers and the suffix of the relative participle or the pronominal suffix, e.g., perukiya (great, big), perukiyatu (grew large or big),
- (iv) forming adjectives by taking the suffix of the relative participle without tense-marker and pronominal suffix, e.g., nalla (good), periya (big).

It is interesting to note that many of these adjective roots thus branch off either as adjectives with suffixes or as verbs with tense markers and suffixes. Thereby they have two distinct forms of growth with two different paradigms.

Class A.	Class B.	Class C.
<i>Roots</i>	<i>Verbs</i>	<i>Adjectives</i>
ciṛu (small)	ciṛutta	ciṛiya
peru (big)	perukiya	periya
kuṛu (short)	kuṛukiya	kuṛiya
karu (black)	karutta	kariya
veḷ (white)	veḷutta	veḷliya
teḷ (clear)	teḷinta	teḷliya

It is also interesting to note that the verbs derived from the adjective roots (class B) have been in the language from the early period, that the adjectives formed from these roots (class C) are of later growth, and that the former are gradually losing the tense signification though they have the tense markers,¹⁶ thus leaving two different forms of words to serve as noun-qualifiers with slightly different shades of meaning acquired in course of time.

16. e.g., inik kuṛukiya nōkkaṃ kūṛātu; uyarnta nōkkame vāṇṇum (hereafter one should not have narrow vision, but only high outlook). The participles kuṛukiya and uyarnta have past tense markers i and t; yet they do not signify tense but simply stand as qualifiers meaning narrow and high.

11. Investigation of all these words used as noun-qualifiers in Tamil reveal the following facts:—

(a) In Tamil, noun roots and stems are placed before nouns and used as qualifiers (pon vaḷaiyal - golden bangles). This is as common in modern Tamil as in old Tamil.

(b) Nouns formed from adjective roots with derivational suffixes are also placed before nouns to qualify them (civappup-pū instead of cempū - red flower, veḷḷaip-pacu instead of venpacu - white cow). This is found only in modern Tamil.

(c) In old Tamil, verb roots were freely used to qualify the following nouns. But this is becoming rare in modern Tamil. It is found only in a few compounds like tinpaṇṭam (eatables) which are almost considered as single words.

(d) Relative participles with the suffix 'a' or 'um' are used as qualifiers. This is as common in modern Tamil as in old Tamil (kaṭṭiya viṭu - built house).

(e) Adjective roots, i.e., the true adjectives are placed before nouns to qualify them. This usage is becoming rarer in modern Tamil. This is now found only in a few compounds which are frequently used and considered like single words. (peru vayiru - big belly).

(f) On the analogy of the relative participles with the suffix 'a', a number of adjectives are formed by suffixing 'a' to the adjective stems. Such forms were not found in ancient Tamil; they appeared later and have now become quite common. It is these analogical formations that replaced adjectives of the type mentioned in item (e).

(g) On the wrong analogy of the relative participles with the suffix 'um', a small number of words are formed in modern Tamil. They are not yet accepted as regular forms (verum vayiru—empty stomach).

12. From these it is evident that the general tendency of modern Tamil in this respect is as follows:—

- (i) to continue the usage of noun roots or stems as qualifiers ;
- (ii) to discontinue the usage of verb roots or stems as qualifiers and instead to use relative participles to qualify nouns ;

and (iii) to discontinue the usage of adjective roots or stems as adjectives and instead of them to use the derived adjectives to qualify nouns.

திருவள்ளுவர்தம் தெய்வக் கொள்கை

B. R. புருஷோத்தம நாயடு,

தமிழ்த்துணைப்பேராசிரியர்

பல்கலைக்கழகம், சென்னை.

1

தெய்வப் புலமைத் திருவள்ளுவனாரை ஒவ்வொரு மதத்தினரும் தத்தம் மதத்தைச் சார்ந்தவர் என்று கூறுப இப்பெரியார் 'நிற்கின்ற தெல்லாம் நெடுமால்' என்னும் உண்மையை ஓர்ந்து உணர்ந்த பரம வைதிகர் என்றும், அங்ஙனமே ஒழுகி வந்த பரம வைணவர் என்றும் வைணவப் பெருமக்கள் கூறுவார்கள்.

தெய்வப் புலமைத் திருவள்ளுவனாருடைய தெய்வக் கொள்கையை நாம் அறிந்துகோடற்குக் கருவிகளாக இருப்பன, அவர் அருளிய திருக்குறளும், அத்திருக்குறளுக்குச் சிறப்புப் பாயிரமாய் எழுந்த திருவள்ளுவமாலையும், திருக்குறளின் நுண்பொருளினைத் தெள்ளிதின் உணர்த்தும் பரிமேலழகருரையும் ஆகிய மூன்றுமேயாம். இம் மூன்றனோடு முரணுதல் இன்றேல், ஏனைய நூல்களுமாம். இவற்றுள், சிறப்புப்பாயிரம் அளப்பரிய ஆகாயத்திற்கு விளக்கமாகிய திங்களும் ஞாயிறும் போலுதலானும், பருப்பொருட்டாகிய பாயிரங்கேட்டார்க்கு நுண்பொருட்டாகிய நூல் இனிது விளங்குமாதலானும் சிறப்புப்பாயிரமாகிய திருவள்ளுவ மாலையை முதலில் ஆராய்வோம்.

2

திருவள்ளுவமலை, அசரீரி, நாமகள் உள்ளிட்டோராலும், கடைச்சங்கத்து வீற்றிருந்த பொய்யடிமையில்லாப் புலவர் நாற்பத்தொன்பதின்மராலும் பாடப்பட்டது என்பர். இம் மலை, உச்சிமேற்புலவர் கொள் நச்சினூர்க்கினியர் முதலிய பண்டை உரையாசிரியர்களால் மேற்கோளாக எடுத்தாளப்படும் மேன்மையுடையது; இதன் வெண்பாக்களுள் சில, நூலின் அளவையினையும்; சில, நூலின் பெருமையினையும்; சில, ஆசிரியர் பெருமையினையும் உவமை முகத்தானும் பிறவாற்றினும் கற்றார் உளங்கொளத் தெள்ளிதின் உணர்த்துவனவாம். இவற்றுள், ஆசிரியர் பெருமையினையும், நூலின் பெருமையினையும் உவமை முகத்தால் விளக்கும் வெண்பாக்களே ஈண்டு எடுத்து ஆராயப்படுகின்றன, அவையே, ஈண்டுக் கூறப்புகும் விஷயத்திற்குப் பயன்படுவன ஆதலின்.

‘மலர்களுக்குள்ளே தாமரை மலரும், பொன்களுக்குள்ளே சாம்புநதப் பொன்னும், பசுக்களுக்குள்ளே காமதேனுவும், யானைகளுக்குள்ளே ஐராவதமும், தேவர்களுக்குள்ளே திருமாலும் போன்று, நூல்களுக்குள்ளே திருவள்ளுவருடைய திருக்குறள் வெண்பா சிறந்தது, ’ என்னும் பொருளமைந்த

‘பூவிற்குத் தாமரையே பொன்னுக்குச் சாம்புநதம்
ஆவிற்கு அருமுனியா யானைக் கமர்உம்பல்
தேவில் திருமால் எனச்சிறந்த தென்பவே
பாவிற்கு வள்ளுவர்வெண் பா.’

என்பது திருவள்ளுவமாலையில் 36-ஆம் செய்யுள். இதனுள் உவமையாகக் கூறப்பட்ட பொருள்கள் எல்லாம் அந்த அந்த இனத்தில் உயர்ந்தவை என்பது சான்றோர்க்கெல்லாம் ஒப்ப முடிந்தது.

‘வினைபயன் மெய்யுரு வென்ற நான்கே
வகைபெற வந்த உவமத் தோற்றம்.
விரவியும் வருஉம் மரபின என்ப.

“உயர்ந்ததன் மேற்றே உள்ளங் காலை.”¹

என்பன இலக்கணம். எனவே, இச்செய்யுளால் தேவருள் உயர்ந்தவன் திருமால் என்பது அக்காலத்து ஆன்றோர்கள் கொண்ட முடிபு என்பது பெறுதும்.

‘அறுபொருள் இவன்என்றே
அமரர் கணம் தொழுதேத்த’²

என்றார் இளங்கோவடிகள். ‘என்றே’ என்பதில் ஏகாரம் பிரிநிலை; வேறு ஒருவர் இலர் என்பதனைக் குறிக்க வந்தது.

1. தொல்காப்பியம், பொருளதிகாரம், உவம வியல், 1—3.

2. ஐயமற்ற பொருள் இவன் என்றே கொண்டு அமரர்திரள் எல்லாம் உன்னைத் தொழுது ஏத்தாநிற்க. அறுபொருள் - அற்றபொருள்; வினைத் தொகை; ஐயமற்ற பொருள் என்றாயிற்று. இனி, அறுபொருள் - தீர்ந்த பொருள் என்றுமாம்; “அற்ற காரியம்” என்றற்போலே. இனி, அறு பொருள் - அறுவகைச் சமயத்தாரும் துணிந்த பொருள் என்றுமாம், என்பது அடியார்க்கு நல்லாருரை.

“ அதனால்,
இவ்வும் உவ்வும் அவ்வும் பிறவும்
ஏம மார்ந்த நிற்பிரிந்து
மேவல் சான்றன எல்லாம்
சேவலோங் குயர்கொடி யோயே.”¹

என்பது பரிபாடல்.

“ மனிசர்க்குத் தேவர் போலத் தேவர்க்கும் தேவாவோ!”²
என்பது தமிழ்மறை.

‘உயிர்கள் நல்லதும் தீயதும் உணர்ந்து உய்ந்து கரைமரம் சேர்தற்பொருட்டு அம்முழுமுதற்கடவுளான திருமால் தானே தன்னுடைய தண்ணளியால் தானே அவதரித்தும், மஹரிஷிகள் முனிவர்கள் பெரியோர்கள் இவர்கள் மூலமாக நின்றும் வேத சாஸ்திரங்களையும் இதிகாச புராணங்களையும் வெளிப்படுத்தினான். ஆதலால், உலகிற்குப் பரமாசாரியன் அவனே,’ என்பது நம் முன்னோர்கள் கொள்கை. இதனாலே, ஞானோபதேசம் செய்யும் பெரியோர்கட்கு உவமை கூறு மிடத்து அவ்விறைவனையே கூறிச் செல்வர் நம் முன்னோர்.

“ நிலந்தரு திருவின் நெடியோன் போல ”³ என்ற அடிக்கு உரை வகுத்த நச்சினூர்க்கினியர், “ எல்லா நிலங்களையும் தன்னிடத்தே காட்டின பெருஞ்செல்வத்தையுடைய மாயோனைப்போலத் தொல் லாணையினையுடைய நல்லாசிரியர்,” என்றது, கண்ணன் எப்பொருளும் தானாயிருக்கிற படியைக் காட்டி யூநீ கீதை அருளிச்செய்து எல் லாரையும் போதித்தாற்போல எல்லாரையும் போதிக்க வல்ல ஆசிரி யர் என்றவாறு,” என்பர்.

“ பயின்ற கேள்விப் பாரத்து வாசன்
நான்மறை துணிந்த நற்பொரு ளாகிய
தூய ஞானம் நிறைந்த சிவச்சுடர்
தூனே யாகிய தன்மை யாளன்
நவின்ற வாய்மை நச்சினூர்க் கினியன் ”

என்று புகழப்பட்ட நச்சினூர்க்கினியர் கூறுவது நினைவில் இருத்துத் தற் குரியதன்றோ ?

1. “ இவையும் உவையும் அவையும் பிறவுமாய் நின்கணின்று பிரிந்து நின்னால் ஏமமுற்றன எல்லாம் பின்னும் நின்னோடு மேவலமைந்தன.” என்றது, உலகுயிர்களின் தோற்றமும் நிலைபேறும் ஒடுக்கமும் நின்கண்ண என்றவாரும்,” என்பது பரிமேலழகருரை.

2. திருவாய்மொழி. 8 : 1 : 5.

3. மதுரைக்காஞ்சி.

“ உப்பக்கம் நோக்கி உபகேசி தோள்மணந்தான்
உத்தர மாமதுரைக் கச்சென்ப—இப்பக்கம்
மாதாநு பங்கி மருவு புலச்செந்நாப்¹
போதார் புனற்கூடற் கச்ச.”

என்ற திருவள்ளுவமலை 21-ஆம் செய்யுளை நோக்குவாம். ‘வட திசையை நோக்கி, நப்பின்னைப் பிராட்டியை மணந்த ஸ்ரீ கண்ண பிராணை உத்தர மதுரைக்கு அச்சு (ஆதாரம்) என்று கூறுவர்; இப்பக்கத்தை நோக்குமிடத்து, மாதாநுபங்கியுடன் கூடியவரும் குற்ற மற்ற புலமையையுடைய செந்நாப் போதாருமான திருவள்ளுவர் தென் மதுரைக்கு அச்சாவார்,’ என்பது இதன் பொருளாம். உபகேசி-நப்பின்னைப் பிராட்டி; ‘கூந்தல் அழகுடையவள்’ என்பது இச்சொல்லின் பொருள். “திணையே பாலிடம்”³ என்ற சூத்திரத்தின்கீழ் இச்செய்யுளை உதாரணமாகக் காட்டி, ‘உபகேசியாவாள் - நப்பின்னைப் பிராட்டி’ என்ற விளக்கமும் எழுதினர் நேமிநாத உரையாசிரியர். ஆதலால், உபகேசி என்பதற்குப் பிறவாறு பொருள் கூறுதல் ஆன்றோர் கருத்தொடு முரணுதலுமாம். இச்செய்யுளால், ஸ்ரீ கீதாசாரியனாய் உலகை வாழ்வித்தருளிய ஸ்ரீ கண்ணபிரான் போன்று, திருக்குறளாசிரியராய்த் தமிழகத்தை வாழ்வித்த பெரியார் நம் திருவள்ளுவர் என்பது பெறப்படுதல் காண்க.

“முதன்முறை இடைமுறை கடைமுறை தொழிலின்
பிறவாப் பிறப்பிலை பிறப்பித்தோ ரிலையே.”³

என்கிறபடியே, அவ்விறைவன் உயிர் அளிப்பான் எந்நின்ற யோனியுமாய் அவதரித்த அவதாரங்களுள் திரிவிக்கிரமாவதாரமானது, உயிர்கட்கும் இறைவனாகிய தனக்கு முள்ள சேஷி சேஷ சம்பந்தத்தை உணர்த்தி அகவிருளைப் போக்கி உலகத்தாரை உய்யச்செய்த அவதாரமாதலின், அவ்வவதாரத்தில்⁴ நம் பெருமக்கள் அனைவரும் ஈடுபட்டுப் போந்தார்கள். நூலைப்பற்றிக் கூறுமிடத்து இதனை விரித்துக் கூறுவன்.

1. “மாதாநுபங்கி மறுவில் புலச்செந்நாப்” என்ற பாடமும் உண்டு.
2. நேமிநாதம்.
3. பரிபாடல். 3. 71-72.

4. “உலகங்கொண்ட, அடியன் அறிவருமேனி மாயத்தனாகிலும், கொடிய என்நெஞ்சம் அவன் என்றே கிடக்கும்,” என்றும், “அன்றொருகால் வையம் அளந்தபிரான் வாரான் என்று ஒன்றொருகால் சொல்லாதுலகு” என்றுமிதே இவர் கிடப்பது. திருமங்கையாழ்வாரும் “முன்னங்குறளுருவாய் மூவடிமண் கொண்டளந்த, மன்னன் சரிதைக்கே மாலாகிப் பொன்பயந்தேன்” என்று இவர்கள் எல்லாரும் ஈடுபடுவது இச்செயலுக்கிறே! என்பது நப்பின்னை ஈடு.

“ திரண்டமரர் தொழுதேத்தும் திருமால்! நின் செங்கமல
இரண்டடியால் மூவுலகும் இருள்தீர நடந்தனையே.”¹

என்று இளங்கோவடிகள் உளமுருகி ஈடுபடுதல் காண்க.

‘ மாலுங் குறளாய் வளர்ந்திரண்டு மாணடியால்
ஞால முழுதும் நயந்தளந்தான்—வாலறிவின்
வள்ளுவரும் தங்குறள்வெண் பாவடியால் வையத்தார்
உள்ளுவவெல் லாம்அளந்தார் ஓர்ந்து.’

என்பது, திருவள்ளுவ மாலையில் 6-ஆம் செய்யுளாக உள்ளது. இது பரணர் பாடியது. ‘ திருமாலும் குறளாக அவதரித்து வளர்ந்து மாட்சிமைப்பட்ட இரண்டு திருவடிகளால் உலகமனைத்தையும் விரும்பி அளந்தான்; மெய்யறிவினையுடைய திருவள்ளுவரும் தம் குறள் வெண்பாக்களின் இரண்டு சிறிய அடிகளால் உலகத்துள்ளோரால் நினைக்கப்பட்டவற்றை எல்லாம் ஆராய்ந்து அளந்தார்,’ என்பது இதன் பொருள். பரணர், இச்செய்யுளால் தேவர்களுள் உயர்ந்தான் ஒருவன் செய்த செயலையும், மக்களுள் உயர்ந்தார் ஒருவர் செய்த செயலையும் ஒப்பிட்டுப் பாடுதல் காணலாகும். இப்புலவர் பெருமான் தாம் பாடும் செய்யுள்களில் அவ்விடத்திற்குப் பொருத்தமுற யாதா னும் ஒரு சரிதத்தை அமைத்துப் பாடும் இயல்புடையார் என்பதனை அகநானூறு புறநானூறுகளில் இவர் பாடிய பாக்களால் உணரலாகும். இங்கு,² “உள்ளக்கமல மலர்த்தி உளத்துள்ள, தள்ளற் கரிய இருளைத் தள்ளிய” நம் வள்ளுவர் பெருமானுக்கு “மூவுலகும் இருள் தீர நடந்த” அப்பரமனைத் தவிர வேறு ஒருவரை அவரால் கூற இயலுமோ? அறிவுடையோர் சிந்திக்கக் கூடவர். ‘ மாலும் மாணடி

1. “ இச்செய்யுளில் ‘ இருள் ’ என்றது, மூவரும் ஒத்த காரியத்தில் அதிகரித்து நிற்கின்றார்கள்; இப்படி நிற்கையாலே மூவரும் பிரதானரோ? மூவரிலே ஒருவன் பிரதானரோ? என்னும் ஐயத்தாலுளதாகும் அஞ்ஞானம். ‘ தீர நடத்தலாவது’, ‘மேலேயுள்ள உலகங்களை ‘ அப்பால்மிக்கு ’ என்கிற படியே, விஞ்ச வளர்ந்து பூமிப்பரப்பெல்லாம் திருவடிகளின் கீழே இட்டுக் கொண்ட இவ்விதிமாநுஷ்ச் செயல்களையுடைய சர்வேசுவரனைக் காட்டிலும், ஒக்கப் பரிமாருநிற்கக் கட்டக்குடி என்று கழிக்கலாந் தெய்வந்தான் உண்டோ என்னும்படி நடந்தமையைத் தெரிவித்தபடி. ஆக, எல்லார் தலைகளிலும் காலைவைத்தவனை ஈசுவரன் என்னவோ? இவன் காலிலே துகையுண்டவர்களை ஈசுவரர்கள் என்னவோ?” என்கிறார் என்றபடி.

யால் ¹ நயந்து அளந்தான் ; வள்ளுவரும் வாலறிவின் ஓர்ந்து அளந்தார், ' என்ற சொற்களின் நயங்களைச் சிந்தித்தல் தகும்.

'காணின்ற தொங்கலாய்! காசிபனூர் தந்தது முன் கூறின் றளந்த குறளென்ப—நூன்முறையான் வானின்று மண்ணின் றளந்ததே வள்ளுவனூர் தாறின் றளந்த குறள்.'

இது, திருவள்ளுவ மாலையில் 14-ஆம் செய்யுள் ; பொன்முடியார் பாடியது. இச்செய்யுளில் 'குறள்' ² என்ற பெயர் ஒப்புமையும் காணலாகும்.

பாரதம் பாடிய பெருந்தேவனூர், திருக்குறளுக்கு மகாபாரதம், இராமாயணம், மனுதர்ம சாஸ்திரம், பண்டை மறை என்னுமிவையே ஒப்பாவன என்றும், மற்றை நூல்கள் ஒப்பாகமாட்டா என்றும் கூறுகின்றார்.

'எப்பொருளும் யாரும் இயல்பின் அறிவுறச் செப்பிய வள்ளுவர்தாம் செப்பவரு—முப்பாற்குப் பாரதம்சீ ராம கதைமனுப் பண்டைமறை நேர்வனமற் றில்லை நிகர்.'

என்பது அச்செய்யுள். இதன்கண் 'நேர்வன' என உடன்பாட்டால் கூறிப் பின்னும் 'மற்றில்லை நிகர்' என எதிர்மறை முகத்தானும் கூறும் திட்டநுட்பங்களை அறிஞர் அறிவர். இதனுள் கூறப்பட்ட பாரதம், சீராமகதை, மனு, பண்டை மறை என்னும் நான்கும் வைதிக சாஸ்திரங்களாய் ஸ்ரீமந் நாராயணனுடைய கல்யாண குணங்களை ஓதுவன என்பது வைதிக நெறியில் நின்ற பெரியார்க்கெல்லாம் ஒப்ப முடிந்தமை தெளிவு. இத்திருக்குறளுக்கு இவையே ஒப்பாவன எனின், அவைபோன்று இதுவும் வைதிக சாஸ்திரமாய் ஸ்ரீமந் நாராயணனுடைய கல்யாண குணங்களை ஓதுவது என்பது வெள்ளிடைமலை போல் விளங்குகின்றதன்றோ? இதற்கு வேறும் ஒரு சான்று வேண்டுமோ? நன்று; 'இவற்றுள், பாரதமும், சீராம கதையும்,

1. "மலர்மிசை ஏகினுன் மாணடி" என்பது திருக்குறள்.

2. கண்ட திறத்திது கைதவம் ஐய !
கொண்டல் நிறக்குறள் என்பது கொள்ளேல்
அண்டமு முற்று மகண்டமு மேனாள்
உண்டவ னுமிது ணர்ந்துகொள் என்றன்.

என்றார் கவிச்சக்கரவர்த்தி கம்பநாட்டாழ்வார்.

பண்டை மறையும் ¹ ஸ்ரீமந் நாராயணனுடைய கல்யாண குணங்களை ஒதுகின்றன என்றல் அனைவர்க்கும் ஒப்ப முடிந்தது ; மனுதர்ம சாஸ்திரம் ஸ்ரீமந் நாராயணனுடைய கல்யாண குணங்களை ஒதுகின்றது என்றல் யாங்ஙனம் பொருந்தும்? ஒப்பாயவாறு என்னை? எனின், கூறுவன்: “ஒப்பு என்பது, சிறிது ஒத்துச் சிறிது ஒவ்வாதொழிவது; என்னை? ‘குவளைப்பூப் போலும் கண்’ என்றால், நீலம் மாத்திரை ஒக்கும்; மற்று, ஒவ்வாப்புடை பெரிது; ‘பவளம் போலும்வாய்’ என்றால், செம்மை மாத்திரை ஒக்கும்; மற்று, ஒவ்வாப்புடை பெரிது,” என்பர் இறையனார் களவியல் உரைகாரர். இதனால், ஒப்புமை என்பது, சிறிது ஒத்தும் சிறிது ஒவ்வாதும் இருப்பது என்பது பெறுதும்.

இனி, மனுதர்ம சாஸ்திரத்தைப் பார்ப்போம். மனுதர்ம சாஸ்திரமானது, “தர்ம சாஸ்த்ரேஷு மாநவ:” என்கிறபடியே, தர்ம சாஸ்திரங்களிற் சிறந்தது; “யத்யத் மநுரவத் தத்தத் பேஷணம்” என்கிறபடியே, மனுவானவர் சொல்லுவ அனைத்தும் பிறவிப் பிணிக்கு மருந்து என்று புகழப்படும் சிறப்பு வாய்ந்தது. இத்தகைய நூலில் முதலில் உலகத் தோற்றத்தை உரைக்குமிடத்து (6-ஆம் சுலோகம் தொடக்கம்) “இவ்வாறு பிரளயகாலம் முடிந்த பின்பு, உயிர்களைப் போலக் கருமத்தினால் சரீரம் எடுக்காமல் தன்னிச்சையாலே சரீரத்தை எடுக்கின்ற சுவயம்புவான பகவான், கண் முதலான புற இந்திரியங்களால் இழுக்கப்படாதவராயும் ஒருவராலும் தடுக்கப்படாத

1. “வேதார்த்தம் அறுதியிடுவது ஸ்மிருதி இதிகாச புராணங்களாலே, ஸ்மிருதியாலே, பூர்வபாகத்தில் அர்த்தம் அறுதியிடக்கடவது; மற்றை இரண்டாலும், உத்தரபாகத்தில் அர்த்தம் அறுதியிடக்கடவது. இதிகாச சிரேஷ்டமான ஸ்ரீராமாயணத்தால் சிறையிருந்தவள் ஏற்றம் சொல்லுகிறது; மஹாபாரதத்தால் தூதுபோனவன் ஏற்றம் சொல்லுகிறது. இவை இரண்டாலும், புருஷகாரவைபவமும் உபாயவைபவமும் சொல்லிற்றுயிற்று,” என்பது பின்னே லோகாசாரியர் ஸ்ரீ சூக்தி. “பகவானே! வேதங்களானவை முதலிலே வேறொரு பிரமாணத்தை விரும்பாமலே தாமாகவே பிரமாணங்களாகின்றன; மனு முதலான ஸ்மிருதிகளானவை இதிகாசங்களோடு கூடின புராணங்களோடும் பூர்வ உத்தர மீமாஞ்சைகளோடும் கூடி அந்த வேதங்கட்குப் பொருள் விவரணம் செய்வதில் முடிகின்றன; வேதங்களில் முதற்பகுதியானது, தேவரீருடைய திருவாராதன முறையைச் சொல்லும் வகையில் முடிகின்றது; பிற்பகுதியோ என்னில், தேவரீருடைய செயல்கள் குணங்கள் விபூதிகள் இவற்றை விளக்கத் தெரிவிப்பதனாலே தேவரீருடைய திருவடிகளைச் சேர்வதில் முடிகின்றது; ‘எல்லா வேதங்களாலும் அறியப்படுகின்றவன் நானே,’ என்று தேவரீர் அருளிச்செய்ததும் உளது,” என்பது பட்டர் ஸ்ரீ சூக்தி. (ஸ்ரீரங்கராஜஸ்தவம். 1: 19.)

படைப்பு முதலிய முத்தொழில்களையுமுடையவராயும் ஆகாயம் முதலிய ஐம்பூதங்களையும் விளங்கச் செய்பவராயும் உலகிற்கு இன்றியமையாதவராயும் விளங்குகிறார்,” என்று கூறி, பின் தண்ணீரின் சிருஷ்டியைச் சொல்லி, அதில் பகவான் தன் சத்தி வடிவமானதொரு விதையை விதைத்ததையும் அதில் நான்முகனைப் படைத்ததையும் கூறி, பின் தண்ணீர் ‘நரன்’ என்னும் இறைவனால் படைக்கப்பட்ட மையின் ‘நாரம்’ என்ற பெயரை அடைந்தது; அவ் விதையன் அந் நாரத்தில் ¹ வசிப்பதனால் நாராயணன் என்ற பெயரை அடைந்தான் என்றும் கூறப்பட்டிருக்கின்றது. ஆக, மனுதர்மசாஸ்திரத்தில் “தத ஸ்வயம்பூர் பகவான்,” என்று தொடங்கி, பின் அந்தப் பகவானால் உலகம் முதலியன படைக்கப்பட்ட விதத்தைக் கூறி, பின் ‘அவ்வாறு படைத்த அந்தப் பகவானை நாராயணன் என்று நினைமின்,’ என்று அறுதியிட்டிருக்கிறார் மனு என்பது தெளிவாகும். பின், அவ்வாறு பகவானால் படைக்கப்பட்ட உலகத்திற்கு உரிய தர்மங்கள் விரித்துப் பேசப்படுகின்றன அம் மனுதர்ம சாஸ்திரத்தில் என்பதும் கற்றார் யாவரும் அறிவர். இனித் தமிழ்மறையை நோக்குவாம் :

திருக்குறள் உலகத்துத் தோன்றிய தமிழ் நூல்களுள் ஒப்புயர்வற்றது என்பதும், அது பிறவிப்பிணிக்கு மருந்து என்பதும் கூறல் வேண்டா அன்றே? அத்தகைய திருக்குறளில் முதன் முதலில் கடவுள் வாழ்த்தில்,

‘அகர முதல எழுத்தெல்லாம் ஆதி
பகவன் முதற்றே உலகு.’

என்ற குறளால் ‘உலகிற்கெல்லாம் காரணன் ஆதிபகவன் ஆவன்,’ என்று கூறிப்

‘பிறவிப் பெருங்கடல் நீந்துவர் நீந்தார்
இறைவன் அடிசேரா தார்.’

என்ற பத்தாவது குறளால் அவ் வாதிபகவன் நாராயணனே ஆவன் என்று அறிதியிட்டிருத்தல் காண்க. அவ்வாறு அறுதியிட்டு, பின் அவனால் படைக்கப்பட்ட உலகத்திற்கு அவன் அருளிச்செய்த தர்மங்களைக் கூறிச் செல்லுதலையும் காண்க. மனுதர்ம சாத்திரத்தில் முதல் முன்னம் கூறிய அத் துணைப்பொருளையும் “பகவன் முதற்றே உலகு” என்ற சிறிய அடியானது தனக்குள் அடக்கிக்கொண்டு

1. “நின், தோற்றமும் அகலமும் நீரினுள்” என்ற பரிபாடற்பகுதியும், நாராயணன் என்னுந் திருநாமம் நீரின்கட் காணப்படுதலாகிய இக் காரணம் பற்றி வந்தது, என்ற அதன் உரையும் காணத்தகும். 4: 30,

மிளிர் தலை நாம் காண்கிறோம். ¹ ஆக, உலகத்தைப் படைத்த முதல்வனும் பரமன் பகவானாகிய நாராயணனே என்னும் கொள்கையில் இருநூல்களும் ஒத்துச் சேறல் காணலாகும். 'யாரும் யாதும் இல் காலத்தில் உலகத்தைப் படைத்தான் பகவான்,' என்று தொடங்கி, 'அவனே நாராயணன்,' என்று அறுதியிட்டார் மனு; நம்பொய்யில் புலவர் "ஆதிபகவன் முதற்றே உலகு," என்று தொடங்கி, முடிந்தது முடித்தலாகப் "பிறவிப் பெருங்கடல் நீந்துவர் நீந்தார், இறைவன் அடிசேரா தார்," என்று முடிக்கின்றார். பரம வைதிகரான இப்பெருந்தகையாரிருவரும் வேறு யாங்ஙனம் கூறுவர்?

'பேசிற்றே பேசலல்லால் பெருமைஒன்றுணர லாகாது
ஆசற்றார் தங்கட் கல்லால் அறியலா வானுமல்லன்
மாசற்றார் மனத்து ளானை வணங்கிநா மிருப்ப தல்லால்
பேசத்தா னை துண்டோ? பேதை நெஞ் சே! நீ சொல்லாய்.,
என்பது ஆழ்வாருடைய ஸ்ரீசூக்தி.

நன்று; தெய்வப்புலமைத் திருவள்ளுவரை ஆதிபகவனை இறைவன் என்ற சொல்லாற் குறித்தனரேயன்றி நாராயணன் என்ற திருப்பெயராற் குறித்திலரே? அங்ஙனமிருக்க 'நாராயணன் என்று அறுதியிட்டார்' என்று கூறல் யாங்ஙனம் பொருந்தும்? எனின், கூறுவன்: இறை என்பது இயற்பெயர் என்றும், அது ஒருமைக்கும் பன்மைக்கும் பொதுவாய் நின்று வருமொழி வந்த பின்பு 'இறைவன் வந்தான், இறைவர் வந்தார்' என நிற்கும் என்றும் கூறுவர் இலக்கணக் கொத்து நூலுடையார். இறைவன் என்ற சொல்லிற்கு 'எப்பொருளினும் தங்குகின்றவன்' என்று பொருள் கூறினர் சிலப்பதிகார உரையாசிரியர். ² நாராயணன் என்பது, நாரம் அயனம் என்னும் இரண்டு சொற்களாலான தொடர். அதற்கு இரண்டு வகையாகப் பொருள் கூறியுள்ளனர் நம் பெரியோர். நாரம் - அழிவில்

1. 'தினையளவு போதாச் சிறுபுல்நீர் நீண்ட
பனையளவு காட்டும் படித்தால்—மனையளவு
வள்ளைக் குறங்கும் வளநாட! வள்ளுவரை
வெள்ளைக் குறட்பா விரி.

என்பது திருவள்ளுவமலை.

2. "இறைவன் குரவன் இயல்குணன் எங்கோன்" என்ற சிலப்பதிகார அடியையும் 'இறைவன் - எப்பொருளினும் தங்குகின்றவன்' என்ற அதனுரையையும் காண்க. சிலப். நாடுகாண், 184.

லாப் பொருள்களின் கூட்டம்;¹ அவையாவன : மூலப்பகுதியின் விகாரமாகவுள்ள எல்லாப் பொருள்களும், எல்லா உயிர்களும், மோக்ஷமாகிய பரமபதத்திலுள்ள எல்லாப் பொருள்களுமாம். அயனம் - இடம். ஆக, நாராயணன் என்னும் இத்தொடர், அழிவில்லாப் பொருள்களின் கூட்டத்திற்கு இருப்பிடமாய் உள்ளவன் என்றும், அழிவில்லாப் பொருள்களை இருப்பிடமாக வுடையவன் என்றும் பொருள்படும். அழிவில்லாப் பொருள்களின் கூட்டத்திற்கு இருப்பிடமாயுள்ளவன் என்பது, இறைவன் எல்லாப் பொருள்களையும் தனக்குள் அடக்கி எங்கும் வியாபித்துள்ள நிலையை உணர்த்தும். அழிவில்லாப் பொருள்களை இருப்பிடமாகவுடையவன் என்பது, இறைவன் எல்லாப் பொருள் கட்டும் அந்தர்யாமியாய் உள்ள நிலையையுணர்த்தும். சங்க இலக்கியங்களுள் ஒன்றாகிய நற்றிணையின் கடவுள் வாழ்த்துச் செய்யுள் இக்கருத்துகளை அழகாக விளக்குகின்றது,

‘ மாநிலம் சேவடி யாகத் தூநீர்
வளைநரல் பெளவம் உடுக்கை யாக
விசம்புமெய் யாகத் திசைகை யாகப்
பசங்கதிர் மதியமொடு சடர்கண் ணை
இயன்ற எல்லாம் பயின்றகத் தடக்கிய
வேத முதல்வன் என்ப
தீதற விளங்கிய திகிரி யோனே.’

என்பது அச்செய்யுள். இதன்கண், “இயன்ற எல்லாம் பயின்றகத் தடக்கிய, வேத முதல்வன்”² என்பதே இங்கு வேண்டுவது. ‘இயன்ற-உலகத்திலே தோன்றியுள்ள, எல்லாம் பயின்று - எல்லாப் பொருள்

1. “ நாராயணன் என்பது, நாரங்களுக்கு அயனம் என்றபடி. நாரங்களாவன : நித்திய வஸ்துக்களினுடைய திரள். அவையாவன : ஞான ஆந்த அமலத்வாதிகளும், ஞான சக்தியாதிகளும், வாத்தல்ய சௌசீல்யாதிகளும். திருமேனியும், காந்தி சௌகுமார்யாதிகளும், திவ்ய பூஷணங்களும், திவ்யாயுதங்களும், பெரிய பிராட்டியார் தொடக்கமான நாய்ச்சி மார்களும், நித்ய சூரிகளும், சத்ரசாமராதிகளும், திருவாசல் காக்கும் முதலிகளும், கண்திபரும், முகத்தரும், பரமாகாசமும், பிரகிருதியும், பத்தாதமாக்களும், காலமும், மஹதாதி விகாரங்களும், அண்டங்களும், அண்டத்துக்குட்பட்ட தேவாதி பதார்த்தங்களும். அயனம் என்றது, இவற்றுக்கு ஆசிரயம் என்றபடி. அங்ஙனன்றிக்கே, இவை தம்மை ஆசிரயமாகவுடையவன் என்னவமாம் இவை இரண்டாலும் பலித்தது, பரத்வ சௌலப்பங்கள். அந்தர்யாமித்வமும் உபாயத்வமும் உபேயத்வமுமாகவுமாம்,” என்பது முமுக்ஷுஸ்படி திருமந்திரப்பிரகரணம்.

2. ‘ அறிகிலேன் தன்னுள் அனைத்துலகும் நிற்க
நெறிமையால் தானும் அவற்றுள்ளிற் கும்பிரான்
வெறிகமழ் சோலைத்தென் காட்கரை என்னப்பன்
சிறியளன் னொருயி ருண்ட திருவருளே.’

என்பது தமிழ்மறை. (9: 6: 4.)

களினுள்ளும் (உயிர் - உயிரில் பொருள்களாகிய எல்லாப்பொருள் களினுள்ளும்) அந்தர்யாமியாய் நின்று, அகத்து அடக்கிய - அவ் வெல்லாப் பொருள்களையும் தன்னுள்ளே அடக்கியுள்ள (வியாபக மாகவுள்ள), வேத முதல்வன் என்ப - வேதத்தால் உணர்த்தப்படும் முதற்பொருள் என்று மெய்யுணர்ந்தோர் கூறுவர்', என்பது அப்பகுதி யின் கருத்தாகும். விரிவு கருதிச் செய்யுள் முழுவதுக்கும் உரை எழுதப்படவில்லை. ¹ “அதனால், நின்மருங்கின்று மூவேழுலகமும்” என்ற பரிபாடற்பகுதியும், ‘ஆதலால், மூலப்பகுதியும் அதன்கண் உறும் அநாதியான காலமும் ஆகாயமும் காற்றொடு கனலும் கூடிய மூவேழ் உலகத்து உயிர்கள் எல்லாம் நின்னிடத்தவாயின,’ என்ற அதன் உரையும் ஈண்டுக் கவனித்தற்குரியன. ஆக, இதுகாறும் கூறியவாற்றான் இறைவன் என்ற பெயரும் நாராயணன் என்ற திருப் பெயரும் ஒருபொருட் சொற்களாயினவாறு கண்டுகொள்க. விஷ்ணு, வாசுதேவன் என்ற திருப் பெயர்களும் இப்பொருளனவே யாம். ²

நன்று; இறைவன் என்ற பெயர் பொதுவாகப் பலர்க்கும் வழங்குகின்றதே? எனின், ஆம்; சிந்தாமணி சிலப்பதிகாரம் முத லிய பண்டை இலக்கியங்களிலும் அவற்றின் உரைகளிலும் வழங் கப்பட்டு வருகின்றது. “இறைவனை ஆடல் கண்டருளிய அணங்கு” (சிலப். வழக். 37.) என்றவிடத்துச் சிவபெருமானையும், “ஏகமும் நீங்கா இறைவன் கை வேலன்றே” (சிலப். குன்றக்.) என்றவிடத்து முருகவேளையும், “துறைபோயவர் முடிந்த பின்னர் இறையோனும்” (சிலப். கனாத்.) என்றவிடத்து மகாசாத்தனாரையும், ‘தேவர் நன்னாட் டுக் கிறைவனாகிய பெருவிறல் வேந்தே’ (மணிமே.பாத். 42.) என்ற விடத்து இந்திரனையும், “இறைவன் குரவன் இயல்குணன் எங்கோன்” (சிலப். நாடு.) என்றவிடத்து அருகக் கடவுளையும், “மறையோன் கூறிய மாற்றமெல்லாம், இறையோன் கேட்டாங்கு இருந்த எல்லை யுள்” (சிலப். நீர்ப்.) என்றவிடத்து அரசனையும் குறித்தல் காணலாம். நச்சினூக்கினியர் முதலிய உரையாசிரியர்களும் மேற்கூறிய பலரையும் இறைவன் என்ற சொல்லால் வழங்குதல் அவரவர்களுடைய

1. பரிபாடல், 13: 23-25.

2. “பகவந் மந்திரங்கள்தாம் அநேகங்கள். அவதாம், வியாபகங்கள் என்றும், அவ்யாபகங்கள் என்றும் இரண்டு வர்க்கம். அவ்யாபகங்களில் வியாபகங்கள் மூன்றும் சிரேஷ்டங்கள். இவை மூன்றிலும் வைத்துக்கொண்டு பெரிய திருமந்திரம் பிரதானம். மற்றவை இரண்டுக்கும் அசிஷ்டபரிக்கரமும் அபூர்த்தியுமுண்டு. இத்தை வேதங்களும் ருஷிகளும் ஆழ்வார்களும் ஆசார் யர்களும் விரும்பினார்கள்,” என்பது முமுக்ஷுப்படி, திருமந்திரப் பிரகரணம்.

உரைகளில் காணலாம். ஆசிரியர் பரிமேலழகரும் 'இந்திரன் முதலிய இறைவன் பதங்களும் அந்தமில் இன்பத்தழிவில் வீடும்' எனத் திருக்குறள் உரைப்பாயிரத்தில் இந்திரன் முதலான தேவர்களை வரையும் 'இறைவர்' என்ற சொல்லால் வழங்குதல் காணலாகும். ஆயின், இறைவன் என்ற சொல்லின் பொருளை நோக்குமிடத்து அப்பெயர் நாராயணன் என்னும் பெயரையுடைய அப்பரமன் ஒருவனையே குறிக்கும் என்பதும், ஏனையோரை 'இறைவன்' என்ற சொல்லால் வழங்குதல் உபசார வழக்கு என்பதும் தெளியப்படும். தெய்வப் புலமைத் திருவள்ளுவனார் கருத்தும் இதுவே என்பதனைப் பின்னர்க் கூறுவன்.

ஆக, திருக்குறளுக்குச் சிறப்புப் பாயிரமாய் அமைந்த திருவள்ளுவ மாண்பில் வேறு தெய்வங்களும் அத்தெய்வங்கள் சம்பந்தமான வேறு நூல்களும் கூறப்படாமை உளங்கோடற்குரியன.

இனி, நூலை நோக்குவோம் : கடவுள் வாழ்த்தில் முதற்செய்யுளாகிய "அகர முதல எழுத் தெல்லாம்" என்ற குறளால் எல்லா உலகங்கட்கும் ஆதிபகவன் காரணன் என்றார். அவ் வாதிபகவனுடைய கல்யாண குணங்களை "இருள் சேர் இரு வினையும்" என்ற குறளால் நித்தியம் என்றார். "பிறவிப் பெருங்கடல்" என்ற பத்தாவது குறளால் அதனையுடையவன் நாராயணன் என்பதனையும், அவன்திருவடிகளே பிறவிப்பெருங்கடலைக் கடத்தும் புனை என்பதனையும் கூறினார். பொருட்பாலில் "மடியிலா மன்னவன்" என்ற குறளால் இவனே சர்வ ரக்ஷகன் என்று கூறி, காமத்துப்பாலில் "தாம்வீழ்வார் மென்தோள்" என்ற குறளால் அவன் உலகமே மோக்ஷ உலகம் என்று கூறுமுகத்தால் அவனுடைய மோக்ஷ பரதத்துவத்தைக் கூறினார். ஆக, தெய்வப் புலமைத் திருவள்ளுவனார் தம் நூலில் ஆதிபகவானாகிய ஸ்ரீமந் நாராயணனுடைய சர்வஜகத் காரணத்துவத்தையும், சர்வஜகத்ரக்ஷகத்துவத்தையும், மோக்ஷபரதத்துவத்தையும் கூறியருளினார் என்றே தெளிதல் தகும். அன்றி, "அகர முதல எழுத்தெல்லாம்" என்ற குறளால் ஆதிபகவனை முதலாக வுடைத்து உலகம் என்று கூறிய ஆசிரியர், அவ்வுலகம், லீலா விபூதி என்றும் நித்தியவிபூதி என்றும் இருவகைப்படுதலின், ¹ லீலாவிபூதி அவனுக்கே உரியது என்பதனை "மடியிலா மன்னவன்" என்ற குற

1. லீலாவிபூதி - விளையாட்டுக்குரிய உலகம்.

'உலகம் யாவையும் தாமுள வாக்கலும்
நிலைபெறுத்தலும் நீக்கலும் நீங்கலா
அலகி லாவினை யாட்டுடை யாரவர்
தலைவ ரன்னவர்க் கேசரண் நாங்களே.'

ளால் கூறி, நித்திய விபூதி¹ அவனுக்கே உரியது என்பதனைத் “தாம் வீழ்வார் மென்றோள்” என்ற குறளால் கூறி, அவ் வாதிபகவன் ஆவான் உபய விபூதி நாயகன்² என்பதனைத் தெரிவிக்கின்றார் என்னலுமாம்.

ஆக, தமிழ் மறையாகிய இந்நூலில் சுருக்கமாகவும் முடிந்த பொருளாகவும் கூறப்படுகின்ற இப்பொருளும், பிரபந்தஜந கூடஸ்தரான நம்மாழ்வார் அருளிச்செய்த தமிழ்மறையான திருவாய்மொழியின் முதல் திருவாய்மொழியில் பேசப்படுகின்ற பொருளும் ஒரே மிடருக ஒத்துச் சேர்தலைக் கண்டு கொள்க. பரிமேலழகர் அருஞ்சொற்களையும் அருந்தொடர்களையும் சங்ககாலத்து இலக்கண இலக்கியங்களினின்றும் திருக்கோவையார் முதலிய சான்றோர் இலக்கியங்களினின்றும் மேற்கோள் காட்டி விளக்கிச் செல்லுதலைப் போலவே, தத்துவப் பொருள்களை விளக்குங்கால் இறைவனால் மயர்வற மதிநலம் அருளப்பெற்ற ஆழ்வார் அருளிச்செய்த தமிழ்மறையினின்றும் மேற்கோள் காட்டி விளக்கிச் செல்லுவதும் இக்கருத்தே பற்றி என்க.

பிற்காலத்து ஆசிரியர் ஒருவர்,

‘தேவர் குறளும் திருநாள் மறைமுடிவும்
மூவர் தமிழும் முனிமொழியும்—கோவை
திருவா சகமும் திருமூலர் சொல்லும்
ஒருவா சகம்என்று உணர்’

என்று தேவர் குறளையும் திருவாய்மொழியினையும் ஒரு சேர அடுத்து வைத்துப் பாடுதலும் இதனை வலியுறுத்தும். ‘திருநான்மறை முடிவு’ என்றது, தமிழ் மறையான திருவாய்மொழியினை. ‘மொழியும்’ என்பதனைப் பெயரெச்சமாகக் கொண்டு கோவைக்கு அடைமொழி ஆக்குவாரும், எண்ணும்மையாகக் கொண்டு பிரமசூத்திரம் என்று பொருள் கூறுவாரும் உளர்; பிரஹ்மபுரீ. உ. வே. டாக்டர். ஐயரவர்கள் ‘முனிமொழி’ என்றே தமிழ் நூல் ஒன்று இருந்ததாகக் கூறியுள்ளார்கள், நன்று; ‘திருநான்மறை முடிவு’ என்றதனை வேறு ஒரு

1. நித்திய விபூதி - அழியாத உலகம்; பரமபதம்.

‘சிறுகா லையிலா நிலையோ திரியா
குறுகா நெடுகா குணம்வேறுபடா
உறுகால் கிளர்நூ தமெலாம் உகினும்
மறுகா நெறி.’ (கம். ஆரணி. சரபங். 20)

என்பதும் அப்பொருள் பற்றி வந்தது.

2. வைணவர்கள் இறைவனை ‘உபய விபூதி நாயகன்’ என்ற பெயரால் கூட்டுவார்கள்.

நூலாகக் கோடல் அமையாதோ? எனின், திருநான்மறை முடிவாகக் கூறப்படும் வேறு ஒரு தமிழ் நூல் வழக்காற்றில் இன்மையானும், இருந்ததாக இதுகாறும் ஒருவரும் கூறாமையானும், நம்மாழ்வார் அருளிச்செயலையே ¹ 'தமிழ்மறை' என்று பெரியோர்கள் கூறிப் போந்தமையானும் அமையாது என்க.

“குருகூர்ச் சடகோபன் என்றொருபேர் கொண்டிங்கு
அருநான் மறையா யிரஞ்சிரமும் ஓரோர்
திருவாய் மொழியாகச் செந்தமிழால் தென்திக்கு
இருணீக்கி மற்றிதுவே இன்பமா கின்ற
பரலோக மாகப் பரங்கருணை யாலே
தருமார் அமிர்தம்.” [கலிமடல்]

“சாந்தியினை நேராக வுடைய நல்ல
சடகோபர் அமிர்தத்தைத் தாமே உண்டு
தீந்தமிழ்என் ரொருகோடி வேத மாகச்
செய்யதிரு வாய்மொழிந்தார் தேற மாட்டோம்.”
[அஞ்ஞவதைப்பரணி]

என்றார் தத்துவராய சுவாமிகள்,

‘அகர முதல எழுத்தெல்லாம் ஆதி
பகவன் முதற்றே உலகு.’

என்பது கடவுள் வாழ்த்தின் முதற்செய்யுள். இதனுள் ‘அகர முதல எழுத்தெல்லாம்’ என்றதன் பொருளைப் பார்ப்போம்:

1. “எய்தற்கரிய மறைகளை ஆயிரம் இன்தமிழால்
செய்தற் குலகில் வருஞ்சட கோபன்” (இராமாநுச நூற்.18)

“அந்தமி லாமறை ஆயிரத் தாழ்ந்த அரும்பொருளைச்
செந்தமி ழாகத் திருத்திலனேல்”

“குறையா மறையின்,
திடரைக் கலக்கித் திருவாய்மொழி எனும் தேனைத் தந்தான்”

“இழைத்தார் ஒருவரு மில்லா மறைகளை இன்தமிழால்
குழைத்தார்”

என்பன சடகோபரந்தாதி.

“மறைப்பாற் கடலைத் திருநானின் மந்தரத் தாற்கடைந்து
துறைப்பாற் படுத்தித் தமிழா யிரத்தின் சுவை அமிர்தம்
கறைப்பாம் பணைப்பள்ளி யானன்ப ரீட்டங் களித்தருந்த
விறைப்பான் கழலன்றிச் சன்ம விடாய்க்கு நிழலில்லையே.”

“அருமறை துணிந்த பொருண்முடிவை இன்சொல், அமுதொழுது
தமிழினில் விளம்பி, யருளிய சடகோபர்” [கின்ற]

என்றார் திவ்விய கவி.

“ ஓளகார இறுவாய்ப்
பன்னீ ரெழுத்தும் உயிரென மொழிப”¹

என்ற தொல்காப்பியச் சூத்திரத்தின் விசேடவுரையில் “ அவ்வகரர் தனியே நின்றலானும் பல மெய்க்கணின்று அவ்வம்மெய்க்கு இசைந்த ஓசைகளைப் பயந்தே நின்றலானும் வேறுபட்டதாதலின், ஒன்றேயாயும் பலவேயாயும் நிற்பதோர் தன்மையையுடைத்தென்று கோடும். இறைவன் ஒன்றேயாய் நிற்குந் தன்மையும் பல்லுயிர்க்குந் தானேயாய் அவற்றின் அளவாய் நிற்குந் தன்மையும்போல” என்றும்,

“ மெய்யி னியக்கம் அகரமொடு சிவனும் ”

என்ற சூத்திரத்தின் விசேடவுரையில் “ எழுதிக் காட்டுமிடத்துக் ககரமுதலியன உயிர் பெற்று நின்ற வடிவாகவே எழுதிப் பின்னர்த் தனிமெய்யாக்குதற்குப் புள்ளியிட்டுக் காட்டுகின்ற வாற்றான் இவை இயக்கு மிடத்தும் அகரங்கலந்து நின்றவாறு காண்க.” என்றும்,

“ இங்ஙனம் மெய்க்கண் அகரங் கலந்து நிற்குமாறு கூறினாற் போலப் பதினோர் உயிர்க்கண்ணும் அகரங் கலந்து நிற்கும் என்பது ஆசிரியர் கூறராயினார்; அந்நிலைமை தமக்கே புலப்படுதலானும் பிறர்க்கு இவ்வாறு உணர்த்துதல் அரிதாகலானும் என்று உணர்க. இறைவன் இயங்குதிணைக்கண்ணும் நிலைத்திணைக்கண்ணும் பிறவற்றின் கண்ணும் அவற்றின் தன்மையாய் நிற்குமாறு எல்லார்க்கும் ஒப்ப முடிந்தாற்போல, அகரம் உயிர்க்கண்ணும் தனி மெய்க்கண்ணும் கலந்து அவற்றின் தன்மையாயே நிற்குமென்பது சான்றோர்க்கெல்லாம் ஒப்ப முடிந்தது. ‘ அகரமுதல ’ என்னுங்குறளான் அகரமாகிய முதலையுடைய எழுத்துகளெல்லாம்; அதுபோல, இறைவனாகிய முதலையுடைத்து உலகம் என வள்ளுவனார் உவமை கூறியவாற்றானும், கண்ணன்² ‘ எழுத்துகளில் அகரமாகின்றேன் யானே ’ எனக் கூறியவாற்றானும், பிற நூல்களானும் உணர்க. இதனும், உண்மைத் தன்மையும் சிறிது கூறினாராயிற்று,” என்றும் எழுதியுள்ளார் உச்சிமேற் புலவர்கொள் நச்சினூர்க்கினியர்.

இங்கு, அகரம், உயிரும் மெய்யுமாகிய எல்லா எழுத்துகளுக்கும் முதலில் தனித்தும் அவ்வெல்லா எழுத்துகளோடு கலந்தும் நிற்குமென்றும், அவ்வாறிருத்தல் இறைவன் சராசரங்களின் வேறாய்த் தனித்தும் அவற்றோடு கலந்தும் நின்று விளங்குவதனைப் போன்றது என்றும் கூறி, அங்ஙனங் கூறியதற்கு மேற்கோளாக ‘ அகர முதல’

1. தொல். எழுத்ததிகாரம்.

2. ‘ அக்ஷராணு மகாரோஸ்மி ’ (பகவத்கீதை. 10: 33.)

என்னும் இக்குறளையும், பகவத்கீதையில் பகவான் கூறிய வார்த்தையை யும் எடுத்துக் காட்டித் தாம் கூறிய பொருளை நிறுவுகிறார் நச்சினூர்க்கினியர். இதனால், அகரத்தின் பொருளாயுள்ளவனும் ஆதிபகவனாயிருப்பவனும் கண்ணன் எம்பெருமானே என்பது அப்பெரியார் கருத்தாதல் தெளியப்படும். தாம் எடுத்துக்கொண்ட பொருளை நிறுவுவதற்குப் பிரமாணமாக இவ்விரண்டினையுமே அப்பெரியார் எடுத்துக் காட்டுவதனால் தத்துவப் பொருளை விளக்குவதற்கு வேறு நூல்கள் பிரமாணங்கள் ஆகமாட்டா என்பதும் இவ்விரு நூல்களும் இவ்விஷயத்தில் ஒத்த கருத்துடையன என்பதும் அப்பெரியார் கருத்தாதல் தெளியப்படும். “ உப்பக்கம் நோக்கி ” என்ற செய்யுளின் பொருளையும் ஈண்டுக் கடைப்பிடிக்க. வைதிகசமயத்தாருக்கு உயர்தரப் பிரமாணமாக முதன்மை பெற்று விளங்கும் ‘ பிரஸ்தானத் திரயங்கள் ’ எனப்படுகின்ற சுருதி, கீதை, சூத்திரம் என்னும் மூன்றனுள் கீதை ஒன்றாதலும் ஈண்டு நினைவு கூர்க.

தமிழ் மொழியில் தொல்காப்பியத்தைப் போன்று வடமொழியில் “ அ இ உண் ” என்றதனை ஆதியாகவுடைய மாகேஸ்வர சூத்திரங்களை அடியாகக் கொண்ட பாணினீயம் என்னும் பெரியதோர் உயரிய இலக்கண நூல் உண்டு என்பதனை அறிஞர் அறிவர். அக்காலத்துச் சிலர் அந்நூலில் மங்கலச் சொல் இல்லை என்று குறை கூறினாராக, அப்பொழுது “ அ இதி பகவதோ நாராயணஸ்ய பிரதம அபிதாநம் கிந்நாம மங்களம் நகருதம் ” - அகரமானது பகவானான ஸ்ரீமந் நாராயணனுக்கு முதல் திருப்பெயர் ஆகையாலே அவனைக் குறிக்கும் அவ்வகரம் முதற்கண் எடுத்திருப்பதனால் எந்த மங்களந்தான் இங்குச் சொல்லப்படவில்லை? ” என்று கூறி அக்குற்றத்தை நீக்கியருளினார்கள் பண்டைப் பெரியோர்கள்.

இதனால், பகவான் என்னும் பெயர்க்குரியவன் நாராயணனே என்பதும், அவனது திருப்பெயரே அகரம் என்பதும், அவனது திருப்பெயராகையாலே அகரம் மங்கலச் சொல்லாம் என்பதும் தெளியப்படும்.

‘ ஓம் ’ என்னும் பிரணவம் பஞ்சாக்ஷரம் முதலான மகாமந்திரங்களோடு சேர்த்து எண்ணப்படாமையும், எட்டெழுத்தாகிய திருவட்டாக்ஷர மகா மந்திரத்தோடு சேர்த்து எண்ணப்பட்டிருத்தலும் அகரத்தின் பொருளாயுள்ளவன் திருமாலே என்பதனை வலியுறுத்தும்.

‘ ஓம்எனும் ஓரெழுத் ததனி னுள்ளுயிர்
ஆமவன் அறிவினுக்கு அறிவு மாயினான்
தாமமு வுலகமுந் தழுவிச் சார்தலால்
தூமமுங் கனலும்போல் தொடர்ந்த தோற்றத்தான். ’
என்பர் கம்பநாட்டடிகள். [இரணியன் வதைப். 76]

ஆக, மேலே காட்டிப் போந்த பெரியோர்களுடைய வசனங்கள் முதலியவற்றால் 'அகர முதல எழுத்தெல்லாம்' என்றதன் பொருளையும், 'எழுத்தெல்லாம் அகர முதல' என்று கூறுது, சர்வ மங்கள சொரூபியாகிய திருநாராயணனுடைய முதல் திருப்பெயர் அகர மாதலின் அப்பரமனுடைய திருப்பெயராகிய அகரத்தை மங்களத்தின் பொருட்டு முதலிலே வைத்து 'அகர முதல எழுத்தெல்லாம்' என்று கூறினர் என்ற உண்மைப் பொருளையும் தெளிந்தோம். "அகாரோ விஷ்ணு வாசக:" என்பது மறைமொழி,

இனி, "ஆதிபகவன் முதற்றே உலகு" என்பதனை நோக்குவோம்: 'ஆதிபகவன் முதற்றே உலகு' என்னும் இத்தொடரிலுள்ள 'ஆதிபகவன்' என்னும் பெயர் கண்ணன் எம்பெருமாளையே காட்டுகின்றது என்று கொண்டார் நச்சினூர்க்கினியர் என்பதனை மேலே தெளிந்தோம். பகவன் என்னும் பெயரை ஸ்ரீமந் நாராயணனுக்கே உரியதாகக் கொண்டார் பாணினீயத்திற்கு விரிவுரை எழுதிய பதஞ்சலி பகவான் என்பதனையும் மேலே தெளிந்தோம். அப்பெரியார் இருவரும் அங்ஙனங் கூறுதற்குத் துணையாக நின்ற சாஸ்திரங்களை இனிப் பார்ப்போம்: "வேதார்த்தம் அறுதியிடுவது, ஸ்மிருதி இதி காச புராணங்களாலே, ஸ்மிருதியாலே பூர்வ பாகத்தில் அர்த்தம் அறுதியிடக் கடவது; மற்றை இரண்டாலும் உத்தர பாகத்தில் அர்த்தம் அறுதியிடக் கடவது," என்பர் பெரியோர் ஆதலால், அவ் விரண்டனுள் ஒன்றான புராணம் கூறுவதனைக் கீழே தருகின்றேன்:

"பரப்பிரஹ்மத்தின் சொரூபம், எங்கும் உள்ளதும் தனக்கு ஒரு காரணம் இல்லாததும் வேறு ஒன்றினால் வியாபிக்கக் கூடாததுமாயிருக்கின்றது. மேலும், எதினின்றும் எல்லாம் உண்டாகின்றனவோ, ஞானிகள் எதனைக் காண்கின்றார்களோ, அதுதான் பிரம்மம். அதுதான் மேலான ஜோதி. விஷ்ணுவின் உத்தம சொரூபம் என்று சுருதிகளில் சொல்லப்பட்ட சூக்ஷ்மமான அந்தப் பிரஹ்மத்தை மோகூம் பெற வேண்டுகவர்கள் தியானிக்க வேண்டும். பரமத்துமாவின் அந்தச் சொரூபந்தான் 'பகவான்' என்ற சொல்லுக்குப் பொருள். அந்தப் பகவான் என்னுஞ் சொல் எம்பெருமானுடைய சொரூப ரூப குண விபவங்களைக் குறைவின்றிச் சொல்லுகின்றது. இப்படி நன்றாகச் சொல்லப்பட்ட சொரூபம் முதலானவைகையுடைய அந்தப் பரமத்துமாவின் தத்துவம் எதனாலே விளங்குமோ, அத்தகைய துவாதசாக்ஷரத்தை அங்கமாகக் கொண்டதுதான் பரவிததையாகும். மற்றைய வேத பாகமெல்லாம் அபர விததையாகும். 'பகவான்' என்னும் இந்தப் பதம் நாம ரூபமாகிற விஷயத்தினின்றும் விடுபட்டவ

னாய்ப் பிரமசமனான முக்தனையும் பூஜை நிமித்தமாய் உபசாரத்தாற் சொல்லும். ஆனால், குற்றங்களுக்கு எதிர்த்தட்டாயும் மகா விபூதிகளை யுடையதாயும் சர்வ காரணங்களுக்கும் காரணமாயும் இருக்கிற பரப் பிரஹ்மத்தைத் தான் முக்கியமாகச் சொல்லுகின்றது. இச்சொல், பிரகிருதியைத் தூண்டுதலும், உடையனாயிருத்தலும், போஷித்தலும், காத்தலும், அழித்தலும், உண்டாக்கலும், எல்லாவற்றிற்கு மிடமாயிருத்தலும் என்னும் இப்பொருள்களையுடையதாதலால், பரப்பிரமமாகிய வாசுதேவனுக்கேயல்லாது பிறருக்குச் செல்லாது. உயர்வு குறித்துச் சொல்ல வேண்டியவிடத்திலே இச்சொல்லைச் சங்கேதமாய் உபயோகிப்பார்கள். அச் சங்கேதத்தின்படியும் வாசுதேவனையே முக்கியமாக உணர்த்தும். மற்றைய இடத்தில் உபசார வழக்கமாய்ச் செல்லும். அப்படிச் சொல்லுவதற்கு ஞான விசேஷம் அவ்விடத்தில் இருக்க வேண்டும்; என்றது, உத்பத்தி பிரளயம் பூதங்களின் போக்கு வரவு வித்தை அவித்தை இவற்றை அறிந்தவன் பகவான் என்று உபசார வழக்கால் சொல்லப்பட வேண்டும் என்றபடி. மேலும், 'பகவான்' என்னும் இந்தப் பெயர், நிறைந்திருக்கின்ற ஞானம் சக்தி பலம் ஐசுவரியம் வீரியம் தேஜசுக்களாகிய நற்குணங்களையும், இழிந்த குணங்கள் ஒன்றுமில்லாமையையும் சொல்லுக்குப் பொருளாகக் காட்டுகின்றது. ஆதலால், 'பகவான்' என்னும் இப் பெயர் எல்லாக் குற்றங்கட்கும் எதிர்த்தட்டாயும் எல்லா நற்குணங்களையுமுடையவனாயுமுள்ள வாசுதேவனுக்கே முக்கிய வாசகமாகின்றது. சகல ஆதாரமாயும் சகல ஆதேயமாயும் விளங்குகின்ற ஸ்ரீ விஷ்ணுவை வாசுதேவன் என்னும் பெயர் காட்டுகின்றது," என்று ஸ்ரீ விஷ்ணுபுராணம்¹ கூறுகின்றது. இதனால், பகவான் என்ற பெயர் வாசுதேவனுக்கே உரியது என்பதும், அப்பெயரால் ஏனையோரை வழங்குவது உபசார வழக்காதலும் தெளியப்படும்.

இனி, வழக்குகளைப் பார்ப்போம்: திருமால் அடியார்கள் 'பாகவதர்' என்று வழங்கப்படுகின்றார்கள். பகவானுக்கு அடிமைப்பட்டு அவனை வணங்கி வழிபடுங்காரணத்தால் அவர்கள் அப்பெயரால் குறிக்கப்படுகின்றார்கள். இப்பெயர் வேறு எம்மதத்தினர்க்கும் வழங்காமை காண்க. மற்றையோர் சைவர், ஜைனர், பௌத்தர், என்ற இன்றோரன்ன பெயர்களால் வழங்கப்படுவர்.

² 'தாவில் சௌமியரே யோகர் துகம்பரர் சமண நீத்தோர் மாவிரதியரே பாசுபதர் களாமுகர் சைவத்தோர்

1. விஷ்ணுபுராணம், அம். 6. அத்-5. சுலோ. 67-80.
2. சூடாமணி நிகண்டு, மக்கட்பெயர்த் தொகுதி, 3.

மேவுமால் சமயத் தோர்பேர் மிக்க பாகவதராகும்
சீவகர் பௌத்தரோடு தேரர் சாக் கியரே புத்தர்.

என்பது நிகண்டு.

கண்ணபிரான் அருளிச்செய்த கீதையே 'பகவத்கீதை' என்று வழங்கப்படும்; மற்றையோர் கூறிய கீதைகள் பிரம கீதை, சிவ கீதை என்ற பெயர்களால் தெரிக்கப்படும். பகவானைப்பற்றிக் கூறும் புராணம் 'பாகவதம்' என்று வழங்கப்படும்; ஏனையோரைப் பற்றிக் கூறும் புராணங்கள் பிரம புராணம், இலிங்க புராணம் முதலிய பெயர்களால் கூறப்படும். ஓர் அவதார விசேஷத்தில் பகவானுடன் பிறந்த துர்க்கை 'பகவதி' என்ற பெயரால் வழங்கப்படுகின்றாள்; அவளைப் பற்றிய புராணம் தேவி பாகவதம் என்று வழங்கப்படுகின்றது.

ஆக, மேலே காட்டிப் போந்த புராண வசனங்கள் முதலியவற்றால் பகவான் என்னும் பெயர் நாராயணனையே குறிப்பதாம் என்பது வெள்ளிடை மலைபோல் விளங்குதல் காண்க. முன்னையோர் கூற்று களும், புராண வசனங்களும், வழக்காறுகளும் இங்ஙனம் இருப்பதனால், இப்பெயரால் மற்றையோரை வழங்குதல் உபசார வழக்காதல் தெளியப்படும். இவற்றையெல்லாம் திருவுள்ளம்பற்றியே "ஐஞாநாதிகளால் அல்பம் உத்கர்ஷம் உடையவன்பக்கலிலே பகவத்சப்தம் வர்த்தியாநின்றதிறே; 'அந்யதரஹ்யுபசாரத:' என்கிற படியே, பகவத்சப்தம் முக்கியமாக வசிப்பது இவன் பக்கலிலே; அல்லாதார்பக்கல் ஓளபசாரிகம்," என்று வரையறுத்தனர் வைணவப் பெரியோர்.

இனி, 'ஆதிபகவன்' என்னும் தொடரில் முன்னேயுள்ள 'ஆதி' என்றதனை நோக்குவோம்; ஆதி பகவன் என்ற தொடருக்கு 'ஆதியாகிய பகவன்' என்று பொருள்கூறி, 'ஆதிபகவன் என்னும் இரு பெயரொட்டுப் பண்புத் தொகை வடநூல் முடிபு' என்று விசேட முங் கூறினர் ஆசிரியர் பரிமேலழகர். இதனால், இவ்விருபெயர்களும் ஒரு பொருளுக்காக வழங்கப்படும் பெயர்கள் என்பது அவர் கருத்தாதல் பெறுதும். மேலும், 'பகவான்' என்பது, திருமாலுக்குரிய திருப்பெயர் என்பது மேலே கண்டோமாதலின், 'ஆதி' என்பதும் அவ்விறைவனையே காட்டும் பெயர் என்பது சொல்ல வேண்டாவன்றே? சிவஞான சித்தியார் பரபக்கத்தில் பாஞ்சராத்திரிமதமறுதலையில் கூறப்படும் "ஆதியாய் அருவு மாகி" என்ற செய்யுளாலும் 'பாஞ்சராத்திரி! நீ உன் கர்த்தாவை 'ஆதி' என்று கூறினாய்; அங்ஙனம் ஆதியாயின், ஆதிக்கு முடிவுண்டாய்க் கர்த்தா

வும் அல்லனாவான்', என்ற அதன் உரையாலும் 'ஆதி' என்ற பெயர் திருமாலுக்கு உரிய பெயர் என்பது வலியுறும். இதனால், 'ஆதி' என்ற பெயரைத் தம் தெய்வத்திற்கு வைத்து வழங்கிய தெய்வப் புலமைத் திருவள்ளுவனாரும் பாஞ்சராத்திரியாதல் கண்டு கொள்க. 'பாஞ்சராத்திரம்' என்பது வைணவ ஆகமம்; அதன் நெறியில் நிற்பவர்கள் பாஞ்சராத்திரிகள். "அந்தமில் ஆதியம் பகவன்" என்ற தமிழ் மறை எழுந்ததும் அவர்தம் கூற்றினை நோக்கியே போலும்!

ஆக, இதுகாறும் கூறியவாற்றால் அகரத்தின் பொருளான வனும், ஆதி என்ற பெயராலும் பகவன் என்ற பெயராலும் சொல்லப் படுகின்றவனுமான கண்ணன் எம்பெருமானே காரணன் என்பது முதற்குறளால் தெளியப்பட்ட பொருளாம் எனத் தெளிதல் தகும்.

நன்று; நிகண்டு நூலார், 'பகவன்' என்ற பெயர்க்குரிய பொருள்களைக் கூறுமிடத்துப் "பகவனே ஈசன் மாயோன் பங்கயன் சினனே புத்தன்" என்று ஈசனை முதலில் வைத்துக் கூறுதலானும் சிவபிரானுடைய சக்தியாகிய தூர்க்கைக்கும் பகவதி என்ற பெயர் உண்மையானும் 'பகவன்' என்ற பெயரைச் சிவபிரானுக்கே உரிய பெயராகவும் கூறுதல் அமையுமே? எனின், கூறுவல்: நிகண்டு நூலார் சொற்களுக்குரிய பொருள்களைக் கூறுமிடத்து அப்பொருள் களைக் காட்டும் பெயர்களைச் செய்யுளின் ஓசை இன்பம் ஒன்றையே நோக்கி முதலிலோ இறுதியிலோ அமைத்துப் பாடுமியல்புடையார் என்பதும், பொருள்களின் சிறப்பும் சிறப்பினமையும் நோக்கி அவ்வவ்வெயர்களை முதலிலோ இடையிலோ இறுதியிலோ அமைத்துப் பாடுமியல்புடையாரல்லர் என்பதும் அந்நூலைப் படித்த அனைவரும் அறிவர். பொருள்களின் சிறப்பும் சிறப்பின்மையும் பார்த்துப் பெயர்களை முன்னும் பின்னும் அமைத்துப் பாடியிருப்பாராயின், அருக மதத்தினரான அவர், அருகனையன்றே முதலில் வைத்துப் பாடுவார்? ¹ 'பகவனே ஈசன் மாயோன் பங்கயன் சினனே புத்தன்' என்று சினனை நான்காவது எண்ணில் வைத்துப் பாடுவாரா? இதனைச் சிந்தித்தல் வேண்டாவோ? மேலும், "ஆதியே முதல் நே ரோடல் அருகன் மால் ஈசன் வேதன்" என்று 'ஆதி' என்ற சொல்லிற்குரிய பொருள்களைக் கூறுமிடத்துச் சிவபிரானை அருகனுக்கும் மாலுக்கும் ஈற்றில் வைத்துப் பாடுகின்றார் அந்நிகண்டு நூலார்.

1. "பகவனே அருகன் மாயோன் பங்கயன் சிவனே புத்தன்" என்ற பாடமே முன்னர் இருந்தது; பின்னர், ஒரு சிலரால் திருத்தப்பட்டது என்று பெரியோர் கூறக் கேட்டிருக்கிறேன்.

இங்கு எந்தக் காரணத்தைக் கூற முடியும்? மேலும், பகவன் என்பது சிவபிரானுக்கே உரிய பெயர் என்று அவர் கொண்டிருப்பாராயின், சிவபிரான் அடியார்களைப் 'பாகவதர்' என்று அவர் கூறமைக்குக் காரணம் யாது? அங்ஙனம் கூறாததோடமையாது, திருமால் அடியார்களையன்றே அவர் பாகவதர் என்று கூறுகின்றார்? ஆதலால், ஈசன் என்ற பெயரை முதலில் வைத்தார்; ஆதலால், பகவன் என்ற பெயர் சிவபிரானுக்கே உரிய பெயர் என்பது அவர்தம் கொள்கை என்று கூறல் அவர்தம் கருத்துக்கு முரணம் என்க.

'பகவதி' என்ற பெயரைப் பார்ப்போம்: இச்சொல் 'பகவானுடைய சம்பந்தத்தையுடையவள்' என்று பொருள்படும். இப்பெயரால் திருமகளும் தூர்க்கையும் வழங்கப்படுவார்கள். பகவானுக்கு மனைவியாதலின் திருமகள் பகவதி என்றும், ஓர் அவதார விசேடத்தில் பகவானுடன் பிறந்தவளாதலின் தூர்க்கை பகவதி என்றும் வழங்கப்படுகின்றார்கள் என்க. திருமகளுக்கு மனைவி சம்பந்தம்; தூர்க்கைக்குத் தங்கை சம்பந்தம். இங்ஙனம் பொருள் கோடலே மரபு. இவ்விருவரும் 'நாராயணி' என்ற பெயரால் வழங்கப்படுதலையும் இங்கு நினைவிற்கோடல் வேண்டும். நாராயணனுடைய சம்பந்தத்தையுடையவர்களாதலின் திருமகளும் தூர்க்கையும் நாராயணி என்று வழங்கப்படுகின்றார்கள். இங்கும், திருமகளுக்கு மனைவி சம்பந்தம்; தூர்க்கைக்குத் தங்கை சம்பந்தம். "சூலி நீலி மாலவற் கிளங்கிளை" என்றார் இளங்கோவடிகள். 'மாலினுக்கு இளைய நங்கை பகவதி'; "விமலை வண் கலையானத்தி விசயை நாரணியே விந்தை" என்பன நிகண்டு. மாலினுக்கு இளைய நங்கையாயினாள்; அதனால், பகவதி என்ற பெயரினள் ஆனாள் என்ற கருத்து மண்டல புருடன் வாக்கில் தொனித்தல் காண்க. இங்ஙனம் நேர்ப்பொருள் கொள்ளாது, 'பகவதி என்பது, பகவானுடன் சிவனுடைய மனைவி - தூர்க்கை' என்று பொருள் கூறின், அச்சொல் திருமகளைக் குறிக்கும்போது யாங்ஙனம் பொருள் கொள்வது? மேலும், நாராயணி என்பது, தூர்க்கையைக் குறிக்கும்போது நாராயணனுடைய மனைவி என்று பொருள் கொள்ள இயலாதே? ஆதலால், தொல்லோர் சென்ற நெறியே சென்று 'பகவதி' என்பதற்குப் பகவானுடன் கண்ணபிரானுடைய தங்கை என்றே கொள்ளல் வேண்டும். 'சிவபிரானுடைய மனைவியாதலின், தூர்க்கை பகவதி என்ற பெயரடைந்தாள்' என்று கூறல் மரபுக்கு மாறுபட்டது என்க. இவ்விரண்டும் வடமொழிப் பெயர்கள். "வடநூல் உணர்ந்தார்க்கன்றித் தமிழியல்பு விளங்காதென்பதும் உணர்ந்து கோடற்கன்றே பாயிரத்துள் 'ஐந்திரம் நிறைந்த தொல்காப்பியன்' என்றதூஉம் என்க," என்று மாதவச் சிவஞான யோகிகள் கூறுவர்.

ஆதலால், தமிழில் கலந்துள்ள வடமொழிப் பெயர்களுக்குப் பொருள் கூறுங்கால் அம்மரபு கெடாதவாறு பொருள் கோடல் வேண்டும் என்க.

நன்று; 'ஆதி' என்பதற்குச் சிவசக்தி என்று பொருள் கொண்டு ஆதியோடு (சக்தி) கூடிய பகவன் என்று பொருள் கொண்டால் என்னை? எனின், கூறுவன்: ஆசிரியர் நூல் செய்த காலத்தும் அதற்கு முற்பட்ட காலத்தும் அச்சொல் அப்பொருளில் வழக்காற்றில் இல்லையே என்க. தொல்காப்பியம் முதலிய இலக்கண நூல்களிலும், தொல்காப்பியங்களான எட்டுத் தொகை பத்துப்பாட்டு முதலிய இலக்கிய நூல்களிலும் அச்சொல் அப்பொருளில் வழங்காமை காண்க. பிற்காலத்தார் ஒருசிலர் கூறின, அது கொண்டு முற்காலத்துச் சான்றோர் இலக்கியங்கட்குப் பொருள் காண்டல் மரபு அன்மையானும், "ஆதியே முதல் நேரோடல் அருகன் மால் ஈசன் வேதன்" என்று நிகண்டு கூறுதலானும், அந்நிகண்டிலே தெய்வப் பெயர்த் தொகுதியிலும் 'ஆதி' என்ற பெயரைச் சிவசக்திக்குக் கூருமையானும் (தெய்வப் பெயர்த்தொகுதி, செய். 32, 33, 38, 39, 40) அங்ஙனம் பொருள் கோடல் ஏற்புடைத்து அன்று என்க. மேலும், பகவன் என்ற பெயர் கண்ணபிரானுக்கே உரிய பெயராக மேலே தெளிந்தோ மாதலாலும், அங்ஙனம் பொருள் கூறல் ஆசிரியர் கருத்துக்கு முரணான மாறுங் காண்க.

இனி, மேலே செல்வோம் :

இறைவனைப் போன்றே இறைவனுடைய கல்யாண குணங்களும் நித்தியமாய் உள்ளவை என்பது வைணவ மதத்தின் கொள்கை. ¹

'இருள்சேர் இருவினையும் சேரா இறைவன்
பொருள்சேர் புகழ்புரிந்தார் மாட்டு.'

என்பது திருக்குறள் கடவுள் வாழ்த்தில் ஐந்தாவது குறள்.

இதனுள், "இறைவன் பொருள்சேர் புகழ்" என்னுந் துணையே இங்கு வேண்டுவது. இதனால், 'இறைவனைப் போன்றே இறைவனுடைய புகழும் நித்தியம், என்றுமுள்ளது,' என்பது அவர் கருத்தாதல் அறியப்படும். இங்ஙனம் இப்பெரியார் கூறுதற்கு அடி, ஆசிரியர் தொல்காப்பியனார் என்பதனைக் கூறவும் வேண்டுமோ?

1. "என்பெருக் கந்நலத்து, ஒன்பொரு ளீறில, வண்புகழ் நாரணன்", "பல பிறப்பாய் ஒளிவரு முழுநலம் முதலில கேடில" "புட்பாகன் பெரிய தனி மாப்புகழே" என்பன தமிழ் மறை.

“மாயோன் மேய மன்பெருஞ் சிறப்பின்
தாவா விழுப்புசுழ்ப் பூவை நிலையும்”¹

என்ற அடிகளால் இறைவனுடைய புகழைத் ‘தாவா விழுப்புசுழ்’ என்று தொல்காப்பியம் கூறுதல் காண்க. “தொல்காப்பியன்றன் ஆணைவழி நின்றல் தமிழ் அறிந்தோர்க்குக் கடனே” என்றார் பல்காயனார். தொல்காப்பியத்தில் ‘மயங்கக் கூறல் இல்லை’ என்பதே மாதவச் சிவஞான யோகிகள் கருத்தாகும். பின் வந்த சான்றோர்களும்

“தேயா விழுப்புசுழ்த் தெய்வம் பரவுதும்” (கலித். 103.) என்றும்,

“தோலா நல்லிசை நால்வ ருள்ளும்
கூற்றெுத் தீயே மாற்றருஞ் சீற்றம்
வலியொத் தீயே வாலி யோனைப்
புகழொத் தீயே இகழுந ரடுநனை” (புறம். 57.)

என்றும்,

“வல்லா ராயினும் வல்லுந ராயினும்
புகழ்த் லுற்றோர்க்கு மாயோ னன்ன
உரைசால் சிறப்பிற் புகழ்சால் மாற!”² (புறம். 56.)

என்றும் பாவொராயினர். இன்னோரன்னவற்றை யெல்லாம் தம் திருவுள்ளத்திற் கொண்டே தொல்லோர் சென்ற நெறியே சென்று “இறைமைக் குணங்களிலராயினரை உடையரெனக் கருதி அறிவி லார் கூறுகின்ற புகழ்கள் பொருள் சேராவாகலின், அவை முற்று முடைய இறைவன் புகழே ‘பொருள்சேர் புகழ்’ எனப்பட்டது,” என்று அத்திருக்குறளுக்கு விசேடவுரை எழுதினார் பரிமேலழகர்.

‘பொறிவாயில் ஐந்தவித்தான் பொய்தீர் ஒழுக்க
நெறிநின்றார் நீடுவாழ் வார்.’

என்பது கடவுள் வாழ்த்தில் 6-ஆம் செய்யுள். இங்குப் ‘பொறிவாயில் ஐந்தவித்தான்’ என்றது கண்ணபிரானை. ‘பொய்தீர் ஒழுக்க நெறி’ என்றது பகவத்கீதையை. ‘பொறிவாயில் ஐந்தவித்தான்’ என்ற

1. தொல். பொருள். புறத். 5.

2. “வல்லவர்க்கும் மாட்டாதார்க்கும் ஒப்பப் புகழ்ந்து முடிய ஒண்ணு மையின் மாயோனன்ன’ என்றார்; அன்றி, அவ்விருவர்க்கும் ஒப்ப அருள் பண்ணுதலின் அவ்வாறு கூறிற்று எனினும் அமையும்;” என்பர் புறநானூற்று உரையாசிரியர்.

பெயர் 'இருடிகேசன்' என்ற திருப்பெயரின் மொழிபெயர்ப்பு என்பர் பெரியோர். 'கிருதக்நன்' என்ற வடமொழிப் பெயரைச் 'செய்ந் நன்றிகொன்றமகன்' என்றும், 'அமாத்யன்' என்ற வடமொழிப் பெயரை 'உழையிருந்தான்' என்றும் பிருண்டும் வடசொற்களை இவ்வாசிரியர் மொழி பெயர்த்துக் கூறுதல் காண்க. கண்ணபிரான் நைஷ்டிக பிரஹ்மசாரி என்பதனைப் பாரதத்தில் பரீக்ஷித்து மஹாராஜன் பிறப்பால் உணர்க.

‘கோளில் பொறியிற் குணமில்வே எண்குணத்தான்
தானை வணங்காத் தலை.’

என்பது திருக்குறள் கடவுள் வாழ்த்தில் 9-ஆம் குறள். ⁴ இறைவனை குணங்களைக் கொண்டே நிரூபிப்பது வைணவ மதக் கொள்கை. ¹ இச்செய்யுளில் 'எண்குணத்தான்' என்று குணங்களைக் கொண்டே இறைவனுக்குப் பெயர் அமைத்திருத்தலைக் காண்க. 'எண்குணத்தான்' என்ற பெயர்க்குப் பலரும் பலவாறு பொருள் கூறுவர். ஆயின், இளங்கோவடிகள் இத்திருக்குறளின் பொருளை விரித்துக் கூறுவார் போன்று 'எண்குணத்தான்' என்ற பெயரின் பொருளை விரித்துப் பாடுதலை நாம் கவனிக்க வேண்டும். அவற்றைக் கீழே தருகிறேன் :

‘முவுலகு மீரடியால் முறைநிரம்பா வகைமுடியத்
தாவியசே வடிசேப்பத் தம்பியொடுங் கான்போந்து
சோவரணும் போர்மடியத் தொல்லிலங்கை கட்டழித்த
சேவகன்சீர் கேளாத செவிஎன்ன செவியே!
திருமால்சீர் கேளாத செவிஎன்ன செவியே’!

‘பெரியவனை மாயவனைப் பேருலக மெல்லாம்
விரிகமல உந்தியுடை விண்ணவனைக் கண்ணும்
திருவடியும் கையும் திருவாயும் செய்ய
கரியவனைக் காணாத கண்ணென்ன கண்ணே!
கண்ணிமைத்துக் காண்பார்தங் கண்ணென்ன கண்ணே!

‘மடந்தாமும் நெஞ்சத்துக் கஞ்சனார் வஞ்சங்
கடந்தானை நூற்றுவர்பால் நாற்றிசையும் போற்றப்
படர்ந்தா ரணமுழங்கப் பஞ்சவர்க்குத் தூது
நடந்தானை ஏத்தாத நாஎன்ன நாவே!
நாராயணு என்னு நர்வென்ன நாவே’!

1. 'உயர்வற வுயர்நல முடையவன் எவன் அவன்
துயரறு சுடரடி தொழுதுஎழுள் மனனே,'
என்பர் வேதம் தமிழ் செய்த மாறர்.

என்பன அவர் பாடியவை. திருக்குறளிற் கூறப்பட்ட 'தலை' என்னும் உறுப்பை நீக்கிச் 'செவி' முதலிய உறுப்புகளையே எடுத்து "என்ன செவி! என்ன கண்! என்ன நா!" என்று பாடுதலும் கவனித்தற் குரியன. "காணாத கண் முதலியன போல வணங்காத தலைகள் பயனில் எனத் தலைமேல் வைத்துக் கூறினார், கூறினாரேனும், இனம்பற்றி வாழ்த்தாத நாக்களும் அவ்வாறே பயனில் என்பதும் கொள்க," என்பது பரிமேலழகர் விசேடவுரை.¹ இத்தாழிசைகள் மேற்கூறிய திருக்குறளையே அடியாகக் கொண்டு எழுந்தன என்று கூறின் இதனை இல்லை என்று கூறுவாருமுளரோ? 'குன்றக் குரவை' முதலிய இடங்களில் அவ்வடிகள் இங்ஙனம் பாடாமையும் காண்க. குறட்பாக்களையும் பாக்களின் பொருளையும் ஆங்காங்கு வேண்டிய இடங்களில் அவ்வடிகள் அமைத்துப் பாடியிருத்தலை அறிஞர் அறிவர்.

‘பிறவிப் பெருங்கடல் நீந்துவர் நீந்தார்
இறைவனடிசேரா தார்.’

என்பது கடவுள் வாழ்த்தின் 10-ஆம் குறள். மக்கட்பிறவிக்குப் பயன் கடவுளை வாழ்த்திப் பிறவியை அறுத்தலேயாம். ஆதலின், முடிந்தது முடித்தலான இக்குறளில் 'இறைவன் அடிசேர்ந்தார் பிறவிப் பெருங்கடல் நீந்துவர்,' என முடிக்கின்றார். மாயோன் மலரடியே பிறவிப்பிணிக்கு மருந்து என்பதனை,

“மாஅ யோயே! மாஅ யோயே!
மறுபிறப் பறுக்கும் மாசில் சேவடி
மணிதிகழ் உருபின் மாஅ யோயே!”

என்ற பரிபாடற் பகுதியானும் உணர்க.

‘ஓன்றே பொருளெனின் வேறென்ப; வேறெனின்
அன்றென்ப வாறு சமயத்தார்—நன்றென
எப்பா லவரும் இயைபவே வள்ளுவனார்
முப்பால் மொழிந்த மொழி.’

என்று ஆன்றோரால் சிறப்பித்துக் கூறப்பட்ட திருக்குறளில், தெய்வப்புலமைத் திருவள்ளுவனார், இறைவன் யாவன்? என்னும் வினா

1. 'நீணகம் சுற்றி நெடுவரைநட்டு ஆழ்கடலைப்
பேணன் கடைந்து அமுதம் கொண்டு கந்த பெம்மாளைப்
பூரை மார்பனைப் புள்ளாரும் பொன்மலையைக்
காணாதார் கண்ணென்றும் கண்ணல்ல கண்டாமே.'

என்பது திருமங்கை மன்னன் திருவாக்கு. இங்ஙனமே மற்றை உறுப்புகளையும் தனித்தனியே எடுத்துப் பாடியிருத்தலை அத்திருப்பதிகத்திற் காண்க.

விற்கு விடையாக, 'முறைசெய்து காப்பாற்றுகின்றவனே இறைவனாவான்,' என்றும், அவ்விறைவன் அம்முறை செய்து காப்பாற்றாதலை அரசர் மூலமாகவும் செய்கின்றான் ஆதலின், அவ்வரசர்களும் தொழிலுரிமை பற்றி இறைவன் என்ற பெயரால் வழங்கப்படுவார்கள் என்றும் கூறுகின்றார்.

‘முறைசெய்து காப்பாற்றும் மன்னவன் மக்கட்கு இறையென்று வைக்கப்படும்.’

என்னும் திருக்குறளையும், 'தான் முறை செய்து பிறர் நலியாமல் காத்தலையும் செய்யும் அரசன், பிறப்பான் மகனேயாயினும், செயலால் மக்கட்குக் கடவுள் என்று வைக்கப்படுவான்' என்ற அதன் உரையினையும் காண்க.

ஈண்டுத் தெய்வப் புலமைத் திருவள்ளுவனார், 'முறை செய்து காப்பாற்றுவன் யாவன்? அவன் இறையென்று சொல்லப்படுவான்,' என்பார், அதனை அங்ஙனம் விதிமுகத்தாற் கூறுது, உடம்படு புணர்த்தலென்னு முத்திவகையால் 'முறை செய்து காப்பாற்றும் இறை' என்றும், மன்னவன் இறையென்னும் பெயர்க்குரியனல்லன் ஆயினும், முறைசெய்து காப்பாற்றும் தொழில் உரிமையான், அம் மன்னனும் இறையென்று சொல்லப்பவான் என்பார், 'முறைசெய்து காப்பாற்றும் மன்னவன் இறையென்று வைக்கப்படும்' என்றும், 'மன்னனை இறையென்று கூறியவதனால், அவ்விறைவன் 'முழுவே முலகுக்கும் நாதன் ஆதலைப் போன்று, இம்மன்னனும் முழுவேமுலகுக்கும் நாதன் ஆவானே என்ற ஐயம் தோன்றுமன்றே? அவ்வையத்தை நீக்குதற்கு இவ்வுலகிலுள்ள மக்கட்கு மாத்திரமே நாதன் என்பார், 'மக்கட்கு இறையென்று' என்றும், பாதுகாக்கும் தொழிலுரிமையான் இறையாவான் என்பார், 'வைக்கப்படும்' என்றும் கூறினார். "செயலான் மக்கட்குக் கடவுள் என்று வேறு வைக்கப்படும்" என்ற பரிமேலழகருரையும் ஈண்டுச் சிந்திக்கற்பாலது.

ஆசிரியர் பரிமேலழகர், இத் திருக்குறளுக்கு இவ்வகையில் விரித்து இங்கு உரை கூற்றிறிலர் ஆயினும், அப்பெரியார் கருத்து யான் கூறியதேயாம் என்பதனைக் கீழ் வருவனவற்றான் தெளிக.

‘இறைமாட்சி’ என்னும் அதிகாரத்திற்கு அவதாரிகை கூறப் புக்க ஆசிரியர் பரிமேலழகர், “இறை மாட்சியாவது அவன்தன் நற்குண நற்செய்கைகள்,” என்று கூறிப் பின்னர், ‘அனைத்துலகும் அனைத்துயிரும் அமைத்தளித்துப் போற்றும் பரமனுக்குரிய இறையென்னும் பெயரால் அரசனைக் கூறல் பொருந்துமோ?’ என்ற வினாவைத் தாமே தம்முள்ளத்தில் எழுப்பிக்கொண்டு அதற்கு விடை

யாக, “உலகபால ருருவாய் நின்று உலகங்காத்தலின் இறையென்றார்,” என்ற விசேடமும் கூறித் தாம் கூறிய விசேட உரைக்கு மேற்கோளாகத் “‘திருவுடை மன்னரைக் காணில் திருமலைக் கண்டேனே யென்னும்’ என்று பெரியாரும் பணித்தார்,” என்று தமிழ் மறையின் பாசுரத்தையும் எடுத்துக் காட்டினார். இங்குப் பரிமேலழகர் எழுதிய விசேடவுரை, “முறைசெய்து காப்பாற்றும்” என்ற திருக்குறளை ஆதாரமாகக் கொண்டு எழுந்ததேயாம் என்பது உற்று நோக்குவார்க்குப் புலனாம்.

ஆயின், ‘இறைவன்’ என்பதற்கு எல்லாப் பொருளினும் தங்குகின்றவன் என்ற பொருளை ஈண்டுத் திருவள்ளுவனார் கூறிற்றிலரே? எனின், ‘காப்பாற்றும்’ என்ற சொல்லின் பொருளால் அதனையும் பெறவைத்தார் என்க. ‘எவ்வாறு?’ எனின், ‘காப்பாற்றுதல் என்பது ஒவ்வோர் உயிர்க்கும் விருப்பில்லனவற்றை நீக்கி, விருப்புள்ளனவற்றைக் கொடுத்தல்,’ என்பர் பெரியோர். ஒவ்வோர் உயிரும் விரும்புகின்றனவற்றைக் கொடுக்க வேண்டுமாயின், அவ்வுயிர்களிடத்தில் தான் தங்கியிருந்தாலன்றி, அவற்றின் விருப்பத்தை யறிதலும் அறிந்து கொடுத்தலும் முடியாவாம். ஆதலின், காப்பாற்றுதலாகிய காரியத்தைக் கூறிய வகையில் அவ்வுயிர்தோறும் தங்கியிருத்தலாகிய காரணமும் தானே பெறப்படுதலின், அதனையும் கூறினாரேயாவார். யாண்டும், என்றும் ‘காரணமின்றேல் காரியமும் இன்று’ என்க. ஆக, எல்லாப் பொருளினும் தங்கியிருக்கின்றவனே காத்தலாகிய தொழிலைச் செய்ய முடியும் என்பதும், காப்பாற்றுகின்றவன் எல்லாப் பொருளிலும் தங்கியிருத்தல்வேண்டும் என்பதும் பெறப்படுதலின், இவ்விரண்டும் ஒன்றோடொன்று பிரிவின்றி ஒற்றுமைப்பட்டிருத்தல் காண்க.

ஆக, தெய்வப் புலமைத் திருவள்ளுவனார், இறை அல்லது இறைவன் என்னும் பெயரைக் காத்தற்றெழுழியுடைய ஒரு பொருளுக்கே யுரியபெயராகக் கொண்டார் என்பது வெள்ளிடைமலை போலத் தெற்றென விளங்குகின்றது, விளங்கவே, கடவுள் வாழ்த்தில்,

‘இருள்சேர் இருவினையும் சேரா விறைவன்
பொருள்சேர் புகழ்புரிந்தார் மாட்டு.’

‘பிறவிப் பெருங்கடல் நீந்துவர் நீந்தார்
இறைவ னடிசேரா தார்.’

என வருகின்ற இரண்டு திருக்குறள்களாலும் இறைவன் என்ற பெயரால் காத்தற்றெழுழியுடைய கடவுளையே குறித்தார் என்பது சான்றோர்க்கெல்லாம் ஒப்ப முடிந்த தொன்றும்.

‘மடியிலா மன்னவன் எய்தும் அடியளந்தான்
தாஅய தெல்லாம் ஒருங்கு.’

என்ற குறளை நோக்குவோம்: இச்செய்யுளால் கூறப்படவேண்டிய பொருள், ‘மடியிலாத அரசன் எல்லா உலகங்களையும் ஒருங்கே எய்தும்,’ என்பதேயாம். “சமயக் கணக்கர் மதிவழி கூருது, உலகியல் கூறிப் பொருளிது வென்ற வள்ளுவன்,” என்று புகழ்ப்பட்ட இப்பெரியார், இங்கு ‘அடியளந்தான் தாஅயது எல்லாம்’ என்று இவ்வரலாற்றைக் கொண்டு கூறும் கருத்தை ஆராய வேண்டாவோ? மேலும், இறைவனுக்குரிய திருப்பெயர்கள் பலவற்றுள் ஏதாவது ஒன்றினைக் குறித்து அவனால் ‘தாஅயது’ என்று கூருது ‘அடியளந்தான்’ என்று அடியின்மேலிட்டு அடியின் தொழிலால் இறைவனுக்கு ஒரு பெயரை அமைத்ததற்குக் கருத்தும் ஒன்று இருத்தல் வேண்டும் அன்றே?

இவற்றையெல்லாம் ஆராய்ந்து, இவற்றிற்குத் தக்க விடையிறுக்கவே, “‘மடியிலா மன்னவன்’ என்ற குறளால், இறைவனுடைய சர்வஜகதர்ஷகதவத்தைக் கூறுகின்றார்; அன்றி, லீலா விபூதி அவனுக்கே உரியது என்று கூறுகின்றார் என்று கோடலுமாம்” என யான் முன்னர்க் கூறியது தெளிவாம்.

‘பரந்த பொருளெல்லாம் பாரறிய வேறு
தெரிந்து திறந்தோறும் சேரச்—சுருங்கிய
சொல்லால் விரித்துப் பொருள்விளங்கச் சொல்லுதல்
வல்லாரார் வள்ளுவரல் லால்.’

[திருவள்ளுவமாயை, 13.]

என்றார் அரிசில் கிழார்.

வைணவப் பெருமக்கள் தம் பேரருளால் கூறிப் போந்த பொன் மொழிகளே இவற்றிற்கு ஏற்ற விடையாமாதலின், அவற்றுள் சிலவற்றை ஈண்டுத் தருகின்றேன் :

“நாராயண சப்தார்த்தத்தை நாராயண அநுவாகமாகிற ஓலைப் புறத்தே கேட்டுப்போகாதே கண்ணாலே கண்டு அநுபவிக்கலாம்படி ஸ்ரீவாமனனாய் அவதரித்துத் திரு உலகு அளந்தபடியை அநுபவிக்கிறார்; சேஷ சேஷிதவ சம்பந்தமிறே நாராயண சப்தார்த்தமாகிறது. ஜகத் காரணத்தவத்தாலும் ஈஸ்வரனோடு இவ்வாத்மாவுக்குண்டான சம்பந்தத்தையிறே சொல்லுகிறது; ‘காண்மின்கள் உலகீர் என்று கண்முகப்பே நிமிர்ந்த’ என்று சர்வலோகமும் கண்ணாலே காணலாம்படியிறே திரு உலகு அளந்தருளினது!

ஆகையாலே, நாராயண சப்தார்த்தமான திரைவிக்ரம அபதானத்தை அநுபவிக்கிறார். யக்ருவாடத்தே சென்ற படியையும் அர்த்தித்த படியையும் சொல்லாதே எல்லார் தலைகளிலும் திருவடிகளை வைத்த இவ்வம்சத்தைச் சொல்லுகையாலே சேஷசேஷித்வ சம்பந்தத்தை அநுபவிக்கிறார் என்று தோற்றுகிறதிறே!” “விமுகனான மகாபலிக்கும் ருசியைப் பிறப்பிக்கும் செளந்தர்யத்தையுடையவனை ஒழிய ஆஸ்ரயணீயர் உண்டோ? தன்னுடைமையை லபிக்கைக்குத் தான் அர்த்தியாய்ச் செல்லும் சீலவானை ஒழிய ஆஸ்ரயணீயர் உண்டோ? அதீந் திரியமான விக்ரஹத்தை துஷ்பிரகிருதிகள் கண்ணுக்கும் அகப்பட விஷயமாக்கும் சுலபனை ஒழிய ஆஸ்ரணீயர் உண்டோ? என்கிறார்.” “நாய்ச்சிமார் தொடும்போதும் பூத்தொடும்போலே கூசித்தொடும் திருவடிகளைக்கொண்டு கிடர் காடும் ஓடையும் அளந்து கொண்டது என்று ஆச்சரியப்படுகிறார்!” “வசிஷ்ட சண்டாள விபாகமற எல்லார் தலையிலும் ஒக்கத் திருவடிகளை வைத்தான், இவர்கள் நன்மை தீமை பாராதே தன்னுடைய சுத்தியே இவர்களுக்குமாம்படிபண்ணினான்,” என்பன பெரியோர்களுடைய பொன் மொழிகள்.

ஆக, இத்திருக்குறளால், உயிர்கட்கும் இறைவனுக்குமுள்ள சம்பந்தத்தையும், இறைவனுடைய சர்வ ஜகத் ரக்ஷகத்வத்தையும், இறைமைத்தன்மையினையும், செளலப்யத்தையும் கூறி ஈடுபடுதல் வெளியாய். இதனால், லீலாவிபூதி அவனுக்கே உரியது என்னும் விஷயமும் தானே போதருதல் காண்க. இப் பெரியார்க்கு அவ்வவதாரத்திலுள்ள ஈடுபாட்டினாலேயே அவ்வவதாரத்திற்குரிய ‘திருக்குறள்’ என்ற பெயரைத் தம் நூலுக்கும் பெயராக வைத்தனர் என்று கூறினும் அது மிகையாகாது.

“ஆகுங்கொல் ஐயமொன்றின்றி
அகலிட முற்றவும் ஈரடியே
ஆகும்பரிசு நிமிர்ந்த திருக்குறள்
அப்பன் அமர்ந்துறையும்”

என்பது தமிழ்மறை.

இனி, “இவ்வரலாற்றுச் சரிதையில், அளந்தானின் வேருயது உலகம் என்றும், உலகம் அவனால் அளக்கப்படும் பொருள் என்றும், உலகம் அவனினும் வியாபகமுடையது என்றும் வள்ளுவர் கூறியுள்ளமை தெளிவு. இப்பொருள், இறைமைக் குணத்துக்கு இழுக்குத் தரும்ஆதலால், வள்ளுவர் வைணவர் எனல் எங்ஙனம் சாலும்?” என்பார் உளரே? எனின், கூறுவன்: “அடியளந்தான் தாயுது

எல்லாம்” என்றதனால், ‘உலகம் அவனினும் வியாபகமுடையது,’ என்னும் பொருள் பெறப்படுதல் யாங்ஙனம்? ‘எல்லாம்’ என்பது, எஞ்சாமை என்னும் பொருளையன்றே காட்டும்?

‘ஒண்மிதியிற் புனலுருவி ஒருகால் நிற்ப
 ஒருகாலும் காமருசீர் அவுண னுள்ளத்து
 எண்மதியும் கடந்தண்ட மீது போகி
 இருவிசம்பி னூடுபோய் எழுந்து மேலைத்
 தண்மதியும் கதிரவனும் தவிர ஓடித்
 தாரகையின் புறம்தடவி அப்பால் மிக்கு
 மண்முழுது மகப்படுத்து நின்ற எந்தை
 மலர்புரையும் திருவடியே வணங்கி னேனே.’

என்பது திருமங்கைமன்னன் திருவாக்கு.

[திருநெடுந்தாண்டகம், 5.]

இங்கு ‘மண்முழுதும் அகப்படுத்து நின்ற எந்தை,’ என்ற சொற்றொடரின் சீரிய பொருளைச் சிந்திக்க வேண்டும். மேலும்,

‘நின்றகால் மண்ணெலாம் நிரப்பி யப்புறம்
 சென்றுபா விற்றிலை சிறிது பாரெனு
 ஒன்றவா எனகமெலாம் ஒடுக்கி யும்பரை
 வென்றகால் மீண்டது வெளிபெ ருமையே,’

‘உலகெலா முள்ளடி அடக்கி யோரடிக்கு
 அலகிலா தவ்வடிக் கன்பன் மெய்யதாம்
 இலைகுலாந் துழாய்முடி ஏக நாயகன்
 சிலைகுலாந் தோளினாய் சிறியன் சாலவே.’

என்ற கம்பராமாயணச் செய்யுள்களை, அங்ஙனம் கூறுவார் இனியேனும் நினைத்தல் செய்வார் என்றே எண்ணுகிறோம்.

‘தாம்வீழ்வார் மென்றோள் துயிலின் இனிதுகொல்?
 தாமரைக் கண்ணான் உலகு.’

என்ற குறளை நோக்குவோம்: இதனால், இறைவனுடைய மோகஷப் பரதத்துவம் கூறப்படுகின்றது என முன்னர்க் கூறப்பட்டது; அதனை இங்குப் பார்ப்போம்; ‘நிரதிசய இன்பத்திற்குரிய நீ இச்சிற்றின்பத்திற்கு இன்னையாதல் தகாது,’ என்ற பாங்கற்குச் சொல்லியது இது. ‘தாம் விரும்பும் மகளிர் மெல்லிய தோளின்கண் துயிலுதலாலுண்டாகும் இன்பத்தைக்காட்டிலும், தாமரைக்கண்ணான் உலகில் சென்று அனுபவிக்கும் இன்பம் இனிதாகுமா?’ என்பது இதன் நோப்பொருளாம். இங்கு, ‘நிரதிசய இன்பத்திற்குரிய நீ இச்சிற்றின்

பத்திற்கு இன்னையாதல் தகாது,' என்ற பாங்களை நோக்கி, தலைப் படுசொல்பினுக்குந்தளரேன், சித்தம் பித்தன் என்று மலைத்தறிவாரில்லை, யாரையுந் தேற்றுவன் எனத்தகைய தலைவன், சிறுமான் விழியால் அழிவுற்று மயங்கினுதலின், இக்கொவ்வைச் செவ்வாய்க்கொடியிடை தோள் புணர்ந்தாற் புணருந்தொறும் பின்னும் புதிதாய் வளர்கின்ற பெரும்போகத்துக்கு, நாள் திங்கள் ஆண்டு ஊழி ஊழிதொறும் அப்பொழுதைக்கப்பொழுது ஆராவமுதமாகிய அப்பேரின்பம் ஒப்பா குமா?' என்று கூறுகின்றான். இங்கு, அத் தலைவன் மறுத்த பேரின்ப உலகை, நம் புலவர் பெருமான் "தாமரைக்கண்ணான் உலகு" என்று கூறியிருத்தலால் தாமரைக்கண்ணான் உலகே நிரதிசய இன்ப வீடு என்பதும், நிரதிசய இன்ப வீட்டையுடையோன் தாமரைக்கண்ணான ஸ்ரீமந் நாராயணனே என்பதும் பெறப்படுதல் காண்க. 'தாமரைக்கண்ணான்' என்பது¹ "புண்டரீக மிவாக்ஷிணி" என்னும் சுருதியின்படி பிறிதின் இயைபு நீக்கிய விசேஷணப் பெயராம். "புருஷ: புண்டரீகாக்ஷ:" என்பது உப பிரும்மணம். 'தாமரைக்கண்ணன்' என்ற பெயரைத் திருமாலுக்கு உரிய பெயராக நிகண்டு நூலும் உரைக்கும்,

'மலர்மிசை யேகினான் மாணடி சேர்ந்தார்
நிலமிசை நீடுவாழ் வார்.'

'உரனென்னுந் தோட்டியான் ஓரைந்துங் காப்பான்
வரனென்னும் வைப்பிற்கோர் வித்து.'

'ஐயத்தின் நீங்கித் தெளிந்தார்க்கு வையத்தின்
வானம் நணிய துடைத்து.'

'யானென தென்னும் செருக்கறுப்பான் வானோர்க்கு
உயர்ந்த உலகம் புகும்.'¹

என்ற குறள்களால், மோக்ஷத்தை ஓர் உலக விசேடமாகவே கொண்டார் நம் பெருந்தகையார் என்பது தெளியப்படும்.

1. 'தகும்சீர்த்தன் தனிமுதலி னுள்ளே
மிகுந்தேவும் எப்பொருளும் படைக்கத்
தகும்கோலத் தாமரைக் கண்ணன் எம்மான்
மிகுஞ்சோதி மேலறிவார் யவரே.'

என்பது தமிழ் மறை.

¹ யாதானும் நாடாமா லூராமால் என்னொருவன்
சாந்துணையும் கல்லாத வாறு.'

என்ற குறளால் அம்மோக்ஷவுலகத்தைத் திருமாலுக்குரிய வுலகமாகக்
கொண்டார் என்பதும் தெளியப்படும்.

‘தாம்வீழ்வார் மென்றோள் துயிலின் இனிதுகொல்
தாமரைக் கண்ணான் உலகு.’

என்னும் இக்குறளால், அச்செங்கண்மால் உலகம் நிரதிசய இன்ப
மயமாகவே உள்ளது என்று கொண்டார் என்பதும் தெளியப்படும்.
ஆக, மோக்ஷம் என்பது, ஓர் உலக விசேடமே என்பதும், அது நிரதிசய
இன்பத்தது என்பதும், அது திருமாலுக்கே உரியது என்பதும் நம்
வள்ளுவப்பெருந்தகையாரது திருவுள்ளக்கருத்தாதல் தெளிந்து
கொள்க.

“நாறிணர்த் துழாயோன் நல்கி னல்லதை
ஏறுதல் எளிதோ வீறுபெறு துறக்கம்!”

என்ற பரிபாடற் பகுதியும் இக்கருத்தே பற்றி எழுந்தது காண்க.

‘பற்றற்ற கண்ணே பிறப்பறுக்கும் மற்று
நிலையாமை காணப் படும்.’

என்ற குறளின் உரையில்,

“அற்றது பற்றெனில்
உற்றது வீடுயிர்.’

என்பதும் அது பற்றி வந்தது” என்றும்,

1. ‘யாதானும் நாடாம்—அறம் பொருள் இன்பங்களாகிய இம்மைப்
பயன் மூன்றையும் தெரிவித்தவாறு. மால் ஊராம்—திருமால் ஊராகிய
மோக்ஷ உலகத்தைத் தெரிவித்தவாறு; என்றது, மறுமைப் பயனைத் தெரி
வித்தபடி. ஆல்—ஆகையாலே, சாந்துணையும் கல்லாதவாறு என்—தான்
இறக்கும்ளவும் கல்லாது கழிகின்றது என் கருதி?’ என்பது இதன் பொரு
ளாம். சதுர்வித புருஷார்த்தங்களையுங் கொடுக்கக் கூடியது கல்வியாகை
யாலே அதனைச் சாந்துணையும் பயிறல் வேண்டும் என்பது இச்செய்யுளின்
கருத்து.

“அறம்பொருள் இன்பம் வீடடைதல் நூற்பயனே.”

என்றார் நன்னூலாரும்.

“அறம்பொரு ளின்பமும் வீடும் பயக்கும்
புறங்கடை நல்லிசையும் நாட்டும்—உறுங்கவலொன்று
உற்றுழியுங் கைகொடுக்குங் கல்வியி னூங்கில்லை
சிறுயிர்க் குற்ற துணை.”

என்றார் பிறரும்.

‘ ஆரா வியற்கை யவாநீப்பின் அந்நிலையே
பேரா வியற்கை தரும்.’

என்ற குறளினுரையில் “ களிப்புக் கவர்ச்சிகளும் பிறப்புப்பிணி மூப்பு இறப்புகளும் முதலாயின இன்றி உயிர் நிரதிசய இன்பத்ததாய் நின்ற லின், வீட்டினைப் ‘ பேரா இயற்கை ’ என்றும், அஃது அவா நீத்த வழிப் பெறுதல் ஒருதலையாகலின், ‘ அந்நிலையேதரும் ’ என்றும் கூறினர் :

‘ நன்றாய் ஞானங் கடந்துபோய்
நல்லிந் திரியமெல்லாம் ஈர்த்து,
ஓன்றாய்க் கிடந்த அரும்பெரும்பாழ்
உலப்பில் அதனை உணர்ந்துணர்ந்து,
சென்றாய் கின்பத் துன்பங்கள்
செற்றுக் களைந்து பசையற்றுல்
அன்றே அப்போ தேவீடு
அதுவே வீடு வீடாமே.’

என்பதூஉம் இக்கருத்தே பற்றி வந்தது,” என்றும் பரிமேலழகர் மோகூ விஷயமாக வருமிடங்களில் எல்லாம் தமிழ் மறையாகிய திருவாய்மொழியினின்றும் மேற்கோள் காட்டிப் போந்ததும் இக்கருத்தே பற்றி என்று தெளிதல் தகும். இவ்வீட்டுலகினையே “ இந்திரன் முதலிய இறையவர் பதங்களும் அந்தமில் இன்பத் தமிழினில் வீடும் ” என்று பாயிரத்தும் குறித்துப் போந்தார் என்க. ‘ அந்தமில் இன்பத் தமிழினில் வீடு ’ என்பதும், ¹ ‘ நலமந்தமில்லதோர் நாடு ’ என்பதும், ‘ நிரதிசய இன்பம் ’ என்பதும் ஒரு பொருட்கிளவி கள்.

கொற்றவன்குடி உமாபதி சிவாசாரியார் பரிமேலழகருரையை,
‘ வள்ளுவர்சீர் அன்பர்மொழி வாசகந்தொல் காப்பியமே
தெள்ளுபரி மேலழகன் செய்தவுரை—ஒள்ளியசீர்த்
தொண்டர் புராணம் தொகுசித்தி ஓராரும்
தண்டமிழின் மேலாந் தரம்.’

என்று நூல்களோடு ஒருங்கு வைத்துச் சிறப்பித்துப் பாடுவர். இதனால், இவர் உரை ஒப்புயர்வற்றது என்பது தெளியப்படும்.

1. ‘ புலனைந்து மேயும் பொறியைந்தும் நீங்கி
நலமந்த மில்லதோர் நாடு புகுவீர்
அலமந்து வீய அசுரரைச் செற்றான்
பலமுந்து சீரில் படிமினஓ வா தே.’

என்பது தமிழ் மறை.

“ நன்று ; ‘ தாம் வீழ்வார் மென்தோள் ’ என்ற திருக்குறளைக் காட்டி, முத்திநிலையைத் ‘ தாமரைக்கண்ணன் உல ’ கெனவும், முத்திக்கு வித்தாம் முதல்வனைத் ‘ தாமரைக்கண்ணன் ’ எனவும் கூறியதாலும், வள்ளுவரை வைணவர் என அவர் சான்று காட்டுவர். ஐம்புலநுகர்ச் சியான் ஆகும் காமஇன்பத்திற்குத் தாமரைக்கண்ணன் உலகை ஒப்புமைகாட்டி முன்னையது பின்னையதினும் விழுமியது எனக்கூறிய வள்ளுவர், வைணவச் சார்புடையவர் ஆவாரா என நோக்குக. காம நுகர்ச்சியில் மிதந்து கூறிய ஒருவன் கூற்றாக இக்குறளை வள்ளுவர் அமைத்துப் பாடியுள்ளமையே பரந்தாமன் உலகம், வள்ளுவர் கொள்ளும் முத்திநிலை யன்று எனக் காட்டும் தக்க சான்று, ” என்று கூறுவாரு முளராலோ ? எனின், கூறுவன் :

‘ ஆறார் சடைமுடி யம்பலத் தண்டரண் டம்பெறினும்
மாறார் மழவிடை யாய்கண் டிலம்வண் கதிர்யெதுப்பு
நீறார் கொடுநெறி சென்றிச் செறிமென் முலைநெருங்கச்
சீறார் மரையத ளில்தங்கு கங்குற் சிறுதுயிலே.’

என்பது திருக்கோவையார். இங்குச் ‘ செறிமென்முலை நெருங்கச் சீறார் மரைஅதளில் தங்கு கங்குற் சிறுதுயிலால் வந்த இன்பத்திற்கு அம்பலத் தண்டர் அண்டத்தைப் பெற்றால் உளதாம் இன்பமும் மாறல்ல, ’ என்கிறார் மணிவாசகப் பெருமான். இங்குக் காம இன்பத்திற்கு அம்பலவரது அண்டத்தைப் பெற்றால் உளதாகும் இன்பமும் ஒப்பாகாது என்று கூறுமுகத்தால் முன்னையது பின்னையதினும் விழுமியது என்று கூறுகின்றார் என்பது தெளிவு. இங்ஙனம் கூறுவதால் அவர், திருவாதவூரடிகளையும் சைவர் அல்லர் என்பர் போலும் ! வள்ளுவனார் வைணவராதலின், “ தாமரைக் கண்ணன் உலகு துயிலின் இனிது கொல் ? ” என்றார். திருவாதவூரடிகள் சைவராதலின், ‘ அம்பலத் தண்டர் அண்டமும் சிறுதுயிலுக்கு மாறு அல்ல, ’ என்றார். இதுவே திருவள்ளுவனார்க்கும் திருவாதவூரடிகளுக்கும் வேற்றுமை. மேலும், திருவள்ளுவனார் ‘ இனிது கொல் ? ’ என்கிறார் ; திருவாதவூரடிகள் ‘ மாறு கண்டிலம் ’ என்று கூறுதல் கவனித்தற் குரியது.

சிறிநின்பத்தைக் கூறுமுகத்தால் பேரின்பத்தைக் கூறுதலே நம் பெரியோர்களுடைய மரபு. திருவிருத்தம், திருக்கோவையார் முதலிய நூல்களெல்லாம் இத்தகையனவேயாம்.

“ திருவாத வூர்மகிழ் செழுமறை முனிவர்
ஐம்பொறி கையிகந்து அறிவாய் அறியாச்
செம்புலச் செல்வ ராயின ராதலின்

அறிவனூற் பொருளும் உலகநூல் வழக்குமென
இருபொருளும் நுதலி எடுத்துக் கொண்டனர்.”

என்பர் பேராசிரியர். “கடுத்தின்னொதனைக் கட்டிப்பூசிக் கடுத்தீற்றிய
வாறு போலவும், கலங்கற்சின்னீர் தெருளாமையான் உண்பானை
அறிவுடையான் ஒருவன் பேய்த்தேரைக் காட்டி, ‘உதுக்காணாய்
நல்லதொரு நீர் தோன்றுவது, அந்நீர் பருகாய்; இச்சேற்று நீர் பருகி
என் செய்தி?’ என்று கொண்டுபோய் நல்லதொரு நீர் தலைப்படு
வித்து ஊட்டியது போலவும்” என்ற இறையனார் களவியலுரை
வாக்கியங்களையும் இங்குக் காணல் தகும். இது நிற்க.

“திருவள்ளுவர் வைணவரா? வாசுதேவன் பரம்பொருள்.
எல்லா உலகமும் அவன் பரிணாமம். பாஞ்சராத்திர முறையே தீக்ஷை
பெற்று, வாசுதேவனை வழிபட்டு, அவன் உருவில் இலயமாதலே
முத்தி என்பர் வைணவர். திருவள்ளுவர் ஆதிபகவனை உலக
காரணன் என்றார்; வாசுதேவனிடம் இல்லாத எண்குணங்கள் ஆதி
பகவனிடம் காணப்படுதலால், அவனடி சேர்ந்து நிற்பதே முத்தி
என்பர். பாஞ்சராத்திரர் வாசுதேவனைக் குணத்தவத்தின்மேல்
25-ஆம் தத்துவமாக வைத்து வழிபடுவர் என்று சைவ நூல்கள்
உணர்த்தும். திருவள்ளுவர், ஆதிபகவன் தத்துவங்களைக் கடந்தவன்
என்று ‘பற்றற்றான்’ என்கிறார்,” என்று கூறுவாரும் உளரே?
எனின், நன்று; வைணவர்கள் கொள்கைகளாக அவர் கூறியுள்ளன
வற்றில் ஒன்று ஒழிய ஏனைய எல்லாம் வைணவர் தம் கொள்கைக்கு
மாறுபட்டன என்பதனை மாத்திரம் ஈண்டுச் சுருக்கமாகக் காட்டு;
கிறேன்.

1. “எல்லா உலகமும் அவன் பரிணாமம்” என்பது, வைண
வர் கொள்கையன்று. “நம் தர்சனத்துக்குத் தத்துவங்கள் மூன்று
அவையாவன: சித்தும் அசித்தும் ஈசுவரனும்; பிரகார பிரகாரிகள்
ஐக்யத்தால் ஒன்று என்னலாய், ஸ்வரூபபேதத்தாலே பலவாயிருக்
கும்,” என்பது நம்பிள்ளை ஈட்டு வாக்கியம்.

‘திடவிசும் பெரிவளி நீர்நில மிவைமிசை
படர்பொருள் முழுவது மாயவை யவைதொறும்
உடல்மிசை உயிரெனக் கரந்தெங்கும் பரந்துளன்
சுடர்மிகு சுருதியுள் இவையுண்ட சுரனே.’

என்பது தமிழ் மறை.

2. “அவன் உருவில் இலயமாதலே முத்தி” என்பதும்
வைணவர் கொள்கையன்று. “பரம புருஷார்த்த லக்ஷணமோக்ஷ
மாவது, பிரார்ப்த கர்ம சேஷமாய் அவசியம் அநுபாவ்யமான புண்ய

பாவங்கள் நசித்து, ' அஸ்தி-ஜாயதே-பரிணமதே-விவர்ததே-அபக்ஷிய்யதே-விநஸ்யதி ' என்கிறபடியே, ஷட்பாவ விகாராஸ்பதமாய், தாபத்திரயாஸ்ரயமாய், பகவத் ஸ்வரூபத்தை மறைப்பித்து விபரீத ஞானத்தை ஜனிப்பிக்கக் கடவதாய்ச் சம்சார வர்த்தனமான ஸ்தூல சரீரத்தை உபேகையோடே போகட்டு, சுஷும்நா நாடியாலே சிரகபாலத்தைப் பேதித்துப் புறப்பட்டு, சூக்ஷ்ம சரீரத்தோடே வானேற வழி பெற்று, மன்னுங்கதிரோன் மண்டலத்தின் நன்னடுவுள் அன்னதோர் எல்லையினூடுபோய், சூக்ஷ்ம சரீரத்தையும் வாசநாரேணுவையும் விரஜா ஸ்நானத்தாலே கழித்துச் சகல தாபங்களுமாறும்படி அமாநவ கரஸ்பரிசமும் பெற்றுச் சுத்த சத்வாத்மகமாய், பஞ்சோப நிஷண்மயமாய், ஞானானந்தகனகமாய், ஒளிக்கொண்ட சோதியுமாயிருக்கிற அப்ராக்ருத விக்கிரஹத்தைப் பெற்று, முடியுடைய வானவர் முறைமுறை எதிர்கொள்ள நிரதிசய ஆனந்தமயமான திருமாமணி மண்டபத்தைப் பிராபித்து, லக்ஷ்மீ சகிதனாய்ப் பூமிநீளா நாயகனாய் விலக்ஷண விக்கிரஹயுக்தனாய்க் குழுமித் தேவர் குழாங்கள் கை தொழ்ச் சோதி வெள்ளத்தினுள்ளே எழுவதோர் உருவான ஸ்ரீவைகுண்டநாதனை நித்தியாநுபவம் பண்ணி நித்திய கிங்கர ஸ்வபாவனுகை," என்பது பிள்ளைலோகாசார்யர் ஸ்ரீசூக்தி.

“ களிப்புக் கவர்வுமற்றுப் பிறப்புப்பிணி மூப்பிறப்பற்று ஒளிக்கொண்ட சோதியுமாய் யுடன்கூடுவ தென்றுகொலோதுளிக்கின்ற வானிந்நிலம் சுடராழி சங்கேந்தி அளிக்கின்ற மாயப்பிரான் அடியார்கள் குழாங்களையே,”

“ வந்தவர் எதிர்கொள்ள மாமணி மண்டபத்து அந்தமில் பேரின்பத் தடியரோ டிருந்தமை கொந்தலர் பொழில்சூரு கூர்ச்சட கோபன்சொல் சந்தங்க ளாயிரத்துள் இவைவல்லார் முனிவரே.”
என்பன தமிழ் மறை.

“ தம்மையே நாளும் வணங்கித் தொழுவார்க்குத் தம்மையே ஒக்க அருள்செய்வ ராதலால் தம்மையே நாளும் வணங்கித் தொழுதிறைஞ்சித் தம்மையே பற்றா மனத்தென்றும் வைத்தோமே.”

என்பது, மாறன் பணித்த தமிழ் மறைக்கு ஆறங்கம் கூற அவதரித்த வீறுடைய திருமங்கை மன்னன் திருவாக்கு.

3. “ பாஞ்சராத்திரர் வாசுதேவனைக் குணத்துவத்தின்மேல் 25-ஆம் தத்துவமாக வைத்து வழிபடுவர் என்று சைவ நூல்கள் உணர்த்தும்,” என்பதும் வைணவர் கொள்கையன்று. “ சைவ நூல்

கள் உணர்த்தும்” என்று அவர் கூறுவதனாலேயே வைணவ நூல்கள் உணர்த்துவதனை அவர் கேட்டும் அறிந்திலர் என்பது தோன்றுகிறது. மேலும், சைவ நூல் அங்ஙனம் உணர்த்துமாயின், அதுவும் உண்மையை உள்ளவாறு உணர்ந்து உரைத்திலது என்றே அதனைக் கோடல் தகும். வைணவர்கள், உயிரை—அதாவது புருடனையே— 25-ஆம் தத்துவமாகக் கொள்வர். 26-ஆம் தத்துவம் பரவாசுதேவன் என்பர். “எண்ணிலும் வரும்—‘கடம், படம், ஈசுவரன்’ என்றால், ‘நம்மை இல்லை என்னுதே, இவற்றோடொக்கப் பரிகணித்தானிறே’ என்று வரும். ‘சதுர்விம்சதி தத்துவமாயிருக்கும் அசித்து, பஞ்சவிம்சகன் ஆத்மா, ஷட்விம்சகன் ஈசுவரன்’ என்றால், ‘நம்முடைய உண்மையையும் இவற்றோபாதி இசைந்தானிறே’ என்று வந்து முகங்காட்டும். அன்றிக்கே, இருபத்தொன்று, இருபத்திரண்டு, இருபத்துமூன்று, இருபத்து நான்கு, இருபத்தைந்து, இருபத்தாறு என்று எண்ணினால், ‘இருபத்தாறு நானே’ என்று வருவான் என்றுமாம்.”¹ என்பது நம்பிள்ளை ஈடு.

“மங்க வொட்டுன் மாமாயை திருமா லிருஞ்சோ லைமேய நங்கள் கோனே! யானேநீ யாகி என்னை அளித்தானே!

பொங்கைம் புலனும் பொறியைந்தும் கருமேந் திரியமைம் இங்கிவ் வுயிரேய் பிரகிருதி மாணங்கார மனங்களே.” [பூதம்

என்ற தமிழ் மறையின் பொருளை அறிஞர்களை அடுத்துக் கேட்டுத் தெளியக் கடவர்.

மேலும்,

“பாழெனக் காலெனப் பாசென ஒன்றென

இரண்டென மூன்றென நான்கென ஐந்தென

ஆறென ஏழென எட்டெனத் தொண்டென

நால்வகை ஊழிஎண் நவிறுஞ் சிறப்பினை.”²

என்பது பரிபாடல். இதனுள் ‘நவிறுஞ் சிறப்பினை’ என்றதனானே, நவிலப்படுஞ் சிறப்பினையுடைய பரமன் ஒருவன் உளன் என்பது போதருகின்றதேயன்றோ? இதனையும் அவர் உணரவில்லை போலும்! ‘என்றது, பூதங்களைந்தும் கன்மேந்திரியங்களைந்தும் ஞானேந்திரியங்களைந்தும் புலன்களைந்தும் மனமுதலிய அந்தக்கரணங்கள் மூன்றும் மூலப்பகுதியும் புருடனும் எனப்பட்ட தத்துவம் இருபத்தைந்தனாலும் எக்காலத்தும் ஆராயப்படும் பெருமையையுடைய என்றவாறு’ என்பது அப்பகுதிக்குப் பரிமேலழகர் எழுதிய உரையாகும்.

மேலும்,

“சுவைஒளி ஊரேசை நாற்றமென் றைந்தின்
வகைதெரிவான் கட்டே உலகு.”

என்ற திருக்குறளுக்கு, “அவற்றின் கூறுபாடாவன : பூதங்கட்கு முதலாகிய அவைதாம் ஐந்தும், அவற்றின்கண் தோன்றிய அப் பூதங்கள் ஐந்தும், அவற்றின் கூறுகிய ஞானேந்திரியங்கள் ஐந்தும், கன்மேந்திரியங்கள் ஐந்தும் ஆக இருபதுமாம். ‘வகைதெரிவான் கட்டு’ என உடம்படு புணர்த்ததனால் தெரிகின்ற புருடனும், அவன் தெரிதற்கருவியாகிய மான் அகங்கார மனங்களும், அவற்றிற்கு முதலாகிய மூலப்பகுதியும் பெற்றும். தத்துவம் இருபத்தைந்தனையும் தெரிதலாவது, மூலப்பகுதி ஒன்றில் தோன்றியது அன்மையின் பகுதியே யாவதல்லது விசுவதியாகாதெனவும், அதன்கண் தோன்றிய அகங்காரமும் அதன்கண் தோன்றிய தன்மாத்திரைகளும் ஆகிய ஏழும் தத்தமக்கு முதலாயதனை நோக்க விசுவதியாதலும் தங்கண் தோன்றுவனவற்றை நோக்கப்பகுதியாதலும் உடைய எனவும், அவற்றின்கண் தோன்றிய மனமும் ஞானேந்திரியங்களும் கன்மேந்திரியங்களும் பூதங்களும் ஆகிய பதினாறும் தங்கண் தோன்றுவன இன்மையின் விசுவதியே யாவதல்லது பகுதி ஆகா எனவும், புருடன் தான் ஒன்றில் தோன்றாமையானும் தன்கண் தோன்றுவன இன்மையானும் இரண்டும் அல்லன் எனவும் சாங்கிய நூலுள்¹ ஓதியவாற்றான் ஆராய்தல். இவ்விருபத்தைந்து மல்லது உலகு எனப் பிறிதொன்றில்லை என உலகினது உண்மை உணர்தலின், அவன் அறிவின் கண்ணதாயிற்று,” எனப் பரிமேலழகர் எழுதியதும் அது பற்றி எனத் தெளிக. இதனைத் தெளிய அறிய வேண்டின், ‘தத்துவத்திரயம்’ முதலிய ரஹஸ்ய கிரந்தங்களிற் காண்க.

² ஆமினி மூப்பும் அகன்ற திளமையும்
தாமினி நோயும் தலைவரும்—யாமினி
மெய்யைந்து மீதூர வைகாது மேல்வந்த
ஐயைந்து மாய்வ தறிவு.’

என்றார் ஐயனாரிதனார்,

1. ‘சாங்கியம் யோகம்என் நிரண்டு தன்மைய
வீங்கிய பொருளெலாம் வேறு காண்பன்
ஆங்கவை உணர்ந்தவர்க் கன்றி அன்னவன்
ஓங்கிய மேனினை உணரற் பாலதோ?’ (இரணியன் வதை, 63.)
என்றார் கம்பநாட்டடிகள்.

2. புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா மாலை.

ஆக, இதுகாறும் கூறியவாற்றால் திருக்குறளில் ஆதிபகவானாகிய திருநாராயணனுடைய சர்வ ஜகத் காரணத்வமும், சர்வஜகத் ரக்ஷகத்வமும், மோக்ஷப் பரதத்துவமும் கூறப்படுகின்றன என்பதும், வைணவ மதத்தில் கூறப்படும் தத்துவங்களும் பண்டைத் தமிழ்ப் பெருமக்கள் கூறிய தத்துவங்களும் எவ்வகையிலும் மாறுபடுதலின்றி எல்லா வகையாலும் ஒரே மிடறும் ஒத்துச் செல்கின்றன என்பதும் அறியத்தக்கன.

நன்று. 'நாயனார்' என்ற பெயரைக் கொண்டு திருவள்ளுவனாரை வேறு மதத்தினர் என்று கூறலாகாதோ? எனின், கூறுவன் : திருவள்ளுவமாலையில் திருவள்ளுவர், முதற்பாவலர், தேவர் முதலிய பெயர்கள் கூறப்படுகின்றன. நாயனார் என்ற பெயர் யாண்டும் கூறப்பட்டிலது மணிமேகலையில், 'பொய்யில் புலவன்' என்ற பெயர் கூறப்படுகின்றது. ¹ நச்சினார்கினியர் அடியார்க்குநல்லார் முதலிய உரையாசிரியர்களும் வள்ளுவனார், தேவர், வள்ளுவனார் என்ற பெயர்களையே கூறிச் செல்வர். பரிமேலழகரும் தெய்வப்புலமைத் திருவள்ளுவனார் என்றே கூறுகின்றார். 'நாயனார்' என்ற பெயரைத் தனித்தாயினும் பெயருடன் சேர்த்தாயினும் யாண்டும் கூறிற்றிலர். ஆதலால்,

“ மனத்தது மாசாக மாண்டார்நீ ராடி
மறைந்தொழுகு மாந்தர் பலர். ”

“ மழித்தலும் நீட்டலும் வேண்டர் உலகம்
பழித்தது ஒழித்து விடின. ”

என்ற பொய்யில் பாடல்களைப் பாடிப் போந்த தெய்வப் புலமைத் திருவள்ளுவனார்க்குச் சிவவேடப் பொலிவோடு தாடியும் மீசையும் கொண்ட வடிவத்தை இப்பொழுது அமைத்து வழிபடுவது போன்று, நாயனார் என்ற பெயரும் இடையில் வந்த பெயர் என்றே கொள்க.

மேலும், நாயனார் என்ற அப்பெயரைக்கொண்டு வேறு மதத்தைச் சார்ந்தவர் என்று கோடலும் பொருந்துவதன்று. 'என்னை?' எனின், நாயனார் என்ற அப்பெயர், தந்தை முதலிய பெரியார்கட்கும் வழங்குவதாலும், ஜைன மதத்தில் கடவுட்கும் அடியார் பலர்க்கும் வழங்குதலானும், வைணவ மதத்திலும் 'அழகிய மணவாளப்

1. தொல்காப்பியம், எழுத்ததிகாரம், சூத். 46.
சிந்தாமணி, செய். 1891, 1927, 1928 உரை காண்க.
சிலப்பதிகாரம், மங்கல வாழ்த்து, 36, 39 உரை காண்க

பெருமாள் நாயனார்' என்பது போன்று அடியார்கட்கும், 'ஸ்ரீ வராக நாயனார்' என்பது போன்று இறைவனுக்கும் வழங்குதலானும் என்க.

இனி, சமய சாத்திரங்களில் பெரியோர்கள் குறட்பாக்களையும் அவற்றின் பொருள்களையும் பொன்னே போலப் போற்றி எடுத்து ஆண்டு இருப்பதனால், அவ்வம்மதத்தைச் சார்ந்தவர் என்றுகோடல் பொருந்துமே? எனின், திருக்குறளையும் அதிற் கூறப்பட்ட பொருள்களையும் எடுத்தாளாத தமிழ் நூல்களும் உளவோ? அங்ஙனமாயின், தமிழ் மறையாகிய நாலாயிரத் திவ்வியப்பிரபந்தத்தில் திருக்குறளின் பாக்களும், அவற்றின் பொருளமைதிகளும், சொற்றொடர்களும் ஆங்காங்கு மலிந்து பொலிந்து கிடத்தலை இவ் விருதமிழ் மறைகளையும் கூற்ற பெரியோர் நன்கு அறிவர்; இக் காரணம் ஒன்றையே கொண்டு அவரை வைணவர் என்று துணிந்து கூறிவிடலாம். அங்ஙனம் கூறுதல் நெறியன்று; மரபும் அன்று.

திருக்குறள் வாழ்க !

திருவள்ளுவர் வாழ்க !

THE DATE OF TOLKĀPPIYAM

Dr. M. RAJAMANIKKAM

Reader in Tamil, University of Madras.

(A) INTRODUCTION

Sangam Works :

It is well known that Tolkāppiyam, Tirukkural, Puraṇānūru, Ahaṇānūru, Naṟṟinai, Kuṟuntokai, Ainkuṟunūru, Paḍiṟupattu, Paṛipāḍal, Kalittogai, Pattuppāṭṭu, Silappadhikāram and Maṇimekhalai fall under the category of Sangam Works.* The Sangam period ended by about 300 A.D.† The beginning of the Sangam cannot be definitely ascribed to a period or an age.

During this long period many works on grammar and literature must have been produced. Since they were written on palm leaves which were subject to damages of all kinds and since there were many deluges many of these works were completely lost to the world. The works listed above are the only available works and are called Sangam Works. Some of the names of the works that are lost to us are found mention in the commentaries of Tolkāppiyam, Silappadhikāram, Yaṅparumgalam etc.

The purity of the Tamil language before Tolkāppiyam :

Tolkāppiyar has shown by the words *Enba* (என்ப) - (so say), *Enmanār pulavar* (என்மனார் புலவர்) - (so say the scholars) - *that there were grammarians who wrote grammar before his period.* In some places he has given some special attributes also to the grammarians who have gone before him. For example “*yāpṇa moḷiba yappari pulavar*” (யாப்பென மொழிப யாப்பறி புலவர்) - that is, the scholars who are experts in prosody say that this is *yāppu*” (prosody). But when Tolkāppiyar made rules to use Sanskrit words in Tamil to suit the genius of the language, he does not use the words like ‘*enba*’ (என்ப), ‘*enmanār pulvar*’ (என்மனார் புலவர்) etc. From this it is evident that before

*Some say that Silappadhikāram and Maṇimekhalai fall just after the Sangam period.

†Kanchi became the Capital of the Pallavas at about 300 A.D. The Pallava period extended up to about 900 A.D. No mention has been made in the Sangam works about any of the Pallavas. Therefore it may be safely said that the Sangam period came to a close by about A.D. 300.

Tolkāppiyar alien words had not entered the Tamil language at all and there was no necessity for the grammarians who lived before him to frame rules for the use of alien words in Tamil. It is also clear that there was a period when purely Tamil words were in existence without any mixture of alien words. It is but natural that any language will be without any mixture of alien words for a long time till some impact comes on it. Therefore there is no wonder that Tamil stood as a pure language for a long time till the advent of the Aryans. This impact gave rise to alien words entering the vocabulary of the Tamil language.

In the first part of this long period of the Sangam age there were no Aryans or Northerners in the Tamil country. That is, we may say that long before the age of Tolkāppiyar there were no alien words in the Tamil language. Only in Tolkappiyam and other Sangam works a few Sanskrit and Prakrit words came to be used. Mostly, the words used were in particular relation to the religions of the North. The Puranic stories, and the stories in the Buddha Jatakas found their way into Paripadal, Kalittogai, Silappadhikāram and Maṇimēkhalai which might have been written in the second and third centuries A.D.¹ Considering the above, it is clear, that in the first part of the Sangam age, (B. C. — B. C. 400), Tamil language alone, without any admixture of alien words, was in existence. It is only in the latter half after the advent of the Aryans (about B.C. 400—A.D. 300) Sanskrit and Prakrit words found their way into the Tamil language.

Tolkāppiyam :

Out of the present Sangam works that have come down to us Tolkāppiyam is the most ancient one. It is the only source which gives us all information of the various kinds of work that have been lost to us.

This grammar gives us all about Eḷuttu (எழுத்து)—Letters, (சொல்) - Words and Poruḷ (பொருள்)²—Matter, life etc.

If one carefully examines the work, it will be clear that many works on literature and grammar must have been in existence before Tolakāppiyar. Tolkāppiyar after going through

1. Dr. M. Rajamanikkam, Tamil moḷi-Ilakkiya Varalāru, pp.—273—296.

2. The Tamil literature is divided into Aham and Puṟam. Aham deals with family life, and Puṟam deals with dharma, artha, and moksha. Poruḷ comes under these two categories,

the works on grammar and other literature written during his own age and also the then available works written prior to him has written his grammar *Tolkāppiyam*.

Tolkāppiyar has mentioned in his treatise in about 260 places about the grammarians of his own age and those who had gone before him.

1. *Enba* (என்ப) - So say - has come in 147 places in *Tolkāppiyam*.
2. *Enmanār Pulavar* (என்மனார் புலவர்) - So say the scholars (*pulavār*) - has come in 68 places.
3. *Varaiyār* (வரையார்) - Do not remove or omit-has occurred in 15 places.
4. There are about 30 places with special qualities attached to the phrases having their own sweetness and significance. These phrases can be well understood if read with the sections and *sūtras*.
5. Three examples are given below as illustrations.

Kaṇṇimāi noḍiyēṇa avvē mātṭirai
Nuṇṇitiṇṇ unarndōr kaṇḍa vārē.

கண்ணிமை நொடியென அவ்வே மாத்திரை
நுண்ணிதின் உணர்ந்தோர் கண்ட வாரே.

(*Eḷuttadhikāram* - *Sūtra* 7)

Scholars who have carefully examined have found out that the time taken to winkle the eye brows is the time for one *noḍi* (the time measure of the snop of the fingure).

2. *Sūtra* 158 of *Solladikāram* is as follows:—

Solleṇap paḍuva peyarē viṇaiyeṇṇu
Āyiraṇ ḍeṇba Arindisi ṇōrē.

சொல்லென்ப படுவ பெயரே வினையென்று
ஆயிரண் டென்ப அறிந்திசி னேரே.

Those who are well versed will say that the words consist of nouns and verbs.

3. The *Sūtra* 403 in *Poruladhikāram* says :-

'If the first letter of the first *Sīr* and the first letter of the third *sīr* are one and the same, that kind of prosody is called *Polippu* (பொழிப்பு).

Tolkāppiyar says that this is the definition of *Polippu* given by scholars of yore.

‘Polippena molīdal *pulavar arē*’

பொழிப்பென மொழிதல் புலவர் ஆறே.

(B) THE ANTIQUITY OF TOLKĀPPIYAM

Many have said that Tolkāppiyam is anterior to the Eight collections and Tirukkuraḷ. But Prof. S. Vaiyapuri Pillai has mentioned that Tolkāppiyam came after the Sangam collections. The reasons adduced by the learned Professor was criticised one by one by Vidvan K. Vellai Varanan in his research work on “Tolkappiyam” published by the Annamalai University and has concluded that his reasons are untenable and Tolkāppiyam is anterior to the Sangam collections and not posterior to it.¹

An author who attempts a treatise on grammar would have naturally gone through all available works on literature and grammar during his period and then only will write his treatise. This is a common practice which cannot be denied. He would also lay down rules of grammar after studying carefully the words used by the people in worldly parlance and words used in poetry. If Tolkāppiyam belonged to a period later than that of the Sangam collection he would have made rules of grammar having in mind the words and phrases found in the Sangam works. If he had lived before the date of the Sangam collections, he would not be held responsible for any changes occurring in these works. Having this view in mind, we shall discuss the date of Tolkāppiyam.

Internal Evidences :

(1) The consonant Sa (ச) with vowels A (அ), Ai (ஐ), and Ow (ஔ) will not come as the first letter in the Tamil words. This is said in a sūtra by Tolkāppiyar.

Sahara-k kiḷaviyum Avarṛō raṛṛē
AAi owvenum mūṇṛalāṅ kaḍaiyē

சகரக் கிளவியும் அவற்றே ரற்றே

அஐ ஔவெனும் முன்றலங் கடையே.

(Eḷuttu - Sūtra 62)

1. Vidwan K. Vellai Varanan, “Tolkāppiyam” published by the Annamalai University, pp. 88-127.

As against this rule, we find words in the Sangam collections which do not conform to this rule but are opposite to it.

In Puṛaṇānūṛu, words like Saḍai (சடை) - matted locks of hair, Samam (சமம்) - equal, Sakaṭam (சகடம்) - Wheel, are found (Verses 1, 14, 102). In Pattuppāṭṭu, we have Savattī (சவட்டி) - having bent or twisted, Salam (சலம்) - water, Sandu (சந்து) - peace - (Perumpāṇ āṟruppaḍai, 1.217; Madurai-k-kānchi, 1.112, Malaipaḍukaḍām, 1.392). In Paḍiṟṟuppuattu, we find the word Savattum (சவட்டும்) - Killing (v, 84). In Tirukkuraḷ, we have Saman (சமன்) equal, Samam (சமம்) - equal (Kuraḷ. 99,112).

2. Tolkāppiyar has laid down that the consonant 'ஞ' with the vowel Ā (ஆ), e (ஏ), o (ஓ) only will come at the beginning of a word. (Eḷuttu - Sūtra 64)

As against this rule, we find in Puṛaṇānūṛu,
 ṅamaḷ (ஞமல்) - Yaman,
 ṅamali (ஞமலி) - Peacock,
 ṅimiru (ஞிமிறு) - Bee.

That is, the consonant 'ஞ' with the vowels அ and இ, coming at the beginning of a word (verses 6, 74, 93). In Ahaṇaṇūṛu, we find (ஞிமிறு) - Bee; (ஞமலி) - peacock (verses 59, 140, 385). In Paḍiṟṟuppuattu, we have (ஞரல) to make sound (verse 30). In Paṭṭiṇappālai (ஞமலி) - peacock is found (1.140),

3. The consonant ya (ய) with the vowel ā (ஆ) only will come at the beginning of a word. It will not come with the other eleven vowels.

Āvō dalladu yahara mudalādu.

ஆவோ டல்லது யகர முதலாது.

(Eḷuttu - Sūtra 65)

As against this rule, we find the word yavaṇar (யவனர்) in the Sangam collections.¹

1. Puṛaṇānūṛu, 56

Perumpāṇāṟruppaḍai 1.316

Mullaippāṭṭu, 1.61

Neḍunalvāḍai, 1.101

Silappadikāraṁ, Kāḍai 5, 1.10; Kāḍai 14, 1.67; Kāḍai 29, 1.25.

Maṇimekhalai, Kāḍai, 19, 1.108 etc.

4. Some words mentioned in Tolkāppiyam have lost their usage and not found in the Sangam works. They are the demonstrative words with the ending i (இ)

Adōḷi (அதோளி) - that place,

Idōḷi (இதோளி) - this place,

Udōḷi (உதோளி) - the place in between here and there.

(Eḷuttu, Sūtra 159)

These words are not found in the existing Sangam literature.¹ **If Tolkāppiyar would have lived after the Sangam Collections, he would not have composed a sūtra for the usage of these words.**

5. Tolkāppiyar has laid down some rules of grammar how the numeral word Nāngu (நான்கு) - Four - will combine with other words, and how it will change during combination with other words. (Sūtra 442, 453, 462, 467, 475).

But in Ahanānūru, v. 104 we find: 'Nānṅāḷku pūṇḍa, Kaḍumpari Neḍuntēr" (நன்னால்கு பூண்ட கடும்பரி நெடுந்தேர்). Here Nāngu (நான்கு) has changed into Nāḷku (நால்கு) and for this we do not find any rule in Tolkāppiyam.

6. Tolkāppiyam lays down definite rules for the combination of numeral words from one to ten, hundred, thousand, hundred thousand (Eḷuttu, Sūtra 438-471). Tolkāppiyar has not mentioned the word Kōḍi (கோடி) hundred thousand, Crore. Here it is evident that the word Kōḍi (கோடி) was not in use in the days of Tolkāppiyar. But the word Kōḍi (கோடி) is found in Puṛānānūru.

1. Further, Pērasiriyar, one of the commentators of Tolkāppiyam, has said that the above three words Adōḷi (அதோளி), Idōḷi (இதோளி) and Udōḷi (உதோளி) ending with i (இ), has gone into disuse in the last Sangam period itself as follows:

“ Words which were in existence at one age, have fallen into disuse at a later age. The words Adōḷi (அதோளி), Idōḷi (இதோளி), Udōḷi (உதோளி) and Kuyin (கூயின்) mentioned by Tolkāppiyar have now fallen into disuse.” Rules would not be formed for words like these which were not used at the age of the Commentators but were in existence before. **So Tolkāppiyar is anterior to the Sangam Collections.**

Onrupat taḍukkiya kōḍi Kaḍai-iriyā
Perumait tāhanin Āyul tātē.

ஒன்றுபத் தடுக்கிய கோடி கடையிரீஇய
பெருமைத் தாகநின் ஆயுள் தானே.

(Verse 18)

Kōḍi is the highest number.

May you live long for a number of years.

In Tirukkural, we find 'Kōḍi tohuttārkkum tuittal aridu'.

கோடி தொகுத்தார்க்கும் துய்த்தல் அரிது.

(Kural 377)

They cannot enjoy even if they have saved a crore (Kōḍi - கோடி) of rupees.

7. Tolkāppiar ssys that the plural ending Kaḷ (கள்) will come only in neuter gender.

Kaḷḷoḍu sivaṇum avviyaṇ peyaṇē
Koḷvaḷi uḍaiya palavaṇi soṛkē.

களளொடு சிவனும் அவ்வியற் பெயரே
கொள்வழி உடைய பலவறி சொற்கே.

(Sol. 169)

As against this we find the plural ending Kaḷ (கள்) comes in uyarṭiṇai - (high caste nouns denoting human beings) eg. words like Maṇṇaiyavarkaḷ (மற்றையவர்கள்) other people; pūriyarkaḷ (பூரியர்கள்) base or low people - (Kural 263, 919) and in Kalittokai Ivargaḷ (ஐவர்கள்) five persons - (verse 26).

8. The ending (விருதி) An (அன்) of a word will come only in the third person and that too in masculine gender.

An, Ān, Aḷ, Āḷ ennum nāṇḍum
Oruvaṇ maruṅṅin paḍarkkaic collē.

அன்ஆன் அள்ஆள் என்னும் நான்கும்
ஒருவர் மருங்கின் படர்க்கைச் சொல்லே.

(Sol. 205)

As against this rule, we find in Puṇaṇāpūru, uraittaṇṇaṇ yānāha (உரைத்தனன் யானாக) - I said this -; Andāṇṇaṇ pulavaṇ koṇḍuvan daṇṇaḷē (அந்தனன் புலவன் கொண்டுவந் தனனே) - I, who is a Brahmin poet, brought this - (verses 136, 201). Here we find that the ending an (அன்) has come in first person

singular. In Ahananūru, we have, Ninakkiyān Kilaiñān allānō (நினக்கியான் கிளைஞன் அல்லனே) - Am I not your relation? Yān vājalānē (யான் வாழலனே) - I am not able to live; Mikuti kaṇḍanrō ilanē (மிகுதி கண்டன்றே இலனே) - I have not seen much; Nanī arindaṇro ilanē (நனி அறிந்தன்றே இலனே) - I have not understood much (verses 342, 362, 379, 384), In Narṇipai, we have Kūruvan Vāji tōḷi (கூறுவன் வாழி தோழி) - I shall tell you, my blessed friend; Uḷḷinan allānō yānē (உள்ளினன் அல்லனே யானே) - Have I not thought of it (verses 233, 326). In Kuṇṇutokai, we find Aliyēn yānē (அனியென் யானே) - I am to be pitied; Niyalan yān ena (நீயலன் யான் என) - You are not the person; yān-ḷandanānē யானிழந்தனனே) - I have lost it; yān kaṇḍanrōilaḷō (யான் கண்டன்றே விலனே) - I have not seen (verses 30, 36, 43, 311).

9. The viyangōḷ viṇai (வியங்கோள் வினை) verb in the optative mood will not come in the first and second persons is the rule laid down by Tolkāppiyar.

Muṇṇilai taṇmai yāyi riḍattoḍu
Maṇṇā dāhum viyangōḷ kilavi.

முன்னிலை தன்மை யாயீ ரிடத்தொடு
மன்னா தாகும் வியங்கோள் கிளவி.

(Sol. 226)

As against this, we see that the Viyangōḷviṇai (optative mood of the verb) has come in the Second person in Puṇānūru.

Naḍukkiṇṇi Nilīyarō (நடுக்கின்றி நிலீஇயரோ)

(verse 2)

May you live long without dislocation.

10. Tolkāppiyar has said that the Metrical syllable (அசை) mō (மோ), will come in second person only.

Miyāyika mōmadi ikuṇṇin eṇṇum
Āvayin ārum muṇṇilai yasai-c-col.

மீயாயிக மோமதி யிகுஞ்சின் என்னும்
ஆவயின் ஆறும் முன்னினை அசைச்சொல்.

(Sol. 274)

As against this, we see in Puṇānūru, "Senmō Peruma em Viḷavuḍai nāṭṭēna" (சென்மோ பெருமஎம் விழவுடை நாட்டென) - we will go to our country full of festivities (verse 381). Here we see that Mō (மோ) has come in the first person,

11. All ahapporul matter from Kaikkilai to Peruntinai are best sung in Kalippā (a kind of verse) and Paripādal (a kind of verse) is Tolkāppiyar's view. (Poruḷadhikāram, 56)

But we see in the Sangam collections, all aham poems are mostly in Ahaval metre. If Tolkāppiyar belonged to a period later than the Sangam collections he would not have laid such a rule. **This itself is sufficient proof to show that Tolkāppiyar lived before the present Sangam collections.**

12. In Tolkāppiyam, we find Sēyōṇ, Māyōṇ, Varuṇaṇ, Vēndaṇ, the gods of the four divisions of land. Koṟṟavai (Durga) and the Omnipresent One are all described (Poruḷ 5, 85). But in the Sangam collections we clearly note that Muruga, S'iva, Kaṇṇa, and Balarama are treated as the four great gods (Puṟaṇaṇūru, verses 56, 58). The Sun, the Moon and the Rain are praised as Gods in Silappadhikāram. Even Manmata (Kāma) was worshiped (Silappadhikāram, Kādaḷ 9, 1.60).
13. Tolkāppiyar has stated that ahapporul matter will be sung in Paripādal.

Kocaham Arāham suritaham eruttoḍu
Ceppiya nāngum taṇak-k-kuṟup pākak
Kāmaḥ Kaṇṇiya Nilaimait tāhum.

கொச்சகம் அராகம் சுரிதகம் எருத்தொடு
செப்பிய நான்கும் தனக்குறுப் பாகக்
காமங் கண்ணிய நிலைமைத் தாகும்.

(Sūtra 121)

As against this, we find, that most of the verses in the present work on Paripādal praises Lord Muruga and Lord Vishnu.

Therefore, Tolkāppiyam must be a work written before the present Paripādal was composed; that is, a long time before the third Sangam period. If Tolkāppiyar belonged to a period later than this Paripādal he would have written definite rules for these poems which do not fall under Ahapporul.¹

Thus there are many differences between Tolkāppiyam and the Sangam collections. These are pointed out in "Tamiḷ

1. R. Raghava Ayyangar, Tamil Varalaṟu, pp. 306-307.

Varalāru" and "Tolkāppiyam" published by the Annamalai University.¹ Maha vidwan R. Raghava Ayyangar in his work on Tamil Varalāru published by the Annamalai University has said this : "It is difficult to show examples to some of the rules laid down by Tolkāppiyar with the help of the existing Sangam collections. Moreover, the present Sangam Collections contain (as pointed above) some grammatical usages not found in Tolkāppiyam. Hence it is crystal clear that Tolkāppiyam preceded the Sangam collectins" (p.268).

Thus it is quite clear that Tolkāppiyam is earlier than the present Sangam collections.

Vidwan V. Venkatarajulu Reddiyar² in his research work on Paraṇar (Madras University Publication) has mentioned the following : "The author of a grammar would write his grammar after carefully studying the works of the period and those that have appeared before his period. If Tolkāppiyam belonged to a period later than Paraṇar, Kapilar and Nakkirar of the last Sangam period then he would not have framed rules which are against the usage of words by the poets mentioned. The great variance found in the usage of words by the poets mentioned and the rules of grammar framed by Tolkāppiyar is itself sufficient proof to say that Tolkāppiyar must have lived long before the poets of the last Sangam.

Prof. M. Raghva Ayyangar has said that Tolkāppiyar must have lived long before the age of the Sangam works giving strong and valid reasons.³

The internal evidences so far mentioned go to prove beyond doubt that Tolkāppiyar must have lived long before the age of Puṇaṇnāru and other Sangam Collections. The external

1. Maha vidwan R. Raghva Ayyangar, has in his work on "Tamil Varalaru" clearly shown that Tolkāppiyam preceded the Sangam Collections (pp. 268-273 ; 308-309).

Also Vidwan K. Vellai Varanan of the Annamalai University in his research work on "Tolkāppiyam" has clearly stated the same view (pp. 90-94 ; 213).

Also Prof. T. R. Sessa Ayyangar in his "Dravidian India" has pointed out the same view (pp. 175-178).

2. Also V. Venkatarajulu Reddiyar, Paraṇar, Madras University Publication, pp. 172-173.

3. M. Raghava Ayyangar, Araicci-t-toguti, pp. 101-120.

evidences also strengthen the above truth. Let us now consider them.

External Evidences :

In his *Siṟappu-p-pāyiram* (special Introduction) to *Tolkāpiyam*, *Paṇampāraṇār* has mentioned that Kumari is the Southern boundary of the Tamil Country. The commentators who wrote commentary on this *Pāyiram* has taken Kumari to mean the River Kumari.

Pērāsiriyaṟ has said that before the deluge, as there were other Countries in the north and the south of the Tamil Country, the Southern boundary was mentioned. As there was no country after the Tamil country in the east and west, the boundaries in the east and west were not mentioned. On account of this, the *Siṟappu-p-pāyiram* of *Paṇampāraṇār* has mentioned Kumari as the southern boundary.

Therefore it is clear that the River Kumari and a part of the Pandya country was submerged under the sea.¹

Vaḍakkum Teṟkum kuṇakkum kuḍakkum
Vēṅgaḍam Kumari timpunṟṟ pauvameṟṟu
Inṇāṇ gellai ahavaiyiṟ kiḍanda
Nūladin uṇmai vālidin virippin”

The boundaries of the Tamilnad are given as follows: In the north it is bounded by *Vēnkaḍam*, in the south by *Kumari*, and in the east and west by seas.

(*Perum*) *Kākkai pāḍiṇiyār* has mentioned the River Kumari as the southern boundary of *Tamilagam*. Hence *Pērāsiriyaṟ* considers that (*Perum*) *Kākkai Pāḍiṇiyār* must have been a colleague of *Tolkāpiyaṟ*.

(*Siṟu*) *Kākkai pāḍiṇiyār* who came later than (*perum*) *kākkai pāḍiṇiyār* has given the seas as the boundaries of *Tamilagam* except for the north.

Vaḍatisai marungiṇ Vaḍugu varambāhat
Teṇṟisai yullit̃ teṇjiya mūṇṟum
Varaimaruḷ Puṇariyoḍu karaiporudu kiḍanta
Nāṭṭiyal vaḷakkam

“வடதிசை மருங்கின் வடுகு வரம்பாகத்
தென்றிசை யுள்ளிட் டெஞ்சிய மூன்றும்
வரைமருள் புணரியொடு கரைபொருது கிடந்த
நாட்டியல் வழக்கம்.”

1. *Tolkāpiyam*, *Maṟapiyal*, *Sātra* 94, commentary.

In this stanza it is stated that the northern boundary of the Tamilnad is the language of the Vaḍugar (Northerners), and the south, east and west are bounded by the seas.

Perāsiriyar has clearly mentioned that she (Siṟu kākkai-Pāḍiṇiyār) is later than Tolkāppiyar.¹ Naccinārkkīṇiyar says about her as 'piṇ tōṟiya kākkai pāḍiṇiyār' - Kākkai pāḍiṇiyār who came later than the first Kākkai pāḍiṇiyār)

Silappadhikāram, a work of the 2nd century A.D.,² has mentioned the same boundaries for Tamilagam.

Neḍiyōṭṭu kuṇṇamum toḍiyōḷ pauvamum
Tamilvaram baṟutta taṇṇuṇal nāḍu.

நெடியோன் குன்றமுந் தொடியோள் பெளவமுந்
தமிழ்வரம் பறுத்த தண்டினல் நாடு.

Kāḍai 8, 11. 1-2

The northern boundary is the Vēnkaṭam Hills; the southern boundary is the present Cape Commorin; the east and west are bounded by the seas.

From these it is clear that at one time Kumari was the southern boundary of the Tamilnad, and at another time the sea has become the southern boundary. Even at present the sea is the southern boundary.

Paṇampāraṇār and (Perum) kākkai pāḍiṇiyār have noted Kumari as the southern boundary of the Tamilnad, but (Siṟu) Kākkai pāḍiṇiyār and Iṅgōvaḍiḡal have mentioned the sea as the southern boundary. Most of the scholars opine that the date of Silappadhikāram is the 2nd century A.D. and the Sangam came to a close by about 300 A.D. Considering all these facts it is proper to hold that at the time of Tolkāppiyar the southern boundary was the Kumari River. Hence he must have lived before the deluge; and the deluge must have taken place after the composition of Tolkāppiyam and that is why the later poets mention the sea as the southern boundary.

2. Paṇampāraṇār in his Pāyiram (Introduction) to Tolkāppiyam has said that Tolkāppiyam deals with Eḷuttu (எழுத்து), Sol

1. Tolkāppiyam, Seyyul Iyal, Sūtra 1, Commentary of Perāsiriyar.

2. Dr. M. Rajamanickanar, Tamil moḷi-Ilakkiya Varalaru. pp. 273-296.

(சொல்) and Poruḷ (பொருள்). Tolkāppiyam as said by the commentators contains only the three Adhikārams, Eḷuttu, (எழுத்து), Sol (சொல்) and Poruḷ (பொருள்). In the later period, when (Siru) Kākkai pāḍiṇiyār lived, the grammar of the Tamil language contained in addition to the above three adhikārams another section called Yāppu (யாப்பு) - Prosody as is clear from the following lines :—

Nāṭṭiyal Vaḷakkam nānmaiir kaḍaikkaṇ
Yāppina tilakkaṇaṁ araihuvaṇ muṛaiyē.

“ நாட்டியல் வழக்கம் நான்மையிற் கடைக்கண்
யாப்பின திலக்கணம் அறைகுவன் முறையே.”

The commentator of Irāiyānār Ahapporuḷ has said that Tamil has four kinds :

Tamiḷtān nāngu vahaippaḍum
Eḷlutum, Sollum, Poruḷum, Yāppumēna.

Tamil grammer has four sections - they are - Eḷuttu alphabet, Sol (சொல்) word, Poruḷ (பொருள்) matter, and Yāppu (யாப்பு) prosody.

From what has been said above, it is clear that Tolkāppiyam was written when the River Kumari was the southern boundary of the Tamil country and (Siru) Kākkai pāḍiṇiyār lived after the great deluge when the land between the River Kumari and the present Cape Comorin was washed away by the Sea, and the sea alone came to be the southern boundary of the Tamil land after Tolakāppiyār.

(C) DATE OF TOLKĀPPIYAM

Even before Tolkāppiyam, the Northerners, who were speaking Sanskrit, came to South India and settled themselves. Therefore Sanskrit words came to be used by the Tamils and found entry into the Tamil language and literature of the Tamils.

(1) On account of this

Vaḍasoṟ Kiḷavi Vaḍaveḷut tori
Eḷuttoḍu puṇarnda Sollā kummē.

“ வடசொற் கிளவி வடவெழுத் தொரீஇ
எழுத்தொடு புணர்ந்த சொல்லா கும்மே.”

“Sidainḍana varinḍum iyainḍana varaiyār

சிதைந்தன வரினும் இயைந்தன வரையார்.”

Solladhikāram, 402

(1) If a Sanskrit word is to be used in Tamil it should be Tamilised according to the rules of grammar. (For example, the Sanskrit word Rama (ராம), must be written in Tamil as Irāmaṇ (இராமன்).

(2) Even Prakrit words, if suitable to the genius of the Tamil language it may be included.

Further, he has given the rules relating to Sūtra (சூத்திரம்), paḍalam (படலம்), piṇḍam (பிண்டம்), ambōdharangam (அம்போதரங்கம்), Kāṇḍikai (காண்டிகை) etc. If grammarians before Tolkāppiyar had given the rules for using Sanskrit words in Tamil language, Tolkāppiyar would certainly have referred to these rules and end his sūtras as ‘Eṇba’ (என்ப), ‘Eṇmmanār pulavar’ (என்மனார் புலவர்) etc. Since he has not mentioned any references to such rules of grammar, it is evident that Tolkāppiyar himself framed these rules. In his days some Sanskrit words must have found entry into the Tamil language and it was perhaps not possible for the people to be without using those words; and hence Tolkāppiyar found it a necessity to frame rules of grammar for using such words to suit the genius of the language.

Prof. V. Rangachariar has mentioned that the Aryans (Sanskrit speaking people) would have come to the Tamil country in about the 7th century B.C.¹

Only in the beginning of the 14th century A.D. the Islamic religion began to spread itself in the Tamil country. Kumara-gurupara swamigal, who lived in the 17th century A.D. has used the Hindustani words Salām (சலாம்), Cokkai (சொக்காய்), in his poems. On seeing this evidence, it is clear that it will take about two to three centuries for the words of one set of people to find entry into the language of the other set. If we take this view, it will not be wrong to say that it is only three centuries after the advent of the Aryans into the Tamil country some of these words would have found entry into the Tamil

language. From this point of view, if the Aryans had come to the Tamiḷ country in about the 7th century B. C., then Tolkāppiyar may be said to have lived in or about the 4th century B.C.

(2) Visaka Munivar̄, a disciple of Badrabāhu spread Jainism in South India. Baddrabāhu belonged to the period of Chandragupta (322-298 B.C.). There are some inscriptions in Brahmi script in Madurai District which are said to belong to the 3rd century B. C. by scholars of repute. Therefore, Jainism has in vogue in the Tamiḷ country in the third century B.C.)¹ But in Tolkāppiyam we find no mention of Jainism.²

(3) In the second Rock Edict of Asoka, it is mentioned that facilities for hospitals for both peoples and animals were provided for in the Cēra, Cōla and Pandiya countries. Further, it can be said that Buddhism found its entry in the Tamiḷ Country only during the period of Asoka (273-232 B. C.)

In Kuḷugumalai and other places in the Tamiḷ country, we find Buddhist inscriptions in Brahmi script. These inscriptions, it is said, belong to the later half of the 3rd century B. C.

There is no reference to Buddhism in Tolkāppiyam.³ Hence it is clear that Tolkāppiyam was written before the spread of Buddhist influence in the Tamiḷ land.

(4) Paṇampāraṇār in his Pāyiram (Introduction) Says :—

“Aindiram niṇṇaiṇṇa Tolkāppiyam”

“ஐந்திரம் நிறைந்த தொல்காப்பியன்”

Sanskrit writers believe that Aindiram is a grammatical work which was written long before Panini. From the above lines of Paṇampāraṇār, it is clear that Tolkāppiyar must have had a deep knowledge of the old Pre-Panini grammar Aindiram. This grammar lost its place after the grammar of Panini. If Tolkāppiyar had known the grammar of Panini, then Paṇampāraṇār would have mentioned this also in his Siṇṇappāyiram (special

1. Mayilai Seeni Venkataswami, Samanamum Tāmilum, pp. 34-36.

2. M Srinivasa Ayyangar, Tamil Studies, p. 8.

T. R. Sesa Ayyangar, Ancient Dravidians, p. 109.

3. “The famous Tamil grammatical work, the Tolkāppiyam, may be assigned the period (B. C. 325-B. C. 188) under survey; it is said to exhibit the influence of Aindira vyakaranam, a pre-Panini system of Sanskrit grammar, but it is free from Buddhist influence”. R. Satyanatha Ayyar, History of India, Vol. I pp. 170-171,

introduction). Since he did not mention the grammar of Panini, we may say that Tolkāppiyar must have lived before Panini,⁶ or it may be said that Tolkāppiyar lived during the time of Panini, but his grammar was not known to Tolkāppiyar who lived far away in the south. Therefore, it may be taken that Tolkāppiyar lived before Panini or during his period, when his grammar was not known in the South. The western scholars have fixed the date of Panini as the 4th century B.C.⁸

Kapāṭapuram, the Capital of the Pandyas, was washed away by the sea only after the period of Tolkāppiyar is seen from the Commentary of Iṟaiyaṅkār's Agapporul. Valmiki Ramayanam and Vyasa Bharatam mention about Kapāṭapuram. Winternitz says, that Vyasa Bharatam with all its interpolations is not later than the 3rd century B. C. Hence, Kapāṭapuram might have been in affluent circumstances during the 3rd and 4th centuries B.C.

To strengthen the above statement, we find that Chanakya, the minister of Chandragupta Maurya (325-301 B.C.) has mentioned in his Arthasastra 'Pandya Kavāṭam,' as one kind of pearls when mentioning the names of pearls taken from the sea. It is clear that the pearl 'Pandya Kavāṭam' denotes the pearls taken from Kapāṭapuram, the Capital of the Pandyas. It is not proper to say that after the deluge of Kapāṭapuram, the name would have been used to denote a pearl taken from that area. In the Sangam works, only pearls from Koṟkai is mentioned after the deluge of Kavāṭapuram.⁷

From the history of Ceylon, it is found that out of the three deluges, the first deluge was in 2387 B. C. This separated Ceylon from India. The second deluge was in 504 B. C. There was no serious loss in the second deluge. The third took place in 306 B. C. when Devanampriya Tissa was ruling in Ceylon. This period corresponds to the period of Asoka. On account of this deluge, one lakh of villages, 910 small fishermen villages, and 400 villages where pearl-divers lived were submerged under the sea.⁸

5. Prof. S. Vaiyapuri Pillai had said that some of the sūtra's of Tolkāppiyar resembles some of the sūtras of Panini and some resembles that of Bharata's Natya Sūtras in his work on "History of Tamil language and literature" (p. 68). Vidvan K. Vellai Varanan of the Annamalai University in his research work on 'Tolkāppiyam' has refuted the views of the Professor (pp-106-127). A study of these two will be very useful.

6. History of Ceylon, Volume I, Part I, p. 203.

7. R. Raghava Ayyangar, Tamil Varalaru, pp. 37-38

8. Sir James Emerson Tennent, Ceylon, Volume I, p. 7 foot-note,

As the first deluge divided Ceylon from India, it is natural that the second deluge would have made some havoc in India. That is why the commentary on Iṛayaṅār's Agapporul says that one deluge caused the destruction of the south of Madurai, and the other destroyed Kapāṭapuram.

In Silappadhikāram, we find the following lines which refers to one deluge :

Pahṛuḷi yāṛṛudaḷ paḷmalai yadukkattuk
Kumarri-k kōḍum Kōḍunkaḍal Koḷḷa

ப.:றுளி யாற்றுடன் பன்மலை யடுக்கத்துக்
குமரிக் கோடும் கொடுங்கடல் கொள்ள "

The deluge has swallowed the River Pahṛuḷi and the Kumari mountain which formed a part of the Kumari Range.

These lines denote a great deluge, and hence it may be the first deluge which divided India from Ceylon. Therefore, it follows, that the River Kumari must have been the southern boundary of the Pandya country after that frust deluge.

Therefore, the second or third deluge must have been the cause for the destruction of Kapāṭapuram. The second deluge had not made much impressionable damages is said by the History of Ceylon. Hence, the third deluge must have been the cause of the destruction of Kapāṭapuram.

Hence, unless otherwise proved by proper evidences, it is right to say that Tolkāppiyar might have lived during the 4th century B.C.

நேப்பாளியில் தமிழ்

ந. சஞ்சீவி

தமிழ்த்துறை, சென்னைப் பல்கலைக்கழகம்

1

பாரத நாட்டின் திருமுடியென விளங்கும் பெருமை ஒரு வகையில் நேப்பாளத்திற்கும், திருவடியென விளங்கும் பெருமை தமிழ் நாட்டிற்கும் உண்டு. புவியியல் வகையில் இத்தகு இணைப்பைப் பெற்றுள்ள இவ்விரு நாடுகட்கும் இடையே உள்ள மொழியியலுறவைச் சிறப்பாக நினைவுகூர எழுந்ததே இக்கட்டுரை.

பாரத நாட்டின் ஒருமைப்பாட்டிற்கே அடிப்படையான காரணங்கள் இரண்டே. அவை புவியியற்செல்வாக்கும் சமயவியற்செல்வாக்குமே ஆகும்.¹ ஒரு வகையில் புவியியற்செல்வாக்கையும் வலிவும் பொலிவும் பெறச் செய்வது சமயவியற்செல்வாக்கே எனலாம். இவ்வுண்மை தமிழகத்தில் பாசுபத நெறி பரவிய பான்மையால் தெளிவாகும்.² இன்றும் நேப்பாளத்தைக் கண்டு வருவோர் கூறும் வேறு செய்திகள் சிலவும் கருத்திற்கொள்ளத்தக்கன. அவை இவை :

‘சிவராத்திரி கூழிந்த சில தினங்களுக்குப் பிறகு மீண்டும் கோயிலுக்குச் சென்று பசுபதி நாதரைத் தரிசித்தோம். அங்குப் பூஜை செய்யும் குருக்கள்மாருள் ஒருவர் கன்னட பாஷைக்காரர் என்று கூறினார்கள்.’³

*

‘இந்துக்களிலே சைவம், வைணவம் என்ற பிரிவுகள் இருக்கிற தல்லவா? இந்தப் பிரிவுகளிலே சைவந்தான் நேபாளத்தில் ஆட்சி செலுத்துகிறது. விக்கிரகம் ஒன்றைப் பார்த்தோம். ஒரே செம்பு விக்கிரகத்தில் பாம்பின்மேல் கருடன், கருடனுக்குமேல் விஷ்ணு, விஷ்ணுவின்மேல் சிவபெருமான் இம்மாதிரியாகக் காணப்பட்டது. நேபாளத்தில் பிள்ளையார் கோயில்கள் அதிகம். வீதிக்கு வீதி, மூலைக்கு மூலை பிள்ளையார் கோயில்கள்தான். நேபாளப் பிள்ளையாருக்குத் தும்பிக்கை நேராயிருக்கும். நேபாள நடராஜர் மீசை வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்!’⁴

*

‘பசுபதிநாதருடைய கர்ப்பக் கிரகம் நான்கு வாயில்களை உடையது.எதிரே நின்ற கோலத்தில் எழுந்தருளியிருக்கிறார்

நந்தி. கோயில் மரத்தால் அமைக்கப்பட்டது. மலையாளத்துக் கோவில்களைப் போல அடுக்கு நிலைகள் அமைந்ததாக விமானம் அமைக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது.'⁵

*

‘பெருமான் இந்த நிலையில் நேபாலத்தில் எழுந்தருளியிருந்து எல்லா உயிர்களையும் காத்து அருள் வழங்கி நிற்கிறான். தென்னா டுடைய சிவன் எந்நாட்டவர்க்கும் இறைவன் என்ற முழுக்கத்தின் திருவுருவாகப் பெருமான் அங்கே எழுந்தருளியிருக்கிறான். உலகப் பகுதிகள் எல்லாவற்றிலும் அவனுடைய கருணைப் பெருவெள்ளம் பெருகி நின்று காத்து வருகிறது என்பதற்கு எடுத்துக்காட்டாக எல்லாத் திசைகளையும் பார்க்கும் திருமுகங்கள் நான்கும், அருவ நிலையில் ஒரு முகமும் ஆக ஐந்து திருமுகங்கள் கொண்டு விளங்குகிறான். இதேபோன்ற திருவுரு தமிழ் நாட்டில் திருவக்கரை என்னும் தலத்தில் அமைந்திருக்கிறது.’⁶

*

‘அநந்த பத்மநாப அடிகளிடம் இரண்டாநாள் இரவு பேசிக் கொண்டிருக்கும்போது நேபால நாட்டிலுள்ள இக்கோவிலுக்குத் தாங்கள் எப்படிப் பூசகராக வந்து சேர்ந்தீர்கள்? வடகன்னட நாட்டுத் திருக்கோகர்ணத்திலிருந்து இங்கு வரக் காரணம் என்ன? அங்கே உங்களுக்குப் பூசை முறை இருப்பதாகத் தெரிகிறதே என்று பொழுது போக்காகச் சில கேள்விகளைக் கேட்டு வைத்தேன்.

அடிக : ‘உண்மைதான். வடகன்னட நாட்டில் பிராமண வகுப்பில் எங்களுக்கு நல்ல மதிப்புண்டு. நாங்கள் தமிழில் வழங்கும் அடிகள்⁷ என்ற சிறப்புப் பெயரைப் பெற்று வாழ்கிறோம். பட், சாஸ்திரிகள் என்ற சிறப்புப் பெயர்களும் உண்டு எங்கள் குடும்பம் படித்த குடும்பம். சங்கரர் இந்நாட்டுக்கு வருமுன் பசுபதி நாதருக்கு நரபலி, மது மாமிசம் முதலியன படைத்து வழிபாடுகள் செய்து வந்தார்கள் என்பதை நேற்று உங்களுக்குச் சொன்னேன் அல்லவா?

‘சங்கரர் வருவதற்கு முன்னர், இந்நாட்டில் சந்நியாசிகள் பெருமானைப் பூசித்து வந்தனர். இங்கு பிராமண, சூத்திரிய, வைசிய, சூத்திரர் என்று சாதிப் பிரிவினைகள் இருந்து வருகின்றன. எல்லோரும் மது மாமிசம் அருந்தக்கூடியவர்கள். ஆகார விஷயத்தில் இங்கு அதிக வேற்றுமை கிடையாது. பெருமானுக்குப் பலியிடுதலும் மதுமாமிச நைவேதனமும் கூடாவென்று

சங்கரர் நிறுத்திவிட்டார். அந்தப் பழக்க வழக்கங்களுடைய இந்த நாட்டுப் பிராமணர்கள் பெருமானைத் தொட்டுப் பூசித்தல் அநுசிதம் என்று அப்போதிருந்த அரசனிடம் எடுத்துச் சொல்லிச் சுத்த சைவர்களாயுள்ள பிராமணர்கள்தாம் பூசை செய்ய யோக்கியதை உடையவர்கள் என்பதையும் அரசனுக்குத் தெரிவித்தார்.

‘அப்படிச் சுத்த சைவர்களாக உள்ளவர்கள் எங்கிருந்து கிடைப்பார்கள் என்று கேட்ட அரசனுக்கு, விந்தியப் பிரதேசத்தின் தெற்குப் பகுதியில் உள்ள பிராமண வகுப்பார் நெறியிற் சிறந்தவராகவும் (ஸ்மார்த்த வைஷ்ணவர்கள்) சைவர்களாகவும் இருப்பார்கள். அங்கிருந்து படித்த நல்ல அறிஞர்களை ஒழுக்கத்திற் சிறந்தவர்களைப் பொறுக்கியெடுத்துப் பூசைக்கு வைத்துக்கொள்ளலாம் என்று அவர் ஒரு திட்டமும் வகுத்துக் கொடுத்தார். முதலில் கன்னடப் பிரதேசத்தில் உள்ளவர்களில் தேர்ந்தெடுக்கலாம். அதுவும் பொருந்தாவிட்டால் ஆந்திர நாட்டிலிருந்து தேர்ந்தெடுக்கலாம். இந்த மூன்றிலும் இதற்குப் பொருத்தமாக யாரும் கிடைக்காவிட்டாலும் விந்தியத்திற்குத் தெற்குப் பகுதியிலுள்ள எந்த நாட்டு வைதிக பிராமண குலத்திலுள்ளவர்களிலும் பொருத்தமானவரை எடுக்கலாம்.’⁸

*

‘கோதாவரி—என்ற ஊர் உண்டு. தென்னிந்தியத் தொடர்புள்ள நேபால சின்னங்களுள் இதுவும் ஒன்று.’⁹

2

தொன்றுதொட்டு நேப்பாளத்திற்கும் நமக்கும் உள்ள நல்லுறவை இன்றும் நமக்குச் சிறப்பாக நினைவுபடுத்தும் சீர்மை அந்நாட்டின் தலைநகரின் பெயராகிய ‘காட் மண்டி’ற்கே உண்டு. காஷ்ட மண்டபமே ‘காட்மண்டு’ - காஷ்டம் தமிழ்க் கட்டையே எனில்¹⁰ நேப்பாளத்தின் தலைநகரின் பெயருக்கே உயிர் தரும் ஒரு சொல் தமிழ்ச்சொல்லே. இன்னொரு வகையான நம் கால உறவு வீரம் செறிந்த அந்நாட்டின் குடி மக்களாகிய கூர்க்கருள் 245 மகளிர் உட்பட 1325 பேர் தமிழ் நாட்டில் பெரும்பாலும் பண்டையவனர் போலக் காவலாளிகளாய் வாழ்வதே ஆகும்.¹¹

3

தென்னகத்துடன் இத்தகு தொடர்புடைய நேப்பாளத்தின் மொழியாகிய நேப்பாளியின் முதற்பெருஞ்சொற்களஞ்சியம் 1930-

ஆம் ஆண்டில் வெளி வந்தது. அதன் ஆசிரியர் பேராசிரியர் டர்னர் (R. L. Turner). ஏறத்தாழ ஆயிரம் பக்கங்கள் கொண்ட இச்சொற்களஞ்சியம் பலவகைகளிலும் எடுத்துக்காட்டானதொரு சொற்களஞ்சியமாய்த் திகழும் பெருமை சான்றது. இச்சொற்களஞ்சியத்தில் உள்ள இருபத்தாறாயிரம் நேப்பாளிச் சொற்களும் அவற்றிற்குரிய தேவநாகரி எழுத்திலும் ஆங்கில எழுத்திலும் தரப்பட்டுள்ளன. அவற்றிற்குரிய பொருள் ஆங்கிலத்தில் தரப்பட்டுள்ளது. பெரும்பாலும் ஒவ்வொரு நேப்பாளிச் சொல்லின் வேர் பற்றிய ஆய்வும் அச்சொல்லிற்குரிய ஒப்புச் சொற்களும் காட்டப்பட்டுள்ளன.

‘நேப்பாளி ஒப்பியல் - பிறப்பியல் சொற்களஞ்சியம்’ என்ற பெயருக்கு ஏற்ற பெருமைசான்ற இப்பெருநூலைப் பேராசிரியர் டர்னர் பதினாறுண்டுகள் பாடு பட்டு உருவாக்கியுள்ளார். ¹² இப்பெரும்படைப்புக் கருக்கொண்ட இடம் அல்மோராவின் (Almora) கூர்க்காக் கோட்டையின் அடிவாரம்! ¹³ பேராசிரியர் டர்னர் கடும்போர்ப்பணியில் ஈடுபட்டிருந்த காலம் இச்சொற்களஞ்சியம் சூல் கொண்ட காலம். ¹⁴

4

நேப்பாளியில் வழங்கும் தமிழ் வேருடைய சொற்கள் சிலவற்றின் அகர வரிசை வருமாறு:

நேப்பாளிச் சொல்	பொருள்	தமிழ்ச்சொல்
ஒக்லி	உலக்கை	உலக்கை
கர்	கட்டி, கழலை	கழலை
காலோ	கறுப்பு	கார் *
காஜல்	(கண்ணுக்கிடும்) மை	கருமை *
குட்டு	அடி, நொறுக்கு	குட்டு; கொட்டு
கொர்நு	சுற்றல், சுழலல்	கிறுகிறுப்பு
சங்	படிக்கட்டு	சங்கடம் (= ஒடுக்க வழி. இப்பொருளில் யாழ்ப்பாணத்தில் வழங்குகிறது.)
சிலோ	மாணவர்	சில, சிறு *
சுருட்	சுருட்டு; சுருட்டுக் குடியன்.	சுருட்டு *
டண்டா	குளிரந்த	தண்(மை) *

தல்	தாளம்	தாளம் *
தாரோ	தாடை	தாள் ; தாடை
* * தாலோ	தாழ்ப்பாள்	தாழ் ; தாள்
போல்நு	பேசு	வகுளி ; வகுணி *
		(= ஒலி)
பௌநு	மித, நீந்து	தேலு(தல்);
		தேறு(தல்)*
மார்நு	தேய் ; அடி ; சுருட்டு	மண் ; மண்ணு(தல்)*
மிசுநு	தேய் ; அழுத்து ; பிழி.	மின் ? *
முஸல்	உலக்கை ; உலக்கை	மசி
	நுனி ; மா(வு)	
யுஜார்நு	அழி	* சரி ?
ஜர்நு	பொருத்து	சடை(தல்)
ஜரி	மழைபொழிதல்	சொரி ? *
ஹலிநு	அலைத்தல்	அலை
ஹலுகொ	மெல்லிய	அலை *
ஹெர்நு	பார் ; காண்	பார் ? *

5

பேராசிரியர் டர்னர் நேப்பாளிச் சொற்கட்கு வேர்ச்சொல் விளக்கம் காட்ட வழங்கும் திராவிடச் சொற்களென பிராகுவி, (4) கன்னடம், (27) கோண்டி, (5) கூய், (1) குருக், (5) மலையாளம், (1) தமிழ், (16) தெலுங்கு, (19) தொதுவர் மொழி, (2) துளு, (1) ஆகிய மொழிச்சொற்களைத் தனித்தனியே பட்டியலிட்டுத் தந்துள்ளார். அப்பட்டியல்களை ஆய்ந்து எந்த நேப்பாளிச் சொல்லிற்கு எந்தெந்தத் திராவிட மொழிச் சொற்கள் ஒப்பிட்டுக் காட்டப்பட்டுள்ளன என்பது எளிதில் விளங்கும்பொருட்டுப் பின் வரும் பட்டியல் அகரவரிசையில் அமைக்கப்பட்டுள்ளது. தமிழ்ச்சொற்கள் பல வட மொழியில் திரிந்து வழங்கும் திறமுணர இப்பட்டியல் துணை புரிதல் கூடும். பேராசிரியர் டர்னர் காட்டாத திராவிட ஒப்புச் சொற்களும் இப்பட்டியலில் காட்டப்பட்டுள்ளன. அவற்றின்மேல் உடுக்குறி இடப்பட்டுள்ளது. தமிழ் தவிரப் பிற திராவிட மொழிச் சொற்களின் ஒலி வடிவைப் பேரளவு சரியாக உணர்த்தும் வகையிலேயே தமிழ் வரி வடிவு தரப்பட்டுள்ளது. ஆயினும், தமிழ் எழுத்துகளைக்கொண்டே பிற மொழி யொலிகளை எல்லாம் குறிக்கும் முறை இன்னும் பிறவாமை மறவாமைக்குரியது. பட்டியல் வருமாறு :

ஒக்லி—	உலக்கை (தமிழ்) வாஸ்க் (தொதுவர் மொழி)
கர்—	கழலை (தமிழ்) கடுவு (தெலுங்கு) கட்டா (,,) கட்டே (,,)
காலோ—	கார் (தமிழ்) * கரா (தெலுங்கு) காடு (கன்னடம்) கோச (கோண்டி) (,,)
காஜல்—	குட்டு (தமிழ்)
குட்டு—	கொட்டு (,,) கொட்டு (தெலுங்கு) குடு (கன்னடம்) குட்டு (,,) குடூர் (பிராகுவி) குரும் (கோண்டி) க்சாட் (குருக்கு)
கெர்நு—	கிறுகிறு (தமிழ்) கிரகிரா (தெலுங்கு) கிரி (,,) கிட் (பிராகுவி) கிர்கிர் (குருக்கு)
சஙர்—	சங்கடம் (தமிழ்) ஐங்கலா (துளு)
சிலோ—	சில (தமிழ்) சில்லர (கன்னடம்) சில்லு (,,) சிறு (,,)
சுருட்—	* சுருட்டு (தமிழ்) சுருட்டு (மலையாளம்)
டண்டா—	* தண்மை (தமிழ்) தடி (தெலுங்கு) தண் (,,) தண்டி (,,) தணிட் (தொதுவர் மொழி)

தல்—	தழும்பு (தமிழ்) * தட்டு (, ,) * தட்டு (தெலுங்கு) தட்டு (கன்னடம்)
தாரோ—	தாடை (தமிழ்) தாள் (, ,) தவடை (, ,) தவடா (தெலுங்கு) தவடெ (கன்னடம்)
போல்நு—	வகுளி (தமிழ்) * வகுணி (, ,) பொப்ப (தெலுங்கு) பகுளு (கன்னடம்) பொப்பெ (, ,) பொகளு (, ,)
பெளரநு—	* தேலு தல் (தமிழ்) தேறுதல் (, ,) தேல் (தெலுங்கு) தேல் (கன்னடம்) தார் (பிராகுவி)
மார்நு—	மண் (தமிழ்) மாடு (கன்னடம்)
மிசிநு—	* மின் (தமிழ்) மிச்சு (தெலுங்கு) மிக்கி (, ,)
முஸல்—	* மசி (தமிழ்) மசெ (கன்னடம்) மசகு (, ,) மசிட் (கோண்டி) மசோல் (, ,) மஸ்மசர் (குருக்கு)
யுஜார்நு—	* ? சரி (தமிழ்) (= அழி) ஜட (கன்னடம்) ஜடெ (தெலுங்கு)

ஜர் நு—	சடை (தமிழ்) (= பொருத்து) ஜட்ட (கன்னடம்) ஜடி (,,)
ஜரி—	* ? சொரி (தமிழ்) ஜிடி (கன்னடம்) ஜடி (தெலுங்கு)
ஹலி நு—	அலங்கு (தமிழ்) அலை (,,) அலசு (தெலுங்கு) அலசு (கன்னடம்) அலகு (,,) அலெ (,,) அலுகு (,,)
ஹலுகொ—	* அலை (தமிழ்) அலகளு (தெலுங்கு)
ஹொர் நு—	* ? பார் (தமிழ்) ஹிர் (பிராகுவி) ஹீர் (கோண்டி) ஏர் (குருக்கு) இர் (,,)

6

மேற்கண்ட பட்டியலில் உள்ள நேப்பாளிச் சொற்கள் பல தமிழ் வேருடையனவே என்று நாம் உணரப் பேராசிரியர் டர்னரே மேற் கோளாகக் காட்டும் பேராசிரியர் யூல் பிளாக் அவர்களின் கருத்துகள் சிலவற்றை மேலுள்ள பட்டியலில் உள்ள சொற்களின் அகர வரிசையைத் தழுவினே ஈண்டு முறைப்படுத்தித்தருதல் பொருத்தமும் பயனும் உடையதாகும். அவ்வாறு முறைப்படுத்தப்பட்ட கருத்துகள் வருமாறு : ¹⁵

ஓக்லி :

‘சோமா இலையை இடிக்கும் உரல் உலூக்கல (ரிக் வேதம் I, 28, 6). இது உலக்கை (தமிழ்), வஸ்க் (தொதுவர் மொழி), ஒனகெ (கன்னடம்) ஆகிய திராவிடச் சொற்களை நினைவூட்டுகிறது’.

கர் :

‘சிறு உடல் நோய்கட்கும் அவர்கள் (ஆரியர்கள்) திராவிட மொழிச் சொற்களையே வழங்கியதாகத் தோன்றுகிறது. கண்ட

(ஐத்திரேயம்) 'கட்டா', 'கடுவு' (தெலுங்கு), கட்டெ (கன்னடம்), 'கழலை' (தமிழ்), 'கட்டு' (தெலுங்கு) ஆகிய சொற்களும் ஒரே வேருடையனவே ஆகும்.'

காலோ :

காஜல் :

'கால' என்னும் பகுதியே கருமை என்ற பொருள் தரும் கன்னட - காடு, தெலுங்கு - கரா, 'கறுப்பாக்க' என்னும் பொருள் தரும் கன்னட 'கழ்கு', கரும்பொருளைக் குறிக்கும் கோண்டி - கோசோ, பொதுவாகத் திராவிட மொழிகட்குரிய 'கார்' ஆகிய சொற்களின் வேராக இருத்தல் வேண்டும். இதே சொற்குடும்பத்தைச் சார்ந்ததே கன்னட - காடிகெ, தெலுங்கு - காடிகெ. இச்சொற்கள் சுஸ்ருதம் - கஜ்ஜல், இந்தி - காஜல், காலிக் ஆகிய சொற்களை நினைவூட்டும்.'

குட்னு :

'பேராசிரியர் கிட்டல் குடு (கன்னடம்), குட்டு (கன்னடம், தமிழ்) கொட்டு (தெலுங்கு) ஆகியவற்றை ஒப்பிட்டுக் காட்டுகிறார். இதனுடன் அரிசி குற்றுதல் என்னும் பொருள் தரும் கொட்டு (கன்னடம், தெலுங்கு), 'நொறுக்கு' என்னும் பொருள் தரும் 'கோர்ஸ்', 'கோஸ்' (குருக்கு) ஆகிய சொற்களையும் சேர்த்துக் கொள்ளலாம்.'

கெர்னு :

'சுற்றளவு என்னும் பொருள் தரும் கேர் (இந்தி), மயக்கம் என்னும் பொருள் தரும் கிர்னீ (இந்தி), கெரீ (மராத்தி), சுழல் என்னும் பொருள் தரும் கிர்த்தீ (மராத்தி), கயிறுகளைச் சுற்றும் சக்கரம் என்னும் பொருள் தரும் கிரின் (இந்தி) போன்ற இன்னும் பல இதே வேருடைய சொற்கள் சுற்று என்னும் பொருள் தரும் 'கிரி' (தெலுங்கு) சுற்றாய், மயக்கமாய் என்னும் பொருள் தரும் 'கிரகிரா' (தெலுங்கு) ஆகிய சொற்களை நினைவூட்டுகின்றன. 'கிறுகிறு' என்னும் தமிழ்ச்சொல்லின் பொருளே இவற்றின் பொருளும். குருக் மொழியில் 'விரைவுறு' என்னும் பொருள் தரும் சொல் 'கிர்கிர'; பிராகுவியில் 'உறக்கத்தால் கிறங்கு' என்னும் பொருள் தரும் சொல் 'கிட்'.

டண்டா :

'உரிச்சொற்களைப் பொறுத்த வரையில் பெரிதும் வழக்குடைய ஒரு சொல்லைப்பற்றி மட்டும் குறிப்பிட்டு அமைவேன். 'குளிர்ச்சி' என்னும் பொருள் தருவனவாய் தண்ட் (மராத்தி), இந்தி, 'டண்டா'

ஆகிய சொற்கள் உள்ளன. இவை 'குளிர்ச்சி' என்னும் பொருள் தரும் 'தண்' (தமிழ், கன்னடம்), தாண்ட் (தொதுவம்), ஈரம் என்னும் பொருள் தரும் தடி (தெலுங்கு, கன்னடம்) ஆகிய சொற்களின் வேரினும் வேருனவையாக இருக்கவே இயலாது. இச்சொல் திராவிட மூலம் உடையதாவதற்கு இவ்வேரினின்றும் எழுந்த திராவிடச் சொல் வடிவங்களின் வகை வளமும் மூக்கொலியின் மாறுதலுறும் பண்பும் பெருந்துணை புரிவனவாகும்.

'இச்சொல் குடியேற்ற நாட்டு ஆங்கிலத்திலும் குடி புகுந்துவிட்டது. 'மிளகுத் தண்ணீர்' என்பதில் உள்ள 'தண்ணீர்' என்பதற்குரிய பழம்பொருள் தண்ணிய (குளிர்ந்த) நீர் என்பதே ஆகும். இக்கூட்டுச் சொல்லில் உள்ள முதற்பகுதியைக் கடனாகப் பெற்றதன் பயனே இந்தி 'டண்டா' வும் சமஸ்கிருத 'நீரம்' என்ற சொல்லும்.'

தல்:

'நிருக்தத்தில் குறிக்கப்பெறும் வினைப்பொருளுடைய வேர் 'தட்'. இது 'அடி' என்னும் பொருள் உடைய 'தாளெட்டி' என்னும் பாலிச் சொல்லிலும் உள்ளது. அதர்வ வேதம் 'ஓர்அடி' என்னும் பொருளுடைய 'தாட' என்னும் சொல்லைப் பெற்றுள்ளது. இந்த சமஸ்கிருத 'தட்' என்னும் சொல்லுக்கு ஆரியத்தில் சிறந்த வேர்ச்சொல் ஏதும் இல்லை மாறாக 'அடி' என்னும் பொருள் உடைய தட்டு (கன்னடம் - தமிழ் - தெலுங்கு) என்ற சொல்லும் 'எதிர்த்து அடி' என்னும் பொருளுடைய 'தட்டு' என்ற கன்னடச் சொல்லும் 'வடு' என்னும் பொருள் தரும் 'தழும்பு' என்ற தமிழ்ச் சொல்லும் ஒப்பிட்டு நோக்கற்குரியன'.

தாரோ:

'தாடியைக் குறிக்கும் தாதிக (மனு), தாடி (இந்தி) ஆகிய சொற்கள் 'தம்ஷ்டர்' என்ற வேர்ச்சொல் உடையன என்பதை ஒலியியல் வகையாலோ சொல்லியல் வகையாலோ எளிதில் விளக்க இயலவில்லை. ஆனால், அச்சொற்கள் தாடைக்குரிய தமிழ்ச்சொற்களாகிய தாள், தாடை, தவடை ஆகியவற்றையும் தவடெ (கன்னடம்) தவடா (தெலுங்கு) ஆகியவற்றையும் நினைவுறுத்துகின்றன.

போல்வே:

'பலர்' விழை பண்பும் அதனால் உணர்ச்சி விளக்கமார் பண்பும் பெற்றுள்ள சரிநூட்பக் காரணங்கள் பற்றியே அண்மைக் காலத்தில் திராவிடத்திலிருந்து கடன் வாங்கப்பட்ட உரிச்சொற்களும் வினைச் சொற்களும் உள என்று நான் நம்புகிறேன்.

‘அவ்வாறு கடன்கொண்ட வேர்ச்சொற்களுள் ஒன்று ‘பேச’ என்னும் பொருளுடைய ‘போல்’ என்பதாகும். இச்சொல் திவ்வியாவதானத்தில் பயன் படுத்தப்பட்டுள்ளது. அதைப் ‘ப்ரு’ என்னும் வேருடையதென விளக்க யான் தயங்குகிறேன். ஆனால், ‘போல்’ என்னும் சொல்லோடு ஒலி என்னும் பொருளுடைய ‘வகுளி’ (தமிழ்) ‘பகுளு’ ‘பொகளு’ (கன்னடம்) ஆகிய சொற்களையும் ‘பொப்பெ’ (கன்னடம்) ‘பொப்ப’ (தெலுங்கு) ஆகிய சொற்களையுங்கூட ஒப்பிடலாம்.’

பௌரணு :

‘புதிய மொழிகளில் அசைவு அல்லது பெயர்ச்சியைச் சுட்டும் சில வினைச்சொற்கள் உள்ளன. ‘நீந்து, மித’ என்னும் பொருள் தரும் தைர்னா (இந்தி) என்னும் சொல்லுக்குத் தர், திர் ஆகியன வேர்ச்சொற்களாக இருக்கும் என்று எனக்குத் தோன்றவில்லை. ஆனால், ‘தேல்’ (கன்னடம், தெலுங்கு), தார் (பிராகுவி) ஆகிய சொற்கள் நினைவுக்கு வருகின்றன.’

மார்கு :

‘பாரதம், பாலியில் உள்ள ‘மண்டயதி’ என்னும் சொல்லுக்கும் ‘செய்ய’ என்னும் பொருள் தரும் ‘மாடு’ (கன்னடம்) ‘அணி செய், மெருகிடு’ என்னும் பொருள் தரும் ‘மண்’ (தமிழ்), ‘அணி செய்’ என்னும் பொருள் தரும் ‘மேஜ்’ (சூய்), வீடு என்னும் பொருள் தரும் ‘மாடம்’ (தமிழ்), ‘மாளிகை’ (தெலுங்கு) ஆகிய சொற்கட்கும் பொதுவானதொரு வேர் உண்டு என்றே நான் கருதுகிறேன்.’

மிசினு :

‘மீனைக் குறிக்கும் பழைய ஆரியச் சொல் ‘மத்ஸ்ய’ என்பதே. அமரத்திலும் மனுவிலும் ‘மீன்’ என்ற சொல் இருக்கிறது. ஆனால், நமக்குத் தெரிந்த வரையில் பாலியில் இல்லை. இது மீன் (தமிழ், கன்னடம், கோண்டி), மீனு (சூய்) ஆகும்.’

முஸல் :

‘இது வரை நாம் பார்த்த வடமொழிச் சொற்களுள் திராவிட மூலம் காணக்கூடிய எச்சொல்லும் ரிக்வேதத்தைச் சார்ந்ததாய் இல்லை. ஆனால், அதற்கு ஒரு சான்றைத் தானியங்களை மாவாக்கும் கலை நமக்கு வழங்கும் என்று கருதுகிறேன். உலக்கையைச் சுட்டும் அதர்வ மறை - பாலி சொல்லாகிய ‘முஸலா’வில் உகரத்தை ஸகரம் தொடர்வதாலும் லகரம் உண்மையாலும் பலரறிந்த சொல்லாகும் இச்சொல்லைப் பேராசிரியர் வாக்கர்நகல் அதர்வ மறை¹⁵

23, 8. மஷ்மஷாகரம் என்ற சொல்லோடும் ஒப்பிடுகிறார். ஆரியத்தில் 'நசுக்கு' என்னும் பொருள் தரும் 'மஸ்' அல்லது 'ம்ர்ஷ்' என்னும் பழைய வேர்ச்சொல் ஏதும் இல்லை. மாருகத் 'தேய், அரை, மெருகிடு, கூராக்கு' என்னும் பொருள் தரும் 'மசெ', 'மசகு' (கன்னடம்), கோது, தேய் என்னும் பொருள்தரும் 'மசமசார்' (குருக்கு), சாணைக்கல் என்னும் பொருள் தரும் 'மசோல்' (கோண்டி), என்னும் சொற்கள் உள். நசுக்கு என்னும் பொருள் தரும் மசல்து (இந்தி) திராவிடத்தினின்றும் நேரே ஆரியத்தில் குடி புகுந்திருத்தல் கூடும்.

ஹலிநு, ஹலுகா :

'கிளர்ச்சியுறு' என்னும் பொருள் தரும் ஹில்நு (இந்தி), ஹல்ணே (மராத்தி), ஹால்வு (குசராத்தி), போக என்னும் பொருள் தரும் ஹல்நு (சம்ஸ்கிருதம்), உலுக்கு என்னும் பொருள் தரும் ஹல்நு (பிரிஜி), ஹால்நு (இந்தி), அலராவுன் (காஷ்மீரி) ஆகிய சொற்களின் சுற்றமாய் சொற்கள் பல உள். எடையற்ற என்னும் பொருள் தரும் ஹலூ ஹல்கா (இந்தி) சொற்களும் இங்குச் சேர்த்து எண்ணத்தக்கன. அவ்வாறே அலை என்னும் பொருள்தரும் ஹல்கா, ஹில்க், கில்கோரா ஆகிய பெயர்களும் கருதத்தக்கன. திராவிடத்தில் 'கிளர்ச்சி செய்' என்னும் பொருள்தரும் வினைச்சொற்கள் பலவுள். அவை அலெ (கன்னடம்), அலை (தமிழ்), அலுகு (கன்னடம்), அலங்கு (தெலுங்கு) அசைக்க என்னும் பொருள்தரும் அலகு, அலசு (கன்னடம்) தொந்தரை தருதல் என்னும் பொருள்தரும் அலசு (தெலுங்கு), ஒளி, நிறை புலமை ஆகிய பொருள்தரும் அலக்கனா (தெலுங்கு), சுறுசுறுப்பு அல்லது விரைவு என்னும் பொருள்தரும் எலகி (கூய்), அலை என்னும் பொருள்தரும் 'அலா' (தெலுங்கு) அலெ (கன்னடம்), அலை (தமிழ்) ஆகிய சொற்கள் கருதத்தக்கன.'

ஹெர்நு :

'பிராகிருதத்திலும் இக்கால இந்தோ - ஆரியத்திலும் 'பார்க்க' என்னும் பொருள் தரும் 'ஹெர்' என்னும் வேர் இருக்கக்காண்கிறோம். இது ஹிர் (பிராகு), ஏர் (குருக்கு), ஹீட் (கோண்டி) இரு (தெலுங்கு) ஆகிய வடதிராவிடப் பேச்சுகளில் இருக்கக்காண்கிறோம்.'

இவ்வாறு பேராசிரியர் பிளாக் விளக்கும் கருத்துகளால் தெளிவாகும் உண்மை ஒன்று உண்டு. அது மேற்படி சொற்கள் திராவிடக் கடன் சொற்களே என அவர் துணிவதன் தலைமைக் காரணம் அச்சொற்கட்கு வடவாரிய மொழிகளில் சரியான வேர்ச்

சொல் இன்மையும் மாறாகத் திராவிட மொழிகளில் ஏற்ற வேர்ச் சொற்களும் ஒப்புச் சொற்களும் உண்மையுமே ஆகும்.

7

மேலுள்ள பட்டியலைக் கண்டார் கருத்திற்கொள்ளத் தக்க குறிப்புகள் சிலவுள். அவையாவன ;

1. பேராசிரியர் டர்னர் மேற்கண்ட நேப்பாளிச் சொற்கள் தமிழ் வேருடையன என்று கருதுவதன் காரணம் பெரும்பகுதி அச் சொற்கள் பற்றிப் பேராசிரியர் யூல் பிளாக் அவர்கள் அந்த நேப்பாளிச் சொற்கட்கு வடவாரிய மொழிகளில் தக்க வேர்ச் சொற்கள் இன்மையாலும் மாறாகத் திராவிட ஒப்புச் சொற்கள் உண்மையாலும் அவ்வாறு செய்த முடிவுகளே ஆகும்.

2. நேப்பாளியில் வழங்கும் இத்தமிழ்ச் சொற்கள் வேறு பல வடவாரிய மொழிகளுள்ளும் வழங்குவதையும் இத்தமிழ்ச் சொற்கள் பலவற்றின் திராவிட ஒப்புச் சொற்களையும் பேராசிரியர் டர்னரின் சொற்களஞ்சியம் விளக்குகிறது.

3. மேற்காட்டிய நேப்பாளியில் வழங்கும் தமிழ் வேருடைய சொற்களின் கூட்டுச் சொற்கள் பல உள். அவை யாவும் மேற்காட்டிய பட்டியலில் இடம் பெறவில்லை.

4. தென்மொழிச் சொற்கள் (இக்கட்டுரையில் காட்டப் பட்டவையும் பிறவும்) வடவாரிய மொழிகளில் திரிந்து வழங்கும் திறம் அடிக்குறிப்புகள் 15, 16-இல் குறிப்பிடப்படும் நூல்களால் விளங்கும்.

5. * இக்குறி பெற்ற தமிழ் வேர்ச்சொற்கள் பேராசிரியர் டர்னரால் தமிழ் மூலச் சொற்களாகக் காட்டப்படாதவை. ஆயினும், ஏற்ற தமிழ் வேர்ச்சொற்கள் இவையாயிருக்கலாம்.

6. ** இக்குறி பெற்ற நேப்பாளிச் சொல் திராவிடக் கடன் சொல்லாகப் பேராசிரியர் டர்னரால் காட்டப்படவில்லை. ஆயினும், அது திராவிடக்கடன் சொல்லாக இருத்தல் கூடும். இது போன்ற இன்னும் கண்டு பிடிக்கப்படாத திராவிடக் கடன் சொற்கள் வேறு பலவும் ஆரிய மொழிகளில் இருத்தல் கூடும்.

7. மேற்போக்காகக் காணும்போது வடமொழிச் சொற்களாய்த் தோற்றமளிப்பன பல ஆராயுமிடத்து உண்மையில் தென்மொழிச் சொற்களாகவே திகழ்கின்றன.

8. நேப்பாளியில் தமிழ்ச்சொற்களைக் காண்பது ஆரிய மொழிகளில் ஆயிரத்துக்குக் குறையானதுள்ள திராவிடச்¹⁶ சொற்களை இனங்கண்டுகொள்ளும் இன்பப் பெருமுயற்சியின் ஒரு சிறு கூறே ஆகும்.

9. ஆரிய மொழிகளில் திராவிடக் கடன் சொற்களைக் கண்டுகாட்டும் முயற்சியின் வெற்றி ஆரிய திராவிட மொழிப் புலமையோடு கூடிய நடுவு சார்ந்த நன்னெஞ்சங்களைப் பொறுத்தே உள்ளது.

10. உயர்வு தாழ்வு மனநிலையும் விருப்பு வெறுப்பு உளநிலையும் இன்றி ஒரு மொழியில் கலந்துள்ள பிறமொழிச் சொற்களை அறிந்து அறிவிப்பது மனிதகுல ஒருமைப்பாட்டிற்கு உறுதுணை புரியும்.

8

அண்மையில் (1961) வெளி வந்துள்ள திராவிடச்சொற்பிறப்பியற்களஞ்சியம் பேராசிரியர் டர்னர் முயற்சிக்குப்பின் முப்பத்துநான்கு ஆண்டுகளாக வளர்ந்து வந்துள்ள திராவிடமொழி ஆய்வின் (சிறப்பாகப் பேராசிரியர் பர்ரோ ஆரியத்தில் உள்ள பல நூறு திராவிடச் சொற்களை விளக்கியுள்ளமையின்) பயனாக விளங்கும் பெருமை படைத்தது. அந்நூலின் இறுதியில் பிற மொழிகளில் உள்ள திராவிடக் கடன் சொற்கள் மொழிவாரிப் பட்டியல்களில் முறைப்படுத்தப்பெற்றுள்ளது. அவற்றுள் நேப்பாளிச் சொற்களெனத் தரப்பட்டுள்ளவை மட்டும் நூறு. அவற்றை ஆய்வார் நேப்பாளி மொழியில் உள்ள தமிழ்க் கடன்சொற்களின் வகையையும் வளத்தையும் மேலும் விரிவாக அறிந்து இன்புறுவர்.¹⁷

அடிக்குறிப்புகள் :

1. (i) Dr. R. M. Mookerji—The Fundamental Unity of India—(Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan—1960) pp. 11—44.
2. (ii) N. Sanjeevi—'The concept of Indian Unity in Ancient Tamil Literature'—Journal of the University of Madras (Section A)—Vol. XXXIII—No. 2 (1962).
2. டாக்டர் மா. இராசமாணிக்கனார்—சைவசமய வளர்ச்சி, பக். 163.
- 3-4. ஏ. கே. செட்டியார்—'நேபாளம்'—குமரி மலர் (1944)—பக். 134, 137.
5. பசுபதிநாத் (நேபாலயாத்திரை)—தருமை ஆதீன வெளியீடு(1958) பக். 83.
6. ஷை—பக், 123.
7. இப்படி அருந்தமிழ்ச் சொற்கள் பல பிற திராவிட மொழிகளில் வழங்கும் திறம் தனியாராய்ச்சிக்குரியது.
- 8—9. பசுபதிநாத் (நேபாலயாத்திரை)—பக். 123-25, 232.
10. T. Burrow—'Dravidian Studies, VII—Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies—Vol-XII-p. 368.
11. Census of India—1961—Vol - IX - (Madras), Part II c, pp. 354 - 5.
- 12-14. Introduction to 'A Comparative and Etymological Dictionary of the Nepali Language' by R. L. Turner.
15. Jules Block : 'Some problems of Indo-Aryan Philology', Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, Vol. V, pp. 736 - 743.
16. T. Burrow : 'Dravidian Studies VII'-Ibid-Vol-XII-p. 36.5
17. T. Burrow and M. B. Emeneau—A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary, p. 572.

INDIAN WORDS IN ENGLISH DICTIONARY*

Prof. A. CHIDAMBARANATHA CHETTIAR, M.A., Ph.D.

Chief Editor, English-Tamil Dictionary Department
University of Madras (India)

The Englishmen who came to India in the 16th Century A.D. and thereafter came into contact with the Indian people in their daily walk of life and had therefore to use Indian words in their conversation or writings. During the East India Company's days several Indian words relating to commerce, industry and political institutions got into the English vocabulary. Subsequently, when the English people returned home they could not completely divest themselves of certain usages which they had imbibed while in India. Therefore in their speech in England they occasionally made use of certain Indian expressions. Writers such as Thackeray,¹ Southey,² Francis Thompson,³ Rudyard Kipling⁴ etc. in their fictions and poems introduced some of these words in the course of their writing. In the debates on India in the British Parliament, orators like Burke⁵ also used some of the Indian words to be quite exact and precise in their references to things pertaining to India. In this way several Indian words crept into the vocabulary of the English language and some lexicographers have incorporated these words in the English dictionaries. The information is mainly based on Skeat's Etymological Dictionary (1958) and the Shorter Oxford Dictionary (1956 edn.)

TAMIL WORDS

First, some of the Tamil words that have thus found their place in the English dictionaries will be pointed out.

-
1. William Makepeace Thackeray 1811—63
 2. Robert Southey 1774—1843
 3. Francis Thompson d. 1907
 4. Rudyard Kipling 1865—1936
 5. Edmund Burke 1729—97
-

* A paper presented at the XXVI International Congress of Orientalists at New Delhi in January 1964,

“*Anicut*”, meaning a dam across the river to fill and regulate the supply of irrigating channels, has been adopted from the Tamil expression “*Aṇai*” meaning dam and “*kaṭṭu*” meaning building. This word was taken as early as 1784.

“*Bandy*” is supposed to have gone into the English vocabulary in 1761 by adopting the Telugu word “*Paṇḍi*” meaning a carriage or cart. This word, however, seems to have originally come from the Tamil word “*Paṇḍi*”, that which carries paṇḍam. *Paṇḍi* in this sense is found in early Tamil literature, and a non-collapsible cart was designated in those days in Tamil as “*kollā-ṇḍi*”.

“*Betel*” which appears in English as early as 1553 has ultimately sprung from “*Verrilai*” of Tamil. Through Malayalam-Portuguese channel this word has gone in the shape of “*Vettila*” into English. A species of pepper was known to the Englishmen in 1681 as “*betel*”. *Nammālvār* (8th Century A.D.) has made use of this expression *verrilai* in “*Parukum nīr tinṇum verrilai*”. Gradually, the nut that was chewed with the betel leaves, namely arecanut, came to be called betelnut.

“*Cash*”, meaning a small coin, is another word which has gone into English ultimately from Tamil sources in 1598. Originally the earlier form of this was “*cass*” in English (see *Dampier’s Voyage*).¹

“*Catamaran*” is found in English in the sense of a raft in 1697. This definitely comes from Tamil “*Kaṭṭu*” meaning tied and “*Maram*” a tree or wood. This word slowly came to be “used” in the sense of “torpedo” in 1832 and in the sense of a cross-grained person, especially a woman, in 1833. In the last sense the word “*catamaran*” has perhaps been associated with the English word “*cat*” and the Indian word “*Kaṭṭumaram*” in a way.

“*Chatty*” meaning an earthen pot went into English usage in 1781.

“*Cheroot*” a kind of cigar truncated at both ends must have had its origin in Tamil. This word was used in English as early

1, *William Dampier 1652—1715*

as 1669. The Tamil word “Churuṭṭu” ultimately reached English as “Cheroot”.

“Coir” meaning a rope is found in English from 1582 onwards. It is very often derived from the Malayalam “Kayar” ultimately derivable from “Kayaru” meaning “to be twisted”. H.H. Wilson,¹ however, derived this word from Tamil “Kayaru” or “Kayiru”. The expression “Kayiru” is as old as Tamil literature. It is found, for instance, in Perumpāṇārupadaḱai, “Kayiru piṇittu kāḱi vaitanna”.

“Conicopoly” found in English in 1680 is a corrupted form of Tamil “Kaṇakkapillai” meaning an Accountant or writer.

“Conjee” or “Congee” used in the English language since 1698 ultimately comes from Tamil “Kaṇji” meaning porridge or water in which rice has been boiled. “Cōru vākkiya koḷuṅ kaṇchi” is found in Paṭṭinapālai. This word came to be used in a verbal sense also meaning “to starch with Congee”. In combinations also it was used as “Congee-house”, meaning a military lock-up, because the inmates were fed on conjee.”

“Coolie” in the sense of a porter in English is as old as 1598. Though some persons derive the English “coolie” from Hindi “Kūli” meaning a labourer, lexicographers like Wilson derive it from Tamil “Kūli” meaning daily hire or wages ultimately arising from due recompense. The expression “Kūli” is found in *Tirukkural* “Mey varunta kūli tarum.”

“Corundum”, the name of a crystalised mineral is found in English in 1728. This word is found in Telugu and Tamil in the form of “Kuruvintam” also. This is comparable to Sanskrit “Kuruvintam”. Aphaeresis is at work in the form “Vinta” which is also found in early Tamil literature (vide *Chilapatikaram*).

“Curry”, meaning sauce or relish for rice, has gone from Tamil into English through the channel of Kannada-Portuguese in 1598. “Kaṛi cōruṅḱu” is found in *Purananuru* (1st century A.D.). The Kannada form was “Karil” and the Portuguese form

1. Horace H. Wilson 1786—1860

was "Caril" (Vide Skeat's Etymological Dictionary of the English language). This is not to be confused, however, with the other word "curry" in English which means "to dress" or "to dress leather" which is a Latin-Tuetic word. The word Kari ultimately comes from the Tamil root "Kaṛi", an alternative form of "Kaṛi" meaning "to bite". In this sense it is found as "Karachu" in Telugu too. (cf. Puram. 235 wherein the deers which bite the shrubs are alluded to.)

"Koel" found in English (1826) is supposed to have gone from Hindi "Koel". This word is sometimes looked upon as having had some connection with the Sanskrit "Kōkila". But the Tamil word "Kuyil" which is as old as Tamil literature (see for instance Paṭṭinapālai and Chirupāṇaṟṟuppaḍai etc.) seems to have been the origin of this word. "Kuyil" was the root which originally meant "to call". In this sense it is found in Chilapatikaram and "Kuyilōn" signified a caller.

"Mango" is another Tamil word which has crept into English usage. Sir T. Herbert¹ mentions this word in his Travels as having occurred as early as 1665. Through Malayalam "Māṇṇa" this word appears to have travelled through the Portuguese and the Spanish and ultimately to have reached in the form of "Mango". In Tamil the word is "Māṅkāy" when referring to the un-ripe fruit ("*Mangifera Indica*"). The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary records that this word has gone into English usage as early as 1582 by adoption of the Portuguese expression "Māṅgya". Mango as the name of a tree is found in 1678 and as the name of a pickle is found in 1699. "Māṅkāy" is found in early Tamil literature (for instance, "Māṅkāy narunḱaṭi kūṭṭuvēm"-Kalittokai".)

"Mulligatawny" found in English (1784) as the name of a seasoned soup is ultimately from the Tamil "Milaku" meaning "Pepper" and "Taṇṇir" meaning "water". A curry-paste used for flavouring this soup came to be called Mulligatawny paste in 1858.

"Patchouli" or "Patchouly" found in English in 1845 as a vernacular name in Madras of an oderiferous plant yielding an

essential oil from which the scent is derived, is ultimately derivable from "Pachilai" of Tamil. (Paccai meaning green and ilai meaning leaf). The word "Pachilai" is a pure Dravidian word, being found in Tamil-Malayalam-Kannada in that shape and in Telugu in the shape of "Pachchaku" (aku meaning leaf).

"Pooja" or "Puja" is a word which has gone into English usage through Tamil-Kannada - Marathi - Portuguese channels. The word "Pū" is found in almost all the cultivated and uncultivated languages of the Dravidian group. (See A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary by Prof. Burrow and Prof. Emmeneau page 288-Entry 3564). In the Kui language this word is found in the shape of "Pūju" meaning a flower. Mark Collins expressed the view that "Pūsai" in Tamil should have originally come from "Pū cey" meaning "that which is done with flowers, that is, worship." This view was endorsed by Dr. S. K. Chatterji, a reputed scholar in English, Sanskrit and Bengali.

"Poonac" is another Tamil word which has gone into the English lexicons. This usage is found in English in 1890. Oil cake or the mass left after oil has been extracted from the pulp is known as "Punnaku" or more correctly "Piṇṇaku" in Tamil whose root is "piḷ or piḷi" meaning "to squeeze".

"Poonga" oil found in English in 1866 is from Tamil "Puṅgam", the name of a tree from the seeds of which a dark yellow oil is extracted for use as lamp-oil or as remedy in skin diseases. "Puṅgam" is sometimes called the Indian beech or *pongamin glabra*. In Porunar Ārupadai and other very early Tamil compositions the word "Puṅgam" is found.

The word "Tamil" itself was sometimes spelt as "Tamul" and it occurred in English in 1734 as mentioned by Dr. C.T. Onions. In the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, it is regarded as an expression indicating one of a race of people of the Dravidian stock inhabiting the south-east of India and parts of Ceylon. Secondly, it is looked upon as indicating the language spoken by this people (Tamils-the leading member of the Dravidian family.)

"Teak" used in English in 1698 is ultimately from the Tamil word "Tekku" "*Tectona-grandis*". In Malayalam the form is

“Tēkka” from which the Portuguese copied it as “Teca” which was ultimately adopted in English as “Teak”. The expression “Tēkku” is found in “Perumpāṇarupadai”. In order to distinguish between several kinds of timber trees the English people gradually began to make use of such combinations as *African Teak* and *New Zealand Teak* (1842).

“Tōpe” is another Tamil word found in English as early as 1698 as the name of a clump of trees. Tamil, Malayalam, Kannada, Telugu and Tulu have this word either as “Tōppu” or “Tōpu”.

“Tyre” or “Tyer” meaning curdled milk is found in English in 1613. The expression Tin-tayir has occurred in poems comprised in Pattu-pattu. Though sometimes the word Tayir is derived from Sanskrit “Takra” meaning “butter milk mixed with water”, it seems reasonable to hold that the word is ultimately Dravidian in origin because in all the Dravidian languages it is found as “Tayir” and because at the same time it is not found in this shape in the other Indo-European languages allied to Sanskrit.

“Vetiver” occurring in English in 1858 indicating cus-cus or the aromatic root of an Indian grass is from Tamil “Veṭṭivēr”. (Veṭṭi meaning pathway and Vēr meaning root). This is found as “Kuruvēr” occasionally in Tamil as the name of black cus-cus or “*anatheraum Muricatum*”. Through French “Vetyver” this has gone into English as “Vetivēr”.

SANSKRIT WORDS

There are several Sanskrit words which have crept into the English vocabulary. The list that follows is not exhaustive. The years mentioned against each word are as found in the Shorter Oxford Dictionary (revised and edited by Dr. C. T. Onions—3rd edition—1956 print) “*Avatar*” (1784) means the descent of a deity to the earth. In this sense, Sir William Jones has used this. Sir Walter Scott¹ (in his ‘Bonaparte’) has used this expression in 1815 as equal to “incarnation”.

“*Brahman*” (1481) as the name of a member of the highest or priestly caste among the Hindus got into English; “*Kshatriya*”

1. Sir Walter Scott 1771—1832

(1782) as the name of the military caste, Banian' (1599) from Sanskrit "Vanij" as the name of the mercantile caste and "Sudra" (1630) as the name of the lowest caste entered into the English language.

"*Dēvadarū*", a sub-species of cedar went to the English language as "deodar" through Hindi "deodar".

"*Kalpa*" (1794) a great age of the world or a day of Brahma went to English from Hindu cosmological sources. "*Karma*" (1828) meaning fate or destiny in Buddhism is also from Sanskrit "*Karma*" meaning action originally. An adjective, *Karmic*, in English has been formed from this.

"*Lingam*" (1719) as the name of phallus or Siva-god is from Sanskrit "Linga".

Maharaja appears to have gone to English as early as 1698. "*Mahatma*" (1884) from Sanskrit, "Maha" meaning great and "ātman" meaning a soul was used in the sense of a great-souled person. In Buddhism, this referred to one of a class of persons with preternatural powers. "*Māya*", meaning, an illusion, was used in English as early as 1823.

"*Nirvāna*" (1836) is from Sanskrit "nis" - out and "va" - to blow; nirvana, therefore, is from blowing out or extinction.

"*Purāna*" (1696) from Sanskrit "Pura" meaning 'formerly' had reference originally to that which belonged to former times. This word was used in English as indicating a sacred poetical work containing the mythology of the Hindus.

"*Svarabhakti*" was used in 1880 as a philological term in the sense of "the development of a vowel glide between two consonants." "*Swaraj*" though sometimes supposed to be a Bengali word from "swa" meaning own and "raj" meaning rule is ultimately derivable from Sanskrit "Sva" and "raj". "Sva" is cognate with Latin "suus", according to Ernest Weekley (vide his "Words Ancient and Modern" page 130). "*Swaraj*", meaning home-rule or self-government was used in English almos since 1906.

HINDI WORDS

From Hindi several words have got into the English vocabulary. "*Bazaar*" (1599) meaning a market is a Hindi word derived ultimately from Persian. "*Bund*" (1813) meaning an embankment or cause-way is ultimately from Band of Persian. "*Bunder*" (1673) is another Hindi word which occurs in English in the sense of a quay or seaport; occasionally it is found in the sense of a customs-house. "*Bundook*" (1886) as the name of a handgun is from Hindi "*Bunduq*", which is ultimately derived from Arabic sources. "*Bungalow*" (1676) is from Hindi "*Bangla*" meaning "belonging to Bengal". Bungalowoid is an English adjectival form of bungalow meaning "having the appearance of a one-storied house lightly built with a tiled or thatched roof."

"*Charka*" (1880) is the name of a spinning wheel, which however is spelt in Hindi as charkha from "charkh" meaning to spin. This is sometimes derived from Sanskrit "*Chakra*" meaning a wheel which by metathesis has come to express a slightly varied object from the ordinary wheel. "*Charpoy*" (1845) meaning a bedstead, "*Chupatty*" referring to a small cake of unleavened bread, "*Chutney*" or "*Chatnee*" (1813) are English borrowings from Hindi. The word "*Chutney*" meaning a strong hot relish (that which is licked) comes from "*Chatna*" meaning to lick. "*Cot*" (1634) the name of a light bedstead is supposed to have gone to the English language from Hindi "*Khat*". This word may have ultimately come from either Sanskrit "*Khaṭva*" or Tamil "*Kaṭṭil*" which is found in early literature in compound words also as "*Murasu Kaṭṭil*" (the seat of the drum) and "*Arasu Kaṭṭil*" (the throne) from "*Kaṭṭu*" meaning "to bind" or "to construct" and "il" meaning "a place". "*Crore*" (1609) is an adoption in English from Hindi "*Kror*" meaning ten millions.

"*Dai*" (1782) meaning a "wet-nurse" is supposed to have travelled to English from Hindi through Persian "*Dayah*". But on the one hand it is suggested that it is from Sanskrit "*Dhatri*" meaning "a creatress" and on the other the suggestion is made that it is from Dravidian origins. Tamil and Kannada have "*Tāy*" meaning a mother; Malayalam, Telugu, Tulu and Kannada have the alternative form "*Tāyi*". "*Tāychchi*" is a

wet-nurse in Tamil (vide Burrow and Emmeneau: A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary, page 227)

“*Dacoit*” (1810) is from Hindi “*dakait*” (daka-gang robbery). The word referring to a person belonging to a class of robbers who plunder in gangs is ultimately traceable to Sanskrit “*dashṭaka*” meaning “crowded”. “*Dhal*” (1698) is the Hindi word (dal) with an aspirate. “*Dhobi*” or “*Dhoby*” (1860), a washerman, is from Hindi “*dobe*” to wash. “*Dhoti*” (1622) in reference to a loin-cloth is an adoption of Hindi “*dhoti*”.

“*Ghat*” (1603) is from Hindi meaning a mountain pass or a passage leading down to the river. “*Ghee*” (1665) is from Hindi “*Ghi*”, though it is ultimately traced to Sanskrit “*Ghrta*”. “*Gunny*” (1711) a coarse material from jute fibres is supposed to have gone from Hindi “*gōni*.” (the word ‘jute’ incidentally is itself from Bengali (1746). Probably, the word is traceable to Tamil-Malayalam “*Kōṇi*”. Kannada, Tulu and Telugu have the form “*gōṇi*”. The root ultimately appears to be “*Koḷ*” (to receive) from which a receptacle (a bag) came to be called “*Kōṇi*”.

“*Hartal*” (1920) is from Hindi “*Hattal*” or “*Haḍal*” meaning locking of shops. The closing of shops as a political gesture or as a mark of sorrow was indicated by the word “*Hartal*”. This may be traced ultimately to Sanskrit “*Haṭṭa*” (closing).

“*Khaki*” (1857) is from Hindi “*Khak*” meaning dust. In Persian “*Khaki*” means “dusty” or “dust-coloured”. This appears to be the ultimate origin. “*Kotwal*” (1582) meaning the Chief constable of a town or a Magistrate has gone to English from Hindi. But this may be looked upon as having sprung from Sanskrit “*Kōṭapāl*”, which has connections with Dravidian “*Kōṭṭai*” meaning a fortress. (e.g. Tamil *Kōṭṭai*; Malayalam *Kōṭṭa*; Telugu *Kōṭa*; Kannada and Tulu *Kōṭe*.)

“*Jagirdar*” (1622) is ultimately from Persian “*ja*” meaning place and “*gir*” meaning holding.

“*Lathi*” (1850) meaning a heavy stick comparable with “*yashṭi*” of Sanskrit, and “*loot*” (1842) from “*Lūṭ*” to plunder or a plunder comparable with “*lūṭ*” of Sanskrit have gone to English from Hindi.

“*Moffussil*” (1781) referring to the localities as distinct from the Chief city or station, which has gone to English from Hindi, is ultimately traceable to the Arabic “*fasala*” meaning to separate. “*Moonshee*” or “*Munshi*” (1622) meaning an Interpreter or a Secretary or a Teacher is ultimately from Arabic “*Ansha*’s” meaning to compose.

“*Pan*” (1616) in reference to betel-leaf is sometimes looked upon as an ultimate derivation from “*Parna*” of Sanskrit meaning a leaf. “*Pice*” (1615) as the name of a quarter anna which is found in English has gone from Hindi “*Paisa*” but this is traceable to Sanskrit “*Pada*” meaning one-fourth. Thus one-fourth of an anna was called “*pice*” in Hindi. “*Pie*” (1859) is also similarly traceable to Marathi-Gujarathi “*Pai*” meaning one-fourth. “*Pucka*” or “*Pukka*” (1698) meaning thorough or complete or genuine is from Hindi “*Pukka*” meaning cooked or ripe. This is traced by certain writers (e.g. Shri. Shymasundara Das) to Sanskrit “*pakva*”. The word “*pakka*” in Hindi seems to have emerged as a contrast to “*kaccha*” meaning raw. The shorter Oxford dictionary (1955 edition) records it as being applied to the larger of two weights of the same name. From this sense, the later, “of full weight, full, good, genuine, thorough” have all developed. “*Punkha*” (1625) meaning a fan is from Hindi “*Pankha*” which is sometimes traced to Sanskrit “*Paksha*” meaning a wing. (Shyama Sundara Das in Hindi Sabda-Sagar-1928 edition.)

OTHER INDIAN WORDS

Among other Indian words borrowed by English, mention may be made of the following.

“*Bandicoot*” (1729), a large Indian rat is from Telugu “*Pandikokku*” (Pauri - a pig and kokku = a rat).

“*Batta*” (1680) is from *Kannada* “*bhatṭa*” meaning rice, equivalent to *pattai-coru* of Tamil. “*Batta*” in English is subsistence money or extra allowance.

“*Calico*” (1505) was first used in reference to Calicut (Kōlikōḍu). Later on, as the name of a cotton cloth it was used in 1576. In the United States, as the name of a printed cotton

cloth coarser than muslin, it was used in 1841. Several combinations like calico-printer, Calico-printing etc. have also emerged. "Copra" (1584) is from Malayalam Kopperai (the dried coconut).

"*Jack*" (1613) a kind of bread-tree or its fruit is from Malayalam Chakka (or Tamil Chakkai-palā). This seems to have gone to English through Portuguese "*jaca*".

"*Rupee*" (1608) is from Urdu "*Rupyah*" though sometimes it is looked upon as an adaptation of "*Rupya*" of Sanskrit meaning "*wrought silver*".

"*Ryot*" (1625) from Urdu "*Raiyat*" is ultimately from an Arabic word meaning a subject or peasant.

OTHER INTERESTING WORDS

The word "*Gymkhana*" (1861) is a rather interesting combination of the first part of Latin-Greek Gym(nasium) (a place for training or exercise) and the latter part of Urdu (gend) khana (a ball-house or rocket court). Thus Gym plus khana has become Gymkhana, a hybrid, meaning a public place with facilities for athletics.

"*Glendover*" used by Robert Southey in 1810 is another interesting word. It is an abnormal substitution for Sanskrit "*Gandharva*", a kind of semi-divine spiritual being.

"*Jaggery*" (1598) meaning coarse dark sugar is not an English word, though very often we treat it as one such trying to disregard it in favour of "Sarkarai" or "vellam". The word however seems to have travelled from Sanskrit Sarkara through Kannada Sharkara and Portuguese "*Jagara*".

"*Jungle*" looks very much like an English word and had been used by English writers in school text-books. But actually the word is of Hindi origin, having risen from "*Jangal*" meaning a desert or forest, ultimately, however, from Sanskrit "*Jangala*" meaning a desert.

నేటి ఆంధ్రనాటక రంగసమస్య

S. RAMAKRISHNA SASTRY, M.A., B.O.L.

నేటి యాంధ్రనాటకరంగ పరిస్థితి బహువిచిత్రావస్థలో నున్నది. 'అంగడిలో నన్నీ యున్నవి యల్లుడి నోటిలో శని' యనట్లు తోచుచున్నది నేటి కాలపు టాంధ్రనాటక రంగ పరిస్థితిని పరిశీలించినపుడు.

నిర్వేదనము 'నాట్యకళ' యను త్రైమాసిక పత్రిక 1959 సం. డిసంబరు సంచికలో 'శ్రీవాత్సవ' యను

వారు 'పునర్జీవన' మను వ్యాసమున నిల్లు వ్రాసిరి. 'ఇదివర కెన్నడును లేనంత యుత్సాహ మీనాఁడు తెలుఁగునాటి నాటక కళమీఁద నందఱును ప్రదర్శించుచున్నారు. అయినప్పటికిని సజీవమైన రంగ స్థలము రూపొందడము లేదు. తెలుఁగు నాటకకళ యుండవలసినంత యుచ్ఛస్థాయిలో నుండి యభివృద్ధి కావుట లేదు. ఈ సంగతి యటు నటీనటులు, నిర్మాతలతోఁబాటు రచయితలు, విమర్శకులూ ప్రేక్షక వర్గము గమనించారు. సమయము వచ్చినపుడు ఈ యభిప్రాయాన్ని యన్ని వర్గాల వారు వెల్లడిస్తూన్నారు. నేటి తెలుఁగు నాటకకళ అంత సంతృప్తికరముగా లేదన్నమాట అందరి నోటివెంటా వింటున్నాము...

.....కాని తెలుఁగు నాటకకళ యెడల నిరసన భావముతో కాక, నిర్మాణాత్మక దృష్టితో, అభివృద్ధి మార్గాలు అన్వేషించి, యొక మంచి నూచన చేసేవారు అరుదై పోయారు. 75 సం.లనుండి యభివృద్ధి చెందుతూవున్న ఆంధ్రనాటకకళ ఈనాఁడు కొంచెము అపమార్గము త్రొక్కిందంటే దాని కారణాలు శాస్త్రీయముగా పరిశీలించాలి..... తెలుఁగు నాటకకళ శ్రేయోభివృద్ధులు కాంక్షించే వ్యక్తులున్నారు. సంస్థలూ ఉన్నవి. వారి సదుద్దేశాలను ఆశంకించవలసిన పనిలేదు. ఆంధ్ర నాటక కళాపరిషత్తు, థియేటరు సెంటరు ఉద్యమం, నాటక సమాఖ్య మొదలైనవి ఇతోధిక సేవ చేస్తున్నవి' అని. దాని సంపాద కీయములో 'ఆంధ్ర నాటక రంగము నేడు మహాసంక్షోభములో

చిక్కుకుంది. అటు పూర్వసంప్రదాయ నాటకరంగము, ఇటు ఆధునిక ఔత్సాహిక నాటకరంగము రెండూ కొట్టు మిట్టాడు తున్నాయి. చుక్కాని లేని పడవలా నడుస్తున్నాయి. ఆర్థిక స్థోమత లేకుండా పోయింది. నాటక ప్రదర్శనాలు ప్రజల నెక్కువగా ఆకర్షించడం లేదు. ఈ పరిస్థితులలో ఏం చేయాలి? అనే ప్రశ్న సహజంగా ఉత్పన్నమవుతుంది, అని దాని సంపాదకులు శ్రీనివాస చక్రవర్తిగారు వ్రాసినారు. ఇంక 1958 సం. డిసెంబరు నాటి సంచికలో సంపాదకీయ వ్యాసముగు 'పునర్జీవనోద్యమం' అనే వ్యాసములో నిట్లు వ్రాయబడినది. 'నేటి ఆంధ్ర నాటక రంగం అవతరించి 70 సం.రాలు దాటింది. ఔత్సాహికంగా ఆవిర్భవించి, వృత్తిరంగంగా మారి, ఒక వెలుగు వెలిగింది. వృత్తి నాటక రంగం క్రమంగా క్షీణదశకు రావడంతో, ఔత్సాహిక నాటకరంగం తిరిగి తన స్థానాన్ని ప్రతిష్ఠించుకుంది. విశాలాంధ్ర అంతటా కొన్ని వందల నాటక సమాజాలు, కొన్ని వేల మంది నటులు, ఈ ఔత్సాహిక నాటకరంగంలో పాత్ర వహిస్తున్నారు. ఆంధ్రలో ఉన్నంత నాటక సంచలనం ఏ రాష్ట్రంలోనూ లేదు. అది అనేక చిక్కులకు, కష్టనిష్ఠులకు, కష్టాలకు చిక్కుకొని ఔత్సాహిక నాటకరంగం ఉక్కిరి బిక్కిరి అవుతోంది. నటులలో ఉత్సాహం నడలిపోతోంది. శాస్త్రీయ పద్ధతులలో సాధనం జరగటం లేదు. ప్రోత్సాహం ఎక్కువగా లభించడం లేదు. తగిన పరికరాలు, ప్రదర్శనశాలలు మనకు కరపయినాయి. క్రమ క్రమంగా ఔత్సాహిక నాటకరంగం కూడా దెబ్బతినే ప్రమాదానికి గురి అయింది' అని.

కాన నాంధ్ర నాటకరంగ మీ స్థితికి వచ్చుటకుఁ గారణమే మని విచారింపవలసియున్నది. నాటకరంగాభ్యుదయము ముఖ్యముగా ముగ్గురి మీఁద నాధారపడియుండును. ఒకటి, నాటక రచయిత; రెండు: నటులు; మూడు, సామాజికులు (ప్రేక్షకులు). ప్రజాభిరుచులను నట నాటక రచయితలు గౌరవించుటతోఁబాటు, వారిద్దరును బ్రజాభిరుచులను చక్కదిద్దుటయు గూడ వారు చేయఁదగిన ఫని. అనఁగా, నట నాటక

సామాజికాభిరుచి
తిరస్కారము

రచయితల ప్రభావము ప్రేక్షకుల పై నను, ప్రేక్షకుల ప్రభావము నట
 నాటక రచయితల పై నను పరస్పరముండునని గ్రహింప వలసి యున్నది.
 నాటకము దృశ్యము కాని, కేవలము శ్రవ్యముగాదు. కవి రచించిన
 నాటకమును నటు లభినయపూర్వక వ్యాఖ్యానముతో నటించి, ప్రేక్ష
 కుల నానందపఱతురు. ఈ విధముగ నాటక ప్రదర్శనము సామాజికల
 హృదయానందములకే కాక, చిత్త సంస్కారమునకుఁగూడ తోడ్ప
 డును. ప్రజలు విజ్ఞాన నాగరకతలుగూడ నాటకరంగము నుండి
 గ్రహింతురు. గ్రీసు దేశమున నాటకరంగమే విద్యావిజ్ఞాన బోధలకు
 నిలయముగా నుండెడిదట. ఇట్టి గొప్ప బాధ్యతను నాటకరంగ సంస్థ
 వహించును. తమ ప్రభావము సామాజికలపై నున్నది కదా యని
 నట నాటక కర్తలు, మితిమీరి ప్రేక్షకుల యభిరుచులను, జాతీయ
 సంప్రదాయములను గౌరవింపక, కేవలము విప్లవకారకులుగ పరిణ
 మించినచో, ప్రజలు నట నాటకములపై నిదాదరమును జూపుదురు.
 అందుచే నాటక రచయితలుఁగూడ నుండరు. అయితే యింక నాటక
 ములు సామాజికల చిత్త సంస్కారమునకు, నభిరుచులను చక్కదిద్దు
 టకు, నీతి విజ్ఞానములను ప్రబోధించుటకు నెట్లు సాగునని పూర్వపక్షము
 వచ్చును. ఇందుచే ప్రజాభిమానము గోలుపోకుండ, ప్రజలకు చిత్త
 సంస్కారమును నాటక ప్రదర్శనము చేయవలసియున్నది. అనగా,
 క్రమక్రమముగా, బహు సుకుమారముగ సామాజికల చిత్తవృత్తులపై
 నూతనాభిరుచులను, సంస్కారములను నాటకములు దీసికొనిరావలయునే
 కాని, రాజ్యాంగ విషయములందువలె బలవంతముగను, నాకస్మికమును
 మార్పులు తీసికొని రాఁగూడదు. దీనినే యాలంకారికులు కాంతా
 నమ్మితత్వమందురు. ఇందుచేతనే ప్రజాభిమానములను, నభిరుచులను,
 జాతీయ సంప్రదాయములను గౌరవింపవలసిన బాధ్యత నాటకకర్తల
 కెంతేనియు నున్నదని గ్రహింపవలయును. కాన ప్రజాభిరుచులు,
 నభిమానములు గౌరవింపఁబడినంత కాలము నాటక ప్రదర్శనము లాద
 రింపఁబడకుండ జాలవు. ఇది పరమ రహస్యము. ఇందుచేతనే కాళి
 దాసు 'ఆపరితోషాత్ విదుషాం స సాధు మన్యే ప్రయోగ విజ్ఞానం' అని
 చెప్పకొనవలసి వచ్చినది. ఈ కారణముచేతనే కవులకు నాటకములందు

పాటలు వ్రాయుట కిష్టము లేకపోయినను, పాటలను ప్రవేశపెట్టుట యవసరమైనదని యాంధ్ర నాటక పితామహుడైన ధర్మవరం రామ కృష్ణమాచార్యులవారు తన చిత్రనళీయ నాటక వీధికలో వ్రాయవలసి వచ్చినది. పేక్స్పియరుకవి తన యాంగ్లనాటకములలో యుద్ధములు చేయుట, మొదలైన వానిని రంగస్థలముమీఁద ప్రదర్శింపజేయుట కిష్టము లేనివాడయ్యుండగా, వానిని నాటకములందు ప్రవేశపెట్టవలసి వచ్చినది. కాన ప్రజాభిరుచులనుగూడ గౌరవించవలసిన బాధ్యత నటు నాటక కర్తలకున్నదని ముఖ్యముగా గమనింపవలసియున్నది. ఇంత గొప్ప ప్రాధాన్యము సామాజికలకుండఁగా, నాటకరంగాభ్యుదయమందు 'నాటక ప్రదర్శనము రక్తి కట్టి ప్రజాదరణను బొందుట (1) నాటక రచనమీఁద, (2) నటుల కౌశలముమీఁద, (3) రంగస్థలముమీఁద నాధారపడి ఉంటుంద'ని భావించి, సామాజికల యభిరుచుల స్థానమును లోపింపజేసి, దాని స్థానమున 'రంగస్థల' మను దాని నొకటి క్రొత్తగా తెచ్చిపెట్టి సమర్థింప జూచుటచే నిట్టి సంక్షోభమునకుఁగారణమైనది. రంగస్థలమునకు మితిమీరిన లేనిపోని ప్రాధాన్యమును, ప్రాముఖ్యము నొసఁగి, దానిమీఁదనే నాటక రచనమును, నటాభినయము నాధారపఱచి, రంగస్థలానుగుణముగ కవులు నాటకమువ్రాయవలెననియు, రంగస్థల ప్రాశస్త్యము మీఁదనే నటులయభినయ విశేషములు రక్తికట్టననియు, రంగస్థల ప్రాశస్త్యముమీఁదనే నాటకప్రాశస్త్యముండుననియు, రంగస్థలము లేకపోయిన నాటకములే లేవనియు కొండఱు గొప్పగొప్ప వ్యాఖ్యానములు చేయుచున్నారు. రంగస్థలమున కింత ప్రాధాన్యమిచ్చిన పెద్దలు, రంగస్థల ప్రాశస్త్య మనఁగా నెట్టిదో, దాని పలన నిర్వహింప బడెడి విశేష మేమియో, రంగస్థల ప్రాశస్త్యమునకు మునకు నాటకరచనా ప్రాశస్త్యమునకు నెట్టి సంబంధ మెట్లు సిద్ధించుచున్నవో యెవరు నింతవరకు స్పష్టముగ వివరించినట్లు లేదు.

రంగస్థల మనఁగా నేపథ్యము. (Stage, theatre) అనునవి పర్యాయపదములుగా కలది కదా. ఇందులో నాటకములు ప్రదర్శింపఁబడు

టకు వీలైన తెరలు, ప్రక్క తెరలు, మొదలైనవి యుండును. ఈ రంగ
 స్థలపరికరములు ప్రతి దేశమందును, ప్రతికాల
 రంగస్థలమున కనుచిత్ర ప్రాధాన్య మొనగట
 మందును గూడ తయారగుచుండు సాధన సంప
 త్తిని బట్టి మారుచుండును. ఈ కాలములో
 రంగస్థలమున మైక్రోఫోను, లవుడ్ స్పీకరు, ఫోకసింగు లైట్లు, డిమ్మర్లు,
 టేపురికార్డులు, సెటింగ్సు మొదలైనవి వాడబడుచున్నది. ఇవన్నియు
 నాటక ప్రదర్శనమును స్వాభావికముగా నుండునట్లు చేయుటకై యవ
 లంబింపబడిన సినిమా టెక్నిక్ మాత్రమే. ఇవి యన్నియు నుండి
 ననుగూడ 'అయితే నాటక నిర్వహణలో ఎంత సమర్థత చూపినా,
 ప్రేక్షక జనాదరణం అమితంగా లభించడము లేదు. కారణం ఏమిటి?
 మనకు చక్కగా నిర్దుష్టముగా నున్నవని తోచిన నాటకాలే జనాదర
 పాత్రము కాకపోవచ్చును.' అని శ్రీవాత్సవ పైన దెల్పిన 'పునరుజ్జీవన'
 మను వ్యాసమున నాట్యకళ యను పత్రికలో వాపోవుచున్నారు. కాన
 సమస్తాధునిక పరికరాలున్న నేటి రంగస్థలమందలి నాటక ప్రదర్శనమే
 నేటి ప్రేక్షక జనాదరణమును పొందలేక పోయిన దనగా, రంగస్థల
 ముతో నాటక ప్రదర్శనమునకును, విశేషించి నాటక రచనమునకు
 నెట్టి ముఖ్యసంబంధ మున్నదో విచారింప నగును. టర్నింగు స్టేజి
 మొదలైన యితర పరికరాలు గూడ నుండినగాని నాటక ప్రదర్శనము
 విజయవంతముగా నుండజాలదని వీని యభిప్రాయమై యుండనోవు.
 కాని దానిలోఁగూడ నెట్టి సత్యమున్నదో విచారితము. ఈ నూతన
 పరికరములవలన నాటక ప్రదర్శనానుకూలతయు, విశేష సౌకర్యమును
 సిద్ధించినే కాని, నాటక ప్రదర్శనమును రక్తి కట్టింపఁ జాలవు. ప్రదర్శ
 నమును రసవంతముగను, విజయవంతముగను చేసి రక్తికట్టించు శక్తి
 ముఖ్యముగ చతుర్విధాభినయమం దుండునే కాని, రంగస్థలాధునిక పరి
 కరములపై ముఖ్యముగా నాధారపడి యుండరు. ఇట్లని యాధునిక
 పరికరములను పరిత్యజింపుడని నేను కోరను. కాని వాని కంత
 ప్రాధాన్యమీయ నక్కర లేదనియే నా భావము. ఏలన, ఆధునిక
 నాటకరంగ పరికరములు లేని కొంచెము పూర్వకాలమున మైలవరం
 కంపెనీ, మోతేవారి నాటక సమాజము, తెనాలి రామవిలాస సభ,

రాజమహేంద్రవరములో గున్నేశ్వరరావు కంపెనీలలో నాటక ప్రదర్శనములు బహురమణీయముగా నుండెడి వనియు, ఆ కాలమే ఆంధ్రనాటక ప్రదర్శన స్వర్ణయుగమనియు నిర్ణయింపబడుట కా కాలమున నాధునిక నాటకరంగస్థల పరికరములు లేవు కదా. ఆధునిక పరికరములు లేని యా కాలపు నాటకముల నాధునిక పరికరములు గల నేటి కాల ప్రదర్శనము లేల మించజాలకపోయినవి. మించలేక పోవుట యట్లుంచి, యా మాత్రము ప్రజాదరణమునుఁ గూడ పొందలేక పోవుటయే కాక, మీదు మిక్కిలి ప్రజాదరణమును గోలుపోయి, నాటక కళ దెబ్బతినుస్థితి కేల రావలయును? నేటి కాలపు రంగస్థల పరికరము లాంగ్ల దేశమున 'గారిక్కు' కాలములో లేక పోయినను, షేక్స్పియరు నాటకములకు గారిక్కు తన యభినయవిశేషమున ప్రాణముపోసినాఁడను ఖ్యాతి రానేల? ఆధునిక నాటక రంగ పరికరములు విశేషముగ లేనికాలమునుఁ గూడ నాంగ్ల దేశమున షేక్స్పియరు మొదలైన ప్రఖ్యాత కవులెట్లు నిరుపమానమైన నాటకములను వ్రాయఁగల్గి, యాంగ్లభాష జీవించియుండు నంతకాలము శాశ్వతముగా నుండఁదగిన నాటకము లెట్లు బయలుదేరఁ గలిగినవి. బందరులో రాయల్ థియేటరు, నేషనల్ థియేటరు, ఇండియన్ డ్రామెటిక్ కంపెనీ మొదలైనవి 1910-1925 మధ్యకాలములో చింపిరితెరల మధ్య, బుట్టయ్యపేట నాటకహాలులో ప్రతాప రుద్రీయము, రసపుత్ర విజయము, హరిశ్చంద్ర, చిత్రనళీయము, రామ రాజుపతనము, పాండవనాటకములు మొదలైన చారిత్రక, పౌరాణిక, సాంఘిక నాటకరాజములు, ఈవెని లక్షణస్యామి, ముంజులూరి కృష్ణారావు, డి. వి. సుబ్బారావు, పింగళి సోదరత్రయము మొదలైన మేటి నటులచే నిరుపమానముగ, రసవంతముగ ప్రదర్శింపబడి, రక్తి కట్టబడి, నాటక పోటీ ప్రదర్శనములుగూడ విజయవంతములై, యట్టి నాటకములు తర్వాతఁ జూడఁగలిగిన యాశకూడ లేక పోయినవే! అట్టి నాటక ప్రదర్శన ప్రాశస్త్యమంతయు రంగస్థల పరికరములచేతను, నాటక స్త్రీజైరక్షణ వలనను సిద్ధించినదా? కాన నాటక ప్రదర్శన ప్రాశస్త్యము నాటక రంగస్థల పరికరములమీఁద నాధారపడియున్నదని భావించుట కేవలము భ్రమయే కాని, వేరుకాదు. రంగస్థలమునకు లేనిపోని,

మితిమీరిన ప్రాధాన్యమును, ప్రాముఖ్యము నొసంగి, నాటక కళాభివృద్ధికి ముఖ్యములైన విషయములను గుర్తింపలేక, నాటక కళకే దెబ్బ తేచ్చి పెట్టు చున్న కారణములను గమనింప లేక పోవుట కడుశోచనీయము.

దూరపు కొండలు నునుపనునట్లు, మన నాటక సంప్రదాయములను, అభిరుచులను, మన నాటకానుభవములను, మన నాటకచరిత్రను, మన నాటక లక్షణములను తెలిసికొనక, విస్మరించి, పరిత్యజించి, విదేశీ

పాశ్చాత్యానుకరణము శీయ నాటక పద్ధతులను కేవల మంధానుకరణ మొనర్చి, వారి భావములే ప్రమాణములుగా భావించి, యాచరణలోఁ బెట్టదలఁచికొని నపుడు మన నాటకరంగము దెబ్బ తినక యే మగును? నాటక రచనలో, నాటక ప్రదర్శన విధానములో, నాటకాభినయములో సర్వ విధముల విదేశీయుల ననుకరింపఁ జూచుచున్నాము. అవి మన జాతి సంప్రదాయములకు సరిపోవునా లేదా? మన యభిరుచి కనుగుణముగా నుండునా లేదా? మన సామాజికు లభినందింపఁగలరా, లేదా? అను విచారమే మనకుఁ గలుగుటలేదు. విదేశీయులు నాటక కళలో ముందంజ వేసిరి. కాన మనము వారి ననుకరించినచో వారితో సమానము కాగలమను ధోరణియే కాని, మిగిలిన విషయములను గుర్తించినట్లు లేదు. డాక్టరు, కె. గంగాధరరావనే ఆయన 1957 సం. అక్టోబరు 26-వ తేది నాటి కృష్ణాపత్రికలో 'ఆధునిక నాటకములు : అభివృద్ధి' యను వ్యాసమున 10-వ పుటలో నిట్లు వ్రాసిరి. 'ఆధునిక నాటకరంగం అభివృద్ధి పొందుతోందని ఒప్పుకొనేవారు కూడ ఒక హంసపాదు పెడుతున్నారు. ముఖ్యంగా మన నాటకరంగం పాశ్చాత్యనాటక రంగాన్ని అనుకరిస్తోందని - వీరు నిరుత్సాహపడుతున్నారు. కాని ఏ రంగంలో మనం పాశ్చాత్యనాటక రంగాన్ని అనుసరించటం లేదు'! (ఇక్కడ 'ఏ విషయంలో' అని అనుటకు బదులుగా 'ఏ రంగంలో' అని భాషాప్రయోగం తెలియని వ్యాసరచయిత వ్రాత) 'కాళిదాసాదుల కాలంలో యవనికలుండేవే. కాని ఆ యవనిచలు ఎట్లా పనిచేసేవో మనకు తెలియదు...యవనిక ఎట్లా కట్టాలో తెల్పలేదు. మనకు యవనికల సంగతి నేర్పింది

పాశ్చాత్యులు. కనుక నాటక పద్ధతి మనం పాశ్చాత్యుల నుంచే ఎరువు తెచ్చుకున్నాం. పాశ్చాత్యులు సంపాదిస్తున్న సాంకేతిక విజ్ఞానం వారి వారి నాటకాలలో వెంటనే ప్రవేశిస్తోంది.' (ఇక్కడ సాంకేతిక విజ్ఞానం అను మాట శాస్త్రీయవిజ్ఞానమను అర్థంలో వాడబడింది కాబోలు. సంకేతమనగా గుర్తు, దానికి సంబంధించినది సాంకేతికం.) మన దేశంలోకంటే వారి దేశంలో ప్రోత్సాహం వుంది. కనుక వారి ప్రదర్శన, దానిని బట్టి రచన అమితంగా వృద్ధిపొందుతున్నాయి. వారి మార్గాలు మనం అనుసరించక తప్పదు. అలా అనుసరించక మన పద్ధతినే మనం ప్రయత్నిస్తూ వుంటే ఎన్నోళ్లకూ పాశ్చాత్యులకు వెనుక బడే వుంటాము. ఏ విషయంలోనూ ఏ అభివృద్ధికూడా ఆ దేశపుదిగానే నిలచి పోవడంలేదు. అన్ని దేశాలు అన్నివిషయాలనూ అవసరమైతే ఉపయోగించు కొంటున్నాయి.రంగానికి అలంకారమైన పద్ధతీ, ప్రజలు కూడా వీలైతే ఉపయోగించ తగిన పద్ధతీ, రంగంమీద ప్రయోగిస్తే తప్పేమీ లేదు.మన సంస్కృతిగాని, మన జాతీయత గాని యీ ఫోర్ములమీద, నూట్లమీద ఆధారపడి లేదు. మన మానవత్వం మీద ఆధారపడి వుంది. రంగస్థలంమీద గాని, నిత్యజీవితంలో గాని దానికి చెడినవాడు జాతీయతను గోల్పోతాడు. అలా గోల్పోయినవాడు గూడ భారతీయుడు అవకపోడు. కనుక మనదేశపు నాటకాలలో అల్లా జాతీయతను గోల్పోయినవాడు కూడా ఒక పాత్ర అవవచ్చు. అందువల్ల వచ్చిన నష్టంలేదు. ఇక కథలో చాలా వరకు ఇంగ్లీషు నాటక కథలే తెలుగులో వస్తున్నాయనే మరొక విమర్శ వుంది. స్తబ్ధంగా నిలిచిపోయిన మన సాహిత్యాన్ని ఇంగ్లీషు సాహిత్యం మేల్కొల్పింది.తక్కిన యితర సాహిత్య శాఖల్ని ఇంగ్లీషు సాహిత్య మెల్లా ఇన్ ఫ్లూయన్సు చేసిందో, అల్లాగే నాటిక నాటకాన్ని చేసింది. నాటిక మన పూర్వకాలంలోనే వుందని కొందరనవచ్చు. రామాయణంలో విమానాలూ ఉన్నాయి. మనకు లభ్యం కావు కదా. స్వంతంగా ఊహించలేని రచయిత నేర్చుకోటానికై నా యితర సాహిత్యం మీద ఆధారపడవచ్చు. అల్లా

ఆధారపడి తర్వాత స్వతంత్రరచన చేయుట నేర్చుకొనడమే మంచిది... పరాయి దేశపు నాటకాల చార్యం చేస్తున్నారన నక్కరలేదు. సంస్కృత నాటకాలలో కథలకు కూడా మూలం ఒకటున్నదని గ్రహించాలి... ఏ సన్నివేశమో ఇంగ్లీషుకథనుపోలి వున్నంత మాత్రాన నాటకమంతా అనుసరణ అయిపోదు.' ఇది నాటకకళనుగూర్చిలోతుగా నాలోచింపని, జవాబుదారిలేని యుద్దేశపు వాదన. ఆధునిక నాటకము లీ విధముగా నమర్చింపఁబడుచున్నవి. విదేశీయులమందుల నుపయోగించుకొనుటయు విదేశీయ నాటకానుకరణము నొకటే నట. ఇంతకు నట్టి నాటకకర్త జాతీయజీవితమును ప్రతిపాదించుచున్నట్లా? లేక పాశ్చాత్యనాటకకళానుకరణము చేయుచున్నట్లా? ఏమనుకొనవలెను? జాతీయత మానవత్వము మీఁద నాధాపడి లేదు. మానవత్వము సమస్త జాతుల నారికి నొకటే. అది మన ప్రవర్తనమీఁద నాధారపడి యుండును. సరే, నిత్యజీవితములో ప్రవర్తనమునఁ జెడినవాడు జాతీయతను గోల్పోవును కదా. అట్టివాఁడు కూడ భారతీయుఁడు కాకపోఁడట. అట్టివాఁడు కూడ మన నాటకాలలో నొకపాత్ర కావచ్చునట. గిరీశమువంటివాఁడని కాఁబోలు వ్యాసకర్త యుద్దేశము. అందువలన వచ్చిన నష్టము లేదట. దీనినే పిడివాద మందురు. ఆ వ్యాసకర్తకు నష్టము లేకపోయినను సామాజికులగు ప్రేక్షకులు మాత్ర మటువంటి నాటకము నభినందింప లేరు. పాశ్చాత్యనుకరణము పులిని చూచి నక్క వాతలు పెట్టుకొనినట్లున్నది. ఇందుచే మన నాటకకళ మూలమునకే మోసము వచ్చినది. ఈ సందర్భమున లలిత కళావిమర్శకులును, విశేషవిద్యావంతులును, నాధునిక నాటకరచయితలును, ప్రాద్వివాకులునైన శ్రీ పి.వి. రాజమన్నుగారు అరుణోదయ సంగీత నాటకమండలి ద్వారా వార్షికోత్సవ సందర్భమున 1957 సం. ఏప్రిల్ 27, 8 తేదీల నాటి యుపన్యాసములో నేమని ప్రబోధించినారో గమనింపుడు. 'ఆంధ్రుల జీవితం ప్రతిబింబించేవి యీ పాటలు, నాటలు. ఇవి నశించి పోకుండా ఉండటానికి చెయ్యాలి. చైనాలో ప్రజారాజ్యం స్థాపించిన తర్వాత ప్రభుత్వమువారు జానపద సంగీత నాట్యాల నెక్కువగా నాదరించి ప్రోత్సహిస్తున్నారు. సోవియట్ రష్యా మొదలైన దేశాల్లో కూడా ఆలాగే. సంగీతం నాట్యం

సాహిత్యాలతో సన్నిహిత సంబంధం కలది నాటకకళ. నాటకాలంటే తెలుగువారికి చెప్పరాని యభిలాష. ఆ విషయం బెజవాడలో ఎక్కువగా చెప్పితే తల్లి పుట్టింటి సంగతి మేనమామ దగ్గర చెప్పి నట్లుంటుంది. నాటకకళలోనే దేశసంస్కృతి ఎక్కువగా వ్యక్తమవు తుంది. అందుచేత మన సంస్కృతికి దూరం కాకూడదు. మన నాటక కళా పరిణామం అన్యదేశ విజ్ఞాన సంపర్కాని బహిష్కరించ నవసరము లేదు. కాని కేవలం మనకు సహజం కాని జీవితాంశాలను యథాతథంగా మన నాటకాల్లోకి తెచ్చిపెట్టుకొంటే, పులిని చూచి నక్క వాతలు పెట్టు కున్నట్లు హాస్యాస్పద మవుతుంది. ఇది నా మనవితో గూడిన పౌచ్చరిక '.

బౌత్వాహిక నాటకసంఘములు ప్రదర్శించు నాటకాలనేకము పాశ్చాత్యభాషా సంప్రదాయానుగుణముగా నున్నవని శ్రీ వాత్సవ వైస పేర్కొనిన వ్యాసముననే యిట్లు తెలిపినారు. 'అయితే మన రంగస్థలం మీఁద అమెచ్యూరు సంఘాలు ప్రదర్శిస్తున్న బౌత్వాహికనాటక సంఘాలు, అనేక నాటకాలు ఇతర భాషలనుండి, ముఖ్యంగా పాశ్చాత్యనాటకరణము, సంప్రదాయ తిరస్కారము ఆంగ్లంనుండి, హిందీ సినిమా కథలనుండి, అను వాదాలు, అనుకరణాలూ అనే విమర్శ ఉన్నది.

నిజానికి కొన్ని సాంఘికనాటకాలలో సన్నివేశాలు, సంఘటనలూ, సంభాషణలూ, మన సంఘానికి, మన సమాజ పరిస్థితులకూ విరుద్ధంగా ఉంటున్నాయి. ఒకవేళ యీ నాటకాలు మన రంగస్థలం మీఁద ప్రదర్శించినపుడు తాత్కాలికంగా కిచ్చకిచలు పెట్టినట్లు నవ్వించినా, కవ్వించినా అవి మన జీవితాన్ని ప్రతిబింబించలేక పోతున్నాయి. అట్లాగే కొన్ని చిత్ర విచిత్ర సంభాషణలవల్లా, కొన్ని కృత్రిమపాత్రల వల్లా, కొన్ని ఆకస్మిక సంఘటనలవల్లా, ప్రేక్షకజనాన్ని తత్సమయంలో విభ్రాంతుల్ని చేసి, రక్తి కట్టిన ట్టనిపించుకొనిన నాటకాలున్నవి. అవి కూడా మన జీవితానికీ, వాస్తవ పరిస్థితులకీ దూరంగా వుండి, సాంఘిక దుస్తులు ధరించిన జానపద గాధలులాగా, పొడగడ్డాన్నవి. మరొక తెగకు చెందిన నాటకాలు రాజకీయ సమస్యలూ, సాంఘిక సమస్యలూ

తీసికొని కొన్ని వర్గాలవారిని దూషించి, మరికొన్ని వర్గాలవారిని భూషించి, ఉద్రేకపటచే వర్గనినాదాలతో, ఉపన్యాసధోరణిలో నడచి సభాసదుల హర్షధ్వనా లందుకొంటున్నవి. కాని నిజానికి నాటక శిల్పంలో ఉత్తమస్థాయి నందుకో తేక పోతున్నాయి. అందుచేత రచనలో ఈ లోపాలు గ్రహించి, మంచి చెడ్డలు వివేచన చేసి చెప్పే సభాసదులు కావాలి. సభాసదుల అభిరుచులు సక్రమమార్గాన పట్టేటట్టు సద్విమర్శలు రావాలి.' అని. డా. కె. గంగాధర రావుగారి వాదములో కంటె వాత్సవగారి రచనలో సరసతయ, సౌచిత్యము, సదుప దేశగ్రహణేచ్ఛయు గోచరించుచున్నవి. మొత్తముమీఁద దీనివలన నేటికాలపు నాటకాలలో విదేశీయ సంప్రదాయములే యెక్కువయై, స్వజాతీయ సంప్రదాయములు లోపించుచున్నవనుట స్పష్టము. ఇందు వలన నేటికాలపు నాటకములను సామాజికు లభినందింప లేకపోవుటచే నాటకకళ తగిన ప్రోత్సాహము చెందలేదనుటలో నాశ్చర్యము లేదు. దీనికిదోడు నటులలో నభినయ విధానమును గూర్చి, 'సీమీ' దృక్పథ మనియు, 'ప్లావిస్లవిస్కీ' దృక్పథమనియు, 'పెర్టోల్ట్' దృక్పథ మనియు, విదేశీయ సంప్రదాయములందే యూదరాభిమానములు చూపి, భరతుడు, నభినవగుప్తుడు, విశ్వనాథుడు, విద్యానాథుడు మొదలైన ప్రాచీన నాట్యశాస్త్రవేత్తల దృక్పథములనుగాని, ఈ వెన లక్ష్మణస్వామి, హరి ప్రసాదరావు, బల్లారి రాఘవ, మంజులూరి కృష్ణారావు, మొదలైన యాంధ్ర నటవతంసుల యభినయ విశేషములు గాని, యూదర్శనాత్రము గాకపోవుటచేత నాంధ్ర నాటకములపై మన కాదరాభిమానములు తగ్గి నాటకకళ క్షీణదశకు రావలసిన కారణ మైనది. కాన నాటకకళ యాంధ్రులలో నభివృద్ధి పొందవలెననిన, నాంధ్రుల సంప్రదాయాభిరుచుల నాదరించునవై యుండవలె కాని, నాటకములు తద్భిన్నముగా నెన్నడు నుండరాదు. అందుచేతనే యాంధ్ర నాటకరంగారంభదశ విజాతీయ నాటక ప్రభావమువలననే కలిగినను, నాటకరచనయు, ప్రదర్శనములు గూడ భారతీయ నాటక సంప్రదాయానుగుణముగ సాగుటవలననే, యాంధ్ర నాటకకళ కొంత ముందునకు సాగఁ గల్గినది. నటులలోఁగల వ్యక్తిగత దోషములచే

నాంధ్రనాటక రంగము క్షీణించినది కాని వేరు కారణములచే కాదు. ఆంధ్రనాటక ప్రదర్శన విధానములోఁ గొన్ని లోపముల కారణమున నది సంపూర్ణాభివృద్ధి గాంచలేక పోయినది. ఆ లోపములనే సద్దుకొనఁ గలిగినచో, నాంధ్ర నాటకకళ నేటి కాదర్శప్రాయమై యితర జాతుల వారికిఁ గూడ మార్గదర్శకమై యుండెడి దనుటలో సందేహములేదు. మన నాటకకళ తమిళ నాటకకళను మించియుండ లేదా? అట్లే సక్రమముగ నాంధ్ర నాటకకళ యభివృద్ధి పొందినచో, నది పాశ్చాత్య నాటకకళను గూడ మించిపోయెడి దనుటలో నతిశయోక్తి లేదు. ఆంధ్ర నాటక కళోదయమైన కొలఁది సంవత్సరములకే ఈవని లక్షణస్వామి, హరి ప్రసాదరావు, బళ్లారి రాఘవగార్ల వంటి మేటినటులు బయలుదేరి రనఁగా, నింక విశేషమేమి కావలయు. ఔత్సాహిక నాటక సంఘములు 1929 వ సం. లో నాంధ్ర నాటకకళా పరిషత్తువారిచే నెలకొల్పబడి నేటికి సుమారు 35 సం. లైనను, నాటకకళాభివృద్ధి లేకపోవుటచే దెబ్బతిను స్థితికి వచ్చిన దనఁగా, నింతకంటె శోచనీయస్థితి యేమి కావలయును? నాటకము ప్రేక్షకులకు తేలికగను స్పష్టముగను తెలిసి, యభినందింపఁ గలందులకే నాటకకళ ప్రఖ్యాతమైనది కావలయునని మన యాలంకారికులు శాసించిరి. కాని యది మన నాటకకళా పరిషత్తువారికి నచ్చకపోవుటచే పౌరాణికి చారిత్రక విషయములు వాస్తవికత్వమునకు దూరములని భావించి, వానిని తిరస్కరించి, కథ కేవలము సాంఘికముగా నుండవలయునని శాసించిరి. దాని దుష్ఫలితమే యిది. నాటకకళయే ప్రేక్షకుల కాకర్షణీయము కాక పోయినది. ఈ దూరదృష్టి మన కళాభిజ్ఞులకు లేక పోయినది. నాటకకళా పరిషత్తు వారికోపన్యాసములలో శ్రీయులు పింగళి లక్ష్మీకాంతం, రాళ్లపల్లి అనంత కృష్ణశర్మ, తూములూరి శివరామయ్యగార్లవంటి విద్యత్ప్రముఖు లీ విషయమై జ్యోతిష్యమును వ్యంగ్యముగాఁ జెప్పి నలహా నిచ్చిరి. కాని వారి సదుపదేశము వీరికి దురుపదేశముగాఁ దోచినది. అందుచే నది గ్రహింపఁబడక పోయినది. ఇప్పటికైనను ప్రజలకు నాటకకళపై నాద రాభిమానములు తగ్గుట కిదియొక హేతువని పరిషత్తు వారు గ్రహించినట్లు లేదు. నాటకకళపై గౌరవము తగ్గుటకు, జమీందారులకు పోషకులకు,

కంట్రాక్టర్లకు నటుల నికృష్టవర్తనమే కారణమైనట్లుగా, ప్రజలకుఁ గూడ నేటి నాటకములపై నిరాదానము గలుగుటకు నేటి నాటకముల కథా వస్తువే కారణమని గ్రహింపవలసియున్నది.

నాటకకళా పతనమునకు మఱియొక ముఖ్యకారణము స్వభావ వాదము సతిగా పెంచుకొనుట. ఇది నాటకకళకే వేరుపురుగుగా పరిణమించినది. నాటకకళ స్వభాసిద్ధముగను, స్వతంత్రముగ నుండవలెనని యెంచి యందలి కవిత్వము, సంగీతమును లలితకళల ప్రయోజనము, స్వభావవాదము పరిత్యజింపఁబడినవి. నాటకమందలి పాత్రములు సంగీతముతో పద్యములను చదువుట యసహజమని తలచి, వానిని దిగనాడి వచనములతో మాత్రమే పాత్రలు సంభాషించునటులు చేయఁబడినవి. ఆ వచనములలో నైనను దీర్ఘ స్వగతములు స్వభావ విరుద్ధములని తలచి యవి పరిహరింపఁబడినవి. ఇట్లు నాటకకళ కంగములును, నలంకారములునైన వన్నియు వదిలివేయఁబడినవి. అందుచే నాటకకళ తెంపిపోసిన దానివలె తయారైనది. అసలు కళలే కృత్రిమములు కదా. వానిలో స్వభావ సిద్ధముగా నుండుట యనునది యేమి? ప్రతికళయు కొంత సూచించి, మిగిలినది మన భావనకు వదిలివేయును. కాని కళల ప్రయోజనము ప్రతి సూక్ష్మాతిసూక్ష్మ విషయములను మనసున కంటించునటులు చేయుట కాదు. అది యెప్పుడును కళలలో సాధ్యము కాకపోవుటయే కాక, యసవసరము కూడ. కళల ముఖ్యప్రయోజనము మనకు బ్రహ్మానందమును కూర్చుటయే. కాని, విషయ విజ్ఞానముగూర్చుట కాదు. సాధనము మూల వస్త్రవును కరణము కావచ్చును. సంపూర్ణముగా మూల వస్త్రవునకరణ చేయుట యేలలిత కళకును సాధ్యముకాదు. కాన, సంపూర్ణమైన యానందమును గల్గించుటకై వివిధ లలితకళల పరస్పర సహకారముతో నాటకకళ కూడి వర్ధిల్లినది. అందుచే నది కవిత్వసంగీతముల సహకారములతో సంపూర్ణానందమును కూర్చుటకుఁ జాలినది. ఆనందము వినోద సంతోషముల కంటె సధికమగు మనోస్థితి. కాన నాటకమున నాస్థితిని మానవుడు పొందుట కితర లలితకళల సహకార మెంతైన నవసరమైనది. 'రంగానికి అలంకారమైన పద్ధతీ, ప్రజలు కూడా వీలైతే యుపయోగించతగిన

పద్ధతీ రంగంమీద ప్రయోగిస్తే తప్పేమి లేదు. అది సహజము కాకపోయినను, జాతీయ సంప్రదాయము కాకపోయినను సరే' యని, వెనుక నే నుదాహరించిన డా. కె. గంగాధరరావుగారి కృష్ణాపత్రిక వ్యాసమందలి వాక్యములేల యిక్కడ సంగీత కవిత్వములం దన్వయింప రావు? ఇవి రెండు ససహజములని వారికి తోచినను రంగాలంకరణములు, నానందదాయకములు గూడ కదా. కాన స్వభావాదమును తెగపెంచు కొని నాటకమున సంగీత కవిత్వములను పరిహరింపరాదు. అనవసరమైన సూక్ష్మవిషయములను కూర్చరాదు. సిసీమాలు స్వభావ వాద ముతోఁ గూడినవి కదా, వానిలో పాటలకు పద్యములకు సంగీతమేల పరిహరింపఁబడ లేదు? ఆనందమును కూర్చుటకే కదా వాని నందు ప్రవేశ పెట్టినది. ఆ ప్రయోజనము కోరియే నాటకమునఁగూడ పద్యసంగీత ములు కావలయుననునది కూడ. నాటక మంత స్వభావసిద్ధముగా నుండ వలయునని యాశించినచో, స్త్రీ వేషమునకు స్త్రీనే తీసికొని వచ్చినట్లుగ. రాజు వేషమునకు ప్రత్యక్షముగా రాజునే తీసికొని రావలయును. స్వభావ వాదమునకు మితి, గడువు నెక్కడ? అట్లే యుద్ధముచేయుటకు వాడికత్తులను కటారుల నుపయోగించి హత్యలఁ జేయవలసి యుండును. వీనివలనఁ గలుగు రసాభాసములు వేరుగ చెప్ప నవసరము లేదు! కాన కళలలో స్వభావ వాదమును తెగపెంచుకొనుటవలన విరసముగా పరిణ మించును. అందుచేతనే 'యుద్ధస్య కథా రమ్యా' అనినారే కాని, యుద్ధము రమ్యమన లేదు. స్థానం సరసింహారావు, ముప్పిడి జగ్గరాజు గార్లతో సమానముగగాని, వారిని మించునట్లుగగాని స్త్రీలు నాటక రంగమున స్త్రీ పాత్రములను నిర్వహించినచో నది ప్రశంసా పాత్రమై నాటక కళోద్ధరణము జరిగి నట్లగును. పాశ్చాత్యదేశములలో నట్లు జరిగినవి. దానికి కారణ మాదేశములలో స్త్రీలు మొదటి నుండియు పురుషులతో సరి సమానముగ లజ్జాభయములు లేక స్వతంత్రులుగా సంచరింతురు. వారి ప్రవర్తనయు నాచారములు వారి సంఘమునకు చెల్లిపోయినవి. కాని మన దేశములో నింక నాస్థితి రాలేదు. ఎవరో స్వల్పసంఖ్యాకులు నూటికి ఓటికి నొకరిద్దరు ప్రాశ్చాత్యస్త్రీలవలె వ్యవహరించినను బహు సంఖ్యాకులైన జనము వారిని హర్షించుటలేదు.

ఆధునిక నాటకములలోఁగూడ తెరలు, ప్రక్కతెరలు, సెట్టింగులును వాడుచున్నారు కదా. ఇవి సహజములా, కృత్రిమములా? ఒక యరణ్యమును జూపుటకుఁగాని, యొక మహాసౌధమును జూపుటకుఁగాని, గొప్ప కోటలను ప్రదర్శించుటకుఁగాని తెరలు, సెట్టింగులును వాడుచున్నారు కదా! తెరలు చిత్రకళకు సంబంధించినవి కావా? సెట్టింగులు గృహనిర్మాణ కళకు (archetecture) సంబంధించినవి కావా! నాటక కళ స్వతంత్రకళ యని కదా మీ వాదము. అగుచో, నీ యితర కళల సాయము నాటకము కోరనేల? సహజముగా నుండఁ జేయుటకై నీ కృత్రిమ సామగ్రిని కూర్చనేల? తెరలు, సెట్టింగులును కన్నులను మోసగించి, మనస్సును సమాధాన పఱచుటకు కదా కల్పింపఁ బడినవి. అట్లే కవిత్వ సంగీతముల సాయమును నాటకము కోరుటలో విరుద్ధమేమున్నది? రాత్రిపూట దీపముల యెదుట నాటకమాడుచు హరిశ్చంద్ర నాటకములో కాటికాపరి రంగములో చీకటిని ప్రతిపాదించవలసి వచ్చినది. దీపము లార్పివేసిన కాటికాపరియగు వీరబాహుఁడే కనపడడు. అప్పుడు మనము నాటకమునే చూడఁజాలము కదా. అగుచో నా సమయమున చీకటిని ప్రతిపాదించుట యెట్లు? అందుచే వికత్వకళను సాయమును చేసికొని, భావనాశక్తి నుపయోగించి కవి చక్కని పద్య మిట్లు రచించినాడు. 'అంధకార మప్పుడే బ్రహ్మాండము సంతయు నావరించి, కన్నులున్నవారిఁగూడ గ్రుడ్డివాండ్రను జేయుచున్నది.

సీ. కలవారి యిండ్లలోపలి నిధానములెత్త, నరుగు దొంగలకు సిద్ధాంజనంబు ;
 మగలకూరుక నిచ్చి తగయంటుగాండ్రకై, తారాడు కులటల తార్పు గత్తె ;
 ఆలవోక నలఁతి పిట్టలఁబట్టి వేటాడు, పాడు ఘుకములకుఁ బాడి పంట ;
 మనసంబులోన నింపెసలారు శాకినీ, ధాకినీతతుల చుట్టల సురభి ;

గీ. కేలతాంగికి నల్లనిమేలి ముసుఁగు, కమల జాండములకు నెల్ల కన్నుమాఁత,
 సత్యవిద్రోహి దుర్యశఁచ్యవికిఁదోడు, కటికచీకటి యలమెఁ దిక్తటము లందు !

అని బలిజేపల్లి లక్ష్మీకాంతంకవి తన సత్యహరిశ్చంద్ర నాటకములో రచించెను. చిత్రలేఖనకళ సహాయమున తెరలును, గృహ నిర్మాణ కళ (archetecture) సహాయమున సెట్టింగులను కూర్చి కన్నులను

మోసగించి మనస్సును మభ్యపెట్టినట్లే, కవి తన కవిత్వకళ సహాయమున భావనాశక్తి నుపయోగించి మన చెవులను మోసగించి మన మనస్సును సంతృప్తి పఱచినాడు, చీకటిని ప్రత్యక్షముగా నాటకమున చూపలేము కాన. ఈ విధముగా కవిత్వము మన మనస్సులను, భావనా శక్తిని సమాధాన పఱచుచున్నది. చిత్రలేఖనముగాని, మఱియే యితర కళ గాని నేత్రముల మూలమునగాని, శ్రోత్రముల మూలమున గాని సంతృప్తి పఱచునది మనస్సునే కదా. ఆ మనః సంతృప్తి నేత్రముల ద్వారా చిత్రకళ చేయునపుడు, శ్రోత్రములద్వారా కవిత్వమేల చేయ రాదు? వీనిలో నొకటి సహజమును రెండవది కృత్రిమము నేల యైనది? యథార్థమునకు రెండును కృత్రిమములే కదా? తెరలు లేక యరణ్యమేల లేదో, కవిత్వము లేక చీకటియు లేదు. రెండును సామాజికుల భావనా వీధిలో మనోకల్పితములే, కాన కవిత్వము నాటక మందుండుట వలన సహజత్వమునకు భంగము రాదు.

అగుచో పద్యమేల యుండవలె, వచనరచన చాలదా యందు రేమో. సమాధానమిది. సామాన్యభావములకు వచనము చాలినను భావతీవ్రత కది చాలదు. ఛందోరచనవలననే భావావేశము సిద్ధించగలదు. భావావేశము హృదయావేదనకు సంబంధించినది. హృదయావేదనమును సహృదయులలో గల్గించవలెననిన ఛందోరచన తేలికగా సమకూర్చగలదు. చూడుఁ డా హరిశ్చంద్రనాటకముననే, కాటికాపరి రంగములో హరిశ్చంద్రుఁడు తన పరిస్థితిని తన పూర్వ పరిస్థితితోఁ బోల్చుకొని, తన మూపుపై నున్న సురాభాండము నుద్దేశించి 'ఆహా సురాభాండమా! నీవు పూజ్యరాలవు. కావుననే విశ్వామిత్రుని సహాయసంపత్తిచే విశ్వవిశ్వంభరాదేవికి నాస్థానంబగు నీ భుజపీఠిపై నిట్లధిష్ఠించి యున్నావు' అని కొంత భావావేశముతో పలికినాడు. ఇప్పటికే భాషాశైలులు బుదాత్తము లైనవి. తర్వాత చీకటిలో దారి చూపుటకై చితిలోని కొరవిని గ్రహించినపుడు, తన పూర్వస్థితిని దలచుకొని నప్పటి భావావేశము బహు తీవ్రమై ఛందో రూపము దాల్చి, శ్రోతలగు వ్రేక్షకులకుఁ గూడ హృదయచలనము గల్గించు నట్లున్నది. చూడుఁడు,

“ ఆహా! చక్రవర్తులకు సేవకాజనము పట్టు బంగారపు కరదీపి కలకంటె నా యిప్పటి సేవ స్థితికి నీ కొఱవియే మిక్కిలి యుచితమైనది.

మ. చతురంభోధిపరీత భూవలయ రక్షాదక్ష చామికరా
యత దండంబు ధరించు నీ కరమె యాహా! యిప్పు డిక్కాటిలోఁ
జితిలోఁగాలుచున్నఁ నీ కొఱవిఁ దాల్చెన్, నవ్యమాణిక్యరా
జితసీరాజన కాంతికి బదులు వచ్చెన్ శోచనీయంబుగఁ ||.

అను పద్యములో వెనుకటి వచన రచనకంటె నెక్కువ భావావేశము స్పష్టపడుట లేదా. ఈ పద్యమునకు ముందున్న వచనము సామాన్యముగా నున్నది. భావావేశము తీవ్రరూపము దాల్చుననే యా భావ వ్యక్తీకరణ మొక విశిష్టరూపము దాల్చుట సర్వజన సామాన్యమే యని యందఱు నంగీకరింపక తప్పదు. ఇంతవఱకు సర్వమానవస్వభావ సహజమైనదని యంగీకరింతురు. అభిప్రాయ భేదముండదు కదా. హరిశ్చంద్రుఁడున్న విపరీత సన్నివేశములో నెవ రున్నను నట్టి భావావేశము పొందుట సహజము. కాన నది విశ్వజనీన మనఁబడును. ఆ భావావేశ వ్యక్తీకరణము విన్నవారికిఁగూడ నట్టి భావావేశమే కలుగుచున్నది కదా. ఇందుచేతనే Carlyle 'A vein of poetry runs in the heart of every man' అన్నాడు. కాని యా భావావేశము ఛందోరూపములో నందఱు వ్యక్తీకరించలేరు. కాన నది యసహజ మని స్వభావవాదుల ప్రతిపాదనము. నిజమే. ఆ భావావేశమును సక్రమముగా వ్యక్తీకరింపఁదగిన వాఁడు కవి మాత్రమే. కాని యితరు లెవ్వరికి నది సాధ్యము కాదు. ఆ భావావేశమును తగురీతి వ్యక్తీకరింప లేని సామాన్యజనుఁడు నోరు తెరచినచో నట్టి వచ్చునే కాని, సక్రమముగా వ్యక్తీకరింపలేడు. అతని వచనరూప వ్యక్తీకరణము నపేలవముగా నుండక తప్పదు. కాన కవి మన తరపున ప్రాతినిధ్యము వహించి మన మాస్థితిలో వ్యక్తీకరింపఁ జాలని తీవ్ర భావావేశమును ఛందోరూపమున వ్యక్తీకరించి చూపి, యా పద్యము చదివి నప్పుడెల్ల నా తీవ్రభావావేశమే కలుగనట్లు ప్రయోగమూలమున ఋజువుచేసి చూపుచున్నాఁడు. ఇదియే కవికి సామాన్యలకుఁ గల భేదము. తీవ్ర భావా

వేశము పొందువారు కవులగుటయే జరుగు నేని, తప్పక ఛందోరూపము ననే యాతీవ్రభావముల వ్యక్తీకరింతురు కాని వచనమున వ్యక్తీకరింపరు. వచనమున కా శక్తిలేదు. సామాన్యజనులు తీవ్రభావావేశమును తగురీతి వ్యక్తీకరింపనే లేరు. ఇది వారి యశక్తత, కాని యదివారి యసహజత్వము కాదు. ఇందుచే తీవ్రభావావేశమును వ్యక్తీకరించు పద్యవిధానము సహజమైనది కాదనుట సమంజసము కాదు. కాని యది సామాన్యుల కసాధ్యమైనది. ఇందుచేతనే వాల్మీకి క్రాంచమిధున సందర్భమున గల్గిన శోకము శ్లోకరూపము దాల్చె నందురు. తీవ్రభావావేశ వ్యక్తీకరణమునకు ఛందోరూపమునకు నవినాభావసంబంధమున్నది. అక్షర గణఛందములో వ్యక్తీకరింపఁజాలని పామరులు, మాత్రాగణ ఛందములో నా భావావేశమును వ్యక్తీకరించుటయు మనము జానపద గేయములలో గమనించుచున్నాము. కాన పద్యరచన యసాధ్యమైనను సహజము మాత్రము కాదని యంగీకరింపవలసియున్నది. జనసామాన్య మా పద్యముల నర్థము చేసికొన లేరందురా? అది సామాజికుల దోషము కాని, నాటకకళ దోషము కాదు కద. అందుచేతనే నాటకకళ గొప్ప సంస్కృతిగల కళ గాని పామరకళ కాదు. పామరులకు కావలసిన నాటకకళ యక్షగానము లుండనే యున్నవి. నేటికాలమున సినిమాలు వారి యభిరుచికి దగినవి.

అయితే పద్యములన్నియు నాటకమున తీవ్రభావావేశ నన్ని వేశములను ప్రతిపాదించునప్పుడు మాత్రమే రచింపఁబడు చున్నవా? యవి ప్రశ్నించుచో, నది నాటకకర్త బాధ్యతయే కాని, నాటకకళ బాధ్యత మాత్ర మెన్నటికిని కాదు. ఉచితానుచితములు దెలియని కవి రచించిన పద్యములకు బాధ్యు లెవరు కాగలరు? కాన నాటకకళ కవిత్యకళ నుండి ప్రత్యేక పడి జీవింపలేదు. తీవ్రభావావేశ వ్యక్తీకరణమే రసమని వ్యవహరింపఁబడినది. రసమయములై నవి నాటకములు. నాటకకళతో కవిత్యకళకుఁగల సంబంధమువంటిదే, కవిత్యసంగీతములకుఁ గల సంబంధముగూడ. తీవ్రమైన భావావేశములను పద్యము మాత్రమే వ్యక్తీకరింపఁ గలిగినట్లుగా, సూక్ష్మాతీసూక్ష్మా భావవిశేషములను

సంగీతము మాత్రమే వెలువరించ కలదు. అనగా కవిత్వముగూడ వ్యక్తికరింపలేని యతి సూక్ష్మ సుకుమార భావములు సంగీతమూలమున వ్యక్తికరింపబడును. అనగా చివరకు తేలున దేమనగా, స్థూలమైన సామాన్యభావములను వ్యక్తికరించుటకు వచనమును, తీవ్రభావావేశమును వ్యక్తికరించుటకు పద్యములు పాటలును, సూక్ష్మ సుకుమార భావములను వ్యక్తికరించుటకు సంగీతమును నాటకమున కావలసి యుండును. అయితే యీ యశాచిత్వమును పాటించి నాటకమున సంగీత ముపయోగింపబడు చున్నదా? యని ప్రశ్నించిన, నది నటుల దోషముకాని నాటకకళ దోషముకాదని సమాధాన మగును. నటుల దోష కారణమువలన సంగీతకళ నాటకకళ నుండి బహిష్కరింపవలె నని వాదించుట మాత్రము సరసము కాదు. అట్లు బహిష్కరించి స్వతంత్ర కళావాదమును సమర్థించుటయు సరసము కాదు. నాటకకళ వలన కలుగు నానందము కవిత్వ సంగీతముల వలన నినుమడి ముమ్మడి యగుచున్న దని గ్రహింపవలయును. కవిత్వ సంగీతములు మానవ హృదయములపై ప్రభావమును జూపును. హృదయమును నమ్మిన వారికి సంగీత కవిత్వము లాకర్షించి సంచలనము గల్గించును. అసలు లలితకళలే హృదయము నకు సంబంధించినవి. పాశ్చాత్యుల వచననాటకములు హృదయ కుహరముల దాక లోఁతునకు పోక పైపై వినోదము కూర్చునవి మాత్రమే యగును. మన వచననాటకములుగూడ సంతయే. మానవ స్వభాని మును హృదయకుహరముల వరకు లోఁతునకు పరిశోధించినపుడు కాని కవిత్వ సంగీతము లెంతవరకు సహజములో స్పష్టపడవు. మన మన్ని విధములైన ప్రయోగములను (experiments) చేసి చూచితిమి. వాని వలన ననుకొనిన ఫలితములు సాధింపఁగలిగినచో నవి యవలంబింపఁ దగినవే. కాని తగిన ఫలితములు సిద్ధింప నపుడు వానిని నుపసంహరించుకొనుటలో దోషమేమి?

నాటకప్రదర్శనమున, స్వాభావికవాదమును పురస్కరించుకొని, పద్యములే యుండరాదని కొందఱును, పద్యము లుండినను వానిని పద్యములవలె సంగీతముతోఁ గాక, వచనమువలె జదువవలెనని కొంద

అను, మఱికోదలు పద్యములను వచనమువలె గాక కొంచెము
 సంగీతముతో శ్రావ్యముగ పాడవచ్చుననియు,
 నాటకమునందు
 సంగీతము
 నింకకొందలు రాగాలాపనముతో సంగీత
 శాస్త్రప్రదర్శనము చేయవచ్చుననియు నిట్లనేక
 విధముల నటులు, పండితులు, విమర్శకులు దలఁచుచున్నారు. ఈ విషయ
 మున ప్రాచీనాధునిక నాటకప్రదర్శన నిపుణులును, గొప్ప నటులు,
 విద్యావంతులు, న్యాయనాదులు నాటక ప్రదర్శనములకై తన జీవిత
 మంతయు ధారవోసిన తాడిపర్తి రాఘవగారిట్లు తన యభిప్రాయమును
 వెలిబుచ్చి యున్నారు. 19-11-1930 న. పంచమకళాసమావేశమున
 తిరువాన్కూరు సంస్థానపు కళామహోత్సవముల సందర్భమున (చూ.
 భారతి ప్రమోదూతనామ సం. మాఖమాసము.) “రంగస్థలముపై
 సంగీతమునకు స్థానము లేదని యెంచువాడను గాను నేను. భావప్రద
 ర్శనమే నటకునికి ప్రధానముగ చూచుకొనఁ దగినది. సంగీతము మూల
 మునఁ గాని ప్రస్ఫుటము గాఁజాలని భావములు గొన్ని యుండవచ్చును.
 ఆత్మను అత్యున్నతమగు స్థానమునఁ జేర్చగల ప్రబలసాధనము సంగీ
 తము. నిరంతర బాధాకరమగు అశాంతి నణచివైచి, మనస్సును
 కాపాడఁ గలిగినది సంగీత మన్నప్పుడు, మంచి సంగీత మని నా యభి
 ప్రాయము, కాని రోగము గొన్న పిల్లియరపు కాకూడ దని.
 సౌందర్యము నుత్తమోత్తముగ పర్ణింపఁగల కవితలో సంగీతమున్నది.
 ప్రేమ లలాటమునకు ‘కొహినీర్’ వజ్రము సంగీతము. అంధకారమయ
 మగు సహంకారమును బంగారముగా మార్చి రసవాదజ్ఞున కీయఁగల
 యబ్బరపు సాధనము సంగీతము. వ్యక్తి యాత్మను అనంతత్వమునకుఁ
 జేర్చఁ గలిగినది సంగీతము. ధ్యానములో నున్నవారికి పట్టుమడి సంగీ
 తము. పూజాస్థానమై యున్న నాటకరంగమునుండి సంగీతమును నేను
 దూర మొనర్చను. కాని రంగస్థలమునకు సరియైన సంగీతము నమర్చు
 టకు గొప్ప సంగీతశాస్త్రజ్ఞు డుండవలెను. అట్టివాఁడే నాటకమునను,
 రంగస్థలముపై నను గూడ సంగీతమున కర్హస్థాన మేదో నిర్ణయింపఁ
 గలుగును. రసానుగుణ్యము, సమయానుకూలముగల రాగము నతఁడే

నిర్ణయింపఁగలడు. దినచారమునకును సంగీతమునకును నన్నిహిత సంబంధము గలదను సంగతి నెఱిగినవారు చాల తక్కువ మంది.....
సంగీత మా యా సమయములతో మేళవించి యుండజాలక పోయినచో కళాభిజ్ఞుని వినికొని కది కఠోరముగనే యుండును. నాటకములో అనుకూలమగు సమయ మొకటి యున్నదను సంగతి నెఱిగిన వారు చాల తక్కువగ నుండురు. మామూలు నటకుఁడు నాటకము నంతను పూర్తిగ చదివి, యందలి ప్రతిరంగమునకును గల సమయమర్యాదను గ్రహించుట కెన్నడు ప్రయత్నింపడు. ఇట్టి యజ్ఞానమునకుఁగల ఫలితము మిక్కిలి పరిహాసాస్పదమైనది

నాటకకళా సౌందర్యమునకు సంగీత మొక్కడొక్కడ వన్నెఁబెచ్చునను నంశము నాలోచింతము. భక్తి, సంతోషము, ప్రేమ, దీర్ఘాలోచనము-ఇవి యన్నియు సంగీతమునకు స్థానము నీయఁగలిగినవిగా నుండవచ్చును. కాని యేదో యొకమృగమును వేటాడు నాందోళనమున పడియున్న పక్షుడు కాని, యుద్ధరంగమున శత్రువు నెదుర్కొను చున్న పక్షుడు గాని, భైరవికి, కాంభోజికిని స్థానము లేదను విషయమున మీరు నాతో నేకీ భవించెద రనుకొందును. వేటరంగములో గాని, యుద్ధరంగములోఁ గాని పాటలెందుకుఁ గావలయునో నాకు బోధపడుట లేదు." అని. శ్రీ రాఘవ గారి యుపన్యాసము బహుగంభీరమై, భావబంధురమైనది.

స్వభావ స్వతంత్రవాదముల మాట యెట్లున్నను, నాటకరంగ స్థలముమీఁద పద్యములను విశేషసంగీతముతో, రాగాలాపనముతో పాటకచ్చేరి చేయుట మాత్రము తిరస్కరింపఁదగినదే. ఏలయన నటుఁడు రాగాలాపనముపై నుండు శ్రద్ధచే నభినయమున శ్రద్ధ చూప లేక పోవును. అందుచే నభినయమున లోపము వచ్చును. నాటకమున భావప్రదర్శనమే ప్రధానముగ నటుడు చూచుకొనవలసినది. ప్రేక్షకులు నాటక కథ నభినయపూర్వకముగఁ గాంచుటకుఁ గుతూహల పడుదురే కాని, సంగీతము వినుటకు కాదు. ఇందుచే విశేషసంగీతము నాటకాభినయమున కడ్డు తగిలితీరు ననుట నిర్వివాదాంశము. కాన నాటకమున పద్యములను శ్రావ్యముగఁ జదువవలయునే కాని, పద్యము చివర రాగా

లాపనము చేయరాదు. ఇట్టి పద్ధతిని నాటక రంగస్థలమున శ్రీ నాగ
 రాజారావు, పింగళి లక్ష్మీకాంతం, మాధవపెద్ది వెంకట్రామయ్య,
 ముంజులూరి కృష్ణారావు మొదలగు కొలఁదిమంది నటులు మాత్రమే
 జయప్రదముగ నిర్వహించి శౌరవప్రతిష్ఠలను సంపాదించుకొనిరి. ఇట్టి
 యసిధారానియమవ్రతమును పాటింపలేని నటులు నాటక రంగస్థలమునఁ
 దమ రాగాలాపనమును ప్రదర్శించి యభినయమును ధ్వంసము చేయుట
 చేతనే విసుగుచెంది, నాటకమున నసలు పద్యములే యుండరాదను
 నిర్ణయము చేయవలసిన స్థితికి వచ్చినది. కాని యది సరసమైన పద్ధతి
 కాదు. నియమమును పాటింపలేక పోవుట నటుల దోషము కాని,
 నాటకకళ దోషము కాదు. అందుచే నాటకమున పద్యములను గాని,
 పద్యపఠనమునకుఁ గావలసిన శ్రావ్యగానము గాని లోపింపఁజేయుట
 నాటకకళలోని కొన్ని యంగములను లోపింపఁ జేయుటయే యగును.
 ఆంధ్రనాటకములలో పద్యములుండరాదను వాదము, రాగాలాపనవలన
 నభినయమున కంతరాయముగలుగుట వలనఁగాదు, 'నాటకకళా పరి
 ణామ మన్ని దేశాలలోను కవిత్వాన్ని వినర్జించినది', కాన నాంధ్ర
 నాటకములలోఁ గూడ పద్యములు విడువబడిన వనియు, 'పద్యములుండు
 టయే యభినయాని కంతరాయమైనది, సంగీతముతో రాగాలాపన చేసి
 పాటకచ్చేరి చెయ్యట మాత్రమే యభినయానికి యంతరాయము
 కాదని'యు నొక యనామక బుద్ధిమంతుఁడు 24-12-1961 నాటి విశా
 లాంధ్ర పత్రికలో రచించినాఁడు. ఈ యాక్షేపణ మెంత సరసముగా
 నున్నదో విచారింపుడు. పద్యరచనమువలననే స్వతస్సిద్ధముగా నెట్లభి
 నయమున కంతరాయము వచ్చునో యది యూహింపరాని విషయము.
 పేక్చీయరు నాటకము లన్నియు ముప్పాతిక మూఁడుపాళ్లకు పైగా
 పద్యములోనే రచింపఁబడినవి. గారిక్కు మొదలైన సుప్రసిద్ధనటు లభినయ
 మున కేమియు సంతరాయము లేకుండనే వాని నభినయించిరి; సామాజికు
 లభినందించిరి. పద్యభూయిష్ఠమైన చిత్రనళీయ విషాద సారంగధరాది
 నాటకములను హరిప్రసాద రావు ప్రభృతులు రాగాలాపన లేని సముచిత
 సంగీతముతో శ్రావ్యముగ పద్యములను చదివి, యభినయము చేయుట
 కేమియు నడ్డు రాకుండగనే ప్రదర్శింపఁగ ప్రేక్షకు లామోదించిరి. కాని

రచనమువలననే నాటకాభినయమున కంతరాయము వచ్చిన దనుట సముచితము గాదు. కాని యాపద్యములకు రాగాలాపన తగిలించుట వలననే యంతరాయము వచ్చినదని పూర్వనాటక ప్రదర్శనములను జూచిన వారికే కాక, పురాణం నూరిశాస్త్రీగారు రచించిన నాట్యాంబుజ, నాట్యాశోక, నాటకసంస్కరణాది నాటక విమర్శగ్రంథములతో నేమాత్రము డొక్కశుద్ధియున్న వారికైనను స్పష్టపడును. కాని మారని కానియై, సిసీమాలలో నుదరపోషణ చేసికొను కమ్యూనిస్టుభావాలు గలవారికి లలితకళా రసహ్యములఁగూర్చి, యందులో నాటకతత్త్వమును గుఱించి శాసనవాక్యములను బలుకుట హాస్యాస్పృమైన విషయము. పాశ్చాత్యదేశములలో పద్యములనుగూడ వచనమువలెనే చదువుట సంప్రదాయము గాన, పద్యమయ నాటకములకు, గద్యనాటకములకు విశేషభేదము గనఁబడదు. కాన 18-వ శతాబ్దముననే గోల్డ్స్మిత్తు, షెరిడన్ మొదలైన వారాంగ్లమున వచనములోనే నాటకములు వ్రాసిరి. ఆంధ్రనాటకారంభదశలో 1880 ప్రాంతమున కొండుబొట్ల సుబ్రహ్మణ్యంగారు మొదట వచనముననే బహునాటకములను రచించి, ప్రదర్శింపఁ జేసిరి. తర్వాతనే కదా యాంధ్రనాటకములలో పద్యములు బయలు దేరఁగ, నవి రాగాలాపనమువలన నభినయమున కంతరాయము గలుగుటచే పద్యములు నాటకమున నుండరాదను వాదము వచ్చినది. ఆధునిక సాంసారిక నాటకాలలో పద్యములుండరాదని వాదించుట స్వభావవాదమును పురస్కరించుకొని వివిధదేశాలలో జరిగినది. నే నాంధ్ర ప్రాచీననాటక విషయమును గూర్చి వివరింపఁగా బట్టతలకు మోకాలకి ముడిపెట్టఁ జూచు బుద్ధిమంతుల విమర్శాధోరణి యేమని చెప్పవలె ?

నాటకకళ ప్రత్యేకమైన యొక లలితకళ కాదు. అది యన్ని లలితకళల కూడికవలన వర్ధిల్లిన సమాహారకళ, లేక మిశ్రలలితకళ. ఇందు

కవిత్వము, నభినయము; సంగీతము, చిత్రలేఖనమును కలసి ప్రవర్తిల్లును. ఇందుచేతనే దీనిలో నితర లలితకళల కంటె నెక్కువ మనోహరత్వము, నాటకకళా ప్రాశస్త్యము రామణీయకము, సంతృప్తియు సిద్ధించుచున్నవి. ఎన్ని విద్యలనైన నుపయోగించుకొని సమ కూర్చుకొనఁగలిగినది కళ. కాన వివిధ విద్యలకూడిక వలన వర్ధిల్లిన నాటకకళ నుండి స్వభావవాదమును, స్వతంత్రవాదమును పురస్కరించు కొని కవిత్వ సంగీతములను ప్రత్యేక పఱచి, యభినయము మాత్రము స్వతంత్రముగ, ప్రత్యేకముగా రాణింపవలెననిన, నందు కవిత్వ సంగీతముల వలనఁగలుగు శోభామనోహరత్వములను పోగొట్టుకొనుటకు సిద్ధ పడవలెను. దాన సంపూర్ణకళాసిద్ధి కలుగదు. ఏలన, సంగీత మాపాత మధురమైన లలితకళ, సాహిత్యమాలోచనామృతమైన లలిత కళ. ఇట్టి సాహిత్యముగల దృశ్యకావ్యము నాటకము. నాటక మందలి పాత్రలలోచనామృతమైన సాహిత్యభావముల, నాపాత మధురమైన సంగీత పూర్వక వాచకాభినయ మూలమున ప్రదర్శించి, సమగ్రమైన కళను సాక్షాత్కరింపఁ జేయుదురు. ఇది నాటకకళా ప్రాశస్త్యము.

ఇట నాటకమున పద్యముల స్థానమును గూర్చి పానుగంటి లక్ష్మీ నరసింహంగారు తమ సాక్షి వ్యాసములలో నెట్లు వ్రాసిరో కొంచెము పరామర్శింపఁదగిన విషయము. “పాటలవలెనే యపురూప వృత్తములు నాటకముల నుండఁదగ వని తేలుచున్నది.....మత్తేభ,

నాటకమున పద్యముల స్థానము

శార్దూల, చంపకోత్పలమాలా వృత్తములు గూడ నాటకముల నుండఁగూడదు. వీనికిఁ గూడఁ దాళపు సంకెల, విశేషము లేనప్పటికిని

లేక పోలేదు. నాటకమున పాటకయిన పాటలు పాడుట యెట్లనహజమో, పద్యములు పాడుటకూడ నట్లే యనహజము. ఆ పద్యము సామాన్య వృత్తములయిన సరే, వింతవృత్తములైన సరే, అన్ని వృత్తయిలు నాటకములనుండి బహిష్కరింపఁదగినవే. అట్లులైన నొక్క వచనము తప్ప నాటకమున మరేమియు నుపయోగింపఁగూడదా? ప్రకృతివైఖరి ననునరించి వ్రాసిన యెడల సంతే! అట్లులె సచోఁ బూర్వనాటక కర్త

లందఱు ప్రకృతిజ్ఞానాభావులేనా? దృష్టిగోచరములుగాని, హృదయావస్థల
 బొమ్మలను బాహ్యప్రకృతి నుండు రంగులతోడనే వేయవలసియున్నది.
 కాన నిట్టి సమయమున నుపమాలంకార మావశ్యకముగ వచ్చును...
ప్రశస్తవర్ణనలతోడి యీ మంచి కల్పనము వచనమునఁ బెట్టిన
 యెడల సొగసుగ నుండదనియు, పద్యరూపమున నున్న జనుల జిహ్వోగ్ర
 ముల తఱచుగ నుండఁగలదనియుఁ బూర్వసంస్కృత కవులలో నుత్త
 మోత్తములగు వారెంచి, తాళ సందర్భ సహితములగు వృత్తముల
 నన్నింటిని నిరాకరించి, కేవల వచనమువలెఁ గొంచెము హెచ్చుతగ్గుగ
 నడచు నార్యావృత్తము, ననుష్టుపువృత్తము తఱచుగా నుపయోగ
 వఱచినట్లు గనఁబడుచున్నది.....ప్రశస్తమైన యభిప్రాయమున్న
 యెడల దాని నుపమాధాంతరన్యాసాలంకారములతో మేళవించి, దానిని
 ధారణయోగ్యముగఁ జేయుటకై నడకయందు వచనము కంటె
 విశేషభేదము లేని వృత్తములలోఁ బూర్వోత్తమ కవులు దాని నిముడ్చు
 కొనిరి. వచనమే ప్రకృతి ననుసరించి ప్రధానమైన నాటకమునందీ కార
 ణమున విధిలేక కొన్ని జాతుల పద్యముల నుత్తమకవులు స్వీకరింప
 వలసివచ్చినది.....అత్యంత వచనమును బోలియున్న పద్యము
 కావలయును.....ఇంకాండుదేశ కవులు నాటక
 రచనయందు (Blank verse) బ్లాంకువర్సు అను పద్యము నుపయోగిం
 తురు... ఇదికూడ తఱచు సంభాషణములోఁ దెలియకుండ
 వారుపయోగించుకొందురు. ఇది వచన మనిన వచనము గాదు. పద్య
 మనిన పద్యము గాదు. చక్కని యుభయమధ్యస్థ రచనా చమత్కా
 రము గలిగి నాటకమునకుఁ బరిపూర్ణముగఁ దగియున్నది.....ఇంగ్లీషు
 వారికి (Blank verse) ఉన్నది. సంస్కృత భాషలో 'ఆర్యావృత్తము,
 అనుష్టుపువృత్తము లున్నవి' వీనికి ప్రతిబింబమైనది మన యాంధ్ర
 భాషలో నేమి యున్నదని యాలోచింపఁగ 'తేటగీతి' కనఁబడు
 చున్నది. దీనికిఁ దాళబంధము మిక్కిలి తక్కువ కలదు.....ఇది
 పద్యము కాదు. వచన మంతకంటెఁ గాదు.....దీని కంటె ఛంద
 స్సును వచనమును బోలిన పద్యము వేరొకటి లేదు, అందుచే నిదియే

సర్వవిధముల నాటకరచన కత్యంతమర్హమై యున్నది.....సీసము నాటవెలదిని కూడ నుపయోగపఱచ వచ్చును. వీనిని చదువవలసి నప్పు డా యా రసభేదోచిత కంఠ రవ పరిపాకములఁ జదువవలయును. గాన ధోరణినిఁ బాడఁగూడదు. నాటకములో నన్నియుఁ దేటగీతములే యైనచో వినుగుగ నుండునని కొందఱుందురు. ఇది కేవల మూఢాభిప్రాయము. మన నాటకములలో నచ్చటచ్చట నున్న గీత పద్యములే వినుగు గలిగించు నెడల నారంభము మొదలంతము వఱకు నొక్కటే Blank verse పద్యముగల యింగ్లీషునాటకము లంతకంటె వినుగు గలిగింప వలసి నది కాదా? ”

ఈ డొంకతిరుగుడు వాదమంతయు నాటకమందు పద్యము లుండ రాదను తన మతమును సమర్థించుకొనుటకై తెచ్చిపెట్టికొనిన కృత్రిమ కల్పనా పద్ధతియే. కాన నిందలి విషయములన్నియు నసంబద్ధములు, ననౌచిత్యములు, నసంగతములు గూడ. ఏలన, ముఖ్యముగా లక్ష్య సరసింహంగారికి కవిత్వభావములకు ఛందస్సునకుఁ గల సంబంధ మెట్టిచో బోధపడలేదు. రసవంతములైన భావములకు ఛందస్సునకు నవినా భావసంబంధమున్నదని వెనుక నేను వివరించిన హరిశ్చంద్రనాటక సన్నివేశమును గూర్చియు, వాల్మీకి క్రౌంచమిథునేతివృత్తమునుండియు స్పష్టపడుటయే కాక, పాశ్చాత్య పండితులు కూడ నుత్కృష్ట భావము లకు ఛందమునకు నన్నిహిత సంబంధమున్నదని యంగీకరించిరి. “Poetry is the art of producing pleasure by the just expression of imaginative thought and feeling in metrical language”—Courthope. ‘విభావితాభిప్రాయములను రసములను గణబద్ధమైనభాషలో ప్రకటించి, వాని మూలమున డెందమలరింపఁజేయు కళ కవిత్వమగును. “Poetry is musical thought”—Carlyle. ‘శ్రావ్యమగు భావము కవిత్వమగుచున్న’ దనెను. ‘Poetry is the rhythmical creation of beauty’ ‘లయాన్వితమైన పదజాలముచే సౌందర్య స్వరూపమును సృజించుట కవితయగు’నని Poe పండితుని యభిప్రాయము. మరియు, ‘Poetry is metrical composition. It is the art of uniting pleasure with truth by calling forth imagination to the help of reason

Johnson. 'కవిత్వము ఛందోబద్ధమగు రచన. బుద్ధియు భావనయు సాధనములుగా నానందసత్యముల యొక్కమును జూపుకళ. తర్వాత ఛందోకవిత్వములకుఁగల సంబంధమును గూర్చి (Leigh Hunt) ఇట్లు చెల్వినాఁడు. 'The opinion 'that metre is not necessary' is a prosaic mistake. Fitness or unfitness for song (metrical excitement) makes all the difference between a poetical and prosaic subject. The reason why verse is necessary to the form of poetry is that the perfection of the poetical spirit demands it—that the circle of its enthusiasim, beauty, and power is incomplete without it.' 'ఛంద స్సనవసరమని భావించుట యొక సీరసమైన దుర్వాదము. ఛందోర్హానర్హతలే రసవద్వస్తువునకు శీరస వస్తువునకుఁ గల ప్రధానభేదము. కవితా బాహ్యరూపము ఛందోమయముగా నేల యుండవలయు ననిన, దాని యంతస్సారము స్వసిద్ధికై యూ రూపమునే య పేక్షించును. కనుక భావావేశము, రసము, నోజస్సు మొదలైన కవితాగుణ సముదాయము ఛందస్సులేక సమగ్రము కానేరవు.' పై యాంగ్ల విమర్శకుల ప్రమాణవాక్యములను బట్టి కవిత్వమనఁగా నేమియో, దానికి ఛందస్సునకు నెట్టి సహజసంబంధము గలదో స్పష్టమగుచున్నది. ఇఁక నాటకము దృశ్యకావ్యము కదా. 'కావ్యేషు నాటకం రమ్య' మ్మనియు, 'నాటకాంతం సాహిత్య'మ్మను ప్రమాణవాక్యములను బట్టి నాటకములలో నుత్తమకవిత యుండునని భావింపఁ దగును. ఇట్లుండగా నరసింహారావుగారు 'ప్రళస్తమైన యభిప్రాయమున్న యెడల దాని నుపమార్థాంతరన్యాసాలంకారములతో మేళవించి, దానిని ధారణయోగ్యముగఁ జేయుటకై, నడకయందు వచనముకంటె విశేషభేదములేని వృత్తములలోఁ బూర్వోత్తమ కవులు దాని నిముచ్చుకొనిరి' అని వ్రాయుటలో నొచిత్య మే మున్నది? మఱియు నుత్తేభశార్దూలాది వృత్తములలోఁగూడ తాళపునంకెల లేకపోలేదు. కాన నవి నాటకమున పరిజ్యజింపవలెనట. లక్ష్మీనరసింహారావుగారికి లయతాళములకుఁగల భేదము తెలిసినట్లు తోచదు. 'ఇంగ్లాండు దేశకవులు నాటక రచనయందు Blank verse అను పద్యము నుపయోగింతురు. ఇది వచన మని వచనముగాదు. పద్య మని

పద్యము గాదు. చక్కని యుభయమధ్యస్థ రచనా చమత్కారము గలిగిన నాటకమునకుఁ బరిపూర్ణముగఁ దగియున్నది.' అని నరసింహా రావుగారు వ్రాసిరి. Blank verse లో నొక్క యంత్యప్రాస మాదిరి rhyme మాత్రము లేదు. మిగిలిన గణముల కూర్చున్నది. ఆంగ్ల భాషలో పద్యములను గూడ వచనమువలె చదువు నాచారము గాఢముగా నున్నది. ఆ భాషలో పాటలను (songs) మాత్రమే మన పద్యములవలె పాడుదురు. మన కీర్తనలవలె తాళలయప్రస్తారముతో, మద్దెలమ్రోతతో పాడు సంప్రదాయ మాంగ్లమున నున్నట్లు తోచదు. వారు నృత్యము చేయునపుడుగూడ కర్ణాటనృత్య సంగీతములవలె మద్దెల దగువులతో విశేషము పనియుండదు, బహుసుకుమారముగ నుండును. ఇది వారి సంప్రదాయము. ఇందుచే వారి Blank verse మాలికగా నెన్ని పంక్తులు నడచినను వచనమువలె నుచ్చరించవచ్చును. దీనిలో నూత (accent) మాత్రముండును. ఇది ప్రతిశబ్దములోఁగూడ నుండును. ఈ Blank verse కేవలము నాటకములకే కాదు, పురాణకవిత (epic poetry)లోఁ గూడ వాడఁబడినది. మిల్టన్ కవి (Milton's paradise lost) గూడ Blank verse లోనే వ్రాసినాఁడు కదా. ఆంగ్ల భాషలో నే పద్యమైనను రాగాలాపనతోఁ జదువు సంప్రదాయము లేక పోవుట చేతను, కేవలము వచనమువలె చదువునాచారముండుట చేతను, పద్యమాలికగా Blank verse ను వ్రాయఁగలిగిరి. తెలుఁగునఁగాని సంస్కృతమునఁగాని, పద్యమాలికగా నాటకమును వ్రాయు నాచార ముండు చేతనే లేదు. ఈ భాషలలో పద్యమును వచనమువలె చదువు నాచారము లేదు. భాషాసంప్రదాయము గుర్తింపక తేటగీతిని కాని, యార్యానుష్టుపులను గాని, మాలికగా నాంగ్లభాష ననుకరించుచు వ్రాసినచో చూడవలసియున్నది. వావిలాల వాసుదేవశాస్త్రిగారు జూలియస్ సీజరు నాటకాంధ్రీకరణమును తేటగీతమాలికలో రచించిరి కదా. అది యెంత ప్రజామోద మొందినది. దాని నెవరైన నాంగ్ల భాషాసంప్రదాయముగ వచనమువలె చదివి ప్రదర్శించి రక్తి కట్టింపఁ గలిగిరా? కందుకూరి వీరేశలింగంగారు దన 'విన్నీసు వర్తక చరిత్ర'

(Merchant of venice) అను నాటకాంధ్రీకరణమును ద్వీపద మాలి కలో నాంగ్ల భాషా సంప్రదాయానుగుణముగ వ్రాసిరి. అది ప్రజారంజకమైనదా వారి యభిజ్ఞాన శాకుంతలాంధ్రీకరణము వలె? ఎందుచేత కాలేదు? విన్నీసు వర్తక చరిత్రమున కథాచమత్కారము గాని, రసవత్సన్నివేశములు గాని, హృద్యమైన కవితాభావములు గాని తక్కువ కావు కదా! తత్కర్తయగు షేక్స్పియరు కాళిదాసునకు తీసిపోడు కదా! ఆంధ్రీకరణ కర్త రెంటికి నొకరే కదా! ఈ భేదమెందులకు వచ్చినది! యనగా రచనా విధానము మన సంప్రదాయమునకు విరుద్ధముగా నున్నది. వెన్నీసువర్తక చరిత్రము ద్వీపదమాలికలోఁ గాక, భారతీయనాటక సంప్రదాయానుగుణముగ చతుష్పాద వృత్తాది పద్యములతోను, వచనముతోడను గూర్పబడినచో శాకుంతలాంధ్రీకరణము వలె ప్రజలచే నాదరింపబడెడిదే. ద్వీపదలో ప్రాసలు పరిత్యజించి మంజరీద్వీపదగా రచింప నెట్లుండునో Blank verse యట్లుండును. అంతయే భేదము. 'Blank verse వలె సంస్కృతమున నార్యానుష్టుపు ఛందములు వచనముగాని పద్యముగాని మధ్యస్థ రచన యెట్టిదో తెలుఁగులో తేటగీతి పద్య మట్టిది యట.' దీనికి జన్మసిద్ధమైన యొక్క నడకయే లేదట. రామాయణమును సంస్కృతమున వాల్మీకి మహర్షి వ్రాసి కుశలవులచే పాడించెనని కదా యనుశ్రుతమైన గాథ. ఆ వృత్తము పాడుట కనర్హమైన దని కదా నరసింహరావుగారి వాదము. ఇది యెంతవరకు సమంజసముగా నున్నది. ఆర్యానుష్టుపు ఛందములు గల శ్లోకములను మనవారు వచనమువలె చదివినని పూర్వమెప్పుడైన సంప్రదాయము కలదా? ఉత్తమకవుల వ్రాతలను బట్టి వారికట్లు కనఁబడినదట. నాటకమున పద్యములుండ రాదను దృష్టితోఁ జూచిరి కాన వారికట్లు కనఁబడినది. కాని యందఱ కట్లుకనఁబడదు. ఉత్తమ సంస్కృత కవులు దమ నాటకములలో నార్యానుష్టుపేతర వృత్తములను విశేషముగా వాడినారను సంగతి రావుగారికి తెలియరావు గాఁబోలు. అందులకు వారేదృష్టి నాపాదించినో. ఇక 'తేటగీతికి జన్మసిద్ధమైన యొక్క నడకలేదట. దీనికి మనము దానిలోఁ బ్రయోగించెడు గణము

లను బట్టి గమన భేదముల నీయఁగలముట. పాత్రమునకుఁ గల మనస్థితి భేదములఁ బట్టి యీ గమనభేదము లుండవలయునట.....అది కాక దీనిని కేవలము వచనమువలెనే నడచునట్లు మనము గణముల కూర్పులచేఁ జేయవచ్చునట. అట్లు చేయుట తగునట. నాటకము లోని గీతపద్యములను గీతములవలెఁ జదువఁబోయిన నవి నడవకుండునట్లు వ్రాయవలెనట. అవి వచనములని చదువుకొను నప్పుడే యవి నడవ వలయునట.....ఇట్టివే యాట వెలది సీసపద్యములుగూడనట..... వీనిని జదువవలసి వచ్చినపు డా యా రసభేదోచిత కంఠరవ పరిపాకములఁ జదువ వలయునట, గాన ధోరణిని బాడఁకూడదట.' పద్య ద్వేషులై యింతయవస్థ పడక యిఁక వచనముననే వ్రాయవచ్చును కదా! వచనముననే యుత్తమభానములను వ్యక్తీకరింపవచ్చునే. సంస్కృత భాషలోఁగల కాదంబరి దశకుమార చరిత్రము లిట్టివచన కావ్యములే కదా! గద్యముగాని, పద్యముగాని గబ్బిళమువంటి వృత్తము నేల యాశ్రయింపవలెను. దీనికింత పిచ్చి హొంకతిరుగుడు వాదమేల? ఇందు సారస్యమే మున్నది. నాటకములలో పద్యము లుండరాదని తాను నిశ్చయించుకొని, సంస్కృతనాటక కర్తలను కాదను ధైర్యము లేక, చేసెడి ద్రవిడప్రాణాయాను వాదమే కాని, దీనిలో బలమేమున్నది? ఆంధ్రభారతాది గ్రంథము లందలి తేటగీతి పద్యములు వచనమువలెనే యున్నవా? సీసపద్యములుఁగూడ నట్లేనట. శ్రీనాథుని సీసపద్యములకుఁ గూడ నాగతియే పట్టించిరి. ఇది యపూర్వవాదమే. ఇవి రాగముతోఁ బాడఁగూడ దట. లక్ష్మీనరసింహంగారు రచించిన పాదుకాపట్టాభిషేక రాధాకృష్ణాది నాటకములలోని తేటగీతి పద్యములను వారు వచనములవలెనే వ్రాసినను, వానిని శ్రీ కపిలవాయి రామ నాథశాస్త్రి నాటకరంగస్థలమున మనోహర రాగములతోఁ బాడుట వలననే యా నాటకముల కామాత్రము ప్రజారంజకత్వ గౌరవములు గలిగి యాదరింపఁబడిన వని లోకము గ్రహించినను, రావుగారు మాత్ర మంగీకరించెడి వారు గారేమో? వీరి వచనతేటగీతికంటె నభ్యుదయ కవుల వచన కవిత్యము సహస్ర విధముల మేలు.

“పద్యాలు పాడే వృత్తాలలో ఉండరాదన్న పానుగంటి వారి సిద్ధాంతాన్ని కూడా ఆయన కొట్టివేశారు” అని వెనుక విశాలాంధ్రలో వ్రాసిన యనామక బుద్ధిశాలి నన్నభిక్షేపించినాడు. కాని పానుగంటి వారి వాదములో నింక సనేక దోషములు కెలికి యాయన యల్పజ్ఞతను బైటపెట్టినారు డా. గిడుగు సీతాపతిగా రింతకు చాలకాలము పూర్వమే. ఆంధ్ర పరిశోధక మహామండలి వారి పంచమవార్షికోత్సవ సంచిక (1922)లో (చూడుడు-పుట 42) “పానుగంటి లక్ష్మీనరసింహారావుగారు సాక్షిలోఁ జెప్పినట్లు ప్రకృతి ననుసరించి వ్రాసిన యెడల ఒక్క వచనము తప్ప నాటకమున వేరేమిన్నీ ఉపయోగించకూడదు. శ్రీపాద కామేశ్వర రావుగారు గద్యనాటకము కావలెనని మొట్టపెట్టి ఆంధ్రపత్రిక-సంవత్సరాది సంచికలో (1922) ఒక వ్యాసమును వ్రాసినారు. అయితే వీరు వ్రాసిన విషయములలో ఒకటి నాకు సమ్మతముగాదు. “ఈ రెండును (సంగీతశాస్త్ర పరిచితి, శ్రావ్యమైన కంఠధ్వని) బాగుగనుండు వారు నటవృత్తిలోఁ బ్రవేశించుట లేదు. కావునఁ దగిన వారలు సేకూగునంత దనుక సంగీతము జోలికి పోకుండుటయే శ్రేయము.” అని వారు వ్రాయుటచేత, బాగా పాడఁగలవారు నటకులలో నున్నప్పుడు సంగీత ముండవచ్చునని వారి యభిప్రాయ మైనట్లు కనఁబడుతూ ఉన్నది. లోకములో నే యే సమయములందు సంగీతమునకు అవకాశముంటూ ఉన్నదో ఆ యా సమయములు నాటకములోఁ గనఁబఱచి నప్పుడే సంగీతముండవచ్చును. కాని తక్కినచోట్ల ఉండనే కూడదని నాయభిప్రాయము. అనగా, వనవిహారము చేస్తూ చెలులతో కలసి నాయిక పాడవచ్చును. హరినామ కీర్తనము చేసేటప్పుడు ప్రహ్లాదుఁడు పాడుతూ సృత్యము చేయవచ్చును. పద్యములుండ వచ్చుననిన్నీ, ఆవి గద్యవలెనే చదువవచ్చుననిన్నీ, కామేశ్వర రావు గారంటున్నారు. నిషేధించవలసిన చోట ఈ యాజ్ఞ యెందుకో తెలియలేదు. “కవిత పద్యమునందే కాక, గద్యమునఁ గూడ కల”దని వారే వ్రాసినారు కదా. యతిప్రాస నియమములు గలిగి, గణబద్ధములైన వృత్తాది పద్యములు రాగము మాని చదివినంత మాత్రాన గద్యవలె ప్రకృతి

సిద్ధములు గావు. ఈ విషయమును గురించి పానుగంటి లక్ష్మీనరసింహా రావుగారు సాక్షిలో వ్రాసినది నాకు చాలామట్టుకు సంగీకారమే కాని వారున్న పద్యరచనా వ్యామోహమును పోగొట్టుకొన లేకున్నారు. తేటగీతి, సీనము, ఆటవెలది ఉండవచ్చునని వారి యభిప్రాయము. ఇవి ఇంగ్లీషులోని Blank verse వంటివని వీరనుకొంటున్నారు. “దీనికి Blank verse; ప్రతిబింబమైనది మన యాంధ్రభాషలో తేటగీతి కనబడుచున్నది. దీనికి తాళబంధము మిక్కిలి తక్కువగ గలదు. దీనికి జన్మసిద్ధమైన యొక్క నడక లేదు.” అని వ్రాసినారు. కాని వీరి వాక్యము విమర్శించవలసియున్నది. “Blank verse, on the analogy of Blank cartridge etc., might be held to designate any kind of verse not tipped, loaded or filled up with rhyme. As a matter of fact, however it is not usually applied to the more modern unrhymed experiments, from Collin's 'Evening' onwards, but is confined to continuous decasyllables” (Saintsbury: Manual of English prosody p. 273.) దీనిని బట్టి చూడగా యతిప్రాస నియమములు విడిచిపెట్టితేనే కాని Blank verse వంటి పద్యములు మన యాంధ్రభాషలో గలుగవు. Blank verse లో (rhythm) అనగా ‘తాళబంధంబు’ (నడక) లేక పోలేదు. కాని అది అతిగుప్తమై ఉంటుంది. పద్యమునకు సహజమైన నడక చెడగొట్టిన యెడల Blank Verse కాగలదని అనుకోగూడదు. Blank Verse కానిది rhyme గలది. నరసింహారావుగారి రెత్తి వ్రాసిన Addison's Spectator లోని భాగములో విషయము పూర్తిగా లేదు. మూలము తీసి మరి రెండు వాక్యములు చదివిన యెడల “I am therefore very much offended when I see a play in rhyme which is absurd in English.” అని కనబడును. Blank Verseలో ప్రాసవంటి rhyme నియమ ముండక గూడదు; యతివంటి Pause మారుతూ ఉండవలెను. నడక (rhythm) గుప్తముగా నుండవలెను. అటువంటి Blank Verse ఇంగ్లీషుభాషలో ప్రకృతిధర్మమును అనుసరించి ఉంటుంది. అటువంటి Blank Verse యతి (అక్షరమైతి) పాటించిన నరసింహారావుగారి సీనపద్యము, తేటగీతి, ఆట వెలది కాగలవా? ఈ సందర్భమున నరసింహారావుగారు వ్రాసిన వాక్యములలో మరికొన్ని విమర్శించవలసియున్నది.

“ ఆర్యాది వచన వైఖరి సహిత వృత్తములఁ గొన్నిటిలో మాత్రమే నాటకముల నుంచవలసిన ట్లుత్తమకవుల వ్రాతలఁబట్టి కనఁ బడుచుండగా, సరస కవితాశక్తి తక్కువ, శబ్దగుంభనా శక్తి యెక్కువ, కల తరువాత కవులు క్రమముగ శార్దూలమునకుఁ బిదప వసంతతిలకకు మంగళమహాశ్రీకి మహాస్రగ్ధరకు దిగి దిగి కలములను బారవైచి, తాళపుఁ జిప్పలు చేఁబూన సాహసించిరి ”. అని వ్రాయుట సాహసిక మైనది. ఆర్యావృత్తము వచనమువలె నుండు వృత్తమా ? ఇది కందము వంటిది. సంస్కృతనాటకాలలో గేయములకు తరుచుగా ఆర్యావృత్తములే నుపయోగించినారు. మొదటికవులును, ఉత్తరకవులున్నూ శార్దూలము, వసంతతిలక మొదలయిన వృత్తములను తమ నాటకాలలో వ్రాయలేదని సరసింహారావుగారెట్లు వ్రాయఁగలిగిరో? నాకు తెలియదు. భాసుని నాటకాలలోను, మృచ్ఛకటికలోను, కాళిదాసాది మహాకవుల నాటకాలలోను శార్దూల వసంతతిలకాది వృత్తము లేన్నో కలవు. తాళబంధ మెక్కువగాఁ గల వృత్తములు కదా ఉత్తమకవుల నాటకాలలో కనఁబడుతున్నవి. సంస్కృత నాటకములలో నున్న శ్లోకములు నటకులు నాటక మాడుతూ ఉన్నప్పుడు గద్యవలె చదివే వారో, పాడేవారో నిశ్చయముగా మన మిప్పుడు చెప్పలేము. కొన్ని వ్రాత ప్రతులలో నాటకములోని శ్లోకము లే రాగము ననుసరించి పాడితే ఇంపుగా ఉండునో సూచించినట్లు కనబడుతున్నది.

‘ పూర్వకాలపు అభిరుచి ఎట్లున్నా, పాటల నాటకముల కన్నను, పద్యముల నాటకముల కన్నను ’ గద్యనాటకములలో నాటకప్రయోజన మెక్కువగా నెరవేరు ననుటకు సందేహములేదు. “ ఇంగ్లీషు నాటకము లోని Blank Verse వంటిది తెలుగు నాటకములలో పెట్ట వలెనని సరసింహారావుగా రభిప్రాయపడుచున్నారు. నటకులు సులభముగా ముఖస్థము చేసుకొనుటకు అనుకూలమై యుండునన్న కారణముచేత గద్య కంటె Blank Verse వంటిది మేలైనదని చెప్పవచ్చును. వృత్తములు మొదలైన పద్యములకంటె, తేటగీతులలో తాళసంబంధము తక్కువగా నున్నది. నిజమేకాని, దానికి ‘ జన్మ సిద్ధమైన యొక్కనడక ’ లేక

పోలేదు. ఇదివరకు తెలుగు వారికి పరిచితిగల పద్యమేదిన్నీ Blank verse కాలేదు. ఇంగ్లీషువారికి పద్యములు పాడుకొనే ఆచారము లేదు. కాని, మనకు మాత్రము పద్యము లేదో యొకరాగము వరుసను పాడుకోవడము అలవాటయినది. కనుక, ఇదివరకు సుప్రసిద్ధమైన పద్యములను Blank verse గా నుపయోగించుకొనుటకు వీలులేదు. తాళ బంధము (rhythm) గుప్తమైయుండి, యతి (అక్షరమైతి) ప్రాసము లేక, లోకవ్యవహారమునకున్న, ప్రకృతిధర్మమునకున్న విరుద్ధము కాకుండ వచనమువలె అన్వయక్రమము గలిగి ఉండే Blank verse కావ సినయున్నది.”

డా. గిడుగు సీతాపతిగారి పై రచనమునుబట్టి, యాంగ్ల సంస్కృత ఛందోసంప్రదాయములు తెలియకుండ, కల్లబొల్లమాటలతో బూక రించి, తెలుగుఛందోవృత్తములకు దుర్యాఖ్యానము చేసి పా. లక్ష్మీనర సింహారావుగా రెట్లు జనుల పెడమార్గమునఁ బెట్ట చూచిరో స్పష్టము కదా. అట్టి వారిని విమర్శించినందులకు “పానుగంటి వారి సిద్ధాంతాన్నికూడా కొట్టిశారని” పై విశాలాంధ్ర వ్యాసకర్తయగు బుద్ధిమంతుడు బుద్ధిపోయి నన్ను ధిక్కరించినాడు. సినీమాగోడువారికి నాటకమీమాంస గోడేల? పైన జరిపిన మీమాంసను బట్టి (1) తాడిపత్రి రాఘవగారు నాటకరంగ స్థలమునుండి సంగీతమును బహిష్కరింపఁదలంప లేదు. భక్తి, సంతోషము, ప్రేమ, దీర్ఘాలోచనము-ఇవి యన్నియు సంగీతమునకు స్థానము నీయఁ గలిగినవిగా నుండవచ్చునను తన యభిప్రాయమునుఁ బట్టి నాటకమున పద్య సంగీతము లుండవలెనని వారంగీకరించిన నట్లే కద. (2) శ్రీపాద కామేశ్వరరావుగారు సంగీతశాస్త్ర పరిచితియు, శ్రావ్యకంఠధ్వనియు రెండును గలిగిన నటుఁడున్నచో నాటకమున సంగీతమును తన్నూలమున పద్యము లుండవచ్చునని సమ్మతించి నట్లే కద. (3) డా. గిడుగు సీతాపతిగారు, హరినామ సంకీర్తన, వన విహారాది సమయములలో సంగీతమును తన్నూలమున పద్యములు పాటలు నాటకమున నుండ వచ్చునని యామోదించిరి కద. దీని పర్యవసానము నాటకమునుండి సంగీత కవిత్వములు వేరుచేయరాదని

నిశ్చయింపవచ్చును. నాటకరచనలో ననుచిత పద్యరచనమును, రంగస్థలమున ననందర్భవు కూనిరాగములును గర్వింపఁదగిన వని యుండఱు సంగీకరింతురు.

నాటకమున పద్యములుండరాదనియు, నొకవేళ నుండినను వానిని వచనమువలెనే చదువవలయును గాని, రాగముతోఁ జూడరాదని భావించు నరసింహారావుగారి మతమునకుఁ జెందిన శ్రీపాద కామేశ్వర రావు, భమిడిపాటి కామేశ్వరరావుగార్లును నరసింహారావుగారివలె నిట్టి విచిత్రవాదమును మాత్రము చేయలేదు. అది యొక మేలు. భారత భాగవత రామాయణాది పురాణములు చెప్పు పౌరాణికులు పురాణము లందలి వచనములను గూడ పద్యములవలె సంగీతముతోఁ జదువుచుండగ, పీఠ పద్యములను గూడ వచనములవలె చదువవలెనని యనుశాసించు దురు. ఇక వీరి దృష్టిలో పద్యవచనములకు భేదమే యుండరాదు గాఁబోలు. వీరి సరసతయు, రజ్జునికతయు నిట్లుండగా నెవరేమి చేయఁ గలరు? 'లోకోభిన్నరుచింకదా. సంగీతమును నేర్చిన నటుల చపలస్వభా వముచేత కదా నాటకమున సంగీతమే యుండరాదనియు, దానికి దోహ దముచేయు పద్యములు పాటలు కూడ నుండరాదని యిట్టి వాదమునకు దారి తీసినది. నాటకప్రదర్శనమున కెంతమాత్రము సంగీతము కావలయునో విచారించి, తదనుగుణముగ ప్రయోగించు నిగ్రహము లేకపోవుటచేతనే కదా యిట్టి విపరీతవాదములకు దారి తీసినది. 1924-వ సం.లో భారత మునిబృందమును నేరుతో నొక నాటకకళాశాలను బెజవాడలో స్థాపించి, యందు నటులు శిక్షణ పొందినవారుకూడ, కళాశాల దాటివచ్చిన వెంటనే తమ సంగీతచాపల్యమును నాటకరంగస్థలముపైఁ జూపక పోలేదట. సంగీతజ్ఞానహూన్యతే నాటకరంగస్థలమున నెక్కువ రక్తిగట్టింపఁగలరు. నాటకప్రదర్శనమునకుఁ గావలసిన సంగీతపరిజ్ఞానము బహుస్వల్పము మాత్రమే. అది శ్రావ్యముగా నర్థవంతముగా పద్యము చదవఁగల్గుట మాత్రమే. అంతకంటె సధికముగాని, తక్కువగాని సహించరాదు. నాటకమున పద్యములను పరిత్యజించినచో నందు రమణీయార్థ ప్రతి పాదకత్వము లోపించి, కావ్యత్వమే భ్రంశమగును. పద్యహీనమైన

నాటకప్రదర్శనమున సంగీతమునకు పరిపూర్ణ బహిష్కారము గలుగుట వలన, హృదయరంజకత్వము విడనాడి యది చప్పగ, నీరసముగ నుండుటచే, పేక్షకుల నాకర్షింపలేదు. కాన కవిత్వ సంగీతములు రెండు నభినయమునకు సాయపడి నాటకకళను సమగ్రము చేయవలెను. ఆంధ్రసారస్వతము సంస్కృత సాహిత్య సంప్రదాయములో నన్నయనాట నుండి పుట్టి పెరిగినది. వంద సంవత్సరముల నుండి మాత్రము పాశ్చాత్యసాహిత్య ప్రభావము తెలుగుపై నెరవుచున్నది. కాన స్థిరపడిన సంప్రదాయానుగుణముగ నాంగ్లసాహిత్య ప్రభావమును తెలుగున నిలుపుకొనవలెఁగాని, నూతన సంప్రదాయములను బలవంతముగా ప్రవేశపెట్టినచో వికటించి రసాభాసమగును.

నాటకభేదము ననుసరించి గానము వానిలో ప్రధాన స్థానముల నాక్రమించుచున్నది. 'అపెరా' అను నాటకజాతిలో పద్యరూపము లనే సంభాషణములుండి జంత్రగాత్రములతో పాడఁబడును. ఇందు భావగీతములును, నృత్యములును ముఖ్యాంగములుగ నుండును. దీనిలో గానము ప్రధానస్థాన మాక్రమించును. ఉదా: గీతగోవిందము ఇట్టిది. ఇది గేయమయ రూపకము. 'మెలో డ్రామా'లో మామూలు నాటకమందలి వాచకముతోఁ బాటు పాటలు, పద్యములు జంత్రసంగీతమును జేరును. ఇది నాటకమునకును అపెరాకును మధ్యస్థ రచనముగా నుండును. కాన దీనిలోఁగూడ సంగీతముండును గాని, అపెరాలో నుండునంత విశేషముగా నుండదు. ధర్మవరం కృష్ణమాచార్యులవారి గద్య పద్య గేయాత్మక నాటకము లీ మెలో డ్రామాజాతిలోఁ జేరును. ఇఁక, వాచిక ముపయోగింపకుండ, తమ నోటితో గాత్రసంగీతము పాడకుండ, నేపథ్యమందు వాయింపఁబడు జంత్రగాత్ర సంగీతమున కనుకూలముగ నృత్యాభినయ మొనర్చెడి పాత్రలతోఁ గూడిన రూపకము 'బాలెట్టు' అందురు. ఇది మలయాళుల 'కథకళి' వంటిది. మన యక్షగానములు బాలెట్టు - ఆపెరాలకంటె విశిష్టమైనవి. బాలెట్టులో పాత్రలు మూకాభినయము మాత్రము చేయఁబడఁగా, యక్షగానమందు గాత్రసంగీతమునుగూడ పాత్రలు చేయుదురు. ఆపెరాలో వాచకము

నకు స్థానము లేకపోగా, యక్షగానమున వాచకమునకుకూడ మంచి స్థానము గలదు. ఇక నాటకమున, పాశ్చాత్యులలో పద్యములున్నను వానిని వచనమువలె చదువుదురు కాన, సంగీతమునకందు స్థానము లేదు. కాని మనము పద్యములను రాగధోరణిలో చదువుదుము గాన సంగీతము నకుఁగూడ నందు కొంత స్థానమున్నది. పాటలకు సంస్కృతనాటకము లలో స్థానము లేకపోయినను, తెలుఁగు నాటకములలో మొట్టమొదట ధార్వాడ నాటకమువారి పార్షీనాటక ప్రభావమువలన పాటలు మొచ్చు కొనఁబడి, బళ్లారివారి నాటకముల మూలమున ప్రవేశించి, గున్నేశ్వర రావు కంపెనీలోని బాపట్ల కాంతయ్యగారి వలన ప్రచారమొంది, మైలవరం కంపెనీవారివలన మితిమీరి స్థిరపడిపోయినవి. కాన నాటకమున సంగీత మప్రధానమై స్వల్పముగా నుండును. కాని పూర్తిగా లోపింపదు. ఈ సందర్భమున ముఖ్యముగ గమనింపఁ దగిన విషయ మొకటియున్నది. నాటకమున నటులు పద్యములను శ్రావ్యముగాఁ జదువునపుడు వారి కంఠధ్వనిని మించునట్టి హోర్మోనియం మ్రోతను పరిజ్యజింపవలెను. హోర్మోనియంతోపాటు తపలానుగూడ పరిహరింప వలెను. ఆంధ్రనాటకారంభదశలో ధార్వాడ, పార్షీనాటక కంపెనీల ననుకరించుచు ప్రవేశపెట్టఁబడిన నుష్టజంత్ర పరికరము లివి రెండును. ఇవి పామరులలో నాదరము సంపాదించుకొనినను, వీని మ్రోత దుస్సహ మైనది. నాగరికులు, సుకుమారహృదయులు దీని మ్రోత భరింప లేరు. వీని స్థానమున శాస్త్రీయసంగీత వాద్య విశేషములగు ఫిడేలు, మద్దెలను వాడుకొని, రెండురంగముల మధ్యకాలమున లలితమనోహర మైన సేవధ్యవాద్య సంగీతమును ప్రవేశపెట్టిన నెంతయో హృద్యముగ నుండి సామాజికుల నాకర్షించును. ఆంధ్రనాటకరంగమునఁ జేయవలసిన ముఖ్య సంస్కరణ మిది. నాటకమున సంగీత మెంత దుర్వినియోగము చేయబడి మర్యాద నతిక్రమించి ప్రకృతవిరుద్ధముగా ఘన్నదో పాను గంటి లక్ష్మీనరసింహారావుగారు తమ 'సాక్షి'లో తెలియఁజేసినారు. నాటకము మూఁడు గంటల నేపాడినపుడు, సుమారు రెండు గంటలన్నర కాలము హోర్మోనియం నాదము వినఁబడుచునే యుండును. నాటకము

చూడవచ్చిన వారిలో చాలామందికి పద్యముల యర్థము తెలియనే తెలియదు. తక్కిన వారికైనా వాని యర్థము స్పష్టము కాదు.

నాటకమున పద్యములు మానివేసి వచనముతోడనే సంభాషణ మంతయు జరుపుటయే కాక, యందలి పాత్రలు వాడు భాష గ్రాంథిక మైనచో నది కృత్రిమభాష యనియు, వ్యావహారికభాష జీవవంతమైన

సర్వత్రా వ్యావహారిక
భాష పనికిరాదు

దనియు వాదించి, ముఖ్యపాత్రములకుఁ గూడ పచ్చి వ్యావహారికభాషయే వాడఁబడినది. అంద్రనాటక ప్రారంభదశలో నీచపాత్రలకుఁ

గూడ గ్రాంథికభాషయే యుపయోగింపఁబడుటచే నసహజముగా గోచ రించెడిది. కందుకూరి వీశేశలింగంగారి యభిజ్ఞాన శాకుంత లాంధ్రీకరణ మున పల్లెవాఁడు గ్రాంథికభాషలో మాట్లాడుట గాంచినపుడు, 'వీఁడె పుడు బాలవ్యాకరణము చదువు కొనెనురా' యనిపించును. దానికి ప్రతీ కారముగఁ గాఁబోలు ప్రస్తుతకాలమున నాయకపాత్రములకుఁ గూడ పచ్చి వ్యావహారికభాష వాడఁబడుచున్నది. ఇందుచే నాయకపాత్రమునకుఁ గల యుదాత్తత నాశనమై, నీచపాత్రయు, నాయకపాత్రయు నొక్కటే దశయందున్నట్లు గోచరించుచున్నది. ఇది మాత్రము కృత్రిమమై యసహజముగ నుండదా? నీచనాయకపాత్ర లిద్దరు గ్రాంథికభాషలోనే మాట్లాడుట యెట్లసహజముగ నుండునో, వారిద్దరుగూడ పచ్చివ్యావ హారికభాషలో మాట్లాడుటకూడ నట్లే యసహజముగ గోచరింపక మానదు. నీచనాయక పాత్రముల భేదము భావములలోను, ప్రవర్తన లోను స్పష్టమగునటుల, భాషలోఁగూడ స్పష్టమగు చుండవలెను. చతుర్విధాభినయములలో వాచకాభినయమునకుఁ జెందినది భాష కదా. భావమును బట్టి భాషలో నుదాత్తానుదాత్త స్వరిత భేదాదులను ప్రతిపా దించుట మాత్రమే కాక, నీచప్రధాన పాత్రములకుఁగల భేదము వ్యావహారిక గ్రాంథిక భాషాప్రయోగ భేదముచేఁగూడ స్పష్టపఱుప వలసియున్నది. ఇట్టి భేదము లేక ప్రధానపాత్రములకు పచ్చివ్యావ హారికభాష యొక్కటే వాడఁబడుటచే నాటకప్రదర్శనమున గాంభీర్యము చచ్చిపోయి చప్పచప్పగా నుండినది. సాధారణముగ నీచపాత్రముల

కంటే నాయకపాత్ర ముదాత్త భావములను వ్యక్తీకరించునని మనము భావింపవచ్చును. సీచభావములు వ్యావహారికభాషలో వ్యక్తీకరింపఁ బడుట యెట్లుచితముగా నుండునో, యుదాత్తభావములు గంభీరముగా నుండును గాన, నవి గ్రాంథికభాషలో వ్యక్తీకరింపఁబడినపు డుచితముగా నుండునే కాని, వ్యావహారికభాషలో పేలవముగా నుండక తప్పదు. అందుచేతనే పాత్రోచిత భాషాభేదము సిద్ధింపఁగలదు. కేడియో నాటకములలో పాత్రముల సీచప్రధాన భేదము ధ్వని మూలముననే గుర్తింపవలయును కాన, నందీ గ్రాంథిక వ్యావహారిక భాషాప్రయోగము లెంతయేనియు నవసరమగును.

పాత్రోచితభాష విషయము వచ్చినపుడు పూర్వనాటకము లలోఁ గూడ నిది యొక బహుక్లిష్ట సమస్యగ పరిణమించినది. ఈ సందర్భమున డా. గిడుగు సీతాపతిగారు వెనుక డెలిపిన వ్యాసముననే యిట్లు వ్రాయుచున్నారు.

పాత్రోచిత భాష

“నాటకాలలోని భాష ప్రకృతిధర్మమునకు విరుద్ధము గాకుండా పాత్రోచితమై యుండవలెనా, ఉండ నక్కర లేదా? అనే విషయము చాలా ముఖ్యమైనది. నాటకాలలో వ్యావహారికభాషకు, గ్రామ్య భాషకు ప్రయోజనము చూపించిన వారిలో మొదటివారు వేదము వేంకట్రాయ శాస్త్రిగారు. తమ ప్రతాపరుద్రీయములోను, బొబ్బిలి నాటకములోను పాత్రోచితభాష కొంతవరకైనా ప్రయోగించడమే కాదు. తమవలెనే ‘గ్రామ్యము’ వాడిన విక్రమ దేవవర్మగారిని మెచ్చు కొన్నారు. శ్రీనివాసకల్యాణనాటకణమును గూర్చి శాస్త్రిగారు తమ యభిప్రాయమును తెలియఁ జేసినపుడు “I admire your boldness displayed in assigning gramya for the lower characters” అని వ్రాసినారు. ఇందుకు సంతోషమే కాని శాస్త్రిగారు వాడుక చేసినది ఎంతవరకు పాత్రోచితమైనదో చూడవలెను. బొబ్బిలినాటకములోను, ప్రతాప రుద్రీయములోను నాలుగు విధములైన భాష కనిపిస్తూ ఉన్నది.

(1) గ్రాంథికము (2) ఉత్తమ జాతివారి వ్యావహారికము (3) గ్రామ్యము (4) తురక - తెలుఁగు. బొబ్బిలినాటకములో హైదరుజంగుకు తురక

తెలుఁగున్ను, బుస్సీకి గ్రాంథికమున్ను ప్రయోగించిన శాస్త్రిగారు ఏ సంప్రదాయమును అనుసరించినారో తెలియదు. ప్రతాపరుద్రీయములో రాజుగారు, రాణిగారు, సోమయాజులుగారు గ్రాంథికభాష మాట్లాడఁ గలరు ; కాని సోమిదేవమ్మ వ్యావహారికభాష గాని, గ్రాంథికము మాట్లాడ లేదు. సంస్కృతనాటక సంప్రదాయము చూస్తే రాణిగారు కూడ సోమిదేవమ్మగారి వలెనే వ్యావహారికభాష మాట్లాడ వలసి యుండును. లేదా ఎపరిభాష వారిదే అంటే, సోమిదేవమ్మగారికి రాని గ్రాంథికభాష రాణిగారికి మాత్రమెట్లు వచ్చియుండును ?

“ వేదం వెంకట్రాయశాస్త్రిగారిని చూచి కొంతమంది తురక-తెలుఁగు నాటకాలలో ప్రయోగించడము నేర్చుకొన్నారు. వీరిలో ఇచ్చాపురపు యజ్ఞనారాయణగా రొకరు. అయితే శాస్త్రిగారి పక్కికిన్ని, వీరి పక్కికిన్ని కొంత భేదమున్నది. సుల్తాను మొదలు సిపాయి వరకు శురకలందరికిన్ని ఒకరీతి తురక-తెలుఁగే శాస్త్రిగారు వాడినారు. యజ్ఞనారాయణగారు మాత్రము తమ రసపుత్రవిజయములో ఔరంగ జేబుకున్ను, అక్కరుకున్ను గ్రాంథికమున్ను పద్యములున్ను, తక్కిన వారికి తురక-తెలుఁగున్ను కూర్చినారు. ఔరంగజేబు మహాజీ యని సెయిస్థఖానును బిలిచి గౌరవించుచుండే వాడు కదా. అటువంటి సెయిస్థఖానుకు రాని గ్రాంథికము బాలుఁడైన ఆక్కరు కేలాగు వచ్చి ఉండెనో ! ఈ నాటకములలోని తురక-తెలుఁగు కృతకభాషే. కాని ప్రకృతిధర్మము ననుసరించి లేదు. ధర్మవరం కృష్ణమాచార్యులగారు తమ ప్రహ్లాదవాటకములో “ నాకు ఎలు చెప్పల్యా దొందుపాతలు వచ్చు ” అని ఉచ్చారణ సౌష్ఠ్యము లేక మాట్లాడుతూ చంటిబిడ్డడై ఉన్న ప్రహ్లాదుని చేత దీర్ఘసమాసములుగల పాటలు పాడించినారు !

“ పాత్రోచితభాష రసోత్పత్తికి సాధనము కాగలదని రసజ్ఞులకు తెలిసిన విషయమే. నాటకకర్తలలో చాలమంది ‘పాత్రోచితభాష ప్రయోగించుటకే ప్రయత్నిస్తున్నారు ; కాని, వారి ప్రయత్నము కొన్ని పాత్రల భాషలోనే కనఁబడుతున్నది. నాటకమందు పూర్తిగా

పాత్రోచితభాష ప్రయోగించుట మంచిది. నాటకకర్త తన నాటకము లోని పాత్రలకు సమమైనవారు తన కాలమునాటి యాంధ్రులలో నెటు వంటివారై యుండురో చూచుకొని వారు వ్యవహరించే భాష ఔచిత్యని బట్టిన్ని, కవినమయ న్యాయమును (convention) బట్టిన్ని కొంతమట్టుకు మెఱుగుపెట్టి ప్రయోగించిన యెడల నాటక ప్రయోజనము సార్థకము కాగలదని నా నమ్మకము.”

ఇటువంటి యాక్షేపణల కవకాశములు నాటకములలోఁ గలుగు చున్నవి. సంస్కృతనాటకములలో కథలు పురాణాంతర్గతములే యగుటచే, నందలి ప్రధానపాత్రములకు సంస్కృతభాషయు నితరులకు వివిధ ప్రాకృతభాషలను వాడుట సంప్రదాయమైనది. ఆంధ్రనాటకములలో కథ లాంధ్ర దేశీయములై నప్పు డందలి ప్రధానాంధ్ర పాత్రముల కాంధ్ర భాషయు, నొకవేళ తురకపాత్రములున్న వారికి తురక - తెలుఁగు వాడుట పాత్రోచిత భాషయనఁబడినది. ప్రతాపరుద్రీయాది నాటకములలో నది చెల్లిపోయి హృద్య మనిపించినది. ఆంధ్రనాటకములలో నాంధ్రేతరులగు తురకలకు తురక - తెలుఁగు వాడఁబడినట్లుగా, బొబ్బిలి నాటకములో బుస్సీకి శ్రేణి - తెలుఁగు వాడఁబడవలె యథార్థమునకు. కాని యట్లు వాడఁబడలేదు. కాని ప్రతాపరుద్రీయ రచనకాలమునకు సమకాలముననే గురజాడ అప్పారావుగారిచే వ్రాయఁబడిన కన్యాశుల్కములో గిరీశమునకు ఇంగ్లీషు - తెలుఁగు వాడఁబడినది. అతఁడు పాశ్చాత్యుడు కాక పోయిననుకూడ. ప్రతాపరుద్రీయమును జూచి యితర నాటకములలో తురక - తెలుఁగు వాడఁబడినట్లే, కన్యాశుల్కమునుఁ జూచి యింగ్లీషు - తెలుఁగు భారతీయపాత్రలకే ధారాళముగ నాటకములలో వాడఁబడుచున్న దిప్పడిప్పడు. కాని యింగ్లీషు పాత్రములకు ఇంగ్లీషు - తెలుఁగు వాడఁబడిన నాటకము గనఁబడుట లేదు. అట్టి పాత్రములుగల నాటకము లేకుండుటయే దీనికి కారణము. ఈ పద్ధతి ప్రకారము రసపుత్రవిజయములో చిల్లర తురకపాత్రములకు తురక - తెలుఁగు వాడఁబడినట్లుగా ఔరంగజేబు, అకబరులకు కూడ తురక - తెలుఁగు వాడఁబడిన బాగుగనే యుండును. కాని కథానాయకుడగు

రాజసింహునకు, కథానాయిక యగు విమలకు, నితర రాజపుత్రులగు తాకూరు దుర్గాదాసు మొదలైన వారి కేయుత్తర దేశభాషతోనో కలిసిన తెలుగునే వాడవలయునా కాదా? ఈ నాటకములో శుద్ధాంధ్ర పాత్ర మొక్కటి కూడ లేదు. కాన నాటకమంతయు సంకర తెలుగు భాషతో నిండియుండును. ఇది క్లిష్ట సమస్యయే యగును. కాన నితివృత్త మే యాంధ్రేతర మైనప్పు డందలి ప్రధానపాత్రములకైనను శుద్ధాంధ్రమును వాడక పోయినచో నది యాంధ్రనాటకమనే యనిపించుకొనదు. అందుచే రసపుత్రవిజయ కర్త ప్రధానపాత్రములకు శుద్ధాంధ్రమును వాడి, చిల్లర పాత్రలకు మిశ్రాంధ్రమును వాడియుండును. అప్పుడును విమల చెలి కత్తెలకును కేసరికి నే భాష వాడవలయును? వారి కుత్తరదేశ భాషతో మిశ్రమైన తెలుగు వాడనిచో, చిల్లర తురకపాత్రలకు తురక - తెలుగు వాడుటలో నేమి యకాచిత్యమున్నది? ఈ రీతిగ రోషనారానాటక ములో శివాజీ కే భాష వాడవలయును? రోషనార కే భాష వాడవల యును? వారిద్దరకు తెలుగుతో సంబంధమే లేదు కదా! రసపుత్ర విజయ నాటక పాత్రములవలె రామదాసునాటకమున తానేమాకు తురక - తెలుగు వాడఁబడినది. అది బాగుగనే యున్నది. అందలి యితివృత్త మాంధ్రదేశకథ కనుక. విజయనగర రాజ్యపతన నాటకమునఁ గూడ నితి వృత్తము ఆంధ్రదేశీయమే. కాని యందు రామరా జాంధ్రుడైనను ప్రధానపాత్రులగు పతానును, ఆమాబీయు తురకవారు కదా. వారికి తురక - తెలుగు వాడలేదు కవి. కాన పాత్రోచిత భాష లేదీ నాటక మున నని చెప్పవలయునా, వలదా? ప్రధానపాత్రములకు సంకర తెలుగు వాడుట రసపోషకమా, రసాభాసమా? అని విచారింపఁదగినది. ఆంధ్రేతి వృత్తము గల విజయనగరరాజ్యపతనముననే యిట్లైనప్పుడు, ఇతివృత్త మాంధ్రదేశీయము కాని రసపుత్రవిజయములో ప్రధానపాత్రములగు ఔరంగజీబు ఆకబరులకు శుద్ధాంధ్రము వాడుటలో దోషమేమి? అట్లే రోషనారానాటకములో శివాజి రోషనారలకు కూడ కదా?

ప్రాచీన నాటకకర్తలు నాటకరచనకుఁ గావలయు నలంకరణము లను, సాధనములను పరిశోధనము చేసి, యేర్చి, కూర్చుకొనినారు. అట్టి

వానిలో దీర్ఘస్వగత మొకటి. దీనివలన నాటకమునకు పొంకము, పాత్ర
 దీర్ఘ స్వగతాలు శీలమునకు గాంభీర్యమును గల్గించును. కాని
 యాధునిక నాటకకర్త లిది యసహజమునే
 దృష్టితో నాటకమునుండి దీనిని తీసి పారవేసినారు. ఎంత యస్వభావమని
 దీనిని తీసివేసినను పాత్రస్వభావమును వ్యక్తీకరించుట కిదియే ముఖ్య
 సాధనమైనదని ప్రాచ్యపాశ్చాత్య నాటకకర్తలు గ్రహించినారు. షేక్స్పి
 యరు నాటకములలో నిది యెంతయో వన్నె తెచ్చినది. సామాన్యముగా
 ప్రతిమానవుడు నోదో యొక క్లిష్ట సందిగ్ధ పరిస్థితిలో నున్నప్పుడు
 నొంటరిగా తన పూర్వాపర పరిస్థితులను, సాధక బాధకములను తలచు
 కొని 'కర్తుం, న కర్తుం, అస్వభా కర్తుం వా' అని కర్తవ్యము నాలోచించు
 కొనుట సహజము. ఇది ప్రతిమానవుడును తన స్వానుభవమువలన,
 స్వబుద్ధి ప్రమాణమువలన సిద్ధాంతము చేసికొనవచ్చును. ఇది తన
 మనస్సులో జరుగు రహస్యవ్యాపారమే కాని బహిరంగముగా నితరులతోఁ
 జెప్పఁ దగినది కాదు. కనుక బైటకు చెప్పఁబడదు. బైటకు చెప్పట
 మాత్ర మసహజ మనుటలో సందేహము లేదు. నాటకము మానవజీవిత
 ప్రతిపాదనము గాన, విశ్వజీవనమైన యీ మానవజీవిత విశేషమును
 నాటకమున ప్రవేశపెట్టి కళాకార్యము నిలుపఁబడినది. కాని యీ స్వగత
 వాక్యములు పాత్ర పెదవులనుండి బైటకు వ్యక్తీకరింపఁబడును గాన, నిది
 యసహజమని స్వభావవాదుల సమర్థనము. యథార్థమున కిది నాటక
 మందలి యితరపాత్రల కెవ్వరికిని వినకుండుటకే యిది యుద్దేశించినది.
 సామాజికులు విందురు కదా యందురా ? సామాజికులు సర్వము విను
 చునే యుందురు. వారు వినరాని దేదియు నుండదు. ఈ స్వగతముల
 వలన సామాజికులకు కథ స్పష్టముగ విశదము కాఁగలదు. ఇక
 నభినయదృష్ట్యా యిది ప్రదర్శనమును రక్తికట్టించి, నటుని యభినయ
 సామర్థ్యమును బైటపెట్టును. ఈ స్వగత విశేషములనుగూర్చి వెనుక
 నుదాహరించిన కృష్ణాపత్రిక వ్యాసములో డా. కె. గంగాధరరావుగారే
 యిట్లు వ్రాయుచున్నారు. "స్వగతం లేకుండా వ్రాయఁబూనటం చాలా
 కష్టమైన పని. ఒక్కమాట స్వగతంలో అనిష్టిస్తే సరిపోయే విషయం,

ఒక సన్నివేశం ద్వారా చెప్పాల్సి వస్తుంది. దీనిక రచయిత ఎంతో ప్రతిభావంతుడవాలి. రచయిత ప్రతిభను బయటపెట్టే ఈ స్వగతవు లోపం కొంతవరకూ నటకునకు ద్రోహం చేసిందని చెప్పాలి. స్వగతం అసహజం గనుక తీసి పారవెయ్యటమే మంచిది. కాని ఈ స్వగతం నటించి నటకుడు తన శక్తిని నిరూపించుకోవటానికి అవకాశం ఉండేది. పెద్ద నటకు లందరూ ఈ స్వగతాలు బాగా నటించి పేరు తెచ్చుకున్నవారే. 'చిత్రాంగి' నాటకములో ఆఖరిరంగం స్థానంవారు ప్రత్యేకం వ్రాయించు కున్నది. అట్లాగే యడవల్లివారికి దుర్యోధనసాత్రమునకు ద్రాపదీ వస్త్రాపహరణములో మయనభ స్వగతం పేరు చెప్పించి. రంగూన్ రాడీలో ఆఖరి వచ్చాత్తాపం దొమ్మేటిని మేటిని చేసింది. 15-20 నిమిషాలనేవు రంగస్థలమంతా ఆక్రమించి, నటకుడు ప్రేక్షకుల హృదయంమీద హత్తుకొనిపోయేవాడు. ఆధునికులకు ఈ అవకాశం లేకుండా పోయి, వారెంత చక్కని నటన చూపినా, ప్రేక్షకుల హృదయాలు చూరగొనలేక పోతున్నారు. కనుక ఆధునిక నాటక రచయితలుగూడాయిది గుర్తించి, స్వగతవు రూపంలో కాకపోయినా, ఎక్కువభాగం చిన్న చిన్న సంభాషణలతో చకచక నడిచే సంభాషణలతో నాటకం నడిపినా, నటకుడు స్వేచ్ఛగా తన సామర్థ్యం చూపటానికి అనుకూలంగా పెద్ద సంభాషణలు కూడా అక్కడక్కడా వుంచటం మంచిది," ఈ రచనలో వ్యాసకర్త నిష్కాపట్యమును, సంతరాత్మశుద్ధిని నే నభినందించుచును. ఎంత పిడివాదము చేసినను'దీర్ఘ స్వగతమురచన ప్రదర్శనము'లలోని నాటక కళాశక్తిని చక్కగ గుర్తించి, యది లేని లోపమును గ్రహించి, యధార్థమును వచింపఁగలిగినాడు. అంతయే చాలు. ఇటువంటి నాటకావయవమును కత్తిరించి నాటకము రక్తి కట్టుట లేదని విచారపడి లాభమేమి? నాటకకర్త నటుడుగూడ నైనపుడే యా నాటకము ప్రయోగానుగుణ్యముగ నుండునని నవీనులు వాదింతురే, నటనా సౌకర్యమును సంహరించు స్వగతలోపమును వారు గుర్తింపక, స్వభావవాదమును పట్టుకొని దేవు లాడుటలో ప్రయోజనమేమి? షేక్స్పియరు నాటకములలోఁ గూడ నీ దీర్ఘస్వగతములే (Soliloquy) రక్తి కటించినవి కదా.

స్వభావవాదమును తెగ పెంచుకొని చేసిన సంస్కరణములలో నాటకరంగమున స్త్రీల పాత్రములను స్త్రీలే ధరింపవలె ననుట. నీతి వాదమును పురస్కరించుకొని స్త్రీల నైతిక ప్రవర్తనమున కిది తగదని కొందఱు నిషేధించిరి. కాని ప్రస్తుతకాలమున నెవరి నైతిక ప్రవర్తనమునకు వారే బాధ్యులు కావలసిన స్థితి వచ్చినపుడు నిషేధము వారి నరికట్టలేదు. స్త్రీల దుష్ప్రవర్తనమునకు నాటక రంగప్రవేశము మాత్రమే దోహదము కాఁజాలదు. అగుచో వారు కళాప్రవీణులై పురుషులతో సమానముగ ధైర్యసాహసములతో నభినయింపఁగలిగినచో నాటక కళోద్ధరణమగును కదా యని సంతృప్తి చెందవచ్చును. కాని యట్టి దేదియు లేక, వినోదము కొఱకు స్త్రీలను రంగస్థలముపైకి నెక్కించుట మాత్రము కళకు నిరుపయోగమే యగును. మానవులలో నే జాతిలోనైన లలిత కళాసిద్ధి జన్మవిశేషముచేతనే ఫలించును. కాని కేవలము సాధనచే సాధ్యమగునది కాదు. సాధన మభివృద్ధిచేసికొనుటకు మాత్రమే యుపయోగపడును. అది నూటికి కోటికి యొకరికి మాత్రమే సఫలమగును. మిగిలిన వారికిది బులబాటము మాత్రమే తీర్చఁగలదు. గాత్రసంగీతము నేర్చిన వారిలో నెంతమంది శ్రీమతి డి. కె. పట్టమాళ్వలె పాడఁగలరు? ఫిడేలు వాద్యసంగీతము నేర్చినవారిలో నెంతమంది మైసూరు చౌడయ్య, ద్వారం వెంకటస్వామినాయుడుగార్లవలె కమాను వేయఁగలరు? భరతనాట్య మభ్యసించిన వారిలో కుమారి కమలవలె నెంతమంది దభినయింపఁగలరు? నటులలో నెంతమంది బల్లారి రాఘవాచారి, ఈవని లక్ష్మణస్వామిగార్లవలె నటించగలరు? అయితే మిగిలిన వారి సంగతి యేమిటనగా, వారందఱు యా శాస్త్రములందు, కళలందు నభినవేశము, నభిరుచి, యభిమానము, ప్రవేశముగలవారని మాత్రమే చెప్పవలయును. నేటికాలమున నౌత్సాహిక నాటక సమాజము లెన్నియున్నవి. అందలి నటులు వేలకుపై గానున్నారని కదా. 1958 సం. డిశెంబరు నాట్యకళాపత్రిక సంపాదకీయమగు 'పునరుజ్జీవనోద్యమ'మును వ్యాసములో 'విశాలాంధ్ర అంతటా కొన్ని వందల మంది నాటకరంగంలో పాత్ర వహిస్తున్నారని వ్రాయఁబడినది.

స్త్రీ పాత్రను స్త్రీయే ధరింపవలెనా?

ఆ నటులందఱు నాట్యకళాసిద్ధిపొందిన వారని చెప్పజాలము కదా. వీరిలో నే స్వల్పసంఖ్యాకులో మాత్రమే కళాసిద్ధిని పొందినవారై, మిగిలిన వారందఱు నాట్యకళాభిమానులనియే చెప్పవలయును. మఱియు నాటక కళాసిద్ధి నటుల యధికసంఖ్యమీద కూడ నాధారపడియుండదు. 'నిక్కమైన మంచినీల మొకటిచాలు, తఱుకు బెఱుకు రాళ్లు తట్టెడేల' అని కదా పెద్దలవాక్యము. నటులు వేలకొలదిగ నున్నను, ప్రత్యేక వ్యక్తిత్వము గల ప్రశస్తనటులు కొలదిమంది మాత్రమే యుండి, వారి విశిష్టాభి నయమువలన నాటకప్రదర్శనమున కంతయుఁ పేరువచ్చును. వారిపేరు ప్రఖ్యాతులు నలుగడల వ్యాపింపఁగ, నితరులు వారి ననుకరింపఁజూతురు. వారు నాట్యకళా గురువులువంటి వారగుదురు. వారి యభినయ విశేషములను తిలకించుటకు ప్రత్యేకముగ పనికట్టుకొని 'ప్రేక్షకులే కాక, సామాన్యనటులు గూడ వారి నాటకప్రదర్శనములకుఁబోవుటకు కుతూహలపడుదురు. ఇది సహజమే కాని దోషమందు లేదు. ఆ ప్రదర్శనము లలో ప్రసిద్ధనటుల వ్యక్తిత్వము ప్రకటితమగుటయే కాక, తదితరనటులు గూడ సముచితముగ నటించిననే కాని యా ప్రసిద్ధనటుల యభినయ విశేషములు రాణింపవు. కాని కంట్రాక్టునాటకములలో మాత్రము ముఖ్యపాత్రధారులు క్రొత్తవారగుటచే మిగిలినవారితో కలిసికట్టుగ నభినయింప లేకపోవుటచేతను, నా నటశ్రేణులు సమష్టి నాటకరక్తి యందుకంటె తమ వ్యక్తిత్వము నెరవేర్చుకొనుటయందె శ్రద్ధ వహించుటచేత నా నాటకములు జయప్రదములు కాకపోయినను, వ్యక్తి నటుల యభినయవిశేషములు మెప్పు పొందెడివి. ఇది యా వ్యక్తి నటుల దోషము కాదు కదా. కంట్రాక్టర్ల దోషము. ఇంత మాత్రముచే నటుల వ్యక్తిత్వము ప్రకటితమగు ప్రదర్శనము దోషమని భావింపరాదు. మంచి కలసి కట్టు తనమున్నను నాటకప్రదర్శనమున నభినయవిశేషము లతో ప్రధానపాత్రధారులగు ప్రసిద్ధనటుల వ్యక్తిత్వము ప్రకటితము గానిచో నాటకము రాణింపజాలదు. నటుల వ్యక్తిత్వము మరుగు పడఁగలదా? ప్రతిభ ప్రకాశింపక తప్పదు. కాన ప్రస్తుతకాలమున నౌత్సాహిక నాటకములలో వ్యక్తిత్వప్రదర్శనము లేదనియు, కలసి కట్టు

పనియే గోచరించుననియు గర్వపడుటలో నర్థములేదు. రెండును ముఖ్యముగా కావలసినవే. కాని ప్రేక్షకజనము కోరికమీద పద్యముల మరియొకమారు పాడుట (once more) గాని, వేరు నాటకములలోని పద్యములను సామాజికుల ప్రీత్యర్థము రంగస్థలమున పాడి వ్యక్తిత్వమును సంపాదించుట కాని చేయు నటులు గర్వింపఁదగినవారే.

కాని సర్కసులో కోఁతి బైస్కిలు త్రొక్కువినోదమును జూచుటకై ప్రేక్షకులు పోవునట్లుగ, పరపురుషులతోఁగలసి స్త్రీ నాటకరంగమున వర్తించు వినోదమును జూచుటకై గుంపులుగూడి జనులు పోవుట నాటకకళోద్ధరణము కాఁజాలదు. స్త్రీ చేసిన ప్రతిచేష్టయు స్త్రీ పాత్రకుచితమైన యభినయమే యని యానటి భావించినచో నా నాటకము భగ్నమైనటులే తలంపవలె. అట్టి స్వభావస్త్రీ నటులకంటె స్త్రీ పాత్రధారణకు పురుషనటులే సహస్ర విధముల మేలు. పురుషులు స్త్రీ వేషములను ధరించినపుడు కొఙ్జాలవలెఁ గనిపించుదురని కొందఱు నవీనులు తలఁచుదురు. కాని యది యథార్థముగాదు. స్త్రీ స్వభావసిద్ధముగా నుండునటుల కొందఱు ప్రతిభావంతులైన పురుషనటులు నటింపఁగల్గుట మనము చూచుచున్నాము. వారు స్త్రీ వేషమును ధరించి నాటకరంగముపైకి వచ్చి యభినయించు నపు డావేషధారి పురుషుడని చెప్పినను నమ్మని స్త్రీ లెందరో యుండెడివారు. అనగా వారి స్త్రీ పాత్రాభినయము స్త్రీలను గూడ మెప్పించెడిది. వారి స్త్రీ వేషమును గాంచి స్త్రీలు గూడ స్త్రీ స్వభావమున కుచితమైన కొన్ని వేషభాషలను, హావభావ విలాసములను నేర్చుకొనెడివారనిన నతిశయోక్తికాదు. అటువంటి నటులు క్రిందటి తరమున కూచిపూడి భాగవతులలో వెంపటి వెంకటనారాయణయ్య, నాటకరంగముగ ముప్పిడి జగ్గరాజును. ఈ తరము వారిలో స్థానం నరసింహారావుగారి విషయము నెఱుంగనివారుండరు కదా. వీరల స్త్రీ వేషములను జూచియు, స్త్రీ వేషములను స్త్రీలే ధరింపవలయుననెడి స్వభావవాద మేల నికను జేయుదురో తెలియరాదు. స్త్రీ స్వభావమును గూడ మించునట్లుండునే వీరి స్త్రీ పాత్రాభినయము. ఒక విధముగ పురుషుడు స్త్రీ వేషము నభినయించి సామాజికుల మోహమును పొందుట

దుర్ఘట కార్యమే యగును. వేషభాషలతోఁ బాటు స్త్రీలకు సహజమైన సుకుమార కంఠస్వరమును గూడ నలవరచికొనుట పురుషులకు కష్టమే యగును. అట్టి కష్టకార్యమును సాధించుటయే కళాప్రతిభ యగును. అదియే యథార్థమైన నటన యనిపించుకొనును. అందుకనే వెనుకటి తరములో నమర్చులగువారైన కీ. శే. కాళినాథుని నాగేశ్వరరావుగారు, కోపల్లి హనుమంతరావు, టంగుటూరి ప్రకాశంగార్లు గూడ నీ దుర్ఘట కార్యమును సాధించుటలోఁ దమ యుత్సాహమును, కళాపాసను జూపెడి వారు. అభినయమునుగూర్చి భరతుని నాట్యశాస్త్రములోఁ జెప్పబడిన విషయములు 'నాట్యవేదమ'ను వ్యాసములో (భారతి 1940-వ సం. మేనెల. అసగా 18-వ సంపుటం 5-వ సంచిక) జమ్మలమడక మాధవరాయశర్మగారిట్లు వ్రాయుచున్నారు. 'జన్మాంతర సంస్కారముల సంసిద్ధి ఉంటేనే కాని నటుఁడు కావటం కష్టం. అసలు నటుడై పుట్టాలి గాని, పుట్టి నటుఁడు కావటం దుర్లభం. నూత్నుదేహానికి సంస్కృతి యుంటేనే నటత్వం వస్తుంది. నటజీవితంలో అనుకరణం ముఖ్యం. మానవజీవితానికి అనుకరణ మవసరము. దానివలననే శక్తులకు వికాసం గలుగుతుంది. భావనాబలముతో అనుకృతిని స్వాధీనం చేసికొంటే జీవితం పరిమళిస్తుంది. స్త్రీలుగూడ నటనానికి అర్హత గలిగే యున్నారని భరతుఁడు కంఠరవేణ పలుకుతున్నాఁడు. వాస్తవికత్వానికి ఆరోపకల్పన అవసరం. కాకపోతే ఆస్వాదన పుట్టదు. అందువలన పురుషుఁడు స్త్రీపాత్రాభినయం చేస్తే, స్త్రీ పురుషపాత్రాభినయం చేస్తే, భావానుకీర్తనం బాగా ఉంటుందని కొందఱు అనుభవజ్ఞుల అప్రతిష్టే ప్యమైన వచనంలో, వాస్తవికత్వం భాసించాలి అని అనుకోరాదు. అవి రావటానికి నాట్యాభిమానులు ప్రయత్నం చేయటం వ్యర్థం. అటువంటి ప్రయత్నమునే వాళ్లు స్వీకరించితే భావనాబలమున్న సామాజికులను చక్కగా మోసగించటాని కుద్యమించుచున్నారన్న మాట. అటువంటి మోసగించే ప్రయత్నము మానుకొని, భావకుల భావనకే అన్నిహక్కులనూ విడిచిపెట్టితే నాట్యాభినయం సఫలమౌతుంది.' (పుట 620).

ŚABDAMANĪDARPAṆA

(Continued from A.O.R. Volume XIX-Part I)

TRANSLATED BY

Dr. A. Shanker Kedilaya, M.A., B.T., Ph.D.

47. *puḍigum nirdhāranada-
lladeyemba dekāradeḍeḡe pīridum lōpam
puḍiyadu lōpam praṭiṣē-
dhadolalladuvemba padamanaltenalakkum.*

There is elision optionally for the syllable *de* of the word *allade* (except) when it is used for emphasizing. There is no elision of *du* in the word *alladu* (not), signifying denial. This *alladu* can be said as *altu* (not) and this occurrence is optional.

Example for the elision of *de*—‘*goravanallade pogaḷen*’ (I will not praise anyone except *gorava* — Śiva, as a mendicant—) can also be used as

‘*goravanalla pogaḷen...*’

Example of usage in the three genders in negation.—

avanaltu (not he) !
avalaltu (not she) ! *adaltu* (not it) !

for the three numbers :—

‘...ōrvane gaṇḍanalte jagatṭaladoḷ’ || 33 ||
(Is he not the only hero in the world !)

‘...irbare tōḡaḷalte nripatige raṇadoḷ’ || 34 ||
(Are not those two the arms of the king in the battle field !)

‘...tējōnidhikavinilayadoḷṣatprabhar
mahāprabharalte’ || 35 ||

(Do not poets of ordinary lustre (merit) gain much prominence when in the company of more lustrous (great) poets ?)

48. *ya ra la ṇa na la ra la varṇō-
tkarame valam paḍada kaḍeyolaṣvaravidhiyam
pīridum tāḷdugumivanari-
vare kannadaḡabbadoḷ toḍaṅkade salvar.*

The letters *y, r, l, n, n, l, r, l*, when occur finally in a word, do not take any vowels mostly. The poets who know this do not find difficulty in their compositions.

Example for *y* — *key* hand, *mey* body, *bey* to bake, *ney* oil, *koy* to cut, *ḥoy* to beat, *pāy* to jump, *sāy* to die, *miv* to bathe, *bāy* mouth, *bay* to abuse.

for *r* — *nār* fibre, *bēr* root, *tēr* chariot, *bar* to come, *temar* lengthy ground, *bemar* sweat, *usir* breath, *mosar* curds, *talir* a young shoot, *kulir* cold.

for *l* — *pāl* milk, *kāl* a water-jar, *kōl* stick, *sal* to be enough, *nūl* thread, *kal* stone, *nel* paddy, *bil* bow, *kaval* to fork, *aval* to pound, *tandal* drops of water.

for *ṇ* — *pavaṇ* measure, *nāṇ* modesty, *jāṇ* cleverness, *māṇ* to stop, *gēṇ* a span, *kaṇ* eye, *maṇ* earth, *pūṇ* to promise, *puṇ* wound.

for *n* — *ḥon* gold, *ben* back, *ēn* what, *jēn* honey, *sin* to sneeze, *in* to bring forth young, *bān* sky, *pēn* louse.

for *ḷ* — *oḷ* in, *beḷ* white, *taḷ* to join, *kaḷ* to rob, *miduḷ* brain, *karuḷ* intestine, *kuruḷ* lock of hair, *tiruḷ* pith, *muguḷ* bud.

for *r* — *er* to be full?, *basir* stomach, *kesar* mud, *pesar* name, *nēsar* sun, *eḷcar* wakefulness, *ḥoravār* the posteriors.

for *ḷ* — *vāl* (?), *pōḷ* to split, *biḷ* to fall, *tēḷ* scorpion, *bāl* to live, *esaḷ* petal, *agaḷ* what has been dug, *negaḷ* to become famous, *ḥogal* praise.

There are some exceptions wherein the above consonants end in vowels. They are — *karu* embossed work, *tanu* satiation, *anu* fitness, *karu* calf, *turu* cow, *ḥulu* worm etc.

49. *eraḍum palavum varṇam*
parasparam kūḍuvandamadu sandhi valam
svararahita vyañjanamavu
paravarṇamanaidutirpuvā samhiteyoḷ.

The joining of two or more letters to each other is called euphonic combination (*sandhi*). In sandhi, consonants without any vowel enter the following letter.

Examples for consonants with vowels—

kūrtu (with love) + *ivan* (he gives) — *kūrtivan* (he gives with love), *enna* (my) + *arasan* (lord) — *ennarasan* (my lord), *munne* (previously) + *iṛivan* (he kills) — *munniṛivan* (he kills in front).

Examples for consonants without vowels —

jān (cleverness) + *untu* (is) — *jānunṭu* (there is cleverness), *kurul* (lock of hair) + *koṅkāyṭu* (became curved) — *kurulkoṅkāyṭu* (lock of hair became curves).

50. *padamadhyam padadantyaṃ*
vidagḍharim sandhiviśayamerāḍakkumilā-
viditaprakṛitipratyaya
modavida paḍayugada berake bēḍirdudariṃ.

There are two kinds of sandhis:— 1. *padamadhya* (internal) *sandhi* and 2. *padānta* (final) *sandhi*. The first occurs within a word when the Nominal base or Verbal theme joins with suffixes. The second takes place when a word joins with another.

Examples for internal sandhi:—

For nominal suffix — *mātu* (talk) + *am*²⁰ — *mātam*, *mātu* + *im* — *mātim*, *mātu* + *iṅge* — *mātiṅge*, *mātina* + *attanṃim* — *mātinattanṃim*, *mātu* + *ina* — *mātina*, *mātina* + *oḷ* — *mātinōḷ*.

For verbal suffix — *nuḍida* (said) + *am*²¹ — *nuḍidam*, *nuḍida* + *ar* — *nuḍidar*, *nuḍida* + *ay* — *nuḍiday*, *nuḍida* + *ir* — *nuḍidir*, *nuḍida* + *en* — *nuḍiden*, *nuḍida* + *evu* — *nuḍidevu*.

Examples for final sandhi —

For nouns — *avana* (his) + *āḷtanam* (bravery) — *avanāḷtanam* (his bravery), *kāmana* (of cupid) + *aṅdale* (torment) — *kāmanaṅdale* (torment of cupid).

20. The suffixes *am*, *im*, *iṅge*, *attanṃim*, *ina* and *oḷ* cited in the examples are nominal case suffixes of accusative, instrumental, dative, ablative, genitive and locative respectively.

21. The verbal suffixes *am*, *ar*, *ay*, *ir*, *en*, *evu* cited in the examples are of the third person singular, third person plural, second person singular, second person plural, first person singular and first person plural respectively.

For nouns joining with verbs — *nuḍidar* (said) + *avar* (they)—
nuḍidaravar (they said), *besasidevu* (we told) + *olḥam* (the truth)—
besasidavolḥam (we told the truth) *etc.*

51. *idu pūrvaprakaraṇamin-
 idarol sākalya sañjne pēlavenalbē-
 dūḍita prakaraṇagana sū-
 tradiṣṭadim sañjneyoḍane pēlalḥaḍegum.*

This is the first section. The explanation of all the *sañjñās* (terms) may not be found here ; they will be explained along with the *sūtras* in the relevant sections.

The section on letters is finished.

Second Section, Particularities of Euphonic Combination

1. COMBINATION OF VOWELS

52. *svaramidirolire vibhakti*
svarakam prakritisvarakkamakum lōpam
varasamskrita karṇātaka-
meradarōlam nāmarūḍhiyalīyada pakṣam.

Elision of vowels at the end of inflected and uninflected words both in Samskrita and Kannada, before vowels, generally takes place, when such an elision does not make the meaning uncertain.

Examples for the elision of vowel at the end of Samskrita inflected word —

kramade in order + *āyitu* happened—*kramadāyitu* (it) happened in order, *indraṅge* to Indra + *airāvataṁ* Airāvata—*indraṅgairāvataṁ* Airāvata, to Indra, *giriyaṭṭaṇḍe* from the mountain + *ilīdan* (he) descended—*giriyaṭṭaṇḍilīdan* (he) descended from the mountain, *grihadalli* in the house + *irdan* (he) was—*grihadallirdan* (he) was in the house, *īśvarana* of the Lord + *olavu* grace—*īśvaranolavu* grace of the Lord.

Examples for the elision of vowel at the end of Samskrita uninflected word —

budha + *ar*—*budhar* wise persons, *uddhata* + *ar*—*uddhatar* the arrogant persons, *dēva* + *embar*—*dēvembar* (they) say Lord, *rāga* + *isu*—*rāgisu* to love, *bhanga* + *isu*—*bhangisu* to break, *bhāva* + *isu*—*bhāvisu* to think etc.

For the elision of vowel at the end of Kannada inflected word —

neladinde + *unban* — *neladindunban*
(he eats from (the produce of) the earth).

lēsinge + *oḍeyan* — *lēsingoḍeyan*
(master for the good).

maradattaṇḍe + *ilīdan* — *maradattaṇḍilīdan*
(he got down from the tree).

calada + *ānman* — *caladānman*
(resolute master).

poladalli + irdan — poladallirdan
(he was in the field).

nelade + eḷṭandan — neladeḷṭandan
(he came from the ground).

For the elision of vowel at the end of an inflected verb —

māḍidevu + olpam — māḍidevolpam
(we did good).

For the elision of vowel which has come as *ādeśa* (substitute) for the inflection of a verb.

kūḍi²² + irdan — kūḍirdan
(he was together).

pasidu + unḍan — pasidunḍan
(he ate, after being hungry).

For the elision of vowel at the end of Kannada uninflected word —

1. for the vowel *a* —

arasa + āḷ — arasāl (a messenger of the king).

acca + āne — accāne (a fine elephant).

jīya + emban — jīyemban (he says 'my lord!')

baḍabaḍa + ādan — baḍabaḍādan (he became very feeble).

sāvanta + ōlagam — sāvantōlagam (an assembly of feudatories).

2. for the vowel *i* —

dālittan (he made an assault),

handittan (?),

savadittan (he spent).

3. for the vowel *e* —

sēsikkidan (he threw holy rice),

mudīgikkidan (he placed on the head),

mattellam (all else), *munnaṛivan* (he knows before-hand).

22. The author probably means that in the place of the final vowel, u of the verb *kūḍu*, the i of *kūḍi* has come as *ādeśa* (substitute) and that has been elided in the compound *kūḍirdan*. Similarly u has come as *ādeśa* for the final i of the verb *pasu*. The elision of the vowel u takes place in the compound *pasidunḍan*.

4. for the vowel *u* —

suttōle (a coiled *ōle*²³ ?), *hattēṅṅu* (ten or eight),
lēsellam (all the good), *sovaḍonḍu* (a sharp smell).

There is no elision in sandhi for the vowel of the uninflected base of Samskrita and Kannada words if the meaning becomes uncertain.

paṭu + *ēkavākyam* — *paṭuvēkavākyam* (one clever word).
vidhu + *idu* — *vidhuvidu* (this is the moon).
maḍu + *idu* — *maḍuvidu* (this is the pool).
kuḍu + *illa* — *kuḍuvilla* (there is no bend).

53. *ātvadinivarnadim ma-*
ttōtvadinaitvadinevarnadim mundakkum
yatvamavadadhāraṇe para-
matvam pīntāge ṣaṣṭhīniyamade yatvam.

y is inserted after (1) *ā*, (2) *i*, (3) *ī*, (4) *ō*, (5) *ai*, (6) *e*, (7) *ē* and (8) after *a* when it is an affix of the genitive and followed by the emphasizing *e*.

(1) Example for the insertion of *y* after *ā* —

“*āyirda māḷkōyim para-*
māyusyaṅtambaram.....” || 36 ||

“*kāyalum balu garvadim nelavellavam...*” || 37 ||

(when protecting the land with much pride).

“*sāyale vēḍi tānīyane dhareyam gaṅgēya kēḷ*” || 38 ||

(O Bhishma ! Did he not give his land welcoming death ?)

(2) for *i* —

kaviyāṛ (who is the poet ?),

niṣkāmiyāvaḷ (which woman is without desire ?),

“*baliyam beḍugumendu kaṭṭidalagum kiḷterde*” || 39 ||

“*piḍiyendasitalāpatramam jatiyittam*” || 40 ||

(Commanding to take, the ascetic gave the sword-like palmyra leaf).

23. *ōle* a coil of palmyra leaf occasionally worn as an ornament in the lobe of a female's ear.

(3) for *i* —

“*īyalbandattu kalpāṅghripamabhimatam.....*” || 41 ||

(The wish-yielding tree came to give the desired thing).

“*śrīyam pūrvārjita pu-
nyāyattadinaraṣi kaṅbavol kaṅḍan.....*” || 42 ||

(He saw like finding after a search fortune on account of the merit of the previous births).

“*strīyembanātheyemba-
nyāyada koleyemba.....*” || 43 ||

(4) for *ō* —

nōyisidan (he caused pain),
tōyalum (when it was drenched),
hiṅḍalum (when it was squeezed).

“.....*amarāṅ-
ganeyar jōyendu paḍidar jōguḷamam.*” || 44 ||

(The celestial women sang the lullaby, ‘jō’.)

“.....*brahmar
bhōyenalum ballar kole
dhōyenalum ballarīṅiyalavarettarivar.*” || 45 ||

(Brahmins know to shout and to decry slaughter as hedious. What do they know about fighting ?)

(5) for *ai* —

daiyendan (he begged humbly),
raiyoḍavittu (prosperity came).
“*oḍedadri kṣītisandhipattuviḍe bhaibhai-
yembinam kiltu. . .*” || 46 ||

(6) for *e* —

“*naḍenaḍeyendēm naḍedudo.*” || 47 ||
“*toṛeyam pāydetti bandan gaḍa masagi
jarāsandha bhūpan*” || 48 ||

(The king Jarāsandha came raging with his army after crossing the river).

“*paseyirdan garuḍavēganripanandaneyol*” || 49 ||
(Garuḍavēga was seated with the princess).

(7) for *ē* —

tēyisidan (he caused to grind), *mēyisidan* (he caused to graze), *ēyendan* (he said 'ē').

“..... .bōn-

*kane dēvastrīyarandaratiyanugheyughē-
yendu tandettutirdar*”.

|| 50 ||

(The celestial women were waving *ārati* (a platter containing a burning lamp) saying 'ughē, ughē').

(8) for emphasis —

avalāye (her own), *avarāye* (their own).

“*ātanāye tōradoḍegaḷ. . .*”

|| 51 ||

(his own big thighs).

54. *sadamāḷa kaṛṇā-*

*ṭadadantaprakritigalḷisupratyayamin-
tidirāge yatvamanukriti*

paḍakam mundanukritisvaram nīle yatvam.

y is inserted between the Samskrita or the Kannada themes with final *a* and the affix *isu*. *y* is also inserted after imitative sounds with final *a*.

Examples for Samskrita words —

śuddha + isidan — *śuddhayisidan* (he purified).

tāra + isidan — *tārayisidan* (he made them to cross over).

nirṇa + isidan — *nirṇayisidan* (he decided).

pūra + isidan — *pūrayisidan* (he finished).

Examples for Kannada words —

ora + isidan - *orayisidan* (he caused to tell), similarly *tērayisidan* (he retreated), *tellayisidan* (he became strong), *mēlayisidan* (he caused them to come together), *ōlayisidan* (he paid homage to).

Examples for imitative sounds —

“*paḷapaḷayendālikalgaludirduvu nabhadim*”.

|| 52 ||

(the hailstones fell from the sky with the sound *paḷa, paḷa*).

“gulugulugala-
galayenutam pariva parivonal sogayisugum” || 53 ||

(the running river with *gulu gulu* and *gala gala* sounds, looks charming).

55. *avatarisirkumuwarnada*
riwarnadōtvadagradoḥ svaramire va-
tvavidhānam bahūlate ya-
tvavatvadoḥ samskritakke tānillendum.

When any one of the vowels — (1) *u*, (2) *ū*, (3) *ri*, (4) *rī*, (5) *ō*, (6) *au* is succeeded by a vowel, *v* is inserted. There is no arbitrariness²⁴ regarding the insertion of *y* or *v* in Samskrita.

Examples of usages where the insertion of *y* or *v* is compulsory.

(1) before the vowel *u* —

“*kuḍuvudu kūrmeḃalli. . .*” || 54 ||

(give with affection).

“*manuvina mārgam suraguru-*
vinarīvu
.
.
. negaldanā vibhuvīḃeyol’.” || 55 ||

(the path of Manu, the knowledge of the preceptor of the Devas.the lord shone in the world).

(2) before the vowel *ū* —

“*pūvina billakoppanodedēriḃi tāvare nūla nāriyam*
jēvoḃegaidu.” || 56 ||

(placing under the feet the horn of the flower-bow, raising it, and twanging the bow-string made of lotus fibre).

“*.lalita-*
bhrūvangajanikḃuḃāpasahacaramakkum’” || 57 ||

24. In Kannada there are some usages where insertion or otherwise of *y* or *v* is found. But in Samskrita words, the insertion of *y* or *v* is compulsory.

(the delicate eye-brow will be the companion of the sugarcane bow of Cupid (*Angaja*).

(3) before the vowel *ri* —

“*hōtriveyānadhvariyaī*

bhratrive nīnūlīdā rītvijar. . .”

|| 58 ||

“. . . *kartrivādadānītātīśayamam*

tāldudī kanneyandam.”

|| 59 ||

(4) before the vowel *ri* —^s

rīvendan (he said) *rī* (an interjection of warding off reproach and terror), *rīvittan* (he recollected?).

(5) before the vowel *ō* —

gō + am — gōvam (the cow, acc. case),

gōvina hiṇḍu (the herd of cows),

gō + indam — gōvindam (from the cow).

(6) before the vowel *au* —

nauvanēridan (he got into the boat),

glauvam nōḍidan (he saw the moon),

cauvivam (?)

Insertion of *v* is found after *i* and *ī* also.

Examples — *vīvu granthagaḷu* (these are the books),

vīvidu grantham (this is the book),

vī + idu — vīvidu (this).

In Kannada, the insertion or otherwise of *y* or *v* is found optional in some cases.

Examples — *otte + iṭṭan — ottiṭṭan, otteyiṭṭan* (he mortgaged),

tagave + appode — tagaveyappode, tagavappode (if there is delay),

matu + ellam — matuvellam, matellam
(all the talks).

sovaḍu + ondu — sovaḍuvondu, sovaḍondu
(a sharp smell).

“... .. *otti-*

ṭṭirulīkeya kaitavakañji porapattīrdan.”

|| 60 ||

(Being afraid of the dense night, he had started).

Examples for usages in Samskrita where the insertion of *y* or *v* is compulsory —

nadyellam (all the rivers), *surasindhuve* (the celestial river), *vidhuvilladiru!* (the night without the moon).

“*vidhuvilladiru tannaye
vadhuvillada lile madhuramadhuvillada pū-
dadhiyilladunisadēvudō
budharillada sabhe sarasvatīmukha tilakā.* || 61 ||

(Of what worth is the night without the moon, the sport without one's wife, the flower without the sweet honey, the meal without curds and the assembly without the wise ones).

56. *avikritigalevarnamova-
ṛnavantyavenisida nipātamavadhāraṇe ta-
līta viśankegalēnbivarō
vyavaharisadu sandhiyā plutakkamabhāvam.*

There is no sandhi when a word denoting *nipāta* (particle), *avadhāraṇe* (emphasis) or *viśanke* (suspicious question) ending with the vowel *e*, *ē*, *o* or *ō* is followed by a vowel. Sandhi does not take place also when a *pluta* ending word is followed by a vowel.

Examples for *nipāta* (particle) —

“arame aralda bayaldā-
varegala podaruḡaḡolaramē eḡadaḡira latān-
taradōḡulidulidū kāḡuḡu-
miruḡappinamarasuviniyāḡam cakrāvham || 62 ||

(The *cakravāka* bird (the ruddy goose), by remaining sometimes in the bushes of field-lotuses and sometimes in the midst of creepers with tender shoots, gives pain to its searching spouse till nightfall).

“... ..eḡe idalte tuhinakṣōnīdhraduttuḡasā
nūḡaḡol.... ..” || 63 ||

(Is this not in the high plateaus of snowy mountain... ..)

“are eḡe hastiśikṣāṇa vicakṣāṇarindare
aśvaśikṣeyim.” || 64 ||

(In some places by experienced elephant-trainers and in some places by the training of horses).

“ōhō īralim peravara
māhatmyamum” || 65 ||

(others' greatness, leave it alone !)

Examples for *avadhāraṇe* (emphasis) —

“nuḍidane kāvudanē erde-
giḍadir javanitturakke ninagivudanēn
nuḍidane adu kayyadu mē-
nṇuḍidudu tappugume ganga-cūḍamaṇiya.” || 66 ||

“ātane indranātane guṇōnnatanātane
ambujōdaram.” || 67 ||

(He alone is Indra, he alone is virtuous, he alone is Viṣṇu).

Examples for *viśanke* (suspicious question) —

“inīyane belladindiniyan nīvane aḥ
piridīvanittudam
nenevane ciḥ adam neneyam ...” || 68 ||

(Is he sweet? He is sweeter than jaggery. Is he generous? He is very generous. Does he recollect what he has given? Never, He does not think about it).

“aneyo adriyo.” (Is it an elephant or a mountain?) || 69 ||

“guruvilla kaṇṇanilla guruwina maganilla
... ..ennire enniniyan kavirājakunjaran.” || 70 ||

(There is not the preceptor (Drona), there is not Karna, there is not the preceptor's son (Ashwathama)... .. will you not say, my lord is Kavirājakunjara (the famous among the great poets).

Examples for *pluta* —

“hā ramā endu site bāyalidaltal.” || 71 ||

(Sita lamented loudly crying “Ha! Rama!”).

“ku kkū kūū endu kōli kūgittagal.” || 72 ||

(The cock crowed then, “ku kkū kūū.”)

57. *meccinolaḥṣēpakado*
lbeccōvabhyupagamārihademaśabdām ka-
ṭṭaccariya gaḍārthatvam
biccirkum svaramavidiroḷire khēdadoḷam.

Sandhi does not take place when \bar{o} ending words expressing approval or reproach, the word *ema* expressing consent and the \bar{a} which comes in the place of *gaḍā* (meaning surprise) are followed by vowels. Sandhi does not take place also in lamentation.

Examples — for approval —

“ententō aḥ kabbamoḷḷitāyṭu.”

(Somehow, the kāvya was finished well).

“ententō \bar{o} dina pari lēsu lēsu.”

(Somehow, the way of reading was nice).

for reproach —

“... ..edaridanō avana nosalakkaravam

... ..todeḍudakkum.”

|| 73 ||

(If he is dishonest his writing on the forehead (life) will be erased.)

“muttidanō inde kōṅṭe dhūḷiḷpaṭam.”

|| 74 ||

(If he besieges, the fort will now itself be reduced to dust.)

for the word *ema* —

“nimagakkema abjagarbhanāyṭum śrīyṭum.”

|| 75 ||

(May you have the longevity and prosperity of the god, Brahma.)

“singamakkema aṅṅjen”

|| 76 ||

(Let it be a lion, I will not fear.)

for the \bar{a} meaning *gaḍā* —

“palā amardā inidu gaḍā...”

|| 77 ||

(Milk! ambrosia! sweet indeed!)

“anā immaḍiyā eralkudureya

irbargeralkaiduva.”

|| 78 ||

for lamentation —

“ayyo akkata indrange kēḍāyṭe.”

|| 79 ||

(Alas! Did evil happen to Indra?)

58. *poṛagoḷagu poṣatu paḷadeḷa-
darīkeyadantateyanā samāsāntaradoḷ
nere tāḷdu sandhiyāgavu
tarīsandidiroḷ svarangalāvuvu nileyum.* || 68 ||

When the words *poṛagu* (outside), *oḷagu* (inside), *poṣatu* (newness), *paḷadu* (that is worn out) and *eḷadu* (that is tender), after dropping their final syllables²⁵ *gu*, *gu*, *tu*, *du* and *du* respectively are followed by any vowel, sandhi does not take place.

Examples — *poṛa aḍi* (the outside of the foot), *oḷa aṭṭam* (the loft that is inside), *poṣa aḍake* (new arecanut), *paḷa alagu* (old blade of a sword), *eḷa aṅce* (young swan.)

59. *parapadapūrvam dviṭvā-
kṣaramāgire pūrvapada caramam hrasvā-
kṣaramāge sandhidōṣam
sarēphamidirāge sithilamendanukariṣar.*

When the initial letter of the second word is doubled and the final letter of the first is short, the sandhi that is made, is faulty. If the initial letter of the second word is a consonant with *r*, this doubled consonant is considered as slack.

Example of sandhi which is faulty —

- “*barisipradhānaram ku-
llirisipriya kuśalavārteyam nere kēḷdu
sthiramirḍuprabhu nuḍiye
pravūḍhamudanādanātanembudamārgam.*” || 80 ||

Example where the beginning letter of the second word is a consonant with *r*.

- “*misuguttirpa trisūladim*” || 81 ||

(with the shining trident

- praṇayade tripathege naḍedan
triṅētranolavinde tāḷdidan mastakadoḷ.* || 82 ||

25. This dropping of the final syllable occurs in the formation of compounds.

60. *bageyade satrinābhyavahā-
rigalūsirvar gadyakāvyaḍoḷ nirbandham
pugadendarōcigaladam
tegalendā gadyapadyakāvyaḍoḷirkar.*

The persons who are not discriminate allow such usage in prose compositions saying that in prose such strictness is unnecessary. On the other hand persons who are discriminative do not allow such usage in both prose and verse compositions.

61. *karegatvadirgeyallade
paramire padyārdhavākyaḅvēṣṭānadeḍegam
sphuradanukritigam svaramavu
paramire ritvakkamante sandhi vikalpam.*

Sandhi is optional for the word *kare* when it is followed by *al* and *ira* followed by *ade*. Sandhi is optional also when a half-verse, quotation from Samskrita or when imitative sounds are followed by any vowel. In words followed by *ri* also, sandhi is optional.

Example for sandhi not occurring in *al* and *ade* —

kare + al — *kare al* (when called),

ira + ade — *ira ade* (without being).

“bagevoḍalūnisira ade.”

|| 83 ||

for sandhi occurring in *al* and *ade* —

“maigareyal pāṇḍavarge neredudu barisam.”

|| 84 ||

(The time was ripe for the Pandavas to remain unknown.)

“irade garjisi boppalan taḷardan javan
taḷarvandadim.”

|| 85 ||

(Immediately Boppala roared and started like Yama, the God of Death.)

for sandhi not occurring in a half-verse —

“alliyidunṭembarthado-
ḷelliyumulloḍeyavanta śabdamumakkum
ellandadoḷam pōlisu-
valli guṇādhikaroḷantevōlenalakkum.”

|| 86 ||

LĪLĀTILAKAM

A Treatise on Malayalam Grammar and Rhetorics

Translated by

K. N. EZHUTHACHAN

PREFACE

The 14th century *Līlātilakam*, though a treatise on the *Maṇi-pravāḷa* style, is a very important work for the study of old and medieval Malayalam. It was first edited and published by Attoor Krishna Pisharati in 1917¹ with a Malayalam translation (the original is in Skt. in the old *Sūtra-vṛtti* style,^{1a} the examples only being given in Malayalam) which was later on revised. Some other scholars have followed him with their own translations, the latest being that of Prof. Ilankulam Kunhan Pilla.² It is a very learned and interesting work but has to be used with some caution. The author is the protagonist of a 'Traivarṇika' theory which, with its anti-Brahman bias, reads new meanings into the original text. This leads to the twisting of the original, driving the translator at times into contradictions. (According to him the term 'Kēraḷa-s' in the text means only the *Sūdras*, viz., Nairs etc. and the language of the three upper castes (*Traivarṇikas*) was different from that of these people). L. V. Ramaswamy Iyer's 'Grammar in *Līlātilakam*' comments on the *Sūtras* and *Vṛttis*, but gives no translation.³ J. Brough has translated the *Sūtras* of the first three *Śilpas* but has omitted many portions of the *Vṛtti*.⁴ It must be remembered that a lot of important linguistic material lies embedded in *Vṛttis* of these *Śilpas* especially of the first. The work is also important from the sociological and historical points of view. Again, the Skt. original in printed books is not free from mistakes. In view of all this, it was thought better to have a complete English translation of the work for the use of scholars. The translation has been prepared on the basis of a re-edited text after a careful collation of the printed original with a manuscript (No. 1) kept in the Government Manuscript Library, Madras. Pains have been taken to make the translation as faithful, objective and literal as possible without any effort being made to give any new interpretations. It is with this view that the terms of the original like *Kēraḷabhāṣa* (Malayalam), *Pāṇḍyabhāṣa*, *Cōḷabhāṣa* (both meaning Tamil) etc. are used as they are.

1. Attoor Krishna Pisharati, *Lil.* (Trans.), 1st Edn., Trivandrum, 1917; 2nd Edn. 1930; 3rd revised Edn. with 'Unmilanam' commentary, Trichur, 1944.

1a. There is no need to take the authors of *Sūtra* and *Vṛtti* as different persons as Brough does (BSOS XII, p. 150)

2. K.V.M., Trichur 1940; Soornad Kunhan Pilla, Trivandrum, 1946; Ilankulam P. N. Kunhan Pilla, Kottayam, 1955; revised Edn. 1958.

3. L. V. Ramaswami Iyer, *Grammar in Līlātilakam*, Trichur, 1944.

4. John Brough, "Līlātilaka; "A Sanskrit Tract on Malayalam Grammar and Poetics", BSOS, XII (1947-48), pp. 148.162.

Much light has been thrown in recent years on the history of Maṇipravāḷa style in Malayalam.⁵ Prof. Ilankulam Kunhan pilla has quoted a stanza occurring in one of the temple inscriptions of Rājaraḷa the Great (10th century) which is written in this style.⁶ The word Maṇipravāḷa appears to be an old one. We find in Ahananūru, a Tamil Sangham work, a portion called Maṇi midai pavaḷam (coral and pearl combination), along with 'Kalirru yānai nirai' (row of young elephants) and Nittilakkōvai (garland of pearls). The first-named metaphor might have been the fore-runner of the later Maṇipravāḷam.

Scholars have shown that Tamil has Maṇipravāḷam only in prose and that too in the works of Jains and Vaiṣṇavas. The Telugu poet Pāṅkurkki Sōmanātha (14th century A.D.) has used this word in his Vṛṣādhipa Śataka. Investigations show that Kannada poets of the medieval period also knew this style; for, Pārśvanātha writes that Aggaḷa (12th cent. A.D.) the author of Candraprabhā Purāṇa had written a 'rūpastava' (head-to-foot description of God) in Maṇipravāḷa ('Vāstava bhakti-yutam rūpastavana maṇipravāḷam').⁷

It is well-known that the 11th century Viracōḷiyam (Tamil grammar) has alluded to this style in a particular Sūtra (Alaṅkā-rappaḷalam, 40). This Sūtra places Maṇipravāḷam⁸ along with 'Viraviyal (Ex. Kṛṣṇan, Kiruṭṭan), 'Kiḷavikkavi', 'Turaikkavi, 'Pirahēligai' (Skt. Prabhēlika) etc. and hence it is doubtful whether the term showed any typical genre of literature. However, Viracōḷiyam says that Skt. words mingled with Tamil will form Maṇipravāḷa and that there is no rhyming in it.⁹

Other interesting points connected with the Līlātilakam may be found in the general introduction that follows.

K. N. Ezhuthachan

5. See Dr. P. K. Narayana pilla, (Ed.) Padyaratnam, Trivandrum Mal. Series No. 71 (1949) Intro. pp. 1-35. Ullur KSC, I, p. 72 ff. LVR, GL, pp. 5 ff. See also K. M. Panikkar, Maṇipravāḷam in Java", Dr. Kunhan Raja presentation Vol., Madras, 1946, pp. 65 ff.

6. Lil. (Tr.) 1st Edn., p. 79.

7. I am indebted to Sri C. Govinda Rao, the late Kannada Lecturer, University of Madras, for this information.

8. Ex. usṇa nir (hot water). Here the first component is Skt. and the second, Tamil.

9. The Sutra runs thus: 'Idaiyē Vaṭaveḷu-tteytīl Viraviyal iṭṭtukai iṭaiyestu milla Maṇipravāḷamam.'

Though the argument of the author of Lil. that Maṇipravāḷa is found only in Malayalam is evidently wrong, it has to be conceded that this style struck deep roots only in this language. For some interesting remarks on macaronic style in other languages, See Brough, op.cit., p. 148-9.

Transliteration

Vowels :

അ	ആ	ഇ	ഈ	ഉ	ഊ	ഋ	ഌ
a	ā	i	ī	u	ū	r̄	l̄
എ	ഈ	ഐ	ഒ	ഓ	ഔ	അം	അഃ
e	ē	ai	o	ō	au	am	ah

Consonants :

ക	ഖ	ഗ	ഘ	ങ
k	kh	g	gh	ṅ
ച	ഛ	ജ	ഝ	ഞ
c	ch	j	jh	ñ
ട	ഠ	ഡ	ഢ	ണ
ṭ	ṭh	ḍ	ḍh	ṇ
ത	ഥ	ദ	ധ	ന
t	th	d	dh	n
പ	ഫ	ബ	ഭ	മ
p	ph	b	bh	m
യ	ര	ല	വ	
y	r	l	v	
ശ	ഷ	സ	ഹ	ള
ś	ṣ	s	h	!l
റ	ഴ	ണ	ററ (single)	
r	l	ṅ	ṭ	*

* Hard r (റ) when doubled or combined with ṅ has the pronunciation of alveolar ṭ (as in attest) in Malayalam. The Tamil ṅr is pronounced as ṅṭ. But as in Tamil it has no separate script. It always occurs in a doubled form or in combination with ṅ.

Pālōṭu tulyaruci mauliyil ullasikkum
bālēndu-manda-mṛḍula-smita-veṇṇilāvu
kōlinra pūrṇa - kaṇṇuṇākula - dṛṣṭi vācā -
mūlam telīññu mama cēaṭsi tōṇra-vēṇṭum

(Let the Root principle of the Word, Lord Śiva, who has his head adorned by the milk - white crescent emitting the soft - smiling rays and who casts his fully sympathetic glance (at his worshippers) shine in my mind (while writing this treatise).

LĪLĀTILAKAM

Translated by

K. N. EZHUTHACHAN

ŚILPA ONE

S. 1. Bhāṣā-samskr̥tayōgō Maṇipravālam.

(Maṇipravāla is the *yōga*¹ or artistic preparation of Bhāṣā² and Samskr̥ta).

Aim and originating causes.

Whatever is told about the aim and originating causes of Samskrit kāvya, applies equally to manipravala also.³

Explanation of the definition. Why both the terms Bhāṣā and Samskr̥ta are used in the Sūtra.

Suppose by thinking that Samskr̥ta is also a *bhāṣa*, i.e. a language, the Sūtra is worded as '*Bhāṣayōgō Maṇipravālam*,' the meaning that it consists of two languages will not become clear. Again, suppose we say '*Bhāṣayōr yōgō Maṇipravālam*,' i.e., Maṇipravāla is the *yōga* of two languages, then again, the idea of distinct languages will not be clear. Hence the use of the words *Bhāṣa* and *Samskr̥ta* in the Sūtra.

What is meant by Bhāṣa in the Sūtra :

Bhāṣa here means *Kēraḷabhāṣa*, as is found in the contexts like "*Bhāṣamīśram poḷutu kathayāmi*" (for the present I shall explain the *muhūrtas*, i.e., auspicious occasions, in *Bhāṣamīśram*) where *bhāṣa* is used in that sense.⁴

1. *Yōga* is usually translated as 'combination' but see the author's definition below.

2. Stands for *Kēraḷa-bhāṣa* (Malayalam).

3. Attainment of fame, money, etc. are the aims, and talent, training etc., are the originating causes according to the Sanskrit rhetoricians.

3a. The verse line is taken from an old work *Muhūrta vidhi* which deals with the auspicious occasions for religious rites,

What is meant by yōga in the Sūtra :

Yōga means here *sannāha* i.e., preparation or effort to capture the hearts of *Sahrdayas* or connoisseurs, a result which can be attained by the total absence of *dōṣas* (defects) and the perpetual presence of *guṇas* (merits), while the figures of speech and *rasa* (sentiment) may be optional.⁴ In poetry there must be good metrical construction also. In small sentences the above '*yōga*' is supplied by the context. For example, while writing literature, in prose, verse or in both, if you use '*Candanam koṅṭā*' (Bring sandal wood) in a manner which is not unsuitable to the context, even that small sentence has good *yōga* (i.e., it is capable of capturing the hearts of the *Sahrdayas*) by virtue of its being placed in the middle of two sentences. In that case it gets the name of *Maṇipravāḷa*. Similar is the case with the words 'Hear this then', 'I shall give some tamarind seeds' etc. These sentences, when used at the beginning or end of a literary composition, are found to be enchanting, being placed as they are in the middle of a multitude of such interesting sentences. If there is no such contextual accompaniment, and if you merely say, 'Bring sandalwood,' then the meaning of these words is restricted either to (1) giving a piece of knowledge of worldly affairs, or (2) to imparting a piece of news, or (3) to effecting an imitation. In such cases it can be determined that there is no attempt to please the connoisseurs of art. Moreover, in such conversations, either preceding or following, there will be defects like repetition, colloquialism, and gestures with hand now and then. There may be also talks with or by others. In such places there is no '*sannāha*' or artistic preparation. Hence there will not be *Maṇipravāḷa* also.^{4a}

Similarly, the common conversation of the people will not become *Maṇipravāḷa* because there will be defects of repetition etc. and the *guṇas* (merits) like *slēṣa*⁵ are wanting and thus there will be no proper *sannāha* or preparation.

4. *Guṇas* and *dōṣas* are elaborately dealt with in books on rhetorics. *Rasa* is the predominant emotional content of a poem.

4a. What the author wants to convey is that *bhāṣa* (Malayalam) and Skt. words make *Maṇipravāḷa* only when they are used in literary contexts. Mere combination of them in ordinary talks does not matter.

5. i. e., intimate union of words which gives flow to a verse.

Difference between 'Maṇipravāla' and 'Tamiḷ' :

Now a question may be asked : In dramatic performances and others, stories known as 'Tamiḷ' are recited by Nambiyars.^{5a} There we have the above mentioned *yōga* of *bhāṣa* and Samskr̥ta. Moreover, *dōṣas* (defects) are absent while *guṇas* (merits) like *ślēṣa* and figures like *anuprāsa* (alliteration) are present. But these works are not called Maṇipravāla. Why?

The reply is : In such works, Samskr̥ta is used without its inflexional endings. Mere words (stems) are taken from Samskr̥ta; the case suffixes are all *bhāṣa*.⁵ Hence such stories (as are told by the above-noted Nambiyars) cannot be called Maṇipravāla. In proper Maṇipravāla there must be Samskr̥ta words with Sanskr̥ta inflexional endings. Where such case endings are *bhāṣa*, the Samskr̥ta also becomes *bhāṣa* because it appears more like the latter. Hence the name 'Tamiḷ'.⁶ The same is the reason why the story compositions like *Abhimanyu-vadha* etc. are not called Maṇipravāla.^{6a}

Another defect based on the problem of rasa (sentiment). The place of Rasa in Maṇipravāla.

Well, we hear about Ālattūr Maṇippavāla.^{6b} Here there is no proper *yōga* of *bhāṣa* and Samskr̥ta, which will captivate the hearts of *sahṛdayas*, for *rasa* (sentiment) is absent in it. Where can *rasa* be found in a treatise dealing with the treatment of diseases? Obviously *rasa* must be present in Maṇipravāla. (Hence terms like Ālattūr Maṇipravāla should be wrong, but they are current.)

The reply is : It is not so. *Rasa* and *alankāras* (Figures) are not compulsory elements. Of course, in a Sūtra which follows (I. 10) *viz.* 'Nyūnatvē adhamam' (That Maṇipravāla is inferior

5a. In 'Kūṭiyāṭṭam' performances the dramatic story is narrated by Nambiyār, member of a temple caste. Acting of Skt. drama is called Kūṭiyāṭṭam.

6. Note that the author equates *bhāṣa* with Tamil.

6a. These works are not available now.

6b. This is a *Bhāṣamiśra* (mixed language) work on medicine. It appears that Maṇi Prāvāla is only the literary form of this type. Ālattūr is the name of place in Palghat District, Kerala. Ālattūr Nambis were famous physicians who wrote medical treatises.

which has a little *rasa*) we have admitted that the term 'inferior' denotes meagre quantity, which implies that the presence (in some measure at least) of *rasa* is compulsory in Mañipravāḷa. Still, meagreness is tantamount to its absence, for it will not give enjoyment at all. Such being the case, *rasa* is not at all inevitable to make a poem appealing to *sahṛdayas*. That result can also be attained by the absence of *dōṣa* (defects) and the presence of *guṇās*. If it be said that only by *rasa* you can entertain *rasikas*, then it may be asked, 'What is the difference between a *sahṛdaya* and *rasika*?' (Nil). As far as a *rasika* is concerned, he will feel enchanted not by *rasa* alone; the absence of *dōṣas* and the presence of *guṇās* befitting the *rasa* will also suffice. Enough on this.

For the *yōga* of *bhāṣa* and Samskr̥ta there must be invariably both kinds of words. Such a sentence structure is called Mañipravāḷa. It is a term of connotational identity (*sādhyavasā-akṣaṇā*). Here *maṇi* or coral stands for *bhāṣa* and *pravāḷa* or pearl for Skt. For example, it is said :

Tamiḷ maṇi, Samakṛtam pavalaṃ
kokkinṛēn vṛttamāna cennūnmēl

(I am tying on a metrical string the coral of Tamiḷ and the pearl of Samskr̥ta.)

An error rectified :

Such verses as these are found :

Tamiḷ samskr̥tam ennuḷḷa
sumanassukaḷ koṇṭoru
iṅṭamala toṭukkinṛēn
punḍarīkakṣapūjayā

(I am weaving a thick garland with the flowers of Tamiḷ and Samskr̥ta for the worship of Viṣṇu).

*Samskr̥tamāyina ceññalinīrum
narramitākina piccakamalarum
ēka kalaranu karampakamālām
vrttamanōjnam grathayisyē (ham*

(I shall weave a mixed garland (māla) with the red lotus of Samskr̥ta and the 'picci' (Jasminum grandiflorum) flower of Tamil).

Such instances are not of the same nature as the one which befits the name Mañipravāla; for the bhāṣa and Samskr̥ta yōga of these verses does not bear the particular name of Māla (See, 'inṭamāla, karampakamāla in the examples), which is used here only as a word of secondary significance (*lakṣanā*) denoting similarity. Mañipravāla is a particular term with *rūḍhi* (congenital significance) having also the *lakṣana* denoting similarity.^{7a}

Tamiḷ and its meaning.

In the above verse 'Tamiḷ mañi', by the term 'Tamiḷ', Kēraḷabhāṣa is meant and not the bhāṣa of the Cōlas and others (i.e. the Tamilians). It is found to be used as such. Kēraḷas are called Dramiḍas; hence their language is called Tamiḷ which is an apabhramśa or corruption of Dramiḍa. Or else, the term Dramiḍa is used for Cōlas, Kēraḷas and Pañḍyas alike.⁸ Some say that Karnātas and Āndhras (i.e. Kannada and Telugu people) are also Dramiḍas. It is not so; for their language is completely different from that which is used in the Dramiḍa Vēda (scripture). Also they have not got the pattern of Dramiḍa saṅghāta (phonemes.)⁹ *Dramiḍa Vēda* is a Tamil composition (bhāṣā prabandha) much respected by the Colas etc.¹⁰ It is said :

7a. What the author desires to point out is this :—In the above verses the Tamiḷ and Samskr̥ta words are taken as, or compared to, flowers and the composition is called a garland. But this composition has not got a special name "garland"; it is a poetic expression based on similarity only. As opposed to this, in the case of Mañipravāla it is a special as well as a general term based on a poetic conception of similarity.

8. The old Tamil land was divided into three kingdoms, Cēra, Cōla and Pañḍya; Cēra is Keraḷa.

9. i.e., Tamil letters consisting of 18 consonants and 12 vowels. See LVR's remarks on these topics, GL. p.11 ff.

10. The work alluded here is said to be the *Dravidōpaniṣat saṅgati*.

“ I worship that saint Śaṭhakōpa^{10a} who wrote the *Dramida Vēda*, which has got a thousand branches (songs) and is on a par with the Vēdas created by Brahman, and who also destroyed the intelligence of heretics.”

What is Dramida-saṅghāta ?

Dramida-saṅghāta means the Dravidian (Tamil) alphabet where the three intermediate *Vargas* or groups (*Atikhara* kh, ch, ṭh, th, ph; *Mṛḍu* g, j, ḍ, d and b and *Ghōṣa* gh, jh, ḍh, dh and bh), the *ṣmas* (ś, ṣ, s), ṛ, and the *visarga viz.* h (of the Aryan scheme) are absent. It has a long as well as short -e and -o and the phonemes are pronounced with an -n ending.¹¹

The beauty of Maṅḍipravāla :

It should not be thought that such a mixture of *bhāṣa* and Samskr̥ta is one which is not graceful. It is said :

“ One who tells stories in friendly companies without using too much of Samskr̥ta or too much of the local language will gain honour.”¹²

In Maṅḍipravāla the Samskr̥ta words used should be quite as common and elegant as *bhāṣa* words.¹³ The latter should be mostly such as are not used by illiterates (*i.e.*, it should not be of a low colloquial standard). Then only there will be perfect combination between the words of those two languages. To show its elegance and beauty of the style the term Maṅḍipravāla is given to it. It is evident that coral and pearl when strung together on a thread appear as one because of their identity of colour.

10a. This is the synonym of Nammālvār (9th cent. A.D.) the famous Vaiṣṇava saint of the Tamil land. Literally the word Śaṭhakōpa means one who is angry with bad people or heretics.

11. It appears the writer is alluding to the pronunciation of Tamil letters like ānu, inu, kānu (a, i, ka) etc. by the people. Cf. Toḷ. El. 135. Ilampūraṇar says in the commentary that ‘ānam’, ‘ōnam’ are used instead of ākaram, ōkaram etc. Vatteḷuttu which contained only the Tamil alphabet was called *nānam mōnam* where an euphonic n crops up after the initial n and m respectively.

11a. Bhōja's Sarasyat Kaṅṭhābharaṇa, II. 12.

12. Difficult Samskr̥ta words are thus avoided. Good Maṅḍipravāla works generally stick up to this rule.

Such is not the case when gems (*māṇikya*) and pearls or pearls or blue stones are strung together. In the same way the combination of *bhāṣa* and Samskr̥ta must be perfect. Disharmony should not be felt anywhere. It is not proper that such a literary composition which appears to have only words of identical nature should go in the garb of Samskr̥ta. Better that it should appear as *bhāṣa*, which is also logical. The matter may rest here.

A flaw in the definition itself poin ed out :

Well, this is only regarding the propriety of diction. Let us first think about the definition itself as contained in the above Sūtra on Maṇipravāḷa. You say *bhāṣa* means Kēraḷabhāṣa only and no other. And for this *bhāṣa* also, you did not accept a 'yōga' (combination) with any language other than Samskr̥ta. You have maintained that Maṇipravāḷa is the yōga of Kēraḷabhāṣa and Samskr̥ta only. Well, this definition appears to be defective. I assert that in Maṇipravāḷa there is Cōlabhāṣa (Tamiḷ) also, for such words as kūntal (hair), kuḷal (hair), koṅka (breast) are seen in it and these words are undoubtedly Cōlabhāṣa.

Reply :

Why, you have quoted only very little. Say that hundreds and thousands of Cōlabhāṣa words like *mula* (breast), *tala* (head), *kāl* (leg), *paḷlu* (teeth), *pon* (gold), *tēn* (honey), *vila* (price), *taḷa* (anklet), *tina* (millet) *paṇa* (palmyra tree), etc., are seen in Maṇipravāḷa. If you think this is a great flaw in our definition, you can extend it by adding that Maṇipravāḷa contains Karnātabhāṣa also. *Āna* (elephant), *aḷu* (person), *alla* (not), *illa* (nil), *āṭū* (goat), *eli* (rat) are Kannada words. You can say there are Āndhrabhāṣa words also like *uṭal* (body) etc.^{12a} Why can't you complain that Kuṭanaṭṭu-bhāṣa like *accan* (father), *talla* (mother) also are found in Maṇipravāḷa.^{12b} Well, then let the inconsistency of the definition increase.

Moreover, why do you say that only in Kēraḷabhāṣa yo get the words of Cōḷa, Karnāta and Āndhrabhāṣas ? Why don't

12a. Actually many of these are common to all the Dravidian languages and we must not attach too much importance to the assertion of our author.

12b. The commentators on Tamil grammars quote a number of such dialectical words.

you say that in Karṇāṭa (Kannada) and its *Bhāṣa-prabandhas* (literary compositions) there is Cōlabhāṣa also? You must add that in Cōlabhāṣa compositions also there are Kēralabhāṣa words. Then again, you can say that in Samskr̥ta there is Prākṛt eg. *maṇi* (gem), *rāma* (Rama), *viraha* (separation), *mōha* (delusion) etc. Similarly it is possible to assert that there is Samskr̥ta in Prākṛt also.

Why stop there? Why can't you say there is Cōlabhāṣa in Samskr̥t poems like *Raghuvamśa* etc. also? There you see words like *kalpana* (thought), *kāma* (desire), *kanaka* (gold), *kaḷa* (indistinctly beautiful), *vanita* (lady), etc. which are Cōlabhāṣa. In Prākṛt poems also there are Cōlabhāṣa words like *aravinta* (lotus), *makaranta* (honey), *taranka* (wave), *kanka* (Ganga?) etc.¹³ Thus it will be seen that there is no fixed regional language or literary work nor even a fixed region. Even Samskr̥ta will become *Apabhramśa* (corruption) and *Apabhramśa* will become Samskr̥ta. This is excellent!

Reply :

My great scholar: In the case of Maṇipravāḷa such an opinion does not look nice. Look here, these regional languages and words are fixed entities. The same is the case with Samskr̥ta and others. But some words are at times recognised by some persons as similar to the words of other languages. You should not think that they belong to those languages; the most reasonable way is to take them as similar to the words of a given language. Or else, a person may try to load or milk a *gavaya* (a kind of deer) or *Dēvadatta* (name of a human being) simply because they have the outward appearance of a cow. The above-noted *kūntal* and others are similar to the Cōlabhāṣa words, but are not actually so. On the same principle we must hold that *uṭal* etc. are similar to Āndhrabhāṣa words but not really belonging so it. Likewise, *nāle* (tomorrow), *illa* (nil) etc., are similar to Karṇāṭaka words but are not actually the words of that language.

13. Much credence should not be given to these examples which appear to have not been scientifically investigated by the author. It seems he is giving some examples at random perhaps to confuse the opponent.

Some other points have also to be added. At times there may be such doubts as to whether a word is Cōḷabhāṣa or not. But how can you definitely say that a word used in Maṇipravāḷa is Cōḷabhāṣa? Is it because that you do not see it used in the common language of the Kēraḷa people? If so, how did you determine that it is Cōḷabhāṣa? Could it not be Karnāṭabhāṣa or Āndhrabhāṣa? The argument that in Maṇipravāḷa there is a language other than Kēraḷabhāṣa is very feeble because you have not specified that language.

Moreover, why do you say that it is on account of not seeing in common parlance that you take a word to be Cōḷabhāṣa? Is not usage in literature (*visēṣa vyavahāra* i.e. usage on particular occasions) sufficient to show that it belongs to Kēraḷabhāṣa? Usage, whether it is common or not (*i.e.*, restricted to literature or not), is, however, usage. *Maṇipravāḷa is the literary usage (i.e., visēṣa vyavahāra) of the Kēraḷa people*, and there words like *kūntal* exist.

Something more has to be added: By holding that it is the absence of such words in common language which makes you to take them as Cōḷabhāṣa, do you mean to say that all such words seen in literary usage (*viz.* Maṇipravāḷa) are Cōḷabhāṣa? Or does this apply only to words like *kūntal* etc.? The first does not seem to be correct, for you have said that there is Cōḷabhāṣa *also* in Maṇipravāḷa (which means that in the latter there is Kēraḷabhāṣa also). The second view, too, is not different from the first, for you have already asserted that *kūntal* etc. found in Maṇipravāḷa are Cōḷabhāṣa. Perhaps you mean that *kūntal* and others are found in the ordinary language of the Cōlas and hence they are Cōḷabhāṣa words. Well, friend! these words are found in the literary usage of Kēraḷa people; hence how do you know that they are Cōḷabhāṣa?

If you say that witnessing their use in literary language is immaterial, then how can the Cōḷabhāṣa words like *ātūu* (male; cf. Mal. *āṇ*), *makatū* (daughter; cf. Mal. *makaḷ*),¹⁴ *naṭuri* (half a measure; cf. Mal. *navuri*),¹⁵ etc. be taken as either Cōḷabhāṣa or Kēraḷabhāṣa? For, those words are found in Pattupāṭṭu, Eṭṭuttokai

14. Cf. Tol. El. 272.

15. Ibid., 241.

etc., which are literary compositions of Cōḷas and Pāṇḍyas.¹⁵ They are not used in ordinary language (*sāmānya-vyavahāra*).

You may reply: Words like *āṭūu* etc., are seen in the dictionaries and grammars of the Pāṇḍyas and Cōḷas; hence they are determined as belonging to Cōḷabhāṣa. Well, I say: Those words which are not found in the common language of the Cōḷas but which exist in their literary compositions only are undoubtedly Cōḷabhāṣa. What if you have lexical authority or not in this case? Usage is the principle underlying lexical authority. In every way it is from the usage in literary compositions that we know them as belonging to Cōḷabhāṣa. Such being the case, how can a usage seen in literature fail to help recognition of a word as belonging to one particular language?

You may say: *Āṭūu* etc., though present in the literary works only are Cōḷabhāṣa words for there is a lexicon for it, while for words like *kūṅṅṅal* etc. found in Maṇipravāḷa there is no lexical or other authority to prove their Kēraḷabhāṣa origin. Well, the reply is: Even in the case of such words as *kāl* (leg), *kallu* (stone), *mala* (mountain), and *puli* (tiger) which are found in the common language of the Kēraḷa people, there is no lexical authority. They are seen in the dictionaries of the Pāṇḍyabhāṣa. Hence even those words will not be Kēraḷabhāṣa but Pāṇḍyabhāṣa or Cōḷabhāṣa. If it is argued that they are Kēraḷabhāṣa because they are present in the everyday language of the Kēraḷa people, I have already told you about the futility of resorting to common and special terms (*i.e.* usage in common and literary languages) in this matter. If we decide from mere usage, then words like *kūṅṅṅal* etc. will be clearly understood as Kēraḷabhāṣa. Moreover, what sense is there in taking a word which is not used at all, but merely found in dictionaries, as belonging to a particular language? Of course, Kēraḷabhāṣa is not decided by lexicon. Similar is the case with Āndhrabhāṣa. It is by continuous or traditional usage that we know to which language a word belongs. The usage may either be common or particular (*i.e.* literary). Its presence in either of these categories will suffice for its admission to any given language.

15. *i.e.* the Tamilians.

सोमाङ्गभूतेष्टिषु प्राकृतं याजमानं कर्तव्यं न वेति विचार्यते । किं प्राप्तम् ? न कर्तव्यम् । प्रत्यक्षविधानात् । सर्वेष्वङ्गेषु चोदकप्राप्तेषु यत् कस्यचित् प्रत्यक्षविधानं तत् पुनः परिसंख्यानार्थं यथा आज्यभागौ यजतीति गृहमेधीये । तद्वदिदं यज्ञो-
बभूवेति पुनस्संकीर्तनं अन्यपरिसंख्यानार्थमेवेति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ स्तुतशस्त्रयोस्त्वनुमन्त्रणार्थमामनन्ति तत्संयोगपृथक्त्वं
यथा पञ्चावत्ते ॥ २-२-१२ ॥ (सि)

यज्ञो बभूवेति स्तुतशस्त्रानुमन्त्रणमिदं अर्थान्तरसंयुक्तं नेदमैष्टिकमेव पुनरा-
म्नायते । तदुभयोरपि विधानयोः परस्परं संबन्धाभावात् न परिसङ्ख्यार्थत्वमिति
संयोगान्तरत्वात् । यथा चतुरवत्तपञ्चावत्तयोः इति । आज्यभागयोस्तु अविकृत-
योरेव श्रवणमित्यदृष्टान्तः । अतस्तानि न चोदकप्राप्तानि याजमानानि ।

॥ ५ ॥ चतुरवत्तं जुहोतीति सर्वेज्यानामविशेषात्
॥ २-२-१३ ॥ (पू)

‘चतुरवत्तं जुहोति’ इत्यत्र सन्देहः किं होममात्रं चतुरवत्तं आहोस्वित्
होमविशेष इति । किं प्राप्तम् ? होममात्रमिति । कुतः ? अविशेषात् । उद्दिश्य-
मानत्वाद्धोमानां विशेषयितुमशक्यत्वात् होममात्रमनुष्य तत्र चतुरवत्तं विधीयते ।
तस्मात् सर्वहोमेषु चतुरवत्तं इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ अदर्विहोमानां वा लिङ्गात् ॥ २ - २ - १४ ॥ (सि)

दर्विहोमादन्यत्र चतुरवत्तं विधीयते । कथं ? चतुरवत्तहोमयोः संबन्ध-
विधानात् । सर्वत्र संबन्धविधाने ज्ञातयोः संबन्धमात्रं विधीयते अनिर्ज्ञातयोस्तु
संबन्धिनोः अन्तर्भाव्य तावर्थौ सम्बन्धविधानमिति । तदत्र होमो ज्ञातः, चतुरवत्तं च
निर्ज्ञातं वाक्यान्तरात् तयोस्संबन्धमात्रमेव विधीयते इति चतुरवत्तं जुहोतीति
सामान्या श्रुतिः वाक्यैकदेशोपात्तेन सामर्थ्येन विशेषे व्यवस्थाप्यत इति । “ छन्दांसिवै
देवेभ्योऽपाक्रामन् न वो भागानि हव्यं वक्ष्याम इति तेभ्य एतच्चतुरवत्तमधारयन्
पुरोनुवाक्यायै याज्यायै देवतायै वषट्काराय यच्चतुर्गृहीतं जुहोति छन्दांस्येव
तक्षीणाति तान्यस्य प्रीतानि देवेभ्यो हव्यं वहन्ति” इति चतुरवत्तं जुहोतीति श्रुतिः^१

पुरोनुवाक्याभिरभिसंबन्धयमाना विशेष एवावतिष्ठति । न च दर्विहोमे पुरोनु-
वाक्यादिविशेषयोग इति ।

॥ ६ ॥ पञ्चावत्तं जमदग्नीनामिति सर्वेषामविशेषात्

॥ २-२-१५ ॥ (पू)

किं पञ्चावत्तं जामदग्नेयसंबन्धिषु सर्वहोमेषु किं वा यत्रैवावत्तं तत्रैव तेषा-
मपीति । किं प्राप्तम् ?

ये जामदग्न्यानां होमाः तेषु संबन्धश्रुतिसामर्थ्यात् अविशेषेण सर्वत्र पञ्चावत्तं
निविशते इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ स्याच्चतुरवत्ते तस्यैव लिङ्गदर्शनात् ॥ २ - २ - १६ ॥ (सि)

चतुरवत्तस्यैव विकारस्यात् यस्य चतुरवत्तं तस्यैव विकारः स्यादित्यर्थः ।
असन्निहितविकारस्यान्याय्यत्वादित्यर्थः । लिङ्गदर्शनात् ॥

किं च लिङ्गदर्शनात् “जमदग्निर्वाऽस्मिन् लोके—स न - समर्थमपश्यत्
स एतं पञ्चममवदानमपश्यत् तन्निरवपत् ।” इति ब्रुवन् अधिकं चतुरवत्तेऽवदानं
दर्शयति । तस्मात् अधिकारापेक्षया चतुरवत्तविकारः पञ्चावत्तमिति ।

॥ ७ ॥ पञ्चमावत्तमाज्यात् संख्यासंयोगात् ॥ २ - २ - १७ ॥ (पू)

पञ्चावत्तिनः पञ्चमेऽवदाने सन्देहः । किमाज्यात् पञ्चममवदेयं उत
औषधादिति । किं प्राप्तम् ?

आज्यात् पञ्चममवदेयम् । कुतः ? पूरणार्थत्वात् । चतुरवत्ते हि सामान्ये
चतुर्थमाज्यं तत्क्रमसंयोगात् व्यवर्धेत इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ औषधाद्वा तत्संप्रदानेनाभिप्रेतम् ॥ २ - २ - १८ ॥ (सि)

प्रधानहविषोऽवदीयेत प्रधाने हि यदभिप्रेतम् तदेवावदेयम् अवदेयं च
पुरोडाशद्रव्यम् । अतो मुख्यत्वात् तत एवावदेयम् । यत्पुनरुक्तम् - संख्यासंयोगा-
दिति । तत्रोच्यते । मध्यमेपि स तावत् घटते यथा षष्ठो भ्राता न हश्यत इति ।

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥ २ - २ - १९ ॥

लिङ्गं खल्वप्येतमर्थं दर्शयति यथा औषधात् पञ्चममवदानमिति “पशुर्वा एष यत्पुरोडाशः यन्मध्यादवद्यति यथा हृदयस्यावद्यति एवं तत् यत्पूर्वादवद्यति यथा जिह्वाया अवद्यत्येवं तत् । यत्पश्चार्धात् यथा ¹गुदादवद्यत्येवं तत् पञ्चावत्तं पशो-
र्व्याप्त्यै² इति इयमपि श्रुतिः उक्तमेव न्या[यमनुवद]ति ।

॥ अन्ततः क्रमसंयोगात् पञ्चमशब्दश्चाविप्रतिषिद्धः ॥ २ - २ - २० ॥ (पू)

तत् पञ्चममवदानं अभिघारणादुत्तरकालं आहोस्वित् स्वकालमिति सन्दिह्यते । किं प्राप्तम् ? अभिघारणादुत्तरकालमिति । कथं आगन्तूनामन्ते निवेश इति । पञ्चमशब्दश्चायं न विप्रतिषिध्यते पञ्चानां पूरण इति । तस्मादभिघारणादुत्तरकाल-
मिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ पुरस्ताद्वाऽभिघारणात् संस्कारार्थमभिघारणम् संख्यार्थः

पञ्चमशब्दः ॥ २ - २ - २१ ॥ (सि)

औषधात् द्वितीयमवदाय तृतीयं तत्कालमेवावदेयम् पश्चादभिघारणम् । कुतः ? संस्कारार्थत्वात् अभिघारणस्य । पुनरभिघारणेन संस्क्रियेत । पञ्चम-
शब्दस्य संख्यार्थत्वात् यत्र तत्र स्थितेन संख्या पूर्येत इत्यविप्रतिषेधः । तस्मादौषधात्
स्वकालं पञ्चममवदानमिति सिद्धम् ।

॥ ९ ॥ पश्चार्धात् तृतीयं पञ्चावत्तिनः क्रमसंयोगात् ॥ २-२-२२ ॥ (पू)

पञ्चावत्तिनः तृतीयमवदानं औषधादिति स्थिते चिन्त्यते । तृतीयमवदानं पुरोडाशस्य पश्चार्धात् ग्राह्यं उत खिष्टकृत आवापादिति । किं प्राप्तम् ? पश्चार्धादिति पाठक्रमेण तृतीयस्य पश्चार्धयोगो गम्यते । तस्मात् पश्चात् ग्राह्यमिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ आवापस्विष्टकृतो द्वितीयं पञ्चावत्तिनः ॥ २ - २ - २३ ॥ (सि)

मध्यात् पूर्वमवदाय स्विष्टकृदवदानस्थानात् द्वितीयमवदानं भवेत् पञ्चा-
वत्तिनः इति । लिङ्गात्, “यदुभयतोऽवद्येत् उभयतः पशुना परिवेषयेत् उत्तरार्धा-

1. S गुदस्य

2. S पशोराप्त्यै

देवोभे अवद्यत् । तत एव रुद्रं पशुभ्यो निरवदेत् ” [इति] स्विष्टकृतः आवापात्
द्वितीयमवदानं आहत्य पञ्चावत्तिनो विधत्ते । तस्मादयं विधिः पञ्चावत्तिविषय इति ।

॥ १० ॥ ^१सकृदुपहतेन वनस्पतिं यजतीति संस्कारप्रतिषेधः
शब्दसंयोगात् ॥ २-२-२४ ॥ (पू)

वनस्पतीज्यां प्रकृत्य समामनन्ति “ सकृदुपहतेन वनस्पतिं यजति ” इति ।
तत्र संशयः किमयं संस्कारप्रतिषेधः, किं वा पञ्चावत्तिनः तद्द्वितीयावदानप्रतिषेधः
किं प्राप्तम् ? सकृच्छब्दसंयोगादुपस्तरणामिधारणानि निवर्तन्ते ।

॥ ^२कर्म वा संसर्गार्थनिवृत्तत्वात् ॥ २-२-२५ ॥ (सि)

कथं तर्हि संसर्गार्थस्याभावात् कार्याभावादेव हि तानि निवृत्तानि । तेषु च
निवृत्तेषु संस्कारेषु सकृदेवावदानं प्राप्तम् । द्विस्तु पञ्चावत्तिन इति यत्तद्द्वितीयं
तस्यायं प्रतिषेधः । तस्मादयमपि पञ्चावत्तिवाक्यशेषः ।

आचार्यः खल्वपि पृषदाज्यात् चतुर्गृहीतेन चेदिति पक्षान्तरं ब्रुवन् स्वाभा-
विक्रीमुपस्तरणामिधारणनिवृत्तिमभ्युपजगाम । तथा ‘ यत्पृषदाज्यस्योपहरति ’ इति
चोदनाविशेषमादाय अयमेवार्थोऽवधार्यते ।

॥ ११ ॥ यदपरमवदानं तत्पूर्वमिति देशतः कालतो
वोभयस्य भागित्वात् ॥ २ - २ - २६ ॥

अनुजोऽपरःतस्य यदपरमवदानं तत्पूर्वमवदाय पूर्वार्धे सुचो निदध्यात्
इति । ‘ यदपरं ’ इति किमयं देशतः कालतो वा वादः उत कर्मत इति विशयः ।
किं प्राप्तम् ? देशतः कर्मतो वा स्यात् । कुतः ? उभयस्य लक्षयितुं शक्यत्वात् ।
अतो विकल्प इति प्राप्ते—

॥ कर्मतो वा कर्मलक्षणत्वादवदानस्य ॥ २ - २ - २७ ॥

1. सकृदुपहतेन भा. दी.

2. This sutra is not found in S'

अवदाय इतिवत् अवदानमिति कर्मलक्षणगुणो विधीयते अवदानमपि कर्मैव अवदीयत इत्येवमवदानविशेषविधानेन प्राकृतस्यान्यविधानं बाध्यते । तस्मात् कर्मवाद एवेति ।

॥ १२ ॥ पूर्वपूर्वाण्यवद्येज्ज्येष्ठस्य ज्यैष्ठिनेयस्य यो वा गतश्रीः स्यात् यो वा पुरोध्याकामः स्यात् अपरपूर्वाण्यवद्येत् कनिष्ठस्य कानिष्ठि-
नेयस्य इत्येनेन व्याख्यातम् ॥ २ - २ - २८ ॥

अत्र पूर्वपूर्वाणीति नित्ये । निमित्तसंयोगे अपरपूर्वाणीति नैमित्तिकः क्रम-
विपर्यासः इति ।

॥ १३ ॥ षोडशान्याज्यानि^१ भवन्तीत्येकेषां स विकल्पो
विप्रतिषेधात् ॥ २ - २ - २९ ॥ (सि)

‘चतुर्जुह्वां गृह्णाति’ इत्याज्यग्रहणानि । तेषां “तानि षोडशान्याज्यानि भवन्ति”
इत्यस्य च विकल्पः, उत समस्य वाद इति । किं प्राप्तम् ? चतुर्जुह्वामित्यादिभिः
आज्यैः सर्वषोडशानि विप्रतिषेधात् विकल्प्येरन् ।

समस्यवादौ वा यथा चतुर्दश पौर्णमास्यामाहुतयो हूयन्ते
त्रयोदशमावास्यायामिति ॥ २ - २ - ३० ॥

षोडशानि भवन्तीति पूर्वेषां समस्यवादोऽयं स्यात्^२कस्मात् ? चतुरादीनां
षोडशसङ्ख्यायाश्च एकार्थसमावेशासंभवात् समस्यवादस्य न्याय्यत्वात्^३ यथा पौर्णमासा-
हुतीनां चतुर्दशेति । विकल्पात् समावेशस्य लघीयत्वात् समस्यवाद इति ।

॥ १४ ॥ सप्तदशानि पशुकामस्य गृह्णीयादित्येतेन
व्याख्यातम् ॥ २ - २ - ३१ ॥ (पू)

^४कथमयमपि विकल्प उत समस्यवाद इति । समस्यानां तावतामभिधानात्
सङ्ख्यार्थत्वेनैकार्थत्वात् विकल्प इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

1. S. and R read षोडशान्याख्यातानि
2. S. तस्मात्
3. S. स्यान्याप्यत्वात्
4. अग्निहोत्रप्रकरणगते वाक्ये सन्देहः

दर्शपूर्णमासयोर्व्यपदेशात् तद्विधानात् ॥ २-२-३२ ॥ (सि)

तानि पञ्चगृहीताति अग्निहोत्रप्रकरणादुत्कृष्येरन् । एतान्याज्यानि दर्शपूर्ण-
मासयोः शेषाणि स्युः । व्यपदेशात् । यदग्निहोत्रं पयः प्रभृत्याज्यादीनि च
पृथग्व्यपदेशात् तदेवं जातीयकं वचनम् विभागकृत्यात् ।

¹चत्वारि पञ्चगृहीतानि । तदुक्तं—यत्रेति वाऽर्थवत्वात् स्यात्² ।

॥ १५ ॥ तेषां पृथक्कृतानां निरवदानं यथाऽन्येषां हविः
पृथक्त्वात् ॥ २ - २ - ३३ ॥ (पू)

इन्द्राय राज्ञे पुरोडाशमेकादशकपालं निर्वपेत् इन्द्रायाधिराजायेन्द्राय स्वराजे
इत्युक्त्वा 'पुरोडाशमधिश्रयति' इत्यधिश्रयणे कृते अवदानवेलायां पुरोडाशान्
पृथक्कृत्य पृथगवदानानि तन्मध्यपूर्वार्धाभ्यां ग्राह्याणि आहोस्वित् सहैवेति
सन्दिह्यते । किं प्राप्तम् ? पृथगिति । कुतः ? हविर्भेदात् । मिन्नानि हि तानि
हवींषि । तस्माद्धविर्भेदात् आग्नेयवन्निरवदानमेवेति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ वचनात् सर्वेषां सहावदीयेत नहि वचनं किञ्चिद्बुभूषति
॥ २ - २ - ३४ ॥ (सि)

“सर्वेषामभिगमयन् अवद्यत्यच्छंबट्कारं” यावता हि न प्राप्नुयात् तावता
छंबट्कुर्यात् यथावचनात् अध्यधिश्रयणादेव वाचनिकं सहावदानमिति ।

॥ १६ ॥ तेषां सहप्रदानमवदानैकत्वात् ॥ २ - २ - ३५ ॥

तानि त्रीण्यपि हवींषि सह प्रदीयेरन् उत भेदेनेति सन्देहः । किं प्राप्तम् ?
सहप्रदानमिति । कथं ? अवदानैकत्वात् । अवदानैकत्वं समवदानविधिसामर्थ्यात् ।
सहैव प्रदानं बुद्धिस्थो वा न ह वेद इति (?)

1. मी. 2 - 1 - 21 भाट्टदीपिकायां तु पशुकामस्य पञ्चगृहीतं ध्रुवायां यथाप्रकृती-
तरयोः इति कल्पसूत्रानुमितवचनात् प्रकृतौ सप्तदशगृहीतत्वसिद्ध्या तदनुवाद
इति व्याख्यातम् ।

2. A पृथग्वचनानि

॥ १११ ॥ नाना वा देवतापृथक्त्वात् ॥ २ - २ - ३६ ॥ (सि)

[पृथग्वा प्रदानं स्यात् । राजादिगुणभेदेन देवतापृथक्त्वात् अवदानादेर्वचनाद्यौगपद्येऽपि प्रदानानि भिद्येरन्नेव । भा. दी.]

॥ अन्यार्थदर्शनाच्च ॥ २ - २ - ३७ ॥

याज्यानूवाक्याविनियोगपरवचनं प्रदानभेदं प्रकाशयति — “ प्रथमामनूच्य मध्यमया यजेत् मध्यमामनूच्योत्तमया यजेत् उत्तमामनूच्य प्रथमया यजेत् एवं सर्वा अनुवाक्याः सर्वा याज्या भवन्ति ” इति ।

॥ ११७ ॥ एककपाले वैश्वानर्या वपायां वा अवदानसंपत्क्रियेत
प्रकृत्युपबन्धात् ॥ २ - २ - ३८ ॥ (पू)

एककपालादिषु अवदाय प्रदातव्यं उत नेति सन्दिह्यते । किं प्राप्तं ? अवदायेति । कुतः? प्रकृत्युपबन्धात् चोदकानुग्रहायेत्यर्थः । तस्मात् प्रकृतिवच्चोदनातः अवदातव्यमित्येवं प्राप्ते मूः—

॥ प्रतिषेधान्निवर्तते ॥ २ - २ - ३९ ॥ (सि)

“ यजमानो वा एककपालः यदेककपालस्यावद्येत् यजमानस्यावद्येत् यजमानः प्रमीयेत सकृदेव होतव्यम् ” इति ‘ तस्मान्नावद्यति ’ इति ‘ जीवन्नेव देवानप्येति ’ इति । वैश्वानर्या “ उपस्तृणीताज्यं हिरण्यशकलेनाभिधारयति ” सा पञ्चावत्ता भवति ” इति वपायाः प्राकृतो धर्मो विधिस्तितोपि प्रतिषेधान्निवर्तते । तस्मादेतेषां होमानां निरवदानप्रतिषेध इति ।

॥ ११८ ॥ त्र्यङ्गणामर्धस्य पृषदाज्यस्य च प्रत्यभिधारणं न विद्यते
शेषकार्यतयाऽर्थे श्रूयते^१ ॥ २ - २ - ४० ॥ (पू)

१. इदं सिद्धान्तसूत्रं ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्येषु श्रीशङ्कराचार्यरामानुजाचार्यश्रीकण्ठाचार्यादिप्रणीतेषु “ प्रदानवदेव तदुक्तं ” इत्यधिकरणे (३-३-४३) स्पष्टमुदाहृतमस्ति । मातृकायां तु केवलपूर्व-पक्षसूत्रं तद्भाष्यं च दृश्यते । सिद्धान्तसूत्रतद्भाष्ये न दृश्यते । अस्याधिकरणस्य नानाप्रदानाधिकरणं इति नामापि परिमलकारैः उल्लिखितं वर्तते । ततः इदं पूरितम् ।

श्रीशङ्करभाष्ये ‘ नाना वा देवतापृथग्ज्ञानात् ’ इति सूत्रपाठः दृश्यते । सकृर्षकाण्डभाट्ट-दीपिकायां तु “ नाना वा ” इति प्रतीकग्रहणं दृश्यते (पु. ५२)

२. त्र्यङ्गणां मध्यस्य पृषदाज्यस्य प्रत्यभिधारणं न विद्यते शेषकारित्वात् ॥ भा. दी. मातृका

दैवतान्यवदाय शेषप्रत्यभिधारणं कर्तव्यं न वेति विचार्यते । किं प्राप्तं ? व्यङ्गाद्यर्थं प्रत्यभिधारणं न कर्तव्यम् अशेषत्वात् । अशेषत्वं ह्यनिज्याशेषत्वात् शेषस्य च हविषो यातयामदोषनिर्घातात् प्रत्यभिधारणं विधीयते “ किं प्रत्यभिधार-
यत्ययातयामत्वाय ” इति । न च व्यङ्गादिष्वेतत् संभवति, अशेषत्वात् । इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ विद्यते हविस्संस्कारत्वाद्धेतुमात्रमितरत् यथा दीक्षामोचनं
नक्तं संस्थापनस्य ॥ २ - २ - ४१ ॥ (सि)

विद्यत एवात्र प्रत्यभिधारणं हविषः संस्कारत्वात् । दृष्टं संस्कारमादधत् अर्थवत्तामासादयति । प्रत्यभिधारणस्य च संस्कारार्थत्वं लोकतः प्रसिद्धं कल्प्येत[न] अयातयामार्थत्वम् । तस्मादयातयाममर्थवादमात्रम् । यथादीक्षामोचनम् अत्यक्तदीक्षेऽपि यजमाने नवमे निरूपितम् (९ - १ - ३१)

कथं तर्हि उपस्तरणाभिधारणयोः कृष्णलेषु निवृत्तिः इति । उच्यते । तयोः स्नेहनार्थत्वात् तस्य च स्नेहनस्य कृष्णलेष्वसंभवान्निवृत्तिरिति । अवदानेषु पञ्चविंशति-
रिति विहितकालानां समासवचनं यथा चतुर्दश पौर्णमास्यामाहुतय इति ।

॥ १९ ॥ पशोः प्रदानं यथा प्रकृतौ ॥ २ - २ - ४२^१ ॥ (पू)

पशौ किमवदानेन प्रदानान्तेनानुसमयः उत सर्वेषां ^२समवदानं इति सन्देहः । किं प्राप्तम् ? प्रकृतौ दर्शं कृतं[यथा]तथाऽत्रापीति । कुतः ? प्रकृतिवच्चो-
दनया यथा अवदानेन प्रदानान्तेनानुसमयः प्रकृतौ तथाऽत्रापि स्यादिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ एककालानि वा लिङ्गदर्शनात् ॥ २ - २ - ४३ ॥ (सि)

एककालानि सर्वाण्यवदानानि । कथमवगम्यते ? समवत्तशब्दात् । समवत्त-
शब्दश्च अकृतेषु अवदानेषु नोपपद्यते । “ त्रेधा गुदं करोति त्रेधा वा एतर्हि पशुः
व्यङ्गाणि समवत्तमवदानात् ” इति त्रेधा गुदं करोतीति त्रि(वि)धा निक्षिपतीत्यर्थः ।
अवदानव्यङ्गसमवत्ते यथोत्सर्गं कुर्विति ।

1. R A यथा वृत्तौ

2. S R समवदानं

ननु लिङ्गमिदं ; कःपुनरत्र न्याय इति ? वाक्यसामर्थ्यमेवात्र न्यायः “दैवतान्यवदाय अथोपहृत्य अथ समवत्तधान्यां” इति अवदानानां समानकालतां विधत्ते । अथोपहृत्य अथ समवत्तधान्यामिति अथशब्दो विप्रकर्षान्नोपपद्यते । तस्मात् पञ्चावदानानि समानकालानीत्युत्सर्गः । येषु पुनः पशुषु प्रैषसामर्थ्यात् वचनाद्वा प्राकृतः प्रकरण-कल्पः प्रामुखात् तेषु तथैव प्रचरिष्यत इति ।

॥ इति सङ्कर्षकाण्डभाष्ये द्वितीयाध्यायस्य द्वितीयःपादः ॥

—: * :—

अथ तृतीयः पादः

॥ १ ॥ यजेतीज्यासम्प्रैषः शब्दसंयोगाद्यथा पचेतिवचनानि¹
येयजामह इति प्रतिश्रवणे यथा अहं तु पक्ष्यामि
इति ॥ २ - ३ - १ ॥ (सि)

यज येयजामहे इति किमेतौ शब्दावुच्चारणमात्रेणोपकुर्वन्ति, उत प्रैषार्थ-
प्रतिपत्त्यर्थाविति सन्दिह्यते । किं प्राप्तम् ? अदृष्टार्थौ । प्रकृतसंयोगादेव याग-
कर्तव्याप्रतीतेः । ऋत्विग्वरणस्य यागार्थत्वात् यथायागं स्मृतेः प्राप्तत्वात् । काल-
स्मृतिरप्राप्तेति चेन्न । प्राकरणिकस्य कर्मकालस्मृत्यारोहणद्वारेण दृष्टार्थत्वे सति
अदृष्टार्थत्वे प्रमाणाभावात् । अनारभ्यवादेन यागसंयोगश्रुतेः “स एष सप्तदशः
प्रजापतिर्यज्ञमन्वायत्” इति वचनात् अदृष्टमुपकार इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

यजेति यागार्थः प्रैषः प्रकृतिप्रत्ययार्थविभागेन प्रैषार्थप्रतिपत्तेः । लोटः
प्रैषार्थत्वात्, यजेरिज्यार्थत्वात् यथा पचेति पाकसम्प्रैषः । येयजामह इति
²इष्टिप्रतिपत्तिः; यथा ‘अहं पक्ष्यामि’ इति । साधुसामर्थ्यात् उत्तमपुरुषलोभाच्च
यथा अहं तु पक्ष्यामीति पाकार्थप्रतिपत्तिः ॥

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥ २ - ३ - २ ॥

लिङ्गमप्येतमर्थं दर्शयति । “भूतं भव्यं च होत्रा यजमानोऽवरुन्ध इत्याहुः
येयजामहे इत्युक्त्वा भूर्भुवस्सुवरिति व्याहृतिं पुरस्ताद्दध्यात्” इति येयजामहस्य
होत्रा संयोगं दर्शयति । तस्मादपि प्रतिश्रवणार्थः ।

तथाऽपरं लिङ्गम्—“यज्ञमेव तमृत्विजः संप्रदायं विभ्रति । सोऽनुब्रूहीत्ये-
वोक्त्वाऽध्वर्युः नापव्याहरेत् नो एव होताऽपव्याहरेत् । आश्रावयत्यध्वर्युः तदग्नीध्रे यज्ञ
उपावर्तते । सोऽध्वर्युर्नापव्याहरेत् आप्रत्याश्रवणात् प्रत्याश्रावयत्यग्नीत् तत्पुनरध्वर्युं

1. पचेतिवचनानि-भा-दी. मातृका

2. R, स्पष्ट

यज्ञ उपावर्तते । सोध्वर्युर्नापव्याहरेत् आयजेति वक्तोः यजेत्येवाध्वर्युः होत्रे यज्ञं
संप्रयच्छति स होता नापव्याहरेत् पुरा वषट्कारात् होतारमेतर्हि यज्ञ उपावृत्तो
भवति वषट्कारेण तमग्नौ रेतोभूतं सिञ्चति^१ ” । सोऽयमवधिव्याहरणपरः^२ अन्यार्थः,
कर्तृभेदेन श्रुतो यथाकालं प्रैषार्थप्रतिपत्तिविनियोगं दर्शयति ।

“ सएष सप्तदशः प्रजापतिर्यज्ञमन्वायत् ” इति यज्ञसंयोगःश्रूयते “ आश्रा-
वयेति चतुरक्षरमस्तु श्रौषडिति चतुरक्षरं यजेति द्व्यक्षरं ये यजमाह इति पञ्चाक्षरं
द्व्यक्षरो वषट्कार ” इत्येतेषां अक्षराणामर्थप्रतिपादनद्वारेण परस्परं संबद्धानां
यज्ञसंबन्धःश्रूयते । न चार्थविवक्षा प्रतीयमाना परित्यक्तुं शक्यते । तस्मात् प्रैषप्रैषार्थ-
प्रतिपत्तिरूपेण [सम्बन्धः]

॥ २ ॥ प्रजापतिर्यज्ञमन्वेतीत्यत्र देवतानामादेशो न विद्यते
अनाम्नानात् ॥ २ - ३ - ३ ॥ (पू)

तत्र प्रजापतौ देवतानामधेयं विशेषणादेष्टव्यं उत नेति विचार्यते । किं
प्राप्तम् ? देवतानामादेशो न स्यात् । कुतः ? अनाम्नात् अनभिधानात् । ये यजा-
माह इति केवलप्रैषार्थप्रतिपत्तिः न तत्र देवतानामधेयं श्रूयते । यावान् श्रुतस्योत्सर्गे
दोषः तावान् अश्रुतकल्पनायाम् । तस्मान्न विशेषेण देवतानामादेशः कर्तव्य
इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ विद्यते वाऽन्यार्थदर्शनेभ्यः आश्राव्याह देवान् यजेति अथ
इन्द्रायानुब्रूहि इन्द्रं यजेति ॥ २ - ३ - ४ ॥ (सि)

ऐन्द्रस्यावद्यन् ब्रूयादिन्द्रायानुब्रूहीत्याश्राव्य ब्रूयादिन्द्रं यजेति मारुतस्यावद्यन्
ब्रूयान्मरुद्ब्रूयोऽनुब्रूहीत्याश्राव्य ब्रूयान्मरुतो यजेति । तथाऽपरं स यत्रैतदध्वर्युराह
समिधो यजेति आग्नेयमेव तद्रूपं परोक्षमग्निं यजेत्येवमादि श्रूयते । यत्तनूनपातं यज
इडो यजेति ब्रूयात् जामि स्यात् यजयजेत्येव ब्रूयात् । इत्यनेनार्थात् सर्वेषु याज्यादि-
प्रैषेषु देवतादेशवत्तां दर्शयति ।

1. शतपथ 1.5-2

2. R. अनवध्याहरणपरः

ननु लिङ्गान्येतानि । का प्राप्तिः ? उच्यते । देवतोद्देशेन द्रव्यत्यागो यागः । नहि तामनुद्दिश्य यागस्सम्भवति । तस्मान्प्रियमेन याज्यादिप्रेषेषु देवतादेशनं कर्तव्यमिति ।

॥ आम्नातः प्रयाजेषु देवतादेशः तस्य प्रतिषेधो वचनम्

॥ २ - ३ - ५ ॥

एकेषां शाखिनां प्रयाजेष्वाम्नातो देवतादेशः तस्य प्रतिषेधो “ यत्तनूनपातं यजेडो यजेति ब्रूयाज्जामि स्यात् यजयजेति ब्रूयात् ” इति । तस्मादिदं दर्शनम् ।

॥ वचनानीतराणि स्युः अर्थवच्चात् इतरथा वादमात्रं

अनर्थकं स्यात् इति ॥ २ - ३ - ६ ॥

विधानंसामर्थ्यादेवान्यत्र देवतादेशाभाव इति विपरीतान्येतानि लिङ्गानीति ।

॥ आम्नातो वैकेषां तद्दर्शयति अगुष्मा अनुब्रूह्यमुं यजेति

॥ २ - ३ - ७ ॥

अपदिश्य देवता यजेतीति शक्यते वक्तुम् । इदमपि यागे सामर्थ्य[सिद्ध]मेव देवताव्यादेशमनुवदतीति ।

॥ ३ ॥ देवान्यजेत्यनूयाजेषु साधारणो बहुशब्दः श्रूयते

॥ २ - ३ - ८ ॥ (सि)

“ देवान् यज ” इत्ययं प्रेषः किं प्रथमानूयाजविषयः आहोस्वित् सर्वेषामनूयाजानां साधारण इति सन्देहः । किं प्राप्तम् ? सर्वेषां साधारणो भवितुमर्हतीति । कुतः ? बहुवचनश्रुतेः ।

॥ प्रथमस्य वा स्थानात् ॥ २ - ३ - ९ ॥ (पू)

प्रथमानूयाजविषय एवायं प्रेषः । देवान् यजेत्यनन्तरं प्रथमस्य क्रमः । तस्मात् तदर्थः स्यादिति । किं च

॥ उत्तमयोश्च प्रैषाम्नातात् ॥ २ - ३ - १० ॥

उत्तमयोश्चानूयाजयोः प्रैषावम्नायेते यजयजेति । अतोऽपि प्रथमस्यैवेति ।

॥ शब्दविप्रतिषेधान्नेति चेत् पाशवत्स्यात् ॥ २-३-११ ॥

इति चेत् पश्यसि एकस्मिन् प्रथमे अनुयाजे 'देवान् यज' इति बहुवचन-
विप्रतिषेध इति, पाशवद्भवितुमर्हति । यथैकस्मिन् पाशे "अदितिः पाशान्
प्रमुमोक्तु" इति बहुवदभिधानम् । एवमिहापि भविष्यति ।

॥ प्रथमे विप्रतिषेधाद्वा साधारणः ॥ २-३-१२ ॥ (सि)

साधारण एवानूयाजानां प्रैषो भवितुमर्हति शब्दविप्रतिषेधात् बहुवचनस्यै-
कस्मिन् अर्थे प्रयोगो विप्रतिषिद्धः ।

किं च :—

॥ क्रमात् पृथक् स्वलिङ्गात् सर्वेषां, क्रमाच्च लिङ्गं बलवत्तरम्

॥ २-३-१३ ॥

उत्तमयोर्मन्त्राज्ञानादिति यदुक्तं तत्रोच्यते—सन्निपातिकर्मणां समुच्चयोऽपि
न विरुद्धश्च इत्युक्तम् । यत्तु पाशवदिति, एकत्वात्पाशस्यागत्या तदभ्युपगतम् ।
इह तु अस्ति गतिः देवताबहुत्वम् । [अतः]क्रमात् सर्वेषां साधारणः प्रैष इति ।

॥ असन्निपातित्वात् उपरवे सन्निपातित्वम् ॥ २-३-१४ ॥

नैतदेवं, असन्निपातित्वात् । असन्निपाती प्रैषः । सोऽर्थबहुत्वे सति
नायथार्थो भवितुमर्हति । उपरवमन्त्रस्तु करणमन्त्रत्वात् सन्निपाति प्रत्युपरवं भिद्यते ।
एकस्मिन्नुपरवे बहुत्वस्याभावात् । प्रातिपदिकार्थस्य विवक्षितत्वात् प्रत्ययार्थस्याविवक्षा
संख्यायाः, कर्मादिविवक्षा चेत्यगत्या अङ्गीकृता । अस्ति पुनरिह देवानां बहुत्वा-
वगतिः । तस्मात् सर्वेषां साधारणोऽयं प्रैष इति ।

॥ संस्कारत्वात् द्विर्वचनेऽप्रतिषेधः ॥ २-३-१५ ॥

यदुक्तमुत्तरयोः प्रैषाज्ञानमनर्थकमिति । अत्रोच्यते । संस्कारत्वात् द्विर्व-
चनमविप्रतिषिद्धम् । यथा "आवह देवान् यजमानाय" इति । ब्रह्मबहुत्व-
पक्षवदिति वा (?)

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥ २-३-१६ ॥

लिङ्गमप्येतद्दर्शयति । देवान्यजेत्युक्त्वाऽऽह—“ छन्दांसि वै देवाः, छन्दांस्येव तद्यजति । यद्बर्हिर्यजति गायत्रं तद्यजति यन्नराशंसं त्रिष्टुभं तत् यत्स्विष्टकृतं जगतीं तत् ” इति देवान्यजेति प्रैषमुक्त्वा गायत्र्यादीन् देवान् विभज्य निर्भ्रुवन् प्रैषस्य साधारणत्वं दर्शयति । तस्मात् स्थितं साधारणः प्रैष इति ।

अधिकरणचिन्तायाः प्रयोजनं अवभृथेष्ट्यां “ अपबर्हिषः प्रयाजान् यजति अपबर्हिषावनूयाजौ यजतीति बर्हिष्यनूयाजे प्रतिषिद्धे यदा पूर्वपक्षः तदा प्रथमार्थस्य तदभावे प्रैषस्य लोपः स्यात् । सिद्धान्ते तु साधारणवैशेषिकयोः प्रैषस्समुच्चयेन । द्वितीयेऽनूयाजे देवौ यजयजेति प्रयोग इति ।

॥ ४ ॥ एकादश प्रयाजान् यजति एकादशानूयाजान् यजतीति
समशः स्वस्थाना विवर्धेरन् क्रमानुग्रहात् यथोपसदः

॥ २ - ३ - १७ ॥

सङ्ख्याविवृद्धौ प्रयाजानूयाजाः स्वस्थाना विवर्धेरन् क्रमानुग्रहात् यथोपसदः
[न] दण्डकलितवदावृत्तिः न्याय्यत्वादधिकैराद्या विक्रियेरन् ।

“ आदितो वा प्रवृत्तिः स्यात् ” (10.5 1) इति क्रमसङ्ख्यामात्रयोः दृष्टस्य न्यायस्यापवादः ।

॥ ५ ॥ दशमं बर्हिरनूयाजेषु तदुत्तमस्य स्थानात् ॥ २ - ३ - १८ ॥

अनूयाजेषु दशमं बर्हिरुत्तमस्य विकारः स्यात् । कथमिति? स्थानात्, क्रमा-
दुत्तमविकारत्वमिति ।

॥ प्रथमस्य वा देवतासामान्यात् तदकर्मलिङ्गमितरत्

॥ २ - ३ - १९ ॥ (सि)

न वा एतत् क्रमादुत्तमविकारो बर्हिरिति । किन्तु देवतासामान्यात् प्रथ-
मस्यैव विकारः । देवतासामान्यं अन्तरङ्गं, उत्पत्तिविधिशेषत्वात् देवतायाः ।
बर्हिरङ्गं क्रमसामान्यप्रयोगः कालसमुत्पन्नकर्मसमाश्रयत्वात् क्रमस्य । तस्मात् प्रथम-

विकार एव दशमः । अवशिष्टास्तूपसद्यागेन स्थानतो विक्रियेरन् । चत्वारः प्रथमस्य, चत्वारो मध्यमस्य द्वावुत्तमस्य इति अपवादविषयानालीढत्वात् । अनूयाजेषु वृत्ता कथा ।

प्रयाजेषु परं वर्तते—चतुर्थोत्तमावन्तरेण षडागन्तवः प्रयाजास्तेषां समुदायेन सर्वेषामपि विकार यथा वैकृत्यस्सामिधेन्यः[इति प्राप्ते]

॥ चतुर्थोत्तमयोर्वा स्थानात् ॥ २-३-२० ॥ (सि)

कार्याः प्राकृताः प्रयाजास्तेषां न समुदायेन समुदायविक्रिया, नाप्येकैकः सर्वैर्विक्रियते । तदुक्तं-एकंवा चोदनैकत्वादिति¹ । प्रच्युतस्थानत्वाच्च न स्वस्थान-विवृद्धिः । तस्मात् चतुर्थोत्तमयोः स्थानापन्नत्वात् तद्विकारत्वमागन्तूनामिति त्रय ए[कै]कस्येति ।

॥ एककर्मणा सामिधेनीसंयोगं बादरायणः तत्र विशेषो
नोपलभ्यते तदुक्तं सामिधेन्य इति ॥ २-३-२१ ॥

सामीधेनीकार्यस्याहवनीयसमिन्धनस्य [अ]भेदात्² सर्वविकारत्वमुपपद्यते इति बादरायणो मन्यते । तस्मात् [न]समो दृष्टान्त इति ।

चिन्तायाः फलं अनुमन्त्रणेष्वावहतीति ।

॥ ७ ॥ पश्वनूयाजेषु मैत्रावरुणः प्रेष्यति स वैशेषिकस्य स्थानात्
॥ २-३-२२ ॥ (पू)

पशौ सन्ति मैत्रावरुणपैषाः । ते किं वैशेषिकस्य विकारा उत साधारणविकारा इति सन्देहः । किं प्राप्तम् ? वैशेषिकविकारा इति । कुतः ? स्थानात् । अध्वर्यु-पैषापेक्षया अभिहितो द्वितीयो वैशेषिकः³ इत्यस्मात् क्रमसामान्यात् वैशेषिक-विकारा इति ।

ननु किञ्चित्साधर्म्यमेतत् । उच्यते । किञ्चित्साधर्म्यादपि कार्यसिद्धिं न्याय-विदो मन्यन्ते—किञ्चित्साधर्म्यादुपसंहारसिद्धेर्वैधर्म्याप्रतिषेध इति । (न्या. सू.)

॥ प्रथमस्य वा शब्दसामान्यादुभयत्र देवताशब्दः श्रूयते
(साधारणस्य श्रूयते) ॥ २-३-२३ ॥ (सि)

1. 8-2-20

2. R सविकार

3. R. adds वदति यः

साधारणस्य बर्हिषः प्रथमस्यानूयाजस्य विकारो मैत्रावरुणस्य प्रैषः । कथं ? देवतासामान्यात् उभयत्र हि देवताशब्दः समानः—देवान् यज, देवं बर्हिरिति । शब्दसामान्यं च क्रमाद्द्वलीयः अन्तरङ्गत्वात् । तस्मात् साधारणविकार एवेति । उत्तर-(उभय)विकारेषु उभौ ब्रूयाताम् । तदर्थं चिन्ता—

उत्तरविकारेष्वनूयाजेषु उभाम्यामिज्यासंप्रैषो वक्तव्यः; प्रकृतौ उत्तरयोर्द्वि-
प्रैषत्वात् । उत्तरत्र साधारणो यजिसम्प्रैषः, अध्वर्युणा प्रथम एवानूजाजे सकृद्वक्तव्यः
यथापूर्वं सिद्धान्तः । उत्तरविकारेषु भेदेनाध्वर्युणा वैशेषिको यजिसम्प्रैषो वक्तव्यः ।
एवं सति प्रथमविकारेषु च उत्तरविकारेषु च मैत्रावरुणप्रैषप्राप्तेरवैलक्षण्यं भविष्यति ।
कथं ? साधारणविकारा एव ह्येते प्रैषाः । एवं च सर्वेऽत्र भवन्ति वचनाद्विभ-
ज्यन्ते । इतरथा हि क्वचिद्विकारः क्वचिदविकार इति वैलक्षण्यमन्याय्यं स्यात् ।

चातुर्मास्येषु¹ प्रथमविकारे इज्यासम्प्रैषः उच्यते । साधारणस्य² सर्वार्थत्वात्
सर्वसन्निधौ प्रथमस्य प्रकृतौ साधारणः प्रयुक्तः । इह पुनः प्रथमविकाराणां सन्निधौ
हि प्रयुज्यते । तत्रार्थात् यजिसम्प्रैष उच्यते । देवताशब्दोऽपि कर्मण उच्यते इति
सामान्येनोक्तत्वात् । तस्मादर्थसिद्धेः ॥

नतु सम्प्रैषाद्वेत्तेऽर्थः सिद्धयति । प्रति यजि तस्यानारभ्य नियमात् तस्माच्चजे-
त्येवोच्येतेति । यथा उभावर्थविदो मन्यन्ते तथोत्तरयोर्विकारेषु पशानुभौ ब्रूयाता-
मित्यप्रयोजनं भवति । उत्तरविकारेज्याकाले हि मैत्रावरुणप्रैषस्याविद्यमानत्वात् ।
कृत्वाचिन्तेयम् (तदा) पश्चनूयाजेषु मैत्रावरुण इति ।

॥ ८ ॥ उपप्रेष्य होतर्हव्या देवेभ्य इति प्रैषस्य प्रैषो यावदाज्ञातं
शब्दपूर्वत्वात् ॥ २ - ३ - २४ ॥ (पू)

उपप्रेष्य होतर्हव्या देवेभ्य इत्याहेति किं प्रैषस्य प्रैषः उत प्रैष एवायमिति ।
किं प्राप्तं ? प्रैषविषयोऽयमुपदेश इति । कुतः ? यावान् कश्चनाम्नायः स स्वाध्याय-

1. चातुर्मास्येषु नवानूयाजाः आद्या अष्टौ पाशुकाः प्रैषवर्जे, पाशुकैकादशेन नवमश्च कार्यः । तत्र अष्टसु आद्य चतुर्णां प्रथमविकारत्वं तत्रापि द्वितीयतृतीयचतुर्णामपि यज यजेति द्वियजित्वं इति श्री-सू
2. देवान् यजेति प्रैषः सर्वानूयाजसाधारण इति

विधिना कर्मावबोधार्थः शब्दपूर्वकत्वात् कर्मणाम् । शब्दैरेव कर्मविधायकैः भवितव्यम् । एवं शब्दानामर्थवत्ता ।

॥ अग्निगुप्रैषो वा तेनापदिश्येत यथा अमृतमसि प्राणायत्वेति
हिरण्यमभिव्यनिति इति ॥ २ - ३ - २५ ॥ (पू)

अग्निगुप्रैषस्यार्थं मन्त्रः । कुतः ? प्रतीकोपदेशात् । दृष्टश्चान्तेनापि मन्त्रो-
पदेशः यथा “ अमृतमसि प्राणाय त्वा ” इति अनःप्राण इत्यस्य मन्त्रस्योपदेशः ।
[प्र]कृतशेषत्वं चैव भविष्यति ।

॥ प्रैषो वा व्यपदेशात् ॥ २ - ३ - २६ ॥ (सि)

प्रैषेण व्यपदेशः स्यात् । नायं व्यपदेशस्यान्तेनोपदेशः किन्तु प्रैष एवायम् ।
यतः एनमध्वर्युराह—उपप्रेष्य होतर्हव्या देवेभ्यः इति । यमध्वर्युणा होता प्रेष्यते
सोऽन्वाह अजैदग्निः असनद्राजन्नि इति सोऽन्वाह इति होतारं प्रैषार्थप्रतिपत्तारं
दर्शयति । तस्मात् प्रैष एवायमिति ।

॥ ९ ॥ होतारं ब्रूयाच्छब्दसामर्थ्यात् ॥ २ - ३ - २७ ॥ (पू)

उपप्रेष्य होतर्हव्या देवेभ्यः इत्ययमध्वर्युप्रैष इति स्थितम् । सोऽध्वर्युः
किं होतारं प्रेष्यति किं वा मैत्रावरुणमिति सन्देहः । किं प्राप्तम् ? होतारमिति ।
कथं ? शब्दसामर्थ्यात् । होतर्हव्या देवेभ्य इति होतृशब्दः श्रुत्या होतारं ब्रूयात्
लक्षणया मैत्रावरुणम् । श्रुतिश्च लक्षणातो गरीयसी । तस्मात् श्रुतिसामर्थ्यात् होतारमेव
प्रैष्यमिति प्राप्ते :—

मैत्रावरुणं वा व्यपदेशात् ॥ २ - ३ - २८ ॥ (सि)

उत्तरस्यान्ते होता श्रूयते प्रैषान्ते होतृशब्दश्रवणात् होतुरन्यस्योपप्रेषव्यपदे-
शात् होतृशब्दोऽयं गौणो मैत्रावरुणे, यथा अध्वर्युशब्दः ‘ अध्वर्यून् वृगीते ’,
इत्यत्र । तस्मात् मैत्रावरुणमेव प्रेष्येदिति ।

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥ २ - ३ - २८ ॥

“ यदध्वर्युर्होतारमुपप्रेष्यति अथ कस्मान्मैत्रावरुण उपप्रेष प्रतिपद्यते ” इति
मैत्रावरुणं प्रैषार्थप्रतिपत्तारं दर्शयति ।

॥ १० ॥ उक्थशा यज सोमस्येत्यन्येषां स्तुतशस्त्रवतां सोमानामाह
 अनुब्रूहि प्रेष्येति^१ होतारमाहेत्युभयलिङ्गानां
 शब्दसंयोगात् ॥ २ - ३ - २९ ॥ (पृ)

उक्थशा यज सोमस्येत्यन्येषां स्तुतशस्त्रवतां सोमानामाह अनुब्रूहि प्रेष्येति
 होतारमाह इति । किं स्तुतशस्त्रवत्सोमविषय एवायं प्रैषः उत सर्वविषय इति
 सन्देहः । किं प्राप्तम् ? उभयलिङ्गानामिति, कुतः ? शब्दसंयोगात् । ये
 स्तोत्रवन्तः शस्त्रवन्तश्च सोमास्तेष्वयं प्रैषः शब्दसंयोगात् स्तुतशस्त्रवत्सोमा-
 नाहेति ।

॥ शस्त्रवतां च नानार्थानां समासवचनम् यथा उक्थश्रैयाकरणानानयेति
 शब्दः स्तुवतां आज्ञस्यात् ॥ २ - ३ - ३० ॥ (सि)

पृथगर्थयोर्हि समासवचनमेतत् यथा केवलौक्थिकेषु केवलवैयाकरणेषु चाने-
 तव्येषु औक्थिकवैयाकरणान् समस्य प्रतिपाद्यते । तद्वदत्रापि ।

अथ वा सर्व एव स्तुतशस्त्रवन्तः सोमाः यान्यपि हि केवलशस्त्रवन्ति कर्माणि
 तान्यपि स्तोत्रवन्ति पवनोत्थानीति वचनात्, तस्मान्न केवलानीति ।

॥ ११ ॥ बहुशब्दो गणेषु शब्दसंयोगात् शेषमितरे
 चतुरवत्तम् ॥ २ - ३ - ३१ ॥ (नि)

उक्थशा यज सोमानां इत्यन्येषां स्तुतशस्त्रवतां सोमानाहेति श्रूयमाणे सन्देहः-
 किं सोममात्रे निवेशः उत गणेष्विति, किं प्राप्तम् ? प्रातिपदिकार्थविवक्षायां
 सोममात्रे निवेश इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—बहुशब्दो गणेषु, गणेष्वेवास्य निवेशः यज
 सोमानामिति प्रत्यक्षश्रुतेर्विवक्षितार्थत्वात् अद्विवक्षाकारणानावात् प्रत्ययार्थस्य प्रधान-
 त्वात् । तस्माद्गणेष्वेवात्र निवेशः अन्यत्रैकत्वाभावे । यथा जमदग्निषु पञ्चावत्
 अन्यत्र चतुरवत्तम् ।

॥ १२ ॥ तां पुरोऽध्वर्युर्विभजति मैत्रावरुणः पश्चादिति देशतः कालतो वा उभयस्य भागित्वात्^१ ॥ २-३-३२ ॥ (पू)

यावानदश्वसुत्यायां यजमानो मैत्रावरुणप्रदानं प्रति वाचं यच्छति—ततश्चो-
दिते मैत्रावरुण ऋत्विग्भ्यो वाचं विभजति होतर्यज नेष्ट्यज ब्रह्मन् यज अच्छावाक
यजेत्युक्त्वा तां पुरोऽध्वर्युर्विभजति मैत्रावरुणः पश्चात् [इति] श्रूयमाणे सन्देहः किं
देशतः कालतो वा अनियमः उत देशत एवेति ।

किं प्राप्तम् ? पुरः पश्चादिति देशतः कालतो वा एष वादः स्यात् 'सह
वषट्कारेणाहवनीयं गच्छति' इति गमनसंबन्धात् उभावप्यर्थौ यत्र भागिनौ [कालतो]
देशतो वा - 'तां पुरोऽध्वर्युर्विभजति मैत्रावरुणः पश्चात्' इति ।

॥ देशतो वैष वादः स्यात् वषट्कारेणाहवनीयं गच्छतीति
गमनसंबन्धात् ॥ २ - ३ - ३३ ॥ (सि)

देशवाद एवायम् 'गङ्गां गच्छति' 'पाटलिपुत्रं गच्छति' इति देशवाद-
वन् । तस्मादाहवनीयसमीपेऽध्वर्युर्विभजति सदसि मैत्रावरुणो विभजेत् ऊर्ध्वकालो
मैत्रावरुणकालात् प्रातस्सवनोत्तरकालः । उत्तरयोस्सवनयोः पश्चाद्धि प्रस्थिता याज्या
ऋतुयाजेभ्यः । तेऽप्येव मैत्रावरुणो विभजति उत्तरकालं पूर्वस्मादध्वर्युकालात्
पूर्वमुत्तराभ्यां इति ।

॥ १३ ॥ ऋतुग्रहणेषु अध्वर्युः समाख्यानात् ॥ २ - ३ - ३४ ॥ (पू)

ऋतुग्रहणेषु अध्वर्युर्विभजेत् मैत्रावरुणो वेति सन्देहः समाख्यानादध्वर्यु-
र्विभजेदिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः ।

॥ ऋतुग्रहे मैत्रावरुणो विभजते ॥ २ - ३ - ३५ ॥ (सि)

तेषु अत्र प्रेषास्समाम्नायन्ते असौ यजासौ यजेत्येव । तस्मात् प्रेषाम्ना-
सामर्थ्यात् मैत्रावरुण एव विभजेत् अन्यत्राध्वर्युरेव विभजेत् समाख्यानात्
शेषेऽध्वर्युरित्येवं होतर्यजेति ।

॥ १४ ॥ पुनरभ्युन्नीतेषु मैत्रावरुण उच्येत प्रकरणात्
तस्माद्धोतृशब्दो यथा यदप्रतिरथं द्वितीयो
होतान्वाहेति^१ ॥ २ - ३ - ३६ ॥ (५)

पुनरभ्युन्नीतेष्वेव^२ किं मैत्रावरुण उच्येत आहोस्वित् होतैवेति । किं प्रासम् ? अध्वर्युणा मैत्रावरुण उच्यते । कुतः ? प्रकरणात् प्रकृतोऽसाविति, होतृशब्दश्च तस्मिन् युज्यते । सौम्यस्याध्वरस्य यज्ञकतोः सप्तहोत्राः प्राचीर्वषट् कुर्वन्तीति । यद्वा विन्दति यदप्रतिरथं द्वितीयो होतान्वाहेति ।

ननु च भक्त्या मैत्रावरुणे होतृशब्दो भवति । सत्यम् । मुख्यस्य मैत्रावरुणेन प्रेषितत्वात् तत्रासंभवात् भक्तिः कल्प्यते । ननु च तस्यापि प्रैष आम्नातः प्रशास्तर्यजेति । एकार्थास्तु विकल्पेर्न इति विकल्पो भविष्यति । तस्मान्मैत्रावरुण एवोच्येतेति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ होता वाऽग्निष्टोमचमसेषु शब्दसंयोगात् शेषोऽनारभ्यवादः
तद्व्याख्यातम् ॥ २ - ३ - ३७ ॥ (सि)

सर्वेषु चमसेषु सवनमुखीययागेषु होतर्यजेति होतैवोच्यते । शब्दसंयोगात् श्रुति^३संयोगादित्यर्थः । होतृशब्दः लक्षणया मैत्रावरुणे ; श्रुतिश्च लक्षणातो गरीयसी । बलेश्च न भविष्यति ।

ननु च मुख्योऽन्यत्र मैत्रावरुणेन प्रेषित इति नित्येषु ग्रहेषु मध्यतः कारिणां चमसेषु मुख्यं प्रेष्यति—आदित्याश्च पुनरभ्युन्नीय....भूयादित्युक्तम् । अपि चाध्वर्युः प्रेष्यत्यधर्माणः ते चमसा इति आध्वरोऽपि प्रयोग उपलभ्यते । तस्माद्धोतर्यजेति तेषु सहहूयमानेषु अध्वर्युणा होतैवोच्यते ।

शेषोऽनारभ्यवाद इति तथान्येषां तद्व्याख्यातम् । अधिकारसामर्थ्यादप्युक्तशेषः । शेषः इतरः यथा चतुरवत्तमिति ।

1. सहवषट्कारेणाहवनीये गच्छतीत्यत्र पुनरभ्युन्नीतेषु चोक्ता अतः स्तुतशस्वता उच्यशायजेति प्रैषाम्नातात् । —मूले अधिऋन्
2. तत्र अध्वर्युकर्तृकप्रैषगणमध्ये होतर्यज प्रशास्तर्यजेति भूतौ प्रैषौ । तत्रेत्यर्थः ।
3. A & R read अतिसंयोगात् ।

अपरः सूत्रार्थः—

॥ होता वाऽग्निष्टोमचमसेषु शब्दसंयोगात् ॥ २ - ३ - ३७ ॥

अग्निष्टोमचमसा इति सर्वचमसेषु तास्सवनमुखीया अभिप्रेताः । तेषु होता अर्ध्वर्गुणोच्येत । एवं मुख्यार्थेन होतृशब्दसंयोक्ष्यते ।

॥ शेषोऽनारभ्यवादस्तद्व्याख्यातम् ॥ २ - ३ - ३७ ॥

न चैतदस्ति यदुक्तं ; मुख्यो ह्यत्र मैत्रावरुणेन प्रेष्यते (तस्मात्) होतृयजेत्यनेना अनारभ्यवादः शेषविनिवेशेन गौणो मैत्रावरुणेन, तद्व्याख्यातम्, “अव्यक्तशेष” इति । दृष्टश्च गौणोऽपि प्रयोगः यथा अग्नौ तिष्ठतीति । समानलिङ्गे चास्य समानकर्तृकेन प्रशास्तृयजेत्यनेन (विकल्पेन) विकल्पो युक्तः; प्रस्थितशेषलिङ्गेन असमानकर्तृकेन च समानकार्ययोर्वचनात् समन्वयो युक्तः ।

॥ १५ ॥ आश्रुतप्रत्याश्रुते संप्रैषश्चानुवषट्कारे न विद्यते
अनुवषट्करोतीति तु विप्रकर्षे नोपपद्यते ॥ २-३-३८ ॥ (पू)

किमाश्रावणादयोऽनुवषट्कारे भवेयुः न वेति विचार्यते । [न]भवेयुः अनुशब्दस्य (अ)विप्रकर्षेऽनुपपत्तेः । यदि पुनराश्रावणादयो भवेयुः अनुशब्दो विरुद्धश्चेत्, तस्मान्नाश्रावणादयोऽनुवषट्कारे भवेयुरिति ।

विप्रतिषिद्धास्त्वेकेषां नाश्रावयतीति ॥ २-३-३९ ॥

आश्रावणादयोऽनुवषट्कारे प्रतिषिद्धयन्ते । प्रतिषेधश्च प्राप्तिपूर्वकः तस्मात् सन्त्याश्रावणादयोऽनुवषट्कार इति ।

न, नित्यानुवादो वा न्यायसन्निधानात् ॥ २-३-४० ॥ (सि)

नैवेदमाश्रावणादयोऽनुवषट्कारे भवेयुरिति । न्यायसन्निधानात् । सन्निहितो न्यायः अनुशब्दोऽत्र विप्रतिषिद्धयत् इति । न चायं विप्रतिषिद्धः नित्यानुवादश्रुतेः न्यायस्यात्राविशेषात् । “सोमस्य यज ” “वृतस्य यज ” “अग्नेः पाल्नीवतस्य यज ” इत्याम्नाताः । एतैस्तत्र संप्रैषाः यथाम्नानमेव भवेयुः वाचनिकत्वादिति ।

॥ इति सङ्घर्षकाण्डभाष्ये द्वितीयाध्यायस्य तृतीयःपादः ॥

॥ चतुर्थः पादः ॥

॥ १ ॥ देवतायोगेन प्रदानात्मके चोद्यमाने
आहुतिर्यथा लोके ॥ २ - ४ - १ ॥ (सि)

‘आग्नेयोऽष्टाकपाल’ इत्यादौ किं सङ्कल्पमात्रेणैव यागः उत प्रदानान्त इति । किं प्राप्तम् ? सङ्कल्पमात्रेणैवेति । कथं ? संकल्पमात्रस्य यागत्वात् देवतोद्देशेन कृते द्रव्यपरित्यागात्मके सङ्कल्पे कृतं चोदितमिति न प्रदानमादर्तव्यमिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

देवतासंयोगेन “आग्नेयोऽष्टाकपाल” इति चोद्यमानं प्रदानं आहुतिः यथा देवदत्ताय दातव्यमित्युक्ते तत्प्रदानं गम्यते, एवमाहवनीयादिदेशे अवदानावच-द्रव्यसम्प्रापणं याग इति । तदुक्तं—यजतिस्तु द्रव्यफलभोक्तृसंयोगादिति पू. मी ॥ २ - ३ - १४ ॥

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥ २ - ४ - २ ॥ (गु. सू.)

‘उत्तरार्धे जुहोति’ ‘मध्येऽग्नेः^१ आज्याहुतीः पुरोडाशाहुतीश्च जुहोति’ इति । तत्र जुहोतिचोदनात् आहवनीयसम्बन्धः प्रतीयते । तस्मान् प्रदानमिति सिद्धम् । अस्यार्थस्य तन्त्रस्थाने प्रतिपादितत्वात् पुनरुक्तत्वमिति । पुन[र्वचन]मुत्तरविवक्षार्थमिति ।

॥ २ ॥ अदेवतासंयोगेन चोद्यमानेऽर्थगृहीता देवता तत्संयोगे
जुहोतिशब्दो यथा भोजनशब्दो मनुष्यसंयोगे ॥ २-४-३ ॥ (सि)

अनुपात्तदेवता यत्र यजतिजुहोतिचोदना यथा ‘उपांशुयाजमन्तरा यजति’ ‘तूष्णीमेव जुहोति’ इत्यादि तत्र तत्संयोगे अनुपात्तदेवताकतया विनैव देवतया कर्म कर्तव्यं उत केनचित्प्रकारेण देवताऽङ्गीकर्तव्येति । विनैव देवतया तत्कर्म कर्तव्यम् । कुतः ? देवताचोदनाभावात् उपांशुयाजमन्तरा यजतीति नात्र देवता श्रूयते । ‘विष्णु-रुपांशु यष्टय’ इत्येवमादीनां देवतापरत्वं, उक्तार्थपरत्वात् । न चाध्याहा-रादिभिः कल्प्यमाना देवता चोदिता स्यात् । न चतुर्थ्यादिकं किञ्चित् देवता-

प्रमाणमस्ति । असत्यां देवतायां यागासम्भव इति चेत् सामान्येन त्यागांशस्य विद्यमानत्वात् । तस्मात् विनैव देवतया द्रव्यमुत्सृष्टव्यमिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

अदेवतासंयोगेन चोद्यमाने कर्मण्युपांशुयाजादौ यजतिजुहोतिचोदनयाऽर्थ-
गृहीता देवता । यथा भोजनचोदनायां मनुष्ययोगस्सर्वत्रारूपातशब्दार्थः समाक्षि-
प्ताशेषकारककलाप एव वर्तते ।

यथाचोक्तं पतञ्जलिना—पचतीत्युक्ते नियमार्थोऽनुवादः काष्ठैरित्यादि ।
पुरुषव्यापारेण सामान्येन सप्तकारकाक्षेपः । यजतिचोदनायां (पवन)[यजि]धात्वर्थे-
नापि देवताक्षेपः । देवतोद्देशेन द्रव्यत्यागस्य यागत्वात् ।

यत्पुनरिदमुक्तम्—अचोदितत्वात् देवताऽभाव इति । नैतदेवम् ।
धातुचोदनया^१ सामान्येन चोदितत्वादिति विशेषतो विप्रतिपत्तिः । मान्त्रवर्णिके
मन्त्रसंयोगेन चोद्यमाने योऽर्थो मन्त्रैः श्रूयते सा देवता प्रदानसंयोगात् । न ह्यन्यत्
प्रत्यक्षं विद्यते । यत्र मन्त्रसंबन्धं कर्म चोद्यते—यथा “ प्रजापते न त्वदेतान्यन्यः
इति तस्यैव ग्रहैर्जुहुयात् ” इति तत्र मन्त्रार्थः प्रजापतिर्देवतात्वेनाभिसंबध्यते ।
न ह्यन्यत् प्रत्यक्षविहितदेवतात्वे कारकमस्ति । सत्यपि निराकर्तृसंप्रदानत्वे देवता-
कारकस्य सामान्येन क्रियाक्षिप्तस्य प्रकारान्तरेण विशेषप्रतिपत्तिरिति ।

॥ ३ ॥ सुक्तवाक एव याज्या प्रस्तरप्रहरणमाहुतिरिध्मः प्रथममाहुतीनां
हूयत इत्येतेन व्याख्यातम् ॥ २ - ४ - ४ ॥ (पू)

इध्मप्रस्तरयोः किमाहुतित्वेनारादुपकारकत्वं उत सामवायिकत्वं इति सन्देहः
किं प्राप्तम् ? आरादुपकारकत्वं “ सुक्तवाक एव याज्या प्रस्तर आहुतिः ” इति ।
इज्यतेऽनयेति याज्या । मान्त्रवर्णिकयो देवताः प्रस्तर आहुतिः “ इध्मः प्रथम
आहुतीनामित्याहुः ” (नमश्शिवयेति त्ववगम्यत इति ?) इध्मे मान्त्रवर्णिकी देवता
द्रव्यं इध्मः । तस्मात् प्रयाजादिवदारादुपकारकत्वमिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ प्रशंसा वा संस्कारः प्रस्तरस्य सन्निधानात् ॥ २ - ४ - ७ ॥ (सि)

(धात्वर्थ इव) क.ष्ठे अग्निसंबन्धे अग्निवृद्धयर्थः प्रत्यक्षो गम्यते । अतोऽत्रापि
सामिधेनीभिराहवनीय एवाभिधीयते । न देवताग्निः । देवताकर्मभिरपि ज्वलनस्य

संस्तुतिः दृष्टा, तद्वद्रुपचारात् । दधिक्रावनदीवच्च सरस्वती स्तूयते इति । तस्माद्-
भयोरपि सन्निपातित्वमेवेति ।

यदा चैतदेवं तदा “उपदेशो वा याज्याशब्दो हि नाकस्मात् (३-२-१२)
इति कृत्वाचिन्ता सा तन्त्रे । इध्मस्य निशीष्टौ प्रयाजवत् प्रसङ्गात् कार्यसिद्धौ न
भेदेन^२ क्रिया यदा पूर्वः पक्षः । यदा तर्हि सिद्धान्तः तदाऽग्निसमिन्धनस्य भेदेनैव
विवक्षितत्वात् भेदेनैव क्रियेतेति । मन्त्रा न किञ्चित्समाज्जानन्ते ।

॥ ४ ॥ अज्यानीरेता उपदधातीत्याग्रयणं निरुष्यैता आहुतीरिति
तत्संयोगपृथक्त्वम् ॥ २-४-५ ॥

मन्त्राणां तुल्यसन्निधानात् तदग्नौ आप्रयणे च वाचनिको मन्त्राणां सन्नि-
धानादनेकत्र विनियोग इति भूतार्थवादविनियोगपरं सूत्रम् । नानेनाधिकरणं शक्यं
कर्तुमिति ।

॥५॥ चित्रया यजेत पशुकाम इत्युक्त्वा अथैता आहुतीर्जुहोत्येते वै देवताः-
पुष्टिपतयः तयैवास्मिन् पुष्टि दधाति अग्ने गोभिर्न आगहि इन्दो
पुष्ट्या जुषस्व नः इन्द्रो धर्ता गृहेषु नः इत्येतैर्मन्त्रैर्जुहुयात्
आनन्तर्यात् पुष्टिशब्दश्चोभयत्र श्रूयते ॥ २-४-६ ॥

‘अथैता आहुतीर्जुहोति’ इत्यत्र प्रकारणिका मन्त्रा अनियमेनोपादेयाः उत
पुष्टिलिङ्गा इति । प्रकरणादनियमे प्राप्ते—

उच्यते । एत एव पुष्टिलिङ्गाः । कथं क्रमलिङ्गाभ्यां, एते वै देवताः
पुष्टिपतय इति पुष्टिलिङ्गमन्त्रनियम इति । इन्दो पुष्ट्या जुषस्वनः इति च ।

॥ ६ ॥ दर्विहोमे सकृद्गृहीतमर्थापत्तेः ॥ २-४-७ ॥

किमनियमः सकृत् असकृद्वा गृहीतेन दर्विहोमाः कर्तव्याः इति सन्देहे
नियमकारिणोऽसम्भवादनियमे प्राप्ते ब्रूमः ।

दर्विहोमेषु सकृद्गृहीतमाज्यं भवेत् । कथं ? अर्थापत्तेः अर्थो हि ग्रहणं
नासकृद्गृहीतेन दर्विहोमाः कर्तव्या इति ।

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥ २ - ४ - ११ ॥

चतुरुन्नयति द्विर्जुहोति अथ क द्वे आहुती भवत इति चतुर्षु चतस्र आहुतीः
[सङ्ख्याय दर्शयन्] प्रत्याहुति पृथग्ग्रहणं दर्शयति ।

॥ ७ ॥ गणेषु चतुर्गृहीतं समवायाद्यथा ध्रुवायाः ॥ २ - ४ - १२ ॥ (पू)

आहुतिगणेषु किं तन्त्रमाज्यग्रहणं उत भेदेनेति सन्देहः । किं [प्राप्तम्?] तन्त्रमिति । कथं ? समवायादाहुतीनाम् । तासां पुरस्तादगृह्यमाणविशेषत्वात् तन्त्रं स्यात् यथा ध्रुवायां सर्वार्थग्रहणमिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ प्रत्याहुति वा प्रदानसंयोगात् ॥ २ - ४ - १३ ॥ (सि)

प्रत्याहुति[इष्येत] ^१आज्यग्रहणं ; प्रदानसंयोगात् गृहीतदेवतोद्देशेन[अ] प्रदायान्यत् ग्रहीतुं न शक्यते । प्रत्याहुति गृह्यमाणस्येति ध्रुवाया[यां] ग्रहणं आज्यसंस्कारत्वात् तन्त्रमेव स्यादिति ।

॥ तत्र समासे वचनं क्रियेत कर्मविभागात् ॥ २ - ४ - १४ ॥

तत्र तेषु दर्विहोमेषु बहूनां देवतानामेकस्मिन् पात्रे गृह्येताज्यं यदि गृह्येत [हविषः] संसर्गात् कार्यं इति । (ग्रन्थपातः)

॥ ८ ॥ समिदाधानं न विद्यतेऽनाम्नानात् ॥ २ - ४ - १५ ॥ (पू)

दर्विहोमेषु समिदाधानं कर्तव्यं न वेति विचार्यते । किं प्राप्तं ? न कर्तव्यमिति । कुतः ? न ह्येधजातीयकेषु स्वार्थेषु वचनमन्तरेण प्रवृत्तिर्भवति । न च दर्विहोमेषु अपूर्वत्वात् अन्यतः सर्वप्राप्तिः । तस्मान्न तेषु समिदाधानम् । इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ समिधं प्रत्याहुति दर्शयति ॥ २ - ४ - १६ ॥ (सि)

अग्निहोत्रे सामामनन्ति “यदेकां समिधमाधाय द्वे आहुती जुहोति अथ कस्यां समिधि द्वितीयामाहुतिं जुहोति” इति एतस्यां समिधि अप्राप्तायां द्वितीयामाहुतिं कस्यां समिधि जुहोतीति ब्रूयात् इति प्रत्याहुति समिधमुचितां दर्शयति । तदेतल्लिङ्गम् ।

कस्यां समिधि प्राप्तायां द्वितीयामिति अग्निहोत्रविषयत्वात् “अग्निहोत्रे द्वे समिधौ कार्ये आहुती” इति विहितयोरेकं परित्यजन् “तस्यां द्वितीयामाहुतिं जुहुयात् द्वे ह्येते आहुती” (इव)[इति] आहुतिद्वित्वप्रयुक्ते समिधौ ब्रुवन् तद्विषयौ समिधौ दर्शयति । न चार्थवादत्वेन प्रकृतविधिशेषत्वे संभवति अविहितस्य^१ लिङ्गतः प्रकल्पनं न्याय्यम् । तस्मादग्निहोत्रे एकस्मिन् नान्येषु दर्विहोमेषु इत्येतत्सूत्रमुल्लङ्घ्य^२ पूर्वपक्ष एवाङ्गीकृतः कैश्चित् ।

अत्रोच्यते — “कस्यां समिधि द्वितीयामाहुतिं” इति (न)सामर्थ्यादापन्नम् समिधा विना[ना]हुतिर्होतव्येति । सामर्थ्यं च शब्दैकदेशः । तस्मात् श्रुत्येकदेशः स इति । न च सामर्थ्यादाहुतिमाले समायन्ती समित् अग्निहोत्रेण विशेषेण शक्यते । प्रकरणस्याविशेषकत्वात् । लिङ्गं द्विविधम्-द्योतकं सामर्थ्यात्मकं च । द्योतके न्यायान्तरापेक्षा । सामर्थ्यात्मकं तु प्रमापकमेव भवति । अपि चैकेषामग्निहोत्रे एका समित् तदपेक्षं वचनं औचित्यात् द्वे समिधौ द्वे आहुती भवत इति । यस्मात् द्वे समिधाविति ब्रुवन् प्रत्याहुति समिधं दर्शयति तस्मात् दर्विहोमेषु समिदाधानं कर्तव्यमेवेति ।

॥ ९ ॥ पाकयज्ञशब्दस्सर्वयज्ञानामविशेषात् यथाऽऽहुति-
शब्दः ॥ २ - ४ - १७ ॥ (पृ)

किमय पाकयज्ञशब्दः लौकिकवैदिकयज्ञमात्रस्य वाचकः उत दर्विहोमानामिति । यदा दर्विहोमानां तदा किं सर्वदर्विहोमानामुत लौकिकानामेवेति ।

किं प्राप्तम् ? पाकयज्ञशब्दः सर्वेषां यज्ञानां नामधेयमिति । कथं ? अविशेषात् । नहि विशेषः कश्चिदध्यवसीयते अस्यैतन्नामधेयमिति यथाऽऽहुतिशब्दः सर्वाहुतीनामेवं पाकयज्ञशब्दोऽपीति ।

॥ केषांचिद्व्यपदेशात् ॥ २ - ४ - १८ ॥ (सि.)

“मनुर्वै पाकयज्ञीय आसीत् स इमं इतरं यज्ञमपश्यत्” इति इतरव्यपदेशात् कस्यचिदेव यज्ञस्य वाचकः पाकयज्ञशब्द इति ।

1. R. reads अवहितस्य
2. R. reads सूत्रमुल्लङ्घ्य

॥ १० ॥ सर्वदर्विहोमानां स्याल्लिङ्गसंयोगात् ॥ २ - ४ - १९ ॥ (सि)

पाकमभिनिर्वर्त्य यज्ञः पाकयज्ञः सोमयागादयमन्य इति [प्राप्ते] विज्ञायते अन्यो दर्विहोमः लिङ्गसंयोगात् “यद्वै चातुर्मास्यानां पाकयज्ञः सैव तदेषां पशव्यं गृहमेधीयो ह्येषां पाकयज्ञे[ज्ञो]नेध्मावर्हिर्भवति न सामिधेनीरन्वाह न प्रयाजा इज्यन्ते” इतीध्मादीनामिष्ट-चङ्गानामभावे पाकयज्ञत्वं ब्रुवन् दर्विहोमेषु पाकयज्ञ-शब्दं दर्शयति । तस्मात् दर्विहोमः पाकयज्ञ इति ।

॥ ११ ॥ सर्वेषामविशेषात् ॥ २ - ४ - २० ॥ (पू)

लौकिकवैदिकानां सर्वेषां दर्विहोमानामेषा संज्ञा स्यात् अविशेषात् ।

॥ लौकिकानां वा तेषां एतन्नामधेयम् ॥ २ - ४ - २१ ॥ (सि)

लौकिकानां दर्विहोमानामेषा संज्ञा स्यात् लोके द्विरेतेष्वेव प्रयोगदर्शनात् “शिबीनां च पाकयज्ञः उशीनराणां पाकयज्ञ” इति ।

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥ २ - ४ - २२ ॥

लिङ्गमपि लौकिकानामेव दर्विहोमानां पाकयज्ञे[ज्ञशब्दं]दर्शयति “यदा-ऽन्यस्य हविषः स्रुच्यवद्यति सर्वमेव तदग्नौ जुहोति । अथ कस्मात् द्विर्जुहोति द्विर्निर्माष्टि द्विःप्राश्नाति उत्सृज्याचामति निर्लेडीति तदस्य पाकयज्ञस्य” [इति] । अतः पाकयज्ञस्यैवार्यं धर्म इति व्यपदेशात्[न] वैदिकमग्निहोत्रं पाकयज्ञसंज्ञमिति ।

॥ १२ ॥ धर्मोपदेशो विप्रतिषेधात् यथावदेतत् ॥ २ - ४ - २३ ॥ (सि)

पाकयज्ञानां वा अनया श्रुत्या धर्म उपलभ्यते ।¹ यदि पुनर्नोपदिश्येरन् एषा श्रुतिर्विप्रतिषेध्येत । तेनैषा श्रुतिरुभयकारिणी “यद्येतां नालमेत वायव्यस्यैव शिर उपदध्यात्” इति । पक्षे पश्चनालम्भे शिरउपधानं चोभयमेषा श्रुतिः [प्रापयति] एवमेषा श्रुतिरगत्या उभयकारिणी ।

यदि पुनः शास्त्रान्तरोन्नीता वा ‘द्विर्जुहोति’ इत्यादीनां धर्माणां केषामपि पाकयज्ञेषु प्राप्तिः स्यात् (तस्मात्)[तदा]तस्य पाकयज्ञस्यैव इति श्रुतिः यथाप्राप्तानु-वादी[दिनी]भवति न विप्रतिषेधाद्विकारत्वायेति ।

1. अत्र ग्रन्थपातः स च “उत तेषां सन्निपातिर्भिरङ्गैः नैराकाङ्क्ष्यमिति सन्देहे सन्नि-पात्यङ्गैरेव नैराकाङ्क्ष्यमिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः । द्विर्जुहोति इत्यादिभिः अङ्गानि ।” इति ऊह्यते

आधारं प्रकृतिं प्राह दर्विहोमं तु[मेषु]वादरिः ।

अग्निहोत्रं तथाऽऽत्रेयः काशकृत्स्नस्तु पूर्णताम् ॥

तस्मात् अनुवाद एवेति ।

॥ १३ ॥ प्राचीनप्रवणे यजेतेत्यधिकरणनिर्देशः
स्यात् ॥ २ - ४ - २४ ॥ (सि)

“ प्राचीनप्रवणे वैश्वदेवेन यजेत ” इति किमयं अग्निविकारः उत विहार-
विकारदेशोपदेश इति संशये किं प्राप्तम् ? अग्निविकार इति । प्राचीनप्रवणे
यजेतेत्यधिकरणनिर्देशः स्यात् अन्तरङ्गत्वात् यथा “ पदे जुहोति ” इत्येवमग्निवि-
कारः एवमत्रापीति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

प्राचीनप्रवण इति विहारदेशोपदिदिक्षा न देशोऽग्निविकारः । कथमिति ?
देशोपदेशस्वरूपत्वात् वचसः । प्राचीनप्रवण इति देशो विधीयते न होमाधि-
करणम् । यथा पर्वतान्ते यजत इति । एवमत्रापि । केचित्तु कार्यसामान्यस्य
आहवनीयविकारं मन्यन्ते । तदयुक्तम् । आहवनीयादिकार्यस्य शास्त्रैकसमधिगम्य-
त्वात् । तदुक्तं—न देवताग्निशब्दक्रियमन्यार्थसंयोगात् इति ।

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥ २ - ४ - २५ ॥

यदीदमग्निविकारः स्यादाहवनीयो न दृश्यते । दृश्यते तु “ यजमानो वा
एककपालः स्वर्गो लोक आहवनीयः यदेककपालमाहवनीये जुहोति यजमानमेव
स्वर्गं लोकं गमयति ” इति ।

॥ १४ ॥ पदे जुहोति वर्त्मनि जुहोति बल्मीकवपायां जुहोतीत्येतेन
व्याख्यातम् ॥ २ - ४ - २६ ॥ (पू)

पदादिरग्निदेशः उताग्निविकार इति । किं प्राप्तं ? पूर्वेण न्यायेन देश-
विकार इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ अग्निविकारा वा जुहोतिसंयोगेन चोद्यमाने अर्धशब्देन विधीयन्ते
यथा उत्तरार्धेऽग्नये जुहोति दक्षिणार्धे सोमायेति
देशशब्देन विधीयन्ते ॥ २ - ४ - २७ ॥ (सि)

वाशब्दात् पक्षो विपरिवर्तते । न पदादिभिर्देशो विक्रियते । किन्त्वग्नि-
विशेषविधानात् आहवनीयादिविधेस्सावकाशत्वात् जुहोतियोगात् प्रयोगशब्द-

संयोगात् अर्धशब्देन विधीयन्ते इति । यजतेरधिकार्थप्रापकेण जुहोतिशब्देन विधीयमानस्य अधिकरणविकारत्वं ऐक्षिष्ट हि—यथा उत्तरार्धे जुहोति दक्षिणार्धे जुहोतीत्यादौ । तद्वदत्रापि जुहोतिशब्देनासेचनं गम्यते । तस्य चाधिकरणत्वमग्नेः । पदादयोऽपि तत्र श्रूयन्ते । तस्मादग्निविकार इति । कार्यापत्तेश्चाग्निधर्मत्वात् पदादीनाम् इति । “चतुष्पथे जुहोति” इति विधाय एष वा अग्नीनां पड्वीशो नाम अग्निवत्येव जुहोति इति चतुष्पथस्य अन्येन प्रकारेणाग्निमत्तां ब्रुवन् पदादीनामग्निविकारत्वं द्योतयति ।

पूर्वेणास्य लिङ्गं पुनरुक्तं मन्यमानाः अस्य सूत्रस्यापरं पाठमाहुः—

॥ १४ ॥ चतुष्पथे जुहोतीत्यनेन व्याख्यातम् ॥ २-४-२८ ॥ (पृ)

अस्मिन्नध्याये अधिकरणातिदेशार्थं सूत्रम् । पूर्ववदत्र पक्षोपन्यासः विकारश्चेति । “चतुष्पथ एकोल्मुकमुपनिधाय जुहोति” इति (इत्येकेषां विकल्पः ।) विप्रतिषेधात् केवलचतुष्पथे होतव्यं एकोल्मुके वा इति विकल्पः उतोल्मुकमुपनिधायैवेति ।

किं प्राप्तम् ? विकल्प इति । कुतः ? विप्रतिषेधात् श्रुत्योरेकार्थतयैव । उल्मुकोऽप्यग्निः पड्वीशोऽप्यग्निरेव । अतः तुल्यार्थत्वात् विकल्प एवेति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ प्रशंसा वा अग्निवत्येव जुहोतीति यथा ब्राह्मणवान्
ग्राम इति ॥ २-४-३० ॥ (सि)

सत्स्वप्यन्येषु ब्राह्मणवत्सु ग्रामेषु योऽनेकब्राह्मणवान् सोऽभिधीयते ब्राह्मणवानिति । एवमत्रापि प्रशंसार्थत्वमिति ।

॥ १५ ॥ प्रत्यञ्चोऽवभृथेन चरन्तीति प्राङ्मुखाः कर्माणि कुर्युः
तद्व्याख्यातम् ॥ २-४-३१ ॥ (सि)

किं विहारस्य ^१प्रत्यङ्मुखतोच्यते [उत कर्तृणामिति] किं प्राप्तम् ? प्रत्यञ्चोऽवभृथेन चरन्तीति । प्रत्यङ्मुखं विहारं कृत्वा पश्चात् विहारस्य प्राङ्मुखाः सन्तः प्रचरेयुः । तद्व्याख्यातम्-प्राङ्मुखानि कर्माणि कर्तव्यानीति । अथवा तद्व्याख्यातम् कर्तृणां प्रत्यङ्मुखत्वे विधेये विहारपरिवृत्तिः प्रत्यङ्मुखता च सह विधीयेयाताम् । तत्र वाक्यभेदः भवतीति ।

॥ तद्व्याख्यातम् ॥

प्रत्यङ्मुखात् विहारसंयोगात् प्रत्यङ्मुखा वा कर्तारो भवेयुः विहारसंयोगात् विहारं परिवर्तमानमनु (वक्तारोति) कर्तारोऽपि विपरिवर्तन्ते । यथा हस्तिनि अश्वे वा परिवर्तमाने तस्याः प्राणिनोऽपि परिवर्तन्ते तद्वदत्रापीति । प्रत्यञ्चोऽवभृथेन चरन्तीति विहारपरिवृत्तिमाप्नुयात् । तामनु कर्तारोऽपि विपरिवर्तन्त इति न तद्विकारत्वविधिरिति “ न प्राची वै द्विरूपत्वात् पितृयज्ञो हि भवति न दक्षिणा यज्ञोऽभ्युदेति त्वन्तरोभयोः^१ भवति । अत्रेज्यन्ते देवाश्च पितरश्च ” इति इदमन्यार्थदर्शनं उक्तन्यायस्य दृढिन्नः कारणमिति ।

॥ १७ ॥ ‘पृथिव्यै स्वाहान्तरिक्षाय स्वाहा’ इति मन्त्रान्ताम्रातः
स्वाहाकारः प्रदानार्थत्वात् तौ ह्यौ श्रुत्या संयुज्येते
॥ २-४-३३ ॥

मन्त्रान्ताम्रातः स्वाहाकारः प्रदानार्थो भवेत् श्रुत्या प्रदानार्थता चोदिता चेति “ स्वाहाकारेण वषट्कारेण वा देवेभ्योऽन्नं प्रदीयते ” इति प्राप्तिस्त्वमेतदुत्तर-विचक्षार्थमिति ।

॥ १८ ॥ पुरस्तादपि मन्त्राः श्रूयमाणाः तदर्थाः प्रदानसंयोगात्
यथा देहि ब्राह्मणाय ब्राह्मणाय देहीति ॥ २ - ४ - ३४ ॥ (सि)

“स्वाहा वाचे स्वाहा वाचस्पतये” इति पुरस्तान्मन्त्रैः[न्त्रेभ्यः]श्रूयमाणः स्वाहाकारो न प्रदानार्थः उत प्रदानार्थ इति । किं प्राप्तम् ? वैदिकानां यथाज्ञानं कार्यनिष्पादकत्वमिति ; गिरापदस्थाने इरापदवत् [वा]विनियोगः । तदुभयमपि[न]पुरस्ताद्वर्तिनि स्वाहाकारे । तस्मान्न तस्य प्रदानार्थत्वमिति स्वस्थानप्रच्युतेः । स्वमन्त्रान्ते व्यवस्थितस्य स्वाहाकारस्य वषट्कारस्य वा प्रदानार्थत्वं दृष्टम् । न चात्र दृष्टम् । तस्मान्न प्रदानार्थत्वमिति । सत्यपि कर्णालङ्कारशब्दे कर्णदेशात् प्रच्युते कर्णशोभाजनकत्वं न दृष्टं तथेहापीति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

पुरस्तादपि मन्त्रस्य हविः^२ प्रदानार्थ एव स्वाहाकारः । प्रदानग्रहणे स्वाहाकारेण वषट्कारेण वा देवेभ्योऽन्नं प्रदीयत इति । यत्न यत्न स्वेन कार्येण दृष्टेनादृष्टं

1. त्वन्तरोद्धृत्योः R. A.

2. A. R. पयः

कार्यमपास्य संबध्यते यथा देहीत्ययं शब्दो देहि ब्राह्मणाय, ब्राह्मणाय देहीति देशान्तरसंबद्धोऽपि अनुवदन् अन्यमर्थं न भजते एवमत्रापीति ।

॥ आम्नायाच्च ॥ २-४-३५ ॥

आम्नायोऽप्येतं दर्शयति “पुरस्तात्स्वाहाकृतयो वा अन्ये देवाः उपरिष्ठात्स्वाकृतयोऽन्ये” इति निजदेशस्यापि स्वाहाकारस्य प्रदानार्थत्वं दर्शयति ।

॥ १९ ॥ स्वाहाकृत्य ब्रह्मणा ते जुहोमि स्वाहाकृतमिति प्रयतं जुहोमि^१
स्वाहाकृतमिन्द्राय ते जुहोमि स्वाहाकृतः पुनरप्येति देवान्
इत्येतेन व्याख्यातम् ॥ २-४-३६ ॥ (पू)

एतेऽपि स्वाहाकाराः प्रदानार्था भवेयुः पूर्वेण न्यायेन रूपसामान्यादिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ अप्रदानार्था वा स्तुत्यर्थः श्रूयते ॥ २-४-३७ ॥ (सि)

अप्रदानार्था एते स्वाहाकाराः विशेषणत्वात् ^२अङ्गीकृतनिष्ठाप्रत्ययार्थेन स्वाहाकाराः द्रव्यार्थतयोपादीयन्त इति द्रव्यस्तुतिद्वारेण वाक्यार्थसमवाये सति स्वाहाकारस्य न प्रदानार्थत्वे प्रमाणमस्ति । तस्मादेवंजातीयकाः स्वाहाकारा न प्रदानार्थाः इति ।

॥ २० ॥ वषट्ते विष्णवाः आकृणोमीत्येतेन
व्याख्यातम् ॥ २ - ४ - ३८ ॥ (सि)

“वषट्ते विष्णवाः आकृणोमि” इत्यत्रापि किं वषट्कारः प्रदानार्थः उत नेति सन्देहः एतेन व्याख्यातमित्यधिकरणातिदेशः । पूर्वाधिकरणे यौ पूर्वेत्तरपक्षौ तावेवात्रापीति ।

सत्यपि देवतासंबन्धे ‘वषट्ते आकृणोमि’ इति करोतिसमन्वयो वषट्कारस्येति ।^३

1. Bhatta Dipika ms. omits this portion of the Sutra.

2. A. & R. नाङ्गी

3. अत्रापि वषट्कारस्य न स्वातन्त्र्यं तस्य आकृणोमीत्यनेनान्वयादित्यर्थः

॥ २१ ॥ स्विष्टकृद्विकारे याज्यायां देवतानिगमाः स्युः
प्रकृत्युपबन्धात् ॥ २ - ४ - ३९ ॥ (सि)

स्विष्टकृद्विकारे वनस्पतौ याज्यायां देवतानिगमाः स्युः नेति विचार्यते ।
किं प्राप्तम् ?

वनस्पतौ याज्यायामविशेषेण[देवतोप]बन्धः । प्रकृतावपि दर्शपूर्णमास-
स्विष्टकृति एवमुपलक्षिताः । प्रकृतिवदत्रापि भवेयुरिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः —

॥ उपलक्षणप्रधानास्तूपलक्षिताः पुनः प्रैषे ॥ २ - ४ - ४० ॥ (सि)

उपलक्षणप्रधान एव[प्रैषे तेषां] उपलक्षितत्वान्नोपलक्षणान्तरमपेक्षन्ते । तस्मा-
दर्थभावाच्च स्युरिति याज्यानुपलक्षणम्^१ ।

अन्यः पुनरेषोऽर्थः । अन्यार्थं प्रैषसंयुक्तं पूर्वार्थं देवतोपलक्षणं अन्यकार्य-
मेदात् एते निगमा इति । स्विष्टकृतो याज्या एतेन व्याख्याता । प्रकृतेपि स्विष्टकृति
याज्यायां देवतोपलक्षणस्यान्यार्थत्वात् । तस्मात् प्रकृतावपि याज्यायां देवः[भेदः] ।

॥ २२ ॥ स्वाहेत्यालेखनः प्रदानकर्मा चतुर्थीविभक्तेः

॥ २ - ४ - ४ ॥ (पृ)

‘चित्तं च चित्तिश्चाकूतं चाकूतिश्च’ इत्यादि समाज्ञातम् । किं प्रथमान्त-
मेव प्रयोगकाले प्रयोक्तव्यम् उत चतुर्थ्यन्तं विपरिणमयितव्यम् । “स्वाहाकारेण
वा वषट्कारेण वा देवेभ्योऽन्नं प्रदीयते” इति प्रदानार्थत्वात्स्वाहाकारस्य संप्रदाने
चतुर्थीति नियमो भवतीति चतुर्थ्यन्तं विपरिणमयितव्यमिति । अपि च स्मृतिः
चतुर्थीमेव नियमयति “नमः स्वस्तिस्वाहास्वधालं वषड्योगाच्चेति” तस्माच्चतुर्थ्यन्तस्य
प्रयोगं आलेखनो मन्यते स्मेति ।

॥ यथासमाज्ञानमित्याश्मरथ्यः प्रवचनलक्षणत्वान्मन्त्राणाम्

॥ २-४-४२ (सि)

यथासमाज्ञानं एवंजातीयकमित्याश्मरथ्यो मन्यते स्म । कुतः ? प्रवचन-
लक्षणत्वान्मन्त्राणाम् । समाज्ञायलक्षणो मन्त्रः ये यथा समाज्ञायन्ते ते तथैव
प्रयोक्तव्या इति ।

विभक्त्यन्तरितव्यत्ययोऽपि छन्दसि दृष्टः बहुलवचनात् । तस्माद्यथासमा-
ज्ञानं प्रयोग इति ।

॥ २२ ॥ चित्ताय स्वाहा चिन्त्यै स्वाहेत्येकेषां विकल्पो
विप्रतिषेधात् ॥ २ - ४ - ४३ ॥ (सि)

किमेतयोर्मन्त्रपाठयोश्शाखान्तरीययोः समुच्चयः आहोस्विद्विकल्प इति
सन्देहः । किं प्राप्तं ? समुच्चय इति ।

कुतः ? विकल्पस्यान्याय्यत्वात् । मन्त्रान्तरतया समुच्चयोपपत्तेः ॥ [इति प्राप्ते]
'येन कर्मणोर्त्सेत् तत्र जयान् जुहुयात्' इत्यनुपात्तसङ्घट्टानां होमानां मन्त्राणां
प्रत्ययमात्रभेदात् एकार्थत्वात् असति समुच्चये विकल्प एवेति । अथवाऽस्य विकल्पो
विप्रतिषेधादिति । स एष प्रथमाचतुर्थ्योः स्वार्थप्रत्ययत्वे सत्यपि प्रातिपदिकोच्चारणयोः
समुच्चयविप्रतिषेधात् विकल्पः प्रयोगे स्यात् ।

॥ २३ ॥ भूतानामवेष्टिभिरिष्टका उपदध्यात् अर्थवाद-
सामान्यात् ॥ २ - ४ - ४४ ॥ (पू)

भूतेष्टका उपदधाति अत्रात्र वै मृत्युर्जायते यत्र यत्र वै मृत्युर्जायते तत एवै-
नमयजतीति^१ । तत्र सन्देहः किं राजसूयसमधिगतैः पृथिव्यै स्वाहेत्यादिभिः
भूतानामवेष्टिमन्त्रैः इष्टका उपधातव्याः आहोस्वित् प्राकरणिकैः ब्राह्मणविहितैः
“पृथिव्यसि जन्मना” इत्यादिभिरुपधानं कर्तव्यमिति । किं प्राप्तम् ? राजसूय-
समधिगतैरिति । कुतः ? अर्थवादसामान्यात् भूतानामवेष्टिभिरिति । तुल्यशब्दत्वाच्च ।
तुल्यश्चोभयत्र भूतशब्दः भूतानामवेष्टयः भूतेष्टका इति । तुल्यत्वमेवमर्थवत्त्वमासादयेत्
यदि राजसूयप्रकरणसमधिगताभिः प्रतीयेरन् इति प्राप्ते—ब्रूमः

॥ अग्नौ वा येऽब्राह्मणा मन्त्रास्तद्व्याख्यातम् ॥ २-४-४५ ॥ (सि)

अग्नौ ये मन्त्रसामान्याये पठिता मन्त्रास्ते अब्राह्मणाः अविद्यमानब्राह्मणविनि-
योगा इत्यर्थः । प्रकरणात् प्राकरणिकैः “पृथिव्यसि जन्मना च साग्निना गर्भमाधत्तां
सा मया संभवेत्” इत्येवमादिभिरेवोपधानं कर्तव्यं भूतेष्टकानाम् । तदुक्तम्—
तदाख्यं वा प्रकरणोपपत्तिभ्यामिति^२ ।

यत्पुनरर्थवादसामान्यादिति, तत्रोच्यते ।

॥ नानार्थयोरर्थवादसामान्यं यथा ऋतुषु
पृथक्त्वम् ॥ २ - ४ - ४६ ॥

पृथग्भूतयोरेव तदर्थसादृश्यम् यथा ऋतुपृथक्त्वे अर्थवादसादृश्यम् । उत्सन्नयज्ञो वा एष यदग्निः इति उत्सन्नयज्ञो वा एष यदग्निहोत्रं इति च ।

॥ एतेन तुल्यशब्दत्वं व्याख्यातम् ॥ २ - ४ - ४७ ॥

तुल्यशब्दाभिधेयत्वं नानाभूतयोरपि दृष्टम् । यथा कुण्डपाये जुहोतौ अग्निहोत्रे चेति ॥

॥ २४ ॥ मन्त्रागमे सस्वाहाकारः प्रतीयेत वाक्य-
संयोगात् ॥ २ - ४ - ४८ ॥ (सि)

भूतानामवेष्टिमन्त्रैः केवलैरेवोपधानं कर्तव्यम् उत स्वाहाकारेणेति । किं प्राप्तम् ? स्वाहाकारैरिति । कुतः ? वाक्यावयवत्वात् । वाक्यैकदेशत्वात् स्वाहाकारस्य मन्त्रेषु प्राप्तेषु तदेकदेशभूताः स्वाहाकाराः कथं न प्राप्नुयुरिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ अस्वाहाकारा वा प्रदानार्थस्वाहाकारेभ्यः ॥ २-४-४९ ॥ (पू)

पुनरेषोऽर्थः अस्वाहाकाराः प्रतीयेन् । (न) प्रदानार्थो हि तत्र स्वाहाकारः न चोपधानं [प्रदानं]; अस्वाहाकारास्तु उपधाने प्रत्येतव्याः । कुतः ? प्रदानार्था हि तत्र स्वाहाकाराः प्रतीयेन् । [तेन] न प्रदानार्थस्वाहाकारा एव मन्त्राः प्राप्नुयुरिति ।

स्थितं तावदपर्यवसितम् ।

अन्तरा चिन्त्यते ।

॥ २५ ॥ प्रप्रैषेण यजतीत्येतेन व्याख्यातम् ॥ २-४-५० ॥ (पू)

प्रदानार्थत्वाद्वषट्कारस्य वषट्कारेणैव प्रदानमृतुग्रहेषु इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

यथा अस्वाहाकारेण उपधानं एवं 'होता यक्षत् होतर्यज' इत्येतौ वर्जयित्वा अन्यैः केवलैरेव कर्तुः प्रैषैरिज्यापि ।

स्थितादुत्तरम् ।

॥ स्याद्वा इष्टकासु स्वाहाकारो यथा मुष्टिकरणे ॥ २-४-५१ ॥ (सि)

अवेष्टके यथा अन्ते मन्त्राम्नांसामर्थ्यात् मन्त्रे समाम्नातः स्वाहाकारः मन्त्रावयवत्वादवयवविनि मन्त्रे प्राप्नोत्येवेति । यथा अप्रदानमुष्टिकरणे मन्त्रसमाम्नानात्

स्वाहाकारः¹ एवमिदमपीति । ननु मन्त्रेऽनवधानं किन्तु प्राकरणिकैरेव....
कथमुक्तम् । सस्यमेवं, कृत्वाचिन्तेयम् ।...देतेन तत्कथमिति (?)²

॥ २६ ॥ ऋताषाडृतधामेति यथार्थविनिष्कर्षोऽर्थपृथक्त्वात्
यथा सूक्तवाकानाम् ॥ २ - ४ - ५२ ॥ (पू)

“ ऋताषाडृतधामाग्निर्गन्धर्वस्तस्यौषधयोप्सरस ऊर्जा नाम स इदं ब्रह्म क्षत्रं
पातु ता इदं ब्रह्म क्षत्रं पान्तु तस्मै स्वाहा ताभ्यः स्वाहा ” इत्यत्र पुंसंयुक्ताः
स्त्रीसंयुक्तार्थमन्त्राः प्रतिहोमं यथार्थं विनिष्कृष्य प्रयोक्तव्याः उत व्यतिषक्तानामेव
मन्त्राणां प्रयोगः स्वाहाकाराभ्यास इति ।

किं प्राप्तम् ? विनिष्कृष्य इति । कथं ? अर्थपृथक्त्वात् । पृथगर्था एते
मन्त्राः लिङ्गात् यथार्थं विनिष्कर्षमर्हन्ति वाक्यात् व्यतिषङ्गेण प्रयोगः । वाक्याच्च
लिङ्गं बलवत्तरमिति । किन्तु अर्थप्रकाशनद्वारेण उपकारमातन्वतां मन्त्रपदानां दर्श-
पूर्णमासवाचिनामपि निष्कर्षो दृष्टः तद्वदत्रापीति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ यथासमाज्ञानं वा व्याख्यातम् ॥ २ - ४ - ५३ ॥ (सि)

यथासमाज्ञानमेव प्रयुज्येरन् एवंजातीयकानि मन्त्रवाक्यानि । कुतः ?
प्रवचनलक्षणत्वात् मन्त्राणाम् । समाज्ञातारो यथा समामनेयुः तथा ते प्रतिपत्तव्याः
व्यतिषक्तपदांश्च मन्त्रात् समाधीयते । तस्मात् व्यतिषक्तपदेष्वपि मन्त्रेषु व्यव-
धारणकरूपनं यथाभिधानसामर्थ्यस्याविरोधात् । यथा लोके

कान्तं पृच्छामहे तन्वीपुलकोत्तम्भकारिणम् ।

द्रुतमायस्तनेत्रान्तं गतःक्रेति प्रियस्तव ॥

इत्यत्र श्लोके पुंलिङ्गान्तानि पदानि यथा संबध्यन्ते एवमत्रापीति ।

यत्पुनरुक्तं सूक्तवाकवदिति । युक्तं तत्र कालभेदात् विनिष्कर्षः न त्वेवमत्र
कालभेद इति व्यतिषक्ताभिधानसामर्थ्यात् व्यतिषक्ताभिधानजनिकामेव पूर्वमध्य-
वसीयते । कर्मविभागात् स्वाहाकारमात्रस्याभ्यास इति ।

1. स्वाहोत्प्रेरन्तरिक्षात् इति मुष्टीकरोति आ. श्रौसू. 10.1

2. All mss. do not supply good reading

॥ २७ ॥ षड्जुहोतीति पर्यायवादो यथा सावित्राणि
जुहोतीति ॥ २ - ४ - ५४ ॥ (सि)

षड्जुहोति इति किमयं पर्यायवादः आहोस्वित् आहुतिवाद इति [किं प्रासं ? आहुतिवाद इति] कथं ? सङ्ख्यायाः पृथक्त्वविनिवेशात् षडाहुतीर्जुहोतीति । ननु कर्म सङ्ख्यया न संबध्यते । व्यवहरादर्शनात् पञ्चकर्माणीति । तेन नात्रापि संबध्यत एवेति प्राप्ते—

ब्रूमः । पर्यायवादोऽयं भवितुमर्हति । कुतः ? श्रुत्यविरोधात् । एवं हि [द्वयो] रेतयोः श्रुत्यविरोधो भविष्यति । षडाहुतीरिति द्वे द्वे आहुती एवं [एकं] कृत्वा निर्दिशति । 'सावित्राणि जुहोति' इति आहुतिगणवादः । एवमत्रापि 'द्वादश जुहोति' इति वादेपि स्यात् यथा चतुर्दश पौर्णमास्यामाहुतयो ह्यन्ते त्रयो-दशामावास्यायां इति एकविषयतया समस्यवादोऽयं अविरोधाद्वाक्यप्रकरणयोरिति ।

॥ २८ ॥ ^१भुवनस्य पत इति सप्तमीमाहुतिं
जुहोतीति ॥ २ - ४ - ५३ ॥ (सि)

किमयमपि पूर्ववादाहुतिवादः ? पर्याय इति पूर्वाधिकरणातिदेशः पूर्वोत्तरयोः पक्षयोः समानत्वात् । सप्तमीमाहुतिं पर्यायवत् त्रयोदशीमित्यनुवाद इति ।

॥ २९ ॥ भुवनस्य पत इति स्थगुखे पञ्चाहुतीर्जुहोतीति
दशेत्येकेषां दर्शनात् पञ्चस्ववयुत्यवादो यथा-
[षड्भि]रुपतिष्ठते इति ॥ २-४-५६ ॥ (सि)

केषांचिच्छाखिनां दशाहुतयस्समाह्नाताः अन्येषां पञ्च । तदेतयोर्वाक्यभेदेन आहोस्वित् एकवाक्यतया द्वे द्वे एकवत्कृत्वाऽपर्यायवादः । किं वाऽवयुत्य इति ।

किं प्राप्तम् ? दशाहुतीर्जुहोतीति भिन्ना । पञ्चाहुतीर्जुहोतीति भिन्नविषयत्वात् नैकवाक्यत्वम् । सङ्ख्ययोश्च एकार्थत्वात् विप्रतिषेधाद्विकल्प इति विध्यनुवादयोश्च विधिर्ज्यायानिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः

भुवनस्य पते स नो भुवनस्य पते इति द्वे द्वे आहुती समानरूप्यात् एक-पर्यायीकृत्य पर्यायवाद एवायम्' [यथा] एकशाखाधीतानां 'षट् जुहोति' इति

पर्यायवादः । तथा समानरूपत्वात् नानाशाखाधीतानां पञ्चसु इत्यवयुत्यवादः महत्यां सङ्ख्यायामुपात्तायां तदन्तर्भूतानां सङ्ख्यानामुपादानमस्तीति दृष्टम् । तद्वदत्रापि स्यादिति । संभवति चैकवाक्यत्वे वाक्यभेदेन विकल्पस्यान्याप्यत्वात् ।

यत्पुनः शास्त्रान्तरीयस्यावयुत्य वाद इति । उच्यते । शास्त्रान्तरीयाणामपि विधीनामेकवाक्यत्वस्य प्रतिपादितत्वात् । वाक्यैकवाक्यतायां चावयुत्यवादेन स्तुत्यर्थत्वमुपपद्यत एवेति ।

॥ ३० ॥ स्वाहाकारवषट्कारनमस्काराः प्रदानार्था
यथान्यत्र ॥ २ - ४ - ५७ ॥ (पू)

“क्वचिच्छ्रूयते—भूतं भव्यं भविष्यद्वषट्स्वाहा नम” इति । अस्मिन् वाक्ये वषडादयः प्रदानार्था भवन्ति आहोस्वित्तेति सन्देहः । यथा अन्यत्र वषडादयः प्रदानार्था एवमत्रापि । ननु सामान्यतो दृष्टमेतत् । नेत्युच्यते । वषडादीनां प्रदानार्थत्वं वाक्यगम्यत्वात् कथमन्यत्रापनेतुं शक्यते । तस्मात् प्रदानार्था इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः ।

अप्रदानार्था वाक्यसंयोगात् यथा मुष्टिकरणे स्वाहाकारः
स्वाहाकारः ॥ २ - ४ - ५८ ॥ (सि)

अप्रदानार्था वा वषडादयो भवेयुः । कथं ? वाक्यसंयोगात् । वाक्यावयवत्वात् । वाक्यैकदेशे श्रूयमाणा वषडादयो भूतादिभिः आनन्तर्यात् संबध्यमानाः प्रदाने नाभिसंबध्यन्त इति ।

अथवा ^१अन्यार्थसंयोगाद्वषडादीनां भूतादिभिः ऋगादिभिश्च संबन्धः अन्यविशेषणविशेष्यभावे स्तुत्यर्थत्वमेवैषामिति । दृष्टश्चाप्रदानात्मकेपि कर्मणि स्वाहाकारः यथा मुष्टीकरणे । द्विरभ्यासश्चाध्यायपरिसमाप्त्यर्थे इति ।

॥ इति श्रीदेवस्वामिनः कृतौ सङ्कर्षकाण्डभाष्ये चतुर्थःपादः
अध्यायश्च

॥ परिसमाप्तः ॥

— : * : —

अथ तृतीयाध्यायस्य प्रथमः पादः

आदितः पञ्चदशोऽध्यायः

॥ १ ॥ विक्रमसन्निपातौ^१ दर्शपूर्णमासयोः इज्याकालस्त-
त्संयोगात् ॥ ३ - १ - १ ॥

कालनामधेयं श्रूयते । अहोरात्रसम्मितौ कालौ दर्शपूर्णमासाविति । किं तत्राविशेषेण यागः कर्तव्यः आहोस्वित् परस्मिन् सन्निकर्षे परे वा विप्रकर्षे इति ।

किं प्राप्तम् ? अविशेषेणेति । लोके सकलस्याहोरात्रस्यामावास्यापौर्णमासी-
शब्दवाच्यत्वात् । तत्र च यागः श्रूयते—अमावास्यायां अमावास्यया यजेत
पौर्णमास्यां पौर्णमास्या यजेतेति । अर्थविशेषेणाहोरात्रस्य सन्निकृष्टकालेषु कर्तव्य इति
प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

विक्रमसन्निपातौ दर्शपूर्णमासयोरिज्याकालः । विक्रमो विप्रकर्षः सूर्या-
चन्द्रमसोः सन्निपातः तयोरेव सन्निपातः तौ विप्रकर्षसन्निपातौ दर्शपूर्णमासयो-
र्यागकाल इति शिष्टास्मरन्ति । स्मृतिश्च नः प्रमाणम् । तेन च कालेन कर्मण-
स्संबन्धात् कर्मण्यपि कालनामधेयश्रुतिर्लक्षणया न विरोत्स्यति । अथवा प्राप्तिस्तृत्तर-
विवक्षार्थमिति ।

॥ २ ॥ द्वाविज्याकालौ वचनात् ॥ ३ - १ - २ ॥

अमावास्यायां पौर्णमास्यां च एकमेवाहर्हजनीयम् आहोस्वित् द्वे अहनी^२
इति सन्दिह्यते । किन्तावप्राप्तम् । एकमेवाहः, लिङ्गदर्शनेभ्यः । यस्मिन्नहनि [परो
विप्रकर्षः] परस्सन्निकर्षो वा तदेवैकमहर्हजनीयम् अन्यपरेभ्योऽध्यवसीयते ।
“ तस्मात् सदृशीनां रात्रीणां अमावास्यायां च पौर्णमास्यां च देवा इज्यन्ते ” इति
अमावास्यायां पौर्णमास्यामिति द्विवचननिर्देशात् एकमेवाहर्हजनीयमिति । “ ते
वा एते मध्ये अहनी यजनीये दर्शपूर्णमासौ ” इति च द्विवचननिर्देशात् एकमेवाहर्ह-
जनीयमिति ।

1. अत्र तृतीयान्तं सत्रं दृश्यते । मुद्रितभाङ्गदीपिकायां तु विक्रमसन्निपातौ इत्येव
प्रतीकग्रहणमुपलभ्यते ।
2. A T R द्वे आहवनीते

तथाऽपरं लिङ्गं— द्वादश वै संवत्सरस्य पौर्णमास्यः द्वादशमावास्याः इति । यदैकमेवाहर्षजनीयं अभविष्यत् तदा द्वादश पौर्णमास्यो द्वादशमावास्या इति दर्शन-मवकल्पेत । यदि पुनर्द्वे अहनी स्यातां ततश्चतुर्विंशतिपौर्णमास्यो वा भवेयुः चतुर्विंशत्यमावास्या इति ।

ननु लिङ्गान्येतानि । का प्राप्तिरिति उच्यते । पौर्णमास्यामित्येकवचनस्या-वृ(त्ति)[त्त]त्वं न्याय्यमिति । ते एते अहनी इति द्विवचननिर्देश इति । तस्मात् सन्निकर्षविप्रकर्षयुक्तः(ः)कालौ यागकालावित्येव (य)इज्याकाल इति । [इति प्राप्ते]

द्वाविज्याकालौ वचनात् ॥

तत्र यज्ञे यत्रैनं पश्चादस्तमितं पुरस्तात् आदित्योऽभ्युदेति स वै संप्रत्येव यजेत इति संप्रति वृत्रहननादिति । “ यदहरेष पुरस्तान्न पश्चान्न दृश्येत तदहरुपव-सेत् श्वो न दृष्ट्वा ” इति चेत्यादिभिर्वाक्यैः अस्तमितमनमितं दृष्ट्वाऽदृष्ट्वेति श्रूयमाणं इज्याकालद्वित्वं दर्शयति ।

ननु लिङ्गमेतदसाधकम् । उच्यते । अस्ति वाचनिकी प्राप्तिः । या पूर्वा पौर्णमासी सा अनुमतिः योत्तरा सा राकेति । या पूर्वाऽमावास्या सा सिनीवाली योत्तरा सा कुहूरिति पूर्वोत्तरव्यपदेशात् । संज्ञामेदाच्च इज्याकालद्वित्वमध्यवसीयते । स्थितं तावदपर्यवसितम् । अन्तरा चिन्तान्तरं प्रक्रम्यते—

॥ ३ ॥ रात्रौ यज्ञे शब्दसंयोगात् ॥ ३ - १ - ३ ॥ (पू)

अमावास्यायां अमावास्यया यजेतेति किं रात्रौ यागः कर्तव्यः आहोस्वित् अहनीति सन्देहः । किं प्राप्तम् ? रात्राविति । कथं ? शब्दसंयोगात् “ तस्मात् सदृशीनां रात्रीणां अमावास्यायां च पौर्णमास्यां च देवा इज्यन्ते ” इति रात्रीणामिति शब्द-श्रवणात् रात्राविज्येत ।

नन्वत्र^१ सप्तम्यश्रवणात् सदृशीनां रात्रीणामिति कालविधानं गम्यते । सत्यं, अत्र विधेयान्तराभावात् षष्ठ्यन्तमपि अविवक्षितप्रत्ययार्थप्रातिपदिकार्थविधान-मेव युक्तम् । अपि च सदृशानां ब्राह्मणानां मध्ये यज्ञदत्तो विरूप^२ इत्युक्ते यज्ञदत्तोऽपि

1. A. R. S. ननु

2. S निरूपः

ब्राह्मण इति गम्यते । एवमत्रापि सदृशीनां रात्रीणाममावास्यायां पौर्णमास्यां च रात्रावेव देवता इज्यन्त इति संबन्धाद्गम्यते । तस्माद्रात्राविज्येति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः ।

॥ अहनि वा तद्व्याख्यातम् ॥ ३ - १ - ४ ॥ (सि)

अहन्येव वा स्यादिज्या—तद्व्याख्यातम् । ‘उदगयने आपूर्यमाणपक्षे पुण्याहैषु दैव्यानि कर्माणि कर्तव्यानि’ इति । यत्पुनरिदं प्रातिपदिकार्थमात्रविधानमिति । तत्रोच्यते । रात्रिशब्दस्य प्राप्तार्थत्वात् अविधेयत्वम् । कथं ? अनुवादसरूपत्वाद्वाक्यस्य । तदुच्यते ।

॥ प्रक्रमभिधानाद्रात्रिशब्दो यथाऽन्यत्राहोरात्रसम्मितः

पञ्चाहेनागतः इति ॥ ३ - १ - ५ ॥

अनुवादसरूपे च वाक्यावयवे न समुदायो विवक्ष्यते । तत्र कदाचित् अहस्तः प्रक्रमः कदाचिद्रात्रितः । यथा अन्यत्र लोके पञ्चाहेनागतः पञ्चरात्रेणागतः ।

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥

अहनीज्येति गम्यते । ते वा एते पूते मेध्ये अहनी यजनीये दर्शपूर्णमासाविति । यथा “पूर्वेद्युरधिगृह्णाति उत्तरं चाहर्यजते” इति अहश्शब्दयोगात् अहन्येव याग इति गम्यते ।

॥ ४ ॥ उदिते ^१सूर्ये तन्त्रप्रक्रमः प्रधानसंयोगात् ॥ ३ - १ - ६ ॥ (पू)

दर्शपूर्णमासयोः किं प्रधानवदङ्गान्यपि अहन्येव प्रयोक्तव्यानि उताङ्गेष्वनियम इति । प्राप्ते प्रधानस्याहःकालत्वात् ^२तत्कालत्वं नियमेनाङ्गानामिति । एवं प्राप्ते ब्रूमः । यस्य ^३अगृहीतं हविरभ्युदियात् अथ यस्य गृहीतं हविरभ्युदियादित्युक्तेः अगृहीते गृहीते वा हविरभ्युदितेऽपि निर्मितमाशङ्क्य अनुदितेऽपि दर्शपूर्णमासयोस्तन्त्रप्रक्रमं सामर्थ्यात् दर्शयति । द्विवचनमावास्यायां विप्रतिषेधात् । यथा “यद्येताञ्चालभेत” इति ।

1. आदित्ये
2. S तत्कालत्वनियमो नाङ्गाना
3. R निस्तं हविर

अमावास्यायां वाचनिकः प्रक्रमकालः न लैङ्गिकः वचनन्यायविप्रतिषेधात् । यदितु अहनीति न्यायेन अहनि तन्त्रं प्रक्रम्येत यस्य गृहीतं हविरिति वचनं विप्रतिषिध्येत । तस्मादेतद्वचनमुभयकारि यथा यद्येतान्नालभेत इति ।

॥ यजनीये वा तद्व्याख्यातम् ॥ ३ - १ - ७ ॥

इदं पदोत्तरं सूत्रम् “ विक्रमसन्निपातौ इज्याकाल ” इत्युक्तम् । न च तौ नियोगतोऽहन्येव भवतः । तस्माद्वात्राविज्येति । सूत्रेणोत्तरम्—यजनीये वा तद्व्याख्यातम् । अहर्त्यजनीयः कालः न रात्रिरित्युक्तम् । तदहन्येव यजेत । यत्पुनरुक्तं विक्रमसन्निपातौ न नियोगतोऽहन्येव संभवत इति । अत्रोच्यते । सन्निकर्षविकर्षा- [त्मकः] कालः परमसूक्ष्मः तेन कर्म न व्याप्तुं शक्यते । किन्तु तमन्तर्भाव्य कर्म क्रियते । यदि पूर्वाह्णे संभाव्येत ततो नितरां शोभनम् । यदि पुनरपराह्णे रात्रौ वा तदहरूपोष्य श्लोभूते यागः कर्तव्य इति, बहिर्भूताद्धि यागकालादन्तर्भूतो यागकालो ज्यायानिति ।

॥ ५ ॥ एतेन सोमकालो व्याख्यातः ॥ ३-१-८ ॥

अतिदेशसूत्रमेतत् । यथा दर्शपूर्णमासयोः विक्रमसन्निपातौ प्रधानसन्निकृष्टौ एवं सोमे कर्तव्याविति—स्थितादुत्तरः—

॥ विक्रमसन्निपातयोर्वा स्यात्^१ तत्संयोगात् न ह्यन्यत्
प्रत्यक्षं विद्यते ॥ ३-१-९ ॥ (सि)

विक्रमसन्निपातयोरिज्याकालत्वम् । एक एवेज्याकालः विक्रमः सन्निपातो वा । तेन कालेन श्रुत्या यागः संयुज्यते । ‘पौर्णमास्यां यजेत’ ‘अमावास्यायां यजेत’ इति । मास इति चन्द्रमसो नामधेयम् । पूर्णो मासो यस्यां तिथौ सा पूर्णमासी एकवचसा^२ । अमेति सहार्थे । सह यस्यां तिथौ सूर्याचन्द्रमसौ वसतः सा अमावास्या । सापि न द्वयोरहोः तौ सह वसत इति सूर्याचन्द्रमसोर्गतिविशेषस्य (अ)द्वयस्य व्यासयसंभवात् नेज्याकालद्वित्वमिति ।

यत्पुनः द्वाविज्याकालौ वचनादिति ; न ह्यन्यत् प्रत्यक्षं विद्यते । यदि ह स तत्र यजेतेत्यादिलिङ्गदर्शनं कारणत्वेनोपन्यस्तं तदुभयोरावयोस्साधारणत्वाद-

1. माहदीपिका reads विक्रमसन्निपातयोर्वातथा

2. A एको वचसा

विशेषकम्^१ । उत्तरस्यामिति च रात्र्यपेक्षं वचनं भविष्यति । तस्मात् एक एवेज्या-
काल इति ।

॥ ६ ॥ यदि मन्येत त्वपूर्णांमिति नान्यद्भविरन्तरं निर्वपेत्
पौर्णमासीमेव यजेत श्वोभूत इति सर्वेष्टीनाम-
विशेषात् ॥ ३-१-१० ॥ (पू)

नान्यद्भविरन्तरं निर्वपेदिति किं सर्वास्विष्टिष्वयं प्रतिषेधः किं वा अविहित-
कालविशेषास्तु नैमित्तिकास्विति । किं प्राप्तम् ? सर्वेषामयं प्रतिषेध इति । कथं ?
अविशेषात् । नान्यद्भविरन्तरं निर्वपेदित्यविशेषा श्रुतिः कथं विशेषे व्यवतिष्ठेत् ।
तस्मात् सर्वेषां यागानामयं प्रतिषेध इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ दोषसंयुक्तानां वा कल्पत्वात् ॥ ३-१-११ ॥ (सि)

कालस्य दोषनिमित्ततया नैमित्तिकहविरभिस्यन्दननाशनिमित्तास्तु अयं प्रति-
षेध इति । स चेष्टिपशुसोमाग्रयणेषु । (अ)शास्त्रलक्षणत्वात् पौर्णमासीकालस्य “ य
इष्ट्या पशुना सोमेन आग्रयणेन यक्ष्यमाणोऽमावास्यायां कर्म पश्चान्नैमित्तिकं
कर्तव्यमिति ।

॥ ७ ॥ न यवानां आग्रयणं विद्यत इत्यौडुलोमिः तासा-
मितरेणेत्येकवच्छ्रूयते ॥ ३-१-१२ ॥ (पू)

आरण्यश्यामाकैः तासामाग्रयणं कर्तव्यम् । यथा ये फालकृष्टास्तासामितरेणेति ।
तत्र किं यवानामाग्रयणं न विद्यते आहोस्वित् विद्यत इति ।

किं प्राप्तम् ? औडुलोमिमतेन न विद्यत इति । कथं ? आरण्यानां
श्यामाकैराग्रयणं कृतं भवति । फालकृष्टानामितरेणेत्येकवच्छ्रूयते । एकमेव व्रीहीति
ग्राम्याणामाग्रयणं स्यादिति । “ संवत्सराद्धेयतदधिभवति^३ इति च नोपपद्यते^४ ।
यदि च व्रीहिमिरिष्ट्या संवत्सरात्पुनर्व्रीहिमिरेवेज्येत ततस्संवत्सरात् अध्येतद्वकल्पते ।
वसन्ते यवैराग्रयणं संवत्सरादधिभवेत् तत्रैतद्दर्शनं नावकल्पेत् ।

१. R अवैशेषकं

२. R त्येतत्

३. इति वा, स. S.

४. वसन्ते यवैः आग्रयणकरणे तु वत्सरमध्य एव तदावृत्तेस्तद्विरोधः—भा.दी.

ननु सप्तविधद्रव्यैराग्रयणे^१ व्रीहिद्रव्य(साध्यत्वात् ग्रहणे) [साध्याग्रयणे] विषमं दर्शनं भविष्यति । तत्रापि संवत्सरात् व्रीहियवात् न द्रागिति । उच्यते । प्रकरणात् कर्मप्रतीतेः द्रव्यद्वारा तु कर्मप्रतिपत्तिर्विलम्बिता तस्मादुपपद्यत एतद्दर्शनमिति । तस्माच्चवानामाग्रयणं न विद्यत इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ उभाभ्यामाग्रयणेनेति प्रत्यक्षश्रुतेः ॥ ३ - १ - १३ ॥ (सि)

द्वे ग्राम्याग्रयणे व्रीहियवद्रव्यके । द्वे ग्राम्याग्रयणे स्यातां मरुतः, इति प्रत्यक्ष-श्रुतेः । का पुनरत्र श्रुतिः ? “ उभाभ्यामाग्रयणेन ” इति । “ द्वौ बालचूतौ मध्यौ व्रीहयश्च यवाश्च । तस्मात्ताभ्यामुभाभ्यामग्निहोत्रं जुहोति । उभाभ्यां दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यां यजेत उभाभ्यामाग्रयण ” इति फालाफाल^२कृष्टविषयमेतदुभाभ्यामिति चेन्न; प्रकृतत्वात् व्रीहियवप्रतीतेः । अर्थवादोपपत्तेश्च । यवसाधनके सति आग्रयणार्थवादः उपपद्यते । “ द्विर्वा एष आदित्यः संवत्सरादावर्तते । तमेताभ्यामाग्रयणाभ्यां अर्वाञ्च पराञ्च च अभियजते ” । अर्वाञ्च पराञ्चेति दक्षिणोत्तरे अयने विवक्षिते । व्रीहियवद्रव्यसाध्ययोः^३ कालसन्निकर्षात् । कालविधिपरश्चान्यार्थो व्रीहियवयोरग्रयणं दर्शयति । “ व्रीहिभिरिष्टा व्रीहिभिरेव यजेत न यवेभ्यः यवैरिष्टा यवैरेव यजेत न व्रीहिभ्यः व्रीह्याग्रयणेनेष्टा व्रीहिभिरेव दर्शपूर्णमासौ कर्तव्यौ । यवैरिष्टा यवैरेव न व्रीहिभ्य इति दर्शपूर्णमास[द्रव्य]नियमपरोऽप्ययं विधिः यवैराग्रयणं दर्शयति ।

॥ ८ ॥ सर्वेषां प्राशन्न्यो यथा भक्षाणामविशेषात् ॥ ३-१-१४ ॥ (पू)

त्रयाणामेव तेषां श्यामाकव्रीहियवानां ऋचः तिस्रः प्राशने[श्रूयन्ते] “ अग्निः प्रथमः प्रश्नातु स हि वेद यथा हविः शिवा अस्मभ्यमोषधीः कृणोतु विश्व-चर्षणिः ” इति श्यामाकानां प्राशनमन्त्रः । “ भद्रान्नः श्रेयः समनैष्ट देवाः । त्वया वसेन समशीमहि त्वा । स नो मयोभुः पितो आविशस्व शं तोकाय तनुवे स्योनः ” इति व्रीहीणाम्, “ एतमुत्थं मधुना संयुतं यवं सरस्वत्या अधि मनावचर्कुषः इन्द्र आसीत्सीरपतिः शतक्रतुः कीनाशा आसन् मरुतः सुदानवः ” इति यवानाम् इति

1. A T R सत्वविधवैराग्रयणे

2. फालाफालकृष्ट

3. A T R व्रीहियागद्रव्य

मन्त्रत्रयाज्ञानम् । किं मन्त्रवतामेताः प्राशिन्यः अमन्त्रवतश्च भक्षणात्[दौ]उत मन्त्रव-
तामेवेति सन्देहे ।

सर्वेषां भक्षणामेता ऋचः प्राशिन्यो भवेयुः अविशेषात् यथा सोमे सर्व-
भक्षणावविशेषेण भक्षणमन्त्रवत्ता ।

॥ मन्त्रवतां वा ॥ ३ - १ - १५ ॥ (सि)

सामान्यमन्त्रवतां वा भक्षणामेताः प्राशिन्यो भवेयुः न सर्वभक्षणात् ।
सामान्याद्विकारो गम्यते अपूर्वत्वात् ।

॥ ९ ॥ अनिष्टाग्रयणस्य नवाशनप्रतिषेधः आरण्यफालकृष्टानां
वाक्यसंबन्धात् ग्राम्याणां न स्यात् ॥ ३-१-१६ ॥ (पू)

आग्रयणमेव प्रकृत्य श्रूयते—“ आनि वा एष देवानां य आहिताग्निः
तस्य देवा अन्नं स यद्यनिष्टाग्रयणेन नवस्याश्लीयात् देवानां भागं प्रति कृत्स्नमन्य-
दार्तिमाच्छेत् तस्मान्नानिष्टाग्रयणेन नवस्याशितव्यं ” इति ।

तत्र सन्देहः—किं फालकृष्टानामेव अनिष्टा नवाशनप्रतिषेधः आहोस्वित्
सर्वग्राम्याणामिति । किं प्राप्तम् ? फालकृष्टानामेवेति । याः फालकृष्टाः तासामियम् ।
एवं कृतं भवति । याः फालकृष्टाः तासामितरेणेति फालकृष्टव्यतिरेकेण अन्येषां
ग्राम्याणां इतरेणेति नवांशः स्तूयते । फालकृष्टः श्रुतिवृत्तो भवति । इतरथा
ग्राम्यान् लक्षयेत् ।

॥ वाक्यसंयोगाच्च ॥ ३ - १ - १७ ॥

आरण्यश्यामाकैस्तासामाग्रयणं कृतं भवति याः फालकृष्टास्तासामितरेणेति
फालकृष्टव्यतिरेकेणान्येषां भक्षणं अनियतं स्यादिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ ग्राम्यारण्यव्यपदेशो वा फालकृष्टाभिराख्यातं लभेदन्यथा^१ सर्वग्राम्याणां
पृथग्व्यपदेशः स्यात् प्रत्यक्षत्वादारण्याभिधानस्य ॥ ३-१-१८ ॥ (सि)

यथा आरण्यानां सर्वेषां नवाशनं प्रतिषिध्यते तद्वत् सर्वेषां ग्राम्याणां
फालकृष्टशब्देन एकदेशवृत्तिना ‘ छत्रिणो गच्छन्ति ’ इति छत्रिशब्दवत् सर्वग्राम्याणा-
मभिधानं स्यात् इति । तस्मात् सर्वग्राम्याणामेवायं प्रतिषेधः ।

॥ १० ॥ शाकपक्ववौषधीनां प्राशने यथाकामी
स्यात् ॥ ३ - १ - १९ ॥ (सि)

शाकपक्ववौषधीनां किं अविशेषेण प्रतिषेधः, आहोस्वित् यागयोग्यस्याशन-
प्रतिषेध इति । सस्यं नाश्रीयादिति तस्याशनप्रतिषेधात् शाकादीनामपि प्रतिषेध
इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—शाकपक्ववौषधीनां प्राशने यथाकामी स्यात् । कथं ? यादृशं याग-
योग्यं तादृशं अनिष्टाग्रयणो नाश्रीयादिति प्रतिषेधः । तस्मात् हरितयवादिप्राशने
याथाकाम्यम् । अग्रपाकस्य यागनिमित्तत्वात् ।

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥ ३ - १ - २० ॥

“ देवा ओषधीषु पक्वास्वाजिमीयुः तानिन्द्राग्नी प्रथममुदजयताम् ” इत्यादिषु
पक्वास्विति पाकेन ता विशिनष्टि । तस्माच्छाकादीनां प्राशने याथाकाम्यम् । पाकस्य
यागनिमित्तत्वं स्यादिति देवानां भार्गं प्रति कृतं समर्प्याद्यात् इति भागस्य भावात्
यागयोग्यस्याशनप्रतिषेधः । तस्माच्छाकादिष्वनियमः ।

॥ ११ ॥ तेन शमीधान्यं व्याख्यातम् ॥ ३ - १ - २१ ॥ (सि)

शमीधान्यमपि मुद्गादि कृत्वा आग्रयणं भोक्तव्यं उत अनियमेनेति सन्देहे
अधिकरणातिदेशः । शमीधान्यमपि नियमेनोपभोक्तव्यम् भोजनसंयोगात् । व्यङ्गनार्थं
हि तत् । न केवलमश्यते । तेन नानिष्टनवस्याशितव्यं इति अशनप्रतिषेधः ।

ननु शमीधान्यमपि केवलमश्यते । सत्यम् । अन्याभावात् केवलं भुङ्गते ।
तस्मात् शमीधान्यमनियमेन भोक्तव्यमिति ।

॥ १२ ॥ प्राशितेऽग्नीनादधानो न कृतप्रसव-
त्वात् ॥ ३ - १ - २२ ॥ (सि)

यः प्राशितयवोऽग्नीनादधीत सः किमाग्रयणेन अधिकृतः उत नेति । फलार्थ-
त्वात् सामित्वाच्च अधिकृत एवेति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

प्राशिते नवे कृतेऽग्रपाके निमित्तेऽग्नीनादधानः नाधिकृत एवाग्रयणेन
स्यात् । कुतः ? कृतप्रसवत्वात् । प्राशिते कृतमनेनानाहिताग्निन्यायेनाग्रयणम् ।
न कृते पुनः कर्तव्यम् तस्मान्नासावधिकृत इति ।

॥ १३ ॥ अविद्यमानोऽभोक्ष्यमाणश्चाधिकृतौ
सस्यसंयोगात् ॥ ३-१-२३ ॥ (सि)

सर्वमनुष्याणां द्रव्यलिप्सा विहिता । यस्याग्रपाको न विद्यते यश्च न
बुभुक्षेत तावनधिकृतौ उताधिकृताविति सन्दिह्यते ।

यश्चाविद्यमानाग्रपाको योऽपि न बुभुक्षेत तावप्यधिकृतौ सस्यसंयोगात् ।
अग्रपाकद्रव्यसाध्यमेतत् कर्म फलार्थं न द्रव्यप्रयुक्तं नापि नवभोजनप्रयुक्तम् ।
न चाविद्यमाननवपाकस्य जीवनं सम्भवति । सर्वपुरुषाणां द्रव्यलिप्सामन्तरेण जीवना-
सम्भवात् । असत्यामपि बुभुक्षायां यागः कर्तव्य एवेति । संवत्सरादर्वागपि
प्रतिपाकमाग्रयणं प्राप्नोतीति चेन्न इन्द्रामिषेकजस्य तस्य विवक्षितत्वात् । तथा च
संवत्सरादेतदधिभवतीत्यर्थवादो घटत इति ।

॥ १४ ॥ अत्राग्रयणाभ्यासः प्रकरणात् ॥ ३-१-२४ ॥ (पू)

[त्रीहिमिरिष्ट्वा त्रीहिमिरेव यजेत न यवैः] किमयमत्राग्रयणाभ्यासः आहोस्वित्
अन्तरालस्थयोः द्वयोर्दर्शपूर्णमासयोर्द्रव्यनियम इति ।

किं प्राप्तम् ? आग्रयणाभ्यास इति । कुतः ? प्रकरणात् । आग्रयणप्रकरणे
परिपठितोऽयं विधिः आग्रयणार्थ एव स्यात् । वाक्यसामर्थ्याच्च आग्रयणयागः
त्रीहिमिरिष्ट्वा त्रीहिमिरेवैतमभ्यसेदिति गम्यते । तस्मादाग्रयणाभ्यास एवायमिति
प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ दर्शपूर्णमासयोरन्तरालसंयोगान्न ह्यन्यदन्य^१

क्रमं विद्यते ॥ ३-१-२५ ॥ (सि)

अन्तरालसंयुक्ततया दर्शपूर्णसयोरेष नियमः चोद्येत । तस्यावधिराग्रयण-
विधेरन्तरालस्य कार्यं भवति । न च दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यामन्यदेवंलिङ्गम् किञ्चिदन्तराले
कर्म विद्यते । तस्माद्दर्शपूर्णमासयोरेवार्यं द्रव्यनियम इति ।

॥ १५ ॥ स विकल्पः स्यात् त्रीहियवयोर्यथाग्निहोत्रे ॥ ३-१-२६ ॥

द्रव्याणां आग्रयणकर्मणि श्यामाकत्रीहियवानां विकल्पः यथा अग्निहोत्र—
द्रव्याणां दधिपयःप्रभृतीनामिति । केवले कर्मण्युत्पन्ने अग्रपाके निमित्ते पश्चात्

द्रव्यविधिः एकार्थत्वाद्विकल्पनिमित्तम् । द्रव्यसंबन्धभेदाच्च वाक्यभेदः स्यादिति । न च विशिष्टविधिः, एकार्थविधाने सति अनेकविधिशक्तिकल्पना । अर्थापत्तिक्रमत्वात् सस्यपृथक्त्वाद्वापत्तेः । सिद्धान्तः— निमित्तसंयोगाच्छ्रयामाकानां अग्रपाकनिमित्तं वर्षासु कर्म, व्रीहीणामग्रपाकनिमित्तं शरदि, यवानां वसन्ते इति सर्वाणि चैतानि विशिष्टविधानानि । पक्तिभेदाच्चावर्तते । न त्वेवमग्निहोतृहविः । 'अर्वाञ्च पराञ्चश्च' इति विकल्पे विप्रतिषिद्धम् । तस्मात् समुच्चयः । विकल्पे सत्यपि शरदि विकल्पोऽयं स्यात् । ततश्च संवत्सरादधि भवतीति विप्रतिषिद्धम् । इतरथा पुनर्विप्रतिषिध्यते ।

॥ १६ ॥ स षण्मासादध्यधिभवेत् ॥ ३-१-२७ ॥ (पू)

संवत्सरो ह्येतदधि भवतीत्यत्र सन्देहः— किं पार्वणस्य गणितसंवत्सरस्य वादः आहोस्वित् सस्यपक्तिवाद इति । किं प्राप्तं ? पार्वणस्य^१वाद इति । एतेनैव लोके सर्वत्र संवत्सरव्यवहारदर्शनात्, यथा संवत्सरादागतो देवदत्त इति ।

॥ लिङ्गदर्शनाच्च ॥ ३-१-२८ ॥

द्वादशमासास्संवत्सरः इति गणितसंवत्सर एव द्वादशमासः, न सस्यपक्ति-द्वादशमासात् । तस्मात् गणितसंवत्सर एवेति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ सस्यपक्तेर्वाऽविप्रतिषेधात् ॥ ३-१-२९ ॥ (सि)

यथा 'संवत्सरे सस्यानि पच्यन्ते' इत्यादौ सस्यपाककालो य उचितः तस्य संवत्सरादग्रे पाकेऽपि । इज्यार्थश्च एवं न विप्रतिषिध्यते । दृष्टञ्च सस्यसंपत्तेः संवत्सराभिधानं लोके यथा संवत्सरे सस्यानि पच्यन्ते इति । यथा द्वादशमासास्संवत्सर इत्यत्र । पाको ह्ययं संवत्सरे । अतः तत्र गुणवादेन शब्दस्य [प्रवृत्तिः ।]^२

1. पर्वणि समाप्यमानः पार्वणः

॥ अपूर्वत्वात् तथासोमे ॥

2. त्रिंशन्मासानि चातुर्मास्थानि विशायन्ते 'त्रिंशद्वै रात्रयो मासाः एकैकया वा आहूय वा देवेष्वात् दशद्वादशारात्रीरयुतं तावती संवत्सरस्य रात्रिस्तावती सञ्जयाता इति चातुर्मास्थानां त्रिंशन्मासवत्त्वं दर्शयति । इदमधिकमुपलभ्यते मातृकासु ।

॥ १७ ॥ पार्वणमासानि विज्ञायन्ते ॥ ३ - १ - ३० ॥ (सि)

^१पार्वणमासानि चातुर्मास्यानि । कस्मात् ? पार्वणसंवत्सरात् षड्भिरहोभिः सावनस्य संवत्सरस्यातिरेकात् । ये वै त्रयसंवत्सरास्तेषां षट्त्रिंशत्पौर्णमासा ये द्वे तयोश्चतुर्विंशतिः त इमाश्चतुर्विंशतिमुपपद्यन्ते एष वै त्रयोदशमासः तमेतं संपादयति तमतियजत इति षडहातिरेकं(त्वं) दर्शयति । पञ्चसु सावनेषु संवत्सरेषु पार्वणमासं एकमुपजायमानं अनुदृश्य पञ्चानां संवत्सराणां षष्टिपूर्णमासाननुक्रम्य एष वै त्रयोदशो मास इति उत्सृज्यौ मासौ प्रत्येकमेकवचनेन निदर्शयति । सावनाच्च षड्भिः सौर्यस्य पञ्चवर्षस्य षष्टिःसौर्यस्य मासा एकषष्टिसावनाः द्विषष्टिःपार्वणास्तयोश्च मासयोः उत्सर्गात् द्विषष्टिपार्वणमासं दर्शयति । तस्मात् पार्वणमासांस्त्रीनिष्ट्रोत्सृष्टव्ये सति उत्सृष्टव्यमासमुत्कृष्य संवत्सरान् मासांश्चोत्सृजति कर्ममध्ये नोत्सृक्ष्यामीति । तच्चार्षतृतीयेषु उत्सृष्टव्यमिति(त्रिंशत्) संदर्शयति । त इमे षट्त्रिंशन्मासाः ता इमाश्चतुर्विंशतिमेव संपद्यन्त इति । तेषां षट्त्रिंशत् तयोर्विंशतिरिति वा त्रयोदशमासानवसाय कर्मयुक्तानामेव पर्वणां मासानाचष्टे । तस्मात् पार्वणाश्चत्वारो मासाः पर्वान्तरालकालः ।

॥ त्रिंशद्वै सावनस्य विप्रतिषेधात् पार्वणस्य यथा यद्येतान्ना-
लभेत इति ॥ ३ - १ - ३१ ॥

त्रिंशद्वै रात्रयो मासा इति च सावनस्य यान्यहोरात्राणि तेषु विप्रतिषेधात् पार्वणस्य यान्यहोरात्राणीति । यदि तेषु गौणाः कल्पिष्यन्ते श्रुत्या विरोधः ।

तथा 'यद्येनान्नालभेत' इति पश्वालम्भः शिर उपधानेन सहोच्यते । एवमिहापि रात्रीणां सङ्ख्यापरिमाणे ।

॥ मासो वा ॥ ३ - १ - ३२ ॥

त्रीनिष्ठा चतुर्थमुत्सृजेत् अत्र संवत्सरप्रकरणात् चतुर्थमिति संवत्सरोऽभिप्रेतः त्रीनित्यधिकृतत्वात् इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—मासो वा । "एष वै त्रयोदशमासस्तमेवैतं

1. अत्र फाल्गुन्यां पौर्णमास्यां चातुर्मास्यमारभ्य चतुर्षु चतुर्षु मासेषु अन्यानि पर्वणि विहितानि, तत्र कीदृशो मासो ग्राह्यः सावनो वा चान्द्रो वेति सन्देहे सावनमास इति पूर्वपक्षः बहिरेव द्रष्टव्यः । सिद्धान्तस्तु सूत्रेणोच्यते ।

सम्पादयति तमतियजते” इति चतुर्थं तृतीयमित्युक्त्वा एष वै त्रयोदशमास इति मासशब्देनापदेशात् मासोऽभिप्रेतः । तस्माच्चतुर्थमिति सप्तम्यर्थे द्वितीया । [यथा]

चतुर्थं पञ्चमं वापि पञ्च शाखा[ः] फलानि वा ।

यो जीवयत्यतद्धर्मं सचातितरमोदकः ॥ (१)

इति । कर्मप्रवचनीयलोपो वा चतुर्थं संवत्सरं प्रतीति ।

॥ द्वौ पराविष्टा तृतीयमुत्सृजेदिति अनन्तरं यथा
पुरस्तात् ॥ ३-१-३३ ॥ (सि)

यथा त्रीनिष्टा चतुर्थमुत्सृजेत् इति अन्तराऽऽम्नातं एवमत्रापि स्यात् ।

॥ १९ ॥ आदेर्वा कर्मणोऽपवर्गात् ॥ ३-१-३४ ॥ (पू)

यथा पञ्चानामेव कर्तव्यः षष्ठं न करिष्यामि इति आदिश.....न्यमारभ इति । स हि वाक्यार्थः । षष्ठस्य कर्मणः आरम्भप्रतिषेधोऽयम् । पञ्चभिर्वर्षैः कर्मापवर्गात् षष्ठस्य कर्मणः आरम्भप्रतिषेधः । [इति प्राप्ते] ।

॥ विज्ञयते च स त्रिषु त्रिषु संवत्सरेषु मासमुत्सृजेदिति । तेन
नन्यामहे एतद्वचनमभ्यासो विप्रतिषेधात् यथा
दाक्षायणयज्ञे ॥ ३-१-३५ ॥ (सि.पू.)

स त्रिषु संवत्सरेष्विति पञ्चभ्यो वर्षेभ्य ऊर्ध्वमित्यवगम्यते । सति हि अभ्यासे एतद्वचनमुपपद्यते इति न्यायो गम्यते । तद्धि त्रिषु त्रिषु संवत्सरेष्विति वा । द्वातृतीयेष्वित्यर्थः । दश पार्वणमासोऽत्र गौणः संवत्सरोऽभिप्रेतः । तस्य उक्तो विनियोगः द्विरिष्ट्वा त्रिरिष्ट्वेति । तस्मात् यावज्जीविकाभ्यासवाक्यशेषोऽयम् । चातुर्मास्यानां पञ्चवर्षप्रयोगे च यावदर्थः करोति ।

॥ २० ॥ पञ्चसु चातुर्मास्येषु वैश्वानरपार्जन्ये पञ्चहोता च नापद्यन्ते
एकोपक्रमत्वात् यथा आरम्भणीया ॥ ३-१-३६ ॥

प्रक्रमसंयोगादेतेषां नैकवाक्यत्वाच्चोपक्रमस्य न प्रतिकर्म आवर्तेरन् । यथा दर्शपूर्णमासयोरारम्भणीया । तदुक्तं सकृद्वाऽऽरम्भ संयोगात् (पू. मी. ९-१-५५ ।)

॥ २१ ॥ यदि वसन्ता यजेत द्विरुपस्तृणीयात् द्विरभिधारयेत्
 ओषधयो वै शब्द ओषधीष्वेव पशून् प्रतिष्ठापयति यदि
 प्रावृषि यजेत सकृदुपस्तृणीयात् द्विरभिधारयेत्
 द्विष्या (?) पशून् अभिजिघन्तीति वैश्वदेवस्य
 प्रकरणात् ॥ ३ - १ - ३७ ॥ (पू)

वैश्वदेव एवैष वादः प्रकरणात् । तस्यापि पशुकामपक्षेषु प्रावृत्कालेषु
 प्रयोग उपपद्यते ।

॥ वरुणप्रघासानां लिङ्गसंयोगात् यथा विप्रतिपन्नेषु ॥ ३-१-३८ ॥ (सि)

एतदन्यत् प्रत्यक्तम विद्यते प्रावृषि वरुणप्रघासैरिति । प्रावृत्कालेन लिङ्ग-
 संयोगात् वरुणप्रघासान् प्रतिकृष्येत । तथा विप्रतिपत्त्यर्थं बहिः स्थित इति ।
 यदुक्तं पशुकामपक्ष इति नहि तत्प्रत्यक्तमम् । तद्यथा जटिलं भोजयेदित्युक्ते
 अप्रकृतोऽपि जटिलः जटिलवचनलक्षितो भोज्यते । न प्रकृतोऽपि [अ] जटी लक्ष्यते ।
 तद्वरुणप्रघासलिङ्गमेव ।

॥ २२ ॥ वैश्वदेवेन पशुकामो यजेत यस्मिन् ऋतौ प्रभूतं गोषु पयः
 स्यादिति सर्वमविशेषात् ॥ ३ - १ - ३९ ॥ (पू)

हेमन्ते वसन्ते वा यस्मिन् ऋतौ स्वायां गवि बहु पयः स्यात् तस्मिन्
 यजेताविशेषात् ।

॥ वसन्तानां वा तस्य कालत्वाद्वैश्वदेवस्य यथा यस्मिन्
 ऋतौ बहुव्रीहिः स्यात् तस्मिन् यष्टव्यमिति वसन्त
 एव यजेत ॥ ३ - १ - ४० ॥ (सि)

प्रकृतेष्यादौ ऋतुशब्दो वर्तते । यथा यस्मिन् ऋतौ यस्य बहुव्रीहिः
 स्यात् तस्मिन् यष्टव्यमित्युक्ते नान्यकाल इज्येत प्रकृतवृत्तिवाटुशब्दस्य ।

॥ २३ ॥ वैश्वदेवस्य कालाभ्यासः प्रतिषेधे न विधीयते ॥ ३-१-४१ ॥ (पू)

वैश्वदेवेन यजेत पशुकामो न वरुणप्रघासैर्न साकमेधैः न शुनासीरीयेणेति
 (वैश्वदेवाङ्गमितरेणेति) वैश्वदेवः केवलं फलाय विधीयते । इतरेषां प्रतिषेधात्
 वैश्वदेवाङ्गमितराणि स्युः ।

॥ वैश्वदेवस्याभ्यासः विहितस्य स्थाने
कालोत्कर्षः ॥ ३-१-४२ ॥ (सि)

इतरेषां पर्वणां स्थाने आपशुलामाद्वैश्वदेवाभ्यासो विधीयते । कथं ? न वरुणप्रघासेनेति—वैश्वदेवेनेति ह्यर्थः । तस्मात् नाप्यनङ्गत्वात् प्रासानां प्रतिषेधी स्यात् । तानि पशुलामादुत्तरकालं उत्कृष्यन्ते । तस्माद्वैश्वदेवस्य कालाभ्यासः प्रतिषेधेन विधीयते । विज्ञायते च “यदा सहस्रं पशून् प्राप्नुयात् अथ वरुण-प्रघासैर्यजेत अथ साकमेधैरथ शुनासीरीयेण ” वैश्वदेवेनैतस्मात् कालादित्यर्थः ।

आपशुप्राप्तैर्वैश्वदेवेन तेषां स्थाने [यजेत] प्राप्य चानन्तरं वरुणप्रघासादि-
[मिरि]ति स्वकालादित्यस्य वाक्यस्यार्थः ।

॥ २४ ॥ मासमग्निहोत्रं जुह्वति मासं दर्शपूर्णमासाभ्यामिति स्वकालः
स्यात् प्रकृत्युपबन्धात् ॥ ३-१-४३ ॥ (पृ)

स्वे स्वे काले प्रयोगः । एवं प्रकृत्यनुग्रहस्यावैगुण्यम् ।

॥ अहरहर्वा चोदितत्वात् यथा त्रिवृता मासं ततः अहरहः
सकृदग्निहोत्रं हूयेत ॥ ३-१-४४ ॥ (सि)

यथा “त्रिवृता मासं” इति त्रिवृदहः क्रियते कर्मणां त्रिंशद्विषये तद्विह त्रिंशत्कृत्वोऽभ्यसेत् । चत्वारोऽभिप्लवाः षष्ठ्यहः षडहः स मास इति मासशब्दे प्रकृते त्रिंशत्कर्माणि विधीयन्ते । नाहानि । इहापि तेषां कर्मणां विषये तेनैव शब्देन विधानात् तावन्त्येव कर्माणि विहितानि इहापीति पश्यामः । तस्मादिहापवर्गः त्रिंशत्कृत्वोऽभ्य(सेदिति ।) स्येति ।

इति श्रीदेवस्वामिनः कृतौ सङ्कर्षकाण्डभाष्ये

तृतीयस्य अध्यायस्य प्रथमः पादः ॥

॥ कालपादः समाप्तः ॥

॥ द्वितीयः पादः ॥

॥ १ ॥ तत्सर्वार्थमविशेषात् ॥ ३ - २ - १ ॥ (पू)

अस्मिन् पादे अपूर्वत्वात्तथा सोम^१ इत्यारभ्य अपादसमाप्तेः भावदासमेव भाष्यमिति । आधाने ब्राह्मौदनिकस्याग्नेः समारोपणमाज्ञाय मन्थनं विधीयते “शल्कैस्तां रात्रिमग्निमिन्धीत । तस्मिन्नुपव्युषमरणी निष्ठेत् यथा ऋषभाय वाशितान्या विच्छायति तादृगेव तत् । अपोदूह्य भस्माग्निं मन्थति । सैव साम्नेः सन्ततिः” इति । तदेतत् ब्राह्मौदनिकस्य मन्थनं सर्वार्थं उत गार्हपत्यार्थमिति ।

किं प्राप्तम् ? अविशेषात् । न तत्र कश्चिद्विशेषो गम्यते—एतदर्थ-मेतन्निर्मन्थनमिति ? निर्मथितं विभज्य सर्वेऽग्नय आधीयेरन् इति । अपि च कार्यप्रयुक्तं मन्थनं, कार्यं चाग्नयः प्रयोजनप्रयुक्तत्वात् अपूर्वाविशेषात्^२ सर्वाग्नयर्थं मन्थनमिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ गार्हपत्यार्थं ब्राह्मौदनिकं स्यात् गार्हपत्येन संवत्सरमासी-
तेति तत्संयोगात् ॥ ३ - २ - २ ॥

गार्हपत्यार्थं ब्राह्मौदनिकस्य मन्थनं स्यात् । ब्राह्मौदनिके गार्हपत्यत्वश्रावणात् गार्हपत्ये संवत्सरमासीतेति भविष्यद्गार्हपत्ययोगात् । गार्हपत्यशब्दसंयोगात् स्वार्थं [प्यन्]कारणे कार्यवदुपचारात् । तस्मात् कृत्स्नेन निर्मथितेन गार्हपत्य एवाभिधीयते ।

॥ २ ॥ लोकत इतरे यथान्यानि द्रव्याणि ॥ ३-२-३ ॥ (पू)

लोकत इतरेऽग्नय आधीयेरन् उत गार्हपत्यादिति सन्देहः । लौकिकं स्यात् सर्वार्थत्वादित्यनेन न्यायेन यथा अन्यानि द्रव्याणि व्रीह्यादीनि तथा तेऽप्यग्नयः लोकवत् लौकिकोपायैः [आधीये]रन्निति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ गार्हपत्याद्वा आहवनीयो लिङ्गात् ॥ ३-२-४ ॥

“अयं चापरो भुः असौ पूर्वो भुवः तमपरमाधत्ते भूर्भुवः सुवरिति उभावेतौ सहाधत्ते एषो ह्येतस्य योनिः एतस्माद्भ्येषोऽधिप्रणीयते” इति गार्हपत्यादाहवनीय

1. This Sutra is not found in this pada. But it is in pada 1.

2. अपूर्वविशेषात्

आधेयः । एषो ह्येतस्य योनिरिति गार्हपत्यं आहवनीयस्य प्रकृतिं दर्शयति । एतस्माद्ध्येषो विहिते इति गार्हपत्यादेव विहारं दर्शयति ।

ननु लिङ्गमिदं का प्राप्तिरिति । उच्यते । आहवनीयादयः शब्दाः संस्कारवचनाः गार्हपत्यात्तस्याधानं संस्कारः । तस्मिन्नसति आहवनीयत्वमेव न स्यात् इति । अपि च शब्दसंस्पर्शमन्तरेण लौकिकस्योपादानं स्यात् इह गार्हपत्यादाहवनीय-स्यादानमिति ।

॥ ३ ॥ आहवनीयात् सभ्यावसथ्यौ ॥ ३-२-५ ॥ (पू)

किमेतौ सभ्यावसथ्यौ आहवनीयात्, उत लोकत इति सन्देहः । किं प्राप्तम् ? आहवनीयादिति । कथं ? सहाधानवचनात् । “ भूर्भुवस्वरिति उभावेतौ सहाधत्ते सहि तस्य योनिः । तस्मात् सोऽभिप्रणीयत ” इति । एतच्च सहाधान-माहवनीयात् सभ्यावस्थ्यविषयम् । न गार्हपत्याहवनीयविषयम् । तयोरुपादानो-पादेययोः सहाधानासम्भवात् । अपि च ‘ यदेव तृतीयं ज्योतिस्तदेव तेनाप्यते ’ इति तेन पूर्वेणाहवनीयः[येन] तृतीयं ज्योतिराप्यते इति एतमेवार्थं दर्शयति । तस्मादाहवनीयादेव सभ्यावसथ्याविति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ पृथक्प्रकल्प्येतां वा शब्दपृथक्त्वात् यथा ऋत्विजः ॥ ३ - २ - ६ ॥ (सि)

पृथगेव तौ लोकतः कल्प्येते । कुतः ? नामभेदात् । यथा ऋत्विजां पृथक् प्रकृतिः नामभेदात् । लोके सभ्यावसथ्यसंज्ञा । तस्माल्लोकतश्च प्रकृतिरिति ।

यदेव तृतीयं ज्योतिः तदेव तेनाप्यते इति उत्तरवैदिकस्यैतद्दर्शनम् । सहि तस्मात् प्रणीयते । विशेषग्रहणात् । इतरयोस्सहितयोर्लोकत इति । सोऽभिप्रणीयत इति एकवचनं द्वयोः सभ्यावसथ्ययोः असमञ्जसं स्यात् । प्रकृतत्वादौत्तरवेदिकस्य सोऽभिप्रणीयत इति सर्वनाम्ना परामर्शः । तयोर्लोकतः प्रकृतिरिति ।

॥ ४ ॥ ^१आम्नातं दक्षिणाग्नेः ॥ ३ - २ - ७ ॥

दक्षिणाग्निरपि किं लोकतः आधेयः उत गार्हपत्यादिति सन्देहे—प्रकल्प-नमाम्नातम् । विशेषाग्रहणात् प्रयोगस्वभावत्वाच्च लोकत इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः ।

॥ 'निर्मन्थ्यात् दक्षिणाग्निमादधीत' इत्येक[केषां]
दर्शनम् ॥ ३ - २ - ८ ॥ (सि)

सर्वाग्नियोनित्वात् गार्हपत्यादेवाधानमिति ॥

॥ ५ ॥ व्याख्यातं धारणम्^१ ॥ ३ - २ - ९ ॥ (पू)

सर्व एवाग्नेयो धार्या उत नेति विचार्यते । किमिति युक्तम् ? धारणं व्याख्या-
तम्—द्रव्यस्याकर्मकालनिष्पत्तेरिति^२ । धृते आहवनीये कर्म शक्यते कर्तुं नान्यथा ।
तस्माद्धारणीय एवाहवनीय इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ अनुगच्छेद्वाऽऽहवनीयो लिङ्गात् ॥ ३ - २ - १० ॥ (सि)

कर्मापवर्गे अनुगच्छेद्वा आहवनीयो गार्हपत्ये । कुतः ? लिङ्गात् “नान्त-
राग्नी वीयात् यदन्तराग्नी वीयात् यजमानस्यामेध्यं तदनुसंसीदेत् अथो रुद्रस्य धनुः
घातुकं यात् । कामं हुते सञ्चार्यं पश्चाद्धि स तर्हि गत” इति “पश्चाद्धि स तर्हि गत”
इति आहवनीयस्य कर्मापवर्गेऽ(व)स्थानं दर्शयति ।

इदमपरं लिङ्गम्—उद्धरेदेव । सायं उद्धरति प्रातः इति प्रतिकर्मोद्धरणं
दर्शयति । तस्मादुद्धृतोऽनुगच्छेत् ।

ननु लिङ्गमेतत् का प्राप्तिरिति ? उच्यते । अजस्रपक्षे चाहवनीयस्य कर्मापवर्गे
धारणस्यान्धानमिति ।

॥ ६ ॥ प्रत्यर्थमाधानमिति ॥ ३ - २ - ११ ॥ (पू)

संस्कारस्य कर्मापवर्गेऽपवर्गात् अर्थप्रयुक्तत्वाच्च सम्मार्जनवत् प्रतिकर्म कर्तव्य-
माधानमिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ तुल्यश्रुतित्वाद्वा इतरैराहितस्य धारणयोगात् वच-
नाद्यथा समारोप्य ॥ ३ - ३ - १२ ॥ (सि)

सकृदाहितस्याहवनीयस्य धारणयोगः । कथं ? सर्वेषामग्नीनां आधानश्रुते-
स्तुल्यत्वात् । यथा गार्हपत्यस्य सकृदाहितस्य जागरणं अरणिर्वा धारणं तथैवास्या-

प्याहवनीयस्य गतिः—अरणौ वा धारणोपाय इति । ननु गार्हपत्यमसौ त्यक्त्वा गच्छेदित्येतन्नोपपद्यते । सत्यमेवम् । न तत् प्रत्यक्षादिगोचरं किंतु शास्त्रसंवेद्यं अग्नीनां गमनं यथाऽरणिगमनमिति ।

अथवा तुल्यो धारणे योगः अग्नीनां वचनात् प्रतिपत्तेः आहिताग्निमग्निमिर्द्ध-
हन्ति यज्ञपात्रैश्च इति । आहवनीयश्चेदपूर्वः प्राप्नुयात् धारणमितरैर्न तुल्यमाहवनीय-
स्येति । न च प्रतिपत्तिः आहवनीयाधानं प्रयोजयेत् । अपि वा प्रतिपत्तित्वात्तन्त्र-
स्यात् (पू. मी. ११-४-३४) इति न्यायेनेति । संमार्जनस्य सन्निपातित्वात् प्रतिकर्म
प्रवृत्तिः ।

॥ ७ ॥ दक्षिणाग्नेरेतेन व्याख्यातम् (३ - २ - १३) (सि)

प्रत्युद्धरणमाधानं सकृदक्षिणाग्नेरिति पूर्वाधिकरणेन व्याख्यातम् इत्यतिदेशः ।

॥ ८ ॥ पूर्वं गार्हपत्यादाहवनीये उद्धृते पुनरनुगते तत्
बोद्धियेत तद्गतत्वात् ॥ ३ - २ - १४ ॥

प्रतिकर्म प्रादुष्करणं कर्तव्यमित्युक्तम् । तत् अरणीत उत गार्हपत्यादिति
सन्दिह्यते । तत्सिद्धयर्थं चेदं निरूप्यते । किमाहवनीयः कर्मापवर्गे प्रतिगच्छन्
अरणिं प्रतिगच्छति, किं वा गार्हपत्यमिति । किं प्राप्तम् ? अरणीतः प्रादुष्करण-
मिति । कथं ? अग्नेररणियोनित्वात् । प्रकृतौ च विकारप्रतिसंसर्गदर्शनान्, यथा-
पृथिव्यां घटादीनाम् । [न हि] आहवनीयस्य गार्हपत्यो योनिः । निष्क्रमणाद्यो-
निररणिरग्नेः । कार्यं चाग्निः । कार्यस्य च कारणे प्रतिसंसर्गः । तस्मादरणीतो
मन्थनमिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

गार्हपत्यादुद्धृतेऽयाहवनीये पुनरन्यस्मै कर्मणे तत् एवोद्धरणं नारणीतः । गार्ह-
पत्यमेव कर्मापवर्गे प्रतिगतत्वादाहवनीयस्य । शास्त्रेणाधिकारो गम्यते न लोकतः ।
शास्त्रेण च गार्हपत्यादाहवनीयस्याशासनं गम्यते । तस्यात् गार्हपत्यादेव प्रतिकर्मो-
द्धरणं गम्यते ।

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥ ३ - १ - १५ ॥

‘गार्हपत्यादाहवनीयं ज्वलन्तमुद्धरति’ इति । अग्निहोत्रे गुणविविपरमेत-
द्वाक्यं प्रतिकर्मोद्धरणं प्राप्तं दर्शयति ।

॥ ९ ॥ अहोमार्थेष्व्वाहवनीयः श्रूयमाणोऽनवेतः शब्दनित्यत्वात्

॥ ३ - २ - १६ ॥ (सि)

“ आहवनीयमुपतिष्ठते ” इति श्रूयमाणे संशयः—किमुद्धृत्योपस्थेयं आहोस्वित् आयतनस्थ एवेति । [किं प्राप्तं ? अनुद्धृत्येति]

अनुद्धृतस्यापि शास्त्रतः आहवनीयत्वानपायादिति प्राप्ते—

उच्यते । आहवनीयशब्दो विकृतमायतनस्थानं ब्रूते । शब्दार्थसम्बन्धस्य नित्यत्वात् । न च होमेनाहवनीयः क्रियते । सिद्धे ह्याहवनीये होमविधानात् । यथा होमे तथा कार्यान्तरे शब्दार्थयोरव्यभिचारस्य अनन्यथात्वात् ।

॥ १० ॥ अपवृत्ते कर्मणि धार्यमाणो लौकिकोऽर्थसंयोगात्

यथा समारूढे ॥ ३ - २ - १७ ॥

अपवृत्ते कर्मणि धार्यमाणं ज्योतिः वैदिकं न वेति विचार्यते । शास्त्रारोपित-वैदिकबुद्धज्योतिषः शास्त्रादेव तद्बुद्धयपगमस्य न्याय्यत्वात् । न शास्त्रं स्पष्टमस्य अपवृत्ते कर्मणि ज्योतिर्वैदिकं न भवतीति । यद्यपि आहवनीयादयश्शब्दाः संस्कार-वचनाः तथापि अधिकरणज्योतिस्संस्काराणां ज्योतिर्भावित्वात् तत् ज्योतिर्वैदिकमेवेति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

अपवृत्ते कर्मणि धार्यमाणोऽग्निः लौकिक एव स्यात् । कथं ? अर्थसंयोगात् । अकार्ययोगित्वात् । संस्काराणां कार्यापवर्गेषु प्रतिगमनात् । यथा समारोपणे कृते विद्यमानमपि ज्योतिर्लौकिकं एवमपवृत्ते कर्मणि ।

॥ लिङ्गदर्शनाच्च ॥ ३ - २ - १८ ॥

“ कामं हुते सञ्चर्यं पश्चाद्भि स तर्हि गत ” इति कर्मापवर्गे प्रतिगमनमग्नेर्दर्शयति । “ अग्नये ज्योतिष्मते पुरोडाशमष्टाकपालं निर्वपेद्यत्याग्निरुद्धृतोऽहुतेऽग्निहोत्र उद्गायेत् अपर आदीप्यानुद्धृत्य इत्याहुः तत्तथा न कार्यं यद्गागधेयमभिपूर्वं उद्ध्रियते किमपरोऽभ्युद्ध्रियेतेति तान्येवावक्षणाणि सन्निधाय मन्थेत् ” इति उपशान्ते न प्रवृत्ते कर्मणि अप्रतिगमनमाह । तस्मात्कर्मापवर्गे विद्यमानमपि ज्योतिर्लौकिकमेवेति ।

॥ ११ ॥ एतेन सोमो व्याख्यातः ॥ ३ - २ - १९ ॥ (पू)

सोमे दीक्षणीयादिषु प्रतिकर्म उद्धरणं कर्तव्यं उत दीक्षणीयाग्निरेव धारणीय इति ।

किं प्राप्तम् ? एतेन सोमो व्याख्यात इति पूर्वाधिकरणसिद्धान्तेन प्रतिकर्मोद्धरणमिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ दीक्षणीयाग्निर्धार्येत संस्कारयोगात् देवतापरिग्रहं
श्रूयते ॥ ३ - २ - २० ॥ (सि)

दीक्षणीयाग्निरेव धार्येत, न प्रतिकर्मोद्धरणम् कुतः ? संस्कारसंयोगात् देवतापरिग्रहणार्थलक्षणसंस्कारो दीक्षणीयायां श्रूयते “ देवता एवोभयतः परिगृह्य यजमानोऽवस्वन्धे ” इति । परिगृहीतदेवतावरोपितसंस्कारश्चाहवनीयो यद्यनुगच्छेत् संस्कारो विच्छिद्येत । नचेतद्दीक्षणीयायामुद्धरणं अप्राकृतसामर्थ्यत्वेन, अपूर्वत्वात् । तेनैव च प्रसङ्गादिष्टिषु कार्यसिद्धेः । तस्मात् सकृदुद्धृत एवासौ आसोमसमाप्ते-
राहवनीयो धार्यते ।

॥ लिङ्गदर्शनाच्च ॥ ३ - २ - २१ ॥

“ गार्हपत्ये यजमानस्य व्रतमधिश्रित्य अपूर्वमग्निमुपञ्चरन् परेणाहवनीयं व्रत-
माहृत्य प्रयच्छति अपरेणाहवनीयं ” इति सकृदुद्धृतमाहवनीयं दर्शयति^१ ।

॥ १२ ॥ तदुत्तरवेद्यां कृत्स्नं प्रणयेद्धोमसंयोगात् स
आहवनीयः ॥ ३ - २ - २२ ॥ (पू)

[सोमे प्राञ्चमग्निं प्रणयन्तीति प्रणीयमानः आहवनीयः] सकल एव प्रणीयेत उत एकदेशमिति ।

किं प्राप्तं ? सकलमिति । कथं ? होमसंयोगात् यस्मात् औत्तरवेदिक आहवनीयस्सर्वहोमानामधिकरणं; अतः कृत्स्नं उत्तरवेद्यां प्रणयेयुरिति ।

१. भेदो नास्तीत्यर्थः

॥ शेषं वा कुर्याल्लिङ्गात् ॥ ३ - २ - २३ ॥ (सि)

“ तस्मात् पश्चात् प्रति पूर्वमग्निमभ्युदेति ” “ पूर्वमग्निं ” इति शालामुखीयो यस्तस्मिन्नेव अग्निशेषं दर्शयति । तस्मादेकदेशमेव प्रणयनं न कृत्स्नमिति । उद्यत-होमश्चाधीयते—“ न वा कृत्रिमः कश्चिदागमः पूर्वं यत्सन्नपरो भवासि । ” “ घृतेन त्वं तनुवो वर्धयस्व ” “ मामार्हिंसीरधिगतं पुरस्तात्स्वाहा ” इति । पूर्वं यत्सन्नपरो भवासीति सति अग्निशेषे उपपद्यते । तथाऽपरं लिङ्गम्—“ एतमाहवनीयमाहवनीयात् प्राञ्चं प्रणयन्ति ” इति पञ्चमी निर्देशात् । ध्रुवं च यदपादाने तत्र पञ्चमी भवति । सत्येवाग्निशेष उपपद्यते ।

॥ १३ ॥ आहवनीयविभागस्य पुरस्ता-
दुद्ध्रियते ॥ ३ - २ - २४ ॥ (पू)

किं शालामुखीयप्रहृतावुभावाहवनीयौ उत शालामुखीयो गार्हपत्य इति ?
उद्धृत आहवनीयस्य एव द्विधा कृतः तस्मादुभावप्याहवनीयावेताविति ।

॥ गार्हपत्यो वा शेषो लिङ्गात् ॥ ३ - २ - २५ ॥ (सि)

“ सम्मार्ष्टि गार्हपत्यौ ” इति प्राजहितशालामुखीययोः । गार्हपत्याद्धृत आहवनीयः स एव द्विधा कृतः । तस्मादुभावप्याहवनीयावेताविति गार्हपत्यशब्दाभि-धेयत्वं गम्यते ।

ननु लिङ्गमेतत् । का प्राप्तिः ? प्रहृते होमाम्नात् । “ सर्वाण्याहवनीय-कार्याणि प्रहृते कर्तव्यानि शालामुखीये गार्हपत्यकार्याणि ” ।

(वर्णकान्तरम्)

॥ १४ ॥ आहवनीयविभागः स पुरस्तादुद्ध्रियते । (पू)

किमेक एवाहवनीयः ^१प्रहृतशालामुखीयभेदेन हि मन्यते । आहोस्वित् प्रहृत आहवनीयः गार्हपत्य इतर इति ।

आहवनीय एवायं द्विधा व्यवहृत इति मन्यामहे । गार्हपत्यात्प्रणीतस्य ज्योतिषो द्विधाकरणात् । यथा वरुणप्रघासेषु वेदिभेदेन द्विधा कृतोऽप्याहवनीय एव तद्वदत्रापीति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ गार्हपत्य एव तच्छ्रूयते ॥ (सिद्धान्तसूत्रे पाठान्तरम्) (सि)

गार्हपत्य एवायं शालामुखीयः । तत्र गार्हपत्यशब्दः श्रूयते । सम्मार्ष्टि गार्हपत्याविति । प्राजहिते शालामुखीयगार्हपत्ययोगो न विरोत्स्यते ।

॥ १५ ॥ सर्वेषां गार्हपत्यानामविशेषात् ॥ ३ - २ - २७ ॥ (पू)

स्थितमिदं शालामुखीयो गार्हपत्य इति । तत्र सर्वाणि गार्हपत्यकार्याणि न वेति विचार्यते । किं प्राप्तम् ? सर्वाणि । कुतः ? विशेषाभावात् । अयमत्र पदार्थः कर्तव्यः, अर्थं नेति विशेषो न गम्यते । गार्हपत्यश्चेच्छालामुखीयः तत्र सर्वाणि कर्तव्यानीति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ श्रुतिभूतान [नां दार्शिक] प्रकृतेश्वा-
धिकारात् ॥ ३ - २ - २८ ॥ (सि)

शालामुखीयस्य दीक्षणीयानन्तरकालं प्रणयनं सोमार्थमित्युक्तम् । सोमप्रकरणे यानि कर्माणि श्रूयन्ते “ द्वाभ्यां गार्हपत्ये जुहोति ” इत्येवमादीनि तावन्त्येव तत्र क्रियेरन् । प्रकरणात् । यानि च दर्शपूर्णमास [प्रकृतिकानि] तेषामपि नात्यन्तविकारित्वं स्वेन गार्हपत्येन संबन्धात् ।

॥ लिङ्गदर्शनाच्च ॥ ३-२-२९ ॥

“ प्राञ्चमग्निं प्रहरन्त्युत्पत्नीमानयन्ति अन्वनांसि प्रवर्तयन्ति अथवा अस्यैषधिष्णियो हीयते सोऽनुध्यायति स ईश्वरो रुद्रो भूत्वा प्रजां पशून् यजमानस्य शमयितोर्यर्हि पशुमाप्रीतमुदञ्च नयन्ति तर्हि तस्य पशुश्रपणं हरेत् तेनैवैनं भागिनं करोति ” इति पशुश्रपणेनैव प्राजहितस्य भागित्वं ब्रुवन् अन्येषां गार्हपत्यकार्याणां शालामुखीये करणीयत्वं मन्वीतेति ।

॥ १६ ॥ आहवनीयात् (धिष्णियान्) विहरेद्धोम-
संयोगात् ॥ ३ - २ - ३० ॥ (पू)

आहवनीयादाग्नीधीयं प्रत्युद्धर्तव्यं उत शालामुखीयादिति सन्दिह्यते । किं प्राप्तम् ? प्रहृतादाग्नीधीयमुद्धरेदिति । कुतः ? होमसंयोगात् । प्रहृतस्य प्रकृतहोमार्थत्वात् अन्यस्यापि होमार्थस्य तत एव विहरणं न्याय्यमिति प्राप्ते—

॥ शालामुखीयाद्वा देशसंयोगात् ॥ ३ - २ - ३१ ॥ (सि)

शालामुखीयादेव प्रणयनम्—

“ अग्निप्रथमाः प्राञ्चोऽभिप्रव्रजन्ति सोमप्रथमा वा ”

“ अग्नीषोमाभ्यां प्रणीयमानाभ्यामनुब्रूहि ” इति “ अग्निप्रथमाः प्राञ्चोऽभिप्रव्रजन्ति ” इति (यत) [प्राग्गमन] विधानात् । अग्नीषोमाभ्यामिति सह सोमेन प्रणयनविधानात् शालामुखीयादाग्नीध्रं परेयुरिति ।

अपरं दर्शनम्—आहवनीयैकदेश एव आग्नीधीयःहोमसंयोगात् यावदस्योद्धरणं तावत् अनभिव्यक्तत्वमेव शालामुखीयेऽस्य । गार्हपत्यार्थं अवितत्वात् आहवनीयशेषस्य; उद्धृतेऽस्मिन् गार्हपत्याविर्भावात् । तथा च स्मृतिः—‘ एषोऽत ऊर्ध्वं गार्हपत्यो भवति ’ इति ।

॥ १७ ॥ आहवनीयात् धिष्णियान् विहरेद्वोम-
संयोगात् ॥ ३ - २ - ३२ ॥ (पू)

“ अङ्गारैर्द्वे सवने विहरति शलाकाभिस्तृतीयं सशुकत्वाय ” इति श्रूयमाणे सन्देहः—किमाहवनीयात् द्विसंयुक्तात् [उत आग्नीधीयादिति । तत्र] आहवनीयाद्वोमविहरणं युक्तम् अर्थसामान्यात् । तस्मादाहवनीयात् धिष्णिया विहियेरन्निति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ आग्नीधीयाद्वा आम्नायतः ॥ ३ - २ - ३३ ॥

यत एवं प्राप्ते वचनं ‘ आग्नीधीयात् धिष्णियान् विहरति ’ इति । होमसंयोगोऽत्र न विरुद्धयते । तस्याहवनीयैकदेशत्वात् । अनुसवनमाग्नीधीयादेव धिष्णिया विहियेरन्निति ।

॥ १८ ॥ अनुसवनं सवनसंयोगात् ॥ ३ - २ - ३४ ॥ (पू)

धिष्णियान् प्रकृत्य श्रूयते—¹अङ्गारैर्द्वे सवने विहरति शलाकाभिस्तृतीयं” इति । किं प्रतिसवनमेव विहरणं उत चतुर्थमर्हति इति सन्दिह्यते । किं प्राप्तं ? प्रतिसवनमेवेति । कुतः ? सवनसंयोगात् प्रतिसवनं सकृदेव विहियेरन् ।

अङ्गारैर्द्वे सवने विहरति शलाकाभिस्तृतीयं इति वचसो[गुणवि]धिपरत्वान्न विहरणेत्यावधारणार्थत्वमिति । उच्यते । सत्यं; यदि विहरणान्तरं अभविष्यत् (भविष्यति) तस्यापि गुणो व्यधास्यत् । न तु विधीयते । तस्मान्नास्ति सः । ननु समुत्कर्षणं चतुर्थस्य विहरणस्यैको गुणो विधीयते । नेति ब्रूमः, पात एवैतत् । “समुत्कर्षयित्वा ज्योतिष्मतीः कृत्वा” इति प्रागुत्कर्षणमात्रं विधीयते न हि विहरणान्तरम् । तस्मात् प्रतिसवनमेव विहरणमिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ चतुर्थं वा अग्निष्टोमसामलिङ्गात् ॥ ३-२-३५ ॥ (सि)

“साम वा अग्निष्टोमः तस्य वा हितास्तनवो यद्विष्णियाः” इत्यग्निष्टोमसाम प्रकृत्य ज्योतिष्मतीः कृत्वेति ब्रुवन् विहरणान्तरमेव² दर्शयति । नहि धिष्णियेषु प्रतिजागरणं संभवति । कार्यकालत्वाद्विहरणस्य । “एतावतीर्वा अग्नेस्तनूः षोढा सप्त सप्त एता एव प्रीणाति ।” इति न चाग्निष्टोमसामकालविहरणमन्तरेण अग्निस्तनूनां द्विचत्वारिंशत्सङ्ख्या पूर्येत । तस्याश्च पूरणं श्लोकद्वयेन पूर्वाचार्यैः विहितम् ।

महाग्नयश्चत्वारः शामित्राश्च त्रयः पृथक् ।

निर्मन्थ्याश्चापि चत्वारः त्रयश्चोपयजः पृथक् ॥

प्रातस्सदसि षड्धिष्ण्या मार्जालीयश्च (सक) सप्तधा ॥

तस्मादस्ति चतुर्थं विहरणम् । इति ।

॥ १९ ॥ ³अनुसवनं व्याधारणमविशेषात् प्रत्यङ्ङासीनो धिष्णियान् व्याधारयतीति ॥ ३-२-३६ ॥ (सि)

तृतीयसवने व्याधारणं कर्तव्यं उत प्रतिसवनमिति । किं प्राप्तम् ? ‘धिष्णियान् व्याधारयति’ इत्यविशेषश्रुतेः प्रतिसवनं व्याधारणमिति ।

1. A & R इत

2. प्रकरणान्तरमेव मा.

3. B. reads तृतीयसवने विशेषश्रुतेः प्रतिसवनं विहियेरन् विप्रतिषेधात् ।

॥ तृतीयसवने चाविशेषलिङ्गात् ॥ ३ - २ - ३७ ॥

तृतीय एव घृताहुतिं प्राप्स्यसि न सोम्याः प्रस्तुतो युष्मान् सोमेन समयं ममाहथ(?) इति ^१तृतीयसवने विशेषश्रुतेः प्रतिसवनमेव विहितेरन्निति ।

॥ विप्रतिषिद्धो वा एकवाक्ययोगात् कालहविषोरिति
बादरायणः ॥ ३-२-३८ ॥ (सि)

एकस्मिन् वाक्ये कालहविषोर्विधिः विप्रतिषिद्धः वाक्यभेदप्रसङ्गात् । यदि तृतीयसवनं कालो नियम्येत तदा हविर्न विधियेत अथ हविर्न काल इति ।

॥ २० ॥ तस्मात्तेषु जुह्वतीत्यर्थः^२ ॥ ३-२-३९ ॥

अनुसवनं व्याघारणं धिष्णियानामनुमतमिति स्थितम् । अधुनेदं विचार्यते— किं सोमेनेषां व्याघारणं कर्तव्यम् उताज्येनेति । सोमेनाहवनीयं, आग्नीधीयं होत्रीयं मार्जालीयं च, आज्येनेतरत् । कुतः ? लिङ्गात् । “तेषां ये नेदिष्ठं पर्य-विशन् ते सोमपीथं प्राप्नुवन् आहवनीय आग्नीधीयो होत्रीयो मार्जालीयः” इति प्रकृत्य “तस्मात्तेषु जुह्वति” इति अवसाने प्रकृतस्य सोमस्य तेषु जुह्वति सोममित्यर्थः । आहवनीयग्रहणं च प्राप्तेः अविध्यर्थः । यथा चक्री च सद इति (?) । विहित-प्रतिषेधात् सोमेनाज्यं विकल्पते । “अभिघार्य वषट् करोति द्विर्हेतेन सोमपीथे-नार्ध्यन्ते” इति निन्दार्थवादसामर्थ्यात् प्रतिषेधोऽवसीयते । आज्येनेति विधिः विहितप्रतिषिद्धत्वात् सोमेनाज्यं विकल्प्येत व्याघारण इति ।

॥ २१ ॥ तेषां वायव्यं पालं चमसो वा प्रकरणात् यथा
शूर्पेण जुहोतीति ॥ ३-२-४० ॥

धिष्णियानां व्याघारणे वायव्यं [पालं] ग्रहचमसमिति । कथं ? प्रकरणात् । प्रकृतत्वादित्यर्थः । सर्वत्र द्रव्यविधौ प्रकृतद्रव्यातिक्रमप्रमाणाभावात् यथाऽस्यैव ग्रहणमेवमत्रापीति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

1. तृतीयसवने आज्येन व्याघारणम् इतरयोः सोमेनेत्यर्थः । न तु सामान्यविहितस्य व्याघारणस्य तृतीयपरतया उपसंहारः—भा.दी.
2. B ms. reads तस्माद्धौमैक वाक्ययोगात्

“^१परिप्लवमानात् द्रोणकलशात् परिप्लवया राजानमादाय प्रत्यङ्ङासीनो धिष्णियान् व्याघारयति” इति वचसा [परिप्लवाया एव व्याघारणेपि करणत्वम् ।]

॥ २२ ॥ सोमे होमेष्वाज्यं हविश्चोदनापृथक्त्वात् ॥

३ - २ - ४१ ॥ (सि)

सन्ति सोमे ‘वैसर्जनानि जुहोति’ इत्येवमादयः दर्विहोमाः । ते किं सोम-द्रव्यकाः आहोस्वित् आज्यद्रव्यका इति सन्देहः । किं प्राप्तम् ? सोमद्रव्यका इति । उत्पत्तावुपात्तद्रव्यविशेषात् । [अद्र]व्यस्य च होमस्य सन्निहितद्रव्याकाङ्क्षाच्च । दर्विहोमानां प्रधानद्रव्यमेव होमेषु इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

सोमे ये दर्विहोमास्तेषु आज्यं हविः स्यात् कुतः ? चोदनापृथक्त्वात् । प्रधानयागेषु चोदितद्रव्यं न दर्विहोमेषु प्राप्नुयात् विधिभेदात् । यत्र चोदितस्तत्र स्यात् । तेनानादिष्टद्रव्याणां आज्यद्रव्यं स्यादिति । तथा च न्यायमूला शिष्टा-चारस्मृतिः “आज्यद्रव्यं हविरनादेशे” इति ।

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥ ३-२-४२ ॥

‘धिष्णियव्याघारणसम्पातेनाज्येन पालीवतं श्रीणाति’ इत्याज्यद्रव्यका दर्विहोमाः । तेप्यत्र दर्शयति ।

॥ २३ ॥ स वैव स्यादित्याहवनीयस्यायं

वादः ॥ २-२-४३ ॥ (पू)

सदसो ह्यनन्तरे वाक्ये “अस्यैष धिष्णियो (विहियते)हीयते सोऽनुध्यायति स ईश्वरो रुद्रो भूत्वा प्रजां पशून् यजमानस्य शमयितोः यर्हि पशुमाप्रीतमुदङ्गं नयन्ति तर्हि तस्य पशुश्रपणं हरेत् तेनैवैनं भागिनं करोति । यजमानो वा आहवनीयो यजमानं वा एतद्विकर्षन्ते यदाहवनीयात् पशु श्रपणं हरन्ति सवैव स्यान्निर्मन्थ्य वा कुर्यात् यजमानस्य सात्मत्वाय” इति । किमाहवनीयस्य सवैव स्यादिति वादः आहोस्वित् प्राजहितस्य वेति ।

किं प्राप्तं ? आहवनीयस्येति । कथं ? आहवनीयस्य वाक्ये प्रकान्तत्वात् ।
 “यजमानो वा आहवनीयो यजमानं वा एतद्विकर्षन्ते यदाहवनीयात् पशुश्रपणं
 हरन्ति^१” इति वाक्यात् तेनैवायं वाद इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः

॥ प्राजहितस्य वाऽपदेशात् अर्थवादप्रतिषेधाच्च ॥ ३-२-४४ ॥ (सि)

प्राजहितस्य वाऽयं वादः (अभेदव्यपदेशात्) निर्मन्थ्येन तुल्यवद् व्यपदेशात्
 स वा स्यात् निर्मन्थ्यो वेति । निर्मन्थ्यस्य चा सन्दिग्धम[ना]हवनीयत्वं आहवनीये
 विप्रतिषिध्यते । अपि चायमर्थवादो यजमानस्य सात्मत्वायेति यजमानो वा आहवनीय
 इत्युक्त्वाऽऽह - किं तेनैव आहवनीयेनैव तस्य सात्मत्वं सम्भवति अन्येनान्यसात्मत्वा-
 सम्भवात् । प्राजहितस्यायं वाद इति ।

॥ पशौ शालामुखीयः स तदर्थः प्रकृतौ न सोमे गार्हपत्य-
 कर्म विद्यते ॥ ३-२-४५ ॥ (सि)

^२निरूढे पशौ शालामुखीयः स्यात् । प्रकृतौ हि अग्नीषोमीये तस्य पश्वर्थता
 दृष्टा । न हि प्रधानसोमे गार्हपत्यसंयोगोऽस्ति । तस्मादङ्गार्थ एव सोमे इति ।

॥ २५ ॥ पश्चिष्ट्यामाहवनीयो धार्येत संस्कारसंयोगात्
 स दीक्षणीयया व्याख्यातः ॥ ३ - २ - ४६ ॥

पशाविष्टिमुभयतः केचिदधीयते । केचिदन्यतरतः । पश्चिष्ट्यपवर्गे किमु-
 त्सष्टव्य आहवनीयः उत धारणीय इति । किं प्राप्तम् ? अर्थप्रयुक्तत्वादुद्धरणे [णस्य]
 इष्ट्यपवर्गे लौकिको जात इत्युत्सष्टव्य इति । [ब्रूमः] पश्चिष्ट्यामुद्धृत आहवनीयो
 धारणीयः संस्कारसंयोगात् । स दीक्षणीयया व्याख्यातः दीक्षणीयाहवनीयवद्धा(दुद्ध)
 रणीयः इत्यधिकरणातिदेशः^३ । तस्याः पश्चिष्टेः अन्ततः आम्नातपशोः पूर्वप्रयोगे
 देवतासंस्कारत्वात् (यदादीक्षणीयायाः) । तस्मादासाङ्गपशुयागसमाप्तेराहवनीयो धार्य
 इति ।

1. Bhatta Dipika आहवनीयग्रहणे यजमानस्यैव विकर्षणं स्यादिति विनिन्द्य
 यजमानस्यात्मलाभाय विधीयमानस्याग्नेः आहवनीयातिरिक्तत्वावश्यकभावात् ।

2 अत्र पूर्वपक्षः वरुणप्रधासेषु प्राजहितादेवोत्तरवेदिप्रणयनवत् निरूढपशावपि संभवाच्च
 शालामुखीयो भवेदिति प्राप्ते—मा. दी.

3 15.2-10 एतेन सोमे etc.

॥ २६ ॥ पूर्वेद्युः काले पशवुत्तरवेदिकेऽग्निहोत्रं जुहुयादाह-
वनीयत्वात् ॥ ३-२-४७ ॥

पशौ पूर्वेद्युः काले प्रणयने कृते अग्निहोत्रं तत्रैव हूयेत । औत्तरवेदिकस्य तदा नियतत्वात् । पूर्वस्य च तस्यां अवस्थायां गार्हपत्यत्वात् । तस्मादौत्तरवेदिक एवाग्निहोत्रं हूयेतेति ।

(मध्ये चिन्ता)

॥ २७ ॥ अग्निहोत्रस्य शालामुखीये श्रपणं
प्रसङ्गात् ॥ ३-२-४८ ॥ (पू.)

पशौ, किं शालामुखीये अग्निहोत्रं श्रप्यते स्वस्य गार्हपत्यस्य विद्यमानत्वात् उत प्राजहित इति । किं प्राप्तम् ? शालामुखीय इति, तस्य अधुना गार्हपत्यत्वात् । सर्वकर्माश्रित्वाच्च । तस्य तन्त्रमध्येविधानतया प्रसङ्गाच्च शालामुख एवेति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

॥ प्राजहिते विद्यमानत्वात् ॥ ३-२-४९ ॥ (सि)

प्राजहित एवाग्निहोत्रं श्रूयते [श्रप्येत] स्वस्य गार्हपत्यस्य विद्यमानत्वात् । असति स्वद्रव्ये परप्रसङ्गोपजीविता स्यात् । यादृक्षं स्वद्रव्योपयोगे सुखं न तादृक्षं प्रसङ्गोपजीवने । तस्मात् प्राजहित एव अग्निहोत्रं श्रप्येत इति ।

॥ २८ ॥ शामित्रे पशुपुरोडाशस्य श्रपणं
प्रसङ्गात् ॥ ३-२-५० ॥ (पू)

पशुपुरोडाशं प्रति सन्देहः—किमयं शामित्रे श्रपयितव्यः उत शालामुखीय इति । किं प्राप्तम् । शामिल इति । कथम् ? पशुतन्त्रस्य शामित्रे प्रसक्तत्वात् तन्त्रमध्येऽस्य विधानाच्च शामिल एव पशुपुरोडाश इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः

॥ शालामुखीये प्रयुक्तत्वाद्द्रव्यस्य प्रयुक्ते
प्रसङ्गात् ॥ ३-२-५१ ॥ (सि)

शालामुखीय एव पशुपुरोडाशः श्रप्येत । प्रयुक्तत्वाच्छालामुखीयस्य अन्येषु गार्हपत्यकार्येषु । सति स्वे द्रव्ये गरीयसि न च परकीयं लघीयोऽप्युपादीयते । न

हि देवदत्तः [स्वीये सति] परकीयक्षौममादित्सति । तस्माच्छालामुखीये श्रप्येतेति ।
षशुपुरोडाशः श्रप्येत । तन्त्वान्तेष्यमनपक्रान्तोऽग्निः प्रणयनसाकल्यवचनायेति ।

॥ २९ ॥ द्व्यहे त्र्यहे उत्तरवेदिः क्रियेत प्रकृत्युप-
बन्धात् ॥ ३ - २ - ५२ ॥ (पू)

वैकृतेषु च यथा[प्रकृति]उत्तरवेदिकालः उत नेति भवति विचारणा ।

किं युक्तम् ? अग्नीषोमीयविकारे द्व्यहः । कथं ? प्रकृतिः यस्मिन् काले कृतः
तत्रैव विकारः कर्तव्यः चोदकप्राप्तेः— [इति प्राप्ते]

स्वकालत्वात् सद्यस्काल एव पशुः वरुणप्रघासश्चोत्तरवेद्या-
मग्निहोत्रं सञ्चष्टे ॥ ३ - २ - ५३ ॥ (सि)

“ अपि वा स्नात्वा उप्त्वा केशश्मश्रूणि अरण्योरग्नीन् समारोप्य उदवसाय
निर्मथ्य पौर्णमासेन यष्टव्यम् । न ह्यवकल्पते उत्तरवेद्यामग्निहोत्रं जुहुयात् ”¹ इति ।
न ह्येतदवकल्पते यदुत्तरवेद्यामग्निहोत्रमित्युत्तरवेद्यामग्निहोत्रहोमपरिसङ्ख्या[ख्यया]
वरुणप्रघासवत् सद्यस्कालत्वाध्यवसानान्न प्रकृतितः उत्तरवेदिकालप्राप्तिः । प्रधानत्वा-
दग्निनिधानादे[रि]केषां प्रकृताविव वत्सापाकरणं सद्यस्कालमेव । (काले वत्सापाकरणं
प्रतिनिदध्युः । वेदिदोषमुक्त्वा दोहकाल एतेषां विहितः) । तदपेक्षं चैतत्
सद्यस्कालत्वं प्रकृतित एव ।

॥ ३० ॥ पशुवरुणप्रघासेषु² दर्शपूर्णमासविकारत्वाच्छाला-
मुखीयो न स्यात् ॥ ३ - २ - ५४ ॥ (पू)

वरुणप्रघासेषु शालामुखीयः स्यान्न वेति संशये दर्शपूर्णमासविध्यन्तग्राहित्वात्
न वरुणप्रघासानां तत्र शालामुखीयस्य प्रतीतिः । नापि प्रत्यक्षविधिः स्पष्टः । तस्मान्न
वरुणप्रघासेषु शालामुखीय इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

1. आ, श्रौ 8-8-23

2. S' प्रघासानामिति

॥ विद्यते तद्व्याख्यातम् ॥ ३-२-५५ ॥ (सि)

भवेद्वा शालामुखीयो वरुणप्रधासेषु । तद्व्याख्यातम्—तदेतदुक्तं तन्त्रे—अर्थ कर्म वा कर्मशब्देन विधीयते^१; प्राकृतं वाऽनामत्वादिति^२ च । प्रतिपादितमेतत् । वस्तुतो विशिषवि[धि]रेवाङ्गीकृत इति ।

॥ ३१ ॥ संस्थिते सोमे शालामुखीयाम्नीध्रीयोत्तरवेदिकाः

समारोप्य नित्यं धार्यन्ते ॥ ३ - २ - ५६ ॥ (पू)

शालामुखीयादयः सोमापवर्गे समारोप्या न वेति सन्देहः । कर्मापवर्गे अर्थनियोगतः समारोप्येर्न् कर्मयुक्ते नियमेन धारणाज्ञानात् ।

॥ अनुगतेषु प्रायश्चित्तमाज्ञातम् ॥ ३-२-५७ ॥

अनुगतेषु च शालामुखीयादिषु वहिषु प्रायश्चित्ताज्ञानात् तेषामेव धारणम् । कर्मापवर्गे समारोपणमिति निश्चीयते । “ यदा आहवनीय उद्धायेत् आग्नीध्रादुद्धरेत् । आग्नीध्र उद्धायेत् गार्हपत्यादुद्धरेत् गार्हपत्य उद्धायेत् अत्र एव पुनर्मन्थेत् ” इति तेष्वेव प्रायश्चित्तमाज्ञातमिति ।

॥ प्राजहितं वा सर्वार्थत्वात् आधानस्य^३ सोमलक्षणं

इतरेषां तत्सोमापवर्गेऽपवृज्येर्न् यथाऽग्निहोत्रा-

दुद्धरणम् ॥ ३ - २ - ५८ ॥ (सि)

प्राजहितमेव समारोपयेत् तदाधानस्य तद्धारणस्य सर्वार्थत्वात् । सोमलक्षण-मिति । इतरेषां सोमार्थत्वाद्विहारान्ते सोमापवर्गेऽपवृज्येर्न् यथाऽग्निहोत्रार्थमुद्धृतोऽग्नि-होत्रापवर्गेऽपवृज्यते^४ तद्वत् । अत्रापि परयोः प्रायश्चित्ताज्ञानयोः कर्मार्थोपयोग उपपद्यत एवेति ।

॥ ३२ ॥ ^५गतश्रियश्शालामुखीयं नित्यत्वात् ॥ ३ - २ - ५९ ॥

1. c f 4 - 2 - 2

2. पू. मी. 7-3-21

3. R आयास्यै

4. ऽ परित्यज्यते

5. शालामुखीयद्वितीयं

अजस्रपक्षे शालामुखीयं समारोपयेयुः, नित्यत्वात्, सर्वकर्माश्रितया तद्धारणस्य । अविशेषेण चैकेषां आहवनीयस्य धारणमाह्नात् । तदप्यनेन व्याख्यातम् ।

॥ ३३ ॥ दीक्षिताग्नेः समारोपणं न विद्यते अग्निहोत्रानन्तर्यात्
तत्पुनः प्रतिषिद्धं तस्य ॥ ३ - २ - ६० ॥ (पू)

किं दीक्षितस्य सतः प्रयास्यतोऽग्निसमारोपणं न वेति चिन्त्यते । किं प्राप्तं ? न कर्तव्यम् । कथं ? अग्निहोत्रानन्तर्यात् । “ पातरग्निहोत्रं हुत्वा समारोपयेत् ” इति वाक्यात् अग्निहोत्राङ्गं समारोपणम् । तच्चाग्निहोत्रं प्रतिषिद्धं दीक्षितस्य । ‘ सकृन्न दीक्षितो जुहोति ’ इति । यथा अनन्तरे धारणप्रायश्चित्ते । यथा अन्नघङ्गं सौत्रामणी तद्ब्रह्मन्नापीति ।

॥ विद्यते चाप्रयाणसंयोगात् ॥ ३ - २ - ६१ ॥ (सि)

प्रयास्यन् समारोपयतीति न च तत् प्रयाणाङ्गम् नाप्यग्निहोत्राङ्गम् । किन्तु प्रयाणे निमित्ते समारोपणमाग्निनयनोपायः । नचानन्तर्यमङ्गकारणं असति प्रमाणे । किन्तु श्रुत्यादिप्रमाणकलापोपनीतं तादर्थ्यमङ्गकारणम् । यथाऽग्निहोत्रानन्तरभाविनो वास्तोष्पतीयस्य प्रमाणाभावाच्चाग्निहोत्राङ्गत्वमेवमत्रापीति ।

॥ ३४ ॥ ^१प्रत्यग्रचरणभेदो द्रव्यपृथक्त्वात् ॥ ३ - २ - ६२ ॥ (पू)

अग्निसमारोपे द्रव्यपृथक्त्वं निर्दिदिक्षितं नेति संशयः । किं प्राप्तम् ? प्रत्यग्नि दाह्यद्रव्यपृथक्त्वात् अग्निपृथक्त्वात् असंसर्गस्य विधित्सितत्वात्, प्रत्यग्नि अरणिभेद-इति ।

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥ ३ - २ - ६३ ॥

‘ सहारणिभिस्तरन्ति ’ इत्यरणिबहुत्वदर्शनं तु अरणिभेदे सत्युपपद्यत इति ।

अरणिभ्यामित्येकेषां स विकल्पो विप्रतिषेधात् ॥ ३ - २ - ६४ ॥

‘ अरणिभ्यां सह तरन्ति ’ इत्येकेषामाह्वानम् । तस्मात् द्वित्वबहुत्वयोर्विकल्प इति ।

॥ इतरस्य वा धर्मविधित्सा यथा रथाङ्गेन
तरन्तीति ॥ ३ - २ - ६५ ॥

अरणिप्रातिपदिकार्थोऽत्र करणं विधीयते नारणिगतसङ्ख्या विवक्षिता इति । अरणिभिरिति यद्यपीयं तृतीया न कारकलक्षणा तथापि सहयोगलक्षणत्वादप्राधान्यम् तदाह - तरणस्य धर्मविधित्तया रथाङ्गेन तरन्तीति । तदविवक्षितसङ्ख्यस्य प्रातिपदिकमात्रस्य तरणे प्रतीतिः । एवमत्र । कारकविभक्तिमन्तरेण कथं क्रियाङ्गतेति चेत् । द्रव्याणां कर्मसंबन्धे गुणत्वेनाभिसंबन्धस्योक्तत्वात् ।

न च तरणक्रियायाः कर्त्रा सम्बन्धः, कारकाणां परस्परसंबन्धाभावात् । तस्मात्तरणे द्वित्वबहुत्वश्रुतिरकारणम् । अरणिद्वित्वबहुत्वे वाचनिक्यौ ॥

॥ ३५ ॥ उख्याग्नेर्न समारोपणं पात्रसंयोगात्
॥ ३ - २ - ६६ ॥ (सि)

उख्याग्निः समारोप्य नेतव्यः उत सह पात्रेणेति । किं प्राप्तम् ? समारोप्य नेतव्यः । नह्यग्नेः क्वचिदपि प्रत्यक्षं नयनमस्ति । तस्मात् समारोप्यैव नेतव्यमित्येवं प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—उख्याग्नेर्न समारोपणं पात्रसंयोगात् । उख्यसमाख्यानात् पात्रेणापि युक्तः उख्य एव । यदि पुनः समारोप्यते पात्रे(णापीज्यत)[ण वियुज्यत] इति समाख्याविरोधः स्यात् ।

॥ ३६ ॥ अपरयोस्तु विद्यते विप्रतिषेधात् ॥ ३ - २ - ६७ ॥ (सि)

गार्हपत्यसमारोपणं न वेति चिन्ता । साम्निचित्ये कृते पूर्वैर्न न्यायेन वैलक्षण्यात् प्रत्यक्षमेव नयनमिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः :—

तुशब्दात्पक्षो विपरिवर्तते । अपरयोर्धर्मविप्रतिषेधात् साम्निचित्येपि समारोपणं स्यात् । यथा उख्ये समाख्याविरोधो नैवमितरयोरिति । ‘ उपर्यपराग्नी समारोपयन्ती’ति प्रकृतावजस्रपक्षेऽस्ति प्रत्यक्षं नयनम् । तस्यैव चोदकप्राप्तस्यायमनुवाद इति ।

॥ ३७ ॥ आत्मसमारोपणे अरण्योश्च विकल्पो विप्रतिषेधात्
॥ ३ - २ - ६८ ॥ (पू)

आत्मन्यरण्योश्च किं समुच्चयेन उत विकल्पेनेति । आत्मसमारोपणस्यात्मनि संस्कारत्वात् विकल्पस्य चातिदुष्टत्वात् समुच्चय एवेति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः ।

॥ एकार्थत्वात् समुच्चयः विप्रतिषेधाद्विकल्प इति ॥ ३-२-६९ ॥ (सि)

ननु [सन्तर्दन] पूर्वपक्षेण (३-३-११) गतमेतदधिकरणम् । सत्यमेवम् । प्राप्ति-सूत्रमेतत् उत्तरविवक्षार्थमिति ।

॥ ३८ ॥ आत्मसमारूढे विप्रतिषेधात् ॥ ३-२-७० ॥ (पू)

लौकिकेऽग्नौ [प्रत्यवरोह] मन्त्रजपः [आत्मनि] अरण्योर्वा उपनयने स्यात् । (स्यमन्थेत्) [यद्यपि] 'यस्याहिताग्नेरग्निर्मथ्यमानो न जायते' इत्यविशेषेण मथनश्रुतेरात्मगतमग्निमरण्योरुपावरोह्य मन्थेत् । मन्थनश्रुतेरविशेषेण प्रवृत्तत्वात् "यस्याहिताग्नेरग्निर्मथ्यमानो न जायते यत्नान्यं दीप्यमानं परापश्येत् तत आहृत्य होतव्यम्" इति "यस्याहिताग्नेरग्निर्मथ्यमानो न जायते" इति च अविशेषेण वचनं श्रूयते । अथाप्युपवेषवत् प्रत्यक्ष एव नियम्येत । यथा "उपवेषेणाङ्गारमपोहति" इति प्रकरणादविशेषेणेति प्रसक्ते असम्भवात् सान्नाय्यपक्ष एव नियतः । एवमिदं¹ मन्थनं अणिसमारोपपक्षे स्यादिति । तस्मादात्मसमारोपणपक्षे लौकिक एवाग्नौ प्रत्यवरोहणमिति ।

एकार्थत्वाद्वा नियम्येत श्रुतेरविशिष्टत्वात् ॥ ३-२-७१ ॥ (सि)

आत्मनि समारोपितस्य लौकिकाग्नौ अरण्योर्वा प्रत्यवरोहणमर्थतः प्राप्तम् अविशेषेण मन्थनविधानान्यथानुपपत्त्या अरण्योरेव प्रत्यवरोहणं व्यवतिष्ठते । यत्पुनरुपवेषवदिति—युक्तं खल्वपवेषस्यानुनिष्पादने नियमः सान्नाय्यपक्षे स्यादिति ।

संसर्गे वापि दोषः स्यादिति (पू. मी. १२-४-२२) अवरोहस्य वैदिकस्याग्नेः लौकिकाग्निना संसर्गे दोषमाह ।—'यस्याहिताग्नेस्सतो ग्राम्येणाग्निना संसृज्येरन्' इति आहवनीये होमाः श्रूयन्ते । आहवनीयस्य होमाधिकरणतया श्रूयमाणत्वात् यदाहवनीये जुह्वतीति न लौकिकस्य होमाधिकरणत्वं स्वरवमन्तरेण संभवति । न

चैकार्थत्वात्समुच्चयात् प्रत्यवरोहणद्रव्ययोः समुच्चयः । विप्रतिषेधात् । एकेनाप्यर्थ-
सिद्धिरिति ।

कालविशेषनियमाशङ्किनो नियमादिदं आशङ्कितोत्तरं सूत्रं यत् अग्निर्मथ्य-
मानो न जायते होमकालातिक्रमश्चाशङ्क्यते, यथा तत्र लौकिके होमो दृष्टः तथा
तस्मिन्नेव विषये लौकिके प्रत्यवरोहणमिति । तत्र,

कालविशेषस्य अग्न्यजन्मनिमित्तं वचनात् (न) लौकिके नैवं प्रत्यवरोहण-
निमित्तप्रतिपत्तिः । तस्मादरण्योरेव प्रत्यवरोहणं न लौकिकेऽभाविता । मन्थने च
विप्रतिपत्तेः 'न यस्य' वचसां च विप्रतिपद्यमानत्वे मन्थनं सामर्थ्यादरण्योरेव ।
तस्मादात्मसमारोपणे प्रत्यवरोहणमरण्योरेव ।

केचिद्विप्रतिपत्तिमार्याणां मन्थने वर्णयन्ति । दर्शनाच्च मन्थनमेव स्यादिति
सूत्रकारः । केचिल्लौकिके प्रत्यवरोहणं स्मरन्ति । अस्मृतिस्सा हेतुदर्शनप्रभवत्वात् ।
सुकरं लौकिके प्रत्यवरोहणं, दुष्करं मन्थनम् ।

तदनृतवत् [तदनृतमिति] केचन । तत्र एषा स्मृतिरिति । श्रुतेः स्मृत्यनु-
मानमिति केचित् ॥ न ॥ हेतोः अकृतत्वात्^१ न जात्या कश्चिदलौकिकोऽस्ति ।
प्रत्यवरोहणसंस्कारादयमेवालौकिक इति चेन्न ; संस्कारत्वेनाविधानात् ।

अथ यथा प्रतिगतेनाहवनीयेन गार्हपत्यबुध्यवस्थसंसर्गे न दोषः तद्वदत्रापीति
चेत् ।

न, अत्र संसर्गस्य प्रत्यक्षात् । शास्त्रार्थस्य संसर्गे न दोषः । लघीयसामपि
विधीनां गरीयोभिर्विकल्पो दृष्टः यथा एकविंशतिः सर्ववेदसं वेत्युच्यते ।

विधानान्यथानुपपत्त्या भवति । एवमत्र लौकिके प्रत्यवरोहणं विधीयत
इति ।

॥ इति श्रीदेवस्वामिनः कृतौ सङ्कर्षकाण्डभाष्ये ॥

॥ तृतीयाध्यायस्य द्वितीयः पादः ॥

॥ अग्निपादस्समाप्तः ॥

—: * :—

॥ अथ तृतीयाध्यायस्य ॥

॥ तृतीयः पादः ॥

॥ १ ॥ अतिग्राह्यास्समानविधानास्तद्व्याख्यातम् ॥ ३-३-१ ॥ (सि)

अतिग्राह्यास्समानविधानाः प्रकरणस्थैर्ग्रहैः समानधर्मिणो भवेयुरिति तद्व्याख्यातम् । संयुक्तं वा तदर्थत्वात् शेषस्य तन्निमित्तत्वादिति (पू.मी ३.६.३३) । ग्रहगतमशेषं वस्तु चिन्तयितुं प्रस्तावसूत्रमेतत् ।

॥ २ ॥ विश्वजिति सर्वपृष्ठे ग्रहीतव्या अप्यग्निष्टोमे इत्यपि विश्वजितो वादेन विश्वजित्त्वेन व्यपदिश्यते ॥ ३-३-२ ॥ (सि)

विश्वजिति अग्निष्टोमसंस्थे अतिग्राह्या गृह्येरन् उत प्रकृतावग्निष्टोम इति सन्देहे :—

किं प्राप्तम्—विश्वजित्यग्निष्टोमसंस्थ इति । प्रकरणात् । विश्वजिति प्रकरणे एतद्वाक्यम् । तस्माद्विश्वजिद्विशेषेऽतिग्राह्याणां ग्रहणविधिरिति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

विश्वजिति सर्वपृष्ठे ग्रहीतव्या इत्येकं वाक्यम् अर्थपरिसमाप्तेः । अप्यग्निष्टोमे इति द्वितीयं पृथगर्थत्वात् । अपि च विश्वजिति अतिग्राह्या गृह्यन्त इति अविशेषेण प्रवृत्तो विधिः न विशेषेण शक्यते अग्निष्टोमपदेन, पृथक्त्वात् नित्यत्वाच्च व्यपदेश-पदानाम् । अप्यग्निष्टोम इति विश्वजिदग्निष्टोमो विश्वजिता व्यपदेश्यः । अपिशब्दस्य च प्रतीयमानभेदार्थपरित्यागेनावधारणार्थत्वमयुक्तमङ्गीकर्तुमिति । पृथगर्थत्वाच्च नैकं वाक्यम् । प्रकरणाच्च वाक्यं बलवत्तरमेवेत्यग्निष्टोम इति ।

यथा विश्वजिता अग्निष्टोमो न विशेषेण शक्यते प्रकृतौ तथा वैकृत इति वाक्यादग्निष्टोममात्रस्य विवक्षितत्वादिति । सिद्धान्तस्तु

^१ उच्यते । प्रकृत्यग्निष्टोमार्थ एव स्यात् अनारभ्यविधेः प्रकृतिगामित्वादित्यर्थः । [नच]कृतकरं(च)शास्त्रं; विकृतौ प्रकृतितः प्राप्तिः स्यादिति ।

॥ ३ ॥ स प्रकृतिगःप्रकरणात् संबन्धेऽनारभ्यविधिः

॥ ३-३-३ ॥ (पू)

यत्पृष्ठयेन गृहीयात् प्राञ्च यज्ञं पृष्ठानि संसृ[श्रु]णीयुः यदुक्थ्ये गृहीयात् प्रत्यञ्च यज्ञमतिग्राह्याः संसृणीयुः इति निन्दार्थवादात् प्रतिषेधो गम्यते । स किं प्रकृत्यर्थः उत पार्थिक इति वाक्यादभिष्टोममात्रस्य संशीतिः—

किं प्राप्तम् (कृष्टं) अतिग्राह्यविधेः प्रकरणशेषत्वप्रतिपादनात् । तस्मात् प्राकृतोक्थ्यविषय एवायं प्रतिषेध इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—

पृष्ठ्यवाक्यसन्निधानात् पृष्ठ्ये य उक्थ्यः तत्रैवायं प्रतिषेधः । अतिग्राह्याणां पृष्ठ्यशब्दार्थविशेषणत्वेन वाक्यसन्निहितत्वात् । यत्पृष्ठयेन गृहीयात् तदुक्थ्य इति ।

ननु उक्थ्य इति श्रुतिः सामान्येन प्रवृत्ता पृष्ठ्यशब्देन विशेषे नावस्थापयितुं शक्यते । उच्यते । श्रुतेः प्रकृतावेवार्थवत्ता विकारेषु चोदकप्राप्तेः । अनेक-वाक्यान्तरितस्य च प्रकृतिगामित्वं विक्षेपात् प्रकरणमिव भवति । पृष्ठ्यशब्देन चोक्थ्यशब्दस्य संबन्धो वाक्यादेव भवति । वाक्यं च प्रकरणात् बलवत्तरमिति । (सोन्ववसज्यविधिः ?) सोऽयमाहृत्य पार्थिकेषु उक्थ्येषु अतिग्राह्या न गृह्येरन् इति ।

॥ विकल्पो वा पृष्ठ्यशब्देन^१ विधीयते ॥ ३-३-४ ॥ (सि)

नैतदस्ति प्रतिषेधोऽतिग्राह्याणामुक्थ्येष्विति । किं तर्हि ? विधिरप्यस्ति पृष्ठ्य-शब्देनातिग्राह्याणां—

“वैराजस्य स्तोत्रायाग्नेयो गृह्यते शाक्वराणामैन्द्रो रैवतानां सौर्यं” इत्यु-क्त्वाऽऽह—पृष्ठ्यानि वा एतानि पृष्ठ्याच्चयावयन्ति^२ यत्रैव पृष्ठानि युज्येरन् तेषु तेऽति-ग्राह्याः” इति विधिप्रतिषेधयोरेकविषयोपनिपातित्वात् षोडशिवद्विकल्पः स्यादिति ।

॥ ४ ॥ द्वयाश्रयविकल्पः स्यात् ॥ ३-३-५ ॥ (पू)

विकल्पसमः ननु विकल्पः किन्तु द्वयाश्रयो व्यवस्थितविकल्पः इत्यर्थः । पृष्ठ्यष्षडहो नानापृष्ठ्योऽपि बृहद्रथन्तरपृष्ठ्योऽपि । तत्र वैराजस्तोत्रे यो येन गृह्यते इत्यादिना वैराजादिपृष्ठ्यविशेषसंबन्धोऽतिग्राह्याणां ग्रहणनियमात् तत्र विधि-रेव । बृहद्रथन्तरपृष्ठ्ये वैराजविप्रयोगात् प्रतिषेध एवेति । एते न समान-विधानाः अङ्गत्वेन विधीयन्ते स्वतः प्रधानत्वात् । नद्यज्ञैः स्तोत्रैः वैराजादिभिः

1. शब्दो-भा. दी.

2. श्चयावयन्ति भा. दी.

ग्रहा नियन्तुं शक्यन्ते । समानविधानाः प्राकृतकार्यकाः ग्रहाः पृष्ठाश्च तेषां संयोगमालाधिगतिरिति पृष्ठाद्वा च्यावयन्ति इत्यत्र समानविधानेषु नोपपद्यते । “पृष्ठघ्रा-
द्ब्रह्मेरन्” “पृष्ठानि एता ग्रहकृतयो न च्यावयन्ति ।” ग्रहेषु गृह्यमाणेषु न पृष्ठानि
च्यावितानि भवन्ति इति पृष्ठ-चाप्रच्युतिहेतुत्वं ग्रहणस्य पृष्ठाङ्गत्वे सत्युपपद्यते इति ।

॥ समाने वा कालेऽविच्यावनशब्दोऽविप्रतिषिद्धः ॥ ३-३-६ ॥ (सि)

न पृष्ठाङ्गानि ग्रहाः । समानकाले ग्रहाश्च पृष्ठानि च स्युः । यदा स्तोत्राणि तदा
ग्रहा इत्युक्तेनैव हेतुना । ते तु सहैवोपेयुः । यदा स्तोत्राण्युपयन्ति तदा ग्रहाः ।
अविच्यावनशब्दश्चाविप्रतिषिद्धः । यथा रजन्यां तिरोहितायां नक्षत्राणि तिरोहिता-
नीति असत्यपि निमित्तत्वे संभक्तिव्यपदेशः । तस्माद्धितमिदं न स्तोत्रैर्ग्रहा नियम्यन्ते
इति । अतः तुल्यवत् विकल्प इति ।

‘तान् वै पूर्वस्मिन्स्यहे गृह्णीयात्’ ‘अथोत्तरस्मिन्स्यहे ग्रहीतव्याः’ इति सर्वेषां
चोदनापृथक्त्वात् चोदकेन सर्वविकृतिषु अ[वि]शेषेण प्राप्तानां अतिग्राह्याणां इहायं
विशेषो विकल्पितो विधीयते पूर्वस्मिन्स्यहे इति ।

अयं च विधिः त्र्यहस्य सर्वेष्वहस्यसु अतिग्राह्याणां व्यासज्य ग्रहणं शास्ति ।
कथं ? चोदनापृथक्त्वात् पृष्ठे षडहे गृह्णीयात् पूर्वस्मिन्स्यहे उत्तरस्मिन्निति च
चोदनानानात्वात् । व्यासज्यविधौ अस्याश्चोदनायाः स्यादर्थवत्ता । इतरथा षडहचोदना
समानार्था सत्यपि आर्थिकी स्यात् । वैराजस्य स्तोत्रायाग्नेयो गृह्यत इति प्रत्यक्ष
व्यासज्य विधीयते ।

तन्त्रे चैतदुक्तम्—मासिग्रहणमभ्यासप्रतिषेधार्थमिति । (10 - 8 - 28) किं
चोत्तरस्मिन्नपि त्र्यहे सत्स्वेव वैराजादिषु गृह्येरन् । “उपस्तम्भनमतिग्राह्याः [चक्रे]पृष्ठानि”
इत्यतिग्राह्याणां संयोगादेव “न वैराजस्य स्तोत्रा अतिरिक्ताः तैरते साम भजन्त”
इति च सत्येव वैराजे ग्रहणं दर्शयति ।

॥ ६ ॥ वैराजस्य स्तोत्रायाग्नेयो गृह्यत इति देवताविकार
श्रुतार्थसंयोगात् ॥ ३-३-७ ॥

वैराजादीनि स्तोत्राणि ग्रहणदेवताःस्युः आहोस्विदग्न्यादय एवेति सन्देहः—

किं प्राप्तम्—स्तोत्राणि ग्रहदेवता इति कथं ? चतुर्थीसंयोगात् चतुर्थी-
निर्देशात् वैराजस्य स्तोत्रायेति । चतुर्थ्या देवतानिर्देशो द्रष्टव्यः यथा इन्द्राय राज्ञे
सूकर इति ।

न,[ननु]आग्नेय इत्यादि तद्धितनिर्देशबलीयस्त्वात् अग्न्यादय एव देवताः
स्युः । सत्यमेतत् । वैराजस्य स्तोत्रायेति चतुर्थ्यन्तस्य पदार्थस्यानर्थक्यं माम्भूदित्येव-
मङ्गीकृतः ।

नन्वेवमपि आग्नेय इत्याद्यनर्थकं स्यात् । न स्यात् । ^१उपांश्वादिवन्ना-
मध्येयत्वेनार्थवत्त्वात् । तस्मात्स्तोत्राण्येव देवता इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः ।

॥ अङ्गविधिर्वा यथा क्वास्य रथस्य पुरुष इति ॥ ३-३-८ ॥ (सि)

अङ्गविधिः स्तोत्रस्य ग्रहस्य च संयोगमात्रविधिः पर्यवस्यति । कुतः ? तद्धितेन^२
आग्नेय इत्यादिना विहितत्वात् देवतानाम् । चतुर्थी चेयं षष्ठ्यर्थे द्रष्टव्या ।
सम्बन्धविधेर्विवक्षितत्वात् । तावति च संयुक्तयोरप्यर्थयोः एकत्र षष्ठी अन्यत्र प्रथमा
यथा--क्वास्य [रथस्य]पुरुषः स्यादिति । अथवा तादर्थ्यलक्षणा चैषा चतुर्थी द्रष्टव्या ।
वैराजस्य स्तोत्राय—वैराजस्य स्तोत्रं कथं नाम स्यादिति । नहि संयोगविधिसंभवति
अन्यतरस्मिन्नसति संयोगिनि । नह्यतिग्राह्यत्वं स्तोत्रस्य यदि क्षीणाङ्गत्वं अभविष्यत् ।
न वैराजस्य स्तोत्रैः सामान्वत्ता अनुजिघृक्ष्येत “ ये वा अमी वैराजस्य स्तोमाः^३
तैरेवैते सामन्वन्तः ” इत्यनुग्रहवचनं तादर्थ्ये नावकल्पते । सतो ह्याप्तिवचनं व्यर्थ-
मित्युक्तत्वात् । तस्मात् संयोगविधिरेवायमिति ।

॥ कालवादो यथा प्रातस्सवनेऽतिग्राह्या गृह्यन्त इति ॥ ३-३-९ ॥ (सि)

नैवायं संयोगविधिः; किन्तु कालविधिः सप्तमीनिर्देशात् । स्तोत्रकालमेषां
ग्रहणं विधीयते । यथा प्रातस्सवनेऽतिग्राह्या गृह्यन्त इति ।

अङ्गविधिर्वा कर्मविधिर्वायं भवतीति । संयोगविधिरेवायं उक्तेन हेतुना ।
यत्पुनरुक्तं सप्तमीनिर्देशात् स्तोत्रकालविधिरिति तत्रोच्यते । सम्बन्धविवक्षायामपि
सप्तमीनिर्देशो दृष्टः, यथा लोके ‘ त्वय्यसति सम्बन्धिनि यदस्माभिरकरिष्यत ’ इति ।

१. S आह्यवन्ना

२. A & R read तद्धितेन

३. S' स्तोमाः

॥ प्रातस्सवने गृह्यन्त इति कालवादान्तरं ग्रहणोक्ता गृह्यन्त
इत्येकेषाम् ॥ ३ - ३ - १० ॥ (सि)

एतेषां अतिग्राह्याणां ग्रहणानन्तरमेव प्रदानं उत माहेन्द्रमनुह्यन्त इत्येकेषां
सोऽनुपेत्य^१ विधिः । न ग्रहणानन्तरमेव प्रदानं, किन्तु माहेन्द्रकालं प्रदानमाज्ञातं
एकेषां, तदाहृत्यविधानम् । तस्मान्माहेन्द्रकाल एव अतिग्राह्याः ।

॥ देवतानानात्वात् न ह्यन्यदेवत्यानां याज्यानां^२ देवता-
पृथक्त्वात् ॥ ३ - ३ - ११ ॥ (पू)

[पृथक्]प्रदाना माहेन्द्रादतिग्राह्याः । देवतानानात्वात् । न ह्यन्यदेवत्याया-
मन्यदेवतस्य प्रदानमवकल्पते । अतो नानाप्रदाना इति ।

॥ समानयाज्या वाऽनुह्यन्त इत्यर्थसमवायेनोप-
पद्यते^३ ॥ ३ - ३ - १२ ॥ (सि)

एकयाज्या एकवषट्काराः सहैव माहेन्द्रेण हूयेरन् । अनुयजन्त इति
सकार्ययोगेऽनुशब्ददर्शनात् । यथा—गामनुवत्सो विधीयत इति । तस्मात् समान-
वषट्काराः समानयाज्या अतिग्राह्याः वचनसामर्थ्यात् । न चासहत्ववचनान्नैतदस्ति ।
समानयाज्यावषट्कारवचनात् ।

सिद्धान्तः— अनुशब्दोऽत्रापीति क्रियाया नानार्थत्वात् पश्चादर्थ एवेति ।
यथा (अग्रशेषेष्टमनुत्थो यजेतेति(?))

अतिग्राह्यान् केचित् दर्विहोमानामनन्ति । तत्त्वयुक्तम् । प्रकरणाभावात् ।
वषट्कारप्रदानत्वे ग्रहत्वमेव हेतुः । ग्रहा एते ग्रहाश्च ग्रहधर्माणो भवेयुः । माहेन्द्र-
मनुह्यन्त इति । याज्यावषट्कारभेदेनेज्यन्त इत्यर्थः ।

विश्वजिति पू[स]र्विष्टग्रहणात् तेष्वेव पृष्ठे प्रतीयेरन् यथा[यदा] पूर्वःपक्षः ।
समानविधाना वा माहेन्द्रमनुहूयेरन् तुल्यशब्दत्वात् । यदि प्रकृतिसमानविधाना
वा माहेन्द्रस्य (सो)स्तोममनुहूयेरन् । कस्मात् ? माहेन्द्रमनुह्यन्त इति प्रकृतावेषां

1. अनुपेत्य—दूरत उत्कृष्य 2. देवत्यायां याज्यायाभिति पाठः साधुः
3. All mss. read नोपपद्यते

त्रयाणाम^१पि तुल्यः कालशब्दः । स विकृतावपि न भिद्येत असति कारणे । तस्मात्
त्रयोऽपि समानकाला हूयेरन् यदा सिद्धान्तः ।

॥ दधिग्रहो नित्यस्तद्व्याख्यातम् ॥ ३ - ३ - १३ ॥

नित्यो वा स्यादर्थवादस्तयोः कर्मण्यसंबन्धात् इति (पू.मी. ४ - ४ - ११)
प्रस्तावसूत्रमेतत् उत्तरार्थमिति ।

॥ आदितो गृह्येत क्रमसंयोगात् ॥ ३ - ३ - १४ ॥

किमयं दधिग्रहः सह उपांश्वदिभिः पूर्वो ग्राह्यः उत पश्चादिति सन्देहः ।
किं प्राप्तं ? आदित इति । कुतः ? क्रमसंयोगात् । पूर्वो विधिरुपांश्वदिभ्यः
पूर्वो दधिग्रहस्य । अतो विधिक्रमसङ्ख्यायोगात् आदितो ग्राह्यो दधिग्रहः ।

॥ ज्येष्ठशब्दाच्च ॥ ३ - ३ - १५ ॥

‘ज्येष्ठो वा एष ग्राह्याणां’ इति च प्रथमापेक्षज्येष्ठशब्द उपपद्यते ।

॥ न वां मन्त्रक्रमत्रलीयस्त्वात् ज्येष्ठशब्दो यथा ज्येष्ठमेव
गच्छतीति ॥ ३ - ३ - १६ ॥

मन्त्रक्रमस्यानन्यार्थस्य विरुद्धक्रमात् बलवत्तरत्वात् । स चोपांश्वदीनां पूर्व
तस्मादन्ते दधि गृह्यते इति । यत्पुनरुक्तं ज्येष्ठशब्दात् प्राथम्यं इति; प्रशंसा ज्येष्ठशब्दः ।
यथा लोके कनीयानपि अस्माज्ज्येष्ठः । वेदेपि ‘ज्येष्ठमेव समानानां गच्छति’ इति
ज्येष्ठशब्दस्य प्रशंसार्थता गम्यते । ज्यादेशं च प्रशंसायां स्मरन्ति शिष्टाः । प्रशस्यस्य
च पूज्यस्य च वृद्धस्य चेति ।

॥ लिङ्गाच्च ॥ ३ - ३ - १७ ॥

मन्त्रक्रमात् पश्चात् उपांशुदधिग्रहो नियतकाल इति प्राप्तं, लिङ्गात् काल-
विशेषो नियम्यते । यथा वेदे—“गावस्सञ्जानानाः सञ्जच्छमानाः सञ्जम्यान्योन्मं व्रन्ति
एवं तावेतौ सञ्जानानौ सञ्जच्छमानौ सञ्जम्य न्यस्येन्द्रियं चित उपास्यन्ति एवं
तत्प्राजापत्यं यत्सोमश्चापश्च यत्प्राजापत्यं दधिग्रहं गृह्णाति शमयत्येवैनान्” इति

एषा श्रुतिः अपां प्रदानं दर्शयति । कालं दर्शयति यथा गावः परस्परं सङ्गच्छमानाः इत्येवं प्राजापत्यत्वेन एकजातीयत्वात् सोमश्चापश्चान्योन्यं सङ्गत्येन्द्रियं वीर्यमवितः । दधिग्रहणे दधिग्रहेण गृह्यमाणे नायं दोषः । शमयति इति व्यपनीयापो दधिग्रहणे चरन्तीत्यनुवादरूपमेतद्वाक्यम् अपामपनयनकाले दधिग्रहेज्यां दर्शयति इति ।

॥ उपयामगृहीतोऽसि प्रजापतये त्वा ज्योतिष्मते ज्योतिष्मन्तं

गृह्णामीति ग्रहणे लिङ्गत्वं मन्त्रे ग्रहणलिङ्गात् ॥ ३-३-१८ ॥

॥ 'अपेन्द्रद्विषतो मनोपजिज्यासतो जहि' इत्ययमपि

तत् (?) ॥ ३ - ३ - १९ ॥

अस्यापि मन्त्रस्यास्पष्टलिङ्गत्वात् विनियोगक्रमादाध्वर्युषु काण्डेषु अध्वर्युषु प्रक्रान्तेषु गमनक्रमे मन्त्रस्य पाठात् गमनार्थो मन्त्र इति ।

॥ प्राणाय त्वाऽपानाय त्वा व्यानाय त्वेति होमलिङ्गात् ॥ ३-३-२० ॥

अयमपि मन्त्रो जुहोतीति होमलिङ्गात् होमार्थ इति ।

एतानि त्रीणि सूत्राणि अस्य [अ]विद्यमानपूर्वपक्षविचारस्यापि (वि,ग्रहगता-शेषवस्तुनिरूपणायातानि ।

॥ कामसंयोगस्तद्व्याख्यातम् ॥ ३-३-२१ ॥ (सि)

दधिग्रहं प्रकृत्याम्नायते -- "आज्यग्रहं गृह्णीयात् तेजस्कामस्य तेजो वा आज्यं तेजस्व्येव भवति सोमग्रहं गृह्णीयाद्ब्रह्मवर्चसं वै सोमः ब्रह्मवर्चस्व्येव भवति" (तै.सं. (३-५-९) इति । किमिमे गुणफलसंबन्धविधी आहोस्वित् पृथक्दधिग्रह-विकाराविति । पृथगेवैतौ विधी सन्निधेः दधिग्रहस्य तद्विकारावेतौ ग्रहाविति ।

अत्राह — अयमेव दधिग्रहविधिरिति कथं ? निरपेक्षस्य फले वाक्यस्य समा-प्तत्वात् । दधिग्रहे विषयभूते गुणफलसंबन्धविधानं 'आज्यात्तेजः सोमाद्ब्रह्मवर्चसं' इति । अत्रोच्यते । नैतदेवम् । होमवच्छुद्धस्य ग्रहविधेः अभावात् । आज्ञानवेलायां दधिष्ठस्य कर्मणः फलविधानम् । तस्मात् फलं चाकर्मसन्निधौ (पू. मी. २-३-१२) इत्यनेन न्यायेन भिन्नावेतौ दधिग्रहविधानेन ।

कथं समाने प्रकरणे प्रकृति[विकृति]भाव इति चेन्न ; उक्तोत्तरत्वात् । तदा ह्यस्य व्याख्यातं — नैमित्तिकं तु प्रकृतौ तद्विकारः संयोगविशेषात् (पू. मी. ३-६-३) इति ।

॥ १२ ॥ नित्ये कामो यथा ऐन्द्रवायवे ॥ ३-३-२२ ॥ (सि)

दधिग्रहं प्रकृत्य समामनन्ति — दधिग्रहं गृह्णीयात्पशुकामस्योर्गै दध्यूर्कूपशव ऊर्जेवासा ऊर्जे पशूनवरुन्धे—इति । किमर्थं नित्य एव कामः उत कर्मान्तर-विधिरिति[पूर्ववत् कर्मान्तरविधिरिति] प्राप्ते ब्रूमः

नित्य एव दधिग्रहे कामः यथैन्द्रवायवाग्रतायाम् । कुत एतत् ? संयोग-पृथक्त्वात् ॥ तद्व्याख्यातम्—एकस्य तूभयत्वे संयोगपृथक्त्वमिति । (पू. मी. ४-३-५)

॥ १३ ॥ सोमग्रहो दधिकृतस्सोमधर्मैर्नैमित्तिकत्वात्
दधिग्रहविकारत्वाच्च ॥ ३-३-२४ ॥ (सि)

सोमग्रहं गृह्णीयात् ब्रह्मवर्चसकामस्य ब्रह्मवर्चसं वै सोमः ब्रह्मवर्चसं इत्याम्नायते सोमग्रहः । स किं सोमधर्मैरभिसंबध्यते उत नेति विचारः । किं प्राप्तम् ? भवेयुरत्र सोमधर्मा इति । कथं ? सोमोद्देशेन धर्मविधानात् । वाक्येन च प्रकरणस्याविशेषकर-त्वात् । अपूर्वप्रयुक्तत्वाच्च । यावत्किञ्चित् धृतं सोमद्रव्यं तत्राविशेषेण भवेयुरेव सोमधर्मा इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः

सोमग्रहो दधिकृत एव[न] सोमधर्मैः कृतः नैमित्तिकत्वात् । सः असमान-विधानो हि तैस्तैः ग्रहैः । कथं ? सोमेन यजेनेति चोदनया चोदितस्य सोमयागापूर्वस्य सोमधर्मप्रयोजकत्वात् न दधिग्रहविकारस्य सोमचोदनाचोदितत्वम् । फलभेदेन विधानात् न प्रकृतितोऽत्र धर्मप्राप्तिः । स्वस्याः प्रकृतेः दधिग्रहस्य सोमधर्मैरसम्बन्धात् । सन्निधानाभावाच्च न सोमधर्मप्राप्तिः । तस्मान्न दधिग्रह(कृत)स्सोमधर्मैरिति ।

॥ १४ ॥ तत्रार्थग्रहणोऽभिषवः पात्रसंयोगात् ॥ ३-३-२५ ॥ (सि)

नैमित्तिके सोमग्रहे किमभिषवस्सोमस्य कर्तव्यो नेति भवति विचारः । किं प्राप्तम् ? पूर्वाधिकरणेन न कर्तव्योऽभिषव इति प्राप्ते ब्रूमः—अधर्मकोऽर्थप्राप्तोऽभिषवः कर्तव्य इति । कथं ? पात्रसंयोगात् । चतुस्सक्तिना ग्रहीतव्य इति चतुस्सक्ति-

पात्रसङ्कीर्तनात् । द्रवं हि पात्रेण गृह्यते । ¹न च द्रवः अनभिषुते सोमे सम्भवति । तस्मात् सामर्थ्यात् प्राप्नोत्यभिषवः कर्तव्य एवेति ।

॥ १५ ॥ तिस्रो बह्वस्य समिध इत्येतया सोमं करोतीति
प्रत्यक्षस्य सतः सोमस्य क्रिया नोपपद्यते ॥ ३-३-२६ ॥ (पू)

यद्यदात्मना नास्ति तत्तदात्मना उत्पद्यते । न च सोमात्मनैव सतः सोमस्य क्रिया सम्भवति ।

नवसतोऽपि नैव क्रिया सम्भवति । कारकव्यापारासम्भवात् । नियतकारणो-
पादानात्, सर्वतः सर्वस्यासम्भवात् शक्तिपूर्वत्वाच्च क्रियारम्भस्य सतश्च क्रियेति ।
अत्रोच्यते । सत्यमेवं इह तु सोमकर्णांऋचमाहुः सोमस्य च सतो विशेषा-
भावात् न करणमिति । दधिग्रहविकारात् सोमग्रहादयमन्यत्र उत्कृष्येतेति प्राप्ते
ब्रूमः—

॥ कर्मसंयागाद्वा करणीयं यथा हिरण्यकारः ॥ ३-३-२७ ॥ (सि)

नासदुत्पाद एव करोतेर्दृष्टिः । किन्तर्हि ? संस्कारकर्मणापि संयोगात् इति ।
कारकव्यापारस्य धात्वर्थस्य च स्वेन स्वेनात्मना प्रसङ्गतो विवृद्धस्य प्रतिनियतासाधारणा
कारेण उपचयनाशादिजन्मनो विपरिणामदर्शनात् । तण्डुलपाकात्मकस्य विशेषपरिणा-
मस्य शक्तिकारणपूर्वत्वं नियमादेव सिद्धम् । सर्वस्य च सर्वतोऽसम्भवस्य तथादृष्टत्वात् ।
असतस्सोमस्य तदापादनमेतत् । यच्च क्रियते सा सोमकर्णी तस्याप्यकर्मत्वे
सोमकर्णीति समाख्यानात् प्राप्तोऽभिषवेऽस्य विनियोग इति ।

॥ १६ ॥ अश्वदाभ्यवाक्यं चोर्ध्वमवभृथात् विद्यते क्रियेत चोर्ध्व-

मवभृथात् अथत्रौपानुवाक्ये तस्येतरश्शेषोऽखिलविधानात्

पशुशिरसां त्रिंशद्वाक्ये तद्व्याख्यातम्

॥ ३-३-२८ ॥ (सि)

अश्वदाभ्ययोः समाप्तानं औपानुवाक्ये काण्डे ज्योतिष्टोमे चोर्ध्वमवभृथात् ।
पशुशिरसां त्रिंशद्वाक्ये च । किमेतौ अश्वदाभ्यौ उपांश्रादिभ्यः परेण प्रयोक्तव्यौ

TOWARDS
MODERN INDIAN PHONOLOGY

By

Dr. S. Shankar Raju Naidu,
M.A., Ph.D., F.R.A.S., (London),
Head of the Department of Hindi,
University of Madras,
M A D R A S.

TOWARDS MODERN INDIAN PHONOLOGY

Dr. S. SHANKAR RAJU NAIDU, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.A.S., (London),

Head of the Department of Hindi,

University of Madras, Madras.

For some time now, Indian scholars have been attempting to evolve a common system of orthography for writing down all the languages of India, but little has been done towards the compilation of the essential phonological units to represent the basic sounds of the Indian Languages. It is towards this objective that the present paper endeavours to describe the scope and arrive at conclusions based on the phonological features of Modern Indian Languages.

2. It is worthwhile remembering that in any good and scientific system of orthography, each graphic symbol should represent one unique sound unit and should not be granted exemption to represent more than one. It may be certainly true that for a particular language, a phonemic analyses may give out all the necessary meaningful sound units and we may arrive at a generally acceptable phonological system. But this alone is not sufficient for a proper and appropriate form of utterance of the sounds of any language or languages, particularly when a language is to be read by one whose mother tongue is not that language.

It has been found with only a very few exceptions that when a person speaks a language other than his mother tongue and tries to follow the language through the sound system as accepted for the script of that language, he miserably fails in arriving at

the correct form of utterance which is generally approved of for the language. The range of getting away from the correct form becomes still wider when one studies the language with the help of any script other than the one used for the language by its people, causes for which are endless and it is needless to enumerate them here in detail. I shall only say that the language thus studied and spoken will be a humorous combination of the features of his own mother tongue, the language studied and the sound system of the script as understood by him.

Hence when one ventures to speak about the script for any language other than his mother-tongue or may be even his own mother-tongue, he must necessarily have a clear grasp of the sound system of the language and its relationship with those of others. He must lay his hand over such problems only when he is perfectly sure of the phonological pattern of the language and is confident that the study of the language through the adopted script will not become a mockery.

3. It is still more difficult to arrive at a proper system of orthography for more than one language, specially when they belong to different families. It will only be proving the ignorance of a person should he go to suggest that a script of a language should be, in toto, accepted for another language or other languages.

Writing of a language by a different script is as difficult as the translation of a matter from one language into another, if not more. By and large it may be stated that the meaning of the same word changes when it becomes a loan. Sanskrit word 'upanyasa' in Hindi means a 'novel' and a 'lecture' in South Indian languages. So also the phonetic quality as accepted for a particular symbol for a particular language considerably changes when it is adopted for a different language. However several symbols may retain their qualities.

4. With all these problems in view, when a common system of orthography is to be arrived at for all the Indian languages, a very careful study of the phonological systems of all the languages of India should first be taken up, and after a comparative evaluation of them all, a compact system of writing should be evolved to represent clearly all the essential regional phonological features. Here a compilation of the minimum meaningful sound units alone may not be sufficient, because it may in the long run destroy the very spirit of the language for which it is adopted. Now we have different writing systems for all the major languages of India with a singular exception of Hindi and Marathi which have adopted the Nagari characters with only a very little difference.

5. The two major families of languages in India, namely Indo-Aryan and Dravidian, have very many distinguishing features in all levels of linguistic analysis, the chief among them being the phonetic aspect. I am taking here Hindi as the representative of the Modern Indian Indo-Aryan languages and Tamil as the representative of the Dravidian. If we can evolve a common system of writing for these two languages, the problem will be greatly solved and the All India system of orthography will be clearly visible. But before arriving at the basic orthography, one should necessarily discuss and decide about the necessary sound units.

Hence it becomes imperative that a comparative study of the phonological systems of the two should be taken up at first.

6. *Phonology of Standard Hindi :*

I. *Vowels (Total 13)*

Short a, i, u, ε

Long a:, i:, u:, e:, ε:, o:, ɔ:

Diphthongs ... ai, au

Examples —

<i>Vowel</i>	<i>Word</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
<i>a</i>	अब <i>ab</i>	Initial position
<i>a:</i>	आप <i>a:p</i>	„
<i>i</i>	इस <i>is</i>	„
<i>i:</i>	ईख <i>i:kh</i>	„
<i>u</i>	उस <i>us</i>	„
<i>u:</i>	ऊन <i>u:n</i>	„
<i>e:</i>	एक <i>e:k</i>	„
<i>ɛ</i>	बहना <i>bɛhna:</i> as distinguished from बहो <i>baho:</i>)	Medial position
<i>ɛ:</i>	ऐसा <i>ɛ:sa:</i>	Initial position
	or पैसा <i>pɛ:sa:</i>	Medial position
<i>ai</i>	मैया <i>maiya:</i>	„
<i>o:</i>	ओस <i>o:s</i>	Initial position
<i>ɔ:</i>	और <i>ɔ:r</i>	„
<i>au</i>	कौवा <i>kaua:</i>	Medial position

Positions of cardinal Hindi Vowels —

<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>o</i>
<i>ɛ</i>	<i>ɔ</i>
	<i>a</i>

II. Consonants (Total 40)

Plosives *k, c, t, t, p* (क च, ट, त, प)

All these have their aspirated, voiced and voiced aspirated counterparts bringing them altogether to a total of 20.

Nasals — *ṅ, ṅ̄, ṇ, n, m* (ङ, ञ, ण, न, म)

These correspond to the places of articulation of the five plosives mentioned above.

Lateral — — — l (ल)

Rolled — — — r (र)

Flapped— — — ɾ and also its aspirated counterpart ɾʰ (ड़, ढ)

Fricative — — — v, ś, ʃ, s, h (व, श, ष, स, ह)

Semi-vowel — — — i (य)

Urdu elements —

Plosive Uvular — — q (क़)

Fricative Labio-dental — — f (फ़)

„ Dental — — z (ज़)

„ Velar — — x, ɣ (ख़, ग़)

Here the last five are loan elements and have been so absorbed in Hindi that they can in no way be dispensed with. All the rest are indigenous elements of the Standard Hindi language.

As all the above forty elements have clearcut places and manners of articulation with recognised orthographic symbols as against the vowels, separate examples are not necessary. Any good dictionary will offer the material needed.

7. *Phonology of Standard Tamil :*I. *Vowels (Total 13)*

Short	— — —	<i>a, i, u, e, o, u</i>
Long	— — —	<i>a:, i:, u:, e:, o:</i>
Diphthongs	— — —	<i>ai, au</i>

Examples —

<i>Vowel</i>	<i>Word</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
<i>a</i>	அலை <i>alai</i>	Initial position
<i>a:</i>	ஆம் <i>a:m</i>	„
<i>i</i>	இலை <i>ilai</i>	„
<i>i:</i>	ஈ <i>i:</i>	„
<i>u</i>	உலை <i>ulai</i>	„
<i>u:</i>	ஊர் <i>u:r</i>	„
<i>e</i>	எவி <i>eli</i>	„
<i>e:</i>	ஏர் <i>e:r</i>	„
<i>ai</i>	ஐவர் <i>aivar</i>	„
<i>o</i>	ஒரு <i>oru</i>	„
<i>o:</i>	ஓலை <i>o:lai</i>	„
<i>au</i>	ஒளடதம் <i>audatam</i>	„
<i>u</i>	அது <i>adu</i>	Final position
	(as distinguished from <i>u</i> of 'va:ju' of Hindi in the final position.)	(unrounded <i>u</i>)

Positions of cardinal Tamil Vowels —

(u)... ..Unrounded.

i u

e o

II. Consonants (Total 27)

Plosives — — — k, c, ṭ, t, p (க, ச, ட, த, ப)

The voiced forms of these five — g, ḡ, d, ḍ, b — should also be added. These five have no separate orthographic symbols in Tamil and consequently the same five shown above are used, the voicing of which is followed on certain principles codified by the grammarians.

Nasals — — — ṅ, ṇ, ṇ̇, n, m and alveolar ñ
(ங, ண, ங, ன, ம, ன்)

It is a very remarkable feature that it is only in Tamil that six orthographic symbols are found to clearly distinguish the six nasal elements, and no other writing system of any other language of the world has had them till now. These six symbols are referred to even in Tolkappiam which is supposed to be a work on Tamil Grammar of about 4th century B.C.

Lateral — — — — l, ɭ (ல, ள)

Rolled — — — — r (ர)

Fricative — — — — v, ʃ, s, h (வ, ஷ, ச, ஹ)

Frictionless continuant — — — — ɹ (ய)

This is again a symbol which is a unique feature of Tamil.
(This exists in Malayalam too.)

Semi vowel — — — j (ய)

Another conspicuous sound unit as transcribed by Daniel Jones, is ṭ (ட) which is alveolar with an element of trill and different from t and ṭ.

Examples — pattu (பத்து) meaning ten ; pattu (பற்று) meaning attachment and paṭṭu (பட்டு) meaning silk. This unit has also its voiced counterpart ḍ when it occurs in places like Kaṇḍu (கன்று) meaning calf ; oṇḍu meaning one. The Tamil symbol for both is the same.

As these twentyseven elements also have clearcut features, further examples are not given. Any good dictionary will solve the situation.

8. *Similar phonological units in the two systems :—*

(i) *Vowels — (Total 10)*

Short — — a, i, u

Long — — a:, i:, u:, e:, o:

Diphthongs — ai, au

(ii) *Consonants — (Total 22)*

Plosives — — k, g, c, ʃ, t, ḍ, t, d, p, b

Nasals — — ṅ, ñ, ṇ, n, m

Others — — j, r, l, v, ʂ, s, h

9. *Dissimilar Phonological units in the two systems :—*

(i) *Vowels — (Total 6)*

Short — — ε (Hindi)

e, o, u (Tamil)

Long — — ε:, o: (Hindi)

Diphthongs — Nil.

(ii) *Consonants* — (Total 23)

Plosives — — Aspirates of the ten plosives and
q (Hindi)

Nasals — — ñ (Tamil)

Others — — r, ṛh, ś, f, z, x, ʒ (Hindi)

l, ɾ, ṭ, ḍ (Tamil)

10. Conclusion : Thus to do justice to and keep alive the true phonological features of both Hindi and Tamil, we should necessarily have orthographic symbols to represent distinctively all the above units that are similar and dissimilar in both the languages. We get a total of *Sixty one* clearly distinguishable sound units and all of them should necessarily be represented in the common system of writing. If a lesser number of symbols is suggested, it would only show a lack of proper understanding of the two phonological systems and will ultimately in the long run ruin the genius of both the patterns, thereby blowing a death knell to the indigenous spirit of the languages. Consequently the two will die and new languages will come forth in their places. The best examples of this type of linguistic metamorphosis seem to be Telugu, Kannada and Malayalam.

In order to arrive at a common system of writing for all the Modern Indian Languages, it is imperative that the above methodology should be adopted. A few more symbols may have to be added to the above *sixty-one*. It may however be stated that if grapheme/s could be agreed to upon for signifying the elements of voicing and/or aspiration to be suitably added to the basic voiceless and nonaspirated units, the total number of orthographic units will be considerably reduced.

While offering a suggestion for a common system of writing for more than one language, it must be well remembered that it is the exactitude of the orthographic symbols representing the sound units of the languages that give life to the languages and make them live in their genuine form for ages. If the writing system of any language strikes at a level different from the correct phonological structure of the language, the language will lose its charm in the near or distant future. The life of any language rests to a very great extent on its writing system.

S. SHANKAR RAJU

हिन्दी उपन्यास की व्यक्तिवादी और सामाजिक धारयें ।

Dr. S. N. GANESAN, M. A., Ph.D.

Lecturer in Hindi, University of Madras, Madras.

इतिवृत्त एवं रूप-संविधान के क्षेत्र में वैज्ञानिक दृष्टिकोण का समावेश प्रेमचन्द के पश्चात् हिन्दी उपन्यास की एक प्रमुख प्रवृत्ति रही है । विवेकपूर्ण चिन्तन को प्रश्रय देनेवाली बौद्धिकता ने विश्व-साहित्य के विविध अंगों पर जो प्रभाव डाला है, उससे हिन्दी साहित्य भी मुक्त नहीं रहा । गत दो दशकों में हिन्दी के काव्य, नाटक, उपन्यास और कहानी के विषय, कल्पना और चिन्तन की विस्तृति अथवा परिधि का निर्णय करनेवाली प्रमुख शक्ति बौद्धिक दृष्टि ही रही है । यूरोपीय उपन्यास में यह प्रवृत्ति बीसवीं शती के आरम्भ में जम चुकी थी हिन्दी उपन्यास में प्रेमचन्द के पश्चात् इसका आविर्भाव हुआ ।

हिन्दी उपन्यास की सामाजिक यथार्थवादी परम्परा प्रेमचन्द के बाद कुछ वर्षों तक क्षीण एवं शिथिल होती रही है । यद्यपि प्रेमचन्द के परवर्ती अनेक उपन्यासकारों ने समकालिक समस्याओं का सामाजिक परिवेश में अध्ययन किया है तो भी उनमें अधिकांश न प्रेमचन्द के समान एक विशाल पटभूमि को अपना सके, न जन-जीवन से अधिक मानसिक निकटता प्राप्त कर सके । स्वयं सामान्य स्तर का जीवन व्यतीत करने के कारण प्रेमचन्द भारत के सामान्य जीवन और उसकी समस्याओं से अभिज्ञ थे । स्वयं कठिनाइयों के बीच में संघर्ष करते हुए, अपनी रचनाओं में भी संघर्षमय जीवन के रूप को प्रकट करनेवाले, और पराधीन देश के शोषक वर्गों के विरुद्ध आवाज़ उठानेवाले इस कलम के सिपाही में जितनी इमानदारी थी, वह परवर्ती लेखकों में नहीं रही । समाज के प्रत्येक स्पन्दन को समझने के लिए और उसे संवेदनात्मक एवं जीवन्त भावचित्रों के द्वारा साहित्यिक रूप देने के लिए अनिवार्य रूप में आवश्यक इस इमानदारी के अभाव में परवर्ती लेखक प्रेमचन्द की परम्परा को आगे नहीं बढ़ा सके, तो आश्चर्य की बात नहीं है । फिर भी, शिथिल रूप में ही सही यह धारा चलती रही । दूसरी

ओर, कुछ लेखक व्यक्ति की मनोभूमि में सामाजिक प्रवृत्तियों और समस्याओं को प्रक्षेपित कर उनका अध्ययन करने की ओर उन्मुख हुए ।

बढ़ती हुई बौद्धिकता ने हिन्दी काव्य में एक ओर वैज्ञानिक चिन्तन की स्थापना की, और दूसरी ओर मन के अन्तर्द्वन्द और उलझी हुई संवेदनाओं को भी काव्योचित परिगणित करके ग्रहण कर लिया । चिन्तन - प्रधान काव्य - धारा ने तत्कालीन समाज अथवा मानव मात्र के जीवन की समस्याओं को अपग्रथनार्थ उठा लिया है, तो दूसरी धारा ने व्यक्ति के अन्तर्जगत की संकुलताओं को स्पष्ट करने का प्रयत्न किया है । ये दोनों दृष्टिकोण हिन्दी उपन्यास को भी प्रभावित करके उसे दो पथों से परिचालित करने लगे हैं—व्यक्ति-केन्द्रित और समाज-केन्द्रित ।

प्रेमचन्द तथा उनके समय तक के अन्य उपन्यासकारों ने व्यक्ति और समाज को अलग कर नहीं देखा । अतः उनके लिए दोनों के प्रति भिन्न दृष्टिकोण रखने की आवश्यकता भी नहीं थी । उनकी रचनाओं को न व्यक्ति - केन्द्रित कह सकते हैं न समाज-केन्द्रित ।^१ किसी भी कृतिको उच्च साहित्यिक रूप देने के लिए आवश्यक भाव - तरलता उनमें थी । किन्तु इस भाव - तरलता के साथ बौद्धिक गहनता भी आज की माँग है । अब उपन्यासकार को संभवतः यह प्रतीत हो रहा है कि समाज और व्यक्ति को एक सीमा तक अलग करके ही अधिक गहरा और विशेषीकृत अध्ययन संभव है ।

व्यक्ति - केन्द्रित तथा समाज - केन्द्रित धाराओं की अपनी अपनी विशेषतायें हैं, अपनी अपनी परिमितियाँ भी । जीवन के अध्ययन की विस्तृति और गहराई की दृष्टि से विभिन्न सीमाओं से युक्त इन धाराओं के ध्येय भिन्न है ; तदनुसार उनके रूप और दिशायें भी विभिन्न हैं ।

प्रेमचन्द ने जिस समन्वित दृष्टि को अपनाया था, उसकी भविष्य की सम्भावनाओं की सीमा अब निर्णीत नहीं हो सकती । व्यक्ति और समाज दोनों का आकलन कर, दोनों की अगाधता तक पहुँचने की जो पद्धति प्रेमचन्द ने

१. व्यक्ति-केन्द्रित और समाज-केन्द्रित उपन्यासों को चरित्र-प्रधान और समस्या-प्रधान उपन्यासों से भिन्न समझना चाहिए । आगे यह स्पष्ट होगा ।

प्रस्तुत की, उसे आगे बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न परवर्तियों ने नहीं किया। यह कहना अनुचित है कि प्रेमचन्द की पद्धति की चरम उपलब्धियाँ उनके ही उपन्यासों में पूर्ण हो चुकी हैं। इस पद्धति की शक्तियों का परीक्षण अभी बाकी है। रोमें रोलाँ के 'जाँ क्रिस्तोफ़े' (Jean Christopher) और पुस्त के 'अतीत का पर्यवेक्षण' (A la recherche du temps perdu) जैसे सरितोपम उपन्यास (Roman fleuve) गाल्सवर्दी के फ़ार्साइट सागा जैसे परिवार वृत्तान्त शोलोखोव के दोन उपन्यास ('दोन नदी धीरे बहती है,' 'दोन अपने घर समुद्र को बह जाती है' और 'दोन नदीतट की नयी फ़सल') जैसे विस्तृत पट-भूमि के पनोरमिक उपन्यास आदि के समान जीवन के विराट रूप को प्रदर्शित करनेवाली बृहत् रचनायें हिन्दी में अभी नहीं आयी हैं। जब हमारे लेखक ऐसी रचनाओं की ओर उन्मुख होंगे तभी प्रेमचन्द - शैली की चरम शक्तियाँ प्रकट होंगी।

व्यक्तिवाद का विकास :

जैनेन्द्रकुमार की 'सुनीता' ने हिन्दी उपन्यास को एक नयी दिशा की ओर प्रेरित किया। यद्यपि इस उपन्यास के मनोविश्लेषण की वैज्ञानिकता और पात्रों के आचरणों की स्वाभाविकता निर्विवाद नहीं है, तो भी असन्दिग्ध रूप में यह कहा जा सकता है कि इसमें जिस व्यक्ति-विश्लेषण की नींव डाली गयी वह आगे चलकर उपन्यास की प्रगति की दिशा निर्दिष्ट करनेवाली एक सबल शक्ति बन गया। वैसे जैनेन्द्र के व्यक्ति-विश्लेषण को पूर्णतः मनोवैज्ञानिक नहीं मान सकते। दर्शन और मनोविज्ञान का एक विचित्र सम्मिश्रण — कभी कभी नीतिशास्त्र के पुट के साथ — उनके प्रायः सभी उपन्यासों में मिलता है।¹ पर आगे चलकर अनेक लेखकों ने अपनी रचनाओं में व्यक्ति-विश्लेषण को एक मुख्य स्थान दिया। सीमित सामाजिक परिवेश में व्यक्ति के वैकारिक जगत के उलझे हुए भावों का उद्घाटन करनेवाले उपन्यासकारों में अज्ञेय,

1. मनोविज्ञान कभी भला-बुरा, उत्कृष्ट-निकृष्ट आदि का विवेचन नहीं करता। वैज्ञानिक दृष्टि मूल्य (Values) के शब्दों में जीवन की व्याख्या नहीं करती। नैतिकता या जीवन-मूल्यों के आधार पर मानवीय वृत्तियों की व्याख्या करना नीति शास्त्र या दर्शन का काम है। जैनेन्द्र में यही प्रवृत्ति द्रष्टव्य है।

धर्मवीर भारती, डा. देवराज, इलाचन्द्र जोशी आदि के नाम लिये जा सकते हैं ।

कला की दृष्टि से अनेक वैकल्पों के और वैज्ञानिक दृष्टि से कई असुक्ष्मताओं के होने से इन लेखकों की अनेक रचनायें अपौढ़ हैं । फिर भी उन सब में व्यक्ति की आन्तरिक सत्ता को गहराई से समझने का जो प्रयत्न किया गया है, वह श्लाघनीय है । उपन्यास के क्षेत्र में बल पकड़ती हुई धारा के रूप में भी व्यक्ति केन्द्रित उपन्यास धारा का विशेष महत्त्व है ।

मनोजगत को अथवा उसके सीमित अंगों को प्रगाढ़ रंग देकर चित्रित करना इन उपन्यासों की विशेषता है । जब उपन्यासकार बाह्य जगत के विश्लेषण को भी अपेक्षित समझता है, तब भी उसका लक्ष्य-केन्द्र व्यक्ति ही रहता है । व्यक्ति बाह्य जगत तथा उसके क्रिया कलापों से मानसिक संघर्ष के द्वारा संबद्ध रहता है ; अथवा बाह्य जगत की क्रिया-प्रक्रियाओं से प्रभावित मात्र रहता है । बाह्य जगत एवं व्यक्ति के इस संबन्ध की सीमा के आधार पर व्यक्ति-केन्द्रित उपन्यासों को दो प्रकार के मान सकते हैं — अन्तर्मुखी और बहिर्मुखी ।

अन्तर्मुखी व्यक्ति-केन्द्रित उपन्यास :

जब मनुष्य की किसी मानसिक प्रक्रिया का विश्लेषण मात्र लेखक को अभीष्ट होता है, तब व्यक्ति को सामाजिक परिवेश से विच्छिन्न कर लेना एक तरह से वांछनीय हो जाता है । चित्र कला में अनेक वस्तुओं को समाविष्ट करनेवाला विस्तृत वातावरण स्वयं चित्र का विषय होकर अपना महत्त्व रखता है ; पर सारे वातावरण का परित्याग कर सूक्ष्म रेखाओं द्वारा किसी विशिष्ट वस्तु या उसके अंश मात्र का रूप उतारना भी दूसरी दृष्टि से श्लाघनीय रहता है । किसी मनोभाव मात्र को व्यक्त करते के इच्छुक भाव-शिल्पी को किसी व्यक्ति के कारुण्य को दिखाने के लिए उसके सम्पूर्ण आकार की अपेक्षा नहीं रहती । वह कुछ सूक्ष्म रेखाओं द्वारा मुख-मात्र को — अथवा नयन मात्र को — अंकित करके उद्दिष्ट भाव को अभिव्यक्त कर सकता है । अन्तर्मुखी व्यक्ति-केन्द्रित उपन्यास की भी दशा यही होती है । उसका मुख्य ध्येय किसी मनोभाव

का छोटी या बड़ी काल-सीमा के अन्दर का विकास दिखाना होता है। इसके लिए लेखक वातावरण को न्यूनाधिक मात्रा में सीमित बना लेता है। संभव है ऐसी दशा में उपन्यास के पात्र समाज और सामान्य जीवन से विच्छिन्न से लगे, और असमर्थ लेखक के हाथ में आकर अयथार्थ या अस्वाभाविक बन जावें। अन्यथा लेखक एक भाव-जगत् का सृजन कर पाता है, जिस में प्रविष्ट होकर पाठक बाह्य वातावरण के अभाव को भूल जाता है। ऐसे उपन्यासों को ही व्यक्तिवादी मान सकते हैं। फ्रेंच भाषा में इसके अनेक उत्तम उदाहरण मिलते हैं। आन्द्रे जीद का 'तंग दरवाजा' (La porte étroite) फ्रांसो मारिया का 'जो खो गया' (Ce qui elait perdu) आदि विशेष उल्लेखनीय हैं। 'तंग दरवाजा' की नायिका अपने से कम उम्र के एक बालक से प्रेम करती है। शिक्षा तथा परिसर-सिद्ध मानसिक संस्कृति उसके इस अनुचित भाव का विरोध करती हैं। निसर्ग-प्रेरित प्रेम (या वासना?) और संचित मानसिक संस्कृति का संघर्ष उपन्यास का मुख्य विषय है। इस मानसिक संघर्ष के सामने बाह्य जगत् बहुत ही धुँधला हो जाता है, और अपना महत्त्व खो देता है। 'जो खो गया' में निरन्तर सुधरने का विचार करते हुए भी सदा नैसर्गिक प्रेरणा से उच्छृंखल जीवन व्यतीत करनेवाले एक व्यक्ति के आन्तरिक संघर्ष का और इस उच्छृंखलता के कारण अपार मानसिक व्यथा का अनुभव करती हुई उसकी पत्नी के मनोजगत् के प्रतिकरणों का मार्मिक चित्रण मिलता है। दोनों में प्रतिपाद्य विषय सीमित हैं, और यह सीमा उपन्यास को अधिक प्रभविष्णु बनाने में सहायक है।

हिन्दी में व्यक्तिवाद की परम्परा 'सुनीता' से शुरू होती है। प्रेमचंद द्वारा प्रतिष्ठित पद्धति से पृथक् होकर जैनेन्द्र ने कथानक, चरित्र-विकास और वातावरण को प्रभावित करनेवाले एक व्यतिक्रम का आरम्भ किया। 'सुनीता' में वातावरण को सीमित एवं बहुत कुछ धूमिल बनाकर सुनीता और हरिप्रसन्न की मनोवृत्तियों को — विशेषकर उनके पारस्परिक मानसिक भावों को — गहरे रंगों में उतारा गया है। यद्यपि इन पात्रों का मनोवैज्ञानिक आधार अधिक दृढ़ नहीं है, तो भी प्रथम व्यक्तिवादी उपन्यास के रूप में इसकी गणना अनुचित नहीं है। सुनीता और हरिप्रसन्न की मनोवृत्तियों की स्वाभाविकता-अस्वाभाविकता का परिगणन और मनोवैज्ञानिक आधार का परीक्षण न करके

भाव-विकास तथा उपन्यास के शिल्प पर उसके प्रभाव की गणना करें तो स्पष्ट होगा कि इस उपन्यास का चरित्र-विकास और वस्तुविन्यास पूर्ववर्ती उपन्यासों से कैसे भिन्न हैं। इसमें जो विषयैक्य और गढ़न-दृढ़ता प्राप्त है वह कथा-प्रधान या चरित्र-प्रधान उपन्यास की शृंखला-बद्धता से भिन्न है।

इसके पश्चात् अनेक लेखकों ने व्यक्तिवादी उपन्यास लिखने का प्रयत्न किया। इनमें दो तीन सफल हुए हैं, तो अनेक विफल।

‘शेखर’ और ‘नदी के द्वीप’ :

‘शेखर: एक जीवनी’ और ‘नदी के द्वीप’ व्यक्तिवादी उपन्यास की दो भिन्न विधाओं के उदाहरण हैं। ‘शेखर’ व्यक्तित्व-केन्द्रित है और ‘नदी के द्वीप’ भाव-केन्द्रित। दोनों को व्यक्तिवादी कहने में आशंका नहीं होनी चाहिए। सामाजिक परिवेश में शेखर के व्यक्तित्व का विकास ही ‘शेखर’ का इतिवृत्त है। समाजिक वातावरण व्यक्तित्व के आकलन में सहायक बनकर आता है, या व्यक्तित्व के प्रकटन के माध्यम के रूप में। वह सामान्यतः व्यक्तित्व को गौण या धूमिल बनाकर स्वयं आकर्षण का केन्द्र नहीं बनता, जैसे कि इलाचन्द्र जोशी के अधिकांश उपन्यासों में। ‘नदी के द्वीप’ में विषय अधिक सीमित है। अज्ञेय के ही अनुसार वह ‘व्यक्ति-चरित्र का उपन्यास’ है^१। अत्यन्त सीमित वातावरण में चार पात्रों के चरित्रों का आंशिक उद्घाटन किया गया है, आंशिक इसलिए कि शेखर के समान इसके पात्रों के व्यक्तित्व अपने पूर्ण रूप में व्यक्त नहीं होते। इन पात्रों के पारस्परिक सम्बन्ध को रूप देनेवाली संवेदनार्यें ही वे असंस्कृत वस्तुएँ हैं, जिनसे उपन्यास का निर्माण हुआ है। इनमें भी रेखा और भुवन पर पड़नेवाले प्रकाश की तीव्रता कुछ अधिक है; गौरा और चन्द्रमाधव पर का कुछ क्षीण। अन्य पात्र और वातावरण प्रायः धूमिल और अस्पष्ट ही रह गये हैं। इस तरह कुछ विशेष पात्रों की संवेदनाओं को परिवेश से पृथक् कर लेने से उपन्यास का भाव-क्षेत्र अधिक स्पष्ट और प्रभावशाली हुआ है।

इलाचन्द्र जोशी के मनोवैज्ञानिक उपन्यासों में 'मुक्तिपथ' को छोड़कर अन्य किसी को व्यक्तिवाद के अन्तर्गत मानना कठिन है। 'संन्यासी', 'निर्वासित' 'जहाज का पंखी' आदि व्यक्ति-केन्द्रित होने पर भी व्यक्तिवादी नहीं है। 'मुक्तिपथ' के राजीव और सुनन्दा के व्यक्तित्व का विकास सशक्त और प्रभावान्वित है। यहाँ भी उपन्यास का भावक्षेत्र अत्यन्त सीमित है। दोनों पात्रों के सम्पर्क और उस सम्पर्क से प्रभावित मनोवृत्तियों पर केन्द्रित करके ही घटना-चक्र को आगे बढ़ाया गया है, और व्यक्तित्व-विकास की सुनिश्चित गति और दिशा स्पष्ट की गयी है। बाह्य वातावरण विशेष आकर्षण का विषय नहीं है।

'नदी के द्वीप' के उपरान्त व्यक्तिवादी धारा में कोई उल्लेखनीय रचना नहीं निकली है। फिर भी यह नहीं माना जायेगा कि व्यक्तिवाद अपनी आयु पूर्ण करके समाप्त हो चुका है। संभवतः हमारे उपन्यासकार उस प्रश्न से आतंकित हैं, जिसका सामना 'नदी के द्वीप' के लेखक को करना पड़ा। विषय की सामान्य जीवन से असंबद्धता और पात्रों के भावात्मक अस्तित्व के कारण 'नदी के द्वीप' में प्रकट जीवन की स्वाभाविकता पर ही सन्देह होने लगता है। जब तक पाठक उसमें निर्मित भाव जगत के अन्दर प्रविष्ट नहीं होता तब तक उसके लिए ये पात्र अनवगाह्य ही रह जाते हैं। समाज से पात्रों की ऐसी विच्छिन्नता के सम्बन्ध में एक प्रश्न का उत्तर देते हुए अज्ञेय कहते हैं, "जो उपन्यास मूलतः चार पाँच वैयक्तिक संवेदनाओं का अध्ययन है, उसके पात्र 'समाज से कटे हुए' हैं या नहीं यह प्रश्न मेरे लिए प्रासंगिक ही नहीं हुआ। एक पेड़ की शाखा-प्रशाखाओं की रचना देखने के लिए क्या यह पहले निश्चय कर लेना अनिवार्य (या आवश्यक भी) है कि वह पेड़ जंगल से कटा हुआ है या कि जंगल का अंग है? उपन्यास अनिवार्यतया पूरे समाज का चित्र हो, यह माँग बिलकुल गलत है।" १ इस उत्तर के आलोक में उपन्यास के विषय और पात्रों को समझना अधिक सरल होगा। फिर भी 'नदी के द्वीप' की कुछ दुर्बलताएँ विचारणीय हैं। निश्चित ही किसी विशेष व्यक्ति अथवा भाव को

समझने के लिए सम्पूर्ण सामाजिक परिवेश का निरीक्षण आवश्यक नहीं है। पर कभी कभी पात्र द्वारा सामाजिक मान्यताओं का परिरक्षण अपरित्याज्य होता है। प्रतिपाद्य भाव या मनोवृत्ति मानव मात्र के लिए सामान्य हो, तो सामाजिक परिवेश के अभाव में भी उपन्यास हृद्य और संवेद्य रहता है। ऐसी दशा में पात्रों के समाजिक व्यवहार अनपेक्षित ही नहीं होते, बल्कि वे भाव-विकास में शिथिलता भी लाते हैं। प्रतिपाद्य भाव इस से भिन्न हो, और पात्रों की सामाजिक प्रवृत्तियाँ भी उपन्यास के अविच्छिन्न अंग हों, तो पात्रों का परिचालन सामाजिक आचरणों के अनुकूल होने से ही वे यथार्थ भासित होंगे। 'नदी के द्वीप' में पात्र समाज से एक दम कटे हुए नहीं है। सीमित मात्रा में ही सही, पात्रों का समाज से सम्बन्ध है। किन्तु पात्रों के अनेक ऐसे आचरण हैं, जो तत्कालीन भारतीय समाज के सामान्य आचरणों के अनुकूल नहीं हैं। रेखा, भुवन, चन्द्रमाधव आदि का अर्द्धनिशा के समय पार्कों में घूमते फिरना आदि ऐसे ही प्रसंग हैं। ये पात्र भले ही उच्च शिक्षित विशिष्ट वर्ग के हों तो भी ऐसे आचरणों की इस वर्ग से समन्वित सहज बुद्धि और सामान्य कल्पना के बाहर है। और जो कुछ सहज बुद्धि और सामान्य कल्पना के अतीत होता है, उसके अयथार्थ प्रतीत होने की हरदम संभावना रहती है। ऐसे प्रसंगों के अभाव में ये पात्र समाज से कटे रहकर भी अधिक यथार्थ और इस कारण अधिक अनुभूति-गम्य होते।

'नदी के द्वीप' के बाद व्यक्तिवाद की विशेष प्रगति नहीं हुई है, तोभी तत्कालीन लेखकों के सामाजिक उपन्यासों में भी व्यक्तित्व के गंभीर अध्ययन का जो प्रयास मिलता है, उससे यही ज्ञात होता है कि हमारे उपन्यासकार व्यक्तिवाद के प्रतिष्ठापन के लिए उचित माध्यम या पद्धति के अन्वेषण में लगे हैं। सामान्यतः साहित्य में बौद्धिकता को जो स्थान मिल रहा है, वह इस में सहायक भी है।

बहिर्मुखी व्यक्ति - केन्द्रित उपन्यास :

व्यक्ति - केन्द्रित उपन्यास में जब पात्र या पात्रों की वैयक्तिकता सबल नहीं रहती तब वह बहिर्मुखी हो जाता है। ऐसे उपन्यासों में सामाजिक प्रवृत्तियों का व्यक्ति के मन पर प्रक्षेपण किया जाता है और उसके मानसिक

प्रतिकरणों की लेखा तैयार की जाती है। जोशी जी के 'संन्यासी' 'निर्वासित' 'जहाज का पंछी' आदि इसके उदाहरण हैं। यद्यपि जोशी जी सामान्यतः मन के आन्तरिक स्तरों में प्रविष्ट होने का प्रयत्न करते हैं तो भी इस से पात्र के व्यक्तित्व का सबल विकास नहीं होता। गहरे रंग से चित्रित विस्तृत वातावरण के कारण मनोवृत्तियों की क्रमबद्ध गति को दिखाना असंभव हुआ है। उदाहरण के रूप में 'जहाज के पंछी' को लिया जा सकता है। एक असाधारण व्यक्ति की असाधारण मनोवृत्तियों का विकास ही संभवतः इसका उद्दिष्ट प्रमेय है। किन्तु इसके लिए जो वातावरण सजाया गया है, वह आवश्यकता से अधिक विस्तृत है, और उसके अनेक अंग प्रगाढ़ रंग में चित्रित हैं। सामाजिक विकलताओं और समस्याओं की बहुलता हमें नायक के भाव-जगत में प्रवेश करने का अवसर नहीं देती। इन समस्याओं के सम्बन्ध में नायक के लंबे लंबे भाषण उसकी मानसिक प्रक्रिया से हमें अवगत करने के बदले उन समस्याओं के प्रति ही हमारा ध्यान आकृष्ट करते हैं। परिणाम - स्वरूप पात्रों का बहिर्मुखी रूप ही हमारे सामने आता है।

समाज-केन्द्रित उपन्यास :

जब इस प्रकार हमारे उपन्यास साहित्य में व्यक्तिवादी प्रयोग चल ही रहे हैं, सामाजिक चेतना भी पुनः मुख्यता पाने लगी है। प्रेमचन्द के बाद आठ-दस साल तक सामाजिक उपन्यास की धारा में अधिक उल्लेखनीय रचनायें नहीं आयीं। किन्तु इसके बाद यज्ञदत्त, नागार्जुन, यादवचन्द्र जैन आदि लेखकों ने इस धारा को पुष्ट करने का प्रयत्न किया है। यह कहना उचित नहीं होगा कि इन लेखकों ने सामाजिक उपन्यास के शिल्प में मौलिक सुधार करके उसे प्रेमचन्द के उपन्यास के स्तर से ऊपर उठाया है। फिर भी हम निश्चित रूप में कह सकते हैं कि आकस्मिक घटनायें, कल्पित आदर्श, अप्रायोगिक सुधार-योजनायें आदि जो दुर्बल अंश प्रेमचन्द के उपन्यासों में मिलते हैं उनसे ये क्रमशः मुक्त होते आ रहे हैं। उपन्यास को शिथिल बनानेवाले आदर्श-निरूपण और सिद्धान्त-व्याख्या भी कम होते आ रहे हैं।

इस धारा के विकास में गत एक दशक में कुछ उल्लेखनीय प्रवृत्तियाँ उभर आयी हैं। रेणु के 'मैला आँचल' और 'परती: परिकथा' द्वारा प्रतिष्ठित

आँचलिकता उपन्यास को यथार्थवाद के समुन्नत स्तरों तक ले जाने में सहायक हुई है। इस आँचलिकता से अनुबद्ध पनोरमिक (Panoramic) चित्रीकरण भी विशेष प्रभाव से युक्त है। सामान्यतः सामाजिक उपन्यासों में समाज के अनेक अंशों और समस्याओं को सुगठित रूप में प्रकट करने के लिए किसी व्यक्ति अथवा घटना से सम्बन्धित कथा माध्यम के रूप में स्वीकृत की जाती है। रेणु ने सम्बद्धता के इस माध्यम की उपेक्षा करके जीवन के अगणित आकर्षक दृश्यों को उपस्थित किया है। इन में क्रमबद्धता न होने पर भी, ये सब मिलकर यथार्थ जीवन के एक विस्तृत अंश को मोहक रूप में हमारे सामने रखते हैं।

ऐसे शिथिल गढ़न के उपन्यासों की एक बड़ी दुर्बलता इस विषय में है कि वे पाठक के मन में क्रमशः विकसित होकर चरम सीमा तक पहुँचनेवाली संवेदना उत्पन्न नहीं करते। उपन्यास की गढ़न जितनी शिथिल होती है, प्रभाव भी उतना ही शिथिल रहता है। आरम्भ से अन्त तक व्याप्त रागात्मक इतिवृत्त के अभाव में पाठक उपन्यास के विषय तथा पात्रों से कुछ असंपृक्त ही रहा जाता है।

आँचलिकता को सुरक्षित रखते हुए इस शिथिलता का निवारण संभव है। आँचलिकता के आधारभूत वातावरण को सीमित रखकर या विस्तृत वातावरण में भी घटनाओं को एक कथा-सूत्र से गूँथकर गढ़न को दृढ़ बनाया जा सकता है। इस दोनों प्रकारों के उदाहरण के रूप में क्रमशः रामदरश मिश्र के 'पानी के प्राचीर' और राँगेय राधव के 'कब तक पुकारूँ' के नाम लिये जा सकते हैं। 'पानी के प्राचीर' में कथानक के कुछ शिथिल होने पर भी सीमित वातावरण के कारण एक अन्विति सिद्ध हुई है। 'कब तक पुकारूँ' का विषय अत्यन्त विस्तृत है; किन्तु घटनायें दो कारणों से संबद्ध रहती हैं। प्रथमतः सभी घटनायें कुछ मुख्य पात्रों से सम्बन्धित हैं, और दूसरा कारण यह है कि सभी प्रमुख पात्र एक कथा-सूत्र के द्वारा एक दूसरे से संबद्ध हैं।

परिवार - वृत्तान्त और सामाजिक इतिहास :

समाज-केन्द्रित उपन्यास धारा ने हाल में कुछ नये तत्त्वों को ग्रहण किया है। ऐतिहासिक तथा समाजवैज्ञानिक अध्ययन के आधार पर एक

विस्तृत काल सीमा के अन्दर समाज और परिवार के विकास क्रम का अध्ययन करने की प्रवृत्ति अभी कुछ वर्षों से शुरू हुई है। विशाल ऐतिहासिक पट-भूमि पर हमारे सामाजिक विकास और स्वतंत्रता आन्दोलन को चित्रित करने-वाली मन्मथनाथ गुप्त की उपन्यास-माला ('नया सबेरा,' 'रैन अँधेरी,' 'रंग मंच,' 'अपराजित,' 'प्रतिक्रिया') और स्वतंत्रता आन्दोलन की सामाजिक पृष्ठभूमि के आधार पर रचित भगवतीचरण वर्मा का 'भूले विसरे चित्र' विचारणीय रचनायें हैं।

मन्मथनाथ गुप्त ने अपने उपन्यासों में जिस युग का अध्ययन किया है वह राजनैतिक तथा सामाजिक दृष्टि से भारत के लिए अत्यन्त महत्वपूर्ण रहा है। इस युग के सामान्य भारतीय स्त्री पुरुषों के जीवन, तत्कालीन परिवार के रूप में क्रम से आये हुए परिवर्तन, शिक्षा-पद्धति में मौलिक व्यतिक्रम, जीवन-मूल्य के सम्बन्ध में नयी मान्यताओं का प्रतिष्ठापन इत्यादि के श्रम-साध्य अध्ययन से ही ऐसे एक युग की प्रवृत्तियों का समग्र रूप में प्रति-बिंबन करनेवाला उपन्यास सफल हो सकता है। और ऐसे अध्ययन के अभाव में उपन्यास का पराजित होना निश्चित रहता है। मन्मथनाथ गुप्त का आधार गंभीर वैज्ञानिक अध्ययन नहीं है, देवकी नन्दन खत्री और किशोरीलाल गोस्वामी के काल से ही हिन्दी उपन्यास के लिए सुपरिचित कुछ सस्ते उपकरण हैं। असामान्य और आश्चर्यमय पात्रों का स्वच्छन्द विहार, सामाजिक विप्लव का वास्तविकता से विपर्यस्त एक कल्पित सनसनीदार रूप, जासूसी उपन्यासों की सी रहस्यमय घटनायें आदि के कारण ये उपन्यास एक सामान्य रोमान्टिक उपन्यास के स्तर से ऊपर नहीं उठ पाये हैं। लेखक की योजना उत्कृष्ट है; वर्षों तक के गंभीर अध्ययन के बाद महान् सर्ग-शक्ति और गहरी संवेदना सहित किसी लेखक के द्वारा इसे कार्यान्वित किया जाय तो तालस्ताय के 'युद्ध और शान्ति' अथवा शोलोखोव के दोन उपन्यासों के समान प्रौढ़ उपन्यास की रचना हो सकती है।

भगवतीचरण वर्मा का अकादमी पुरस्कार प्राप्त 'भूले-विसरे चित्र' एक गंभीर रचना है, जिसमें लगभग सन् १८८५ से लेकर हमारी स्वतंत्रता-प्राप्ति के पूर्व तक के सामाजिक जीवन के अनेक अंगों का स्पर्श किया गया है। इस वृहत् उपन्यास के विषय को दो भागों में विभक्त किया जा सकता है— यद्यपि दोनों बिलकुल मिले हुए हैं। एक सामाजिक-राजनैतिक विकासक्रम से

सम्बन्धित है और विशेष भावात्मक न होने पर भी सामाजिक इतिहास की दृष्टि से महत्त्वपूर्ण है। दूसरा पीढ़ियों से होकर विकसित होते हुए पारिवारिक जीवन का चित्र है, जो उपन्यास के वैकारिक अंश के सुरक्षितत्व का भी आधार है। लेखक ने इन दोनों क्षेत्रों का समाज-विज्ञान की दृष्टि से सूक्ष्म निरीक्षण किया है। ऐसी रचनाओं की सफलता के लिए जो यथार्थवादी दृष्टिकोण और गहरी संवेदना अपेक्षित है, दोनों 'मूले बिसरे चित्र' में विद्यमान हैं।

यशपाल का 'झूठा सच', भैरव प्रसाद गुप्त का 'सती मैया का चौरा' आदि भी इस सामाजिक धारा की उल्लेखनीय कृतियाँ हैं। दोनों की काल-सीमा भगवतीचरण की सीमा से बहुत परिमित है, पर इस परिमित काल-सीमा के अन्दर समानेवाले सामाजिक वातावरण का जो चित्रण है वह अधिक विस्तृत है। 'झूठा सच' में लेखक का दृष्टिकोण भी कृति के भाव विकास को एक विशेष रंग देने में सहायक हुआ है। सामाजिक विकास के सम्बन्ध में यशपाल का दृष्टिकोण सदा समाजवादी रहा है, जो अपनी तीव्रता में क्रान्तिवादी या विद्रोहवादी के रूप में उनके 'दादा कामरेड', 'पार्टी कामरेड', 'देश द्रोही' आदि में व्यक्त हो चुका है। साहित्यिक शिल्प को अप्रौढ़ बनाने वाली यह क्रान्तिभावना 'झूठा सच' में आकर नरम हुई है और एक उत्तेजना रहित विकासात्मक आदर्श में परिणत हुआ है।

उपर्युक्त रचनायें समाज-केन्द्रित विशाल अध्ययन की प्रारंभिक उपलब्धियाँ हैं; और ये व्यक्तिवाद के विरुद्ध उत्कृष्ट कृतित्व की संभावना के प्रमाण हैं। प्रारंभिक रचनाओं के रूप में इनकी अपनी अपनी दुर्बलतायें भी हैं। पर ये भविष्य के उपन्यास-साहित्य की दिशा निर्दिष्ट करने में समर्थ होंगे तो विशेष महत्त्व रखेंगे।

व्यक्ति और समाज को केन्द्र बनाकर आगे बढ़ती हुई ये धारायें हिन्दी उपन्यास की तत्कालीन प्रगति की दो दिशाओं की ओर संकेत करती हैं। क्षेत्र तथा दृष्टिकोण में भिन्न इन धाराओं ने उपन्यास के आकार, गढ़न आदि को भी प्रभावित किया है। किन्तु दोनों धारायें बौद्धिकता से प्रभावित यथार्थ-बोध पर आधारित हैं, और अन्तर्मुखी या बहिर्मुखी होकर जीवन का विश्लेषण करने की ओर उन्मुख हैं।

HAFIZ AHMED KHAN

An eminent mathematician and astronomer of Madras
(died 8th Ramazan 1242 A.H. — 5th April 1827 A.D.)

BY

AFZAL-UL-ULAMA MUHAMMAD YOUSUF KOKAN UMARI, M.A.,
*Head of the Department of Arabic, Persian and Urdu,
University of Madras.*

The educational system of the Muslims in South India as elsewhere, till the middle of the 19th century, consisted of two parts: *مقولات* *manqulat* and *معقولات* *maqulat*. Under *manqulat* the Muslims studied Quran, traditions, Islamic jurisprudence and their laws and principles, Arabic and Persian languages and their literatures, with all their subsidiary branches of knowledge like syntax, etymology, rhetoric and prosody and history of Islam and Muslims and geography. Under *maqulat* subjects like Greek logic, philosophy and medicine, scholasticism, mathematics, algebra, geometry and astronomy were taught to them. The study of the last four subjects was regarded as important and sacred by the Muslims as the study of Islamic sciences; because they provided facilities for understanding the delicate and intricate problems of the law of inheritance and also helped in finding the exact direction of *Qibla*, the temple of Ka'ba, which was considered so necessary to perform the obligatory and non-obligatory prayers in a correct manner. Hafiz Ahmed Khan, Azamul Mulk writes :

اما بعد علم حساب بهترین علوم عقلی است که هر چه از افعال
و اقوال دینی و دنیوی فرض کنند ازین بیرون نیست که محتاج حساب
نباشد خصوص برای دریافت علم فرائض که بموجب فرموده حضرت
رسول صلی الله علیه وسلم علم فرائض نصف علم واقع است دانستن
حساب لازم بدستور در علم فقه جهت ادا صدقات فرضیه و لازمیہ
و تقسیم غنائم بسیار می از امور احتیاج بحساب می افتد و در امورات

دنیوی مستغنی از حاجت بیان است پس دانستن این چنین علم بر هر
ذی هوش و ذی رای ضرور است (دیباچہ زبده الحساب) -

The same argument has been advocated by him in another work. He says :

بر ضمایر اولو الالباب محتفی و محتجب نیست که منافع علم
حساب از غایت ظهور و فواید آن از نہایت شیوع نہ محتاج
توصیف و تبیین است و نہ مقتدر تعریف و تحسین - اشتغال این
علم بہمہ علوم منقول و معقول ظاہر و ہویدا است و افتقارش
در معاملات دنیاوی روشن و پیدا - پس اکتساب این چنین علم
کثیر الفواید بجهت تکمیل علوم دینی مثل فرایض وغیرہ بر هر مسلم
لازم و تحصیل این علم رفیع القدر برائے حصول کمال بر هر متنفس
متحتم (دیباچہ اعظم الحساب) -

Again the same reasons have been promoted and asserted by him in learning the science of astronomy. He says :

بر ضمایر اصحاب فطنت و ذکا محتجب نیست کہ از جملہ
معقولات علم ریاضی شریف ترین علمہا است - خصوصا علم ہیئت
اشرف وانفع تر از ہمہ ہا زیرا کہ علم ہیئت موقوف علیہ بسا
امور است مانند اجراء سفن در بحار کہ مدار اکثر عالم بر سفر
بحار است و اطلاع بر تقاویم و کواکب و علم نجوم واسطراب
وغیر ذلک و مثل استخراج سمت قبلہ و تعرف اوقات صلوة کہ از
جملہ اعظم ارکان دین است (دیباچہ مرات العالم) -

The courses of studies in all the Arabic Madrasas included all the above branches of learning. Bahauddin Amili's work *khulasat-al-Hisab* and *tashreehul Aflak* and several other works of Khawja Naseeruddin Tusi, Qazi Zada Rumi, Mulla Abdul Ali Barjandi and Mulla Ali Qaushji were being prescribed from time to time for the Arabic students.

Qazi Nizamuddin Ahmed Sagheer (the junior) of Arcot (d 1188 A.H. = 1775 A.D.) at the instance of Nawab Abdul Wahab Bahadur, the younger brother of Nawab Muhamad Ali Walahjah I, translated and commented upon *khulasat-al-Hisab* in Persian in 1165 A.H. = 1751 A.D. which he named فيض الوهاب شرح خلاصة الحساب. But he could not complete this work. It was later on completed by his great grand son Maulvi Haji Ahmad Saheb, son of Qazi Badruddowlah (see *khanwada-e-Qazi Badruddowlah* Vol. I page 137).

Moulvi Muhammad Ghouse Sharaful Mulk Bahadur (1238 A.H. = 1825 A.D.), the grandson of Qazi Nizamuddin Ahmed Sagheer, wrote a book in Arabic on astronomy, entitled سواطح الانوار في معرفة اوقات الصلوة والاسحار which contains a *muqaddima*, three *babs* and a *khatima*. In the second chapter he has discussed about the zodiac constellations and the movements and the phases of the sun, the moon and the stars. In the third chapter he has shown how days and nights are formed and how the time is to be fixed during nights by observing the position of the stars in the sky.

His son Moulvi Muhammad Sibghatullah, better known as Qazi Badruddowlah (d 1280 A.H. = 1863 A.D.) has left an important work on mathematics in Arabic, entitled غية الحساب which is divided into a *muqaddima* and ten *babs*. The importance of the science of mathematics has been emphasised upon by him in the following words :

ان الحساب من اعظم العلوم نفعا ، و ارفعها عند الملوك
وقعا ، اشرفت شمس اليقينات من مطالع براهينه ، ولمعت انوار
الاصابة من طوابع قوائمه ، رياض الشرع يسقى من شآبيب مسائله ،
وحياض العلوم يفاض من انايب دلائله ، فما من قاسم الا يحتاج اليه ،
ولاحاكم ولا تاجر الا يعول ويعتمد عليه ، اذ ينحل معضلات المسائل
الفرضية ، وينفك مشكلات الوصايا الدورية ، وبه يعرف احكام المداخل
والمخارج ، واليه يرجع تحرير الدفاتر والادراج ، وهذا مفتاح لغلق

ابوابه، ومصباح للسائرین فی ظلم شعابه، مشتملة علی غوامض
اموره، و محتویة لفائس کتوزه (دیباچه غنیة الحساب) -

The contemporary poet and author, Afzalul ulama Qazi Irtaza Ali Khan Safawi Khushnood (d 1270 A.H. = 1853 A.D.) compiled a well known work on mathematics in Persian entitled *نقود الحساب* which was once very popular in South India.

But the best works on mathematics and astronomy are those written by Hafiz Ahmed Khan Alaiddowlah Bahadur Azam Yar Jung Azamul Mulk, the subject of my paper today. First I should like to give a short sketch of his life and character and then show his valuable contribution to the sciences of mathematics and astronomy.

Hafiz Ahmed Khan was the eldest son of a well known savant, Qazi Shaikh Muhammad Ansari, who originally belonged to Tilimsan, a place in North Africa. The Shaikh set out from his native place to Hejaz with the purpose of performing the sacred duty of pilgrimage to Mecca and Madina. Then instead of returning home, he decided to visit India and entered the territory through Surat coast. He reached Delhi during the reign of the Mughal emperor Muhammad Shah (1719-1748) who accorded him a warm welcome, on account of his extra ordinary ability and proficiency in teaching the Quran and traditions of the Prophet. He was an expert in the correct recitation of the Quran and knew fully the rules of science of pronounciation and recitation of the Quran which is known as علم التجويد. The emperor appointed him a teacher in one of the Government Madrasas and himself took lessons from him in the science of the recitation of the Quran.

The Shaikh stayed at Delhi till the beginning of the reign of Shah Alam II (1759-1788) and witnessed pillages and devastations of Delhi during the reigns of Muhammad Shah and his successors, Ahmad Shah (1748-1754) and Alamgir II (1754-1759), at the hands of the Marathas and the two great invaders, Nadir Shah of Iran (9th March 1739) and Ahmad Shah Abdali (1761). He at last took permission from Shah Alam II (1759-

1788) to be relieved of his official duties under the pretext of old age and came down to Madras probably in the year 1173A.H. = 1759 A.D., with the intention of returning home after making a pilgrimage to Mecca and Madina for the second time. The Nawab Muhammad Ali Walajah I (1749-1795) received him with great honour and respect and was very much impressed by his erudite scholarship in the Islamic sciences. The learned people of the city also welcomed him and felt great pleasure to be in his company. The Shaikh requested the Nawab to make an arrangement to send him in one of his two ships, plying between Madras and Jeddah and port Suez. But the Nawab did not like to grant him permission to return to his country ; because he thought that his presence in this part of our country would be useful in disseminating knowledge and piety among the Muslims of South India. He requested the Shaikh to stay here in Madras for some more years and engage himself in teaching the traditions of the Prophet to the people. After a stay of five years at Madras, the Nawab appointed him a Qazi of Arcot and granted him a jagir for his maintenance. Two years had passed to his service as Qazi, when Hyder Ali, the Sultan of Mysore, attacked upon Arcot in 1180 A.H. = 1766 A.D. Almost all the officers of the Nawab fled from Arcot in great terror and fear. But the Shaikh stuck to his place and decided to live in Arcot with patience and courage. His indomitable courage and firm faith in God, the Almighty, were very much admired and commended by the Englishmen. Lord Macartney (1781-1785 A.D.), the Governor of Madras, ordered that the Shaikh should not be disturbed by anybody. When Hall Burton came to Arcot, he paid a visit to the Shaikh, who requested him for permission to go for pilgrimage. He replied that His Excellency the Governor of Madras would not leave him to go back to his country ; because he felt that his stay in this part of the country would be a source of great blessings to others. His son, Muhammad Abdullah, Qadir Nawaz Khan Bahadur, Bharam Jung quotes his words and writes :—

ایشان (ہال برٹن) اصلاً قبول نہ کردند و جواب دادند کہ
 لارڈ صاحب ہرگز صاحب را نخواهند گزاشتہ . بودن صاحب دریں

شهر موجب برکت است (قاضی محمد تلمسانی از ڈاکٹر محمد غوث -
معارف جنوری ۱۹۳۳ ع صفحہ ۲۸)۔

The Shaikh lived at Arcot fully respected by all until he faced the natural death on the 13th Muharram 1201 A.H. - 5th November 1786 A.D.

It is said that Nawab Muhammad Ali Walajah and his two sons, Nawab Umdat-al-Umara and Nawab Amir-al-Umara visited the Shaikh at his death bed. He talked to the Nawab in a feeble and low voice, which could not be overheard by others. When somebody pointed out that the Shaikh was leaving his children under the guardianship of the Nawab, he immediately sat up in an angry mood and exclaimed, "No, by God I am not leaving my children under the guardianship of any one else except Allah".

The Shaikh was buried with all respects in the compound of the congregational Mosque at Arcot. A chronogram, composed by Moulana Baqir Agah, and containing the date of his death, is still to be seen carved in the stone tablet fixed at his grave, which reads:—

تلمسانی کہ سینہ اش در علم
همچو بحر محیط می زد جوش
علم او بود با عمل مقرون
ورعش باخلوص هم آغوش
حلقہ درگوش نطق او بگهر
خلق او را نسیم باد فروش
وا دریغا کہ شد ز صرصر مرگ
شمع جان منورش خاموش
خواستم سال رحلتش از عقل
رضی الله عنه گفت سروش

The Shaikh was survived by four sons of whom two earned name and fame. The one was Hafiz Ahmad Khan, Alauddowlah Bahadur, Azam Yar Jung, Azamul Mulk and the other was Muhammad Abdullah, Qadir Nawaz Khan Bahadur, Bahram Jung. The first was a great mathematician and astronomer and the other was a poet and an administrator. The two others were Moulvi Mahmood Nawaz Khan and Sultan Husain Khan who went over to Hyderabad and settled down there.

Bahram Jung was born at Najeebabad, near Delhi, and came down to Madras with his parents and studied Arabic and Persian and other Islamic sciences under his father and other great teachers of Madras and Arcot. He composed Persian poems under the pen name of *Ashkar* آشکار. He was very young at the time of the death of his father. Hence the post of Qazi was given to some other man. But the jagir was left in his hands and he was held responsible for maintaining the whole family. He was employed in the service of Nawab Muhammad Ali Walajah I in the year 1204 A.H. = 1789 A.D. and served under him for six years. When Nawab Umadat-ul-Umara succeeded his father, he appointed him as his personal adviser. He performed the duties of an emissary between the Nawabs and the English Governors and officials. Bahram June himself has stated :-

نیازمند مدت شش سال در حضور نواب والاجاہ بہ کمال دیانت و راستی و محبت شبانہ روزی سر انجام خدمات مفوضہ خود نمودہ و دیگر امورات سرکار یعنی سوال و جواب صاحبان حکومت و صاحبان انگریز کہ معرفت نواب عمدۃ الامرا بود نواب والاجاہ خود و نواب عمدۃ الامرا نیازمند را واسطہ سوال و جواب مذکورہ داشتہ بودند۔ آن را نیز بخوبی و درستی تمام بتقدیم رسانید از ابتداے گورنری چارلس اوکلی صاحب (۱۷۹۲-۱۷۹۴) و جنرل میڈوس بہادر (۱۷۹۰-۱۷۹۲) و ہنگام تشریف فرمائی مارکوئس کنوالس بہادر در استقرار قرار نامہ مارکوئس کنوالس بہادر (۱۷۸۶-۱۷۹۳) و اوقات

گورنری لارڈ ہوبرٹ بہادر (۱۷۹۸-۱۷۹۴) بسا سوال و جواب متعلقہ اہل حکومت معرفت عمدہ الامرا بوساطت خود نزد نواب والاجاہ بخیر و خوبی و صلاح طرفین بعمل آورد (قاضی محمد تلمسانی از ڈاکٹر محمد غوث معارف جنوری ۱۹۳۳ ع صفحہ ۳۲-۳۳) .

Through him and his elder brother Hafiz Ahmad Khan Alauddowlah Bahadur Azam Yar Jung Azam-ul-Mulk, Nawab Umdat-ul-Umara Bahadur Walajah II, borrowed huge sums of money from sahu-kars and money lenders. After the death of the said Nawab in 1216 A.H. - 1801 A.D., all the sahu-kars and money lenders held the two brothers responsible for these amounts due from the Nawab. The East India Company confiscated his jagir and granted him a monthly stipend of 350 Huns, which was not at all sufficient for maintaining his large family. He appealed to the Governor in Council and other executive bodies but to no good results. He sold out all his personal effects and cleared a part of these dues. The creditors harassed him to such an extent that he was not destined to live for more than three years and he died at a young age in 1219 A.H - 1804 A.D.

A man like Moulana Baqir Agah pitied his immature death and composed the following chronogram.

آہ چوں بہرام جنگ اندر شباب
گشته از تن دور شد باروح جفت
سال تاریخ رحیلش را سروش
روح او در روح وریحان شاد گفت

۱۲۱۹ھ

His elder brother Hafiz Ahmad Khan was also probably born at Najeebabad and was brought up with great care by his father. He memorised the holy Quran and then studied Arabic and Persian along with other Islamic sciences under different

teachers. When Mulla Bahrul Uloom Abdul Ali came down to Madras from Bengal in 1204 A.H. - 1790 A.D., Hafiz Ahmad Khan also studied under him logic, philosophy and scholasticism. But he was chiefly interested in the sciences of mathematics and astronomy. In this year 1204 A.H. - 1790 A.D. he wrote a short treatise on mathematics entitled *Zubdat-al-Hisab* زبدة الحساب which was later on printed and published and included in the courses of studies for Arabic Madrasas. In 1210 A.H. - 1795 A.D. he compiled a book *Siraj-al-Iman* سراج الايمان in Urdu on Islamic theology which was also prescribed as an alternative text for the students in the Arabic Madrasas. He was a fine calligraphist and has copied in 1225 and 1226 A.H. - 1810-1811 A.D., ترح مشوى مولانا روم the commentary of Moulana Rum's *mathnawi*, written by Mulla Bahrul Uloom in three big volumes, which were later on transferred to the personal library of Moulvi Abdul Wahab Madar-ul-Umara Bahadur and they are now possessed by his great grandson Haji Abu Ahmad Muhammad Abdullah of Diwan Saheb Bagh, Madras-14.

Hafiz Ahmad Khan like his younger brother held high positions under the Nawabs of Arcot and performed his duties faithfully. After the death of Nawab Umdat-al-Umara in 1216 A.H. - 1801 A.D., his son Tajul Umara Ali Husain Khan Bahadur requested Hafiz Ahmad Khan Bahadur to take the coffin of Nawab Umdat-ul-Umara to Nathar Nagar (Trichnopoly) and bury him with all respects. Hafiz Ahmad Khan did as he was desired to do and returned to Madras.

When Nawab Azeemuddowlah, the son of Nawab Amirul Umara, succeeded his uncle in 1216 A.D., he awarded Hafiz Ahmed Khan the title of Alauddowlah Bahadur and again Nawab Azamjah, the son of Nawab Azeemuddowlah, awarded him the titles of Azam Yar Jung Azam-al-Mulk.

Hafiz Ahmad Khan is still remembered at Madras on account of a fine mosque, built by him at Elephant Tank in 1233 A.H. - 1818 A.D. The famous poet Syed Kahiruddin Khan Faiq composed the following chronogram which is carved in a stone and fixed in the front wall of this mosque. It reads :—

منبع جود و عطا کان سخا اعظم جنگ
 مسجدے تازه بنا کرد ز فیض قیوم
 کرد تاریخ بنایش چو تامل فایق
 مسجد جامع اعظم ز خرد شد مفهوم
 ۱۲۳۳ هـ

Hafiz Ahmed Khan Bahadur died on Thursday the 8th Ramazan 1242 A.H. - 5th April 1827 A.D. He was buried in the compound of the mosque built by him. His wife Hidayatun Nisa Begum expired on Tuesday the 5th Shaban 1257 A.H. - 21st September 1841 A.D. and she was buried by the side of her husband.

Hafiz Ahmad Khan wrote a few books of which five are now extant. They are as follows :—

1. *Zubdat-al-Hisab*. (pp 76) زیادة الحساب It is a short treatise in Persian on mathematics, algebra and geometry, consisting of seventy six pages, written by him in 1204 A.H. It is divided into a *muqaddima* and four *maqalas*, which are again subdivided into several *babs* and *fusuls*. Here and there we find certain terms defined in the form of poetry. For example, right angle, obtuse angle and acute angle have been defined in the following verses :—

بیان قاعده بشنو از ره تحقیق
 بهر سه قسم مثلث بخواش دل و جان
 چو مال اطول و مالین هر دو ضلع یکی است
 بود بقائمه الزاویه مسمی آن
 وگر زیاده بود مال اطول از مالین
 بود بمنفرجه پیش اهل علم عیان
 اگر کم است ازاں هر دو وقت سنجدین
 نهند حاده اش نام جمع هندسه دان

The area of a triangle is to be obtained in the following way :-

آری مهندس در مساحت طرز آساں گوش کن
 کز پی تسهیل شد مرقوم ارباب رقم
 هر مثلث کافتد خاطر سوے پیمائشش
 جمع کن اضلاع را بایک دگر بیے کیف وکم
 پس تفاضل گیر در هر ضلع و نصف مجتمع
 فضل هر یک را جدا بہتر بود کردن رقم
 ضرب کن آن فضالہا و نصف را در یک دگر
 جذر حاصل رہبر مطلب بود اے محترم

2. *Siraj-al-Iman*. (pp 302 x 15) سراج الایمان It is a short treatise in Urdu which deals with Islamic creed and theology. It is divided into two *maqsads*. The first deals with عقائد and the other with فقہ. This was written by him at the end of 1210 A.H. It was once very popular in the South and it was prescribed as an alternative text for the students of Madrasa-i-Azam, Madras-2 (see Khanwada-e-Qazi Badruddowlah Volume I page 423).

3. *Azam-al-Hussab*. (pp 674) اعظم الحساب This stupendous work on mathematics consisting of 674 pages of close and small type was written by him in 1229 A.H. - 1814 A.D. Originally he had the idea of enlarging the old edition of *Zubdat-al-Hisab* but his friends and disciples insisted upon him to write an independent and exhaustive work on this subject. Hafiz Ahmad Khan himself has stated :—

چون بر ارادہ این عاصی بعضیے دوستان شفیق کہ ازین
 ہیچمدان بدل اتحاد دارند مطلع شدند ازین امر باز داشتند کہ
 بر تشریح و تفصیل رسالہ مذکورہ اوقات خود را صرف کردن
 عبث است - چونکہ درین بلاد ہیچ کتابی بزبان فارسی در علم

حساب که محتوی بر همه کلیات و جزویات آن با امثله و براهین هندسی بر هر واحد از اعمال حسابیه اهل فتوحات و منجمین و اعمال مساحت و جبر و مقابله و غیره باشد نا پیدا است اگر صرف اوقات بعوض منبیه رساله مذکوره بتالیف کتابی علحده براسه در علم حساب که مشتمل بر همه ابواب صدر بود نموده آید اولی و انسب است تا یادگاری از تمادی ایام در روزگار باقی ماند هر چند این حقیر هیچمدان بمد نظر عدم بضاعت و قلت فرصت و مشغولی اوقات در ترددات دنیوی و صعوبت حصول مقصد از اقبال این مهم عظیم پهلو تپی کرد و استعفا خواست اما صاحبان اشفاق فرما عندر بنده را به هیچ نوع پذیرا نکرده زیاده تر بر این معنی مصر شدند بناء علی هذا امثالا لامر احبا با وجود قلت فرصت از مهمات دنیوی و عدم استطاعت درین فن اتکا بر فضل و کرم او تعالی شانہ کرده بتسوید این اوراق شروع نمود و از کتب عربی و فارسی و هندی و غیره متقدمین و متاخرین که در علم حساب و هندسه و هیئت و رسایل اصطلحی و رسایل ربع مجیب و کتب فقه و فرائض و غیره باین احقر العباد بهم رسیدند فواید آنها برخی برسبیل ترجمه از عربی بفارسی و بعضی بطریق انتخاب و خلاصه آن از هر خوان زله برداشته هر قدر که دانست و توانست فراهم آورد و به نیت ثوابت اخروی خالصه لله تعالی بترتیب ابواب و فصول پرداخت و بامید آنکه شاید بنظر فیض اثر یکی از بزرگان دین در آید و مقبول خاطر دریا مقاطر ایشان شده در حق این گناه گار دعاے مغفرت بر زبان فیض ترجمان ایشان جاری شود و سبب نجات اخروی این عاصی گردد.

مگر صاحب‌دلی روزی برحمت
کنند در حق این مسکین دعاے

بار گران این امر خطیر را بردوش ضعیف برداشته این
اوراق را موسوم باعظم الحساب و مترتب بریک مقدمه و هفت
مقاله و خاتمه ساخت .

The book has been divided into a *muqaddima* seven *maqalas* and a *khatima*. Again each of them has been subdivided into several chapters and sections.

The author has consulted almost all the books available on this subject in Arabic, Persian and Hindi. He has also referred to the well known Hindi text *Biganī* on algebra, written by Pandit Bhaskara Charge and translated into Persian by Ataulah Rushdi during the reign of Shah Jahan. Hafiz Anmad Khan says :-

باید دانست که شخصی از قوم برهمنان بهاسکرا چارج نامی
مصنف کتاب لیلوتی که درین دیار هند متداول است در زمان سلف
در علم جبر و مقابله کتابی موسوم به بیج گنت بزبان هندی تصنیف
کرده که از لیلوتی چهار چند زاید و هیچ یکی از فواید و قواعد آن
در لیلوتی مذکور نیست و در زمان شاهجهان بادشاه هندوستان عطاء
الله رشدی ابن احمد نادر آن کتاب را از زبان هندی بزبان فارسی
ترجمه کرده در دیباچه آن ذکر نموده است که فواید و مطالب آن
کتاب خیلی ارجمندی و دقایق و حقایق آن بغایت بلند واقع شده
که در هیچ کتاب عربی و فارسی مسطور نیست و الحق کتاب مذکور
مشحون است از فواید عجیبه و مطالب غریبه که مولف این اوراق
هم در هیچ کتاب عربی و فارسی مطالب آن نه دیده و نه از

زبان احدیے فواید آن شنیده حتی کہ کتاب مذکور را کہ حین تسوید این اوراق نزد مولف حاضر است باکثر اوستادان و علمای این فن نموده همه ها پسند فرمودند و بر عدم اطلاع فواید آن معترف شدند - هر چند طریق استخراج مجمولات باعمال طویل الذیل بیان می کنند - اما چونکہ طریق آن غیر مشهور و اعمال آن غیر اعمال جمہور است این اوراق را از فواید آن محروم نداشته هر قدر کہ می تواند مندرج سازد (اعظم الحساب . مقدمه سیوم در بیان استخراج مجمولات بطریق جبر و مقابله ہندی)

He has also referred to some of the latest writers in his book like فارکس, probably James Ferguson (1710-1776), a Scottish astronomer and mechanician, while discussing about the exact difference between the Christian and the Muslim eras. He says that the difference between the two eras according to the rotation of the sun must be 621 years six months and seven-teen days and not 622 years as mentioned by Ferguson.

The author seems to be an expert in drawing the mathematical and geometrical figures. The book contains several such figures nicely drawn and painted with gold and other colours. Though the book does not contain subjects like the interest and the stocks, which are not permissible by Islam, but it contains problems relating to the law of inheritance and architecture and also weights and measures used in dealing with the business of gold, silver and other precious stones and also with regard to the exact proportions of the ingredients used in preparing various medicines. The book is undoubtedly a more advanced one of his age. No one among the Arabic and Persian writers and scholars has been able to write such a comprehensive work like this. The author deserves our commendation and it will be a great contribution to the knowledge and learning if this work is published.

4. *Mirat-al-Alam*. مرآت العالم This is also a monumental work in Persian on astronomy and geography consisting

of 542 pages. It was written by him in the year 1234 A.H. - 1819 A.D. just to disprove the wrong assertion of the Englishmen that Muslims in India do not know mathematics and astronomy. The author himself has stated :-

لکن بعدم التفات ابناء زمان بسوے این علم قاطبة رواج
آن نمائنده بزایه خمول متواری گشت حتی که دانایان فرنگ خصوص
قوم انگریز که درین فن هر يك از انها ارسطو و ابرخس و بطليموس
را کمتر از اطفال ابجد خوانان قوم خودی شمارند جزم دارند که
هیچ احدی از اهل اسلام دیار هند ازین علم خبر ندارند فلهدا
این هیچ مدان اضعف عباد الله البصمد حافظ احمد بن شیخ محمد مغربی
تلمسانی انصاری الصایمی خواست تا اوراق چند در بیان اجرام علوی
وسفلی بعبارت فارسی قریب الفهم مبتدیان خالی از ایراد براهین
هندسی طویل الذیل بین الاجمال والتفصیل تسوید نماید

For the latest information on the subject he has taken the help of Mr. Kodalingam, the metrologist of the Madras Observatory, constructed in 1792 A.D., and his assistant Mr. Srinavasa Shastri. The author himself has stated :-

وبعضی مقدمات که تعلق برصد دارند حسب الامکان خود
از مستر کودلنگم صاحب رصد جدید بلده مدراس که پیش از
چند سال از طرف کونینی قوم انگریز در بلده مذکور بنا کرده اند
بترجمان سرینواس زنار دار که درین فن مهارتی بهم رسانیده از جمله
راصدان رصد مذکور ومنجم ماهر قوم زنار داران است تحقیق
کرده درین اوراق فراهم آورده مرتب بر مقدمه و دو مقاله و خاتمه
ساخته موسوم به مرات العالم گردانید

The book has been divided into a *muqaddima* and two *maqalas* and a *khatima*. In the *muqaddima* he has defined and explained the scope of this subject. The first *maqala* deals with the heavens, the sun, the moon, the five planets viz., Mercury عطارد Mars مریخ Venus زهره Saturn زحل and Jupiter مشتری and also the principal stars in the northern and southern constellations. The author has divided the first *maqala* into ten chapters but we find actually in the book fourteen chapters subdivided into many sections. The second *maqala* deals with the shape and conditions of the earth, and the formation of days and nights in the four seasons. It is subdivided into twelve chapters and each chapter is divided into many sections. The *khatima* deals with the area of the earth and the distances it has to the other planets. It is subdivided into a *muqaddima* and nine chapters (باب).

This book also contains fine geometrical figures of the sun, the moon, the earth, the planets and their movements. Some of these figures have been painted with gold. There are evidences in the book that he observed the movements of the planets and stars by the help of large telescopes and other metrological instruments of the Madras observatory. In one place he says:-

چنانچه مولف این اوراق از دور بین چه در رصد مدراس
و چه در دیگر مواضع کواکب سبعة سیاره را مشاهده کرده (مرات
العالم - مقاله اولی - باب دوم)

In another place he says :-

چنانچه در ارساد خود بثبوت رسانیده حکم کرده اند که
ارتفاع اعظم جبال از سطح کروی جرم قمر بمقدار پنج میل است
و انخفاض بعض اغوار از سطح مذکور بقدر سه میل ازین جهت
سطح کروی قمر را کسب نور از شمس برسبیل تساوی حاصل نیست
هر چند مولف این اوراق عفی الله عنه ولوالدیه بدوربینان کلان

مشاهده جرم قمر نموده است و بلندی و بستی در سطح آن مطابق ادعای اهل فرنگ یافته اما جزم بر دعوی ایشان ندارد (مرات العالم - مقاله اولی - باب هفتم)

Again he says :-

مخفی نماند که غیر محسوس بودن اختلاف منظر شمس بآلات رصدیه و استخراج آن از حساب شاید قبل از اختراع دوربین باشد والا از دوربین چه در رصد مدراس و چه در غیر آن مسود این اوراق شمس و زهره را بر دائرة نصف النهار مشاهده کرده است و مستر کودلنگم راصد مدراس در رصد خود اختلاف منظر آفتاب را بمقدار هشت ثانیه و چهل و پنج ثانیه یافته است (مرات العالم - مقاله اولی باب دوازدهم) -

In the last chapter of the book, the author has given the Persian translation of the information in English, supplied to him by Mr. Kodalingam, the metrologist of the Madras observatory, with regard to the discovery of five new planets in 1781, 1801, 1802, 1804 and 1807 and the persons who discovered them.

The author has stated :-

باید دانست که اهل فرنگ شمس را مرکز عالم و دیگر اجرام و کواکب و ارض را گرد شمس متحرك دانند چنانکه در صدر این کتاب اشعارے باین معنی نموده ایم و سوائے قمر و خمسة متحیره پنج کواکب دیگر سیار استخراج کرده اند چنانچه راصد مدراس مستر کودلنگم کیفیت استخراج کواکب مذکوره و نام مستخرجین و حرکات آنها که دوره هر یک در کدام مدت گرد شمس تمام می

شود و ابعاد همه سیار از شمس آنچه که بدستخط خود بخط انگریزی
بمحرراین اوراق نوشته داده است ترجمه آن درین جا بحیز تحریر
می درآید (مرآت العالم - خاتمه - باب نهم)

The author has written this book with a critical mind. He has differed with the previous astronomers in many respects and he has given his independent opinion and judgment.

5. *Rub'a Mujeeb*. ربع مجیب It is a short treatise about quadrant consisting of 368 pages, each page having 15 lines. It is divided into a *muqaddima* and twenty five *babs* subdivided into many *fusuls*.

The following are the topics discussed in this book.

مقدمه در بیان رسوم ربع مجیب

باب اول در معرفت اخذ ارتفاع

باب دوم در معرفت جیب قوس و جیب تمام و وتر آن

باب سیوم در معرفت سهم از قوس و عکس آن

باب چهارم در معرفت میل اول و میل ثانی و غایت ارتفاع

آن به سه فصل

باب پنجم در معرفت عرض بلد

باب ششم در معرفت بعد قطر مدار و ارتفاع آن

باب هفتم در معرفت اصل حقیقی

باب هشتم در معرفت نصف فضله

باب نهم در معرفت دایر و فضل آن

باب دهم در معرفت ارتفاع از فضل دایر

باب یازدهم در معرفت ظالین

- باب دوازدهم در معرفت دائره فيما بين ظهر و عصر
 باب سيزدهم در معرفت حصه شفق و مقدار در حصه فجر
 باب چهاردهم در معرفت سعه مشرق و مغرب
 باب پانزدهم در معرفت ارتفاع لا سمت له
 باب شانزدهم در معرفت حصه سمت
 باب هفدهم در معرفت سمت بهر ارتفاعيكه مطالب باشد
 باب هجدهم در معرفت استخراج قبله
 باب نوزدهم در معرفت استخراج جهات اربعه
 باب بيستم در معرفت نصب قبله
 باب بيست و يكم در معرفت مطالع فللكيه و بلديه
 باب بيست و دوم در معرفت كواكب ثابتة
 باب بيست و سيوم در معرفت كواكب ثابتة بوقت شب
 باب بيست و چهارم در معرفت طول اشياء مرتفعه و سعه انهار
 و عمق آبار و بعد سحاب از ارض
 باب بيست و پنجم در معرفت بعد اصل قايم

The book seems to be written just one year before his death in 1241 A.H. - 1826 A.D.

NATIONAL TRENDS IN URDU LITERATURE

BY

SRI HYDER ALI KHAN, M.A , L.T.,

Reader in Persian, University of Madras.

There is a misconception about Urdu language that it is not indigenous, and that its literature does not reflect the spirit of India. Nothing can be farther from truth than these assumptions. The proof for the statement that it is as much indigenous language as any other Indian language can be had from the fact that outside the sub-continent it is not spoken anywhere else. I do not want to dilate too much upon this, as eminent scholars like Firaq Gorakhpuri, Pandit Kishan Prashad Kaul and many others have written much about it. In these few pages I want to show how the Indian spirit is reflected through Urdu literature. We must first have a clear idea as to what constitutes the spirit of India. We are told and rightly too, that Shah Nama of Firdausi reveals the spirit of Iran. It does so because the background of the lengthy poem is Persian. The vocabulary to a very great extent is Persian. The national heroes, irrespective of their beliefs and practices, have been mentioned with respect. Their heroism has been praised, and Iranians have been made to feel proud of such a heritage. This really reveals the spirit of Iran.

If such examples are brought out from Urdu literature, one will be made to admit that Urdu reflects the same spirit as the other Indian languages.

It must be admitted that Urdu poetry, ever since its inception, had adopted Persian metres, and had Persian verse forms as its model. Vocabulary was also freely borrowed from Arabic and Persian languages. Mohammed Quli Qutub Shah, the first Urdu poet, whose works are extant in the form of 'Kulliyat', was a great appreciator of 'Hafiz', the well-known Persian poet. Not only did Quli Qutub Shah borrow expressions but also ideas from that great lyrical poet of Iran. Nevertheless there are Indian influences on his poetry. He calls his

beloved 'Mohan' or 'Sajjan'. He uses a number of Sanskrit, Marathi and Telugu words in his poems. Those that came after him also maintained this line. Mulla Wajhi, a man of letters of the Golkunda durbar, in his famous fiction 'Sabras' uses so many Sanskrit and Hindi words that the work is ordinarily unintelligible to a modern Urdu student unless he frequently refers to the glossary.

Wali Mohammad Wali, who was a poet of the later 17th and earlier 18th century, and who was born in Aurangabad, was the sponsor of Urdu poetry in the North. His work reveals the language spoken in those days all over India. Although he hails from the Deccan, Syed Nurul Hasan Hashimi, who has edited the work of this great poet, proves in the foreword¹ that there is not much difference between Wali's language, and the language of his contemporaries at Dlehi and the Punjab. Wali uses a number of Sanskrit and Hindi words. This shows that in those days Urdu had considerable vocabulary borrowed from Hindi and Sanskrit. Only in the 19th century, because of innovations of poets from Lucknow, among whom Nasikh was the foremost, that many words of Sanskrit origin were dropped. Of late there has been a revival and slowly words of Sanskrit origin are finding a place in Urdu.

Now I shall try to show how genuinely Urdu poets loved Indian towns, rivers, natural scenes and India as a whole.

Wali, whose name has been mentioned above, was greatly attached to Surat town where he lived for a considerable time. He describes the town in the following words :

عجب شہراں میں ہے پر نور اک شہر
 بلا شک جگ میں ہے وہ مقصد دہر
 اہتے مشہور اس کا نام سورت
 کہ جاوے جس کے دیکھیں سین کدورت
 جگت کی آنکھ کا گویا ہے یہ نور
 اچھو اس نور سوں ہر چشم بد دور

1. Kulliyat-i-Wali - Edited by Syed Noorul Hasan Hashimi
 Foreword - Anjuman-i-Taraqqi Urdu, P. 28.

“How dazzling is this town among all the towns! Without doubt this alone is the main purpose of creation. Its famous name is Surat. On a mere look cast on it, all the dirt of the heart is washed off. If the world is the eye, Surat is the light in it. May this always be safe from evil eye.”

About the river Tapti, Wali says :-

کنارے اس کے اک دریاے تپتی
کہ دنیا دیکھنے کو اس کے تپتی
کہ آب خضر کی ہے اس میں تاثیر
ہوا دیتی ہے اس کی یاد کشمیر

“At one end of the town (Surat) river Tapti flows. People throng to see its elegant flow. Its water undoubtedly has the effect of ‘elixir’. The breeze there reminds us of the valley of Kashmir.”

Wali is not only a lover of Surat, but also of entire India. When he leaves Gujarat, he writes a poem lamenting his separation from such a nice place. He is enamoured of Delhi as well.

The Indian festivals and rituals have inspired Urdu poets. Nazir Akberabadi has made a mark in this respect. He has described all festivals (Hindu & Muslim) of his days. There are vivid descriptions of the celebrations of these festivals. Holi seems to have inspired him most. He has written six poems on Holi. He has also written poems on “Divali”, “Rakhi Bandhan”, “Kanhayya ki Ras” and such other topics. I shall quote here one stanza of Nazir regarding Holi :

آجہمکے عیش و طرب کیا کیا، جب حسن دکھایا ہولی نے
ہر آن خوشی کی دھوم ہوی، یوں لطف جتایا ہولی نے
ہر خاطر کو خرسند کیا، ہر دل کو لبھایا ہولی نے
دف رنگیں نقش سنہری کا جس وقت بجایا ہولی نے
بازار گلی اور کوچوں میں، غل شور مچایا ہولی نے

“ Oh! when Holi revealed its beauty, what revelries! what rejoicings! Happiness increased every moment. Such was the favour shown by Holi. Every heart this festival fills with pleasure; and every mind it attracts, when it begins beating its golden drums, in markets, lanes and streets. There is tumultuous joy everywhere”.

“ Rakhi Bandhan” is also a great festival of Hindus in the North. During this festival Brahmins tie the “Rakhis” (coloured threads) round the wrists of Hindus. This thread is supposed to protect the person who has it from misfortunes. Nazir has written a poem commemorating the same. Addressing his beloved on the occasion of this festival he says :

پھرے ہیں راکھیاں باندھے جو ہر دم حسن کے مارے
 تو ان کی راکھیوں کو دیکھ اے جاں، چاؤ کے تارے
 پہن زنار اور قشقہ لگا ماتھے پر بہارے
 نظیر آیا ہے بہمن بنکے راکھی باندھنے پیارے
 بندھا لو اس سے تم ہنس کر اب اس تہوار کی راکھی

“The beauty stricken youths are roaming about with rakhis tied round their wrists. Oh my Life! The star of my love! See their rakhis. With the sacred thread across and with the caste mark on the forehead, Nazir has come to you in the guise of a Brahmin. Now extend your hand with a smile, Oh sweet, and give him the privilege of tying this rakhi on your wrist.”

Indian heroes of pre-historic days have been held with respect by all the Urdu poets and prose writers, Hindus as well as Muslims. Of course Hindus regard them as Gods in accordance with their beliefs. But Muslims have not been behind their Hindu brethren in showing respect and regard to them. Many a quotation can be given in this respect. I shall first quote Nazir. Describing Sri Krishna's Ras Leela known as *Kanhayya Ki Ras*, Nazir says :

آئے ہیں دھوم سے جو تماشے کو گلبدن
 گویا کہ کھل رہے ہیں گلوں کے چمن چمن
 کرتے ہیں نرت کنجج بہاری بصد برن
 اور گھنگرؤں کی سن کے صدائیں چھن چھن
 ہر آن گوپیوں کا یہی مکھ بلاس ہے
 دیکھو بہاریں آج کنہیا کی راس ہے

“With all paraphernalia, girls, as delicate as flowers, have come to see the show. Their groups, spread here and there, are like flower beds in full bloom. There, Kunj Bihari (Sri Krishna) dances wrapped in a dress of varied colours. The sound of ‘ghungrus’ – (small bells tied round the ankles) inspires ‘Gopis’ and they cry, ‘How Grand ! It is Kanhayya’s Ras.’”

I shall mention here a poet of our own times who has paid fitting tribute to Sri Krishna. His name is Hafeez Jalundheri, He sees the statue of Sri Krishna. Getting inspiration from it, he writes a poem. A few lines from the same are quoted below:—

دنیا سے نرالا یہ بانسری والا
 گوکل کا گوالا
 ہے سحر کہ اعجاز کھلتا ہی نہیں راز
 کیا شان ہے واللہ کیا آن ہے واللہ
 حیران ہوں یہ کیا ہے اک شان خدا ہے

بت خانے کے اندر
 خود حسن کا بت گر
 بت بنگیا آکر

“ Unique in the world, this flute player, a cow herd, among cow herds. Is this magic or miracle! No clue do I get. By God what grandeur! By God, what a pose! Bewildered am I to know what it is. Yes, it is God’s glory.

In the precincts of the temple, the very creator of beauty, after assuming a form, has chosen to sit like an idol”.

Besides Sri Krishna, Sri Ram and Guru Nanak also have been frequently mentioned in Urdu poetry. Nazir has written a poem on Guru Nanak. I write below only a couplet from that poem.

اس بخشش کے، اس عظمت کے ہیں بابا نازک شاہ گرو
سب سیس نوا ارداس¹ کرو اور ہردم بولو واہ گرو

“ Guru Nanak is so full of bounty and so full of honour, that all should bend their heads before him, submit their requests and cry in ecstasy, Wah Guru”.

Iqbal has also paid fitting tribute to this great saint of India. I am quoting here just two couplets from that famous poem, “Guru Nanak”.

قوم نے پیغام گوتم کی ذرا پروا نہ کی
قدر پہچانی نہ اپنے گوہر اک دانہ کی
پہراٹھی آخر صدا توحید کی پنجاب سے
ہند کو اک مرد کامل نے جگایا خواب سے

“ The nation, alas! did not give heed to the divine message delivered by Gautam. It did not assess the full value of that rare gem. Years later, from the Punjab, arose the voice, calling people towards the belief that God is one, and none but He. A perfect man awakened the country from the deep slumber that it was in.”

1. عرض داشت or ارداس is the colloquial word.

Now I come to the topic of the love of the motherland. I do not want to tire the readers with copious examples. Men of letters of Urdu literature, a couple of centuries ago, coined the beautiful phrase, which served as an inspiring solgan for them, and for all the Indians. This celebrated phrase is "Hindustan, Jannat Nishan" i.e. 'India, a symbol of paradise'. Let me first refer to Chakbast in this respect. He has paid tribute to his motherland in the following lines:—

اے خاکِ ہند تیری عظمت میں کیا گماں ہے
 دریائے فیضِ قدرت تیرے لہتے رواں ہے
 تیری جبیں سے نورِ حسن ازل عیاں ہے
 اللہ رے زیب و زینت، کیا اوجِ عزو شان ہے
 ہر صبح ہے یہ خدمتِ خورشید پر ضیا کی
 کرنوں سے گوندھتا ہے چوٹیِ ہمالیہ کی

"Oh dust of India! There is no doubt about your greatness. The river of Divine blessing is ever flowing for you. From your forehead is manifest the beauty of the dawn of creation. What beauty! What splendour! How high is your honour and grandeur! It is the duty of the brilliant sun every morning, to dress the locks of the Himalayan bride (the peak)".

Poet Iqbal, in a song written for Indian children entitled "Watan Ka Rag" (The song of the country), says:—

بندے کلیم جس کے، پر بت جہاں کا سینا
 نوحِ نبی کا آکر ٹھہرا جہاں سفینہ
 جنت کی زندگی ہے جس کی فضا میں جینا
 میرا وطن وہی ہے، میرا وطن وہی ہے

"Every Indian, a Moses, and every mountain is Mount Sennai. This is the place where Noah's ark got asylum from the deluge. Its towering mountains are the stepping stones to the Heavens. To live in its environment is to live in Heavens."

There is another song of Dr. Iqbal which is too widely known. It is one of our national songs. I shall just quote two couplets from the same.

سارے جہاں سے اچھا ہندوستان ہمارا
 ہم بلبلیں ہیں اس کی وہ گلستان ہمارا
 مذہب نہیں سکھاتا آپس میں بیر رکھنا
 ہندی ہیں ہم، وطن ہے ہندوستان ہمارا

“Our country is undoubtedly the best of all the countries of the world. We are its nightingales, and it is our rose garden.

No religion teaches that we should have feuds with each other. We are all Indians, and India alone is our country.”

Dr. Iqbal goes even to the extent of saying :—

خاک وطن کا مجھ کو ہر ذرہ دیوتا ہے

“Every particle of my country is God unto me.”

Many poets could be quoted in this respect. But the desire for brevity makes me pass on to another important topic viz. the desire for freedom and a sense of repulsion against the foreign rule exhibited by the Urdu poets. During the later period of the Moghal rule in India there was much confusion and chaos in the country. People did not know what they had lost. Iqbal depicts this period in the following couplet.

وائے ناکامی متاع کارواں جاتا رہا
 کارواں کے دل سے احساس زیاں جاتا رہا

“Alas the disappointment! The caravan has lost its belongings. And the worst of it, it does not realise what it has lost.”

In 1757 there was, what is known as the Battle of Plassey, which gave the British a firm foot-hold on the Indian soil. Hence further concentration of British power in India

was made possible. The death of Sirajuddoulah was indeed a great tragedy. In spite of such great calamity, there was no reaction worth the name in India. It was an Urdu poet by name Raja Ram Narayan Mouzoon, who raised his voice of protest, and recited these two lines which have become immortal in Urdu poetry.

غزالاں تم تو واقف ہو، کہو مجنوں کے مرنے کی
دوانہ مر گیا آخر کو ویرانے پہ کیا گزری؟

“Oh deers of the desert! You must be acquainted with the facts. Tell me of the death of Majnun. They say the mad man is dead, well! What befell the desert after him?”

‘Majnun’ literally means ‘mad man’. The root of this word is ‘junun’ which means ‘madness’. But metaphorically ‘Majnun’ means a man of determination who does not care for the consequences. Sirajuddoulah was indeed such a great hero. The desert is of course Bengal. After the death of such a great man, Bengal and later India, became a slave to the British rule. This lament of Raja Ram Narayan Mouzoon, in fact, reflects deep sense of aversion of a few thinkers of those days against the foreign domination.

In the last decade of the 18th century Nawab Umdatul Umara, Wallajah II, although enjoying British protection, had realised that very soon these foreigners would end the show, and would themselves become the supreme lords. Even at that time there were serious limitations to his powers. Showing resentment at these limitations and impositions, he says in one of his poems :-

ہماری کچھ نہ پوچھو یارو تم بات
ہمارا ملک ہے انگریز کے ہات
ہمیں ہر روز آتی کڑکڑوہی
ہماری زندگی پر ہے تھڑوہی

“ Oh friends ! Do not ask about our affairs. Our country is in the hands of the British. Every day is a day of sorrow for us. Fie on our life ! ”

In the latter half of the eighteenth century Hazrat Shah Waliullah, a great Muslim divine, realised that something must be done to stir the imagination of the Muslims, and to make them realise how they should lead their lives with dignity and honour. He thought the best way of creating the intellectual revolution was to translate the Qur'an, the book of God. As Persian was the vehicle of thought and expression of the intelligentsia of those days, he translated the holy book into Persian. He was the first to attempt the translation of the Quran. Even before he could finish his work, the British who got scared, set up some Ulemas against him. They denounced him as a 'Kafir' and sent him threatening letters. But that man of action did not give heed to the threats and went his way. When he finished his translation, a ruffian, by name Najafkhan, under instigation from the rulers, entered the house of Shah Sahib, and severed both his hands. But Shah Sahib was undaunted. He was in the position of John Wycliff. He considered no sacrifice greater for the noble task that he had undertaken. In 1803, his son Shah Raffiudin wrote Urdu translation of the Qur'an to make the meaning of the holy book available to a wider section. Perhaps referring to these incidents a later poet says :

لکھتے رہے جنون کی حکایات خوں چکاں
 ہر چند اس میں ہاتھ ہمارے قلم ہوے

“We went on writing the bleeding tales of madness, although, while so doing, our hands were severed.”

Referring to Shah Waliullah's movement Ratanlal Bansal says¹ :-

“ In order to deliver India from the clutches of foreign Power, Shah Walliullah kept on fighting. When finally he died, he left as his legacy for his sons, relations, disciples and innumerable admirers those sparks of freedom which made them prefer honourable death to detestable life.”

The efforts of Shah Walliullah did not go in vain. The procedure of blind following and complete dependence upon Ulemas and faith in traditional behaviour began to vanish. Free thinking and action manifested themselves through poetry and prose. A keen desire for freedom of thought and expression developed consequently.

Much earlier than the so-called ‘Mutiny of the Indian sepoys’, Urdu poets began to resent the British domination. Mushafi, a poet of the early 19th century, and a younger contemporary of Mir says,

ہندوستان کی حشمت و دولت جو کچھ کہ تھی
کافر فرڈگیوں نے بتدبیر لوٹ لی

“ The Farangs (Europeans) have pilfered the wealth and grandeur of India in a diplomatic way.”

Jura't, a contemporary of Mushafi had also sensed the bad state of affairs in India, especially with regard to the power of Rajas and Nawabs. He gave his reaction in the following quatrain :

کہئے نہ انہیں امیراب اور نہ وزیر
انگریزوں کے ہاتھ یہ قفس میں ہیں اسیر
جو کچھ وہ پڑھائیں سو یہ منہ سے بولیں
بنگلے کی مینا ہیں یہ پورب کے امیر

“ Don't call them now Amirs or Wazirs. They are all birds shut up in the British cages. Whatever the British teach them, they repeat. The Amirs of the East are the Minas¹ of Bengal.

1. An Indian bird which can repeat words like a parrot.

Hakim Momin Khan Momin, a famous Urdu poet, who died just a few years before the rising of Indian sepoy, was the disciple of Shah Abdul Qader, and Shah Ismail, the son and the grandson of Shah Walliullah respectively. He has expressed his resentment against the British rule in some of his poems. One such poem is in Persian consisting only of four lines. Although I am dealing with Urdu poetry, yet I cannot resist the temptation of quoting this quatrain because this indicates the bend of the poet's mind.

این عیسویاں بلب رساندند
 جان من و جان آفرینش
 تا چند بخواب ناز باشی
 فارغ ز فغان آفرینش

“ These foreigners have drawn out my life and the life of my country. How long would you be callous to the wailings of the Motherland ? ”

In one of his *mathnawies* he prays to God that he may be given the opportunity to die a martyr's death in the cause of his country.

As for the revolt of the Indian sepoy against the British and the reaction of the Urdu poets and prose-writers I shall quote a passage from the essay of Khawaja Ahmad Farouqi, Reader in Urdu, Delhi University. The title of the the essay is '*Jang-e-Azadi Men Urdu Ka Hissa*' (Part played by Urdu in the fight for freedom). The English rendering of the said passage is given below.

1“ The Indian Mutiny is the epoch-making incident of our history. In this fight for freedom many sections of our people did not take part. There were many reasons for the same. With all that this was the first united front that they presented against the British. This incident could never be ignored whenever the history of the freedom movement is written. It is but

natural that such a great event influenced our men of letters. Some literary men and poets were directly connected with this movement. Even as it is, as far as Urdu poetry is concerned, poetry and soldiery had marched hand in hand, and at no time was there a conflict. So (because of their part in this movement) some of them had to experience the hardships of prison, and some others were hanged under the charge of having instigated the mutiny ”.

Much earlier than the rising of the Indian sepoy in 1857, Moulvi Mohammad Baquer, a contemporary of the great Urdu poets, Ghalib and Zauq, had started an Urdu journal styled ‘Urdu Akhbar’. He had been writing articles resenting the British domination in Indian affairs. So after the mutiny was quelled, the British began to arrest those who were supposed to be directly or indirectly connected with the rising. Moulvi Muhammad Baquer was one of those who were immediately arrested, court-martialed and ordered to be hanged.

Moulvi Sahbai, who was a contemporary and a great friend of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, was a great literary figure of those days. He helped Sir Syed Ahmad Khan in compiling the famous book ‘Atharus-Sanadid’, which is a proud record of the work of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. He was such an eminent writer that great poets like Ghalib, Sheefta and Momin held him in great esteem. He was also shot dead along with his two sons for his alleged part in the rebellion.

Moulvi Sadruddin Azurda, the chief judge of the Delhi Court, was imprisoned and sent to jail. He was released from jail after a long time. Only half of his forfeited pension was restored to him. His last days were spent in misery and poverty.

Moulvi Fazl-i-Haq Khairabadi, who was another great literary figure of Delhi, was also tried and awarded life imprisonment, sent to Andamans, where, after suffering humiliation, degradation and unbearable hardships, he died, and was buried there itself. It is said that Ghalib owes much of his fame to Moulvi Fazl-i-Haq, who told the great poet that he must not

publish all that he had written, but only selections thereof. Ghalib entrusted this task to Moulvi Fazl-i-Haq who gleaned gems from his poetry and published the Urdu Diwan. If all that Ghalib had written had been published, he would not have been considered the very great poet that he is now known to be.

Moulvi Mohammad Ismail Hussain Munir Shukohabadi, also a well-known poet of those days, took active part in the first struggle for Indian independence. Like many others he was also arrested, tried and awarded life imprisonment and sent to the Andaman islands. In one of his poems he describes how he was taken to the distant place and how he was made to suffer on the way. The first part of the poem, describing the journey, is given below.

فرخ آباد اور یاران شفیق
 چھٹ گئیے سب گردش تقدیر سے
 آئے باندے میں مقید ہو کے ہم
 سو طرح کی ذلت و تحقیر سے
 کوٹھری تاریک پائی مثل قبر
 تنگ تر تھی حلقہ زنجیر سے
 پھر الہ آباد لیجائے گئے
 ظلم سے، تلبیس سے، تزویر سے
 جو الہ آباد میں گزرے ستم
 ہیں فزون تقریر سے، تحریر سے
 پھر ہوے کلکتہ کو پیدل رواں
 گرتے پڑتے پاؤں کی زنجیر سے
 ہتھکڑی ہاتھوں میں، بیڑی پاؤں میں
 ناتواں تر قیس کی تصویر سے

“Destiny’s cruel hand snatched us from Farrukhabad and from our kind friends there. Imprisoned we came to Banda undergoing a lot of humiliation and degradation. We were given a room darker than the grave and narrower than the link of a chain. Then we were taken to Allahabad with oppression, deceit and devil craft. The tortures that we were subjected to are beyond description, oral or written. From Allahabad we were asked to go to Calcutta on foot. We staggered because we were handcuffed and chained.”

The above few instances, I believe, will suffice the readers to be convinced of the part played by men of letters in this first struggle for freedom. Now let us examine the post mutiny period.

Although the British gained supremacy and became absolute rulers of India, yet the spark of freedom kindled by this historic fight did not extinguish. True it is that it did not develop into a conflagration immediately; nevertheless it was there, and was slowly creating that warmth for freedom in the minds of Indians which later resulted in the great freedom movement led by Lokamaniya Tilak and Gandhiji.

The British had established law and order in the entire country. Feudalism was slowly giving place to capitalism and industrialisation. The rulers thought that those reforms would satisfy the Indians; and they would not entertain ideas of freedom. But literary men were there to educate the masses and to inculcate in them the desire for freedom.

Khwaja Altaf Hussain Hali, although an associate of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, did not like the continuance of the British rule. But he was not for taking any crude action that would not bring the desirable results. He was of opinion that before the Indians stood against the mighty rule of the British they must equip themselves with the modern outlook. They must unite and they must develop industry. In a number of articles that he wrote, he drove home into the reader these ideas. In his article “with the change of Time you should also change”, he wants Indians not to cling to the old outmoded values of life,

but to adopt new values. This alone is the secret of not only survival but also of strength and power. Dogged adherence to old traditions ruins a community.

Supporting industrialisation he has written an article with the title "Is the world machine run by knowledge or by industry?" He defines knowledge as mere book knowledge which has no utility value. He defines industry as knowledge of applied sciences and technology. He proves that mere scholastic learning which ignores practical aspects of life is of no use. In his famous poem, "Musaddas-i-Madd-o-Jazr-e-Islam" or better known as Musaddas-i-Hali he lays stress on work as the means of stability in economics, and upholds its dignity.

Another factor that Hali emphasises for the achievement of honour and dignity for the country is the emotional integration. It is the most vital factor for the very existence and progress. From one of his poems on such a topic two couplets are quoted below :

کہہ رہا تھا یہ اک آزاد کہ ہے جن میں ملاپ
دولت و بخت ہیں ہر حال میں ان کے ہمراہ
پر نہیں رابطہ جس قوم میں اور اک جہتی
اس کی دنیا سے یہ سمجھو کہ گئی عزت و جاہ

"A person of free country was saying the other day that wealth and fortune accompany only those who are united. But the community in which there is no common link and identity of outlook is bound to lose honour and power."

Referring to the British he says that the secret of their success is their consideration of their countrymen.

الغرض اہل وطن کی پاسداری کو یہ لوگ
جانتے ہیں دین و ایماں اپنا قصہ مختصر

"These people (the British) regard consideration for their compatriots their religion and their faith. That is all."

Hali knew that there was no real social justice under the British rule, although much noise was made about it. The privileged classes had all the advantages, and the downtrodden were oppressed. One of his poems is a satire on the British Law. A few couplets from the same are given below:—

کہتے ہیں ہر فرد انسان پر ہے فرض
 مانبا قانون کا بعد از خدا
 پر جو سیچ پوچھو نہیں قانون میں
 جان کچھ مکڑی کے جا لے کے سوا
 اس میں پھنس جاتے ہیں جو کم زور ہیں
 اور ہلا سکتے نہیں کچھ دست و پا
 پر اسے دیتے ہیں توڑ اک آن میں
 جو سکت رکھتے ہیں ہاتھوں میں ذرا
 حق میں کم زوروں کے ہے قانون وہ
 اور نظر میں زور مندوں کے ہے «لا»

“They say it is obligatory on all to follow the law. Obedience to law of the land is next only to obedience God. But the truth is that law has no more grip than what a cobweb has. The weak insect gets arrested in the cobweb; whereas the strong tears it off. The law has its hold on those who are down-trodden. But for the strong, it is not the English word ‘law’ but the Arabic word ‘la’.” ‘la’ in Arabic means ‘nothing’. Hali has punned upon the word ‘law’ because of the similarity of its sound with the Arabic word ‘la’.

Like Hali many other poets and men of letters of the later 19th and earlier 20th century expressed their sense of repulsion against foreign domination. For the fear of being too lengthy I shall deal with only three more poets viz., Akber Allahahadi, Chakbast and Dr. Iqbal. I am purposely avoiding modern poets. I am not prepared to give them as much credit – although I do

not mean to decry them - as I should to the old poets, because these old poets expressed their view, sometimes openly and sometimes coached in a language apparently devoid of sedition, at a time when public opinion against the British rule had not been mobilised.

As for Akbar Allahabadi, he first began his poetical career as a conventional poet of Lucknow School. But very soon he became a severe critic of the British rule and westernisation. There are, as we know, many good things in westernisation; but his aversion to it was purely a psychological problem. Although he was holding the coveted post of a district judge, yet he did not hesitate to refer to the atrocities committed by the then rulers of India. Referring to the severe impositions by the British, and their growing suspicions for nothing, he says :

سانس لیتے ہوئے بھی ڈرتا ہوں
یہ نہ سمجھیں کہ آہ کرتا ہوں

“I am afraid of even breathing lest it be misconstrued as a sigh (in protest against them)”.

Akbar, although a high Government official, longed to be a disciple of Mahatma Gandhi. He expresses this idea in his own humorous style.

اکبر اگر نہ ہوتا مدخولہ حکومت
اس کو بھی آپ پاتے گاندھی کی گویوں میں

“Had Akbar not been owned by the government, you would have found him also among the admirers of Gandhiji.” He uses the word ‘Madkhoola’ for Government official. Madkhoola means a concubine. This metaphor quite fitted in with the circumstances in those days. While a concubine may sometimes be more serviceable to the person who has her, she cannot claim to have equal social status with the wife of that person. The position of high Indian officials in those days was also similar. They were more serviceable to the government than

the European officials. Yet, neither did they enjoy that position, nor were they given their pay. The term "Gopi" for a disciple of Gandhiji is also equally significant. Gopis are the traditional cowherd girls of Gokul whose love for Sri Krishna was spiritual and above sensualism; and Gandhiji's disciples loved him purely for his spirituality. They were selfless, and they had no axe to grind.

I shall conclude this article with a reference to Chakbast and Dr. Iqbal, the two leading poets of the first half of the 20th century.

Birj Narayan Chakbast was a national bard. He openly sided with the Home Rule Movement started by Dr. Anne Besant. He exhorted the Indians towards this goal through his powerful poems. In one such poem he says :-

حکم حاکم کا ہے فریاد زبانی رک جائے
 دل کی بہتی ہوی گنگا کی روانی رک جائے
 قوم کہتی ہے «ہوا بند ہو پانی رک جائے
 پر یہ ممکن نہیں اب جوش جوانی رک جائے
 ہوں خبردار جنہوں نے یہ اذیت دی ہے
 کچھ تماشہ یہ نہیں قوم نے کروٹ لی ہے

"The Government have ordered that all agitations should be stopped; which means that the powerful outpouring of the heart comparable to the flow of the Ganges should be stopped. But the reply of the country is: "Let water and air be kept away. Even then it will not be possible for the youthful enthusiasm to dwindle. Let those who have tried to intimidate us all along know for certain that this is not a mere show. The nation has taken a turn".

In one of his *ghazals* there is a couplet which served as a slogan for many years. The following is that immortal couplet,

مجھے اسیر کریں یا مری زباں کاٹیں
مرے خیال کو بیڑی پنہا نہیں سکتے

“Whether they imprison me or whether they cut my tongue, they cannot bind my ideas in chains”.

Dr. Iqbal's works are too well known to require any lengthy discussion here. The purpose of this article will be served enough if just two of his couplets are produced. Speaking about the growth and development of personality, he says that freedom is the most essential need for the same.

بندگی میں گھٹ کے رہ جاتی ہے اک جوئے کم آب
اور آزادی میں بحر بیکراں ہے زندگی

“In slavery personality reduces itself to a streamlet with a little water stagnating in it, while in freedom it expands into an unfathomable vast ocean”.

Again Iqbal says :-

غلامی میں نہ کام آتی ہیں شمشیریں نہ تدبیریں
جو ہو ذوق یقین پیدا تو کٹ جاتی ہیں زنجیریں

“In slavery neither your swords nor your designs are of any use. You must be sure of your cause and act accordingly. Then you will find that shackles will break of their own accord”.

The poets and men of letters referred to in this article are but a few. In such a brief article as this all the poets could not be mentioned. Even these few examples that have been given, are sure to convince the reader that Urdu has played a vital part in the life of the nation. As Khawaja Ahmed Farouqi puts it, “Urdu did not live in the abode of seclusion. During all these eventful decades it has reflected the national spirit.” It will continue to do so provided it is allowed to develop without any hindrance.

Author's note :-

The following books were consulted by the author during the preparation of this article.

1. Sabras - by Mulla Wajhi, published by Anjuman-i-Taraqqi Urdu, Aurangabad - 1932.
2. Kulliyat-i-Wali, published by Anjuman-i-Taraqqi Urdu, Delhi - 1945.
3. Kulliyat-i-Nazir published by Tej Kumar Book Depot, Lucknow, 1951.
4. Klasike Adab - Khawaja Ahmad Farouqi, Reader, Delhi University.
5. Bang-e-Dara - Dr. Iqbal.
6. Subh-e-Watan - Chakbast.
7. Naghmazar - Hafeez Jalundhari.
8. Maqalat-i-Hali - Part I.
9. Diwan-i-Hali.

REVIEWS.

THE STRUCTURE OF KANNADA

Dr. R. C. Hiremath. Karnatak University, Dharwar, 1961.
Pages 135. Rs. 5/-

The importance of the descriptive approach in the study of language, originally stressed by Pāṇini in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, but neglected by the Western linguists of the nineteenth century in their enthusiasm for the historical and comparative methods, is now being realized by modern linguists because of the penetrating work of the American savant Bloomfield and his staunch followers belonging to the school of Descriptive Linguistics, or Structural Linguistics. Thanks to the financial assistance from the Rockefeller Foundation, Linguistic schools were conducted by the Deccan College at Poona and other places under the direction of American experts as a result of which Indian scholars began to get more and more acquainted with descriptive linguistics. Dr. Hiremath, who is a well-known scholar in Kannada could attend some of these linguistic schools in India and, with the help of a senior fellowship from the Rockefeller Foundation, continue higher studies in the U. S. A. at the University of California, Berkeley. The present work which is the result of this study, gives a descriptive analysis of the structure of the Kannada dialect of Dharwar, and will be of great help to the students of Kannada and Dravidian linguistics. Though mainly a descriptive study, it contains here and there many ideas about the evolution of the language as well. Dharwar Kannada is the North Karnatak dialect spoken in the districts of Dharwar, Belgaum and Bijapur.

K. KUNJUNNI RAJA.

THE PROBLEM OF MEANING IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

R. C. Pandeya. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1963. Pages 303.
Rs. 15/-

In India the various schools of Philosophy, including those of the Sanskrit grammarians and the rhetoricians, devoted much thought to the problems of linguistic philosophy and general

linguistics and evolved different theories to explain the manifold aspects of language behaviour. 'The discussions on the problem of meaning by the great Indian thinkers like Bhartṛhari, Kumāri-labhaṭṭa and Ānandavardhana show extraordinary linguistic acumen and are full of valuable observations which can be of considerable help in clarifying complicated issues in modern discussions on the subject.'

Of late some important works have appeared in the field of Indian theories of meaning. I worked on the subject under Professor Brough in the School of Oriental and African Studies, London, during 1952-4, and prepared my comprehensive thesis. (*Indian Theories of Meaning*, published in 1963 by the Adyar Library, Madras-20) Then came D. S. Ruegg's thesis, *Contributions a l' Histoire de la Philosophie linguistique indienne* (Paris, 1959), and Gaurinath Sastry's book, *The Philosophy of Word and Meaning*, (Sanskrit College, Calcutta, 1959). Miss Biardeau of Paris edited some basic texts on the subject with French translation and notes (*Sphoṭasiddhi* and *Tattvabindu*, published from Pondicherry). Dr. Sreekrishna Sarma (Tirupati) and Dr. K. Raghavan Pillai (Trivandrum) have also been working in the field. The present work by Dr. Pandeya tries to give a general survey of the development of the philosophy of meaning in India. While welcoming more and more new books in the field, it has to be pointed out that the problem of meaning is a difficult one, and the works of ancient scholars like Bhartṛhari can be understood properly only by deep and concentrated study.

Dr. Pandeya apologizes for the printing and other mistakes 'bound to creep' into the book as it is 'printed in a hurry'. What is the need for such a hurry? There are several printing mistakes, not pointed out in the long *errata* at the end. The bibliography is fairly comprehensive, but some of the works mentioned there have not been used in the text. Thus Vācaspati's *Tattvabindu* should have been consulted before writing on the *Sphoṭa* or the *Anvitabhīdhana* and *Abhīhitānvaya* theories. It is surprising that Dr. Pandeya associates the *Anvitabhīdhana* theory not with the Prābhākara school of Mīmāṃsā, but with the Nyāya school; this is a definite mistake. If he had consulted the *Tattvabindu* or Śālikanātha's *Prakaranapañcika*, especially the *Vākyaarthamatrka* section, or the *Bṛhati* by prabhākara

(not mentioned in the Bibliography) he could have avoided this mistake.

The book is divided into three parts. The first part introduces the subject and stresses the need for considering the problem of meaning as a philosophical problem. Part II deals with logical and syntactic problems. The unit of language is taken to be the sentence, the word being unreal. The nature of the parts of speech is also discussed. The third Part deals with the relation of language with reality. The differing views on primary meaning of a word are mentioned; and the sphoṭa theory is discussed, more from the philosophical point of view than from the linguistic.

The language is simple and clear; and the treatment is generally authentic. Dr. Pandeya says, "I have only put together views expressed by thinkers in the past. I have arranged the views of philosophers in a logical order and tried to explain them." It is a useful book and can be recommended to the discriminating students of Indian philosophical approach to the problem of meaning.

K. KUNJUNNI RAJA.

RĀJAŚEKHARA'S KARPŪRAMAÑJARĪ

Critically edited in the original Prakrit, with a Glossarial index and an essay on the life and writings of the poet, by Sten Konow, and translated into English with notes by C. R. Lanman. Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. IV, 1901. Republished by Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi in 1963. Rs. 7-50.

This is one of the many books now republished with the assistance of the joint Indian-American standard works programme. It is a standard critical edition and is thorough in its approach; but Konow does not give the Sanskrit *Chāyā* and gives more importance to the Prakrit grammars than to the evidence supplied by the manuscript material; the later revised edition of the text by Manomohan Ghosh in 1939 has used more manuscripts, and gives better readings. Still it is good to have this standard critical edition made available to the public at a cheap price.

K. KUNJUNNI RAJA.

STUDIES IN THE BRĀHMAṆAS.

By Dr. A. C. Banerjea. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1963, Pages 185. Rs. 15/-

This is an intensive and careful study of some interesting problems in family and tribal relationships during the Brāhmaṇa period. Dr. Banerjea makes an analytical study of terms expressing parentage like *Sajāta*, *bhrātr̥vya* and *anujāvāra*, as well as those indicating the exogamy of the clan such as *Jana* and *Jāmi*. The problems regarding the terms *vrātya* and *ari* are examined afresh, making a comparative study of the evidence available in the *Samhita* texts also. The author is conversant with the modern theories of sociology and applies them in his study of the old texts of the *Brāhmaṇas*.

Dr. Banerjea considers that the Vrātyas were non-Brahmanical Āryans who incurred the contempt of the Brāhmaṇas mainly by their alien ritual practices. He interprets *ari* as 'individual' belonging to the exogamous group as opposed to the group 'non-marriageable'; The idea that a term of exogamous significance gradually changed its meaning to indicate 'a stranger' is interesting; though one would like to get more evidence in support of this view before accepting it.

Chapter I discusses *ari* in the *Ṛgveda*. Chapter II on 'Clan exogamy in the *Brāhmaṇas*' discusses the terms *Jana* and *Jāmi*. The next chapter deals with family relationship, and studies the terms *agredidhiṣu*, *didhiṣupati*, *parivitta*, *parivividana*, *anujāvāra*, *bhrātr̥vya* and *sajāta*. Chapter IV is concerned with social and functional groups. The next chapter discusses the Vrātya problem. Dr. Banerjea has examined the earlier investigation's on the problems discussed and is thorough in his approach.

K. KUNJUNNI RAJA.

THE SOMA-HYMNS OF THE ṚGVEDA

Part III. By Dr. S. S. Bhawe. Oriental Institute, Baroda, 1962. Pages 228. Rs. 7-20/-

This third part of Dr. Bhawe's fresh interpretation of the Soma-hymns deals with twenty more hymns of the *Rgveda* (IX 51-70), and follows the same method as in the previous parts (reviewed in the Annals). In the preface Dr. Bhawe points that his insistence on utilizing Pāṇinian rules fully in the interpretation of Vedic passages does not mean that the results so obtained should not be revised and modified in the light of convincing historical and linguistic evidence available.

In this volume also a sample Sanskrit commentary following Pāṇini's rules (and also the Uṇādi's) by Sri. M. V. Upadhyaya has been given as an appendix. (for hymns 52 and 53).

K. KUNJUNNI RAJA.

THE GĪTĀ AND INDIAN CULTURE

BY

H. H. Sri Jaya Chamaraja Wadiyar.

Orient Longmans, pp. IV. 68. Rs. 3

In two essays entitled 'The Gītā on Righteousness' and 'The Conception of Kṣetra and 'Kṣetrajñā', His Highness presents the central ideas of the Bhagavad Gītā and of Indian culture, true for all times but especially relevant to-day, "when Science has divided the world into compartments and even split it into atoms". He recalls to our mind "the prime wisdom of our ancients of being and belonging to the whole universe as one entity". In presenting his thoughts, he expresses his obligation to the great ācāryās of the Śringeri Śāṅkara School. Analysing the concept of morality, he says that the basis of morality is securely laid in the concept of the identity of the self (ātman) of man with the self of all (Brahman). Bhakti and Karma *prepare* the aspirant but it is Jñāna alone that makes it possible for him to *realize* the great truth of identity and to become a complete man. A man who proceeds along this line does his duty for the benefit of the whole world and without being concerned about rewards and punishments for himself. "A man of knowledge alone can work for the good of the world (lokasaṅgraha), by precept and example (p. 10)"¹⁶ Such a person is poised in the spirit (sthitaprajñā).

In the second essay, His Highness points out that culture from the Indian point of view consists in the cultivation (vyavasāya) of the inner life. The dominant trait of a cultured person is niṣkāma karma by which he develops a vision of the whole universe as one harmonious system (pp. 31-32) "Can any other thing be called 'culture' except the constant realization of that which abides in the fleeting and of the undivided in the divided?" (pp. 56-57)

His Highness stresses the point that the Gītā is Brahma-vidyā. Hence its teaching is not confined to the merely ethical and social aspects of our life but goes beyond them to the spiritual. We should understand the word 'dharma-kṣetra' in the very first śloka as meaning the body which leads to the realization of dharma (pp. 40-41). While Arjuna mistakenly thinks that dharma stands in the way of war, Kṛṣṇa's concept of dharma makes war necessary in the sense that evil has to be combated and not acquiesced in. It is the moral equivalent of war on the physical plane. The evil that is to be destroyed is delusion arising from ignorance. What Kṛṣṇa teaches is adhyātma; what is understood by Arjuna is adhyātma. "This is the Dharma taught by the Gītā ..this is Indian culture." "This is an ancient way, the holy way, the way by which one becomes purified, overcomes evil and crosses over to Immortality". (pp. 67-68)

Though small in size, this is a valuable addition to the books in English on the Gītā and Indian culture.

V. A. DEVASENAPATHI.

PRATYABHIJÑĀHRDAYAM

(Pratyabhijñāhrdayam, Saṁskṛta Text with English Translation and notes by Jaideva Singh, [Phil] M.A. (Sans.) published by Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi - Price Rs. 10.00)

Pratyabhijñā literally means 'recognition'. One of the most important schools of Śaivism coming from Kashmir is the Pratyabhijñā system. According to this school the individual self is Śiva Himself, but the Jīva forgetting its real nature identifies itself with psycho - physical mechanism. This philosophy, like other philosophies in India teaches a way of life; in this system the individual self may recognise its real nature as Śiva through its s'piritual discipline. The literature of this philosophy consists of (1) the āgamas which are believed to be revelations, (2) spanda sāsātra which lays down the important doctrines of the system and (3) the Pratyabhijñā s'āstras which interpret these doctrines to the logical reason of man.

Abhinavagupta is the greatest exponent of this great philosophy and practice. Kṣēma Rāja is his disciple and is the author of the book Pratyabhijñā-Hrdayam now under review. He belongs to the Tenth Century A. D. The most important work earlier to Abhinava Gupta is Īswara Pratyabhijñā by Utpalāchārya. It is the essence of this work which is given by Ksēmarāja in his Pratyabhijñā Hrdayam. Avoiding all polemics, he has composed the work in the form of twenty sutras for which he has himself written a short commentary. *

There is already a translation by Prof. K. F. Leidecker. But this translation according to Shri Jaideva Singh bristles with mistakes. Indian darśanas could not be translated merely with the help of a dictionary. Shri Jaideva Singh who had the good fortune of studying it under Swami Lakṣhmaṇ Joo, is not only the the sole surviving exponent of the system but also one who practises the yogic discipline of that system. The differences from Prof. Leidecker's translation are pointed out in the foot-notes. See pages 34, 35, 38, 43, 46, 47, 48, 57, 59, 61, 62, 64, 74, 76, 78, 83, 84, 87, 88, 96, 98, 101. Therefore a new translation is justified.

This present translation also contains an introduction where the chief features of the Pratyabhijñā system are explained. There is an analysis of the contents of the book which is very helpful. In addition to the translation of the text, there are also foot-notes explaining and justifying the translation. Apart from these, notes are separately given explaining the difficult technical words and conceptions, often giving a summary in a tabulated form. The usefulness of the book is increased by a glossary of technical terms.

This is of special importance to South Indian students of Śaivism, for, this provides an easy way of comparing the Śaiva Siddhānta system. Śaiva Siddhānta does not believe that Jīva is Śiva. The universe does not proceed from Śivaśakti but from His parigrahaśakti according to Śaiva Siddhānta. But there is so much of identity in the explanation of the evolution of the universe and the upāyas. Shri Jaideva Singh has to be congratulated on this useful translation.

T. P. MINAKSHI SUNDARAM

PHILOSOPHY OF TIRUVALLUVAR

BY

Prof. T. P. MEENAKSHISUNDARAM

(continued from previous issue)

III

(a)

The concluding chapter is called *Puḱal*. Tiruvalluvar has emphasised the ephemeral nature of the things of the world, "The flow of fortune is like the gathering of a crowd around a drama; its end is like the melting of the crowd at its close." Human life is not eternal. "Life stands on the edge of a sword which slowly saws it through, pretending to be a measurement of time called a day." This is the glory of the world that one who was yesterday is no more today. Death is but sleep and birth an awakening therefrom. The relation between the body and the soul is also not permanent. The bird leaves in time its nest, never to come back. So does the life fly away from the body. What a pity! There is no lasting abode for this life which resides hard-pressed within this miserable body. The ignorance of those who mistake the ephemeral for the everlasting is of the worst kind. Those who do not realise the momentariness of their life, alas, imagine, not millions of thoughts but many many more.

Thus having described the unfortunate condition of the world, in terms of what Tolkāppiyar calls *kāñci*, Vaḷḷuvar proceeds to describe the *meyyunaṟvu*, as already pointed out. Before the tongue is restrained from movement and hiccough comes as the vanguard of death, good acts should be done. That is our invasion against death. That is his advice to conquer death. All wealth is evanescent. Therefore whenever one gets wealth, one must hasten to perform things which will endure. This is his advice for conquering the ephemeral nature of the things of the world. The *I* and the *Mine* have to be transmuted into the universal Love in *tuṟavaṟam*.

(b)

But in *illaram* the universal love still speaks in terms of one's own society, one's own world, though these have become almost universal. Therefore there is a place for two great things, one the feeling of joy at the conquest of death and two, the establishment of permanence before one attains the joy of universalism. One is the joy of munificence as already described, the other is the establishment of Fame. What else is there of greater profit to man? The poets sing the glories of the famous man. There is a verse addressed to Colan Nalañkiñli in Cankam poetry "Few are the people who have achieved the greatness of poetry rising up like that of lotus rising up above the surface of water, whilst many are those who have disappeared like the lotus leaves never rising above the surface of the water. Those who are blessed with fame sung by poets go to Heaven in a divine chariot driven by no charioteer." Therefore Vaḷḷuvar speaks of praise as the only Fame which arises from curing the hunger of the destitute - the real conquest over dehumanising forces. It is a power of creative joy. In this impermanent world, nothing is permanent except Fame. Kaḷiñkar and Parimēlañakar will assert that even the Heavens will praise the man of Fame rather than the Saints. Vaḷḷuvar explains this mystery. Men of Fame perform a miracle. Their mortal body dies; but the permanent body of fame grows for ever. The body of Fame is eternal whilst their physical body withers away. Who else can perform this miracle except these men of Fame? Therefore it is within one's own power to become famous. It is real infamy not to achieve this Fame; not to beget this glorious child of Fame. Here is a glorius conception of fame where man by his power of charity and Love achieves something of permanence in all walks of life, wresting the laurels of victory from opposing Nature trying to devour us and our wealth. The Fame of poets and philosophers and saints like Vaḷḷuvar, the Fame of great men like of Asoka and Buddha ever remind us of the glories of human life.

IV

(a)

It is therefore from this point of spiritual development that *turavaram* begins. We come back to *turavaram* to view it as a development of *illaram*. Even in *illaram* the poet was always

having in his mind the ultimate goal, to be reached. *Arul* is the basis of *turavaṛam* but as already stated and as already developed, even in the limited sphere of *illaram*, *turavaṛam* can be achieved. Therefore *turavaṛam* is addressed to both the classes of *aṛam*.

(b)

For instance *kūṭā-v-olukkam* naturally implies the rules and regulations of the recluse. But when Tiruvalluvar asserts the futility of the outward signs of renunciation such as the matted hair or the shaven head and insists on the avoidance of the ways which the world condemns, he implies to suggest that the real mental attitude of *turavaṛam* rather than the assumption of the sanyasin garb, is important. Therefore one can argue that it is possible to follow *turavaṛam* even if one remains within the limits of *illaram*. What is important is not the outward shape and form but the effect flowing from those actions. The crooked lute raises sweet music; the upright arrow spells death.

(c)

In the chapter on *Kallāmai* Valluvar speaks of the '*arul karuti anpu utaiyāratal*' 'those who aim at universal love and achieve the blessings of limited love.' Certainly this contemplates the people of *illaram*. This chapter on *Kallāmai* contemplates certain possessions which will be more appropriate to the people of *illaram* in practising *turavaṛam*. '*aḷaviṅkaṅ ninru olukal*' is another phrase occurring in the chapter on *Kallāmai*. *Aḷavu* is taken to mean the *pramāṇās* or the theory of knowledge. Perhaps one may take it as referring to the limitations to be placed on one's wants and possessions. To have anything more than one's necessary minimum requirements is not proper in the path of love and may be considered as misappropriation. Unfortunately none of the commentators give this interpretation, though this idea is as old as Jainism. Interpreted in this way, Valluvar may be said to contemplate here the people of '*illaram*' following '*turavaṛam*'.

(d)

In the Chapter on *Vāymai* 'Truth' there is the famous *Kuraḷ* about the great man who speaks the truth with all his heart being greater than those who perform penance or *tapas*

along with charity or *dānam*. *Dānam* 'gift' is the characteristic feature of *illaṛam* while *tapas* is the characteristic feature of *turavaram*. Therefore '*tavallōṭu tānam ceyvār*' 'those who perform both *tapas* and *dānam*' must refer to the people who are in *illaṛam* but who practice along with it *turavaram*. We have seen '*pukal*' is the glory of *illaṛam* and Tiruvaḷḷuvar states that there is no fame as great as truthfulness. Though it is possible to explain this in other ways, it lends itself to be taken as a reference to those who observe both *illaṛam* and *turavaram*.

(e)

In the Chapter on Anger, as is usual with Vaḷḷuvar, he discusses the topic from the basic point of view common to all. Anger is against the fundamental principle of Love with its joy and pleasure of life. Therefore anger which kills both these is the greatest enemy of man. Against the stronger people, anger is dangerous. But even against the weak, there is nothing worse. The point of view of this *Kuraḷ* is more appropriate to *illaṛam*. '*cinam ennum cērntāraik kolli*' is a beautiful phrase referring to anger as the destroyer of the associates. Vaḷḷuvar continues to add that it burns the float of dear kinsmen kept in reserve. This statement is certainly applicable to the people of *illaṛam*. The highest glory of this loving heart which avoids anger is described in another *Kuraḷ*. The injury inflicted may be like giving one a fire bath; even then if it is possible it is excellent to avoid anger. This is the *Kuraḷ* we have already referred to, in our discussion on Forbearance. The stage here described is the further development of that spirit of forbearance. There is the last *Kuraḷ* in the Chapter on Anger. "Those who exceed the limit of anger are but like unto dead men, suffering rigor mortis. Those who have renounced Anger are greater than the greatest saints, who have renounced the world". This *Kuraḷ* will not be a puzzle if interpreted from the point of view here developed, as referring to people who perform *illaṛam* and *turavaram*.

(f)

Again in the Chapter on *Kollāmai* 'Non-killing' Vaḷḷuvar repeats the beautiful phrase '*pakuttuṅṅu, pal-l-uyir, oṃputal*' 'To share one's food or wealth and thus, to protect many lives'

which we have read in the description of *illaram*. Again there is the Kural, "Even if the wealth leading to happiness were increased without limits by killing, that wealth arising from slaughter is the worst kind of wealth." This reference to wealth certainly contemplates the man in *illaram* and lends additional support to our theory. The Chapter on *Turavu* speaks of cutting away attachments. But the central idea of renunciation emphasised, as already noted, is the renunciation of the feeling of the 'I' and the 'mine'. If this is the main spring of *turavu* it is open to the man in *illaram* also to follow the path of *turavu*. As it is often pointed out in Indian literature, this is a safer course and we have the great story of Janaka, the great Emperor becoming greater than the saints and sages who have renounced the world, though he was himself within the bounds of *illaram*. Therefore this interpretation is not against the tradition of India or Tamil Land.

V

(a)

Therefore Tiruvalluvar describes in *arattu-p-pal* a view of life which starts with the natural attachment to the family; but gradually its love passes beyond the narrow limitations through ever-expanding circles of Love till it encompasses one's own society. Then begins the development of this Love so as to blossom into Universalism. Nothing is repressed where everything is given a righteous and proper place. It leads to the development of human perfection which means in the path of Love, the development of Universalism. As already pointed out, this is nothing new. We have taken a basic Pan-Indian conception. But when we compare this with the Tamilian tradition of Cankam age, the conception of *illaram* and *turavaram* as contemplated in Tirukkural becomes clearer. Even here, the approach of Tiruvalluvar is found to be unique though not revolutionary.

(b)

It will be thus seen that in the description of the development of Love, he not only emphasises this development but at every stage he points out the corresponding expansion of discernment and comprehension, knowledge and wisdom. In this connection, one may remember Spinoza's conception of Love. Spinoza's

Love is different from the mere appetite or lust. Love is, according to him, to be freed from the fetters of emotion, and that is done by proper understanding and control by intelligence. To him, therefore, it is the intellectual love of the animal towards God which is the part of intimate love wherewith God loves Himself. Though Tiruvalluvar does not make Love purely an intellectual love, he does emphasise the importance of discernment. This will appear from the way in which he emphasises that comprehension and discernment are in proportion to the expansion of Love. In this way Tiruvalluvar escapes the degradations of emotion and the pride of intelligence.

(c)

He holds the balance even between *illaram* and *turavaram*; for, he contemplates the possibility of *turavaram* being the continuation of *illaram* or the possibility of practising *turavaram* within *illaram* itself. He holds the balance also between theory and practice, between idealism and pragmatism. From this point of view, the suggestions for translating the ideals into action are valuable and are in accord with modern psychology.

(d)

The importance of this, the path of virtue starting from the Love of the married couple, is significant. As Saint Augustine pointed out "Love of whatever kind is always a living power; never can love be idle in the lover's path; always it moves and drives". From this point of view Kāmattu-p-pāl becomes important, since it is called *aram*. If *aram* is the development of the selfless Love already experienced, that experience happens ordinarily in the minds of the loving couple. If this basic love is not experienced, the further development is difficult to understand and practise. It is this experience of Love that is described in Kāmattu-p-pāl.

4. KĀMATTUPPĀL

I

Tiruvalluvar, as explained in our study of *arattu-p-pāl*, has emphasised Love as the basis of human life. This is in accordance with the modern theories of psycho-analysis, though these theories express this principle in a shockingly revolutionary way:

Tiruvalluvar purifies this basic passion and sublimates it. He starts with the love, existing between husband and wife. To him therefore the physical aspect of pure love is nothing mean. Marriage is a glorious institution. But when there is no Love, one embraces the mere physical frame no more than a corpse, as Valluvar will describe it, in his Chapter on Public women. The physical embrace becomes human and divine, when it is in addition a communion of two loving souls. The Tamilians conceived it in terms of a fabulous bird with two heads but one life. They also felt that such a love is the crown and glory of a communion, developing through atleast seven previous births. Therefore when such a man and a woman, though unknown to each other in the present birth, meet all of a sudden, they are by nature and providence, attracted to each other; and their inner personalities become one in love. Thus, even before marriage, there is this innate experience of love. This is called in Tamil, 'kaḷavu'. It is pre-marital love, where each soul steals the heart of the other. *Kaḷavu* or stealth emphasises the natural or unconscious process, where the heart of one lover is attracted to the other, even as magnet attracts iron. Tiruñānacampantar will speak of the Lord or God lover as 'uḷḷam kavār kaḷvaṅ' 'one who steals the heart of the beloved'. Kampar, following Nammālvār, will speak here of the coming of the lord or lover without any actual coming in, because it is really a manifestation of what is already latent-*Varatē vara vallaḷy*. The unconscious becomes conscious.

II

In this theory of the Tamilians, even physical attraction is something providential, when there is the background of pure love. It is an act of Providence or Nature that their loving souls commingle at first sight, Nature and Providence as it were conspiring to bring them together in a suitable environment, at the appropriate time and place. Such a love is naturally best suited for blossoming into universal love. The Cankam poets have emphasised this great truth. We are told that the great poet Kapilar to explain the message of Tamil to an Aryan King who was himself a musician, composed the great love poetry of Kurifi-ci-p-paṭṭu. After emphasising the chaste love of two such lovers, the poet gives expression to this great ideal of this love when he makes the lady love express it. "When we live

together with our doors open, feeling inspired by hospitality to all those who come, we will enjoy what remains after they are fed, as the crowning glory of this joint life of sacrifice, each seeing in the other's Love the reflected glory, the reflected joy or bliss of the contented society". In some such way we can paraphrase the prayer of the heroine, full of poetic suggestion.

Seen in this light, the Tamilian conception of love between a man and a woman looks almost divine. It is no wonder that in the age of Bhakti revival, this love was actually interpreted as the natural Love between God and the loving soul. Perhaps this later age read the *Kāmatu-p-pāl* of Tiruvaḷḷuvar in some such way. Tiruvaḷḷuvar further purifies the Cankam conception of love. Thus purified the divine-like Love was identified by Tirumālar with God in his explanation of his philosophy, starting as he does as a seasoned teacher, from the known and proceeding to the unknown. Therefore the contribution of Tiruvaḷḷuvar in this field should be emphasised.

III

The Cankam poetry speaks of five aspects of this love; *kuriñci* where the lovers meet and become one in loving embrace, *pālai* or separation where there is the exquisite pang of separation and where the pure gold of love shines all the more brilliant thus sublimated in the fire of selfless sacrifice and love, for the higher cause of state, society or learning, *neytal* or a feeling of despair sometimes clouding this life of Love where also one meets the suffused glow of Love, amidst trying circumstances, in refusing to die and in continuing to live only for the sake of the other, in the fond hope against hope of meeting the other; *mullai* or the joint domestic life and *marutam* or the sulky mood which often arises even in these loving hearts.

The last mentioned aspect of *marutam* is exemplified, in Cankam poetry, by the extra-marital relations of the hero. Perhaps the society of women was cut into two, one, of the chaste women who took up the duties of domestic life and of the continuation of the race and, two, of the free women who though yielding to love refuse to shoulder this duty of a family life but willingly undertook the onerous burden of keeping the torch of the fine arts ever burning more and more gloriously, through

themselves sacrificing to a life of art and beauty, of music and dance. Perhaps in such a society, a man's devotion to art throws him in the midst of public women, necessitating a kind of a divided allegiance and all that it implies. The institution of public women cannot always be kept in this ideal position and it descends to the level of prostitution. The lady love in wedlock cannot be expected to be happy when she suspects the extra-marital relationship of her lover. She, however, concentrates on the domestic duties demanded by the Society. She may excuse the Lover but there has to be at least a righteous resentment because of the family reputation and social ideal. The hero, however, is able to pacify the lady love because of the prevailing ideal of a social tradition which demands that in the presence of the children and guests, the lovers should, not only show no mutual resentment, but also welcome them really with their commingled hearts of love.

But in any ideal love, this extra marital relationship is certainly a blot, whatever social reasons may be advanced for its existence. Tiruvalluvar has condemned the institution of public women in his philosophy of government and society. If even high diplomacy and State policy cannot tolerate it, how can pure love find a place for it? Therefore, he does not bring in the public women for exemplifying the *marutam* aspect of Love. That is one of the major contributions of Valluvar. According to one commentary, the last five chapters deal with *marutam*; according to another the last four chapters alone deal with *marutam*. This *marutam* here is only the natural difficulty involved in two different personalities, nurtured under two different family environments, coming to commingle and to form a new creative family type. This fusion is not effected in a day. It is a slow process of give and take, sometimes giving rise to misunderstandings but only at the surface level.

IV

Love at first sight appears, as it were, as a flash of lightning. It is a kind of a revolution when the latent love becomes manifest, leading to physical changes and emotional involvements. This is *kurin̄ci*. This is absolutely a new experience. The physical beauty brings the unconscious attraction to the conscious level. It looks as though that some divine enchantment

is over-powering the lovers. The lover is dazed in mind. He feels it as a kind of divine experience; separation he feels, will be death. But he senses all the same a life-giving love, full of innocence and modesty, overflowing in the very look of the beloved. He stands almost intoxicated with that love, a hero of many wars but today succumbing to the loving beauty. Her furtive glance and subdued smile are hopeful where words avail nothing. Next follows the divine bliss of her embrace, a bliss which is a feast to all the senses, sweeter than the pleasures of the world of the lotus-eyed Lord, granting him such joys as he desires from every object whenever it is desired. It is not merely a physical pleasure. The very soul is rejuvenated and therefore it is a spiritual bliss. There is also the happiness of fulfilment very much similar to the joy of an ethical life of one who enjoys his allotted share, only after distributing his wealth to all those who deserve it. It is a bliss revealing not only new knowledge and wisdom but also an insight unknown even to his erstwhile rich experience and lofty education. Separation cannot be imagined by him; even a slight waft of the wind coming in between them cannot be tolerated.

V

This is the first experience. But such an experience cannot be continuous. There is the necessity for separation for various reasons. They have to retrain themselves for a new life, a new life of give and take. A complete concord has to be created avoiding all misunderstandings. It is this attempt with all its early failures and successes at mutual understanding leading ultimately to a deeper commingling of two personalities, that is looked upon as *ūṭal* or *marulam* by Tiruvalluvar. The conception is emphasised in the last five or four chapters. This is a new interpretation of *ūṭal* 'sulky mood'. Tiruvalluvar is not cutting himself away from the ancient tradition. He is interpreting it in a new way. There is reference to others loving the hero in Tirukkuṟaḷ. But that is not a fact but a kind of teasing of love by the heroine who thus emphasises how the hero has become the loving apple of the eye of all the world. It is from this point of view that the chapter on *pulavi manukkam* or the subtle bouderie, a chapter full of dramatic poetry, should be interpreted. This is indeed a new way of looking at *ūṭal*.

But the misunderstanding should not take a deeper root. It should not become hatred. The sulky mood makes the succeeding mood of love, a precious gain worthy of achievement by love. It makes the physical embrace intellectually great, as a new insight, mentally satisfying as resolving all conflicts, ethically glorious as a self-sacrifice and spiritually blissful as a commingling of souls. It should not descend to the level of mere carnal pleasure. The experience of love should be always fresh like the morning breeze. Sulky mood is a kind of a restraint. It reveals the depth of other's love through the other's keen suffering at the delay. It is like the precious salt giving taste to the food when added to it in right proportion. An over doze of salt, however, spoils the taste of food. A prolongation of the sulky mood amounts to torturing one who is already in agony. If loving embrace does not succeed the sulky mood, the withering creeper of love will be cut at its root. Therefore love without strife tastes stale like an over-ripe fruit; Love without sulkiness tastes sour like the unripe fruit. There is an ethical grandeur and a beauty of feminine perfection, when the flowery eyes of the beloved feign a sulky mood. But it is not easy to put up this show; the heart melts soon in love in the presence of the Lord. The sulky mood therefore is really an intellectual and physical struggle. Her modesty flies away in his presence. This is the substance of the chapter on '*neñcotu pulattal*' where the heroine condemns her failing heart. The final consummation of this glorious life of love is found in '*ūṭal uvakai*', 'The joy of the Sulky mood.' The complete understanding of each other, the deeper insight into other's nature, the resulting bliss of this identity of feeling and insight reveal the perfection reached by the lovers. He is free from defects. But the sulky mood pays rich dividend; for it reveals the depth of his love. Therefore there is no heaven greater than this sulky mood of love. In this competition of mutual sulky mood, those who are defeated really win the laurels of love. Bouderie is the charm of love; and the charm of that again is the sweet embrace.

This is the resolution of the conflicts when two different personalities, nurtured under two different environments and having two different physical and emotional developments come together for becoming complementary to each other.

VI

There is another kind of conflict raised by the social environment which demands separation and sacrifice in love, for the fulfilment of certain social duties, in war and in peace, in education and religion and for the fulfilment of certain family duties in earning the livelihood or wealth. This is *palai* or separation. This conflict is therefore different from the other conflict exhibited in *uṭal*. Here there is a sharing, a common sharing in suffering and sacrifice. Here the two hearts are drawn nearer and nearer to each other. There is always *uṇartal* or mutual insight and understanding. Thus *uṇartal* becomes perfect in both *pirital* and *uṭal*. *Pirital* is also an *uṭal* though with a difference. *Uṭal uṇartal* and *kūṭal* summarise the story of love. In the discharge of their duties they share the sufferings. Here therefore is exhibited love in all its glory, in all its pristine purity. Suffering, common suffering rather than happiness, is the majestic grandeur of tragedy and therefore this story of separation which has a touch of the tragic in it appeals to the human heart in a mysterious way. Akanānūru has fifty per cent of its verses describing this aspect of separation and suffering, whilst all other aspects of love share amidst themselves the remaining two hundred. According to Paripperumāḷ there are in Vaḷḷuvar eighteen chapters dealing with separation, whilst the first meeting is described in three chapters and *uṭal* in four chapters.

In other words *kurīñci* covers three chapters, *marutam* covers four chapters whilst fourteen chapters deal with separation. The question arises what happens to *mullai* and *neytal*. They must be deemed to be included under separation. *Palai* and *neytal* are two varying degrees of separation. *Mullai* often amounts to remaining at home and sharing the domestic and social duties; but sometimes it is exemplified in the sharing of duties and sufferings of social life which in that way separates them. This is the common sharing which is the characteristic feature of chaste love or *mullai*. Therefore *mullai* also reaches its perfection in a kind of separation, as it is evident in *Mullai-p-pāṭṭu*. According to my old teacher late Mr. Chelvakesavaraya Mudaliar an old copy which he had of the commentary by Maṇakkuṭavar divides the 25 chapters of *Kāmattuppāl* into 5 divisions of 5 chapters each. The first five

belong to *kurīñci*, the second five to *pālai*, the third five to *mullai*, the fourth five to *neytal* and fifth five to *marutam*. Therefore the chapters assigned to separation by Paripperumāḷ will cover *pālai*, *mullai* and *neytal*.

Though Paripperumāḷ tries to justify this three-fold division of Kāmattu-p-pāl on the basis of Vātsyāyana, he himself feels the force of objections to his own theory and therefore finally concludes that this threefold divisions of Kāmattu-p-pāl into union, separation and the sulky mood can be explained according to the Tamil convention itself—for *kūṭal*, *pīrital* and *ūṭal* are well known terms in the Tamil theory of love. Whatever it be, this way of looking at Tirukkuṛaḷ clearly brings out the psychological importance of this three-fold division in the development of a personality well integrated with family and society. Though Paripperumāḷ tells us this is a Tamil convention, such a convention finds its finest exemplification only in Tirukkuṛaḷ.

This is certainly much more elucidating than the older distinction between *kaḷavu* and *karpu* which is the division of the kāmattu-p-pāl according to Parimēlaḷakar. According to him the first seven chapters deal with *kaḷavu* and the remaining eighteen chapters deal with *karpu*. Parimēlaḷakar also feels that by *karpu* one has to understand here only separation. *Marutam* which implies, extra-marital relationship according to the old tradition is also in the opinion of Parimēlaḷakar a kind of separation from the lady-love. It is a nearer separation as contrasted with *pālai* which is a more distant separation. Therefore *mullai* and *neytal* also must be deemed to have been included under *pālai* or separation. It is very unfortunate that Parimēlaḷakar should bring in public women when Tirukkuṛaḷ does not justify such an interpretation. He misses the greatness of Vaḷḷuvar's contribution in reinterpreting *marutam* on a psychological basis. Parimēlaḷakar feels that Vaḷḷuvar follows the Sanskrit tradition in describing love, only in terms of union and separation and that therefore he has included *mullai*, *neytal* and *marutam* under *pālai* or separation which according to him is the characteristic feature of the major part of *karpu*. On the face of it, this is a forced interpretation. All these difficulties arise because it is not realised that there is an original contribution by Tiruvaḷḷuvar who in spite of his deep knowledge of the Tamil and Sanskrit traditions, cuts new

grounds as explained by Paripperumal. The importance of this distinction has already been emphasised.

VII

This new approach makes the very headings of chapters on separation illuminating. After the first embrace and union, the spiritually intoxicated lover gives expression to his experience of his beloved - her tenderness and modesty and her fresh beauty and charm which seem to put to flight the beauties of Nature. He thus praises in a highly imaginary poetry, the inner joy inspired by her. Then follows a much more restrained statement on the greatness of this Love. It is a commingling of complementary aspects of human personalities making life richer and sweeter, and really creating a new integrated life of the physical body and soul - a never - to - be - forgotten realisation of the union of two souls ever present in their eyes and hearts. Then follows the next stage where this Union has to be accepted by the world at large. Dharma and Love demand this and therefore there can be no sense of false shame. This is expressed in terms of the traditional language of *maṭal* where the hero in the face of the opposition from the parents of his lady proposes to cut away his body by being dragged on a horse - like vehicle shaped out of saw-like leaf stalks of the palmyra. From the point of view of the heroine there is the fear that their love is being suspected by the scandal mongers without the realisation by others of true love. This fortunately draws lovers together—a great psychological truth emphasised by Vaḷḷuvar. All along, the lovers though united between themselves stood separated from the world. But time comes when they have no separation because of the social duties—a separation which is felt slowly creeping into their life; it looks as though it spells death. Such is the depth of their love. But soon its necessity is realised though gradually, and therefore, there arises the conflict of emotions and wandering thoughts where the confidence in Love stands as though shattered. The body itself in spite of all her reasonings rebels against this separation, it becomes weak; the healthy colour fades; sleep refuses to come; the tears rush to the eyes. There is thus the conflict between restraining modesty and overpowering love - a conflict which corrodes her life. His thoughts in separation make her miserable and there is a cry of despair. And yet in spite of her seeming

condemnation of his love, her eyes long for the sight of the lover, but only to suffer greater pain ; and she speaks as though taking a revenge on this eye which gave her the sight of the beauty of her Lord. In a poetic way, she feels separated from her eyes, and seems to enjoy in a revengeful mood the miserable tears of the eyes. There is certainly a bit of madness even in this poetic effusion, which therefore shows the despondent mood. Then follows the fading of her beautiful colour which but speaks the inner suffering. She knows that the separation is something to be put up with ; but the heart refuses to listen to the dictates of the intellect. There succeeds the stage when she feels her isolation in a mood of suspicion, that the lover is not feeling the pangs of separation while discharging his duties. Coming out of this shell of isolation, the lovers give expression to their feeling of misery to others. Unlike liquor love is sweet even when recollected. Here again there are conflicting thoughts, about the other. Is he thinking of the love or is he restraining the thoughts of love ? How could anyone forget ? “ He will not be angry however I may think of him ” cries the lady. At the next stage, loving thoughts become so firmly rooted that even in dreams they occur and nature seems to restore the joy, at least in the dreams, but only to make the waking hours much more disappointing. This life of isolation is dreadful, and the lover looks around the beauties of nature, the calm and retiring evening when the whole world of lovers, the world of bees and birds, rush back to their sacred haven of a loving home, to be hugged in by their beloved. This increases by contrast her feeling of separation. What is heaven to others is to her a veritable hell and she condemns the evening time and all its beauties as messengers of death. Her body is still further weakened ; the eyes lose their lustre ; her shoulders become emaciated, the shoulders which embraced him now declare his faithlessness by losing the bangles which slip away. In her growing feeling of isolation, she withdraws into herself. In a mood of despair she speaks to her heart as though it were separate from her. Here again conflicting emotions are given expression to. A further stage is reached where unable to restrain the misery, she openly gives expression to her love as she had never done before. Her feeling of modesty can no longer restrain such open exhibition of love. The conflicts are being resolved, But this, at first takes the form a succumbing to the inevitable. She feels that her heart, her body and her eyes in spite of herself

hanker after him. The lover also rushes back to her. The separation makes their reunion as fresh as the first union. There is however the outside restraint. But the inner feelings transgress their bounds. This restraint makes the innocent charms of human nature, much more wonderful and beautiful. Her love is lying hidden in her smile like the fragrance locked up in the bud almost amounting a cunningness which is expressed through eyes. There is the pain of her love and she begs for relief. At the next stage their is hankering after embrace, where all thoughts of finding fault in the other, fly away. It is a kind of intoxication but a spiritual intoxication where one indulges in drinking even when one feels the evil effects of that intoxication. There is no hard heartedness in love. Even tenderer than a flower is love and few there be who know its delicacy and deal with it gently. Thus ends every thing in the embrace of love.

This summary at once reveals something new in *Akam* poetry. This is much more truthful to psychology and escapes from the tradition which often robs poetry of its charm.

After this resolution of the conflicts raised by social duties, follows the complete integration of the two personalities as described in terms of *m̄tal* and *kūtal*, already referred to. Thus is seen the original contribution of Vaḷḷuvar in describing the development of this integration though seemingly within the frame work of the older traditions.

The purists in Tamil have a bias against the word *kāmaṁ* which is according to them a Sanskrit word. Therefore, they would prefer the name *inpattu-p-pāl* instead of *kamattu-p-pāl*. There is also another reason, why *kāmaṁ* has suffered a kind of deterioration in its signification. The Jains and others believing in renunciation as the highest perfection reached by man, naturally condemned *kāmaṁ* as something demeaning. Cintāmaṇi, therefore, sings: '*kāmaṁ ilittipappattatanrē*', '*kāmaṁ* has been condemned as the meanest'. But this is not the ancient Tamil tradition which, as already hinted, Kapilar explained to an Aryan King. Tamil was there and elsewhere actually identified with this *kāmaṁ*. Gradually, in course of time, the opposition from the Buddhists and the Jains increased. Even the Vedic scholars joined in this onslaught on *kāmaṁ*. The poets of the Tamil tradition of a later age claim a unique greatness for this Caṅkam

theory of Love. *Tiṇaimālainūrraimpatu* according to an old verse was composed for beautifying this theory of love so that the hatred of those who oppose that theory may be appeased. There is a much more direct attack on this opposition hinted in *Paripāṭal* where the Tamilian conception of Love is contrasted with the theory of marriage as contemplated by the Vedic scholars. The main attack is concentrated on showing that the later life is not based on real Love. *Tiruvalluvar* knows nothing of such an opposition. Even if he had known such an opposition, he has purified the conception so much that no opponent can raise any valid objection to his theory of Love. It is because of this that *Jain* works like the commentary on *Nilakēci* claim *Tirukkuraḷ* as a Jain authority.

Therefore, in the age of *Tiruvalluvar* *kāma* was idealised. *Kāma* has been equated with Love and not with mere physical pleasures or lust. *Maṇakuṭavar* at first interprets *kāma* as *anpu*, though to satisfy the other view, he hastens to add it may mean also 'physical union'. It is the emphasis on Love even in the life of physical pleasures that is important in *Tirukkuraḷ*. It is not mere physical pleasure, but the elevating human love which is experienced through the five senses, that is *kāma*. It is therefore different from other material pleasures. As already stated, there is achieved here a spiritual and ethical grandeur. There is nothing demeaning in this *kāma* which as it were defies matter, mind and soul. One need not be ashamed of this *kāma* having its root in physical pleasures. One need not be apologetic and explain that *kāma* is only an aesthetic experience. Such an interpretation will not bring out the beautiful integration of the physical, mental, moral and spiritual personality of man - an integration which is emphasised in his own unique way by *Tiruvalluvar*. *Dr. Graul* and *Dr. Pope* at first were misled by the name of *kāmatuppāl* because in the later age the word *kāma* has become a synonym for lust. But when they were persuaded to read a portion of this *kāmatuppāl*, they at once realised, the unique greatness of this theory of Love which *Valluvar* describes from the highest pedestal ever reached by human perfection. One should, therefore, do nothing to disturb this unique greatness - a greatness which *Schweitzer* explains as the unique glory of the world - affirming philosophy of *Kuraḷ*.

Kāmaṃ is not *inṇaṃ*. *Inṇaṃ* is the final effect aimed at. But all pleasures cannot be glorified as revealing human perfection. That is why the ancient Tamilians, use the term *anṇin aintinai* "The five-fold human conduct of Love" emphasising the fundamental basis of Love which alone can glorify any happiness. The Tamilians equated this word *kāmaṃ* with *anṇu* in such places like *kāma-k-kūttam*. As contrasted with *anṇu* which is much more general, *kāmaṃ* means the love which the lovers feel towards each other. Tiruvaḷḷuvar uses the phrase *kāmatirku inṇaṃ* which differentiates between *kāmaṃ* and *inṇaṃ* as cause and effect. Love becomes a bliss in the right kind of sulky mood. Therefore to take *kāmaṃ* as a synonym of *inṇaṃ* is to miss the contribution of Vaḷḷuvar, in aiming at a complete integration of all the aspects of human life. It is because of this, the phrase *inṇa anṇu* "anṇu or Love which is Bliss" becomes so important even in the spiritual sphere as is evidenced by the use of the term by Cekkilaṛ in describing the final prayer of Kāraikkālammaiṃyār.

VIII

It will be thus clear, that Tiruvaḷḷuvar is nearer the Caṅkam tradition. There is another important aspect of Tirukkuṛaḷ which conclusively proves this standpoint. Caṅkam poetry has no narrative verse. It consists of dramatic monologues capturing the poetic moment in beautiful phrases of lightning flashes revealing the varied aspects of human love, either from the intrinsic or from extrinsic point of view. *Kāmatu-p-pāl* similarly consists only of dramatic monologues; there is no dramatic narration of any story. Therefore, according to that Caṅkam tradition, *Kāmatu-p-pāl* was divided under three headings. The first seven chapters consist of the dramatic monologues of Man. The next twelve chapters form the monologues of Woman. The remaining seven form the monologues of both the Man and the Woman. This is the division which is explained in a verse in Tiruvaḷḷuvamālai attributed to Mōcikiranār. Kāḷinkaṛ's commentary seems to follow this division as is made clear by his introduction to the chapter on *Pirivāṛṛāmai*, "Inability to bear separation." Even the other commentators point out by specifying the speaker under each one of the two hundred and fifty verses. This is enough to show that Tiruvaḷḷuvar is following the Caṅkam tradition and not any other tradition, though here again he has

made his unique contribution in having his chapters forming the rungs of his ladder of love.

IX

We have already referred to the theory that Tiruvaḷḷuvar owes his inspiration to Vātsyāyana. But as has been hinted even Paripperumāḷ admits that Tirukkuraḷ can be explained in terms of the Tamil tradition itself. Vātsyāyana writes a science on physical pleasures of lust. One has only to compare the headings of Vātsyāyana's works with the headings in *kāmattu-p-pāl*. *Kāmam* is not merely love according to Vātsyāyana. It is the pleasure of physical union even though love may be absent; and according to Vātsyāyana and others the woman embraced may be a virgin, a prostitute or a wife of another man. They are interested in stating facts without bringing in any question of values. But Tiruvaḷḷuvar is interested in describing the ideal. He has condemned the hankering after another man's wife as something which goes against Dharma and social well-being. It may give pleasure but he will never condescend to call it *kāmam*. He has condemned the institution of prostitutes in his theory of State and Society. The embrace of a prostitute is the embrace of a corpse according to him; for there is no living inspiration of love. As Paripperumāḷ has himself pointed out, Tiruvaḷḷuvar is interested in describing the idealised embrace of love based on Dharma and working for the social well-being. It is therefore to miss the very life of Tirukkuraḷ, if one were to identify Vātsyāyana's scientific approach with the normative approach of Tiruvaḷḷuvar. This is not to minimise the greatness of Vātsyāyana's contributions, but it is to emphasise the unique greatness of Tirukkuraḷ even as a *kāmasāstra*. Vaḷḷuvar is concerned with values and not with physical facts. This is not to deny that Vaḷḷuvar might have had knowledge of the Sanskrit *kāmasūtrap* and *kāmasāstras* even if we assume that Vātsyāyana was not earlier than Vaḷḷuvar; for the study of *kāmasūtras* can be assigned to a pre-Christian era. Nor is this to condemn Vaḷḷuvar as an idealist, losing touch with realities of the worldly life. The very fact that like the psychoanalysts, Vaḷḷuvar has seen the force of love and has made it therefore the foundation of his philosophy shows how practical he is, inspite of his concern for values and the ideal.

X

Whilst the psychoanalysts emphasise the unconscious, Tiruvalluvar helps one to reach the super-conscious, through sex. The definition of *anpu* is a relationship in which the persons do not love their own personalities at the expense of others which will be *acai*, but give freely to others. "*Uriyar pirarkku*" "They belong to others" reminds us of the Greek and Christian conception of *Philia* as contrasted with the Ego-centred eros and God-centred agape.

D' Arcy explains a conception of sex and love which makes Tiruvalluvar's theory much more lucid. "The culmination of all true love even in human experience is not only complete absence of the consciousness of self but the realisation of the universal in and through our particular passion. The closer one looks at the various manifestations of human love the more one is conscious of a congruity between spiritual love and sex. These various manifestations are not haphazard; they disclose a sequence as unified and progressive as a symphony of music by a great master. It is as if some presiding genius of the species were watching over the expression of love and regulating the human lottery.

"Sex proves to be the surest means of arousing and sustaining love. The permanence of the species is assured and at the same time the greatest variety of the individual encouraged. The vital energies allow themselves to be transformed into something spiritual. What was begun in carnality ends in heaven. What seemed to be mere animal breeding partakes of spirituality and what appears at first to be just a bodily function acquires a value of its own above even that of knowledge. So it came about that the vital energies can be enlisted in the service of the soul and the highest spiritual experience await those who are faithful to the institution of Nature. The art of loving is not in the least what the libertine tradition would have us believe. It is rather the Science of making the fleeting loves of youth endure and multiply in fresh waves of experience throughout the course of a loving human life. Love is no episode; it imposes itself like a divinely regulating inspiration and offering the promise of an undreamt of Perfection."

5. PORUṬPĀL

I

Poruṭpāl is *arīhasāstra*. Dharma has been described in terms of the individual developing his social and universal consciousness. As already explained the individual requires the proper environment not only in nature but also in society. In that way the science of society or government is intimately connected with Dharma. Dharma according to Tamilian conception of *vākai* is not only the discharge of the individual duties but also the duties of the status one occupies in the society. The latter are made clearer in *Poruṭpāl*. *Poruṭ* means wealth and the commentators explain that wealth is possible only in properly organised society; for otherwise might becomes the right instead of the right becoming the might.

Here also the Pan-Indian conception should be emphasised for understanding and appreciating the contributions of Tiruvaḷḷuvar. The theory of State and Society is described under several heads which are called *saptāṅga* or the seven limbs of state viz. the king, the ministry, the army, the finance, the fortification, the country or citizens and the allies. The Kuraḷ “*paṭai kuṭi kūḷ amaiccu natṭu arañ arum uṭaiyān aracarul ēru.*” (381) “He is the lion amongst the Kings who is the Lord of all the Six viz. Army, Citizens, Finance, Ministry, Allies, Fortifications” accepts this theory as the basis.

II-(a)

The king is called Swamin, which Vaḷḷuvar translates it as “*uṭaiyān*”. But even here there is a distinction. He gives the pre-eminent place to the king or the sovereign to whom all the other six become limbs thus bringing out the full force of the term Swamin. The king therefore is not considered as a mere limb of the state. This is made clear by Parimēlaḷakar who includes all the other six under *Anka-v-iyal*. In this way, the conception of sovereignty becomes clearer. Often Tiruvaḷḷuvar uses the abstract terms like *vēntu* and *aracu* which still further emphasise this point of view in the eyes of the modern reader. The term *irai* is significant because it connotes a power all pervasive in the State. Vaḷḷuvar also calls it *oḷi* (light)

which reigns even when the king sleeps. It is the Dharma of the government or society whose concrete representation is looked upon as the king. It is the old theory of the Cankam age which sings, "Food is not the life nor the water; the great expanse of the world has for its life only the king." This may suggest the divine right of the king. But what is emphasised is rather the duties of the king than his rights. He is the custodian of Dharma; he is fearless and full of unsullied military honour; he is wise and educated; he is firm; he is never negligent, always bubbling up with enthusiasm. In all these ways he removes *Adharma* from his kingdom. He has no likes and dislikes of his own. He is easier of access to his citizens. He knows no harsh words. He is full of sweet words; he is munificent and thus gives gracefully, though ruling firmly. He welcomes good advice even when it is personally bitter. He is just and upright; he is full of mercy; he exists for protecting the citizens and the State. He develops the resources of his kingdom, through production and thus amasses wealth through protecting it and distributes it justly. Therefore this king is not only the Lord of Justice but also the great expert in the economics of the common weal; he is full of ideals, personal greatness and popularity. Therefore the king is the ideal man from the social point of view which emphasises all the six limbs of the State.

(b)1

The characteristic features enumerated are important as being supremely human. Here one notices the distinction between Tiruvalluvar's approach and the approach of the other authorities on *arthasāstra*. Others explain and discuss the various aspects of society and government in terms of statecraft and diplomacy. They have the values of their own. But Valluvar's approach is much more fundamental. He discusses all the intricate problems of the State and Society from the basic and common human point of view. In describing the qualifications and attainments of a king, others discuss what kind of education is necessary for a king. Is it economics or law or military science? But Valluvar does not enter into any such discussion. He never forgets that the king or for that matter any officer of State is a human being. Man differs from beast because of education which opens the eyes that can read through

and understand the force of symbols. There is a joy in the company of the learned. Education makes the hidden knowledge within man to well forth like the water from a spring. The learned become the citizens of the universe; and man therefore becomes greater and greater through this life-long process of education. It is not mere acquisition of knowledge that is education, however thorough it may be. Real education consists in living what has been learnt so as to be a standing example to others. It is then that he becomes the universal man realising that others also enjoy in the intellectual world what he himself enjoys. Vaḷḷuvar once again emphasises this important, fundamental human education from the negative point of view. Physical beauty without this life-giving education is nothing more than a well-decked puppet of clay. In the absence of universal consciousness intended by universal education, good fortune itself becomes much more harmful to the world. Noble birth itself becomes futile in the absence of education.

(b)2

In the absence of education one may be well informed; nothing is more life-giving than the feast offered by the great who expound to the ear, a feast sweeter than ambrosia. The words of the great are like a walking-stick to those treading on slippery grounds. It is the subtler intelligence and deeper insight which find expression in the real humility of the speech of the great.

(b)3

This kind of training leads to the development of the real wisdom which becomes the greatest fortress. Here again Vaḷḷuvar describes wisdom not in terms of the king but in terms of all human beings. If all these are necessary for an ordinary man, how much more are they indispensable to a king. That is the way he looks at these great political problems. Wisdom is no slave of the roaming mind. It withdraws from evil. That which directs towards good is real wisdom. Whatever be said and by whomsoever, wisdom is democratic enough to discern the truth therein. The wise man is no pedant. He makes the most subtle ideas clearer to the common man. The wise man identifies this with world and society; for that is the greatness of wisdom. He reads correctly the future. How can such a man be

disappointed? He is fearless but shudders at things to be feared morally. Wisdom is therefore the greatest of wealth. One who has achieved this perfection of knowledge and wisdom knows how to behave in a State; state-craft is crystal clear to his discerning and loving mind. He always takes the tried counsel of the great and he is never lured by deceptive profit. The great always judge aright the strength of the enemy and their own strength, their limitations of force and wealth; theirs is the path of the golden mean; they know the proper time for action and also the proper place therefor. When they want, the service, wisdom and knowledge of others help them to choose aright those who care for the State and Society rather than who care for individual salvation, religious fanaticism, individual aggrandisement or individual pleading as against the Social Welfare. Within the context of Tirukkural *upadhā* should be interpreted in this way and not in a Machiavellian sense. The great do not seek the impossible. There is no man who is flawless and therefore amidst the faults and merits they choose one with the greater merit, on the basis of the others' action which is one's own greatness especially when the other has experienced the responsibility of social and family life. They choose only after deep consideration and thereafter they are no more in any doubt; they are men of action and not mere theorists; they manage the affairs, improve the resources; increase the wealth and scrutinise all the obstacles to progress. One must know who can accomplish and what; and then one should entrust that duty to him. Man should be ever watchful over the actions of his subordinates.

(b)4

In all these ways the practical knowledge and wisdom, education and experience prove useful to man in general in all walks of life and therefore they are equally applicable to the king, in whom these general principles have to be interpreted so as to suit his needs and duties, his rights and privileges.

(c)1

Val̥uvar speaks of the king; and in his age monarchy must have been the rule. But because the author is emphasising the fundamental human ideals, his chapters though intended for monarchy are found suitable much more than anything else, to

democracy which emphasises the basic human virtues and therefore the equality of men. Vaḷḷuvar might not have contemplated a democracy but his basic human approach makes his work best fitted for democracy and democratic government.

(c)2

Man possesses not only knowledge and activity but also a heart. All these three faculties in him have to avoid the evil tendencies, pride, anger, lust, parsimony, a false sense of honour, a futile joy, neglect of duty, self-conceit. One must guard against these weaknesses ever so small they be. One must realise one's own faults before one finds faults in others.

(c)3

In this sphere of political development, the company of the great who are virtuous and wise and who guard others from present and future evil is the greatest help. In their absence, one hastens to his fall. "Water alters and takes the character of the soil through which it flows: even so the mind takes up the colour of the company with which it consorts." The greatness of the mind is really the greatness of the company it keeps. Therefore the evil company should be avoided. Tiruvaḷḷuvar is never satisfied merely with good results. According to him the action which leads to the result should be pure. Purity of action and purity of mind depend upon the purity of association.

(c)4

Tiruvaḷḷuvar never forgets the heart. Some authorities on *arthasāstra* will look upon even sons as dangers. But Vaḷḷuvar, as pointed out by Pariti believes in the efficacy of old attachment remaining with unchanging love even in adversity. Vaḷḷuvar points out to the crow which shares its prey without concealing it. A sweet tongue and a liberal hand with absence of anger, gather kinsmen all around.

(c)5

Even when rendering justice, one must be equitable and merciful. *Kaṇṇōttam* is grace or considerateness. It is not restricted as *Parimēlalakar* will have it to those who are already known to one. Paritiyār will translate it as *kirupai*. "They that of eyes which are not moved to graciousness are like trees that

are rooted at the soil." But this does not affect one's discharge of duty. This *kannōṭṭam* is praised as *nakarikam* in *Narrai* and this precious conception is accepted by *Vaḷḷuvar*. "Those who desire to be styled the very pink of courtesy will drink off even the poison, that has been mixed for them before their own eyes."

(c)6

To render justice in an upright way to a friend and foe alike or punish the evil-doers for protecting the citizens is no blame; that kind of justice is inspired by a loving heart rushing to help the society, however unpalatable that duty may be. It is like rooting out the weeds to help the crops. It is this justice and righteous punishment that make the society rich and contented. One should not, therefore, ever be negligent in the discharge of social duty.

(c)7

But one must remember that this power of judgement and punishment should not be misused. A tyrant is a murderer. The tears of groaning citizens wear away the tyrant's prosperity. Therefore the king must be full of compassion. The country becomes a desert and people become uncivilised when the ruler is a tyrant.

(c)8

Even when one inflicts a righteous punishment, it should not be frightful; it should be proportionate to the wrong committed. Though reverence for the personality of the criminal demands proportionate punishment, the aim of punishment should be to deter one from continuing a crime. But this can be satisfied if the punishment seems to be excessive though not so in reality, which is all that is necessary for the punishment being deterrent. Therefore in *Tiruvalluvar's* theory of punishment the principles of equality, reformation and prevention are emphasised. It is ultimately governed by love and sweet words. A frightful punishment engendered by an angry mood affects the prosperity of the State.

(d)

The necessity for watchfulness and the avoidance of negligence have already been emphasised. The Tamil State of those times

had a system of spies. It is necessary even in the interest of justice to know the truth about all people - the relatives, the enemies and the employees of the king. A spy is successful when he inspires no suspicion, and therefore he should not be honoured publicly. The spy should not merely remain in doubt. Even the spy has to be spied and the king tests one spy by another spy and finally acts only when three spies, unknown to each other, agree in making a statement. Vaḷḷuvar here makes the systems of spies justifiable because the spies form the very eye of the king.

(e)

The king is devoted to and enthusiastic in the performance of his duties. This enthusiasm is real wealth. One is great in proportion to devotion to work. The joy of munificence is denied to those who are not inspired by this devotion. Laziness is its negative aspect. It destroys the whole family. Procrastination; forgetfulness, languor and sleep are the four festive boats that tempt and lead the ill-fated to destruction. Therefore Vaḷḷuvar emphasises as a precious possession the ceaseless effort and perseverance. There is nothing impossible to perseverance. The glory of social benevolence abides in ceaseless effort. Such a man does not hanker after pleasures but lusts for work. Perseverance by-passes fate itself. In that path of perseverance man stands undaunted by opposition and failure. He laughs at misfortunes; and flood-like sorrows vanish away before such a wise man. He finds pleasure in pain, for he considers misery to be natural to man

(f)

This portrait of a king is really a portrait of an ideal man, full of wisdom, full of heroism, full of munificence, always inspired by the high ideals of love and justice. Vaḷḷuvar has followed other authorities. He has probably adopted the conception of *upātai* and espionage. But Vaḷḷuvar's State is the State of love, kinship, compassion and justice, all of which increase the wealth, prosperity and peace of the society. It is not a world of mutual suspicion. The importance of *kaṇṇōṭṭam* 'considerateness' and *curram talāl* "bringing within one's kind hold his relatives" cannot be exaggerated. Here arises the importance of a study of Kauṭilya for comparison. The emphasis on purity of action is something unique in Vaḷḷuvar. We must also emphasise his theory of punishment which seems to be almost

modern, inspired by love and human consideration, though he does not go to the extent of looking upon criminals as suffering from disease as some of the modern criminologists do. The emphasis on *vēlanmai* and munificence which were emphasised in *aram* should lead us to see the interconnection between *aram* and *poruḷ*. *Aram* is the very basis of *poruḷ* as well. As we shall see presently *poruḷ* is intended only as a suitable environment for the perpetuation of Dharma.

III

(a)

The six limbs of the State, according to Parimālaḷakar are discussed in thirty two chapters. Of these the first ten deal with the ministers. The picture of the ideal man will certainly apply to all officers of State and to citizens. A minister is great for the choice of means, season and action and is skilled in the execution of rare enterprises. He is undaunted in his resoluteness. He is ever bent upon protecting the subjects. He is a learned man and has great perseverance. He is a great diplomat in international politics bringing about union and disunion in that field as he likes. His comprehension of the situation is faultless. He performs the proper action through such comprehension in the best manner possible, and his advice is always the best. Yet with all this he never swerves from Dharma. His words are full of weight; he knows the world of books. He has a subtle intuitive knowledge and he understands fully well the current waves of the world. He is fearless in giving his advice.

(b)1

In the description of the ministers who include ambassadors, Valluvar emphasises the importance of oratory or speech. Probably it was a society which relied on learned assemblies and councils, in local and central government. There is a chapter on *colvanmai* "the power of speech", another on *avai-y-arital* "understanding the audience" and a third on *avai-y-añcāmai* "one's fearlessness of the audience". These are worthy of study by members of assemblies of the modern world as emphasising higher ideals whilst at the same time giving us practical hints. The chapter on *tūtu* or ambassador also emphasises the powers of

speech in addition to loving nature, high birth, manners that captivate princes, knowledge of politics, scholarship, personality, natural wisdom, fearlessness and understanding of the right time and place.

(b)2

It is important to note that Tiruvaḷḷuvar here insists¹ on *tāymai* or purity even in the diplomacy of the ambassador along with boldness or fearlessness and truthfulness. The ambassador should also be capable of winning the support of foreign ministers. Friendship, truthfulness, fearlessness and purity are, as already seen, the marks of a man of Dharma. Therefore the diplomacy that Vaḷḷuvar contemplates, is a dharmic one.

(c)

There are certain advices given in the chapters on *manṇarai-cērntolukal* "behaviour of one attached to the king" and on *kuripparital* "comprehending the mind or the idea of the king" which are important for even the modern government servant. "Avoid all graver feelings so as to avoid suspicion. Do not covet things desired by the superior. Be neither too near nor too far from your superior. Avoid whispered words and interchange of smiles in his presence. Be not inquisitive to know his disposition. Seek the right time and suggest the desirable in a pleasing manner. Honour his splendour. Even with friends, avoid unseemly things. Read the mind without any doubt in the face-especially in the eye which reflects the mind whether in anger or joy." These valuable advices are enough to prove Vaḷḷuvar's deeper concern with the practical world.

(d)1

The ministers form the executive body of the State. There are various ways of executing a policy or an act. "Decide and then act without delay. Delay where you must; but delay not where you should not. Act in all ways and that in a feasible way changing the means if need be. But do not leave any act unfinished. Act without any clouded thought on your resources, the means, the opportune time, place, and action, only after considering the aim, the obstacles and the ultimate gain. The best way to perform an act begun is to know its secret, from one who knows it. Undertake an act which will in turn accomplish

another, like making one rutting elephant capture another. Alliance of one's foes may be better than doing a good turn to the friends. The chances of reconciliation with superior foes should be welcomed." These advices therefore cover both the internal and external policy. The means and ends should be both weighed in the cause of peace and success.

(d)2

What is important in all these matters of action is firmness in action which is really the firmness of mind. This alone leads to all glory. "For the firm in mind achieve all that they design. Avoid failures; but once an act is undertaken do not be foiled by obstacle. Do not proclaim an act except by successfully terminating it; for, speech is easy whilst action is difficult. Resolve and then waver not in acting with vigour what will yield pleasure and profit in the end, even if falsity and troubles beset you to start with. The world welcomes none but those who are firm in action."

(d)3

This firmness had been emphasised by all authorities on *arthasāstra*. Living as we do in the Gandhian India, what is much more interesting and significant in Tiruvalluvar is that for him the means must be as pure and desirable as the end itself. The end will not justify the means in his theory. That is the great message of his chapter on *Vinai-t-tūymai*, "The purity of action."

The means should be pure in the sense of being in accordance with Dharma and of winning fame of the right type. "Avoid" therefore he says, "actions which bring neither good nor fame. If you care to be glorious, avoid things that may tarnish your good name. Good allies bring prosperity; but good actions yield everything desired, even if you suffer. Resist from mean things. Never do any act for which you will repent thereafter. The pinching poverty is preferred by the great to the disreputable wealth. Wealth achieved by making others shed tears vanish, making the winner shed tears in return. But good actions causing no injury to others except to oneself, ultimately prove a blessing in disguise. Therefore success through forbidden deeds causes but ultimate sorrow. To lay by wealth through deceit and evil means, is to preserve water in a pot of clay that is not baked."

Vaḷḷuvar makes it clear further that the end does not justify the means. "Even for appeasing the hunger of your mother do not perform anything condemned by the great." This is certainly not in accordance with *Āpaḍ Dharma* preached by Bhiṣmācārya on his death bed to the dharmic Pāṇḍavas. It is clear that Vaḷḷuvar goes against this kind of thought. Even if it were to be shown that, this is not his original contribution, his work is unique in having chosen this theory of purity of action as against *Āpaḍ-Dharma*.

IV (a)

Finance is the mainspring of all actions in a state and society. Vaḷḷuvar realises that wealth makes even worthless things full of worldly value, so much so the poor are despised and the wealthy are honoured irrespective of their other solid virtues. Wealth is an unfailing lamp reaching all dark corners and dispelling all enmity. Therefore one should amass wealth; for, then only any undertaking removed from all dangers, becomes romantic, even as one joyfully witnesses the elephant fight when safe on a distant hill. Wealth is the steel that saws through the pride of your enemies. Once wealth is achieved, *poruḷ* and *kāmaṁ* become an easy gain. Therefore the king enriches his treasury through escheat, through tax and through tributes from enemies' lands. This is indeed worldly wisdom.

(b)

But the dharmic Vaḷḷuvar will not be true to his name, if he does not insist on enriching treasury through virtuous means. Only that wealth amassed through a conscious pursuit of virtuous means and without foul practices that will beget Dharma and Kama. That is the significance of the phrase "*poruḷ eṇṇuṁ poyyā viḷakkam*" 'Wealth which is the light of truth'. "Touch not the wealth that is not gathered through compassion and love". It is in that world of higher values that compassion which is the child of love is reared by the cherishing nurse of wealth. It is thus clear that Vaḷḷuvar emphasises the purity of the means of attaining wealth, a purity which is at once Dharma and Love.

V (a)

Vaḷḷuvar agrees with other authorities on *arthasastra*, that, ultimately force is the basis of sovereignty when internal peace

and external freedom are in danger. Therefore it is the chief wealth of the king. Army is an ancient institution with a long tradition which alone remains undaunted even when repulsed, and which rushes against even the Lord of Death, with a boldness, military pride, traditional chivalry and trustworthiness. The army thus protects peace and prosperity, both within and without, by its supreme self-sacrifice in the cause of the culture represented by the State or Sovereign.

(b)

After singing the glories of the army, Vaḷḷuvar gives us a glimpse of the justifiable pride of a heroic army. In the best tradition of Caṅkam literature here also we get the dramatic monologues. This suggests a thought that perhaps that whole of the Kuraḷ can be looked upon as a series of monologues, but the difficulty is that it is not possible for us at this distant time to imagine the proper context for each of the Kuraḷ as a dramatic monologue.

(c)

The warriors aim at unique greatness. It is glorious, even if you miss, to aim at an elephant rather than at an hare even if you succeed. Glorious valour, *pēr-aṇmai* is really *ūr-aṇmai* 'the generosity to the country' when some danger threatens it. This explains that what appears to be man slaughter on the battle-field is nothing but the expression of the supreme sacrifice of love in the cause of an ideal society, *ūr-aṇmai*. This is also the meaning of the Kuraḷ '*aṟattir-kē aṇpu cārpenpa ariyar maṟattir-kum maṟṟ aḷṭē tuṇai*'. "They say that love is the basis of Dharma alone. They do not know it is equally the basis of heroism" The commentators, however, have interpreted *ūr-aṇmai* in different ways either as generosity to the fallen or as refusing to wield the sword against the weak or as crushing down the enemy's onslaught. Unfortunately these interpretations do not bring out the dharmic aspect of the army inspired by love. Even if the king were to prohibit, the real warrior will not desist from his duty. Even at the moment of death the warrior enjoys the opportunity of his doing his mite for the great cause. "The heroic death on the battle-field is so precious that one may pray for it as the greatest boon; for it brings tears in the eyes of all those who have protected him; for he dies for them all,"

VI

(a)

Vaḷḷuvar passes on to consider international relationship under the term *naṭṭu* which, as the commentators point out, he discusses from its positive and negative aspects.

(b)

In the treatment of this intricate problem of diplomacy, he shows his greatness which arises again from his basic human approach. If universal love should be a permanent achievement for all, international fellowship should be achieved in all the States of the world coming to live as a family of friendly States. Looked at thus, what has to be aimed at is nothing more than what every human being knows as friendship in his wordly relationship with others. Therefore though Vaḷḷuvar discusses international fellowship, the chapters seem to suggest, because of this fundamental approach, that he, as it is were, dealing with the individual friendship of men. The value of this approach in making the abstruse diplomacy clear to and understandable by the ordinary man in the street cannot be easily exaggerated. It is only when the common man understands and appreciates the necessity for international fellowship that it can be really established in this world.

(c)

“True friendship hastens to relieve the distress as readily as the hand of the man whose garment has slipped away.” This is a truth any man will appreciate. Vaḷḷuvar enriches this conception by his own experience. “Like the beauty of a book revealing newer depths and pleasures every time it is studied anew; friendship reveals unexpected depths and sweet aspects at every new contact.” It is not contact which is necessary in international fellowship, for instance; it is the identity of feelings which alone creates the right to friendship. Such a friendship grows day after day like that of the waxing crescent moon. The dharmic aspect is emphasised when Vaḷḷuvar asserts that friendship is not for pleasant contact, but for harsh advice when one swerves from the path of virtue. “Reflect before you decide on friendship. The old allies have a sweetness of their own, especially when there is an identity of feeling, welcoming even their offences towards them. But the friendship of selfish men

has an eye only on profit. It never helps one ; so is the intimacy of the fools. Bitter indeed is the relation of those who say one thing in private and another in public and who do something else in action. There is also the outward friendship without any inner contact ; they are the dissemblers with a smile on their face but a hatred within their heart. The folded hands of such an enemy, even in an attitude of devotion may conceal a weapon."

(d)1

There are twelve chapters which Maṅakuṭavar and Paripperumāḷ will classify as *tunṇa-v-iyal* or that part which deals with the sorrows of the State. But Parimēlaḷakar rightly includes them all under *naṭṭu*. He feels it is the negative aspect of *naṭṭu* which is enmity that is emphasised according to the Pan-Indian theory of State. *Tunṇa-v-iyal* according to him has no separate place. International fellowship may be affected by the individual faults of the statesmen or kings. Therefore these faults have to be looked upon as the internal enemies within one's own mind.

According to Paripperumāḷ, the first eight chapters herein relate to dangers which arise because of others ; the last five chapters describe the miseries caused by one's own acts and tendencies. Parimēlaḷakar relies upon the three basic defects in man viz ignorance, attachment and hatred. Foolishness and what is more intolerable, the fools' pretention of wisdom arise because of ignorance. 1. Malice, 2. inciting hatred, 3. the various aspects of enmity, 4. internal enmity, and 5. the misbehaviour towards the great are the five evils flowing from hatred. 1. Being a henpecked husband, 2. living with prostitutes, 3. intoxication, 4. gambling and 5. disease which can be cured only by medicine, arise from one's attachments to desires.

(d)2

Foolishness binds the harmful and loses the good ; it aspires for the forbidden or the impossible. The fool may be great but does not govern himself. He does not know good conduct and ultimately gets himself fettered. Shamelessness, indifference (to right and wrong) callousness and aversion (from what is desirable) - these are the marks of a fool.

(d)3

" The fool, proud of his wisdom is a greater danger. Foolishness is the greatest poverty. The real nakedness of foolishness

is not covered by that fool who covers only the nakedness of his body. He knows nothing wise and he does not follow other's advice. He is a plague unto himself till death. Wisdom feels its identity with the world, but foolishness is the evil spirit which goes against the world." It will be thus seen that Valluvar does not forget the emphasis on universal consciousness.

(e)1

Malice fosters the evil of disunion among all creatures. It is the greatest disease. Fame comes in only when it is cured. It is the misery of miseries. Hatred leads to all miseries; and friendship leads to all that is good.

(e)2

Next come the innate tendencies and activities which multiply enmities, when there is no love, when there is no friendship, when there is no enjoyment, when there is nothing but fear, ignorance, miserliness and disagreement with others. A man then is full of anger. He keeps no secrets; he does not care for infamy; he has no good qualities; his excessiveness in lust is very marked. Such a one is an easy prey to his enemies. "His enmity is surely to be purchased even at some cost."—so think the politicians.

(e)3

Next follow the varieties of enmity incited and developed. Even in jest, enmity should not be desired. Never incur the hatred of those whose ploughs are words. He is mad who creates many enemies whilst the world abides in him who turns hatred into friendship.

(e)4

Then there is the concealed enmity which pretends to be friendship till the opportunity comes in for attack. "Avoid this secret enmity arising among the kindred. After this secret enmity, there can be no reunion. The association with such enemies is like living with a cobra."

(e)5

The greatest hatred kindled results from insulting the Great-great in power, physical and material. To incite them into hatred

is like beckoning the god of Death. One can escape fire but not the hatred of the Great.

(f)1

To follow the advice of a wise wife is different from becoming a slave to her lust. What she cannot do openly she gets it done through her henpecked husband who is indeed a great shame to society. He is afraid of doing any good deed. The modest woman herself is more dignified than the manliness of him who is slave to her lust. There is no Dharma, Artha, or Kāma for him.

(f)2

An attachment to a prostitute is much worse for what she desires is not love but money. Her embrace is an embrace of unknown corpse. Those who seek universal love will not fall a prey to the worthless charms of harlots.

(f)3

“Intoxication makes one mean enough even in the eyes of one’s own mother. What foolishness that one should purchase unconsciousness thus! Those who drink liquor drink but poison.”

(f)4

Gambling is another great evil inspired by desire. The gain from gambling is the baited iron-hook which the fish swallows. Gambling leads to misery and destroys all reputation.

(f)5

Diseases cripple a man. Gluttony is the greatest evil. Eat only when you feel hungry and even then not in excess. Moderation here as elsewhere is the greatest virtue. Otherwise man becomes a prey to infinite diseases. How can social virtues thrive; how can social duties be performed when one cannot be himself healthy?

(g)

In all these ways the social duties require certain individual restraint and perfection. Here again one sees the intimate connection between Dharma and Artha. It is significant that this individual perfection is emphasised under the topic of

international relationship. Here again it will be seen that Valluvar's approach is from the ordinary human point of view. The ordinary man has to guard himself against these evils. How much more is the necessity on the part of the leader of a state, for warding off these dangers !

VII

(a)1

The theory of the State is that its sovereignty resides in the Head of the State who is an ideal man ; he relies upon the Executive council of ministers full of dharma, knowledge and executive control. The sovereignty ultimately depends on the force of an army for keeping the peace within and from defending the country from others. The State builds up its treasury for the sake of culture, State and society. It occupies a specified and well defined geographical region, well fortified in peace and war. The State is full of worthy citizens. It remains in international relationship with the other States of the world.

(a)2

We have discussed all the limbs of the State except (1) *aran* or fortification and (2) *kuṭi*. In the *arthasāstras* sometimes the geographical region is emphasised and sometimes the citizens who occupy that geographical area are emphasised. There is a chapter called *nāṭu* in Tirukuraḷ and the commentators have interpreted this to refer to one of the six limbs. According to some of them, *nāṭu* has to be equated with *kuṭi*. But unfortunately some of the commentators like Maṅakkuṭavar themselves refer to the thirteen concluding chapters in *poruṭpāl* as *kuṭi-y-iyal*. In the opening verse, Tiruvaḷḷuvar speaks of *kuṭi* and not of *nāṭu* and therefore *kuṭi-y-iyal* must deal with *kuṭi*. There is the older tradition preserved in Tiruvaḷḷuva mālai where the verse (26) attributed to Pōkkiyār gives the following arrangement of *poruṭpāl*. First twenty five chapters deal with the King ; next ten with the ministry ; next two deal with fortification ; the next one chapter deals with finance ; the succeeding two with army ; the next seventeen with *naṭpu* or international relationship ; and the last thirteen with *kuṭi*. According to this tradition, the last thirteen chapters deal with *kuṭi* or citizens. Again, according to this tradition, both the chapters on *nāṭu* and *aran* deal with

fortification. This is very significant. Kāliṅkar also follows this tradition. He interprets *nāṭu* 'the country' as *nāṭṭaran* 'the fortification of the country' and *aran* as the fortified city. A contented and prosperous country is the best fortified place.

(a) 3

We have seen the conception of the limbs of State. Vaḷḷuvar speaks of the limbs of a country viz.. the flowing rivers, the rich mountains, the rain-fed reservoirs and strong forts. He also speaks of the five beauties of a country viz. wealth, natural yield, happiness, safety and absence of disease. Nature, Capital and Labour are there and the people believe in just distribution after production and accumulation of wealth. The country is free from faction, internal enemies and civil war. There is no chronic hunger, incurable disease or ravaging enemy. All these emphasise that peace and prosperity are the greatest fortification for an extensive country.

(b)

But within this geographical boundary we have fortified places, which are the cities. It is this kind of fortification apart from the fortification of peace and culture that is discussed in the chapter on *aran*. A fortress is an offensive and defensive contrivance. It is full of waters, mountains, forest and a fortification of earth. The fortification has height, thickness, solidity and impregnability. It has an extensive space but the places to be guarded are small. It cannot easily be attacked. It is full of food; it is easy to defend. It has everything within it. Above all it has the warrior to defend in times of need. It cannot be overthrown either by a regular siege or by storm or by treachery.

(c)

Here are two important things to be noted. The one is that Vaḷḷuvar speaks of prosperity and peace of the country as a great fortification. This is a truth whose importance is being slowly realised in modern times. The second is that its description of actual fortification is not as detailed as in other *arthasāstras* like Śukranīti. That reveals to us another characteristic feature of Tirukkuraḷ. He emphasises only the basic principles. But one cannot build a fort with the help of Tirukkuraḷ. For that, we must go to practical hand books on fortification. This is true of

all aspects of statecraft discussed by Tiruvaḷḷuvar. Nobody can with the help of Tirukkuraḷ alone govern a State or levy a number of taxes or organise a secretariat or an army in the practical world. For that we require in addition the Board Standing orders, the criminal and the civil Codes and numerous Manuals with detailed rules and regulations. Some of these rules and regulations are found in works like Kauṭilya's Arthasāstra, Śukraniti and Manu Dharma Sāstra. They are in that way of greater practical importance than Vaḷḷuvar. But unfortunately their practical instructions and details are no longer valid. They have become antiquated. That is why Tiruvaḷḷuvar refuses to deal with these ever changing details. He concentrates himself on the unchanging realities of human nature and the eternal verities of life which are eternal ideals. In this way what at first sight appears a defect, from the practical side, becomes Vaḷḷuvar's eternal glory. Here again it is the Pan-Indian background that suggests this unique greatness of Tiruvaḷḷuvar.

VIII

(a)

One may conclude this study with a discussion on the last part of *poruṭṭpal*. Parimēlaḷakar has interpreted *kuṭi* as *nāṭu*. He has taken the chapter on *nāṭu* to refer to this limb of the State viz. *kuṭi*. For one thing Vaḷḷuvar uses the specific term *kuṭi* and not *nāṭu* in the opening Kuraḷ of *poruṭṭpal*. Secondly all except Parimēlaḷakar call the last part *kuṭi-y-iyal*. Thirdly the old tradition preserved in Tiruvaḷḷuva mālai is very specific that this last part of the book deals with the limb of the state referred to as *kuṭi* in the opening Kuraḷ. Fourthly it has already been explained, according to the old tradition, that the Chapter on *nāṭu* along with that on *aran* refer to a beautiful conception of fortification. If this is correct *kuṭi* remains to be explained only in this last part.

According to Parimēlaḷakar, however, there is nothing more to be explained and therefore he feels that the last part is a miscellaneous one, where subjects not elsewhere dealt with are discussed. Apart from the fact that this kind of treatment is against all tradition, it misses the great contribution of Vaḷḷuvar. This last part of *poruṭṭpal* according to tradition should be taken

as dealing with *kuṭi*, the citizens who make up the State. This purpose of the State is fulfilled only when the citizens become perfect human beings. Because of the perfection spoken of here, Parimēlaḷakar is misled into thinking that this portion is miscellaneous in that it mentions the greatness of human beings, a greatness to be achieved by all the limbs of the State. Since all the limbs of the State from the basic point of view are human beings and citizens, there is no necessity for calling this part a miscellaneous section or *olīpiyal*.

In the modern conception especially in the democratic world, the State exists for the peoples' welfare, which is interpreted by Tiruvaḷḷuvar in the widest sense of the term as including the human perfection described in *arattu-p-pāl*. Taking it in this sense, *poruṭpāl* becomes subsidiary to *arattu-p-pāl* in that it creates the proper environment, social and material, for the achievement of such a perfection. All the other limbs of the State are the trustees, if we were to use a term Mahatma Gandhi has used for his purpose; and the citizens are the beneficiaries. Others exist for the sake of the citizens for making the latter live a perfect human life. It is this conception of Tiruvaḷḷuvar which has suggested to Kampan the idea that the real soul or life of the State consists of the citizens whilst all other limbs of State represented by the king, as the concrete embodiment of sovereignty, form but the body which provides the means and forms the source of all kinds of enjoyment for that life. The very fact that the citizens are described in terms of perfection at the end of *poruṭpāl* shows that the citizens form the crown and glory of the State. This is the greatest contribution Tiruvaḷḷuvar makes and it is unfortunate that Parimēlaḷakar's commentary misses the importance of this part of the book.

(b)

The first chapter in *kuṭi-i-yal* emphasises the high birth. It has no reference to any caste or community. In India as in ancient China, family is the cradle for all human perfection. Mother's love and the responsibilities of the family instil in the mind of the child, the natural rectitude and abhorrence of evil action, correct conduct and truth, which make them all, always cheerful, liberal, ever speaking the pleasant words, without reviling anybody or indulging in deceit. The importance of family for the perfection

of human being, whatever be the status one occupies in society, is thus brought out clearly and this has to be understood with reference to the family and love, described in *arattu-p-pāl* and *kamattu-p-pāl*.

(c)

Manam refers here to a deeper conception of honour which consists in living up to the ideal and sacrificing one's life rather than the ideal, if ever there were a competition between the two. That is the glory and real heroism of the great citizens. They never dream of any disreputable act. That is their dignity even in great adversity ; for, they know that men who fall from a high estate are like the lock of hair fallen from the head. This is their great fame and they will never descend to follow those they despise, though they themselves are humble in their prosperity.

(d)

With this high conception of honour of living up to the ideal, they are great, always doing great and famous things. All men are born equal, but great acts make for real greatness. Even one who occupies a lowly state thus becomes great. A woman's chastity is in her hands and similarly one's greatness is in one's own hands. In spite of achieving the impossible, real greatness is modest whilst littleness is extremely proud. Such a great man is perfect in that he is full of all good human qualities. Because of the high sense of his duty these qualities become his second nature. The greatest good is the goodness of character which is full of love, benigance and truth, which abhors evil, and identifies itself with the society. Refraining from killing is the greatness of *tapas* ; refraining from even mentioning other's false is the glory of human perfection. The great man willingly accepts defeat even at the hands of his inferiors. Therein lies the touchstone of perfection ; for humility is the strength of the great which disarms any enemy. The ages may change but not perfection. The perfection reached reminds us of the saints described in *turavaram*. It is the same perfection which is possible to be achieved in a welfare State. What is perfection worth if Man does not do good to even evil-doers ?

(e)

This perfection is exhibited in his own behaviour which shows that one has become one with others, His heart beats in unison

with the hearts of others. He is easy of access and full of love, perfectly nurtured in a family of high reputation. It is not physical resemblance but the identity of human feeling that is found amongst the great people. They pour oil on disturbed waters, exhibiting their pleasing qualities even when others hate them. But for them, the harmony of this world would be buried in the dust. They brighten up the world with their smile, otherwise the world will be steeped in darkness.

(f)

The munificence of such a man has been already discussed, in the chapter on *oppuravu* in *arattu-p-pal*. Its negative aspect is described in *nanriyil celvam* or the ungrateful wealth. The title itself is significant. Wealth is made possible by the whole society at large and the grateful citizens should share it with others in loving gratitude, for otherwise the selfish enjoyment of wealth is a mark of ingratitude. One who does not possess the human feeling or what Shakespeare calls 'the milk of human kindness' cannot feel one's own duties towards one's own body politic. He is no man but a demon, more dead than living, really poor though rich, verily a dog in the manger or like unto a woman fair growing old in loneliness. Valluvar has compared the munificent man to a fruit bearing tree and to a medicinal plant just in the centre of the village. The miser's wealth is also a tree full of fruits in the midst of the village; only it is a poison tree. Therefore one has to bring in the chapter on *oppuravu* in this part of the book on citizens.

(g)

Shying at things evil has become natural to the perfect man. It is said of Ramakrishna Paramahansa that his feeling of renunciation was so great that his body would shrink at the touch of money even when he was unconscious. This cultivated feeling of abhorrence at anything evil is real modesty; for modesty is not merely the blush of women. This higher modesty is a sign of perfection. His flesh itself shrinks and that is why perhaps all spirits claim his home of flesh as habitation. The perfect man shrinks from others' guilt as much as his. In the absence of this natural shrinking from evil, majestic gait becomes a disease. The perfect man will give up his life rather than this modesty. In the absence of this modesty man is but a marionette.

(h)

This feeling of human kindness expresses itself in varied ways-trying to help the perfection of others and to help the family and the State through all their activities. Action thus is the touchstone of human perfection - a never ceasing action aiming at the exaltation of the family and society. Paripperumal will interpret this to mean that such a great man has no time to satisfy fully even his hunger. Manly exertion and a wider intellectual vision thus become useful for others, and God Himself hastens to help such a man. His ideal is thus spontaneously achieved and the whole world will cling to him and claim kinship with him. He is a greater warrior; for he, bears the brunt of all natural attacks on his family and suffers all miseries that may arise therefrom.

(i)

The incessant human effort inspired by the concern for the common weal should result in producing wealth, which as a social institution solves all problems of family and society. Has not Valluvar praised it as the great light of truth which dispells all darkness of misery and ignorance? At this point, therefore the significance of *porul* is realised. The great man is active. Activity seems to be his very breath inspired as he is by love. This activity should take the form of works. In that age of agriculture, that activity was considered the best. In modern age we may take *ulavu* as labour in the descriptive and illustrative sense rather than in an exhaustive sense. However, even in the modern world agriculture has its own virtues not shared by other professions. Agriculture is the backbone of a nation. "Whirl as the world will, it must after all rely on the plough. The agriculture is the linch-pin of the progressive van of society for agriculturists support all, whilst others are subservient. One who works by his own hand knows the sufferings of life and therefore hastens to help the beggar though he himself will never beg." It would have been noticed that in praising the perfect man who has not renounced the world, Valluvar often tries to point out that he is superior to one who has renounced. Therefore here also he points out, that if the husband-man sits still with folded arms, even they who have renounced will have no place in this world. Every aspect of agriculture has to be cared and watched. Land is an exacting mistress who

demands the presence of the agriculturists always by her side. She laughs at those who plead poverty and lead an idle life.

IX

(a)

Thus far, the glories of the good citizens have been sung. But when that perfection is not reached by the citizens, certain evil effects flow and the land is steeped in poverty. One has then to live by begging. Vaḷḷuvar shudders at the very idea of begging at others' doors which is the most powerful dehumanising force in society. Under such an environment instead of human perfection, there is degradation. Therefore, in the remaining four chapters, he emphasises the greatness of human perfection nurtured by the State and society through the proper environment they have provided, and points out its contrast with the picture of a society leading to human degradation. It has already been pointed out that Vaḷḷuvar believing as he does, in the innate divinity of Man, does not forget the importance of Nature and environment in human progress. Poverty is the greatest enemy of man; for, then man ceases to be human. As Avvaiyār sings, when there is chronic hunger, honour, munificence, nobility, greatness, education, wisdom, helpful effort, *tapas*, and love, all fly away. Therefore Vaḷḷuvar asserts there is nothing more painful than poverty, except if it be poverty itself. Poverty as a chronic hankering, destroys all tradition and all human speech and leads to infinite miseries. Even the mother looks upon the *unrighteous poor* as a stranger. Mark the words unrighteous poor. Poverty is veritable death. One may sleep peacefully in fire but not in poverty; it is indeed the depth of human degradation. That this misery does not inspire the poor to welcome renunciation is what Vaḷḷuvar has referred to elsewhere. They are fated to be demons wasting other men's salt and gruel or, as Kāliṅkar puts it, "they become death unto their own erstwhile propriety and good behaviour."

(b)

Vaḷḷuvar, however, recognises the duty of the good citizen to help the unfortunate. What else can the unfortunate do than beg, if there are those who may be begged of. If the latter withhold any help, the blame is theirs and not the beggars. Begging becomes a pleasure when the help comes without causing pain.

There is a charm in begging before those who know their duty. Begging is as blissful as munificence before those who will not withhold anything even in their dreams. Does not this begging bring out all that is good in man? Where will munificence be if there is no one to receive the gift? In the Buddhist epic, Maṇimākalai therefore the munificent Āputtiraṇ is so cursed to have no one to receive his kindness. In the absence of those who seek help from others, where can be cooperation and where can be the exhibition of human virtues? In its absence the world becomes a stage wherein strut wooden dolls.

(c)

This ought not to be interpreted as glorifying beggary; for, Vaḷḷuvar shudders at the very thought of begging. Though from the point of view of the munificent citizen it offers an opportunity for the spontaneous expression of human perfection, from the point of view of the beggar, it is the most dehumanising force. Not to beg is million times better than begging. There is nothing harder than the foolhardiness that believes in ending its indigence by begging. The contentment which refuses to beg even in want, is greater than all the Universe put together. Nothing is sweeter than even the watery gruel earned by one's own toil. Seeking help even for a righteous cause is degrading. The beggar's life is almost dead at a rebuff. But where hides the life of the man who denies help? For verily the latter cannot be a living human being. Vaḷḷuvar explains in a spirit of righteous indignation against whoever is responsible for a society which tolerates begging. "May the ordainer" he cries, "of the present world perish, if the society is, so organised that one has to live only through mendicancy." Therefore it is the duty of man to rectify such an organisation. Coming in the best tradition of Vaḷḷuvar, Bharathi sings 'If there is no food for a single individual, let us destory this dying world and reshape a new world'.

(d)

The last chapter deals with the degradation of Man, the very opposite of human perfection. The degenerate resemble the perfect men in appearance. What an exact resemblance! They are indeed fortunate, for they feel no qualms of conscience. They are like gods doing whatever they like. They compete in degradation. Fear is their only virtue; perhaps there is also a

little amount of strong desire, as a motive. They will never help except when the robber breaks their jaws. They are like the sugar cane which yields its sweet juice only when it is crushed to death. If others are prosperous, the reprobate hastens to slander. Valluvar therefore exclaims: "When suffering presses them down, the degenerate rush to sell themselves away. What other purpose do they serve?" Thus ends *poruṭṭal*.

X

The political philosophy of Tiruvaḷḷuvar is unique in that it makes society and government, the cradle for perfect men, the perfect men described in *aratu-ṭ-pāl*. That is why Tiruvaḷḷuvar insists on the means being as ennobling as the ends themselves. Even the most intricate problems of Statecraft and diplomacy are discussed from their basic human point of view so as to be understood by all without any mystery or mystification.

XI

Thus the philosophy of Tiruvaḷḷuvar is a well integrated one, where Kāma or the experience of idealised Love becomes the starting point for Dharma or human perfection reaching the stage of universal love and where Artha provides the proper environment for the development of that perfection. Nothing is repressed; nothing is negated. Everything is given its proper place so that in the end there is complete harmony, the harmony which is experienced at the end, as universal Love. That is the unique contribution of Tiruvaḷḷuvar.

It has been possible to evaluate his philosophy in this way only within the Pan-Indian background of *puruṣārtha*. Valluvar works within that background; but by varying emphasis on certain aspects, he has given us a new portrait of the ideal human life which attracts the attention of all and which inspires in us all, the hope that we can achieve that success with the practical advice he has given.

1. சிலப்பதிகாரம்

(17—2—1964)

சென்னைப் பல்கலைக்கழகத்தின் ஆதரவில் டாக்டர் ரா. பி. சேதுப்பிள்ளை அவர்களுடைய நினைவுநிதிச் சொற் பொழிவுகளை இவ்யாண்டு நான் இயற்ற வேண்டுமென்று முடிவுசெய்து என்னை அழைத்தமைக்காகப் பல்கலைக்கழக ஆட்சியாளர்களுக்கும், சிறப்பாகப் பல்கலைக்கழகத் துணை வேந்தர் அவர்களுக்கும் என் நன்றியை முதற்கண் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். டாக்டர் சேதுப்பிள்ளை அவர்களுடைய மணிவிழாக் கண்ட பெரியோர்கள் அவர் பெயரினால் ஒரு நிதியம் அமைத்துப் பல்கலைக்கழகத்திற்கு அளித்து அதனைக்கொண்டு தமிழிலக்கியம்பற்றிச் சொற்பொழிவாற்றுவதற்கு ஆண்டுதோறும் வகைசெய்தல் வேண்டுமென வேண்டிக் கொண்டதற்கேற்ப, பல்கலைக்கழகம் இச்சொற்பொழிவுகளுக்கு இவ்யாண்டு ஏற்பாடு செய்துள்ளது. மறைந்த பேரறிஞர் டாக்டர் சேதுப்பிள்ளை அவர்களுக்குச் சிலப்பதிகாரம், திருக்குறள், கம்பராமாயணம் ஆகிய தமிழ்ப் பணுவல் களிதத்து மிக்க ஆர்வம் உண்டென்பதை யாவரும் அறிவர். கவிஞர் சுப்பிரமணிய பாரதியார் தமிழகத்தின் பெருமையைத் துலங்க வைத்த கவிஞர்களாகத் திருவள்ளுவர், இளங்கோவடிகள், கம்பர் ஆகியோரைப்பற்றிப் பாராட்டி உரைத்துள்ளார். பாரதியாருடைய இவ்வாக்கில் மிக்க நம்பிக்கை கொண்டவர் டாக்டர் சேதுப்பிள்ளை. அதனால், பல்லாண்டுகளாக இக்கவிஞர்கள் மூவரைப்பற்றி அவர் அடிக்கடி மேடைகளில் முழங்கியும் கட்டுரைகள் எழுதியும் ஆய்வுரைகள் இயற்றியும் வந்துள்ளார் என்பது பலர் அறிந்த செய்தி. சிலப்பதிகாரக் கதை, சிலப்பதிகார நூனயம் என்ற தலைப்புக்களில் அவரால் எழுதப்பட்ட புத்தகங்கள் நாட்டில் மக்கள் பலரால் படித்துப் போற்றப்படுவன என்பதும் பலர் அறிந்த செய்தி. அவருடைய நினைவுகாரணமாக இயற்றப்படும் இச்சொற்பொழிவுகளின் தொடக்க நாளில் அவரது சிறந்த இலக்கியத் தொண்டினை நாம் நினைவுகூர்ந்து பாராட்டுவோமாக.

சிலப்பதிகாரத்தை முழு வடிவில் நமக்கு வெளியிட்டுத் தந்த தமிழ்ப் பேரறிஞர் டாக்டர் உ. வே. சாமிநாத ஐயர் அவர்களைப்பற்றியும் இன்று நினைவில் இருத்துதல் வேண்டும். பல சுவடிகளை அரிதின் முயன்று தேடிக் கண்ணுற்று அரும் பாடுபட்டுப் பல நூல்களைப் பதிப்பித்த அவர் 1927-இலேயே சிலப்பதிகாரத்தையும் பதிப்பித்துத் தந்தார். அதற்குச் சிறிது பின்னால் சிலப்பதிகார மூலத்தை மாத்திரம் பதிப்பித்த ஒருவர் சிலப்பதிகாரம் சேரமான் பெருமாள்நாயனரால் இயற்றப்பட்டதெனப் பதிப்பித்துவிட்டார். “ஒருந் தமிழ் ஒரு மூன்றும் உலகின்புற வகுத்துச் சேரன் தெரித்த சிலப் பதிகாரத்திற்கு” அடியார்க்கு நல்லார் உரை வகுத்ததாக உள்ள ஒரு சிறப்புப் பாயிரத்தை வைத்துக்கொண்டு சேரன் என்பதைச் சேரமான் பெருமாள் நாயனர் என அவர் தவறாகக் கருதிவிட்டனர் போலும்!

சிலப்பதிகாரப் புகார்க் காண்டத்தை மட்டும் அடியார்க்கு நல்லார் உரையுடன் 1880-இலேயே பதிப்பித்த பெருமை திரு. தி. க. சுப்பிரமணிய செட்டியாருடையது. அப்பதிப்பில் ஒவ்வொரு கதைக்கும் அவர் தந்துள்ள தலைப்பு விளக்கம் அருமையாக அமைந்துள்ளது. அவர் முன்னுரையாகத் தந்துள்ள அறிவிக்கையிலிருந்து எடுகுறிப்பு ஒன்று இவ்வாறு உளது:—“பஞ்சகாவியங்களுள் ஒன்றாகிய சிலப்பதிகாரம் புகார்க்காண்டம், மதுரைக்காண்டம், வஞ்சிக்காண்டம் என மூன்று பிரிவு உள்ளது. இந்நூல் செய்தவர் சேரர் குலத்துதித்த இளங்கோவடிகள். பஞ்சகாவியங்களாவன சீவகசிந்தாமணி, சிலப்பதிகாரம், மணிமேகலை, வளியாபதி, குண்டலகேசி. அடிகள் எனப்பெயர் வழங்குதலால் இவரைச் சமணர் என்று சிலர் சொல்லுகின்றனர். சமணராயின் மணிமேகலையும் குண்டலகேசியும் பௌத்த சமயத்திற்குச் சாத்திரங்களாகவும் சிந்தாமணி அருக சமயத்திற்குச் சாத்திரமாகவும் வழங்குதல்போலத் தவவேடந் தாங்கின இவர் இயற்றிய இந்நூலும் அச்சமயத்திற்குச் சாத்திரமாதல் வேண்டும். அவ்வாறில்லாமையால் இவரைச் சமணர் என்று சொல்லுதல் பொருந்தாது. ஆயின், அருக சமயத்தைப் பெரும்பாலுஞ் சொல்லியிருக்கின்றனரெனின், சைவ வைணவ சமயங்களைச் சிறப்பித்துக் கூறியதுபோல அதனையுஞ் சிறப்பித்துக் கூறினாரெனவும், அவர்காலத்தில் சைவவைணவ சமயங்களைப்போல் அருகசமயமும் பௌத்த சமயமும் வழங்கின

என அக்கால வழக்கைப் பலவிடங்களினுங் கூறியதுபோல இவற்றையுங் கூறினார் எனவும், அடிகளெனப் பெயர் வந்தது உயர்வுபற்றி எனவுங் கொள்ளுதல் வேண்டும்.”

இந்தக் காப்பியம் இளங்கோவடிகளால் அருளப்பட்டது என்பதும், இளங்கோவடிகள் சேரன் செங்குட்டுவனின் இளவல் என்பதும், அவர் அரசுதுறந்து குணவாயிற் கோட்டத்தில் இருந்தார் என்பதும் சிலப்பதிகாரப் பதிகத்தால் அறியப்படுகின்றன. இளங்கோவடிகள் முப்பது காதைகளாக இயற்றிய உரையிடைபிட்ட இப்பாட்டுடைச் செய்யுளை மதுரைக் கூலவாணிகன் சாத்தனார் கேட்டார் என்பதும் இப்பதிகத்தால் அறியப்படுகிறது.

சிலப்பதிகாரம் எழுந்த காலம் கி. பி. 171-4-ஐ ஒட்டிய காலம் என இப்பல்கலைக்கழகத்தில் இந்திய வரலாற்றுப் பேராசிரியராகத் திகழ்ந்த திரு. வி. ஆர். இராமச்சந்திர தீட்சதர் முடிவு கட்டியுள்ளார். அவர் கருத்துப்படி சங்க காலம் என்பது கி. மு. ஐந்தாவது நூற்றாண்டுமுதல் கி. பி. நான்காவது நூற்றாண்டுவரை அமைந்த காலம். சிலப்பதிகாரத்திற் காஞ்சிப் பல்லவர்களைக் குறித்து யாதொரு குறிப்பும் காணப்படாமையால் அது கி. பி. இரண்டாவது நூற்றாண்டிலேயே இயற்றப்பட்டிருக்க வேண்டும் என்றும், இலங்கைக் கயவாகு வேந்தன் (முதலாமவன்) ஆட்சிக்கு வந்த காலம் கி. பி. 171 ஆதலால் கண்ணகிக்குக் கடவுள் மங்கலம் செய்த பொழுது அவன் வந்திருந்த ஆண்டு 174-ஆக இருத்தல் கூடும் என்றும் உள்ள முடிவுகளை 1939-இல் அவர் வெளியிட்டார். இக்கருத்தோடு ஒத்த கருத்தினைக் கொடைக்கானல் வாணிலையாராய்ச்சி வல்லுநர் திரு. பி. ஆர். சிதம்பர ஐயரும் ஏற்றுக்கொண்டுள்ளார். சிலப்பதிகாரத்திற் காணப்படும் “ஆடித்திங்கட் பேரிருட் பாக்கத்து” என வரும் வாணிலை பற்றிய குறிப்புக்களைக் கொண்டு ஆராய்ச்சிசெய்துள்ள

1. “The date of the composition of the Silappadikaram is settled once for all. It was in the 2nd half of the second century after christ”. சிலப்பதிகாரத்தைப்பற்றி அவ்வறிஞர் மேலும் எழுதியிருப்பதாவது:—“It takes a legitimate place among the extant Sangam works and is very valuable to the historian of South India *** A futile attempt has been made to prove that these two epics (Silappadikaram and Manimekalai) were post-Sangam works.”

கணியர் தமிழ்ப்பெரும்புலவர் திரு. இ. மு. சுப்பிரமணிய பிள்ளை மதுரை தீயுண்ட ஆண்டு கி. பி. 144 என்பதை நன்கு ஆராய்ந்து முடிவு கட்டியுள்ளார் ¹.

“சிலப்பதிகாரக் காப்பியம்” என்று நூல் எழுந்த காலத்திற் பெயர் கூறப்படவில்லை. அது முத்தமிழ் விரவியதாதலால் இயலிசை நாடகப் பொருட்டொடர்ஜிலைச் செய்யுள் என்று கூறத்தக்கது என அடியார்க்கு நல்லாராகிய உரையாசிரியர் எழுதியுள்ளார். “சிலப்பதிகாரம் என்னும் பெயரால் நாட்டுதும் யாமோர் பாட்டுடைச் செய்யுள்” என இளங்கோவடிகள் கூறி இதனை இயற்றினார் என்பது புதிசுத்தால் அறியப்படுஞ் செய்தி. இது தொல்காப்பியர் இலக்கணத்தின்படி தொன்மை என்னும் வனப்பு அமைந்த நூல்.

“தொன்மை தானே சொல்லுங் காலை
உரையொடு புணர்ந்த பழமை மேற்றே”

என்பது தொல்காப்பியம். “பெருந்தேவனார் பாரதமும், தகடூர் யாத்திரையும் சிலப்பதிகாரமும் இதன்பாற்படும்” என்பது பேராசிரியர் உரை. இதனைத் ‘தோல்’ என்னும் வனப்புடையதாகவுங் கூறலாம்.

“இழுமென் மொழியான் விழுமியது நுவலினும்
பரந்த மொழியால் அடிநிமிர்ந்து ஒழுகினும்
தோலென மொழிப தொன்மொழிப் புலவர்”

என வரும் தொல்காப்பியத்தையொட்டி இதனைத் ‘தோல்’ எனவுங் கூறலாம். மணிமேகலை என்னுங் காப்பியந்தான் அறம் பொருள் இன்பம் வீடு என்னும் நூற்பொருளையும் கூறுவது என்றும், சிலப்பதிகாரம் அறம், பொருள், இன்பம் மாத்திரம் கூறுவதாற் பெருங்காப்பியம் எனக் கூறத்தக்கதன்று என்றும் கருதுவோர் கருத்து பொருந்தாது. வீடு பேறு அடைந்தவர்களைப்பற்றியும் வீடுபேற்றிற்கு வழிகளைப்பற்றியும் சிலப்பதிகாரம் இடையிடையே சொல்லியிருப்பதாலும், நூல் முடிவில் “செல்லும் தேளத்துக்கு உறுதுளை தேடுமின் மல்லன் மாஞாலத்து வாழ்வீர்” என்று இளங்கோவடிகள் கூறியிருப்பதாலும், இது வீடுபேற்றையும் பேசும் பனுவல்தான் எனக் கொள்ளுதல்கூடும் எனக் கருதுகிறேன்.

2. அவர் இயற்றிய “வள்ளுவர் இருபதாம் நூற்றாண்டுத் தமிழ்” என்னும் புத்தகத்தில் பக்கம் 21-49 காண்க.

புகார் நகரத்திற் பிறந்து தன் குலத்துக் கண்ணகியை மணந்துகொண்டு சில ஆண்டுகள் அவளோடு இனிது இல் றறம் நடத்திய கோவலன் கணிகைகுல மாதவியால் மயங்கிக் கண்ணகியையும் வீட்டையும் மறந்து அவளோடு தங்கித் தன் பொருள் அழியலுற்ற பிறகு ஒருநாள், கடற்கரையோரத்தில் அவன் பாடிய பாடலுக்கு எதிர்ப் பாடலாகப் புறக்கணிக்குங் குறிப்பொடு மாதவி பாடினாள் என்று கருதி இல்லத்திற்கு மீண்டுவந்தவன் பொருளிழந்தமைக்காக வருந்திய ஞான்று கண்ணகி மனமகிழ்ந்து முகத்தில் நகையுடன் தன் சிலம்பு களை எடுத்துத் தந்தாள் என்ற உருக்கமான செய்தியின் அடிப்படையில் இக்காப்பியம் நடைபெறுவதால் இக்காப்பி யத்திற்குச் சிலப்பதிகாரம் என்று பெயரிடப்பட்டுள்ளது.

சிலப்பதிகாரத்தை நாம் ஒதுவது கதைக்காக அன்று; நல்லஇனியஉயரிய இலக்கியம் என்பதற்காக ஆம். எனினும், சிலப்பதிகாரக் கதைப்போக்குக்கூட கோவலன் கதையாக வழங்கும் ஏனைய கதைகளோடு ஒப்பு நோக்கப் பெருமை யடைகிறது. புகழேந்தி பெயரினால் நடைபெறும் “பெரிய எழுத்துக் கோவலன்” கதை, தா. தூ. சங்கரதாஸ் இயற்றிய கோவலன் சரித்திரம், ச. ச. சங்கரதாஸ் சுவாமிகள் இயற்றிய கோவலன் நாடகம், வீரபத்திரன் என்பார் இயற்றிய கோவலன் கண்ணகி நாடகம் ஆகிய சில புத்தகங்கள் கோவலன் கண்ணகி கதையைப்பற்றி இடைக்காலத்தில் எழுந்தவையாகும். சங்கரலிங்கதாஸ் சுவாமிகள் இயற்றிய நாடகத்தில் ஆங்காங்கு மக்களை நல்வழியில் திருப்பக்கூடிய அறவுரைகள் இடைமடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன ஆயினும், இது தானும் சிலப்பதிகாரத்தைத் தழுவியதாக இல்லை. புகழேந்தி பெயரால் அளிக்கப்பட்டுள்ள கோவலன் கதையே இவற்றிற் கெல்லாம் முதலூல்போலக் காணப்படுகிறது. அதனை அடி யொற்றிச் சில இடங்களில் திருத்தியும் விரித்தும் மற்றவர்கள் அக்கதையை எழுதியுள்ளார்கள். எவ்வாறாயினும், சிலப்பதி காரத்தில் வரும் கோவலன் கண்ணகி மாதவி ஆகியோருடைய குணவியல்புகளுக்கும் இக்கதைகளில் வரும் கோவலன் கண்ணகி மாதவி முதலியவர்களுடைய குணவியல்புகளுக்கும் இடையே பெருத்த வேறுபாடுகள் உண்டு. இளங்கோவடி களால் தீட்டப்பட்ட கோவலன் கண்ணகியோடு சில ஆண்டுகள் ஒருங்கியைந்து இன்பந் துய்த்து வாழ்ந்தவன் என்பதும், மாதவியோடு பல்லாண்டுகள் உடன் உறைந்தான் எனினும்

கண்ணகியை அழைத்துக்கொண்டு மதுரையை நோக்கி வாணிகஞ் செய்ய முற்பட்டவன் திருந்திய உள்ளத்தினையு ம் மாறி என்றும் அசைக்கமுடியாத உழுவலன்பினைக் கண்ணகி பால் உடையவனாகிவிட்டான் என்பதும், இந்நிலையில் அவன் வெட்டுண்டு மாய்வது காரணமாகக் காப்பியத்தைப் படிப் போர் இரங்கிய உள்ளத்தராய் வருந்துவர் என்பதும் தெளிவு. பெற்றோருக்கும் உற்றவருக்கும் தான்செய்த குற்றங் காரண மாக உளைந்து உளைந்து கோவலன் வருந்தியுரைக்கின்ற இடங்கள் சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் உயிர்நிலைப் பகுதிகள். கதைக் கோவலனோ மாறாகக் காணப்படுகிறான். மதுரையில் எண் ணெய் விற்ற வாணிகன் ஒருவனது மறுபிறப்பாகக் கதையிற் கோவலன் காட்டப்படுகிறான். மாதவியினுடைய ஆட்டம் தன் மணப்பந்தலில் இருக்கவேண்டுமென்றும் அவ்வாறில்லை என்றால் உயிரைப் போக்கிக்கொள்வேன் என்றும் அவன் கூறியதாகக் கதைப்புத்தகங்கள் கூறுகின்றன. இக்கதைக் கோவலன், தன் திருமணத்தில் மாதவி வந்து ஆடும்பொழுது அறையினுட் பூட்டிவைக்கப்பட்டான் என்பதும், அவன் வேண்டியதற்கிணங்கித் தாய் கதவினைத் திறந்துவிட்டாள் என்பதும், மாதவியோடு திருக்கடையூர்ச் சென்று அவளுக்கு ஏழுடுக்கு மாளிகை கட்டித் தந்தான் என்பதும், மாதவிக்கு அடிமையாகிவிட்டான் என்பதும் ஆகிய இம்முறையில் கதை யில் வருங் கோவலன் தீட்டப்பட்டுள்ளான். சிலப்பதிகாரக் கோவலனோ திருமண நாளிலேயே மாதவி வீட்டிற்கு ஓடி விட்டவன் அல்லன்; கண்ணகியோடு சில ஆண்டுகள் சிற் றின்பந் துய்த்து அவளோடு ஒன்றுபட்டு வாழ்ந்தவன். கதைகளில் வரும் கோவலன் மடிந்து எழுப்புவிக்கப்பட்ட பிற்பாடுகூட “மாதவி என்றால் மடிமேல் வா, கண்ணகி என்றால் தூரச் செல்” என்றவாறு பேசினவனாகக் காணப் படுகின்றான். காப்பியக் கோவலனோ மாதவியைப் பொய்த்தி என்று உதறித் தள்ளிவிட்டவன் அவள் முடங்கலை மறுத்துத் திரும்ப அனுப்பிவிடுகிறான் என்றும், அசைக்க முடியாத அளவு கண்ணகியிடத்து மீட்டும் அன்புடையவனாகிவிட்டான் என்றும் அறியப்படுகிறான்.

கதைகளில் வரும் கண்ணகி மதுரை மீனாட்சியின் பிறப்பு. அவள் காற்சிலம்பொடு பிறந்தவள். அவளைப் பெட்டியில் வைத்து வைகையாற்றில் தள்ளிவிட்டனர். பாம்புகளால் பாது காக்கப்பட்டுச் சென்ற குழவியின் காற்சிலம்பில் நாகரத்தி

னம் பதிக்஑்ப்பட்டது. காவிரிப்பூம்பட்டினத்தில் இக்஑ுழந்
தையை எடுத்து வளர்த்தார்கள். ஐந்து வயதில் கோவலன்
அவளுக்஑ுத் தாலி கட்டும்பொழுதே அவள் அழுதாள். கையில்
மாம்பழத்தைக் கொடுத்து அவன் தாலி கட்டினான். மாங்கனி
தான் திருமணம் என்று நினைத்துக் கொள்ளக்கூடிய பேத
மைப் பருவத்தில் அத்திருமணம் நடந்தது. பன்னிரண்டு
வயதான பிற்பாடு கழுத்தில் தாலி தொங்குவதைக் கண்ட
கண்ணகி ஒருநாள் மாயியாரைக் கண்டு அத்தாலி வந்தவிதம்
கேட்டுச் செய்தி அறிந்து கோவலனுக்஑ு ஓலை அனுப்புகிறாள்.
அவ்வோலையில் தான் சாக்காட்டு நிலையில் இருப்பதாக அறி
விக்கிறாள். மாதவி இல்லைத்தில் ஓலையைக் கொடுக்கப்பெற்ற
கோவலன் வருவதற்கு முயற்சி செய்ய அவனைத் தடைப்படுத்
திக்கொண்டிருந்த மாதவியைக் கண்ணகி சபிக்கிறாள். இன்
னும் பல சாபங்கள் இடுகிறாள். ஆக்குந் திறலும் அழிக்குந்
திறலும் உடையவளாக அவள் கதைகளிற் படைத்துக் காட்
டப்பட்டுள்ளாள். காப்பியத்தில் வரும் கண்ணகியோ பன்னி
ரண்டு வயதில் திருமணம் செய்விக்கப்பட்டவள்; பெற்றோரால்
காற்சிலம்பு கொடுக்கப்பெற்றவள். அவள் மாதவியைச்
சபிக்கவில்லை. மாமதுரையை எரியுண்ணும்படி அவள் இட்ட
சாபத்தைத்தவிர வேறொரு சாபம் இட்டதாகச் சிலப்பதிகாரம்
சொல்லவில்லை. கதைகளில் தொட்டதற்கெல்லாம் அவள்
சாபங்கள் இட்டது போலவும், நினைத்த நினைத்தபொழுதெல்
லாம் கோவலன் அவளுடைய பெயரை மந்திரமாக உச்சரித்து
உதவிகள் கிடைக்கப்பெற்றான் என்பதுபோலவுஞ் செய்திகள்
கூறப்பட்டுள. சிலப்பதிகார வாழ்த்துக் கதையில் காவற்பெண்
டாகிய செவிலித்தாயின் கூற்றாக வரும் ஒரு பகுதி இக்஑ுழ்
நிலையில் உன்னத்தக்கது :—

“மடம்படு சாயலாள் மாதவி தன்னைக்
கடம்படாள் காதற் கணவன் கைப்பற்றிக்
குடம்புகாக் கூவற் கொடுங்கானம் போந்த
தடம்பெருங் கண்ணிக்குத் தாயர்நான் கண்டீர்
தண்டுகார்ப் பாவைக்குத் தாயர்நான் கண்டீர்”.

இவ்விடத்தில் மாதவிதன்னைக் “கடம்படாள்” எனக்
கூறப்பட்டதற்கு விளக்கமாக அரும்பத உரையாசிரியர்
மாதவியைக் கோபித்து வெகுளாளாகிய பெருமையுடையவள்
கண்ணகி என்றவாறு எழுதியுள்ளார். சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில்

கண்ணகியின் பெருமைக்குச் சான்றாக மதிக்கப்படும் சாப மீடாமைக்கு மாறாக, கதைகளில் வரும் கண்ணகி மாதவி வீட்டிலிருந்த கோவலன் பதுமையை எரியுண்ணச் செய்தாள் என்றும், மதுரையில் இடைச்சி வீட்டில் உணவுப் பண்டங்கள் புழுவாகும்படியும் இடைச்சி வீடு வேகுமாறும் சாபமீட்டாள் என்றும் காண்கிறோம். திரும்பவும் வெந்த வீட்டினை மீட்டுக் கொடுத்தாள் என்றும் அவள் கதையிற் காட்டப்பட்டுள்ளாள். இவற்றினின்றும் முற்றிலும் மாறுபட்ட வகையில் அவளது பெருமை துலங்கும்படி சிலப்பதிகாரம் இயலுகின்றது.

அவ்வாறே கதைகளில் வரும் மாதவி மிக்க இழிதகவுடையவளாய்க் காட்டப்பட்டிருப்ப, காப்பியத்தில் வரும் மாதவி வியத்தகு பண்புகள் அமைந்தவளாய் உள்ளாள். இளநீரில் ஊறவைத்த களிப்பாக்கும் தங்கச் சிமிழில் மையுங் கொண்டு வந்து மணநாளில் தானே கோவலனை மயக்கியவளாய்க் காட்டப்படுகிறாள் கதையில் வரும் மாதவி. அவனுடைய பொருட் செல்வத்தையெல்லாம் துடைத்து வாங்கிக்கொண்டு அவனை அல்லலுறச் செய்து, ஆடைகளைக்கூடக் கழற்றி வாங்கிக் கொண்டு சிங்கக் கிணற்றில் அவனைத் தள்ளிவிட்ட கொடுமை யுடையவளாய் அம்மாதவி உள்ளாள். காப்பியத்திலோ கோவலனிடத்தில் மிக்க மதிப்பும் நேயமும் வைத்தவளாயுள்ளாள் மாதவி. “அடிகள் முன்னர் யானடி வீழ்ந்தேன்” என அவனுக்கு அவள் முடங்கல் எழுதியமை நினைக்கத் தக்கது.

இவ்வாறு கதைகளிலும் அண்மைக் காலத்து நாடகங்களிலும் வரும் கண்ணகி கோவலன் மாதவி ஆகியோரைப் பற்றிப் படித்தும் பார்த்தும் மக்கள் பொதுவாக இக் கதைத் தலைவர்களிடம் மதிப்பு வைப்பதேயில்லை. இக்கதைகளில் வரும் கோவலன் கசடன்; கண்ணகி மந்திரவாதி; மாதவி பொருட் பேராசையுடைய கொடுமை மகள்; இவர்களுடைய பொல்லாத இயல்புகளையே சிலப்பதிகாரமும் எடுத்துக்காட்டும் என்று சிலர் தவறாக நினைத்துக்கொண்டு காப்பியத்தினுள் நுழைந்து பார்ப்பதே இல்லை. எல்லோருக்கும் எரிய நடையில் இயற்றப்பட்டுள்ள இப்பெரிய எழுத்து உரைநடைக் கதைகளும், பெரிய எழுத்து நாடகப் புத்தகங்களும், இரண்டு மூன்று நூற்றாண்டுகளுக்குள் எழுந்தவை எனத் தோற்றுகின்றன. புகழேந்தி இயற்றியதாகச் சொல்லப்படும் கோவலன் கதைப்

புத்தகத்தில் கண்ணகியாகிய குழந்தையை வைத்துப் பெட்டியினை “எட்டுக் கட்டு கட்டி எதிரே சீலும் இட்டார்” என்று வருகிறது. எனவே, ஆங்கிலேயர் தொடர்பு ஏற்பட்ட காலத்திற்குப் பிற்பட்ட காலத்தில் ஆங்கிலச் சொல்லாகிய “சீல்” (seal) இப்புத்தகத்தில் எடுத்தாளப்பட்டுள்ளது. இதைப் போன்றுள்ள சில சொல்வழக்குகளால் இக் கதையின் காலம் இரண்டு அல்லது மூன்று நூற்றாண்டுகளுக்கு முந்தியதன்று என்பது தெளிவாகிறது. எனினும், மக்கள் பொதுவாக உரைநடை நூல்களை விரும்பிப் படிக்கலுற்றதும், பொழுது போக்காக நாடகங்களைப் பார்க்கலுற்றதும் ஆகிய செய்திகளினால் நல்ல இலக்கியமும் நாடகக் காப்பியமும் ஆகிய சிலப்பதிகாரம் அண்மைக்காலம்வரை மறக்கப்பட்டிருந்தது. அது பாச்செய்யுள் வடிவத்தில் இருந்தது வேறு பெரும்பான்மையாகப் படிக்கப்படாமல் இருந்ததற்கு ஒரு காரணம். ஏட்டினிற் பூட்டி வைக்கப்பட்டிருந்த அக்காப்பியம் இந்த நூற்றாண்டில் அதிகமாக வெளிவரத் தலைப்பட்டது. நூல் அச்சிட்டு வெளிப்படுத்தப்பட்ட காரணத்தாலும், வித்துவான், எம். ஏ., ஆகிய தேர்வுகளுக்கு இந்நூல் பாடமாக வைக்கப்பட்ட காரணத்தாலும் இதனைப் படித்து ஆய்வு செய்வார் இப்பொழுது நிறைய உள்ளனர்.

கோவலன் கதையை எழுதிய ஆசிரியர் யாவராயினும், அவருக்கு மதுரையினிடத்தில் வஞ்சம் உண்டென்பது மாதிரி உறுதியாகிறது. “தூரும்பெடுத்து மேற்போடும் துன்மார்க்க மதுரை, கொடியெடுத்து மேற்போடும் கொடிதான தென்மதுரை”, என்றும், “நிந்தையிட்டுத் தலையை வெட்டும் நீதியில்லாத் தென்மதுரை” என்றும் மதுரையை வினாயக்க கடவுளும், வேத வாத்தியாரும், பாண்டிமா அரசியும் கூறினதாகக் கதை காண்பித்துச் செல்கிறது. இதற்கும் சிலப்பதிகாரம் காட்டும் மதுரைக்கும் எத்தனை வேறுபாடு! கதைதிறம் உரைத்த காதையில், கோவலன் “மலர்ந்த சீர் மாட மதுரை யகத்துச் சென்று இழந்த பொருள் மீட்டலுற்றேன்” என்றான். புறஞ்சேரியிறுத்த காதையிற் பாடும் பாணர்கள் மதுரையைத் “திருமலி மூதார்” என்றார்கள். “தனியாக நீ அங்குச் சென்றலும் தடுப்பாரும் வதைப்பாரும் இல்லை” என்று கோவலனிடம் அவர்கள் கூறினார்கள். கோவலன்ருளும் கவுந்தியடிகளிடம் “தென்னவர் காக்கும் நாடு செங்கோல் நாடு” என்றும், அங்கு கொடிய விலங்குகள் கூட எவர்க்கும்

துயர்செய்யா என்றும் கூறினமை அக்காதையில் மற்றோரிடத் திற கூறப்பட்டுள்ளது

“ பெண்ணணி கோலம் பெயர்ந்த பிற்பாடு
புண்ணிய முதல்வி திருந்தடி பொருந்திக்
கடுங்கதிர் வேனிலிக் காரிகை பொருஅள்
படிந்தில சீறடி பரல்வெங் கானத்துக்
கொள்வ லுளியமுங் கொடும்புற் றகழா.”

எல்லோருக்கும் எளிய கதையும் நாடகமும் பொதுவாக உள்ள பொழுது சிறிது கடுமையான நடையில் இயன்ற சிலப்பதிகார மாகிய அரும்பெறற் காப்பியம் தமிழ்மக்களுக்கு வேண்டுவ தொன்று என்பதை இதுகாறும் எழுப்பிய ஒப்பீட்டினால் விளக்கினேன்.

இனி, சிலப்பதிகாரம் இயற்றிய இளங்கோவடிகளின் போக்கினைப்பற்றி இன்று சில மொழிந்து அமைவேன். இக்கவிஞர் ஒவ்வொரு சூழ்கிலைக்கேற்பப் பொருத்தமான சொற்களை அமைத்துத் தருபவர் என்பதற்கு ஓர் எடுத்துக் காட்டாக “நோற்றுணல் யாக்கை நொசிதவத்தீர்” என்று கவுந்தியடிகளைப் பார்த்து வம்பப் பரத்தையும் வருமொழியாள னும் கூறியதைக் காட்டலாம். துறவியாகிய கவுந்தியடிகளு டைய உடம்பு மெலிந்து இருந்ததென்ற செய்தியை இச் சொற்றொடர்கள் நன்றாகப் படம்பிடித்துக் காட்டுகின்றன. அவர் அமைத்த கூற்றிலேயே இக்கருத்து அடங்கக்கண்டு இன்புறலாம் அல்லவா? இளங்கோவடிகளைத் தேடிச் சொற் கள் பல வருகின்றன. அவற்றுள் சிலவற்றையே அவர் தேர்ந் தெடுத்துக்கொண்டு தம் காப்பியத்தில் வழங்கி அவற்றிற்குப் பெருமையளித்து விடுகிறார். கணவனை இழந்த கண்ணகி மதுரைக்குத் தீயூட்டிய பிற்பாடு இழந்த கணவனைப்பற்றி நினைத்து உள்ளங்கனன்று பெருமூச்சுவிட்டுச் செல்லும் நிலை யில் அவள் எங்குச் செல்லுகிறாள் என்பது அவளுக்குத் தெரியாது, யாது செய்கிறாள் என்பதும் தெரியாது. இதனைச் சொல்ல நினைத்த கவிஞர்

“ மறுகிடை மறுகும், கவலையிற் கவலும்
இயங்கலும் இயங்கும், மயங்கலும் மயங்கும் ”

என்றே கூறினார். அவளது உள்ளம் மயங்கிய நிலையை வேறு எந்த விதத்திலும் காட்டியிருத்தல் ஆகாது. அவள்

இப்பொழுது பெருந்தெருவிற் செல்லுகிறாள், இப்பொழுது குறுந்தெருவிற் செல்கின்றாள், இப்பொழுது நடக்கிறாள், இப்பொழுது மயங்கிக் கிடக்கிறாள் ” என்று கூறுவதுபோல் இவர் அமைத்த சொற்றொடர்கள் உள்ளன. ‘கவலையிற் கவலும்’ என்று வந்த சொற்களே திரும்ப வந்தனவாயினும் வெவ்வேறு பொருளில் வந்து கவிக்கு உயிரளிக்கின்றன. இயங்குகிறாள் என்று சொல்லாமல் இயங்குகிறதைச் செய்கிறாள் என்றமையான் நடக்கமாட்டாமல் நடக்கிறாள் என்ற குறிப்பு கிடைக்கப் பெறுகிறோம். மயங்கிக் கிடக்கிறாள் என்று கூறாமல் மயங்கலும் மயங்கும் என்றமையால் ஓரளவு மயக்கமும் ஓரளவு நல்லுணர்வும் உடையவளாய் அவள் இருக்கிறாள் என்ற குறிப்பு கிடைக்கப்பெறுகிறது. பெருந்தெரு என்ற பொருளையுடைய மறுகு என்ற சொல்லிற்குப் பின்னால் மயங்கிச்செல்கிறாள் என்ற கருத்தினை மறுகும் என்ற சொல்லில் வைத்து, அந்நேரம் அச்சொல்லுக்கு ஒரு தனி ஆட்சி தந்த பெருமை இளங்கோவடிகளது ஆகிறது. குறுந்தெரு என்ற பொருளுடைய கவலை என்ற சொல்லைப் பெய்த கவிஞரின் திறம் வியக்கத்தக்கது.

“ மறுகிடை மறுகும் கவலையிற் கவலும்
இயங்கலும் இயங்கும் மயங்கலும் மயங்கும் ”

என்ற அடிகளைப் படிக்கும்பொழுதே கண்ணகியுற்ற அருந்துயர் தானாகத் தெளிவாகிறது. இவ்வாறு உலகிற் கவிகளை அமைக்குந் திறம்வாய்ந்த கவிஞர்கள் எண்ணிக்கையிற் சிலரே ஆவார்கள். அவர்தம்முள் ஒருவராக இளங்கோவடிகளுக்குப் பெரியதொர் இடமுண்டு. இதனை ஒத்ததே கட்டுரைக் காதையில் வரும்

“ அவல என்னாள் அவலித்து இழிதலின்
மிசைய என்னாள் மிசைவைத்து ஏறலின் ”

என்னும் பகுதி. பள்ளம் என்றும் மேடு என்றும் பாராமல் கண்ணகி பதறிச் செல்லுகிறாள் என்பதை ஒலிநயம்படக் கவிஞர் கூறிவிட்டார். அவலம் என்பது பள்ளம், மிசை என்பது உயரம், ‘அவலித்து இழிதல்’ என்பது வருந்தி இறங்குதல், ‘மிசைவைத்து ஏறல்’ என்பது மேலே அடிவைத்து ஏறுதல் என்றெல்லாம் விளக்கஞ் சொல்ல வேண்டாமென்று கருதுகிறேன்.

கையினால் தொழுது மனத்தினால் நினைத்து நாவினால் வந்தித்து என்று சொல்லுவது உரைநடைமுறை. கவியில் இக்கருத்துக்களை எவ்வளவு அழகாகவும் செறிவாகவும் சொல்லுவது இயலும் என்பதற்கு இளங்கோவடிகள் காடுகாண் காதையில் அமைத்துள்ள ஒரு முறை சிறந்த எடுத்துக்காட்டு,

“ ஓங்குயர் மலையத்து உயர்ந்தோற் றெழுது
சிந்தையில் அவன்றன் சேவடி வைத்து
வந்தனை மும்முறை மலைவலஞ் செய்தால் ”

என்று மாங்காட்டு மறையவன் வாக்கினில் வைத்துப் பேசும் இளங்கோவடிகள் சிந்தையில் கடவுளது திருவடிகளை வைத்து என்று கூறியவகையால் சிந்தனையால் நினைத்து என்பது பெறப்பட்டது. நெடியவனைத் தொழுது என்று முற்கூறியமையால் மெய்யினால் வணங்கினமை கூறப்பட்டது. மும்முறை வந்தனையோடு மலையைச் சுற்றிவந்தால் என்று கூறியவிடத்து நாவினால் துதிசெய்து மலையைச் சுற்றி வந்தால் என்ற கருத்து குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளது. இவ்வாறு திட்பநுட்பமாகச் செய்யுட் செய்ய வல்லவர் இளங்கோவடிகள் என்பது இதனறழ் புலப்படும்.

இளங்கோவடிகளுடைய செய்யுட் போக்கே ஒரு தனிவகை. தேவந்திகை கண்ணகிக்குக் கூறினாள் என்று சொல்ல வேண்டியவிடத்தில் “ அணியிழைக்கு அவ்வாயிழையாள் கூறினாள் ” என்று கவிஞர் கூறும்போது இடம்நோக்கி அணியிழையும் ஆயிழையும் யாவர் யாவர் என்பதை முடிவு செய்து கொள்கிறோம். அவ்வாறே,

“ மாசில் கற்பின் மனைவியோ டிருந்த
ஆசில் கொள்கை அறவிபால் அணைந்தாங்கு ”

என்றவிடத்தில் அறவி என்பது கவுந்தியடிகளைக் குறிக்குஞ் சொல் என்று எளிதில் அறிந்துகொள்கிறோம். வையை ஆற்றைக் கடந்து எனச் சொல்லவிருக்குந் தறுவாயில் கண்ணகியும் கோவலனும் வையை ஆற்றினைத் தொழுதனர் என்று கூறக் கருதிய கவிஞர்

“ அனநடை மாதரும் ஐயனுந் தொழுது ”

என்று கூறினார். ஐயன் என்பதால் கோவலனும், அன்னநடையுடைய மாதர் என்றமையால் கண்ணகியும் எனப்

பொருள் விளங்கிக் கொள்ளக்கூடிய வகையில் இடத்தோடு பொருந்தச் செய்து கவி அமைத்த திறம் இளங்கோவினது. கவுந்தியடிகள் வையை ஆற்றைத் தொழவில்லை என்ற குறிப்பு தொழுதவர் அன்ன நடையையுடைய மாதர் என்று கூறின மையால் கிடைக்கப்பட்டமை அறிக. கண்ணகியை என்று கூறவேண்டிய இடத்தில் ‘கணவனோடிருந்த மணமலி கூந்தலை’ என்று பிறிதோரிடத்தில் இவர் பேசிய வகையானும், கண்ணகிக்கு என்று கூற வேண்டியவிடத்தில்

“கோவலன் தன்னொடும் கொடுங்குழை மாதொடும்
மாதவத் தாட்டி”

சென்றமையைக் கூறிய வகையானும் அவரது தனித்திறன் தெளிவாகிக் கொண்டு செல்லுகிறது. மற்றோரிடத்தில் கண்ணகியும் கவுந்தியடிகளும் என்று சொல்ல வேண்டியபோழுது

“கருந்துடங் கண்ணியும் கவுந்தியடிகளும்
வகுந்துசெல் வருத்தத்து வழிமருங்கு இருப்ப”

என்று கூறியிருக்கின்றார் என்பதை உற்று நோக்குவோ மாயின் இவரது தனிப்போக்கு விளங்காமலிராது.

கவிஞர் கூறும் சாதாரண சொற்களின் கிடக்கையினாலே ஒருவிதத் தனியின்பம் உண்டாதல் காண்கிறோம்.

“பொன்னிற் பொதிந்தனன் புனைபூங் கோதை
என்னுடன் நங்கை இருக்கெனத் தொழுது”

என்ற இடத்தில் “என்னுடன் நங்கையிருக்க” என்று கண்ணகியை நோக்கி மாதரி கூறியதிலுள்ள அருமைப் பாட்டினை ஒவ்வொருவரும் எளிதில் அறிந்துகொண்டு மகிழ்தல் கூடும். நாம் அறிந்த சொற்களையே கவிஞர் பயன்படுத்தி நாம் எதிர் பாராத ஒரு விளைவினை மாயமாக எவ்வாறோ செய்து விடுகின்றார் என்பது இளங்கோவடிகளினுடைய பல சொல்லமைப்புக்களினால் விளங்கும், சங்கமனை இழந்த நீலி பேசியதாக வரும் பேச்சில்,

“அரசர் முறையோ? பரதர் முறையோ?
ஊரீர் முறையோ? சேரியீர் முறையோ”

என்றும்,

“ எம்முறு துயரஞ் செய்தோர் யாவதும்
தம்முறு துயரம் இற்றருக ”

என்றும் கூறிலுளென்பதுபோல் அமைந்திருக்கும் இடத்திற் சொல் ஒவ்வொன்றும் தனிப் பெருமையுற்றுத் திகழ்ந்து விளைக்கும் விளைவு உன்னத்தக்கது. சிலவிடங்களில் கவிஞர் கதையின் உறுப்பினர்களின் சொற்களாலும் செயலாலும் நாடகமே அனைய விளைவுகளை விளைத்துள்ளார் என்பது அறியப்படும், எடுத்துக்காட்டாக, ஒன்றினைக் கூறுவேன்.

“ காவலன் போலுங் கடைத்தலையான் வந்துநம்
கோவலன் என்றோளார் குற்றினையான் ”³

என்று வரும் இடத்தில், கண்ணகியின் தோழி சிறிது தொலைவில் வந்தவனை அரசன் என ஐயுற்று நின்ற நிலையையும், அவன் கண்ணகியின் இல்லத்தின் மருங்கணைந்த விரைவினையும், அத்தெருவில் வந்தவன் காவலன் அல்லன் கோவலனே என்ற மகிழ்ச்சியையும் இரண்டு அடிகளில் படம்பிடித்தாற்போலக் காட்டியுள்ள நயம் வியக்கத்தக்கது. ‘காவலன் போலும்’ என்று கூறக் கருதிய தோழி சிறிது தொலைவிற்கு பார்த்தமையால் ஐயங்கொண்டாள் என்பதும், ‘கடைத்தலையான்’ என்றமையால் விரைவின் வந்து கடைவாயிற் புருந்து விட்டான் என்பதும், நம் கோவலன் இங்கு வந்துற்றதால் உனக்கும் எங்களுக்கும் பெருமகிழ்ச்சி எனத்தோழி தெரிவிக்கிறாள் என்பதும் ஆகிய செய்திகளை உள்ளடக்கிக்கொண்டு இவ்விரண்டு அடிகளும் நின்றலை அறிஞர்கள் அறிந்து பாராட்டுவர் எனக் கருதுகிறேன்.

இளங்கோவடிகள் எண்கவையும் ததும்பக் கவி செய்வதில் வல்லவரென்பதைச் சிலப்பதிகாரத்தைக் கற்றுணர்ந்தவர்கள் அறிவார்கள். சிறப்பாக, அவலச்சுவையைச் சிலவிடங்களில் அவர் படம்பிடித்துக் காட்டும் முறைகள் கருத்தக்கவை. புறஞ்சேரியிறுத்த காதையிலேயே அவலச்சுவை தொடங்கிவிடுகிறது. இது துன்பமாலையில் உச்சநிலை அடைகிறது. கண்ணகியினுடைய துன்பம்

“ சொல்லாடாள் சொல்லாடா நின்றாள் அந் நங்கைக்குச்
சொல்லாடும் சொல்லாடுந் தான் ”

என்ற இடத்துக் கவிஞரால் தடுமாற்றத்துடன் எடுத்து இயம்பப்படுகிறது. மாதரி நீராடச் சென்றுவிட்டாள் என்றும்,

அவனையொத்த சாயலையுடைய அவள் மகள் ஐயை ஊரில் ஏதோ அரவங்கேட்டு விரைவுற்று வந்தாள் என்றும், “துன்பமலை” என்னும் காதை தொடங்குகிறது. ஊர் அரவங்கேட்டு வந்தவள் ஐயை அல்லள் என்றும், வேறொரு பெண்ணென்றும் விளம்புவாரும் உண்டு. அவ்வாறு வந்தவள் யாவளாயினும், அவள் சொல்லாடாமல் நின்றாள் என்பதும் ஆயினும் சொல்லாடினால் என்பதும் இங்கே கூறப்படுஞ் செய்திகள். இவ்வடிகளில் “சொல்லாடாள்” என்று ஒருபக்கங்கூறிச் சொல்லாடும் என்று மறுபக்கம் கூறியமையால் அமைந்துள்ள முரண்டொடையைப்பற்றி நாம் கவலை கொள்ளவில்லை. அந்நங்கைக்கு என்பது கண்ணகிக்கா வந்த பெண்ணிற்கா என்பதில் பெரும் ஐயப்பாடு உண்டு. ஓடோடி வந்தவள் கண்ணகிக்குச் சொல் கூறினாளா அன்றிச் சொல்லாடாமல் நின்ற அந்த நங்கையிடம் கண்ணகி சொல்லாடினாளா என்பது இன்றும் ஆராய்ந்து முடிவுகட்டப்படாத செய்தியாகும். இவ்வாறுமுடிவு கட்ட முடியாத நிலையில், நம்மைத் திகைக்க வைக்கும் நிலையில், இவ்வடிகள் அமைந்துள்ளமையே கவிஞரின் திகைப்பைத் தெள்ளிதின் எடுத்தாக்காட்டுந் தகையது என்று கூறிவிடுதல் கூடும். சிறந்த கவிஞர் தம் சொற்றிறத்தால் அவ்வந்நேரத்திய உணர்ச்சியைத் தம்செய்யுள் வழியாக அமைத்துக் காட்டிவிடுவர் என்பதற்கு இது பெரியதொரு சான்று.

“சொல்லாடாள் சொல்லாடா நின்றாள் அந்நங்கைக்குச் சொல்லாடுஞ் சொல்லாடுந் தான்”

என்ற அடிகளைப் படிக்கும் நாம் படிக்க வேண்டிய முறைப் படி படிப்போமேயானால் கேட்போரிடத்திலும் அத்திகைப்புணர்ச்சியை ஊட்டிவிடுதல் கூடும். இங்ஙனம் செய்வது தான் கவிதையைப் படிப்பிக்கும் நோக்கங்களில் தலைசிறந்த நோக்கம்.

இருண்ட இடங்களிலும் பொலிவு காணும்படி செய்யக் கூடிய கவிஞர் சிறந்த கவிஞரென மதிக்கப்படுவதுண்டு. இளங்கோவடிகள் அவ்வரிசையில் வைத்து எண்ணத்தக்கவரென்பதைப் பலர் அறிவர். மாண்டுபோன கணவனைக் கண்டு துயர்பொருமல் அவலித்து இரங்கி அவள் அழுதபோது அவள் அழுகையினுடே அவளது வடிவழகினைக் கவிஞர் இழைத்துத் தந்துள்ள திறம் உன்னத்தக்கது. தேவதூதர்கள்

அழுதலைக் காண்பதுகூட அழகிது என்பார்கள் ஆங்கிலேயர் சிலர். கண்ணகி கணவனை நினைத்து “ எங்குற்றாய் ” என ஏங்கி மாழ்கும் நிலையில் “ எழுந்தாள் விழுந்தாள் செங்கண் சிவப்ப அழுதாள் ” என்று அவளைப்பற்றிக் கவிஞர் உரைத்தார். அதே நேரத்தில் “கதிர்களைப் பொழியுந் திங்கள் மேகத்தோடும் கீழ்நிலத்திற் பொருந்தினாலொப்பக் கூந்தல் விரிந்துகிடந்த கோலத்தோடு அமைந்திருந்தது அவள் முகம்” என்று கூறியதில், அவல நிலையிலும் ஓர் அழகுணர்ச்சி தோன்றுமாறு கவிஞர் செய்துள்ளாரென்பது அறியப்படும். இதனை அடியில் வருஞ் செய்யுள் தாங்கியுள்ளது :—

“ பொங்கி யெழுந்தாள் விழுந்தாள் பொழிகதிர்த்
திங்கள் முகிலோடும் சேணிலங் கொண்டெனச்
செங்கண் சிவப்ப அழுதாள், தன்கேள்வனை
‘எங்கணாஅ’ என்னு இனைந்தேங்கி மாழ்குவாள் ”⁴

இளங்கோவடிகளின் எழுத்துப்போக்கில் இன்றொரு செய்தி வெளியாகிறது. எண்களை ஒன்றோடொன்று உறழ்ந்து கூறும் இயல்பினர் அவர் என்பது சிலவிடங்களால் விளங்குகிறது. “ஆறு காவதம்” என்று சொல்ல வேண்டிய விடத்தில் “இருமுக காவதம்” என்று கட்டுரைக் காதையில் (வரி 145) அவர் கூறியுள்ளார். ஆறு காவதம் என்கூறாமல் இருமுக்காவதம் என்று சொன்னமையால் கிடைக்கப் பெற்ற வேறொரு கருத்து எதுவுமில்லை. “இரு முக்காவதம்” என்றும் “செருவெல் வென்றி” என்றும் எதுகை நயம்பட இவ் விடத்தில் அமைந்து கிடக்கின்றன என விடுவதே பொருந்தும். செங்குட்டுவன் ஐம்பது ஆண்டுகள் ஆட்சி செய்த பின்னரும் அறக்கள வேள்வி செய்யாமல் மறக்கள வேள்வி செய்தான் என்று எடுத்துக்கூறிய மாடல மறையவன் கூற்றில் ஐம்பது என்பது “ஐயைந்து இராட்டி” எனக் கூறப்பட்டுள்ளது. ஈண்டு “வையங் காவல்-ஐயைந்து இராட்டி” என மோனைத் தொடை இயன்றமை காண்க. தேவந்திகையொடு சாத்துவன் எட்டாண்டு உறைந்து நீங்கினான் என்ற செய்தியைச் செங்குட்டுவனுக்கு மாடலன் சொல்லுமிடத்தில் எட்டு என்பதற்குப் பதில் “நாலீராண்டு” எனச் சொல்லப்பட்டுள்ளது. இவற்றோடு சேர்த்து நோக்கினால், புகாரிலிருந்து மதுரைக்கு முப்பது காதம் தொலைவு உண்டென்று கண்ணகியிடம் நேர்முகமாகக்

கூறத் தயங்கிய கோவலன் “ ஆறைந் காதம் ” எனக் கூறினான் என்று எடுத்துக்காட்டுவது எத்துணைப் பொருத்தமுடையது என மீண்டும் சிந்திக்க வேண்டிய நிலையில் உள்ளோம். முப்பதுகாதம் என்று சொன்னால் அவர் பெருவருத்தமுறுவான் எனக் கருதி ஆறு-ஐந்து என்று வைத்துப் பேசினான் எனக் கூறப்பட்டுவரும் கருத்து ஆயத்தக்கது.

இளங்கோவடிகளின் மற்றொரு போக்கில் “கொள்கை” என்ற சொல்லை அவர் விரும்பியானும் இயல்பினரென்பது புலப்படுகின்றது.

மாங்காட்டு மறையவன் கோவலனால் ‘யாது நும் ஊர்’ என வினவப்பட்டபொழுது “குன்றச் சிறப்பின் மாமறையாளன்” என்று பேசப்பட்டுள்ளான்.⁵ மாதவி தந்த ஓலையைச் சேர்ப்பிக்கும் நோக்கத்தோடு சென்ற கோசிகன் தான் வந்த செய்தியைக் கோவலனிடம் தெரிவிக்கத் தொடங்கினான் எனக் கூறுமிடத்தில்.⁶

“கோசிக மாணி கொள்கையின் உரைப்போன்”

எனக்கூறப்பட்டுள்ளான். மதுரையம்பதியைக் கண்டு வருவதாகச் சொல்லிப்புறப்பட்ட கோவலன் கவுந்தியடிகளை வணங்கிச்சென்றான் என்றவிடத்தில்

“கோவலன் சென்று, கொள்கையின் இருந்த
காவுந்தி ஐயையைக் கைதொழுது ஏத்தி”

எனக்கூறப்பட்டுள்ளான். இவ்விடத்தில் ‘கொள்கையின் இருந்த காவுந்தி ஐயை’ என்ற சொற்றொடர் வந்திருப்பதை நோக்குக. ⁷ அடைக்கலக் காதையிற் பேசப்படும் குரங்கு ஒன்று தன் சிறு கையை மறுபிறவியிற் கொண்டொரு பாகத்திற் கொள்கையாக வைத்துக் கொண்டிருந்ததாகக் கூறியவிடத்தில் வேண்டுமானால் “கொள்கையின் புணர்ந்து” என்பதற்கு ஓரளவு தனிப் பொருள் வருவிக்கலாம். ஆயினும், மாதரி தன் மனையிற் புகுந்தாள் என்று சொல்ல வேண்டிய அடைக்கலக் காதையின் கடைப்பகுதியில் “கோவலர் மடந்தை கொள்கையிற் புணர்ந்து மனைபுக்கனள்” என்னும் பொருளில்

5 காடுகாண் காதை 33-34

6 புறஞ்சேரியிறுத்த காதை 56

7 ஊர்காண் காதை 15-16

“ வாயில் கழிந்து தன்மனை புக்களளால்
கோவலர் மடந்தை கொள்கையிள் புணந்தென் ”

எனக் கூறப்பட்டிருப்பதால் வருஞ் சிறப்பு ஒன்றுமில்லை.
பிறிதோரிடத்திலும்,

“ குரவரும் நேர்ந்த கொள்கையிள் அமர்ந்து
படுங்கதிர் அமையம் பார்த்திருந் தோர்க்கு ”

என வருவதிற் காணுங் கொள்கை என்ற சொல் சிறப்புப்
பொருள் எதுவும் பெறவில்லை. அவ்வாறே,

“ திருந்துகோல் நல்லியாழ் செவ்வனம் வாங்கிக்
கோவலன் தன்னொடும் கொள்கையிள் இருந்தனள்
மாமலர் நெடுங்கண் மாதவி தானென் ”

என்னுமிடத்து, மாதவி யாழினை வாங்கிக் கோவலனோடு கட
லோரத்தில் தங்கியிருந்தாள் என்று கூறுங்கால் “கொள்கை”
என்ற சொல்லுக்குத் தனிப்பொருள் எதுவும் இல்லையென்பது
அறியப்படும். இவ்வாறு, “கொள்கையின்” என்ற சொல்
லைச் சேர்த்துப் பேசுவது இளங்கோவடிகளுக்கு ஓரியல்பாகி
விட்டது போலும், அது பெரும்பாலும் மோனை நயம்தோன்ற
வரும் இடங்களிற் கையாளப்பட்டுள்ளது என்பதை ஊன்றி
யாராய்வோர் அறிதல் கூடும். இங்ஙனம் இருப்பவும்,

“ குன்றாக் கொள்கைக் கோவலன் தன்னுடன்
அன்றைப் பகலோர் அரும்பதித் தங்கிக்
கண்டடி பணிய நீபோ யாங்களும் நீணெறிப்
படர்குதும் ”

என்றவிடத்திற் கோவலனைக் “ குன்றாக் கொள்கையுடைய
வன் ” எனக் கூறினமையால் கோவலன் குற்றமற்றவன்
என்றே ஒழுக்கம் தவறியவனல்லன் என்றே அறுதியிட்டுக்
கூறுதல் ஒவ்வாது. அவனுடைய குணங்களையும் குற்றங்களையும்
நாடி அவன் நல்லவனா அல்லவனா என்று முடிவு செய்ய
வேண்டுமேயொழியக் கவிஞர்தம் வாக்கில் “ குன்றாக் கொள்
கைக் கோவலன் ” எனக் கூறியதொன்றினையே வைத்துக்
கொண்டு அவன் நல்லியல்பினன் என முடிவுகட்டுதல் கூடாது
என்பதை ஆராச்சியாளர்களுக்குத் தெரிவித்துக் கொள்ள
விரும்புகிறேன்.

இளங்கோவடிகளுக்கு இயற்கைப் பொருட்களில் பெரிய தோர் ஈடுபாடு உண்டு. சிலப்பதிகாரம் நாடுகாண் காதையில் வருகிற

“கடல்வளன் எதிரக் கயவாய் நெரிக்குங்
காவிரிப் புதுநீர்க் கடுவரல் வாய்த்தலை
யோவிறந் தொலிக்கும் ஒலியே யல்லது
ஆம்பியுங் கிழாரும் வீங்கிசை யேத்தமும்
ஓங்குநீர்ப் பிழாவும் ஒலித்தல் செல்லாக்
கழனிச் செந்நெற் கரும்புசூழ் மருங்கிற்
பழனத் தாமரைப் பைம்பூம் கானத்துக்
கம்புட் கோழியுங் கணைகுரல் நாரையுஞ்
செங்கால் அன்னமும் பைங்காற் கொக்குங்
கானக் கோழியும் நீர்நிறக் காக்கையும்
உள்ளும் ஊரலும் புள்ளும் புதாவும்”⁸

என்னும் வருணனையிற் காணப்படும் ஒலிகளின் ஈட்டம் எத்துணை இன்பந் தருகிறது! இவ்விடத்தில் நாம் அறிந்த கோழியும் நாரையும், அன்னமும் கொக்கும், காக்கையும் பிற பொருள்களும் செய்யுளமைப்பிற் சிறந்த சிறந்த இடங்கள் பெற்று இன்பந்தரும் தகையனவாக உள்ளன.

இளங்கோவடிகள் வையை ஆற்றைப் பெண்ணை உருவகித்து அழகியதொரு வருணனையைப் புறஞ்சேரியிறுத்த காதையில் அமைத்துள்ளார்.⁹ இவ்வையை என்னும் பெண்கண்ணகிக்கு நாளை வரவிருக்கும் துயரத்தைத் தான் அறிந்து வருத்தமுற்றவள்போல முட்டாக்கிட்டுக்கொண்டு கண்ணீர் சொரிந்து சென்றவள்போலக் கவிஞர் கூறிய அழகு நினைக்கத் தக்கது.

“வையை யென்ற பொய்யாக் குலக்கொடி
தையற் குறுவது தானறிந் தனள்போற்
புண்ணிய நறுமல ராடை போர்த்துக்
கண்ணிறை நெடுநீர் கரந்தனள் அடக்கிப்
புனல்யா றன்றிது பூம்புனல் யானென
அனநடை மாதரும் ஐயனுந் தொழுது”

என்றவிடத்தில், இயல்பில் வையை என்ற ஆற்றில் புது வெள்ளத்திற் பல பூக்கள் மேலே படிந்து வருகின்ற செய்தி

யையும், அவற்றிற்கு உட்பட்ட வகையில் நீர்நிறைந்து வந்த தாயினும் மேலே உள்ள பூப்போர்வையால் அந்நீர் மறைந்து கிடந்தமையையும் கவிஞர்

“புண்ணிய நறுமலர் ஆடை போர்த்துக்
கண்ணிறை நெடுநீர் கரந்தளள் அடக்கி”

என்ற வகையாற் புலப்படுத்தினார். இயல்பாக இயற்கைப் பொருளில் நிகழும் ஒரு நிகழ்ச்சியை வைத்துக்கொண்டு, அதனடியாக மக்களுடைய உணர்ச்சியை அவ்வியற்கைப் பொருளுக்கு ஏற்றி அமைக்குந் திறமுடைய கவிஞர் பல ராயினும், அப்பலருள் இளங்கோவடிகளுக்கு உயர்ந்ததோர் இடமுண்டு. குவளையும் ஆம்பலும் கமலமும் கண்ணகியும் கோவலனும் நாளை பிரிக்கப்பட்டுத் துயருறுவார்கள் என்பதை அறிந்தனபோலக் கண்ணில் நீர்கொண்டு கால் மிகவும் நடுக்க முற்றன என்று கவிஞர் கூறியவிடத்திலும் இந்நிலையைக் காணலாம்.

“கருநெடுங் குவளையும் ஆம்பலும் கமலமும்
தையலுங் கணவனுந் தனித்துறு துயரம்
ஐய மின்றி அறிந்தன போலப்
பண்ணீர் வண்டு பரிந்தினைந் தேங்கிக்
கண்ணீர் கொண்டு காலுற நடுங்க”

என்னும் வருணனையிற் குவளையும், ஆம்பலும், கமலமும் தத்தம் இடத்தில் நீர்கொண்டு நின்றன என்பதையும், காற்று வந்து பொருந்த அசைந்தன என்பதையும் ஒரு பக்கம் இயற்கை நிகழ்ச்சியாகக் கூறி, மறுபக்கம் கண்ணில் நீர் கொண்டு கால் மிகவும் நடுங்கலாயின என்று பொருள் கொள்ளுமாறு அமைத்த கவிஞரின் திறம் வியக்கத்தக்கது. “கண்ணீர் கொண்டு காலுற நடுங்க” என்பதன்கண் உள்ள சிலேடை நயத்தை உணர்ந்து நாம் மகிழ்தல் இயலும். இளங்கோவடிகளுக்கு இயற்கைப் பொருள்களின்கண் இருந்த ஈடுபாட்டிற்கு இன்னுமோர் எடுத்துக்காட்டுத் தரலாம்:—

“ஏழகத் தகரும் எகினக் கவரியும்
தூமயி ரன்னமுந் துணையெனத் திரியும்

.....

நீணெடு வாயில் நெடுங்கடை கழிந்து”

கண்ணகி கணவனுடன் புகார் நகரத்தில் இல்லத்தினின்றும் வெளியே புறப்பட்டு வந்தவள் எவ்வாறு வாயில்நெடுங்கடை

கடந்தனள் என்பதைக் கவிஞர் கூறுமிடம் இது. அந்த வாயிலில் ஆடுகளும் கவரிமார்களும் அன்னங்களும் ஒன்றிற் கொன்று துணை என்றற்போலத் திரிந்துகொண்டு இருந்தன என்பதும், அவ்வாயிலைக் கடந்து கண்ணகி போயினாள் என்பதுஞ் சாதாரணம். அவ்வாயிலின்கண் தகர்வடிவத்திலும் மான்வடிவத்திலும் அன்னவடிவத்திலும் எழுதப்பட்டுள்ள ஓவியங்களைப் பார்த்து உண்மைத் தகர்களும் கவரிகளும் அன்னங்களும் அவற்றைத் தம் இனம் எனக் கருதி அங்கேயே திரிந்துகொண்டு இருந்தன எனக் கூறுவது மேலும் இனிமையானது. இதனினும்பார்க்க இனிது அவ்வாயிலில் திரிந்து கொண்டிருந்த எழில்விலங்குகளும் பறவைகளும் கண்ணகியைத் தம் இனம் எனக்கருதி அவளோடு அங்கேயே திரிந்து கொண்டு வழியனுப்பத் தயங்கின எனக் கூறுவது. இவ்வாறெல்லாம் பொருள்படும்படி கவிஞர் அமைத்த இச்செய்யுட்பகுதியிலிருந்து அவருக்கு இயற்கைப் பொருட்களின்கண் இருந்த ஈடுபாடும் கவின்கலையின்கண் உள்ள கவர்ச்சியும் நன்றாக விளங்கும்.

II. “சிலப்பதிகாரத்திற்கு முந்திய தமிழிலக்கியம்”

(19—2—1964)

சிலப்பதிகார காலத்திற்கு முன் எழுந்த தமிழிலக்கியங்களுக்கும் சிலப்பதிகாரத்திற்கும் இடையேயுள்ள சில ஒற்றுமைவேற்றுமைகளைக் குறித்து இன்று பேசுவேன்.

குறுந்தொகையில் செவிலித்தாய் கூற்றாக வரும் ஒரு செய்யுளின் கருத்தோடு கண்ணகி சமைத்துக் கணவனுக்கு இட்ட செய்தி ஒப்பிடத்தக்கது. கட்டித்தயிரைப் பிசைந்து மெல்விரல்களைக் கழுவாமலே விரைவில் நழுவும் தன் மேலாடையை எடுத்து உடுத்திக்கொண்டு தாளிப்புப்பதங் கெடாமல் தலைவி ஒருத்தி தயிர்க்குழம்பு சமைத்துக் கணவனை உண்பித்து மகிழ்வித்த செய்தி குறுந்தொகையில் உண்டு. தாளிப்புப்புகை அத்தலையின் கண்களிற் புக்கதற்கு இரங்குவார்போலக் கவிஞர் பாடியுள்ளார் என்பது

“குவளை யுண்கண் குய்ப்புகை கமழத்
தான்றுழந் தட்ட தீம்புளிப் பாகர்”

என வருவதால் விளங்கும். கண்ணகியும் தன் மெல்விரல் சிவக்கும்படி பல பசங்காய்களை அரிந்து முகம்வியர்க்கக் கண் சிவக்கச் சமையல் செய்து கணவனை ஊட்டினான் என்பது சிலப்பதிகாரக் கொலைக்களக் காதையிற் சொல்லப்பட்டுள்ளது. அவள் விரல்களின் மென்மையைக் குறிப்பினால் விளக்குவாராகிக் கவிஞர் அவள் அரிந்த வெள்வரிக்காய் மாதுளங்காய்போன்றவை அரிவாள் மணையில் சிக்கிக் கொண்டிருந்தன போற் குறிப்பிட்டுள்ளார். இக்காய்களை அவள் நெடுநெரம் அரிந்தாள் அல்லது அரிவதற்குத் திணறினான் என்று கூறுவது உரைநடை, “கொடுவாய்க் குயத்து விடுவாய் செய்ய” என்று கவிஞர் கூறியிருப்பதுபோலக் கூறுவது கவிதை. அரிவாள்மணையில் அரிந்தாள் என்று சொல்லவேண்டிய இடத்தில் இவ்வாறு நீளமாகக் கவிஞர் கூறியதிலிருந்து

அரிதற் செயலிற் ஏற்பட்ட நெடுநேரத்தை அவர் குறிப்பு வகையினால் விளங்கவைத்தார் என்பது புலப்படும். குறுந்தொகைச் செய்யுளில் வந்த தலைமகள் தாளிப்புப் புகையினால் ஒரு பக்கம் வருந்தினாள் என்று கூறப்பட்டிருப்பதுபோல இத்தலைமகள் அட்டிற் கரிப்புகை கண்டு வருந்தினாள் என்று கூறப்பட்டிருக்கிறாள்.

குறுந்தொகையில் மற்றொரு தலைவி பரத்தையர் வீட்டிற் குச் சென்று திரும்பிய தலைமகளை வெறுத்து அன்புகாட்ட மறுத்ததாக வருஞ் செய்யுள் உண்டு. ஒக்கூர் மாசாத்தியார் பாடிய அப்பாட்டினுள்¹⁰.

“இன்னா திசைக்கும் அம்பலொடு
வாரல் வாழியர் ஐய! எந் தெருவே”

என்று வருகிற குறுந்தொகைப் பகுதிக்கு மாறாகக் கண்ணகியின் திறம் உள்ளது. கணிகையாகிய மாதவியிடமிருந்து மீண்ட தன் கணவனைக் கண்ணகி வரவேற்றாள் என்பதும், அவன் வறுமைக்கு இரங்கி இன்முகம் காட்டி முறுவல்பூத்து “சிலம்புகள் உள்ளன, எடுத்துக் கொள்ளுங்கள்” என அன்புடன் அளித்தாள் என்பதும் சிலப்பதிகாரம் காட்டும் நய முடைய செய்திகள்.

கலித்தொகையில்,

“பூங்கண் மகளிர் புனைநலஞ் சிதைக்கும்
மாய மகிழ்நன் பரத்தமை
நோவேன் தோழி கடன்நமக் கெனவே”

என்று கூறிய தலைவி ஒருத்தியின் மனநிலையோடு கண்ணகியின் மனநிலை ஒத்திருப்பதை அறிதல்கூடும். கோவலன் மதுரையில் தங்கிய நாளிற் கண்ணகி அருமையாகச் சமைத்து ஊட்டி மகிழ்வித்தவுடன் கோவலன் அவளுக்குத் துயரிழைத்தமையை நினைத்துச் சில சொற்கள் சொல்ல, அவள் அவனது பரத்தைமையை நோவாமல் உடனிருந்து வந்தமையைக் குறிப்பாகக் கூறினாள்.

“சிறுமுதுக் குறைவிக்குச் சிறுமையுஞ் செய்தேன்
வழு வெணும் பாரேன் மாநகர் மருங்கீண்டெழுகென
எழுந்தாய் என்செய்தனை!”

என்று கோவலன் கூறக் கண்ணகி

“போற்று ஒழுக்கம் புரிந்தீர் யாவதும்
மாற்று உள்ள வாழ்க்கையேன் ஆகலின்
ஏற்றெழுந்தனன் யான்”

என்று கூறினான். கோவலன் மாதவியிடத்துக் கொண்டமையலுக்காகத் தான் உள்ளத்தை மாற்றிக் கொள்ளவில்லை என்பதையும், மாற்றிக்கொள்ளாத உள்ளத்தொடு வாழ்ந்து வரும் வாழ்க்கையுடையவள் தான் என்பதையும் அழகாகக் கண்ணகி புலப்படுத்தினாள்.

தலைமகள் ஒருத்தி களவுகாலத்தில் வரையாது வந்தொழுகும் தலைவனிடத்தில் எத்துணை அன்புடையவளாக இருந்தாள் என்ற செய்தியையும் அவளது கற்பு மிகுதியையும் ஆற்றாமையையும் தோழி எடுத்து விளக்கியதாகக் குறிஞ்சிக்கலிச் செய்யுள் ஒன்று கூறுகிறது.

“நோயட வருந்தியும் நீசெய்த அருளின்மை
ஆயமும் மறைத்தாள் என்தோழி யதுகேட்டு
மாயநின் பண்பின்மை பிறர்கூறல் தானுணி”¹¹

என வருந் தாழிசையோடு ஒத்து அடுக்கிவரும் தாழிசைகள் எல்லாம் தலைவனைப் பிறர் பழிகூறலாகாது என்ற விழுமிய நோக்கத்தால் துயரத்தை மறைத்து வெளியிற் காட்டாமல் அத்தலைமகள் இருந்தாள் என்பதைப் புலப்படுத்தும். கண்ணகியும் அவ்வாறே தன் மனத்தயரைப் பிறர் அறியாமற்பாதுகாத்தாள் என்பது சிலப்பதிகாரத்திற் சொல்லப்பட்டுள்ளது. கண்ணகி தன் கணவனுடைய தாய்தந்தையர்கள் தனது துயரத்தை அறியாமல் அரிதின்முயன்று பாதுகாத்துள்ளாள். இதனை அவளே கோவலனிடத்திற் பின்னர்க் கூறுகின்றாள். “நுங்கள் தந்தையார் அன்புள்ளத்தோடு அருள் மொழிகள் சிறையக் கூறி என்னைப் பாராட்டவும், நான் என்னுடைய அகத்தில் ஒளித்துவைத்துக் கொண்டிருந்த நோயையும் துன்பத்தையும் வெளிப்படுத்துவதுபோல் என் பொய்ச்சிரிப்பு இருந்து விட்டது! நான் சிரிக்குஞ் சிரிப்பு உண்மையல்லாத சிரிப்பு என்பதை அவர் உணர்ந்து கொண்டு மன வருத்தம் அடையும்படி. “நீரோ போற்று ஒழுக்கம் புரிந்தீர்” என்று அவள் கூறியபொழுது,

“ யான் அகத்தொளித்த நோயுந் துன்பமும்
நொடிவது போலும் என்வாயல் முறுவல் ”

என்று கூறிய கூற்றில் நோய் என்பது உடம்பின் மெலிவு என்பதும் துன்பம் என்பது மனக்கவலை என்பதும் உரையாசிரியர்களால் விளக்கப்பட்டுள்ளன. எனவே, கணவனது பிரிவினால் அவள் மன வருத்தம் உற்றாளல்லள் என்று கூறுதல் பொருந்தாது. மாறாக, அவள் தன் மெய்வருத்தத்தையும் மனத்தளர்ச்சியையும் அரிதின் முயன்று மறைத்துவைத்துக் கொண்டிருந்தாள் என்றே கொள்ளுதல் வேண்டும். “ வாடிய மேனி வருத்தங் கண்டு ” என்ற இடத்திலும் அடியார்க்கு நல்லார், “ மேனி வாட்டத்தையும் நெஞ்ச வருத்தத்தையும் கண்டு ” என்று எழுதியது இதனை வலியுறுத்தும்.

இவ்வாறு மனநோயினால் வருந்திய கண்ணகி அதனை மறைத்துவைத்துக் கொள்ளுதலையன்றிப் பிறர்மாட்டு எடுத்துக்கூறவுஞ் செய்திலள் ; கணவனை எவ்வாறு தன்வயமாக்குவது என்பதைத் தெளிந்து செயலாற்றவுஞ் செய்திலள். இவளது நிலை நற்றிணையிற் பரணர் செய்யுள் ஒன்றளில் வரும் தலைவியின் நிலையொடு ஒத்ததாய் உள்ளது. அச்செய்யுளிற் பேசப்படும் தலைமகள்

“ உன்பிரிவால் வருந்துதல் அல்லது
பிணித்தல் தேற்றப் பெருந்தோட் செல்வத்து - இவள் ”

எனப் பாராட்டப்பட்டுள்ளாள். “ நின்னைத் தன்வயப்படுத்தலை அறியாத இவளைப் பிரிந்தது கொடிது ” என்று தோழி வற்புறுத்திய இடம் இது. சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் வரும் கண்ணகியின் நிலை இதலேடு ஒத்திருத்தலைக் கண்டறியலாம்.

பாலைக்கலியில் பொழில் ஒன்று அழகுபெறுதல் பேசப்படுகிறது. அப்பொழிலிற் சில பூங்கொம்புகள் உண்டு. அக்கொம்புகளில் உள்ள அரும்புகள் காலம் வரும்வரையில் மலர்தல் இல்லை எனக் கூற வருங்கவிஞர்

“ ஆன்றவர் அடக்கம்போல்
அலர்ச் செல்லாச் சினையொடு கூடிய பொழில் ”

எனக் கூறினார். இவ்விடத்திற் பூங்கொம்புகளுக்கு உவமையாகச் சொல்லப்பட்டது ஆன்றவர் அடக்கம். அறிவு நிரம்பி

யவர்கள் தம் காரியத்தை முடிப்பதற்குக் காலம் வருந்துணையும் காத்திருப்பார். அவர் அடங்கியிருக்குமாறுபோலக் காலம் வரும்வரையில் மலர்தலிற் செல்லாத அரும்புகளையுடைய கொம்புகள் இருக்கும் என்றவாறு நச்சினூர்க்கினியர் உரை எழுதியது நினைவுகூரத்தக்கது. இங்கே கூறப்படும் ஆன்றவர் அடக்கம் ஒத்த அடக்கத்தை உடையவளாய்க் கண்ணகி இருந்தாள் என்பது தெளிவு. கோவலன் அவளைப் பிரிந்து மாதவியின் இல்லத்தில் தங்கியிருந்த நாட்களில் அவளைச் சினவாமல் விட்டுவிட்டு, மதுரைக்கு அவனோடு வந்த வேளையில் இனிதாகச் சமைத்து இட்ட பிற்பாடு அவன் மனமகிழ்ந்து தன் குற்றத்தை உணர்ந்து அதற்காக உண்மையில் வருந்தும் நேரங்கண்டு, அவ்வேளையில் அவனிடத்தில் “போற்று ஒழுக்கம் புரிந்தீர்” என்றாள். இச்சொற்களை முன்னர் எப்பொழுதாவது அவள் கூறியிருப்பாளேயானால், கோவலனை அவள் அறவே இழந்திருக்கக் கூடும். அவ்வாறன்றிப் பொருத்தமான நேரம் பார்த்து அவனிடத்தில் இன்மொழி போன்ற கடுமொழிகளைக் கூறினாள் என்பதால் அவள் பெருமையடைகிறாள். “உன் மெல்லடிகள் இந்தக் கல்நிரம்பிய காட்டு வழியைக் கடக்க எப்படி இயன்றன?” என்றும், “என் பெற்றோருக்கும் உனக்கும் பெருந்தீங்கு செய்தேனே!” என்றும் கோவலன் வருந்தி வருந்திச் செய்ததற்கிரங்கிக் கூறும் நேரம்பார்த்து, திருந்தும் உள்ளத்தினனாகிய அவளை நோக்கிப் “போற்று ஒழுக்கம் புரிந்தீர் யாவதும் மாற்றா உள்ள வாழ்க்கையேன் ஆகலின் ஏற்றெழுந்தனன் யான்” என்று அவள் கூறியதிலிருந்து கலங்கிய உள்ளத்தோடு காலம் கருதியிருந்த பெருமையுடையவள் கண்ணகி என்பது தெரியவரும்.

கலித்தொகையில் (பாலைக்கலி - 15) தலைவி ஒருத்தி தலைவன் சென்ற காட்டின் கடுமையை உன்னி வருந்தினளாயினும், “தலைவன் செல்லுகிற வழியில் மழைபொழிக என மேகத்தை நாம் வேண்டுவதும் பொருந்துமோ?” என்றும், “வெப்பம் குறைந்திடுக எனக் கதிரவனைக் கேட்கவும் பொருந்துமோ?” என்றும், “வெம்மை தீர்ந்து வீசுக என வளிச்செல்வனை வேண்டுவதும் பொருந்துமோ?” என்றும் தோழியிடங் கேட்டாள் என அச்செய்யுள் கூறுகிறது. எனவே, கற்புடைய தலைமகள் கணவனையன்றிக் கடவுளை வாழ்த்துதல் பொருந்தாது என்று அவள் மதித்தாள் என்பது பெறப்படும். இந்நிலையில்தான் கண்ணகியும் இருந்தாள்

என்பது சிலப்பதிகாரத்தாற் புலனாகிறது. தேவந்திகை என்னுந் தோழி ஒருநாள் கண்ணகியை நோக்கி “ முற்பிறப்பில் ஏதோ ஒரு நோன்பு பொய்த்தாய் போலும்! அதனால் இப்பொழுது உன் கணவன் உன்னிடம் அன்பு நிறைந்தவனாய் இல்லை. காவிரி கடலொடு கலக்குமிடத்திற் சோமகுண்டம், சூரிய குண்டம் என இரண்டு தடாகங்கள் உள்ளன; அவற்றில் மூழ்கிக் காமன் கோயிலிற் கைதொழுதால் கணவனோடு இன்புறலாம். நாம் ஒருநாள் அங்குச் சென்று நீராடுவோம் ” என்று உரைத்தவளுக்கு மறுமொழியாகப் “ பீடன்று ” என்று ஒரே சொல்லிற் கண்ணகி விடையளித்தாள். கலித்தொகையினின்று எடுத்துக்காட்டப்பட்ட தலைமகள் “ நாம் கடவுளை வாழ்த்துவதும் இயைவதோ ” என்றாள். கண்ணகியும் காமவேள் கோட்டத்திற் கைதொழுதல் தன்பெருமைக்குப் பொருந்தாது என்றாள். இவ்வொப்புமைநயங்கண்டு உவத்தல் கூடும்.

குறிஞ்சிக் கலியில் தலைவி ஒருத்தியைத் தலைவன் பாராட்டிய விதம் அழகாகச் சொல்லப்பட்டுள்ளது. அவளுடைய நெற்றியையும் முகத்தையும் கண்களையும் நடையையும் சொல்லினையும் நினைத்துத் தலைமகன் பாராட்டலுற்றவன் அவளது நுதல் நுண்ணிதின் தேய்ந்திருக்கிறது என்றாலும் பிறையன்று என்றான். அவளது முகம் மறுவற்றது என்றாலும் மதியம் அன்று என்றான். அவளது கண்கள் பூவின் தன்மை நெருங்கியன என்றாலும் சுனையல்ல என்றான். மெல்ல அழகுற அவள் நடப்பாளாயினும் மயில் அல்லள் என்றான். சொல்லச்சொல்லத் தளரும் இயல்பினள் என்றாலும் கிளியல்லள் என்றான். கண்ணகியின் நலத்தைக் கோவலன் பாராட்டிய விதம் இவ்வருணையோடு ஒப்புநோக்கதக்கது.

“ குழவித் திங்கள் இமையவர் ஏத்த
அழகொடு முடித்த அருமைத் தாயினும்
உரிதின் நின்னொடு உடன்பிறப் புண்மையின்
பெரியோன் தருக திருநுதல் ஆகென ”

என்று அவன் கூறிய இடத்தில், கண்ணகியின் நெற்றி சிவ பெருமான் தலையில் அணிந்துள்ள பிறைபோன்றது என்று சொல்லக்கருதியவன் இவ்வாறு அழகுபெறக் கூறினான் என்பது அறியப்படும். அன்றியும், “ திங்கள் முத்தரும்பவும் சிறு கிடை வருந்தவும் இங்கிவை அணிந்தவர் என்னுற்றனர்.

கொல்” என்று அவன் கூறியதாகக் கவிஞர் வரைந்தார். கண்ணகிக்கு அணிகலன்களை நிறையப் பூட்டியவர்கள் அவளுடைய திங்கள் போன்ற முகத்திலிருந்து முத்துப் போன்ற நீர்த்துளிகள் அரும்பும்படியும் அவளுடைய சிறிய இடை வருந்தும்படியும் அவற்றைப்பூட்டியதாற் பேயுற்றார்களோ என்று கேட்பது போன்று அமைந்துள்ளது இப்பகுதி. திங்கள் போன்ற முகத்தில் முத்துக்கள் போன்ற நீர்த்துளிகள் அரும்பின என்று கூறியவிடத்தில் எத்துணைக் கவிநயம் உள்ளது! இது கவித்தொகையில் வரும் மறுவற்ற முகமாயினும் மதியம் அன்று என்பதனோடு ஒப்புநோக்கத் தக்கது. கவித்தொகையிற் பேசிய தலைவன் அத்தலைவியினுடைய நடை மயில் ஒத்த நடை என்றான். கண்ணகியைப்பற்றிக் கூறிய கோவலன் அவள் சாயலுக்குத் தோற்ற மயில்கள் “தண்கான் அடைந்தன” என்றான். தளர்ந்து தளர்ந்து பேசும் இனிமையால் கவித்தொகைத் தலைவி கிளிபோன்றவள் என்று குறிப்பிடப்பட்டுள்ளாள். அதனோடு ஒப்புநோக்கி இன்புறத் தக்கது கண்ணகியின் சொற்களைப்பற்றிக் கோவலன் அமைத்த வருணனை.

“ அளிய தாமே சிறுபசுங் கிளியே

குழலும் யாமும் அமிழ்துங் குழைத்தநின்

மழலைக் கிளவிக்கு வருந்தின ஆகியும்

மடநடை மாதுநின் மலர்க்கையின் நீங்காது

உடனுறைவு மரீஇ ஒருவா ஆயின ”

என அவன் பேசிய விதத்தில் கவித்துவம் ததும்புகிறது. அவளுடைய சொற்களின் இனிமை குழலோசையையும் யாமோசையையும் அமிழ்தின் சுவையையும் குழைத்து இழைத்தாற் போல் இருந்தது என்று கூறுகிற அளவிலேயே தனியின்பம் காணுகிறோம். “குழலும் யாமும் அமிழ்தும் குழைத்த நின் மழலைக் கிளவி” என்பதை அழகாக டாக்டர் சேதுப்பிள்ளை அவர்கள் பல மேடைகளில் எடுத்துக்கூறி இன்புற்றிருப்பதை நீங்கள் அறிவீர்கள், நானும் அறிந்துள்ளேன். கண்ணகியின் சாயலுக்குத் தோற்ற மயில் கானகத்துட் சென்று ஒளித்துக் கொண்டதாகவும் அவளது மென்னடைக்குத் தோற்ற அன்னம் மலர்ப் பொதும்பருட் சென்று ஒளித்துக் கொண்டதாகவும், மழலைக் கிளவிக்குத் தோற்ற பசங்கிளிகளோ அவள் கையினின்று நீங்காமல் உடன் உறைகின்றன ஆதலால், அவை இரங்கத்தக்கவை. தோற்று ஓடாமல் வென்றவரோடு

நட்புப்பூண்டு உடனுறையும் இக்கிரிகளின் விளையாட்டு மனப்பான்மை போற்றத்தக்கது” என்றவாறு கூறியுள்ள இடத்திற் கண்ணகியின் சொல்லினிமையை எத்துணைக் கவிநயம்பட இளங்கோவடிகள் எடுத்து இயம்பியுள்ளார் என்பதை அறிந்து மகிழ்கிறோம்.

நற்றிணையில் மதுரை மருதனிளநாகனரது பாட்டொன்றில் ¹² “ ஒரு நகில் அறுத்த திருமாவுண்ணி ” என்னும் பெண்ணொருத்தி பேசப்படுகிறாள். வேங்கை மரத்தில் அமைந்த ஒரு பரணிலிருந்துகொண்டு எவனோ ஒருவன் விளைத்த கவலையினால் வருத்தமுற்ற பெண்ணொருத்தி ஒரு நகில் அறுத்துக் கொண்டாள் என்பதும், அவள் திருமாவுண்ணி எனக் கூறப்பட்டவள் என்பதும் இச் செய்யுளால் அறியவருகின்றன. நற்றிணையைப் பதிப்பித்த பின்னத்தார் நாராயணசாமி ஐயர் அவர்கள் “ திருமாவுண்ணி ” என்பது கண்ணகிகதையைக் குறிக்கின்றது போலும் ” என்று எழுதினார். இதனை ஆதாரமாக வைத்துக்கொண்டு சிலர் “கண்ணகி திருமாவுண்ணியே வேறு அல்லள் ” என்று முடிவுகட்டி ஆராய்ச்சி செய்துள்ளனர். நற்றிணையிற் பேசப்படும் திருமாவுண்ணி பற்றிய செய்திக்கும் கண்ணகி பற்றிய நிகழ்ச்சிகளுக்கும் நேர்ப்பொருத்தமில்லை. நற்றிணையில் வேங்கை மரத்தில் அமைந்த பரணில் எவனோ ஒருவன் தீமை விளைத்தான் என்பதும் அதுகாரணமாகத் திருமாவுண்ணி கவலை மீதூரப் பெற்றாள் என்பதும் கூறப்பட்டுள்ளன. கண்ணகி மதுரையை எரியூட்டியபின் சிலநாட் சென்று வேங்கைமர நிழலில் கின்றாள் எனச் சிலப்பதிகாரம் சொல்லுகின்றது. அதற்கும் இதற்கும் தொடர்பில்லை. ஏதிலாளன் செயலால் விளைந்த வருத்தத்தால் திருமாவுண்ணி ஒரு நகிலை அறுத்துக் கொண்டாள் என நற்றிணைச் செய்யுள் கூறுகிறது. கண்ணகியோ மதுரையை எரியுண்ணச் செய்ய நினைத்து இடநகிலைத் திருகி விட்டெறிந்தாள் என்று சிலப்பதிகாரம் சொல்லுகிறது. நற்றிணையில் வருபவள் பெயர் திருமாவுண்ணி. சிலப்பதிகாரத் தலைவி பெயர் கண்ணகி. பொருந்தும் தொடர்பின்மையின் இருவரும் ஒருவரே என்று கூறுதல் தகாது.

புறநானூற்றில் கழாத்தலையார் பாடிய பாட்டாக வரும் ஒன்றனுள் ¹³ சேரமான் பெருஞ்சேரலாதன் கரிகால் வள

12 நற்றிணை-செய்யுள் 216

13 புறம். 65

வனேடு போர் செய்து முதுகிற்புண்பட்ட காரணத்தால் நாணமுற்று வடக்குநோக்கி இருந்தான் என்பதும், அவன் அவ்வாறு பட்டினியிருந்து மடிய எண்ணியமையால் அவனுடைய ஊர் விழாக்களையும் பொலிவினையும் இழந்ததென்பதும் அறியப்படுகின்றன. இதனை

“ மண்முழா மறப்பப் பண்யாழ் மறப்ப
இருங்கட் குழிசி கவிழ்ந்திழுது மறப்பச்
சுரும்பார் தேறல் சுற்றம் மறப்ப
உழவர் ஓதை மறப்ப விழவும்
அகலு ளாங்கட் சீறூர் மறப்ப ”

என்ற வகையால் கழாத்தலையார் அறிவித்தார். முழா மண்பூசுவதை இழத்தலும் யாழ் பண்ணேடு இசைக்கப்படுவதை இழத்தலும் விழா எடுத்தலை ஊர் இழத்தலுமாகிய செய்திகள் இங்கே கூறப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. இப்பாடற் பகுதியிற் கவிஞர் “ மறப்ப ” என்ற சொல்லை ஆறுமுறை பயன்படுத்தியுள்ளார். வந்த ஒருசொல்லே மீட்டும் மீட்டும் வந்தமையால் சிலருக்கு ஒருவகையின்பம் தோன்றுதல் கூடும். ஆயினும், வேறு சிலருக்கு வந்த ஒரு சொல்லே மீண்டும் மீண்டும் வந்தமையால் சலிப்புணர்ச்சி தோன்றுதலும் இயல்பு. இளங்கோவடிகள் இதனையொத்த கருத்தைத் தெரிவிக்கவேண்டிய இடத்திற் சலிப்புணர்ச்சியை நீக்குதற்காக வெவ்வேறு சொற்களையும் முறைகளையும் பயன்படுத்தி எத்துணை அழகுறக் கவி இயற்றியுள்ளார் என்பது அந்திமாலேச் சிறப்புச்செய் காதையில் வருஞ் செயலற்ற கண்ணகிபற்றிய வருணனையால் விளங்கும்.

“ அஞ்செஞ் சீறடி யணிசிலம் பொழிய
மென்றுகில் அல்குல் மேகலை நீங்கக்
கொங்கை முன்றிற் குங்குமம் எழுதாள்
மங்கல வணியிற் பிறிதணி மகிழாள்
கொடுங்குழை துறந்து வடிந்துவீழ் காதினள்
திங்கள் வாண்முகஞ் சிறுவியர் பிரியச்
செங்கயல் நெடுங்கண் அஞ்சனம் மறப்பப்
பவள வாணுதல் திலகம் இழப்பத்
தவள வாணகை கோவலன் இழப்ப
மையிருங் கூந்தல் நெய்யணி மறப்பக்
கையறு நெஞ்சத்துக் கண்ணகி ”

என்னும் இடத்தில், “ மறப்ப ” என்ற சொல்வினை இரண்டு முறை பயன்படுத்தி அக்கருத்துடைய “ இழப்ப ” என்னுஞ்

சொல்லை இரண்டு முறை பயன்படுத்தியிருக்கிறார் கவிஞர் என்பது அறியப்படும். இக்கருத்துடைய இரண்டு வேறு சொற்களாகிய “ஒழிக” “நீங்க” என்பனவும் பயன்படுத்தப்பட்டுள்ளன என்பது குறிப்பிடத்தக்கது. கொங்கை முன்றிற் குங்குமம் மறப்ப எனக் கவிஞர் விரும்பினால் எழுதியிருத்தல் இயலும். அவ்வாறு கூறாமல் “கொங்கை முன்றிற் குங்குமம் எழுதாள்” என எழுதிக் கையாண்ட முறை மாற்றத்தால் கவி மேலும் அழகு பெறுகிறது. குங்குமம் எழுதாளாய், பிறிதணி மகிழாளாய், வடிந்துவீழ் காதினளாய், செயலற்ற நெஞ்சத்தினளாய்க் கண்ணகி இருந்தாள் என்று கவிஞர் காட்டியுள்ளார். இவ்வருணையில் வரிசை நெகிழாமல் அடி, அல்குல், கொங்கை, கழுத்து அல்லது தோள், காது, முகம், கண், நுதல், கூந்தல் ஆகியவை பேசப்பட்டுள்ளன என்பதைக்காணுங்கால் உண்டாகும் இலக்கியவிற்பம்பெரிது.

புறநானூற்றில் வரும் புலவர் ஒருவர் மணப்பறையும் பிணப்பறையும் ஒருங்கு கேட்குமாறும், கணவனோடு புணர்ந்தோர் மகிழக் கணவனைப் பிரிந்தோர் துயருறுமாறும் உலகத்தைப் படைத்தவன் பண்பிலாளன் என்றார். மற்றொருபுலவர் கோப்பெருஞ்சோழன் வடக்கிருந்து உயிர்விட்ட பிற்பாடு அவன் நடுகல்லைக் கண்டு அவன் பெருமையெல்லாங் கூறி, “அத்தக் கோனைக் கூற்றம் கொண்டதாகவின் சுற்றத்தாரோடு சென்று அக்கூற்றுவனை வைவோமாக, வாய்மொழிப் புலவீர் வாரீர்” என்று பாடியதாக அச்செய்யுள் உள்ளது. இதனோடு ஒப்புநோக்கத் தக்கது கண்ணகி அறக்கடவுளைப் பழித்த செய்தி. அவள்

“மறனோடு திரியுங்கோல் மன்னவன் தவறிழைப்ப

அறனெனும் மடவோய்யான் அவலங்கொண்ட ழிவலோ!”

என்று கூறியதாகச் சிலப்பதிகாரத் துன்பமாலைப் பகுதி காட்டுகிறது. பாண்டிய மன்னன் தவறிழைக்கும்படி விட்டு விட்ட அறக்கடவுளை “மடவோய்” எனக் கண்ணகி வைதே விட்டாள். அதனால், வாழ்த்துக் காதையிற் கவிஞர்

“அலம்வந்த மதிமுகத்திற் சில செங்கயல் நீருமிழ்ப்

பொடியாடிய கருமுகிறன் புறம்புதைப்ப அறம்பழித்து”

என்றவாறு கூறினார். பக்குடுக்கை நன்கணியார் “படைத் தவன் பண்பிலாளன்” என்றார். பொத்தியார் “கூற்றுவனை

வைவோம் வாரீர்” என்றார். கண்ணகி அறக்கடவுளை “மடவோய்” என வைதேவிட்டாள்.

புறநானூற்றில் வரும் பாரிமகளிருடைய கையறுநிலைச் செய்யுள் உருக்கம் நிரம்பியது :—

“அற்றைத் திங்கள் அவ்வெண் ணிலவின்
எந்தையும் உடையேமெங் குன்றும் பிறர்கொளார்
இற்றைத் திங்கள் இவ்வெண் ணிலவின்
வென்றெறி முரசின் வேந்தரெம்
குன்றுங் கொண்டார்யாம் எந்தையும் இலமே”

இச்செய்யுளைப் பாடிய பாரியின் மகளிர் இருவரும் தம்முடைய தந்தையைச் சென்ற திங்களிற் பெற்றிருந்ததனால் அடைந்த பெருமையையும் ஏமாப்பினையும் முதலிற் குறிப்பிட்டார்கள். அவர்களுடைய குன்றம் தம்வயம் இருந்தது பற்றி அடுத்த அளவில்தான் அவர்களுக்கு மகிழ்ச்சி இருந்தது. தந்தையையும் குன்றத்தினையும் ஒப்பிட்டுப் பார்க்கும்பொழுது குன்றத்தை இழந்து தந்தையைப் பெற்றிருந்தால்கூடத் தயரம் உற்றிருக்க மாட்டார்கள், அவர்கள் பேசுகிற அந்த நிலவு நேரத்தில் “குன்றம் போயிற்றே எம் தந்தையும் இல்லையே” என்றவாறு கலங்கினார் என இப்பாடலினால் அறிகிறோம். எங்கள் நாடு போயிற்று, எங்கள் தந்தையாவது இருந்திருக்கக்கூடாதா எனக்கருதி அவர்கள் பேசியிருக்கிறார்கள் என்பது “குன்றும் கொண்டார்” என முதலில் வைத்து “எம் தந்தையும் இலமே” எனப் பின்னர் வைத்துப் பேசினமையால் அறியப்படும். இரக்கவுணர்ச்சியைத் தூண்டிவிடத்தக்க உலகச் செய்யுட்களில் இப்புறநானூற்றுச் செய்யுளுக்கேச் சிறந்ததோர் இடமுண்டு. அவ்வாறே, இரக்கவுணர்ச்சியைத் தூண்டிவிடக்கூடியனவாய்ச் சில பகுதிகள் சிலப்பதிகாரத்திற் காணப்படுகின்றன. கண்ணகி பாண்டிய மன்னனை எதிர்நோக்கி, “வாழ்தல் வேண்டி நின்னகர்ப் புகுந்த என்கணவன் உன்றைக் கொல்லப்பட்டனனே!” எனக்கூறி, “வாழ்வு விரும்பினவன் சாவு பெற்றான்” எனத் தெரிவிக்குமிடத்திற் பெரியதோர் இரக்கம் எழுதல் இயல்பு. கோவலன் வெட்டுண்டு கிடந்தவனைக் காணவந்த கண்ணகியைத் தான் காணாய்க் கோவலன் கிடந்த நிலையில் அவள் பாடிய பாட்டு உருக்கத்தின் உயர்ந்த எல்லைக்குச் செல்லுகிறது.

“ வண்டார் இருங்குஞ்சி மாலைதன் வார்குமுன்மேற்
கொண்டாள் தழீஇக் கொழுநன்பாற் காலேவாய்ப்
புண்டாழ் குருதி புறஞ்சோர மாலைவாய்க்
கண்டாள் அவன்றனைக் காணுக் கடுந்துயரம் ”

என்று அவள் கூறிய செய்யுளிலிருந்து காலே நேரத்திற்
கணவனைத் தழுவித் தன் கூந்தலில் அவனால் மாலைசூட்டப்
பட்டாள் என்பதும், மாலையில் அவன் குருதி சோர்ந்து செய
லற்ற நிலையிற் கிடப்பதைக் கண்டாள் என்பதும் அறியப்
படுகின்றன. காலே நேரத்தில் மகிழ்ச்சியும் மாலை நேரத்திற்
கடுந்துயரமும் அவள் அடைந்தாள் என்பதை இப்பாட்டு
வெளிப்படுத்தியுள்ளது. அவன் அவனைக் கண்டால்கூட ஒரு
வாறு தணிவாள்; ஆனால் காணவில்லையே என்ற வாறு
பொருள்படும்படி “ அவன் தன்னைக் காணுக் கடுந்துயரங்
கண்டாள் ” என்ற பகுதி அமைந்திருக்கிறது. கவிஞர்

“ செம்பொற் கொடியனையாள் கண்டாளைத் தான்காணான் ”

எனக்கூறி உருகுகிறார். கோவலனோ கண்ணகியோடு
முதல்நாட் கூட்டத்திற்குப் பிறகு அவள் கூந்தலில்
சில மலர்களை அணிவியாமற் பெரிய மாலையை அணிவித்த
மடந்தையர் பேயுற்றனரோ என்று பேசினான். இன்று
காலையிலோ அவனை அவளது கூந்தலில் மாலையை எடுத்துச்
சூட்டினான் ! அந்தோ பரிதாபம் ! அக்காலேவாய் இன்பம்
மாலையில் துன்பமாயிற்றே எனக் கதறுகிறார் கவிஞர் என்
பது தெளிவு. கட்டுரைக் காதையிலும் கண்ணகி,

“ கீழ்த்திசை வாயிற் கணவனொடு புகுந்தேன்
மேற்றிசை வாயில் வறியேன் பெயர்கு ”

எனக் கூறிச்செல்லுமிடத்தில் வரும் முரண்டொடை அமைப்
பினால் விளைகின்ற உருக்கம் உன்னத்தக்கது.

திருக்குறளுக்கும் சிலப்பதிகாரத்திற்கும் இடையே பல
இடங்களில் ஒற்றுமைகள் உள்ளன. அவற்றைப்பற்றித்
தனியே கட்டுரை எழுதியுள்ளேன் ஆதலின் இன்று அவ்
வொற்றுமைகளைப்பற்றி எடுத்துக் கூறிக்கொண்டிருக்க
மாட்டேன்.

“ பிறர்க்கின்ற முற்பகற் செய்யின் தமக்கின்ற
பிற்பகல் தாமே வரும் ”

என்ற திருக்குறளின் சொல்லும் பொருளும் சிலப்பதிகாரத்
தில்,

“ முற்பகற் செய்தான் பிறன்கேடு தன்கேடு
பிற்பகற் காண்குறூஉம் பெற்றிய காண் ”

என்றவாறு அமைந்துள என்பதைப் பலர் அறிவர் என்
னும் அளவில் அமைவேன்.

கவித்தொகையில் பெண்ணொருத்தியைப் பார்த்துப்பாரா
ட்ட நினைத்த தலைவன் ஒருவன் “ நல்லார் உறுப்பெலாங்
கொண்டியற்றியாள் கொல் ” எனக் கூறினான். இலக்கணம்
வாய்ந்த நல்ல மகளிருடைய நல்ல நல்ல உறுப்புக்களைத்
தனித்தனி எடுத்து உருவாக்கப்பட்ட பெண்மகளோ இவள்
எனப் பேசினான் என்பது கருத்து. சிலருக்குக் கண்ணும்
சிலருக்கு மூக்கும் சிலருக்குக் கையும் அழகாக இருப்பதுண்டு.
அத்தகைய அழகிய உறுப்புக்களையெல்லாம் ஒன்று
திரட்டி உருவாக்கப்பட்ட பெண்ணே இவள் என்ற பேச்சு
கவித்தொகைச் செய்யுளில் வந்திருக்கிறது. சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில்,

“ கயலெழுதி வில்லெழுதிக் காரெழுதிக் காமன்
செயலெழுதித் தீர்ந்தமுகம் திங்களோ காணீர் ”

என்ற இடத்தில் கயல்மீன் போன்ற கண்களையும் வில்
போன்ற புருவத்தையும் மேகம் போன்ற கூந்தலையும் ஒன்று
சேர்த்துக் காமவேள் இயற்றும் செயற்றிறமும் சேர்த்து உரு
வாக்கி முடித்துவிட்ட திங்களோ இவள் முகம் என்று பெண்
னொருத்தியைப்பற்றி ஒருவன் பேசியதாகக் காண்கிறோம்.

“ ஓவியமாக எழுதிய பின்னை யொருமுதல்வன்
ஆவி புகுத்தி விடுத்தன னோவன் றழகையெல்லாந்
தாவி மனத்தாற் றிரட்டின னோவலன் றன்வலிவும்
பூவை யுருவும் நிலையிற்பொன் னாளோர் புதுமையன்றே ”

இப்பாடலில், ஓவியமாக இப்பெண்ணை எழுதிய பிற்பாடு
முதல்வன் உயிரைச் சேர்த்தனனோ, அழகையெல்லாம்
மனத்தால் திரட்டினனோ என்றவாறு சகுந்தலையைப்பற்றி
துஷ்யந்தன் கூறியதாகக் காளிதாசர் எழுதியுள்ளார்¹⁴.
பிரான்சிஸ் தாம்புசன் (Francis Thompson) என்னும் கவிஞர்
ஆங்கிலத்தில் இதைப் போன்று அழகாக வயோலா (Viola)
என்னும் பெண் உருவாக்கப்பட்டமைபற்றி அழகுறத் தீட்டி
யுள்ளார்.

“ All things accomplished, saith the Father of Heaven ! ”

“Bear her down, and bearing, sing
 Bear her down on spyless wing
 Bear her down, and bearing, sing,
 With a sound of Viola.”

* * * *

“Baby smiled, mother wailed,
 Earthward while the sweetling sailed;
 Mother smiled, Baby wailed,
 When to Earth came Viola”

என்ற பகுதியை நோக்குக.

மணிமேகலை சிலப்பதிகார காலத்திற்கு ஏறத்தாழ ஒரு நூற்றாண்டு கழித்துத் தோன்றிய காப்பியம் என்பது தமிழ்ப் பெரும்புலவர் கணியர் இ. மு. சுப்பிரமணிய பிள்ளை அவர்கள் கருத்து.

“மணிமேகலைமே லுரைப் பொருண்முற்றிய
 சிலப்பதிகார முற்றும்”

என்று வரும் நூற்கட்டுரைப் பகுதியிலிருந்து மணிமேகலை சிலப்பதிகாரத்திற்கு முன்னர் இயற்றப்பட்ட நூல் போன்ற தோர் குறிப்புண்டு. அம்மணிமேகலையில் வஞ்சிமாநகர் புக்க காதையில் கண்ணகி கூற்றாக வருவது சிலப்பதிகாரச் செய்தி யினின்று மாறுபடுகிறது. சிலப்பதிகார வழியாக நோக்கி லால் கண்ணகி கோவலனோடு விண்ணலகு புக்குத் தெய்வ மகள் ஆயினள் என்றும். மணிமேகலையிலோ கண்ணகி மணிமேகலையை நோக்கிக் கூறிய கூற்றாக வருவதொன்றை வைத்துப் பார்த்தால் சிற்றங்கொண்டு மதுரை நகரை அழித்த காரணத்தால் கண்ணகிக்கு மீட்டும் பிறப்புண்டு என்னும் கருத்து வெளியாகிறது.

“சீற்றங் கொண்டு செழுநகர் சிதைத்தேன்
 மேற்செய்நல் வினையின் விண்ணவாச் சென்றேம்
 அவ்வினை யிறுதியின் அடுசினப் பாவம்
 எவ்வகை யானும் எய்துதல் ஒழியாது
 உம்ப ரில்வழி யிம்பரிற் பல்பிறப்பு
 யாங்கணும் இருவினை உய்த்துமைப் போல
 நீங்கரும் பிறவிக் கடலிடை நீந்திப்
 பிறந்தும் இறந்தும் உழல்வோம்”

என்று கண்ணகி கூறியதாக வரும் பகுதி நோக்கத்தக்கது. சிலப்பதிகாரத்திற்கும் மணிமேகலைக்கும் உள்ள சில ஒற்றுமை வேற்றுமைகளை மேலெழுந்தவாரியாகக் குறித்துச் செல்வே லாகுக :—

“ சிலப்பதிகாரமும் மணிமேகலையும் ”

சிலம்பு

1. “உனக்குச் சொல்லவும் வேண்டுமோ”....மாடலன் செங்குட்டுவனை நோக்கி.
2. கண்ணகி இறந்த கோவலனை உயிருடன் கண்டமை.
3. மதுராபுரித் தெய்வம் கண்ணகிக்கு உரைத்தது.
4. கோவலன் கணிகையர்பால் கெட்டமை.
5. பாண்டியன் மனைவியோடு கூடச் செல்வோன் முறைபிறழ்ந்து உரைத்தது.
6. படுபொருள் வவ்விய பார்ப்பான் என ஒருவனைச் சிறையில் இட்டது.
7. என்னைப்போல ஈரேழ்நாள் எல்லை நின் மனையாள் துயர் உறுக என நீலி பரதனுக்குச் சாபமிட்டது.
8. பத்தினி கண்ணகியின் திறம்.
9. பார்ப்பான் ஒருவனை யானை துன்புறுத்த அதனின்றி கோவலன் காத்தது.
10. மாடலன் செங்குட்டுவனுக்குச் செல்வ நிலையாமையைக் கூறுவது.

மணிமேகலை

1. “ஆடவர்க்குப் பெண்டிர் கூறவும் வேண்டுமோ”.....மணிமேகலையம் சுதமதியும் உதயகுமரனை நோக்கி.
2. ஆதிரை தீயிடப்பட்டும் இறவாமை.
3. சம்பாபதித் தெய்வம் மணிமேகலைக்கு உரைத்தது.
4. ஆதிரையின் கணவன் சாதுவன் நிலைமகளிர் பால் கெட்டமை.
5. மாவண் கிள்ளி கூடச் செல்வோன் மணிமேகலையை வருக என அழைத்து அவள் கருத்துப் படி சிறைக்கோட்டத்தை அறக்கோட்டமாக்கியது.
6. ஆவினைத் திருடிய கள்வன் என ஆபுத்திரனை அலைத்துத் துரத்திக் கடிஞையில் கல்லிட்டதும், மணிமேகலையைச் சிறைப்படுத்தியதும்.
7. பன்னிரண்டு ஆண்டுக்கு ஒரு முறை நாவற்பழம் சாப்பிட்ட விருச்சிகன் பன்னிரண்டு ஆண்டுகழித்துக் காயசண்டிகை தீப்பசி தீர்க்கப் பெறுவான் என்றது.
8. பத்தினி ஆதிரையின் திறம்.
9. சுதமதியின் தந்தையை ஒருகாளை முட்டிக் குடலை அகற்றித் தள்ளிவிடப் பௌத்தமுனி காத்தது.
10. மணிமேகலை உதயகுமரனுக்கு நிலையாமை கூறுவது.

இவைபோன்றவை பிற கருத்தத்தக்கன.

III. “ சிலப்பதிகாரத்திற்குப்

பீந்திய தமிழிலக்கியம் ”

(19—2—1964)

சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் “கடவுளைக் காணாத கண் என்ன கண்ணே! கண்ணிமைத்துக் காண்பார்தங் கண் என்ன கண்ணே!” என ஆய்ச்சியர்கள் கூடிக் குரவைக் கூத்தின் பொழுது பாடினார்கள் என இளங்கோவடிகள் “ஆய்ச்சியர் குரவை” என்னுங் காதையில் எழுதியுள்ளார்:—

“பெரியவனை மாயவனைப் பேருலகம் எல்லாம்
விரிகமல உந்தியுடை விண்ணவனைக் கண்ணும்
திருவடியங் கையும் திருவாயுஞ் செய்ய
கரியவனைக் காணாத கண்ணென்ன கண்ணே
கண்ணிமைத்துக் காண்பார்தம் கண்ணென்ன
கண்ணே”

திருமலைக் காணாதவர்களுடைய கண்கள் பீலிக் கண்கள்; மரக் கண்கள் என்னுங் குறிப்புப்பட அவர் இவ்விடத்திற்கு கூறியுள்ளார். அவ்வாறே, “பஞ்சவர்க்குத் தூது நடந்தானே ஏத்தாத நா என்ன நா?” எனப் பாடியவிடத்தில் அந்த நா கலப்பை நா, மணிநா என்னுங் குறிப்புப்படப் பாடியுள்ளார். “திருமால் சீர் கேளாத செவி என்ன செவியே?” எனப் பாடியபொழுது அச்செவிகள் மரச்செவி, மட்செவி, கற்செவி, என்னுங் குறிப்புவைத்துப் பாடினார். அவ்வாறே, திருஞான சம்பந்தர்,

‘ஆமாத்தூ ரம்மாளைக் —

காணாத கண்ணெல்லாங் காணாத கண்களே’

‘ஆமாத்தூ ரம்மாளைக்

கூறாத நாவெல்லாங் கூறாத நாக்களே’

‘ஆமாத்தூ ரம்மாளைக்

கேளாச் செவியெல்லாங் கேளாச் செவிகளே’

‘ஆமாத்தூர்

நிச்சல் நினையாதார் நெஞ்சமும் நெஞ்சமே’

என்றவாறு பாடினமை அறியப்படும்.

கவுந்தியடிகள் அருகக் கடவுளையன்றி வேறு எக்கடவுளையுந் தொழும் விருப்பினரல்லர் என்பது நாடுகாண் காதையால் நன்கு விளங்கும். சாரணர்தலைவரைக் கண்ட கவுந்தியடிகள் அருகன் நாமங்களைக் கேட்டுக் கைகளைத் தலைமேற்கொண்டு வணங்கிக் கூறிய கூற்றில் அருகக் கடவுளது திருமொழிக்கு அல்லாமல் வேறு எம்மொழிக்கும் தம் செவிகள் திறக்கா என்றும், அவன் ஆயிரத்தெட்டுப் பெயர்களையன்றி வேறு எப்பெயரையும் தம் நா நவிலாது என்றும், தமது கையகத்து வந்துகின்ற காண்க காண்க எனப் பிற தெய்வங்கள் கதறினாலும் தம் கண்கள் காணமாட்டா என்றும், அவரது திருமெய் எதிரே அல்லாமல் வேறு எவர் முன்னாலும் தம் உடல் வணங்காது என்றும் அவர் கூறிய செய்தி

“காவுந்திகை தன்கை தலைமேற் கொண்டு,
ஒருமூன்று அவித்தோன் ஓதிய ஞானத்
திருமொழிக் கல்லது என்செவியகந் திறவா ;
காமனை வென்றோன் ஆயிரத் தெட்டு
நாமம் அல்லது நவிலாது என்நா ;
ஐவரை வென்றோன் அடியினை அல்லது
கைவரைக் காணினும் காண என்கண் ;
அருளறம் பூண்டோன் திருமெய்க் கல்லதென்
பொருளில் யாக்கை பூமியிற் பொருந்தாது”

என்னும் நாடுகாண் காதைப் பகுதியால்¹⁵ அறியப்படும். திருநாவுக்கரசர்,

“கூத்தாநின் குரையார் கழலே யலது
ஏத்தா நாவெனக் கெந்தை பிரானிரே”

எனக் கூறினாரென்பது இதனோடு ஒப்புநோக்கத்தக்கது. திருவாசகத்திலும்,

‘பழுதிருளல் புகழாள் பங்கநீ யல்லால்
பற்றுநான் மற்றிலேன் கண்டாய்
செழுமதி யணிந்தாய் சிவபுரத் தரசே
திருப்பெருந் துறையுறை சிவனே
தொழுவனோ பிறரைத் துதிப்பனோ எனக்கோர்
துணையென நினைவனோ சொல்லாய்
மழவிடை யானே வாழ்கிலேன் கண்டாய்
வருகவென் றருள்புரி யாயே”

என வந்திருப்பதில், “பிறன்தாள் தொழாமைப் பேரறம்”

மாணிக்கவாசகரால் எவ்வாறு போற்றப்பட்டுள்ளது என்பது அறியவரும்.

கணவன் உழுவலன்போடு பழகும் நாளெல்லாம் அவனோடு மிக்க கேண்மைபூண்டு அவன் விருப்பப்படி நடந்து வந்த கண்ணகி அவன் மாதவியோடு இணங்கி நடத்திவந்த வாழ்க்கையைப்பற்றி முதலில் வெறுத்தொதுக்காமல் இருந்தாளாயினும் வேளை வந்தபொழுது அவள் வாளா இருந்திலள். செய்த தீங்குகளுக்கு இரங்கி அவன் மனம் உளைந்து வருத்தத்தைத் தெரிவிக்கும் ஏல்வையில் கண்ணகி “போற்ற ஒழுக்கம் புரிந்தீர்” என்ற சுடுசொல்லைக் கூறத் தயங்கினாள். அவ்வாறே, பெரிய புராணத்தில் வரும் தலைமகளிர் சிலர் உரிமையின்கண் வேட்கையுடையவராய் இருந்துள்ளார் என்பது தெரியவருகிறது. காரைக்காலம்மையார் கணவன் பரமதத்தன் வேறொரு பெண்ணை மணந்து கொண்டான் என்றறிந்த பிற்பாடு கணவனைப்பற்றிப் பேசும் கூற்றில் இகழ்ச்சி தோன்றக் கணவனை ‘இவன்’ எனக் கூறியது போல் வைத்துச் சேக்கிழார் அமைத்த திறம் நோக்கத்தக்கது.

‘ஈங்கிவன் குறித்த கொள்கை இது-இனி இவனுக்காகத்
தாங்கிய வனப்புநின்ற தசைப்பொதி கழிந்து
நின்தாள்கள் போற்றும் பேய்வடிவு அடியேனுக்குப்
பாங்குற வேண்டும்”

என்று புனிதவதியார் பேசியதாகப் பெரியபுராணம் கூறும் ¹⁶.

இயற்பகை நாயனார் உலகவியலைப் பகைத்து நடக்கும் இயல்பினராதலின் அப்பெயர் பெற்றார். தம் மனைவியைப் பிறருக்குத் தாரேன் என்பது உலகியல். அதனைக் கடந்த இயற்பகை நாயனார் சோதனைக்கிணங்கித் தம் மனைவியை மெய்த் தவருக்குக் (கடவுளுக்கு) கொடுக்க இணங்கினார். கடவுள் சில வேளைகளில் நாம் அறிய பெரிய பொருள் களென்று மதிப்பனவற்றை விட்டுக்கொடுக்க ஒருங்குகிரேமா எனப் பார்ப்பார் போலும்! “உற்றரை யான் வேண்டேன், ஊர் வேண்டேன், பேர் வேண்டேன்” என்று கூறும் பக்தர்கள் கூறுவன அனைத்தும் உண்மைதானா எனக் கடவுள் சில வேளைகளிற் சோதிக்க விரும்புவார் போலும்! அதனால் அன்றே தம்மால் மிகவுந் காதலிக்கப்பட்ட மாசுறு

மனைவியை இயற்பகையார் பிரிவதற்கு ஒருங்குகிராரா எனக் கண்டறிய வேண்டிச் சோதனை நடந்தது! எவ்வாறாயினும், இயற்பகையார் தம் மனைவியைத் தவமுடையார்க்கு அளிக்க இணங்கிவிட்டார். அச்செய்தியை மனைவியிடஞ் சொன்னதும் அவர் கலக்கமுற்றார் என்பதும், பிறகு மனந்துணிந்து பேசினு ரென்பதும் சேக்கிழாரால் அழகாகக் கூறப்பட்டுள்ளன. “மதுமலர்க்குழல் மனைவியார் கலங்கி மனந்துணிந்தவுடன் மற்றிது மொழிவார்” என்பது அவர் வாக்கு. மனைவிக்கு இருக்க வேண்டிய கலக்கம் அந்நங்கையார் எய்தாமலில்லை. எனினும், ஒருவாறு தெளிவுற்று அவர் பேசலுற்றதாகக் கூறப்பட்டுஞ் சொல்லை நோக்குவோமாக :-

“இன்றுநீரெனக் கருள்செய்த திதுவேல் என்னு
யிர்க்கொரு நாத! நீர்உரைத்த
தொன்றை நான்செயும் அத்தனை யல்லால் உரிமை
வேறுளதோ எனக்கென்று
தன்தனிப்பெருங் கணவரை வணங்கத் தாழ்ந்து
தொண்டனார் தாமெதிர் வணங்கச்
சென்று மாதவன் சேவடி பணிந்து திகைத்து
நின்றனள் திருவினும் பெரியாள் ”

என்று வரும் பெரியபுராணச் செய்யுளில், “ பல்லாண்டுகளாக நாமக்குக் குற்றேவல் செய்துவந்த எனக்குத் தாங்கள் திரு வருள் செய்தது இதுவானால், இவ்வரைத்தொன்றை நான் செய்தலையன்றி உரிமை வேறு என்ன இருக்கிறது!” என்று தம் கணவரைக் கேட்டார் இயற்பகை மனைவியாரென அறிகிறோம். தாங்கள் திருவுள்ளங்கொண்டு அருள் செய்தது இதுவானால் என்று கேட்குங்கால், கணவனுடைய முகத்திற் சிவப்புக்குறி தோன்றிற்றுப் போலும்! அதனைத் தடுக்க “ என்னுயிர்க்கு ஒரு நாதனை ” என உடன் அவ்வம்மையார் பேசியது நினைக்கத்தக்கது. இயற்பகை கூறிய வாக்கினைத் தன்வாயினால் திரும்பக் கூறக்கூடத் தான் விரும்பவில்லை என்ற குறிப்பினை “ நீர் உரைத்ததொன்றை நான் செய்யும் அத்தனை அல்லால் ” என்றவிடத்திற் குறிப்பாக விளக்கிக்காட்டினார் அவ்வம்மையார். “ அதனை அல்லால் உரிமை வேறுளதோ ” என அவர் கேட்டவிடத்தில் உரிமை வேறு உள்ளதாயின் அதுபற்றி என்போன்றோர் பேசுதல் இயலும் என்ற குறிப்போடு அவ்வம்மையார் கூறியதாகச் சேக்கிழார் அமைத்த

இலக்கியத்திறம் உற்று நோக்கத்தக்கது. கணவன் கூறியபடி மாதவர் பக்கல் சென்றுநின்ற அவ்வம்மையார் “திகைப்புடன் நின்றார்” என்று சேககிழார் கூறிய வகையினாலே அவ்வம்மையாருடைய மெய்ப்பாடுகள் உணர்த்தப்பட்டுள்ளன.

இதுதான் தமிழ்நாட்டுப் பெண்டிர்களுடைய அழியாப் பண்பு. புறநானூற்றில் வரும் தாய் ஒருத்தி கணவனையிழுந்தவள் தன் சிறுபுதல்வனைப் போர்க்களத்திற்குச் செல்லுக என விடுக்கின்றாள்.

“செருப்பறை கேட்டு விருப்புற்று மயங்கி

* * * * *

ஒருமகன் அல்லது இல்லோள்
செருமுகம் நோக்கிச் செல்கென விடுமே”

எனக் கூறும் புறநானூற்றுச் செய்யுளில் அத்தாயினுடைய வீரமும் பரிவும் ஒருங்குசேர்த்துப் படம்பிடித்துக் காட்டப்பட்டுள்ளன. தன் குடும்பம் நாட்டிற்குப் பணி செய்தலில் தாழ்த்தல்கூடாது என்பதால் வந்த விருப்பம் ஒரு பக்கம்; ஒரே மகனைப் போர்க்களத்திற்கு அனுப்ப வேண்டியிருக்கிறதே என்ற நினைப்பினால் வந்த திகைப்பு ஒருபக்கம். இவ்விரண்டினையுஞ் சேர்த்து “விருப்புற்று மயங்கி” என்ற வகையில் அவரது நிலையினைப் புலப்படுத்திய கவிஞர் திறம் எண்ணத்தக்கது. அவ்வாறே, கண்ணகியும் தனக்குக்கொடுமை செய்யப்பட்ட ஊராகிய மதுரையைத் தீக்கொளுவ எண்ணிவிட்டாளாயினும், மதுரையை எரிக்கிறேனே என்று ஒருபக்கம் உளைந்த மனத்தினொன்பதைப் புலப்படுத்தவே கவிஞர்

“கோநகர் சீறினேன் குற்றமிலேன் யானென்
றிடமுலை கையாற்றிருகி மதுரை
வலமுறை மும்முறை வாரா அலமந்து”

என்று கூறினார். “அலமந்து” என்ற சொல்லினால் கண்ணகி பேயல்லள் பெண்மணியே என்பதனை நிறுவியராகிவிட்டார்.

பெரியபுராணத்தில் வெண்காட்டு நங்கையின் செய்தியாக வருவதொன்றும் இவற்றை ஒருபுடை ஒத்தது. அவர் கணவனார் சிறுத்தொண்டர் மாதவர் ஒருவர் அமுது செய்வதற்கு எனக் கேட்ட பிள்ளைக்கறியைச் சமைத்துத்தர இணங்கி விட்டார். குடிக்கு ஒரே பிள்ளையாக இருக்கவேண்டும் அப்பிள்ளை; உறுப்பில் குறைபாடு இல்லாதிருத்தல் வேண்டும்

அப்பிள்ளை ; அப்பிள்ளையை அரிந்து சமைத்துத்தரின் உண்
போம் என்பதாக மாதவர் கூறிவிட்டார். தன்பால் உள்ள
மைந்தன் குடிக்கு ஒரே பிள்ளையாக இருக்கிறான் என்றும்,
ஐந்து வயதுக்கு உட்பட்டவரை இருக்கிறான் என்றும், ஆத
லால் அவனைக் கறிசமைத்து அடியவர்க்குத் தந்துவிடலாம்
என்றும் உடனே கருதிவிட்டார் சிறுத்தொண்டர். இஃது
ஆண் எண்ணம். அடியவர் விருப்பத்தை மனைவியாருக்கு
அவர் தெரிவித்தவுடன் “ இத்தகைய பிள்ளைக்கறி சமைத்துத்
தருவதில் தடையில்லை. ஆனால் ஒரு குடிக்கு ஒருவரை வரும்
பிள்ளையைப் பெறுமாறு எவ்வாறு? ” என்று கணவனைக்
கேட்டார் நங்கையார். இவ்விலக்கணங்கள் பொருந்திய
பிள்ளை தன்மகன் என்ற எண்ணமே அவருக்கு வந்திலது.
இது பெண் எண்ணம். எனினும், கணவன் தந்த வாக்கினை
நிறைவேற்றாதற்கு உட்பட்டவராகிக் கணவன் செய்யவிருக்
கும் செயலில் துணைநிற்கக் கருதுகிறார் அவர். கணவரை
கூறுகிறார் “ தாழாமே எனே இங்குய்ய நீபயந்தான் தன்னை
அழைப்போம் யாம் ” என்று. மனைவியார் கூறுகிறார் “ நம்
மைக் காக்க வருமணியைச் சென்று பள்ளியினிற் கொண்டு
வாரும் ” என்று. சிறுத்தொண்டர், “ பள்ளிக்கூடம் சென்
றிருக்குப் குழந்தையை நாம் போய் அழைத்து வருவோம்
கறியாக்குதற்கு ” என்று கூறுகிறார். அவர் மனைவியோ ஒரு
புடை ஒப்புக்கொண்டு ஒரு பக்கம் மனம் ஒவ்வாமல் “ நீர்
பள்ளிகுப் போய்க் குழந்தையைக் கொண்டு வாரும் ” என்கி
றார். இதிலிருந்து தமிழ்நாட்டு மகளிர் பொதுவாக அரக்க
ருள்ளம் படைத்தவரல்லர் என்பதும், வீரமுடையவராயினும்
ஈர நெஞ்சத்தினர் என்பதும் வெளியாகும்.

“ குஞ்சி திருத்தி முகந்துடைத்துக் கொட்டை
அரைநாண் துகள்நீக்கி
மஞ்சள் அழிந்த அதற்கிரங்கி மையுங்
கண்ணின் மருங்கொதுக்கிப்
பஞ்சி யஞ்சும் மெல்லடியார் பரிந்து
திருமஞ் சனமாட்டி
எஞ்சல் இல்லாக் கோலஞ்செய் தெடுத்துக்
கணவர் கைக்கொடுத்தார் ”

என வருஞ் செய்யுளிற் சேக்கிழார் உருகுகின்றார் என்பது
தெளிவு. சிறிது நேரத்திற் கறியாக்கப்பட இருக்கும் தன்

அன்புக் கனியைக் கடைசிமுறையாகக் குளிப்பாட்டி அழகு படுத்திக் கணவன் கையிற் கொடுத்தார் அவ்வம்மையார் என்பதைத் தெரிவிக்கும் இச்செய்யுளில் வந்துள்ள ஒவ்வொரு சொல்லும் இரக்கத்தினை எழுப்புகின்றது என்பது அறியப்படும். அடியவர் திருவமுது செய்யக்கூடிய குழந்தையினிடத்தில் அழுக்கு இருத்தல்கூடாது என்பதற்காக உடம்பிலுள்ள அழுக்குகளைப் போக்கி அரைநாளிலுள்ள தூசிகளையெல்லாம் நீக்கினார் அவ்வம்மையார் என்று கூறுவது ஒரு பக்கம். குழந்தையின் தலைமுடியை ஒருமுறைக்கு நான்கு முறை நீவிக் கொண்டு அவர் இருந்தாரென்பது “குஞ்சி திருத்தி” என்ற திறை புலப்படும். குழந்தையின் கண்ணில் மீண்டும் மையிட்டு அழிந்துபோன மஞ்சளாக்குப்பதில் வேறு மஞ்சளிட்டு அழுக்குகளையெல்லாம் போக்கித் திருமஞ்சளம் ஆட்டினார் அவர் என்று கூறுமிடத்து அவருடைய திகைப்பினையும் பதைப்பினையும் கவிஞர் குறிப்பாகக் காட்டுவார்போலப் “பஞ்சி அஞ்சம் மெல்லடியார்” எனக்கூறியுள்ளார். செம்பஞ்சக் குழம்பு ஊட்டுதல்கூடப் பொறுக்கமுடியாத அடிகளையுடைய அவ்வம்மையார் என்று இதற்கு நேரே பொருள் செய்து கொண்டிருப்பதிற்பயனில்லை. அவரது அச்சமும் தயக்கமும் மெல்லியலும் பஞ்சி அஞ்சம் மெல்லடிகள் என்ற சொற்களிற்கு குறிப்புவகையால் அறியவைக்கப்பட்டிருக்கின்றன என்று கொள்ளுதல் பொருந்தும். கடைசியாகக் குழந்தைககுச் செய்யப்படும் அருமைச் செயல்களை இயற்றிக்கொண்டிருக்கும் வகையினால் வெண்காட்டு நங்கையார் குழந்தையைத் தருவதில் எத்துணை அளவு நேரம் கடத்த முடியுமோ அத்துணை அளவு நேரம் கடத்தப் பார்க்கினார் என்பதுதான் பாட்டின் திரண்ட முடிவு. குழந்தையை உயிருடன் எத்துணை நேரம் வைத்திருந்து மகிழலாமோ அத்துணை நேரம் வைத்திருந்து மகிழ விழையும் தாயுள்ளம் இங்கே தொனிக்கிறது. குழந்தையைக் கறியாக்கக் கணவன்பொருட்டு ஒப்புக்கொண்டுவிட்ட பெண்மணி இன்றொரு பக்கத்திற் பெண்ணுள்ளத்தால் எந்த அளவு கலக்கமுறுகிறாள் என்பதைக் கவிஞர் காட்டியிருக்கும் அழகு இலக்கியவுலகில் உயரியதாக வைத்துப் போற்றத்தக்கது.

பாஞ்சாலி சபதத்தை இயற்றிய கவிஞர் சுப்பிரமணிய பாரதியார் திரௌபதியின் கூற்றாக அமைத்த வற்றில் பெண்களுக்கு உரிமையின்கண் உள்ள வேட்கை நன்றாகப் புலப்படுத்தப்பட்டுள்ளது. ஆண்களும் பெண்களும்

நிகராக வாழவேண்டுமென்று விரும்பியவர் பாரதியார். மாதர்களை இழிவுசெய்யும் மடமைகளைக் கொளுத்தவேண்டுமென்று கருதிய அவர், மகாபாரதத்தினின்று சிறிது விவகித் திரௌபதியின் வாக்கில் புதுமைப் பெண்ணின் குரலை ஒலிக்க வைத்துள்ளார். சபைக்கு அழைத்துவரும்படி கூறினார்களெனத் தெரிவித்த தேர்ப்பாகனிடத்தில், “நாயகர்கள் தம்மைத் தோற்ற பிற்பாடு என்னைக் கொடுக்கும் உரிமை அவர்களுக்கு இல்லை” என்று கூறியதோடன்றியும், “கௌரவவேந்தர் சபையில் அறங்கண்டவர் யாவரும் இல்லையோ” என்றும், “அங்கே சாத்திரம் செத்துக்கிடந்ததோ” என்றும் வெகுண்டுரைத்தாள். பிறகு சபைமுன் சென்ற பாஞ்சாலிக்கு வீட்டுமர் நீதியும் வழக்கும் எடுத்துக் கூறியதாக வரும் இடம் நோக்கத்தக்கது.

“சூதாடி நின்னை யுதிட்டிரனே தோற்றுவிட்டான்.
வாதாடி நீயவன்றன் செய்கை மறுக்கின்றாய்.
சூதிலே வல்லான் சகுனி: தொழில் வலியால்
மாதரசே, நின்னுடைய மன்னவனை வீழ்த்திவிட்டான்.
மற்றிதனி லுன்னையொரு பந்தயமா வைத்ததே
குற்றமென்று சொல்லுகிறாய், கோமகளே, பண்டையுக்
வேத முனிவர் விதிப்படி நீ சொல்லுவது
நீதமெனக் கூடும்; நெடுங்காலச் செய்தியது.
ஆனெட்டு பெண் முற்றும் நிகரெனவே யந்நாளில்
பேணி வந்தார், பின்னாளிலி:து பெயர்ந்துபோய்,
இப்பொழுதை நூல்களினையெண்ணுங்கால், ஆடவருக்கு
ஒப்பில்லை மாதர்; ஒருவன் தன் தாரத்தை
விற்றிடலாம், தானமென வேற்றுவர்க்குத் தந்திடலாம்
முற்றும் விலங்குமுறைமை யன்றிவே நில்லை.
தன்னை யடிமையெனக் கொள்வதற்கு நீதியுண்டு.
செல்லு நெறியறியார் செய்கையிங்கு பார்த்திடிலோ
கல்லு நடுங்கும், விலங்குகளும் கண்பதைக்கும்.
செய்கை யநீதியென்று தேர்ந்தாலுஞ் சாத்திரந்தான்
வைகு நெறியும் வழக்கமும் நீ கேட்பதனால்
ஆங்கவையு நின்சார்பி லாகாவகை யுரைத்தேன்”

என்று கூறிய வீட்டுமாச்சாரியார் எதிரே,

“சாலன்கு கூறினீ ரையா, தருமநெறி
 பண்டோ ரிராவணனும் சீதை தன்னைப் பாதகத்தால்
 கொண்டோர் வனத்திடையே வைத்துப் பின்சூட்டமுற
 மந்திரிகள் சாத்திரிமார் தம்மை வரவழைத்தே
 செந்திருவைப் பற்றிவந்த செய்தி யுரைத்திடுங்கால்
 தக்கது நீர்செய்தீர் தருமத்துக் கிச்செய்கை
 ஒக்கும் என்றுகூறி யுகந்தனராம் சாத்திரிமார் !
 பேயரசு செய்தால் பிணந்தின்னும் சாத்திரங்கள்.
 மாய முணராத மன்னவனைச் சூதாட
 வற்புறுத்திக் கேட்டதுதான் வஞ்சனையோ நேர்மையோ ?
 முற்படவே சூழ்ந்து முடித்ததொரு செய்கையன்றே
 மண்டபநீர் கட்டியதுமா நிலத்தைக் கொள்ளவன்றே ?”

என்று திரௌபதி கேட்டதாகப் பாரதியார் காட்டும்வகையில்
 மகளிர்க்கு உரிமையின்கண் உள்ள வேட்கையை நன்கு புலப்
 படுத்தியிருக்கிறார்.

ஏயர்கோன் கலிக்காம நாயனார் “பெண் ஒருத்திபால்
 கடவுளைத் தூதகை ஒருவன் அனுப்புவதாம்; அதற்கிணங்கிக்
 கடவுளும் செல்லுவதாம்” என்று வெகுண்டுரைத்துக் கொண்
 டிருந்தார். இவ்வாறு சுந்தரரிடத்தில் வெறுப்புடையவராய்
 இருந்த அவருக்குச் சூலைநோய் வந்துற்றது இறைவன் அருளி
 னால். இறைவனுடைய செயல்களை யாரே ஆராய வல்லவர்!
 சூலைநோயினின்று கலிக்காமர் நீங்குதற்குரிய வழி சுந்தரர்
 அறிவார் என்றும், அவரால் அந்நோய் தீர்க்கப்படல் வேண்டு
 மென்றும் கேள்வியுற்ற கலிக்காமர் அவர் சூலைநோயைத்
 தீர்க்க வருவதற்கு முன்னால் உடைவாளினால் வயிற்றைக்
 கிழித்துக்கொண்டு இறந்துபட்டார்; சூலையும் தீர்ந்தது. இந்
 நேரத்தில் கலிக்காமர் மனைவியாரும் இறந்துபட எண்ணி அச்
 செயல் செய்ய முற்பட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கும் நேரத்தில், சுந்தரர்
 வருகையைக் கேள்வியுற்ற அவ்வம்மையார் கணவன் எண்ணம்
 பாழாகாதவாறு காப்பதற்காகவே போகும் உயிரினைப்
 பிடித்து வைத்துக்கொண்டு, வன்றெண்டரை வரவேற்றுக்
 கலிக்காமருக்குத் துயர் எதுவும் இல்லையென்றார், வன்றெண்
 டரால் நோய் தீர்க்கப்படலாகாது என்ற கலிக்காமரது விருப்
 பத்தை இறக்கும் உயிரினைத் தாங்கிக்கொண்டு நிறைவேற்ற
 வேண்டுமென்று நினைத்தார் அவர் மனைவியார். வந்த

சுந்தரரோ கலிக்காமர் கிடக்கும் இடம் நேரே சென்று அவர் மாய்ந்ததை அறிந்து, “நானும் இவர் முன் நண்ணுவேன்” என்றார். என்று கூறி உடைவாளைப் பற்றிச் சாகுஞ் செயல் செய்யத் தலைப்பட்ட நேரத்தில் கலிக்காமர் எழுந்து “கேளிரே யாகிக் கெட்டேன்” என்று விரைந்தெழுந்து அவரைத் தடுத்தார் என்று பெரியபுராணம் கூறும். சுந்தரர் பெண்ணின் பால் மிக்க காதலுடையவராய் இருப்பினும், இறந்துபட்ட கலிக்காம நாயனருடைய உயிரைப் பாதுகாத்துக்கொடுக்க முடியாமற்போன காரணத்திற்காக உயிரைவிடத் துணிந்து சாகுஞ் செயல் ஆற்ற முயன்றமையே அவருடைய பெருமைககுச் சான்றாகி விட்டதென அறிஞர் கருதுவர். இவ்வாறு நோக்கின் கோவலனும் பெருமைபுடையவனாகிறான். கண்ணகியைப் புறக்கணித்து மாதவிபால் தங்கி மனமாற்றம் உடைய வனாயினும், ஒரு குடிக்கு ஒருமகனாய் இருந்த சிறுவன் ஒருவன் பொய்க்கரி போயதாகச் சொல்லிச் சதுக்கப்பூகம் அவனைப் பிடித்துத்தின்னும் நேரத்தில் தாயின் துயர் காணமாட்டாமல் கோவலன் பூதத்தை நோக்கி, “என்னுயிர் கொண்டு அவனுயிர் தா” எனக் கேட்டானென்று சிலப்பதிகாரத்தால் அறிகிறோம். இவ்வாறு சாகத்துணிந்து முன்னின்ற வகையினால் கோவலனுடைய சிறப்பு விளங்குகிறது. ஏயர்கோன் கலிக்காமருடைய மனைவி கணவன் கருத்தினை நிறைவேற்று தற்காகச் செல்லும் உயிரினைத் தாங்கினின்றும் போலக் கண்ணகியும்,

“காய்சினந் தணிந்தன்றிக் கணவனைக் கைகூடேன்
தீவேந்தன் றனைக்கண்டுஇத் திறங்கேட்பல் யான்”

எனக் கூறினாளென்று அறிகிறோம். அரசனை நேரிற்கண்டு கணவன் குற்றஞ் செய்தானல்லன் என்பதை நிறுவிவிட்டுத் தனது சினந் தணிந்த பிற்பாடே கணவனைக் கைகூடுவேன் என்று முழங்கிய கண்ணகியின் திறம் இவ்விடத்தில் ஒப்பு நோக்கிப் பாரட்டத்தக்கது.

மகளிர் கணவனை இழந்தபொழுது கலங்கி உரைத்ததாக வருமிடங்கள் பல இலக்கியங்களில் ஒப்புநோக்கத்தக்கனவாய் உள. சீவகசிந்தாமணியில் வரும் விசயையின் கூற்றென்று இவ்விடத்தில் சிந்திக்கத்தக்கது.

“வெவ்வாய் ஓரி முழுவாக விளிந்தார் ஈமம் விளக்காக,
ஒவ்வாச் சுகுகாட் டுயரரங்கில் நிழல்போல் நுடங்கிப் பேயாட

எவ்வாய் மருங்கும் இருந்திரங்கிக் கூகை குழறிப் பாராட்ட
இவ்வா ருகிப் பிறப்பதோ இதுவோ மன்னர்க் கியல்வேந்தே”

என வருஞ் செய்புள் விசயை கணவனையிழந்தவன் சீவகன்
பிறந்தவுடன் புலம்பியதை எடுத்துக்காட்டும் ஒரு செய்புள்.
“சுகாட்டில் உன்னை நான் ஈனும்படி நேர்ந்ததே; இங்கே
உள்ள நரிகளின் கூக்குரல் உனக்கு முழுவாக இருக்கிறது!
இறந்துபட்டவர்களைச் சும் சும் உனக்கு விளக்காக இருக்
கிறது! சுகாட்டு மேட்டில் நிழல்போல அசைந்தசைந்து
பேய்கள் ஆடுவது அரண்மனையில் இயற்றப்படும் நாட்டியம்
போல் இருக்கிறது! எத்தனையோ செவிலியரும் தாதியரும்
போட்டி போட்டுக்கொண்டு உன்னைப் பாராட்டுதற்கு அரண்
மனையில் துடிதுடிப்பார்கள். அதற்கு மாறாக, இங்கே கோட்
டான் குழறி உன்னைப் பாராட்டுகிறது! இவ்வாறாகிப் பிறப்
பதோ! இதுவோ மன்னர்க்கு இயல்! இளவரசே!” என்று
விசயை கூறியதாக வரும் பாட்டில் நிறைய உருக்கமுண்டு.
கண்ணகி கூறிய “பொன்னுறு நறுமேனி பொடியாடிக் கிடப்
பதோ” என்ற சொற்கள் இங்கே கிணைக்கத்தக்கவை. பாஞ்
சோதியார் இயற்றிய திருவினையாடற் புராணத்தில் புகார்
நகரத்திலிருந்து மதுரைக்குப் போகும் வழியில் மதுரை வணி
கன் மாள அதற்காகப் புலம்பிக் கன்னி அழுததாக வரும்
செய்யுட்களில் ஒன்று இவ்வாறு உள்ளது :—

“பொன்னாட்டின் மடவாரைப் புணர்வதற்கோ
நம்மளகா புரத்து வேந்தன்
நன்னாட்டின் மடவாரை மணப்பதற்கோ
உணைக்கடித்த நாகர் வேந்தன்
தன்னாட்டின் மடவாரைத் தழுவுதற்கோ
என்னாவித் தலைவா என்னை
இந்நாட்டில் இருத்தியெனை வஞ்சித்துப்
போயினவா நென்னை யென்னை.”

“நீ இறந்துபட்டது தேவமகளிரைக் கூடுதற்காகவா, குபேர
பட்டணத்து மகளிரை மணப்பதற்காகவா? நாக கன்னியரைத்
தழுவுதற்காகவா? என்னை இந்நாட்டிலிருக்கும்படி செய்து
விட்டு என்னை வஞ்சித்து நீ போனவிதம் என்னை! என்னை!”
என்று அக்கன்னி உரைத்ததாக வருஞ் செய்புளில் இருக்கும்
நயத்தைவிட எவ்வளவு இனிய நயம்

“வாளரா வேணி யானே வாரிநஞ் சுண்ட கோவே
காளமார் கடல்போய் மீண்ட கலங்கவிழ்த் தவர்போல் நின்றேன்
வேளுரு விரதி வேண்ட மீண்டளித் திலையோ இன்றென்
ஆளரி யுயிர்தா ராயேல் அவன்வழி யடைவேன் யானே”

என்று திருவாவையுடையார் திருவிளையாடற் புராணத்தில் வரும் செய்யுளில் உள்ளது? பாம்பினால் இறந்துபட்ட கணவனின் உயிரைத் திரும்பத் தருக எனக்கேட்கும் இப்பெண் மகளின் முறையீடு மிகவும் பொருத்தமாக இருக்கிறது, பாம்புகளைத் தலையில் அணிந்துள்ள கடவுளாகிய சிவபெருமானை நோக்கி, “வாளரா வேணியோனே, இவ்வராவின நஞ்சினைத் தீர்ப்பாயாக” என்றும், கடலில் வந்த நஞ்சினை அமிர்தமாக்கி உண்ட கோவே என்று அழைத்தமையால் இந்நஞ்சினையும் தீர்த்து உயிர் வாழவைப்பாய் என்றும் இப்பெண் கேட்டது போலப் பெரும்பற்றப்புலியூர் நம்பி அமைத்திருக்கும் அழகு நினைத்துநினைத்து இன்புறத்தக்கது. கண்ணகி தன் கேள்வியை “எங்கணாஅ எனக்கூறி நினைந்தேங்கி மாழ்குவாள்” என இளங்கோவடிகள் அமைத்துக் கூறியவிடத்தில் கணவன் எங்கு உற்றானே என்று வருந்திவருந்தி ஏங்கி மாழ்குவாள் ஆயினாள் கண்ணகி என்பதை ஒவ்வொரு சொல்லும் துயரொடு காட்டி நிற்கிறது. நினைந்து ஏங்கி மாழ்குவாள் என்பதற்கண் உள்ள செறிவும் திட்பமும் உன்னத்தக்கவை.

கம்பராமாயணத்தில் வானுலகத்திலிருந்து மீண்ட தசரதனிடம் இராமன் வேண்டியதாகச் சொல்லும் ஒரு வரத்தினைக் கண்ணகி வானுலகத்திலிருந்து மீண்ட பிற்பாடு கூறிய கூற்று ஒன்றினே இ ஒப்புநோக்குதல் பொருந்தும். தசரதன் விருப்பம்போல் கேட்க என்று இராமனிடம் பணிக்க, இராமன் “இன்று திரும்பவும் காணப்பெற்றதே பெரும்பேறு, வரம் வேறு வேண்டத்தக்கது உண்டோ” என, மீண்டும் தசரதன் வற்புறுத்த,

“தீய ளென்றுநீ துறந்த என் றெய்வழும் மகனும்
தாயுந் தம்பியு மாம்வரந் தருகெனத் தாழ்ந்தான்”

இராமன். தசரதனை நோக்கி, “தீயவளென்று நும்மால் கைவிடப்பட்ட என் தெய்வமாகிய கைகேயி எனக்கு மீட்டும் தாயாகும் வரந்தருதல்வேண்டும்” என்றும், “அத்தெய்வத்தின் மகன் பரதன் நும்மால் மகனல்லன் எனத் துறக்கப்பட்டவன் மீண்டும் எனக்குத் தம்பியாக வரும் வரந்தருதல்

வேண்டும்” என்றும் இராமன் வணங்கி வேண்டினான் என்று இராமாயணம் கூறுகிறது. இராமனுடைய தாயாகக் கைகேயி ஒப்புக்கொள்ளப்பட்டவுடன் தசரதனுடைய மனைவியுமாகி விடுகிறாள்; இராமன்தன் தம்பியாகப் பரதன் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளப்பட்டவுடன் தசரதனுடைய மகனாகவும் மாறிவிடுகிறான். விண்ணுலகு புக்க தசரதனுடைய சினத்தைத் தணித்து, தசரதனுடைய தெய்வயாக்கையிலிருந்து அருள்சூரக்கும்படி இராமன் வேண்டினான் என்பது இராமாயணத்தாற் பெறப்படுகிறது. சிலப்பதிகாரத்திற் கண்ணகி தன் கணவனைக் கொல்வித்த பாண்டியனை “அறிவன்ற போயவன்” என்றும், “தேரா மன்னன்” என்றும் வெகுண்டுரைத்தவள் விண்ணுலகு சென்று திரும்பிச் செங்குட்டுவன் எடுத்த கோயிற் படிமத்தில் வந்துற்றுப் பேசிய நாளில்,

“தென்னவன் தீதிலன் தேவர்கோன் றன்கோயில்
நல்விருந் தாயினான் நானவன் றன்மகள்
வென்வேலான் குன்றில் விளையாட்டு யானகலேன்”

என்று கூறினானென அறிகிறோம். குற்றமுடையவன் என்று இகழ்ந்த தன் வாயினாலே அவன் “தீதிலன்” என்று கூறினாள். இதனை அரும்பதவுரையாசிரியர், “கண்ணகி மாநிடயாக்கையிற் கொண்ட சிவப்பாறிப் பேசும் இடம்” எனக் குறிப்பிட்டார்.

இராமாயணத்தில் இராமனை நோக்கி இறந்துபடும் வாவி கூறியதாக வரும் கூற்று இது:—

“வாலியைப் படுத்தாயலை மன்னற
வேலியைப் படுத்தாய் விறல்வீரனே.”

“அற வேலியை அழித்தாய் விறல்வீரனே” என இகழ்ந்து பேசிய வாலியின் கூற்றிற்கு ஒப்பாகக் கண்ணகி அரசன் முன்னின்று “சூழ்கழல் மன்னு” என முழங்கிய முழக்கம் நினைக்கத்தக்கது. “குற்றஞ் செய்திலாத என் கணவனைக் கொன்ற உன் காலில் வீரக்கழல் வேறு சூழ்ந்து கிடக்க வேண்டும்போலும்!” என்ற குறிப்பை வைத்து அவள் பேசினாள் என்பது

“வாழ்தல் வேண்டி ஊழ்வினை தூர்ப்பச்
சூழ்கழல் மன்னு நின்னகர்ப் புகுந்திங்கு

என்காற் சிலம்பு பகர்தல் வேண்டி நின்றாற்
கொலைக்களப் பட்ட கோவலன் மனைவி.”

என்ற வகையால் இளங்கோவடிகளால் எடுத்துக்காட்டப் பட்டிருக்கிறது.

நகரங்களிலும் கோட்டைகளிலும் வீசிக்கொண்டிருக்கும் கொடிகள் கவிஞர் சிலருக்கு வா என அழைப்பது போலவும், சிலருக்குப் போ எனப்பகர்வது போலவும் தோன்றுவதுண்டு. மிதிலையில் வீசிக்கொண்டிருந்த கொடிகள் “இங்குதான் திருமகள் உள்ளாள் வருக ஐயனே” என இராமனை அழைத்ததுபோல் இருந்தன என்றார் கம்பர். வில்விபாரதத்தில்,

“ ஈண்டுநீ வரினும் எங்கள் எழிலுடை எழிலிவண்ணன்
பாண்டவர் தங்கட் கல்லாற் படைத்துணை யாகமாட்டான்
மீண்டுபோ கென்றன்றந்த வியன்மதிற் குடுமிதோறும்
காண்டகு பதாகையாடை கைகளாற் றடுப்ப போன்ற ”

என வரும் இடத்தில் தூரியோதனனை நோக்கிக் கொடிகள் “வாரற்க, பாண்டவர்க்குப் படைத்துணை போக முன்னரே கண்ணன் முடிவு செய்துவிட்டான்” என்று கூறுவனபோல் இருந்தன என்றார். கவிஞர் பாரதிதாசன், கதிர்நாட்டை நோக்கி அதன் பகையான வேழநாட்டுப் படை செல்லும் பொழுது

“ கதிர்நாட்டின் நெடுங்கோட்டை மதிலின் மீது
கைகாட்டி வாபகையே என அழைக்கும்
புதுமைபோல் கொடிபறக்கக் கண்டார் அங்கே.”

என்று கூறினார். பகைக்கு அஞ்சாமல் வருக பகையே எனக் கதிர்நாடு வரவேற்றதென்று அழகுபட வருணித்துள்ளார். இவற்றைச் சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் வரும் ஒரு வருணனையோடு நாம் ஒப்புநோக்குதல் கூடும். புறஞ்சேரியிறுத்த காதையில்,

“ போருழந் தெடுத்த ஆரெயில் நெடுங்கொடி
வாரல் என்பனபோல் மறித்துக் கைகாட்ட ”

என்றவிடத்திற் கோவலனை இங்கு வராதே திரும்பிப் போ என்று காற்றைசைக்க அசையும் நெடுங்கொடிகள் கூறியது போல் வைத்துக் கூறினார் கவிஞர்.

கம்பராமாயணத்தில்,

“மீனாய் வேலையை யுற்றார் சிலர்சிலர் பசுவாய் வழிதொறும்
[மேய்வுற்றார்
ஊனார் பறவையின் வடிவுற் றார்சிலர் சிலர்நான் மறையவ ருருவானார்
மானார் கண்ணின மடவா ராயினர் முன்னே தங்குமூல் வகிர்வுற்றார்
ஆனார் சிலர் சில ரையா நின்சர ணென்றார் நின்றவ ரரியென்றார்.”

என்று வரும் பகுதி இராவணன் மகன் அட்சயகுமரன்
அனுமனார் கொல்லப்பட்டவுடன் தோற்று ஓடியவர்களுடைய
செயல்களைப் புனைந்துரைக்கும் பகுதி.

“வரைக்கலிங்கர் தமைச்சேர மாசை யேற்றி
வன்தூறு பறித்தமயிர்க் குறையும் வாங்கி
அரைக்கலிங்கம் உரிப்புண்ட கலிங்கர் எல்லாம்
அமுணரெனப் பிழைத்தாரும் அனேகர் ஆங்கே.

வேடத்தால் குறையாது முந்நூ லாக
வெஞ்சிலை நாண் மடித்திட்டு விதியாற் கங்கை
ஆடப்போந் தகப்பட்டோம் கரந்தோம் என்றே
அரிதனை விட்டு உயிர் பிழைத்தார் அனேகர் ஆங்கே.

குறியாகக் குருதிக் கொடி ஆடை யாகக்
கொண்டுடுத்துப் போர்த்துத்தம் குஞ்சி முண்டித்து
அறியீரோ சாக்கியரை யுடைகண் டிலேன்
அப்புறமென் றியம்பிடுவர் அனேக ராங்கே.

சேனைமடி களங்கண்டேம் திகைத்து நின்றேம்
தெலுங்கரேம் என்றுசில கலிங்கர் தங்கள்
ஆனைமணி யினைத்தாளம் பிடித்துக் கும்பிட்டு
அடிப்பாணர் எனப்பிழைத்தார் அனேகர் ஆங்கே.

என்று கூறும் கலிங்கத்துப்பரணியில் வரும் தாழிசைகள்
கருணாகரனுக்குத் தோற்றேடிய கலிங்கர்கள் செய்தியைக்
கூறுவன. இவற்றை,

“சடையினர் உடையினர் சாம்பற் பூச்சினர்
பீடிகைப் பீலிப் பெருநோன் பாளர்
பாடு பாணியர் பல்லியத் தோளினர்
ஆடு கூத்த ராகி யெங்கணும்
ஏந்து வாளொழியத் தாந்துறை போகிய
விச்சைக் கோலத்து வேண்டுவயிற் படர்தர”.

என்னுள் சிலப்பதிகாரப் பகுதியோடு ஒப்புநோக்கலாம். செங்குட்டுவனுக்குத் தோற்று வடநாட்டு மன்னர்கள் காஷாய உடையினராய் வளர்க்குஞ் சடையினராய் திருநீற்றுப் பூச்சினராய்த் துறவியராய்ச் சென்று ஓடினார்கள் என்று சிலப்பதிகாரம் கூறுவதால் செங்குட்டுவனுக்குப் பொதுவாகச் சமயத் துறவிகளிடத்துள்ள மதிப்பு வெளியாகிறது. அதனையுணர்ந்து சமயவேடங்கள் தாங்கித் தோல்வியுற்றோர்கள் ஓடினார்களென்பது குறிப்பு. பாட்டுப் பாடுபவர்களாக, பல இன்னிசைக் கருவிகளை இயக்குபவர்களாக, ஆடுங் கூத்தர்களாகப் பலர் தப்பி ஓடினார்களென்று கூறப்படும் இடத்தில் செங்குட்டுவனுக்கு நுண்கலையின்கண் உள்ள ஆர்வம் ஒருபால் எடுத்துக்காட்டப்படுகிறது. அதுகாரணமாக அவர்களை அவன் விட்டுவிட்டான் என்பது குறிப்பு. அனுமன் பெற்ற வெற்றிகண்ட அரக்கர் சிலர் மீனாகிக் கடலுட்புக்கனர் என்றும், பசுவாகி வயல்களிற் சிலர் மேயலுற்றார் என்றும், பறவை வடிவுற்றுச் சிலர் பறக்கலுற்றார் என்றும், மறையவர் உருவிற் சிலர் மறைந்தனரென்றும், முடிமயிரை வகிர்ந்துகொண்டு மடவார்வேடம் பூண்டு சிலர் ஓடினரென்றும் கம்பராமாயணம் கூறுகிறது. சிலப்பதிகாரத்துக் காட்சிக் காதையில் வரும் ஒரு பகுதி இந்நிலையில் நோக்கத்தக்கது :—

“ வடதிசை மருங்கின் மன்ன ரெல்லாம்
 இடுதிறை கொடுவந் தெதிரீர் ஆயின்
 கடற்கடம் பெறிந்த கடும்போர் வார்த்தையும்
 விடர்ச்சிலை பொறித்த வியன்பெரு வார்த்தையும்
 கேட்டு வாழுமின் — கேளீ ராயின்
 தோட்டுணை மறக்குந் துறவொடு வாழுமின் ”

செங்குட்டுவன் முன்னர்க் கடலிலே வெற்றி கொண்டா அதலின் கடலை நோக்கி இப்பொழுது போர்செய்யப் புறப்பட மாட்டான். எனவே கடலினுள் மீனாகிக் குதிக்க என்றும், மலையில் முன்னரே விற்பொறித்து விட்டான் ஆதலின் வென்ற அவ்விடத்திற்கு வேறற் பொருட்டுச் செல்லமாட்டான்; எனவே பறவையாகி மலையின்கண் பறந்து செல்க என்றும் குறிப்பிட்டுக் கூறுவதுபோல் இச்சொற்கள் உள. கடற் பக்கமும் விடர்ப்பக்கமும் சென்றால் உய்யலாம், பிற இடங்களில் நீங்கள் தங்குவீராயின், உங்கள் உங்கள் காதலியரைத் துறத்தல் நேரிடும் என்ற குறிப்புப்பட இக்கூற்று அமைக்கப்பட்ட

டிருக்கிறது. கலிங்கத்துப்பரணியில் சமணத்துறவிகள் வேடம்பூண்டும் அந்தணர் வேடம்பூண்டும் நீராடச் செல்வார் வேடம்பூண்டும் சாக்கியத்துறவிகள் வேடம்பூண்டும் பாடுநர் வேடம்பூண்டும் கலிங்கர்கள் சிலர் தப்பி ஓடினார்களென்பது சிலப்பதிகாரத்தை அடியொற்றி எழுதியிருத்தல் கூடுமென விளம்புவது புனைந்துரையாகாது.

நாமக்கல் கவிஞர் இராமலிங்கம் பிள்ளை

“ ஆனைகட்டி யரசாண்டாலும் பல
ஆயிரம் வித்தைகள் கற்றாலும்
சேனைகட்டிப் பகை வென்றாலும் அவர்
தின்னக் கொடுப்பவள் காவேரி
அன்னம் கொடுப்பவள் காவேரி, நல்ல
ஆடை கொடுப்பவள் காவேரி
இன்னும் மனிதர்க்கு வேண்டிய இன்பங்கள்
யாவையும் காவேரியே தருவாள் ”

என்று காவேரியைப்பற்றிக் கும்பிப்பாட்டாகப் பாடினார். இப்பாட்டினுள் “ தின்னக் கொடுப்பவள் காவேரி, அன்னம் கொடுப்பவள் காவேரி ” என்றார். இது சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் வரும்,

“ வாழி யவன்றன் வளநாடு
மகவாய், வளர்க்குந் தாயாகி
ஊழி யுய்க்கும் பேருதவி யொழியாய்
வாழி காவேரி ”

என்னும் கானல்வரிப் பாட்டோடு ஒப்புநோக்கத் தக்கது. காவேரி வளர்க்குந் தாயாகிப் பேருதவி புரிகின்றாள் என்று சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் வந்திருப்பது பிறகு பெரிதுபடுத்தப்பட்டு விரிவாக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்பது வெளிப்படை.

நாவலர் சோமசுந்தர பாரதியார் இயற்றிய மாரி வாயிலில் தமிழ்வணக்கமாக அமைந்திருக்கும் மூன்று தாழிசைகள் அடியில் வருவன :—

“தமிழினைப் போற்றுதும், தாய்த்தமிழ் போற்றுதும்,
தாயைச்சேய் பேணல் தலையறம், நம் மெல்லவர்க்குந்
தாய்த்தமிழே யாமாத லால்;

தென்மொழி போற்றுதும், தீந்தமிழ் போற்றுதும்,
தாயிற் சிறந்தம்மம் தானும்வாழ் நாளெல்லாம்
ஆய்சுவை யோடளித்த லால் ;

தொன்மொழிபோற்றுதும், சொற்றமிழ் போற்றுதும்,
போனகமாய்த் தாரகமாய்ப் போக்கியமாய் நாமார
வானமுதின் மேலினித்த லால்.

இவை சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் வரும் மங்கல வாழ்த்துப் பாடலிற் காணும் வாழ்த்துக்களை அடியொற்றியவை என்பதை நான் அறிவேன். என் பேராசிரியரான நாவலர் சோமசுந்தர பாரதியார் அண்ணாமலைப் பல்கலைக்கழகத்தில் அமர்ந்து மாரிவாயிலை இயற்றிக் கொண்டிருக்கும்பொழுது சிலப்பதிகாரத்தைத் தழுவியே தாம் தமிழ் வணக்கப் பாடல்களை அமைப்பதாகத் தெரிவித்தார் என்பதை இக்கூட்டத்தின்கண் தெரிவித்துக்கொள்கிறேன். எனவே, சிலப்பதிகாரத்தில் வாழ்த்தாக வந்திருக்கும் தாழிசைகள் இப்பொழுது நினைவுகூரத் தக்கவை.—

“ திங்களைப் போற்றுதும் திங்களைப் போற்றுதும்
கொங்கலர் தார்ச்சென்னி குளிர்வெண் குடைபோன்றிவ்
வங்கண் உலகளித்த லான்.

ஞாயிறு போற்றுதும் ஞாயிறு போற்றுதும்
காவிரி நாடன் திகிரிபோற் பொற்கோட்டு
மேரு வலந்திரித லான்.

மாமழை போற்றுதும் மாமழை போற்றுதும்
நாமநீர் வேலி யுலகிற்கவன் அளிபோல்
மேனின்று தான்சுரத்த லான்.

பூம்புகார் போற்றுதும் பூம்புகார் போற்றுதும்
வீங்குநீர் வேலி யுலகிற்கவன் குலத்தோடு
ஓங்கிப் பரந்தொழுக லான்.”

பரஞ்சோதி திருவிளையாடற் புராணத்தில் மாமனாக வந்து வழக்குரைத்த படலச் செய்யுள் ஒன்று ¹⁷ இவ்வாறு அமைந்துள்ளது :—

“ அரசனிங் கில்லை கொல்லோ ஆன்றவ ரில்லை கொல்லோ
குரைகழல் வேந்தன் செங்கோல் கொடியதோ கோதில் நூல்கள்
உரைசெயுந் தெய்வந் தானு மில்லைகொ லுறுதி யான
தருமமெங் கொளித்த தேகொ லென்றறத் தவிசிற சார்வார் ”

தனபதி வடிவில் வந்த மதுரையங்கடவுள் தனபதியின் தங்கைக்
காகவும் மருகனுக்காகவும் பரிந்துரைத்ததாக வருஞ் செய்யுள்
இது. முறைகெட்டபொழுது “ அ ர ச ண் இங்கில்லையோ,
ஆன்றோர் இங்கில்லையோ, கடவுள் தான் இல்லையோ ” எனக்
கேட்கும் மனிதவியல்பு இங்குக் காட்டப்பட்டுள்ளது. திரௌ
பதியின் வாக்கில் வைத்துப் பாரதியார் இவ்வாறு பேசினார் :—

“ பெண்டிர்தமை யுடையீர் ! பெண்களுடன் பிறந்தீர் !
பெண்பாவ மன்றோ ? பெரிய வசை கொள்வீரோ ?
கண்பார்க்க வேண்டும் ”

“ இவ்வூரீற் பெண்டிர் உண்டோ, சான்றோர் உண்டோ, தெய்
வம் உண்டோ ” எனக் கலங்கிய கண்ணகி கேட்டாள்.

“ பெண்டிரும் உண்டுகொல் ? பெண்டிரும் உண்டுகொல் ?
கொண்ட கொழுநர் உறுகுறை தாங்குறூஉம்
பெண்டிரும் உண்டுகொல் ? பெண்டிரும் உண்டுகொல் ?
சான்றோரும் உண்டுகொல் ? சான்றோரும் உண்டுகொல் ?
ஈன்ற குழவி எடுத்து வளர்க்குறூஉம்
சான்றோரும் உண்டுகொல் ? சான்றோரும் உண்டுகொல் ?
தெய்வமும் உண்டுகொல் ? தெய்வமும் உண்டுகொல் ?
வைவாளிற் றப்பிய மன்னவன் கூடலில்
தெய்வமும் உண்டுகொல் ? தெய்வமும் உண்டுகொல் ? ”

என்று வரும் சிலப்பதிகார அடிகள்¹⁸ கண்ணகியின் கலங்கிய
மனநிலையை எடுத்து விளக்குவன. துயருற்ற கண்ணகி இவ்
வூரீற் பெண்டிரும் சான்றோரும் தெய்வமும் உளவாயின்
மன்னவன் தவறிழைத்திருக்கமாட்டான் என நினைந்து பேசி
னாள் என்பது இதனால் அறியப்படும். இவ்வாறே, கவிமணி
தேசிக விநாயகம்பிள்ளை இயற்றிய மருமக்கள் வழி மான்மியத்
தில் வரும் காரணவனின் ஐந்தாம் மனைவி கணவன் இறந்த
வுடன் மருமக்கள் தாயவழியைக் கண்டித்துப் பேசி வருபவள்
பேசுகிறாள் :—

“ கற்றவர் உளரோ கற்றவர் உளரோ
பெற்ற மக்களைப் பேணி வளர்த்திடாக்
கற்றவர் உளரோ கற்றவர் உளரோ !

அறிஞரும் உளரோ அறிஞரும் உளரோ
வறுமைக்கு இரையாய் மக்களைவிட்டிடும்
அறிஞரும் உளரோ அறிஞரும் உளரோ !

நீதியும் உளதோ நீதியும் உளதோ
மாதர் கண்ணீர் மாரு நிலத்தில்
நீதியும் உளதோ நீதியும் உளதோ !

தெய்வமும் உளதோ தெய்வமும் உளதோ
பொய்வழிப் பொருளைப் போக்கும் இந்நிலத்தில்
தெய்வமும் உளதோ தெய்வமும் உளதோ !

கற்றார் உளரோ, அறிஞர் உளரோ, நீதி உளதோ, தெய்வமும் உளதோ என்று இப்பெண் பேசும் இடத்தில் அவளது சும்பியெரிச்சல் தானாகப் புலப்படுகிறது. இவ்வாறு பாடுதற்குச் சிலப்பதிகார அறிவு கவிஞர் தேசிக விநாயகத்திற்குப் பெரிதும் பயன்பட்டது என்று கூறுதல் தகும். கவிமணிக்குச் சிலப்பதிகாரத்தினிடத்திற் பெரியதோர் ஈடுபாடு உண்டு. அவர் மதித்த பேரிலக்கியங்களில் சிலப்பதிகாரத்திற்குத் தலையாய இடமுண்டு. அதனால்தான்,

“ தேனிலே ஊறிய செந்தமிழின்—சுவை
தேருஞ் சிலப்பதி காரமதை—
ஊனிலே எம்முயிர் உள்ளளவும்—நிதம்
ஓதியுணர்ந்து இன்புறு வோமே ”

எனப் பாடினார்,

இச் சிலப்பதிகாரத்தின் பெருமை கண்ணகியின் பெருமை; கண்ணகியின் பெருமை சிலப்பதிகாரத்தின் பெருமை. உலகத்தில் எல்லோரும் கண்ணகியராக வாழ்ந்து விட்டால் கண்ணகி பெரியவள் ஆதலும் காப்பியத் தலைவி ஆதலும் எவ்வாறு? பிரிந்துறைந்த கோவலன் எழுக என உடன் எழுந்துசென்று, தன் கணவனுக்காக நடுங்கு துயரூற்று நாப்புலர வாடிப் பொறுத்திருக்குங் காலம் வரையிற் பொறுத்திருந்து வேளை வந்தபொழுது நயமாக வெகுண்டுரைத்துத் திருத்தித் தன்பால் மீண்டும் உழுவலன்பினகை ஆக்கிக்கொண்டு நெடுங்காலம் இனிது வாழலாம் என நினைத்

திருந்த வேளையில் அவனைப் பறிகொடுத்துத் தவித்த நிலையில் கள்வன் என்ற சொல் அவனுக்குச் சாலாது என்பதை உணர்ந்து அரசன் முன்னிலையிற் சென்று தன் வழக்கு எடுத்துரைத்து, “கள்வனைக் கோறல் கடுங்கோலன்று” என்று வீறு பேசிய அத்திருமகளை “யானே அரசன், யானே கள்வன்” என்று கூறுமாறு செய்து, மேம்பாடு விளங்குமாறு வாழ்ந்த கண்ணகிபோல் மகளிர் அனைவரும் இருப்பர் எனின், கண்ணகி ஒரு காப்பியத்தின் தலைவியாவது எப்படி?

இம் மூன்று நாட்களிலும் கதைகளில் வரும் கதையுறுப் பினர்களிடமிருந்து எவ்வாறு காப்பிய உறுப்பினர்கள் வேறு பட்டவர்கள் என்பதைக் குறித்தும், இளங்கோவடிகளின் செய்யுட் போக்கு எவ்வாறு எவ்வாறு உள்ளது என்பதைக் குறித்தும், சிலப்பதிகாரக் காலத்திற்கு முன் தோன்றிய நூற் பகுதிகளில் சில இளங்கோவடிகளுக்கு அடிவரைச் சட்டம் போல் உள்ளனவோ எனக் கருதுமாறு உள்ள இடங்கள் எவையெவை என்பதைக் குறித்தும், சிலப்பதிகாரக் காலத்திற்குப் பின் தோன்றிய தமிழிலக்கியப்பகுதிகள் சில எவ்வாறு சிலப் பதிகாரத்தை அடியொற்றி எழுதப்பட்டனவோ எனக் கருது மாறு உள என்பதைக் குறித்தும் ஒருவாறு விளக்கிப் பேசினேன். மூன்று நாட்களிலும் வந்திருந்து கேட்டு மகிழ்ந்து மகிழ்வித்த அனைவீர்க்கும் என்னுடைய மனமுவந்த நன்றியுரியது.

Printed at
THE RATHNAM PRESS,
MADRÁS - 1