On the Condensation and Extension of Knowledge:
The *Sūtra* Style in the *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram*[1]

Eva Wilden

cūttiram tāṉē
āṭi niḻaliṉ aṟiyat tōṉṟi
nāṭutal iṉṟip poruḷ naṉi viḷaṅka
yāppiṉuḷ tōṉṟa yāttu amaippatuvē. (TP 472)[2]

The earliest extant theoretical work in Classical Tamil language is, as is well-known, the venerable *Tolkāppiyam*. The oldest layers of its third, poetological part, the *Poruḷatikāram* (TP), may or may not be roughly contemporary with its first and second parts, concerned with phonetics and grammar.[3] As for their style, however, the three parts are roughly similar, and in describing style we will address several related though distinct questions: the organisation, the transmission, the growth of knowledge. In other words, style opens a view on textual history, and textual history is not a dry philological exercise, but a means to gain insights into historical processes, a text (at least the text in question) being a testimony of a process rather than a snapshot of a momentary state or even an eternal teaching.

The paper presented here, however, cannot hope to give more than a brief exposition of the problems. In many respects what is said will appear to be premature, but simply in order to explain why this should be so, it seemed necessary to put it into words. To give a rough outline of the conceptual horizon (restricted to the Akam part, that is, that part of poetics concerned with love lyrics), in Tamil there is a marvellously rich and extensive poetological tradition, beginning in, perhaps, the first centuries of the Christian era with brief commentaries (*kiḷavi*-s) on single poems and treatises/school traditions the phrasing of which still can be traced in the TP and the *Iṟaiyaṉār Akapporuḷ* (IA).[4] The tradition moves on with texts that have been transmitted to this day, the IA, quite concise and probably more or less of one casting, and the TP, rather long and probably growing for centuries. Then follows a gap of several hundred years (which demonstrably represents a major break in the tradition), ended by a medieval renaissance of Classical poetry and poetics, attested in a wave of commentaries on poems and treatises beginning in about the 12th

---

[2] TP 472: "A *sūtra* itself is created to appear in verse, in order to explain well the meaning, without examination, appearing to be known like the image in a mirror."

[3] For the general question of dating Caṅkam texts see Wilden 2002a, for a summary of the discussion concerning the Tolkāppiyam see Takahashi 1995: 16f.

[4] On the stock of phrases common to the *kiḷavi-s*, the TP and the IA see Wilden 2000 and Wilden 2003 (forthcoming).

century with Nakkīraṉ's commentary on the IA,[5] or with Iḷampūraṇar (Iḷ.) and culminating in about the 15th century with Naccinārkiṉiyar (Nacc.). New poetological treatises are written too, such as the *Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam* (perhaps of the 12th century), the latest major one being the *Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam* of the 18th century, both in their turn provided with commentaries.

Now in order to understand what has happened early on in this enormous mass of transmitted materials it is necessary to keep apart two facts. On the one hand, it can be shown beyond doubt that already the early, that is, medieval, commentators were struggling hard with the text of the TP. The differences between Iḷ. and Nacc. testify not only to uncertainties in the textual transmission – differences in the wording of the root text and problems regarding the length as well as the sequence of *sūtra-s* – but also to major difficulties of interpretation: silent glossing-over of problems, contradictory or obviously biased explanations. This means that it will not be reasonable to rely on these commentaries. On the other hand, at least the outer surface of the materials transmitted bears all the signs of an age-long transmission process: under South Indian climatic conditions, manuscripts have to be reproduced roughly every 100 years, if not earlier, and it seems reasonable to assume that it is the "modern" experts on poetics who actually have copied and handed down also the time-honoured treatises and their commentaries and improved them to the best of their skill and knowledge. This means that in order to evaluate the stylistic disparities not only to be observed in the root text, but in the exegetical texts as well,[6] one will have to trace peculiar phrasing and word usage even in the most recent specimens of the poetological idiom, if there is ever to be a

---

[5] The relation between IA and Nakkīraṉ on the one hand and that between the TP commentators and Nakkīraṉ on the other is still in need of detailed investigation. The dating of Nakkīraṉ's commentary is rather vague and unconvincing. Zvelebil 1972: 121f. proceeds from external data: Nakkīraṉ's not being referred to by Iḷ., but by Pērāciriyar (commentator on TP 6-9), which would point to a date between these two. This would mean some time within the 12th century. Things are complicated by a discussion about a lost commentary on the IA written by Iḷ., but if Iḷ. (provided it was the same man and not just someone with the same name) in his TP commentary doesn't mention Nakkīraṉ, it might either mean that he didn't have access to the earlier commentary, that he deliberately was silent about it, or that it simply wasn't earlier, but later. For unclear reasons, however, Zvelebil doesn't argue along these lines, but instead takes Nakkīraṉ's quotations from the *Pāṇṭikkōvai* as a decisive hint for dating. Now certainly, if the *Kōvai* refers to a Pāṇṭiya king of the 8th century, this means that the IA commentary cannot have been written before that period (as is pointed out already by Aravamuthan 1930: 296), but there is no prima facie reason that it should have been contemporary, as is silently assumed by Zvelebil. As for style, diction and morphology, Nakkīraṉ rather seems to belong into the vicinity of the medieval commentators, even if he isn't quite as prolix as Nacc.

[6] A cogent case in point might be the *kiḷavi-s*. A first tentative search for manuscripts in preparation of a critical edition of one of the lyrical anthologies, the *Naṟṟiṇai*, has brought to light that in different manuscripts there may be different *kiḷavi-s*. If one considers the matter with all due caution, the obvious conclusion is that the relation between a poem and its *kiḷavi* cannot have been looked upon as indissoluble: people must have set out to write new *kiḷavi-s*, and it is, for the time being, impossible to ascertain when this practice stopped. Moreover, the phrasing of certain *kiḷavi-s* shows affinities to the medieval commentary idioms, which certainly gives no upper limit, though perhaps a lower limit for their origin. (See Wilden 2002b)

chance of finding out who made changes and additions (and possibly also omissions?) and why.[7]

To summarise, the goal will not be to deconstruct tradition, but rather to take it for what it is: a long process of interpretation, re-interpretation and mis-interpretation, a struggle towards the integration of disparate concepts, a reconciliation of varying interests, a concession to the change of tastes. This will be quite a time-consuming task, and what I propose to do here is simply to start moderately at one corner: to understand as closely as possible the wording and structure of a part of the TP as it has come down to us, in order to find out what is typical of the text (and perhaps for the genre) and what is special. Even if it will not be possible for the time being to account in every way for this wording (occasionally it doesn't even seem comprehensible), it will be useful to note its peculiarities. One major problem is of course already the wording of the text itself. The commentators, as has been noted, deviate from each other with respect to the *sūtra-s*, and at times also the text of the commentaries is uncertain. It will be unavoidable to collect manuscripts and find out at least what the testimonies actually are, which is impossible on the basis of the current editions.[8] Keeping, however, to what is feasible at the moment – how does one describe the outstanding features of "our" TP text?

First of all, it is not a prose text, it is a metrical one.[9] Like the larger part of the poetry it is written in Akaval metre, the intricacies of which need not be discussed here. Important is that it consists of 4 metrical feet of rather variable length per line, and that, unlike in the poems, the penultimate line is not one foot short. This is already a first indication as to the possible length of sentences: the minimal sentence would be expected to comprise 1 line.[10] This type of sentence is actually to be found, but the longest TP sentence makes up not less than 59 lines. The smallest unit of innertextual division is called a *sūtra*[11], and this usually comprises one complete sentence (possibly with several dependent clauses), occasionally more than one. The word "*sūtra*" is not used as a term of self-reference by the TP itself, but it is the one used by the commentators from Nakkīraṉ onwards (*cūttiram*).[12]

---

[7] One calamity not to be underestimated in this context is the damage happening to manuscripts.

[8] A collection of the remaining witnesses (presumably desintegrating quickly) and the preparation of critical editions is as yet a desideratum not only in Caṅkam philology, but in Classical Tamil philology in general.

[9] Or perhaps one should say that, rather like with the Śloka in Sanskrit technical writing, this metre creates the impression of a kind of rhythmical prose.

[10] Whether this rule of thumb can have any claim to being compulsory is open to discussion. Among the commentators at least Iḷ. occasionally segments 3 metrical feet as a *sūtra*. In the cases to be found in the TP text to be analysed below, however, Nacc. decides differently, and he has reasons of syntax to do so. In any case the relation of metre and syntax is an open question in Caṅkam language in general.

[11] Note that the term chosen by tradition is *sūtra* and not *kārikā*, which can be seen as a hint at least that the text of the TP was not conceived of as poetry but as versified instruction.

[12] Note that the Tamil word *nūl*, the usual word for "thread", and thus expected to be an equivalent for *sūtra*, is explained in the preface of Nakkīraṉ's commentary on the IA – which is one of the earliest available discussions on the matter – to denote a treatise, the smallest unit of which is

Now, the use of the word *sūtra*, even if it had been applied to the specimen in question only about a thousand years later,[13] naturally raises a certain number of expectations, since in Sanskrit/Sanskrit philology it is connected with certain properties. This problem, to be sure, cannot be treated without considering the general question of the influence of Sanskrit thinking in the Tamil tradition. This is a most complicated issue, and it is necessary to restrict it here to a few essential points. As for the TP, some kind of Sanskrit influence can be observed on 4 levels (which at least partly have to be connected with different chronological layers, but to this we will come below).

a) Plainly evident is a reception of Sanskrit poetics, visible in the borrowing of technical terms such as *uvamai/uvamam* for *upamā*. On the basis of this Takahashi has established a first rough division of the 9 TP sections into unsystematic and un-Sanscritic, and therefore early (TP 1, 3-5, [2]), and systematic and Sanscritic, and therefore late (6-9).[14] A detailed investigation of concepts, their provenance and their Tamil interpretation has yet to be carried out; moreover traces are also to be found in the "early" parts.

b) There is a share of Sanskrit vocabulary in the TP which is not easily explained by conceptual borrowing. Quite ordinary everyday words like *kālai* or *nimittam* are used in places where the Tamil equivalents supposedly would have done just as well. The same can be observed in the poetic texts, and there at least in some cases, the word-usage might be considered to betray an acquaintance with Sanskrit literature, as in the case of *kāmam*.

c) There is an obvious influence of Northern notions not so much on a theoretical (poetological) level, but on a more general cultural one, and it is paired with a conscious (and at times seemingly considerable)[15] effort to avoid Sanskrit words, as in TP 89, starting with *iṉpamum poruḷum aṟaṉum*, presumably a transposition of the Sanskrit *kāma, artha, dharma*.

d) There is a distinct (and probably late) superimposition of Northern morals pervading the whole transmitted text of the TP: brahmins, *varṇa-s* and Vedas.

The kind of influence, or for the time being rather a similarity, actually at issue in the present context is less straightforward to define. It is a question of form. At least some parts of the TP, which seem to have a theoretical concept, are written in concise, hierarchical and interdependent sentences at first sight not

---

termed *cūttiram* (see also note 17 for details). There are also two portions in the TP, (*Ceyyuḷ-iyal* = TP 468ff. and *Marapu-iyal* = TP 642ff.) slightly different in terminology, but agreeing as far as *nūl* and *cūttiram* are concerned, which define the types of treatises and their elements. Both are obviously late and not of the same hand, and both are in need of special investigation.

[13] From the text of the TP itself it is impossible to discern whether its *sūtra-s* were already named that way at the time of their composition. And since manuscripts are so young, even the word usage of colophons probably wouldn't be of great help. Once again the only relevant text between the TP and its commentators might be Nakkīraṉ's commentary on the IA plus the even later preface to that commentary, both of which also employ *cūttiram*. Another minor chance might lie in the study of the word usage of the few old and anonymous commentaries preserved for the anthologies, that is, those on the *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu* and *Patiṟṟuppattu* plus the two partial ones on the *Puṟanāṉūṟu* and the *Akanāṉūṟu*.

[14] See Takahashi 1995: 23f.; see also Wilden 2000 and 2003(forthcoming).

[15] Remarkable is TP 89 *tuṟaiyamai nalyāḻt tuṇaimaiyōr* instead of *kantaruvam* in the parallel in IA 1.

unlike the *sūtra* style of Sanskrit, and at a later stage the Tamil tradition itself chooses this term to refer to them. Whether this is more than just a parallelism is impossible to decide offhand, but a closer description might contribute to a basis for further investigation.[16] In order to achieve this we will have to ask, first of all: what is characteristic of a *sūtra* in the Sanskrit tradition?

Leaving aside the partly unsolved problems of origin and historical development[17], the three basic features of a *sūtra* as denoting a rule in a theoretical treatise are conciseness[18], hierarchy and sequence. A conception is packed into formulations as terse as possible[19] and in fairly uniform constructions[20]. Statements are made on different levels of validity, a bit idealizingly we can discern meta-rules, rules and sub-rules. Subsequent *sūtra-s* can stand in a very close relationship, realised on the syntactical level by ellipsis, thus adding considerably to the appearance of brevity.

On treatise level this means, in an ideal case: a lucid structure, where it is possible to follow the course of the argument in an organized whole, and the development of technical terminology. Ideal, because this is often not what we find when looking more closely at transmitted texts. In fact, we frequently encounter more complex formations where a supposed clear outline has been obscured by various accretions. There are basically two ways to account for

---

[16] One possible channel of stylistic inspiration, for example, might have been Sanskrit grammar. Though the grammatical parts of the *Tolkāppiyam* clearly show an independent approach to describing a language most definitely not comparable to Sanskrit in many respects, some of the categories of analysis betray a familiarity with the Pāṇinian(?) system, as the section on compounds, a phenomenon hard to detect in Tamil (a task dutifully taken up by the commentators). Whether the reception of, say, the *Aṣṭādhyāyi* has shaped in any way the formulation of the *Tolkāppiyam* grammatical aphorisms, and whether these, in their turn, have been the model for the slightly later(?) TP aphorisms, for the moment has to remain a matter of mere speculation. An influence of Sanskrit poetics, on the other hand, is tangible only at a rather late stage of textual formation and thus probably cannot have shaped the formal outline.

[17] The topic has been treated at some length by Renou 1963. See also Staal 1992; for a recent renewed discussion see Klaus 2000, 2001, Wezler 2001, von Hinüber 2001. An interesting side-issue is that the distinction between *sūtra* as a rule in a theoretical treatise and *Sūtra* as a treatise made up of *sūtra-s* (graphical denotation introduced by Klaus 2000) doesn't seem to be prominent in Tamil. At least as far as poetics is concerned, there is no work bearing a title ending in *-cūttiram*. This is well in keeping with the word usage as expounded in the preface to Nakkīraṉ's commentary on the IA (cf. IA p. 12). There a treatise is termed *nūl*, its sections *atikāram*, the subsections *ōttu*, and the smallest units *cūttiram*. Such a view on the matter is corroborated in the case of grammatical literature in the title Naṉṉūl (i.e. *nal nūl*), and here a Tamil transposition of the Sanskrit titles ending in *-sūtra* might be considered. It should, however, be noted that this preface (cf. IA p.14) gives a gloss of Tamil *nūl* with Sanskrit *tantra* (*tantiram*).

[18] I won't take into consideration the frequently repeated idea that a *sūtra* generally is prone to be so concise as not to be comprehensible without proper exposition and explanation by a commentary (for a recent example see Buck/Paramasivam 1997: Xf.). Should such a commentary (be it in oral or written form) have been in existence in the case of the TP, there is no positive indication that it was available to Il̤. and Nacc., both of whom have all too many obvious problems in rendering the *sūtra* wording intelligible.

[19] The degree of conciseness is, to be sure, a variable notion, but the point might be the wish to avoid unnecessary redundancy, an endeavour that can range from the mere avoidance of repetitions in subsequent *sūtra-s* to actual compression.

[20] There are perhaps *sūtra* types as many as there are *Sūtra*s – cf. Renou ib. p. 181ff. –, but a lack of variety is notable in the constructions to be found in any given *Sūtra*.

such a state of affairs, which might be termed logical and chronological models. A logical model would proceed from the idea of a number of prescriptions and/or definitions enlarged by complements, thus in a way mirroring the complexities of the reality which is to be described by them (a concept to be found also in the designation of rules and sub-rules). A chronological model would transpose the obvious extensions on a temporal scheme, the idea of a nucleus gradually enlarged by additions. Both models need not be incongruent, but they tend to emphasize different aspects. While the logical one is well suited to explain a complex net of interrelations which may be adequate to the facts (the entity that is to be described or prescribed by the treatise: actual and/or acceptable poetry in the case of poetics), the chronological one is more adaptable to the explanation of breaks which can be explained as part of a historical development.

A third model is envisaged in Srinivasan 1980, a study on the composition of the *rasa* section of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Here the obvious textual and argumentative disparities and the lack of positive evidence allowing for a convincing stratification have led the author to the conclusion that it is impossible to extract a nucleus (be it a conceptional or a temporal one) which has been enlarged by additions, that instead the text must have been composed, or rather compiled, as an addition of several fundamentally incongruent and partly simply irreconcilable notions. Now, the case of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* might still be open to discussion, but what Srinivasan's study demonstrates all too lucidly is that the general level of argumentation in favour of textual division or stratification is still not subtle enough by a long way and needs a lot of further thinking, paying heed also to the special conditions of every particular text.

Now, apart from the question of whether there is a historical relationship between the Sanskrit and the Tamil material (an at least formal influence of a/the Sanskrit *sūtra* style on Tamil poetological texts), we can ask whether the hermeneutical background developed in Sanskrit philology to deal with this kind of text is suitable for describing a similar phenomenon in the Tamil tradition. In order to test such an assumption, the goal of the following considerations will be to analyse the structure of one treatise on the micro-level (the formation of sentences which constitute *sūtra-s*) and on the macro-level (the more or less comprehensive treatment of a theme). As an exemplary case, I have chosen the *Akattiṇai-iyal* of the TP (TP 1), which can be called an intermediate type between a well-structured and organized whole, such as is to be found in the IA, and a mere conglomerate of relevant material, a compilation in the sense of Srinivasan, like the Kaḷavu-iyal of the TP (TP 3). The text (as read by Iḷ. plus the deviations of Nacc.) with a (no doubt sadly preliminary) annotated translation is given as an appendix.[21]

When turning to the microstructure, the *sūtra*, we have to face first of all the problem of *sūtra*-division. It can be quite different with the different

---

[21] My numbering follows the edition cum translation of Sastri 1949f. Further available (minimally annotated) translations are Ilakkuvanar 1963 and Selvamony 1989.

commentaries[22], and the rationale behind this is easy to discern: Iḷ. splits according to content (which occasionally leads to very elliptical sentences, as in the case of TP 6+7), while Nacc. heeds the metrical boundaries. This means that there is at least one sentence per *sūtra* (however elliptical), and possibly more than one (rarely if ever more than two).[23]

Length, as has been mentioned already, has the astonishing range of 1 line (a metrical line of 4 *cīr* with Nacc., with Iḷ. even 3 *cīr*) to 59 lines. The latter is the case with TP 144, the *kiḷavōṉ sūtra* of the Karpu-iyal, and it is the longest but by no means an exception. Especially among the speaker *sūtra-s* there are several well above 30 lines. TP 1, however, retains an intermediate position also in this respect. While 1 line is fairly frequent (18 of 55/57 *sūtra-s* in TP 1), the average lies with 2 lines (23 *sūtra-s* in TP 1), and the rest are longer (4 times 3 lines, 4 times 4 lines, 6 longer than 4 lines). The longest here is *sūtra* 43 with 24 lines (also the one for the man as a speaker).

There are two sets of fairly developed technical terminology. One of them pertains to poetics and mostly is explicitly defined in the course of the argument; parts of it are shared also by the IA (and, of course, the subsequent tradition). The other is a basic inventory of phrases employed in shaping rules, let us call it the *sūtra* idiom, which is not totally homogenous (and probably changing in the course of time), but common to the whole *Tolkāppiyam* as well as the IA. It makes use of a limited number of constructions, the most important of which shall be presented here.

Let us first of all take a look at the structure of main sentences. The three basic types are definition, application and extension *sūtra-s*, less frequent are prohibitions. A definition usually consists of a nominal sentence "X [is] Y", or "what is called X (*eṉa, eṉappaṭuvatu*) [is] Y". Often the predicate noun precedes the subject, but not generally; in TP 6+7, for example, there is a chiasm. An application very often has the form "Y(nom.) is suitable (*uriyatu*, sg., *uriya*, pl.) for X(dat.)", or "Y (nom.) [is] with X(loc.)", i.e. certain occasions of speech are connected with a particular speaker or certain times with a particular setting. Extensions are either of the same form as applications, making use of a conceding "also" (-*um*), or they state that something is not to be excluded (*kaṭivarai il-*). Prohibitions are mostly negated applications. All of these main sentences can be concluded by a kind of authorization: "so they say, so say the scholars" (*eṉpa, eṉmaṉār pulavar*).[24]

Interesting is the way *sūtra-s* are put in sequence. As can be gathered from table 1 (see below), there are thematic hierarchies of definitions, that is, for example, settings connected with basic coordinates consisting in places and times. Repetitions of the hierarchic nexus are avoided, they have to be

---

[22] It might be interesting to see how those manuscripts that are not accompanied by a commentary split the texts – if there are any (at least for the IA I have seen one).

[23] For a tabular concordance of Tolkāppiyam *sūtra* divisions according to the different editions and commentators see Takahashi 1991.

[24] The distribution of these authorizing statements as well as their precise impact are a great puzzle as yet. All that can be said with confidence is that they refer to some kind of past or present expertise.

established by sequence. If references are made, it is with the help of pronouns, which contributes considerably to the density of the exposition and constitutes a major textcritical and exegetical problem: some *sūtra-s* are not placed unanimously within the tradition, and their meaning can be considerably different depending on the context they are put in (see, for example, TP 16 with notes). Another case is that there are pronouns which have no proper reference point in the preceding *sūtra*, which means that in the given context they are hard to make sense of (see, for example, TP 54 and note).[25]

The sub-constructions are even more uniform than the main sentences. They are usually enumerations of predicate nouns or enumerations of conditions for a predicate noun. Depending on whether they refer to things, facts, actions or occasions they consist of nouns, verbal nouns, locative phrases or clauses ending in an absolutive or a conditional. Enumerations can, but need not be coordinated by "and" (-*um*) and may be concluded by a summarising *tokaii*. To indicate the incompleteness of an enumeration a *piṟavum*, "and others" can be added at the end. Thus it is to be explained that the long *sūtra-s* are not basically different from the shorter ones; they contain lengthy subordinate enumerations.

A most remarkable trait, now, is revealed by syntactical analysis: while the short *sūtra-s* as a rule represent well-formed sentences, the long ones more often than not depict a quasi-anacolouthic agglutination of clauses: mixed nouns, verbal nouns, locatives, absolutives, conditionals (or 5 lines of conditionals followed by two lines of locatives and the like), in one line coordinated by -*um*, but not in the next, *tokaii* or *piṟavum* which are not concluding the enumeration, in bad cases even clauses which have no point of reference in the rest of the sentence. These things are markedly worst in the speaker *sūtra-s*, not only in TP 1, but all the more in 3 and 4. The most conspicuous example in TP 1 is s. 43 (see translation + notes). Here, the overall impression is that people must have added sub-themes or occasions of speech for quite some time.

Thus far for the structure of sentences. As for the thematic structure, it is, despite various accretions and several commentatorial misrepresentations, still remarkably clear.[26] We can discern three rather loosely connected parts, one dealing with the settings (*tiṇai-s*) and their constitutive elements (*mutal-poruḷ, uri-p., karu-p.*), one concerned with the basic dramatic situation for poetry, namely separation (*pirivu*), and the different speakers, and finally some addenda to part I and II plus several unrelated ones.

---

[25] On this problem of disrupted sequence betrayed by the use of pronouns see Takahashi 2002.

[26] One of my general questions was whether the notion of a convincing macrostructure, that is, of a coherent concept in the text, might be used as an argument when trying to solve textual difficulties. The more I read, the stronger my feeling that the idea of coherence is highly relevant when weighing the probabilities of possible translations for *sūtra-s* which lack a convincing traditional interpretation and/or don't fit in well with their context. And I cannot see this as the hybris of "Western" interpretation – rather it is a kind of respect due to the authors: what they thought and wrote is supposed to make sense.

I (1-25)	*tiṇai*-s		
	mutal-poruḷ nilam poḻutu in *pirivu*(?)	*uri-poruḷ* 5 states	*karu-poruḷ* elements people
II (26-44)	dramatic situation: *pirivu* speakers [SHE?], mother, confidante, spectators, HE, variable		
III (45-57)	different types of addenda		

table 1. the structure of TP 1

In other words, there are two counter-active movements of condensation and extension discernible on a macro- as well as on a micro-level: a systematic and hierarchic text, the structure of which is obscured by addition and insertion of *sūtra-s* – simple and brief sentences enlarged by adding clauses up to the very limit of intelligiblity. An explanation that might account for such a structure and which can at least claim to be plausible, even if it might be yet another thing to actually prove it, is that there was development over a longer period. Combining considerations of thematic plausibility with the distinction of stylistic features, it is possible to derive a

Tentative chronological model in 4 layers for the development of the *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram Akattiṇai-iyal*[27]

1st layer:	Here we see an attempt at a structural description exclusively in short *sūtra-s* of one or two lines and almost exclusively consisting of definitions. Sanskrit borrowings are only to be found in the *sūtra* idiom. The goal might have been a strictly symmetrical theoretical model of *aintiṇai*, the five settings, but sadly this treatise appears to be lost: TP 1 is clearly designed at a stage when there were seven *tiṇai-s*. This means, we have to postulate a * treatise on the five *tiṇai-s*.
2nd layer:	The next stage can be termed a pragmatic complementation, which is perhaps to be attributed to a requirement of reconciliation between poetics and the actual poetry. Here we see seven *tiṇai-s*, special seasons and the important concept of *tiṇai-mayakku*, the mix of different settings in one poem. This is supposedly the "original" TP 1 text, which inserts additional *sūtra-s* and partly disrupts the sequence in the old treatise. There are a few longer *sūtra-s*, at least one of them obtained by enlarging an extant one, and Sanskrit borrowings are to be found in the *sūtra* idiom.

---

[27] The following commentary on structure and status of the single *sūtra-s* and the stages of their development will be somewhat condensed in order to show the broad outline. For fuller argument and philological details see the footnotes to the translation in the appendix.

3rd layer:	What follows is a further specification and subdivision – a first reworking of TP 1 consisting of the enlargement of extant *sūtra-s*, the insertion of extension *sūtra-s* and addenda at the end. The very long and agglutinative *sūtra-s* find their place here, and we can observe the first borrowings from a Sanskrit poetological idiom.
4th layer:	One further stage, an adjustment to Indo-Aryan values and morals is rarely to be seen in TP 1, but there may be at least 3 additional restrictive *sūtra-s* that are very much in line with such a motivation.

Applying this model to the text, we might divide it up as follows:

TP Akattiṇai-iyal

I. the settings

1:      *eḻutiṇai*   2nd layer

The treatise begins with the introduction of the concept of seven settings, which is traceable in actual poetic usage from the *Kalittokai* (an anthology markedly younger than the *Akanāṉūṟu*, *Naṟṟiṇai*, *Kuṟuntokai* and *Aiṅkuṟunūṟu*) onwards, which thus presents a lower limit of possible composition for the whole section.

2:      *aintiṇai*   2nd layer

The second sentence, bound to the first by an anaphoric pronoun (*avaṟṟuḷ*), picks out the middle five settings, while it remains a little obscure what is actually supposed to be said about them. Is this to be seen as a not totally successful rephrasing of the old treatise concerned with *aintiṇai*?

3:      *mutal-, karu-, uri-poruḷ*   1st layer

The very next *sūtra* introduces the concept of the *poruḷ-s*, the basic sense-units which make up the *tiṇai-s*, and thus gives the framework for the rest of the first part of this section up to s. 26.

4:      *mutal: nilam* (5)(?) + *poḻutu* of *aintiṇai* (6,7,9,10,11)   1st layer

5:      gods and landscapes   2nd/4th layer?

Mutal-poruḷ, the basic constituents, consist of place and time, and they are related in the subsequent *sūtra-s* to the particular settings. Note that the term *pālai* for the middle one of the five settings is not yet given.[28]

Only in s. 5 there is reason to consider either a complete reworking of an older *sūtra* just correlating the settings with landscapes, or otherwise an extension of a given wording: the gods might simply be added at a later stage – unless we want to welcome Varuṇa into an original Tamil pantheon. Since this would be the only instance where Sanskrit vocabulary outside the scope of the *sūtra* idiom can been seen on the second layer, and since the concern with religion clearly belongs to the 4th layer (and is also not reflected in the early poetry) it might be taken as a very late intrusion.

---

[28] One can speculate here whether the notion of its being the middle one among the 5 *tiṇai-s* might have given rise to the analogous imbedding of the 5 *tiṇai-s* between the two younger settings *kaikkiḷai* and *peruntiṇai*.

8, 12:   *paṇi* and *piṉpaṇi*   2nd layer?

> Here, there is no conclusive stylistic indication to exclude the two *sūtra-s* from the 1st layer, but there are considerations of content. At least the first is an extensional rule which can only be explained as a reference to actual poetry: the *paṇi* poems don't fit in with the usual scheme. As for the second, I have no idea, since *piṉpaṇi* is not something that I can relate to the known poems.

16, 17, 18?: in the situation of *pirivu*   1st layer?

> These three *sūtra-s* are among the most problematic ones in the whole section. Either one or several of them have been assigned a new position, and it is difficult to make contentual sense of them in the position after the *uri sūtra*. They appear to make sense, however, if taken as a general explicative complement: separation is the basic situation in which to make use of *mutal-s*. For such inserted explicative *sūtra-s* on a higher theoretical plain there are parallels in the IA. An idea of *pirivu* as a condition for *tiṇai* poetry might also have been the point of amalgamation with the dramatic conception of *pirivu* as connected with speech situations and speakers, as it is to be found in the second part (26ff.).

13, 14, 18?: *tiṇai-mayakku*   2nd layer

> For the *sūtra-s* on the mixture of *tiṇai-s* the same can be said as for the those on *paṇi* and *piṉpaṇi*: they are complementary in character and probably reflect an attempt at mediation between norm and lyrical reality. Additionally, unlike the latter they disrupt the sequence of thought, and information pertaining to them is inserted in several places, which might be cumulative reason enough to place them in the 2nd layer.

15:     *uri-s*   1st layer

> The thread is taken up again with *uri*, the second *poruḷ* constituent, the elementary moods, here clearly not related each with a particular setting – which is the traditional attitude, but actually not at all in keeping with at least the early poetry.

19:     *karu*: elements   1st layer

> If we disregard the highly problematic and perhaps misplaced *sūtra-s* on separation (16?, 17f.), there follows the next item on the list, the *karu* elements, i.e. the faunal and floral elements of the settings.

20:     *mayakku*   2nd layer

> This is complemented by an extra rule as to their mixing.

21-25: *karu*: people

> 21   2nd layer?
> 22-24   3rd layer?

> What follows is a systematically all too long and moreover inconclusive list of rules first pertaining to the names of people connected with regions, and then of social types of people. S. 21 might again be situated on level 2, the attempt to account for actual poetic usage, while the social "discussion" can either be related to the further diversification of layer 3 or even to the moralistic concerns of layer 4.[29]

---

[29] Noticeable is that the first extensive insertion which doesn't make a contribution to systematic concerns is to be found at the end of the first sub-unit, that is, at a clear break in the overall structure.

II. the dramatic situation

26, 27, 34, 35: *pirivu*   1st layer

> The second part of the treatise leads over to a view on poetry that is not exactly irreconcilable with the structural perspective on the settings of poems, but certainly also not necessarily related. We might term it a complement on a thematic level. Here, for the first time the chronological model has to admit failure, since the sociological elaboration of the separation has phrasal correspondences also in the IA, which probably means that it must belong to the oldest parts. Nevertheless the TP version is much more "advanced" than the one of the IA.

28-33:   complements   3rd/4th layer?

> Those further extensions, however, that have no counterpart in the IA, certainly can be attributed safely to a younger layer, be it 3 or 4.

36f.:   restrictions   4th layer

> Clearly belonging to the 4th layer are the two restrictions concerning the role of women at the end of the discussion. There is a tendency of curtailing the scope of action for women traceable mainly in poetics, but eventually having an impact on the development of the poetry too.[30]

38, 41-44: the dramatis personae   2nd + 3rd layer?

> Here follows the earliest enumeration of dramatic speakers to be found in the TP, already bearing the traces of syntactically unmistakable amplification even more typical for the *Kaḷavu-* and *Kaṟpu-iyal*.[31] Most remarkable here is the omission of the most important speaker of all, HER, as is already noticed by Nacc. It is hard to prove, but by no means inconceivable that the main sentence structure forms a skeleton dating back to the 2nd or even the 1st layer, which has been filled up subsequently.

39, 40: restrictions   4th layer

> The first insertion after the *sūtra* for the mother as a speaker, stylistically marked by the change of the word for the mother (*naṟṟāy* in 38, *tāyar* in 39) might be seen as a moralistic regulation of social behaviour of a dramatis persona on a par with ss. 36f.. The rationale of insertion in this place simply seems to be the fact that the preceding sentence deals with the mother. The subsequent s. 40, in its turn, was probably added because it also deals with absence.

III. addenda

The last part of the section doesn't seem to have a thematic nexus at all and simply consists of diverse addenda.

45:       speaking of the past   2nd/3rd layer?

46, 47:   complement on *mayakku*   2nd/3rd layer?

> The following 3 *sūtra-s* can be seen as a contribution to the topic of *mayakku* and thus might belong to the 2nd layer. When in a poem a speaker reminiscises about past events we have a classical situation for the mixture of settings (for example HE

---

[30] For thematic traces of such a trend in the poems and *kiḷavi-s* of the *Kuṟuntokai* see Wilden 2003: 198ff. (forthcoming).

[31] On the growth of the number of speakers in the TP see Wilden 2003: 135f. (forthcoming).

walking through the desert and remembering his last encounter with HER). Still, this might also be a further specification as typical of layer 3, especially since the last *sūtra* here is either badly composed or irrelevant – unless it mirrors a later discussion of *marapu*, the word usage (thus the title of the late TP 9).

48-51:   insertion on *uvamam-s* (subject of TP 7)   3rd layer

Especially difficult to place is the following series of *sūtra-s* concerned with *uvamam*, simile. This is the first instance of an unmistakable repercussion with the Sanskrit poetological idiom. It is, however, clearly distinct in wording and concept from the Uvamai-iyal (= TP 7; note *uvamai*, not *uvamam* as in TP 1). Is it an anterior version?

52-54:   complement on the 2 additional *tiṇai-s*   2nd/3rd layer?

The only complement with a thematic and conceptual bearing on the rest of the section, and thus possibly belonging to the 2nd layer, is the exposition of the two additional settings mentioned in the first sūtra, *kaikkiḷai* and *peruntiṇai*. Puzzling, however, is their position between a number of quite unrelated additional items. Stylistically, that is, for length and syntactical composition, they rather seem to belong to an even later period. Do we have to assume that a thematic exposition of the additional *tiṇai-s* was designed to make up for their absence from the structural description in the beginning of the section (which might have been due to their not having a proper place there: there are no more regions left which could have been associated with them)?

55:   addendum on metres (subject of TP 8)   3rd layer

Difficult to place is also this isolated mentioning of metres (possibly again indicating a textual vicinity to the *Kalittokai* and to the *Paripāṭal*). Since metres are expounded at length in TP 8, it presumably can be connected with the comparison between poetics and the lyrical development preceding the formation of TP 8, the new metres being, besides the additional settings, the most tangible difference between the old anthologies and the younger ones.

56, 57:   addendum on proper names   3rd/4th layer?

These last two complements, whether they actually belong together or not, probably belong to a very late stage, since they seem to presuppose a distinction between *Akam* and *Puṟam* poetry which is not mentioned in the rest of the section (or, for that matter, anywhere in the TP besides section 2).

Appendix: Annotated Translation of TP Akattiṇai-iyal

1. (seven *tiṇai*-s)[32]
kaikkiḷai mutalāp peruntiṇai yiṟuvāy
muṟpaṭak kiḷanta veḷutiṇai yeṉpa.

They say the seven settings expressed clearly before
[are what] begins with[33] *kaikkiḷai* [and] ends with *peruntiṇai*.[34]

2. *(5-1 tiṇai*-s)
avaṟṟuḷ
naṭuva ṉaintiṇai naṭuvaṉa toḻiyap
paṭutirai vaiyam pāttiya paṇpē.

Among these,
the five in the centre, apart from the one in the centre,
[have] the quality of dividing the earth [surrounded] by permanent(?) waves.

3. (*mutal- karu- uri- poruḷ*)
mutalkaru vuriporu ḻeṉṟa mūṉṟē
nuvaluṅ kālai muṟaiciṟaṉ taṉavē
pāṭaluṭ payiṉṟavai nāṭuṅ kālai.

These three, named sense-units (*poruḷ*)[35] [namely] basis (*mutal*)[36], ingredient (*karu*)[37]
[and] mood (*uri*)[38],

---

[32] Apart from its conspicuous position (preceding the actual exposition of the *tiṇai-s*) and the fact that the old part of the poetic corpus makes use of only five *tiṇai-s* if at all, this *sūtra* exhibits no clear stylistic or linguistic trace of being a later interpolation. What arouses suspicion, however, is part of the content: *muṟpaṭa kiḷanta* "clearly expressed before" – what is this supposed to mean in a first *sūtra*? This recalls strangely the beginning of the insertion in TP *Ceyyuḷ-iyal* (TP 488) and the first *sūtra* of the IA. Now, even if we are willing to consider a change of position, there is no place in the TP where this reference could be taken to refer to something already taught. This means, it probably has to be seen in connection with other frequent kinds of reference to former authority such as *eṉmaṉār pulavar*. So, one sad but not too unlikely possibility of explaining it is that the whole *tiṇai* section of the TP is quite a late composition/redaction of partly older/heterogenous materials (not before the time of the *Kalittokai*): the *tiṇai* exposition referred to in TP 488 and IA 1 may no longer exist, though it must have been one of the sources, since there are phrasal correspondences. If what follows here were the original *tiṇai* section, it wouldn't make sense to talk of the five middle *tiṇai-s*, in other words the first *sūtra* has not simply been prefixed to an existing sequence.

[33] *mutal-ā*: this mere verbal root *ā* is analysed by Iḷ. and Nacc. unanimously as an infinitive (glossed by *āka*). One would like to have parallels. Another possibility might be to take it as an absolutive to the verb *mutalu-tal*.

[34] Syntax is not very satisfactory in this sentence: if the first line is supposed to be the predicate noun for the second, it is at least totally unmarked as such. A little awkward is moreover the *iṟuvāy*, which probably has to be analysed simply as a noun meaning "end" (*-vāy* being in this case a suffix which doesn't change the semantics of the root *iṟu*). Then we have to take *peruntiṇaiyiṟuvāy* as a veritable *bahuvrīhi*: "that whose end is *peruntiṇai*" – unless we want to understand something deviating considerably from the traditional view, namely that the seven *tiṇai-s* are the end (in the sense of the complete row) of the great *tiṇai-s* beginning with *kaikkiḷai*. This solution would strangely coincide with TP 488, where we have *kaikkiḷai mutalā vēḻ perun tiṇaiyum*, "the seven big settings beginning with k.".

are important in the order at the time one utters [them][39]— when one examines what is
employed in song.

4. (*mutal = nilam + poḻutu*)
mutaleṉap paṭuvatu nilampoḻu tiraṇṭiṉ
iyalpeṉa moḻipa viyalpuṇarn tōṟē.

What is called *mutal* [has] the nature of two, [namely] region [and] time,
say those who have understood [its] nature.

5. (*mullai, kuṟiñci, marutam, neytal*)
māyōṉ mēya kāṭuṟai yulakamum
cēyōṉ mēya maivarai yulakamum
vēntaṉ mēya tīmpuṉal lulakamum
varuṇaṉ mēya perumaṇa lulakamum
mullai kuṟiñci maruta neytaleṉav
colliya muṟaiyāṟ collavum paṭumē.

The world of the forest residence, connected with(?)[40] Māyōṉ,
and the world of the black[41] mountains, connected with(?) Cēyōṉ,
and the world of the sweet flood, connected with(?) Vēntaṉ,
and the world of the great sands, connected with(?) Varuṇaṉ[42],
[these] are called[43] *mullai, kuṟiñci, marutam* [and] *neytal*,
in the order they have been named.

---

[35] *poruḷ* as a technical term is very difficult. In this threefold distinction it might mean something like
"level of sense", "kind of sense-conveying unit".

[36] The technical sense of *mutal* might be here something like "fundamental element" of place and
time (see next *sūtra*).

[37] *karu* as a technical term refers to the regional elements or implements.

[38] There doesn't seem to be a satisfactory etymological analysis for *uri*. Has it to be connected with
uri-tal "to peel off" (i.e. "bark" in the sense of emotive outer covering)?

[39] *nuvalum kālai muṟai*: is this equivalent to *colliya muṟaiyāl/ṉ* (s. 5)? The glosses are different, but if
this refers to *poruḷ* utterances uttered in a poem, what could it mean? The element named first is the
decisive one? Or does the clause simply refer to the order of utterance here in the *sūtra* (thus the
traditional interpretation)? Since *kālai* is regularly used to form actual temporal clauses (cf. *nāṭuṅ
kālai* in the next line), this solution doesn't seem very satisfactory. This is a case where one might
suspect also textual corruption.

[40] *mēya* might be considered here to be a mere connective particle as in the medieval language
(suggestion by Sascha Ebeling), which would be a linguistic indication of lateness. In this case it
would have to be explained as a contraction of *mēviya* (of the verb *mēvu-tal* "to be dear to") "which
is dear to" – "to belong to, to be connected with" (such the gloss given by Nacc.). Another possibilty
to consider is, however, an infinitive of the root *mey-tal*, in poetry usually "to graze", but also
meaning "to roam": "the world of the forest residence, where Māyōṉ roams, ..."

[41] *maivarai*: mai "collyrium" is used in the lyrics for example of the KT several times as a metaphor
for "cloud", so most probably this means "clouded mountain", that is, mountains so high as to
touch the sky (see Nacc.'s gloss: *vāṉ taṅkiya varai*).

[42] At least Varuṇaṉ is suspicious in this enumeration of *tiṇai* deities. But again there is no conclusive
stylistic/linguistic reason to suppose an interpolation, except for the length, and the *sūtra* as such is
necessary in this place. Here a complement within a given *sūtra* seems to be a plausible explanation.

[43] What is the significance of the *-um* with *collavum*?

6. + 7.[44] *(mullai; kuṟiñci)*
kāru mālaiyu mullai kuṟiñci
kūtir yāma meṉmaṉār pulavar.

Rainy season and evening [is] *mullai*,
kuṟiñci [is] cool season [and] midnight,
say the scholars.

8. *(paṉi)*
paṉiyetir paruvamu murritteṉa moḻipa.

The season facing the dew is also suitable, they say.[45]

9. + 10. *(marutam; neytal)*
vaikaṟai viṭiyaṉ marutam eṟpāṭu   *vaikuṟu (Nacc.)*
neyta lātaṉ meypeṟat tōṉṟum.

That daybreak [and] dawn[46] [are] *marutam*,
that afternoon is *neytal*, appears to be true(?)[47].

11. (the middle *tiṇai)*
naṭuvunilait tiṇaiyē naṉpakal vēṉiloṭu
muṭivunilai maruṅkiṉ muṉṉiya neritte.

The setting situated in the middle has the tradition[48]
of being(?)[49] the result[50] of midday together with summer.

12. *(piṉpaṉi)*
piṉpaṉi tāṉu murritteṉa moḻipa.

The late dewy season[51] itself[52] is also suitable, they say.

---

[44] Here, as well as in 9, the *sūtra* division according to Iḷ. doesn't respect metrical boundaries. Nacc. takes 6+7 as well as 9+10 together.

[45] If we take, against the traditional interpretation, *sūtra-s* 6 + 7 together and read 8 as an additional/exceptional rule to both, we get a description much more in tune with the actual poetry: the *paṉi* poems are at least as often situated in the forest region as in the mountains.

[46] Why *vaikaṟai* plus *viṭiyal*, since both refer to daybreak? Both Il. and Nacc. seem to see a difference, since both of them coordinate the two by *-um*. T.V. Gopal Iyer (oral comm.) explains the former as applying to 2-6 in the morning, the latter as 6-10.

[47] *ātal meypeṟa tōṉṟum*: does this elaborate predicate signify anything specifically (which would distinguish *neytal* and *marutam* from the other *tiṇai-s)*, or is it just a rarer specimen of the predicative idioms connected with former authority?

[48] *neṟi* is probably not just another word for "way" such as *āṟu* and *vaḻi*, but the "traditional path" (thus the interpretation of both commentators). Then *muṉṉiya neṟi* would be "the traditional path, which is [actually] followed".

[49] *maruṅkiṉ*: this locative is difficult to construe. It might be possible to read it not as a mere locative suffix, but take *maruṅku* as an equivalent to *nilam*: "the setting situated in the middle has the tradition [of being situated] in a region that is the result of midday together with summer."

[50] *muṉivu-nilai*, literally "end-state", is best taken as a compound meaning "result". The *sūtra* no doubt refers to the specific *pālai* region, the point being that the setting of *pālai* is to be placed in any region in the state of extremity caused by summer drought. (Nacc. seems to understand it like this, but he restricts the occurrence to *kuṟiñci* and *mullai* regions.)

13. (mix of *tiṇai-s*; not with *nilam*)
tiṇaimayak kuṟutaluṅ kaṭinilai yilavē[.]
nilaṉoruṅku mayaṅkuta lilleṉa moḻipa
pulaṉaṉ kuṇarnta pulamai yōrē.

Also to have the mix of settings is not a state to be excluded.
[There] is no mixing so that [different] regions come together,
say the erudite ones who have well understood the teachings(?).[53]

14. (no *uri* mix)
uripporu ḷallaṉa mayaṅkavum peṟumē.

That those apart from the sense-units [related to] mood are mixed also occurs.[54]

15. (*uri*)
puṇartal pirita lirutta liraṅkal
ūṭa lavaṟṟi ṉimitta meṉṟivai   *livaṟṟi* (Nacc.)
tēruṅ kālait tiṇaikkurip poruḷē.

Uniting, separating, waiting, grieving, quarrelling
– the occasions[55] of these, when one examines them[56],
[are] the sense-units [related to] mood for the settings.[57]

---

[51] What might *piṉpaṇi* be from the point of view of the poetry? And suitable for what? For the middle setting? Does this make sense?

[52] *tāṉ* might be here not much more than an emphatic particle, used to make up a complete metrical foot. Or it might emphasize something special, *piṉpaṇi*, whatever might be the relevance.

[53] This injunction seems to make sense: it is easier to imagine, say, a seashore region in times other than afternoon, and animals (or even plants) straying into other areas, than a mountain on the seashore, though in the poety the division is less distinct than in theory – there are extensive descriptions of forests in mountain poems, for example.

[54] What is the relation to the previous *sūtra*? There it is taught that *tiṇai-s* may be mixed, except for the basic regions, i.e. presumably with respect to time and specific elements (*karu*). Is this one to be read as a special injunction to forbid the mix of *uri-s* (the mix of *uri-s* with *uri-s*, i.e. ambivalent moods? the combination of *uri-s* with different regions?)? Apart from making no sense at all from the point of view of the poetry, it is inconsistent in itself. Neither before nor in what follows the correlation of one *uri* with one *tiṇai* is taught – quite contrary to the modern vulgata version of Tamil poetics.

[55] *nimittam* is, apart from *varuṇaṉ* and an occasional *kālai*, the first clear Sanskritism in this section of which there are quite few compared with the other "old" parts of the TP.

[56] Is *ivai* to be connected with *tēruṅ kālai* (slightly unusual with the idiom) or is it the direct predicate noun to *urip poruḷ*, which is further qualified by *avaṟṟiṉ nimittam eṉṟu*: "the *uri-poruḷ-s* [are] these, or rather the occasions of these, [namely] uniting etc."?

[57] This *sūtra* makes it absolutely clear that there is not one *uri* related to one *tiṇai*. There is no correlation here, and if we go back to the *sūtra-s* relating settings with place and time (6ff.), we find two enumerations identical as to sequence (*mullai – kuṟiñci – marutam – neytal – naṭuvaṉ*) which doesn't conform with the correlation established by the commentators (*puṇartal – kuṟiñci, pirital – pālai, iruttal – mullai, iraṅkal – neytal, ūṭal – marutam*).

16.[58] (*pirivu*)
iruvakai pirivu nilaiperat tōnralum   *tōnrinum* (Nacc.)
uriya tāku menmanār pulavar.

It[59] is suitable[60] to appear when the state of separation is obtained, which [is of] two kinds, say the scholars.[61]

17. (*pirivu* 1)
konṭutalaik kalitalum pirintava niraṅkalum
   kaliyinum...iraṅkinum (Nacc.)
uṇṭena molipa vōriṭat tāna.

Departing with [HER] and [HER] grieving there in being separated,
[this] is of one order, they say.[62]

18. (*pirivu* 1)
kalanta poḷutuṅ kāṭciyu manna.

1. Even at the time [the two lovers] are together, the sight[63] [is] thus[64] too.

---

[58] Sastri places the *pirivu sūtra* here after the *uri sūtra*, but according to Iḷ. as well as Nacc. it precedes the *sūtra-s* on *tiṇai* mix and follows directly the *mutal sūtra-s* (i.e. Iḷ. 13, Nacc. 11). Strangely enough he doesn't at all comment on this fact. Since the subject is elliptical this position would result in a completely different statement, namely to the point that *mutal* application (or even making *tiṇai* poetry) is appropriate in the case of separation. There are two ways of explaining: either the *pirivu sūtra* has been misplaced by the commentators (or in a part of the subsequent transmission, which might even mean the modern editors of the commentary editions), because there is a clear sequence between 16 and 17 as above. Or the *sūtra-s* in between have been interpolated, but this would imply several problems. While it might well be possible that the *tiṇai* mix is an addition here (though there is no stylistic indication that would make this plausible), the same is not true for the *uri sūtra*, which is indispensable. This is one of the cases where one would desperately want to have a look at the manuscripts.

[59] What is suitable for what? Iḷ. reads two sentences: there are two kinds of separation, and both are suitable for *pālai*. Nacc. reads a sub-sūtra to the preceding one: both kinds of separation are suitable during the after-dews. But given the basic character of this differentiation of *pirivu*, doesn't it make more sense to see this as a further characterisation of *mutal*? The differentiation of the world (spacial and temporal as given in the preceding *sūtra-s*) lyrically takes place in the situation of separation, which is of two kinds.

[60] *uriyatu*, n.sg., can, when this positioning of the *sūtra* is tenable after all, only refer to *uri-poruḷ* as a plurale tantum.

[61] The impact of this *sūtra* may be twofold. On the one hand it might be read as a subsequent exposition of one of the *uri-s*, namely *pirital* (followed rather eclectically by *iraṅkal*, but not by the others). On the other hand it is possible to separate *pirital* and *pirivu* and see *pirivu* as a higher category: in the general state of separation (*pirivu*) the *uri-s* will manifest themselves (as a basic thematic or modal subdivision).

[62] This *sūtra* might be taken as the basic definition of *pirivu*, which has two kinds (*iruvakai*), namely HIS going away either with or without HER. The *ōriṭattu* in this case wouldn't refer to these two being the first *vakai*, but it might emphasize their falling under the same category despite basic differences. Structurally this is the only difference of interest between the kinds of separation. True, from the thematic point of view actually going away together is just one fairly rare special case, but it is quite important with respect to the protagonists – the poems where the mother ponders about their whereabouts, which are very prominent in the AN, and in the speaker *sūtra-s* of this section the mother gets the first place.

[63] *kāṭci* is difficult here. It might either be used as a technical term – something like "on *poḷutu* mix one takes the same view", or it might have thematic implication: "THEIR actually seeing each other

2. Also times that are mixed[65] [are of] the same sight.

3. Times and sights(?) that are mixed [are] thus [too].

19. (*karu*)
mutaleṉap paṭuva tāyiru vakaittē
teyva muṉāvē māmaram puṭparai
ceyti yāḻiṉ pakutiyoṭu tokaii
avvakaip piṟavuṅ karuveṉa moḻipa.

What belongs to the two kinds that have been called "basis" (*mutal*),
[that is,] god[66], food, animal, tree, bird, drum,
action/profession together with the type of melody(?)[67],
these kinds and other [are called] "ingredients" (*karu*) they say.

20. (*karu* mix)
ennila maruṅkiṟ pūvum puḷḷum
annilam poḻutoṭu vārā vāyiṉum
vanta nilattiṉ payatta vākum.

In whatever[68] region flower and bird [appear],
even if they don't come with the time of that region,
they become the fruit of the region where they have come.[69]

21. (*karu* people)
peyarum viṉaiyumeṉ ṟāyiru vakaiya
tiṇaitoṟu marīiya tiṇainilaip peyarē.

The names [denoting] the staying in one setting, joined with each particular setting,
are of two kinds, [namely] name and occupation.[70]

(which implies a mix of poetic times?) is still of the same *pirivu* order, i.e. not to be seen as a deviation from the rule.

[64] The most likely interpretation of *aṉṉa* here is that it refers back to the predicate noun of the previous *sūtra*: *oṟiṭattu*, i.e. it still belongs under *pirivu*.

[65] By the commentators *kalanta poḻutum* is taken to refer to THEIR being together, but in the light of the *sūtra-s* on *tiṇai* mix it might be preferable to read it as a synonym to *maya-ttal* and understand that the mix of *poḻutu-s* (poetic times, besides *karu* the only elements that may be mixed) doesn't imply change of the basic feature of *pirivu*.

[66] *teyvam*, here another Sanskritism.

[67] What does *yāḻiṉ pakuti* denote? Do we have to think of a kind of musical version of the poems? How old is this?

[68] Here the interrogative base *e-* apparently is used in an indefinite sense. This is strange, but how else to take it?

[69] So this *sūtra* seems to regulate *tiṇai* mix with respect to *karu-s*. But why only flowers and birds? Is this a "realistic" rule? – of both of these there are so many, and they are indeed not clearly correlated to particular regions.

[70] This is an important *sūtra* since it throws light on our general problem of generic names. Is *paratavar* the name of a tribe of fishermen, or is it the word for fishermen (who might have been organised in a tribal way, or even as a caste)? The TP doesn't offer a solution, but sees already the same phenomenon.

22. (*karu* people)
āyar vēṭṭuva rāṭūut tiṇaipeyar
āvayiṉ varūuṅ kiḷavaru muḷarē.

Setting[-related] names of males [are] (for example?) *āyar* (herdsmen), *vēṭṭuvar* (hunters);
the designations for HIM are such as come in this place.[71]

23. (*karu* people)
ēṉōr maruṅkiṉu meṉṉuṅ kālai   *pāṅkiṉum* (Nacc.)
āṉā vakaiya tiṇainilaip peyarē.

As for the others, when one considers it,
there are innumerable kinds of names [denoting] the staying in one setting.[72]

24. (*karu* people)
aṭiyōr pāṅkiṉum viṉaivalar pāṅkiṉum   *viṉaivala* (Nacc.)
kaṭivarai yilapuṟat teṉmaṉār pulavar.
As for[73] slaves and workers(?)[74],
they are not to be excluded, [but] they are outside (the usual scope)[75], say the scholars.

25. (*karu* people)
ēvaṉ marapi ṉēṉōru muriyar
ākiya nilaimai yavaru maṉṉar.

According to someone's(?)[76] usage, others are suitable too;

---

[71] *āyar* is not a frequent term; it appears just once in the old anthologies (PN 390.1) and lots of times in Kal. *vēṭṭuvar* is there occasionally, but also not frequent, and both not for HIM. Why these choice of examples and not some really common ones? Perhaps it would be better to separate into two *sūtra-s*, one referring to the tribe/occupation names and one drawing the parallel to the *nāṭaṉ* type, the latter without examples because it is self-evident.

[72] What is the impact of this *sūtra*? Is this not a restriction, as usual, but on the contrary, an extension, i.e. there are not only family- and occupation names? Then it should go together with the second part of the previous *sūtra*, because the designations for HIM are structurally of the same type as the others, but they are mostly based on residence (*nāṭaṉ* "the man from a land", *cērpaṉ* "the man from the coast") or even more complicated (*makiḻnaṉ* "the one who gives joy"?). A few of the other regional names are also based on residence (*kāṉavar* "forest inhabitants").

[73] *pāṅkiṉ* is not to be counted among the numerous regular locative suffixes, but it seems hardly possible to see anything else here.

[74] The exact meaning of *viṉaivalar* is doubtful. Etymologically it could mean either "those who are able to work" or "those working under instruction"; in any case in combination with *aṭiyōr* "slaves" it seems to be a social classification.

[75] The reading of *puṟattu* as a second predicate noun is grammatically problematic, since we expect a neuter plural (*puṟatta*), as would parallel *ila*. It might, however, be possible to postulate the special *sandhi* with following *eṉṉutal* (*puṟatta-eṉmaṉār*). (The commentary explanation that this refers to there being outside *aintiṇai*, but allowed for *peruntiṇai* and *kaikkiḷai*, is not supported by the text, but systematically possible.) Alternatively it would be possible to read an extra injunction for Puṟam poetry ("they are not to be excluded in Puṟam"), but this is problematic in the context. There has been no mention of the division into Akam and Puṟam, and the description so far clearly pertains to Akam alone.

[76] *ēvaṉ*, actually interrogative pronoun, is problematic here, but it seems once again best to take it as an indefinite: there are also people (poets? poeticians?) who deal with yet more kinds of person. This seems to be a concession to actual occurrence. On the other hand both commentators read *ēval*, a verbal noun here. This would be a usage which is imperative. This doesn't make much sense unless read as a late insertion.

they are thus under the conditions that have arisen.[77]

26.[78] (*pirivu* 2)
ōtal pakaiyē tūtivai pirivē.

Reciting, enmity [and] message [are reasons for] separation.[79]

27. (*pirivu* 2)
avaṟṟuḷ
ōtalun tūtu muyarntōr mēṉa.

Among these, reciting and message are for highborn people.

28. (*pirivu* 2)
tāṉē cēṟalun taṉṉoṭu civaṇi   civaṇiya (Nacc.)
ēṉōr cēṟalum vēntaṉ mēṟṟē.

Going himself and others going in his company [is] with the king.[80]

29. (*pirivu* 2)
mēviya ciṟappi ṉēṉōr paṭimaiya
mullai mutalāc colliya muṟaiyāṟ
piḷaittatu piḷaiyā tākal vēṇṭiyum
iḷaitta voṇporuṇ muṭiyavum pirivē.

Separation [is] in order to achieve the appointed bright wealth,
even if wanting that which is failing to be/become unfailing,
by the sorts that have been taught beginning with *mullai* as an example(?),[81]
for(?) others of wished-for superiority.[82]

---

[77] *ākiya nilaimai* might refer to the state of affairs as it is to be found in the actual poetry of the day. So this once again might be read as an extensional *sūtra* making concessions to actual usage (as against the normative usage). The persons of *karu* thus take a whole 5 *sūtra-s*, which might mean that on this point there has been a lively controversy.

[78] The following renewed discussion of *pirivu* is peculiar in several respects. Firstly, it is disproportionately long, comprising *sūtra-s* 26-36. Secondly, from the structural point of view it is of no avail at all, and thus at discrepancy with what has been taught so far. It is a "sociclogical" analysis of the phenomenon of *pirivu*, enumerating different sets of reasons for seperation and different kinds of people for whom these reasons may be valid. Nothing of this kind has any repercussions with either poems or *kiḷavi-s*. We know, however, that this must have been an old concern, because a similar discussion (with the only phrasal correspondences to be found in this section) is to be found in the IA, though considerably more concise and comprehensible (= IA 35-40).

[79] *ōtal, pakai, tūtu*: these three are traditionally interpreted as study, warfare and diplomatic errand.

[80] This *sūtra* might make sense if taken elliptical. While the *uyarntōr* separate for studying or delivering a diplomatic message, the king goes to make war (*pakai* "enmity"), the third element of the basic enumeration of s. 26.

[81] *patimaiyam* = Skt. *pratimā-*?

[82] This *sūtra* is an enigma and its different, widely disparate interpretations would make a whole paper. Neither wording, nor context nor correspondences of any kind give a clue to what might have been said in the first three lines, while the fourth adduces wealth as a reason for separation, indeed the only one so far to have a clear correspondence to *kiḷavi-s* and poetry.

30. (*pirivu* 2)
mēlōr muṟaimai nālvarkku murittē.

For the four[83] the right of the ones above[84] is suitable.

31. (*pirivu* 2)
maṉṉar pāṅkiṟ piṉṉōr ākupa.

Those who are [mentioned] subsequently belong to[85] the chiefs.

32. (*pirivu* 2)
uyarntōrk kuriya vōtti ṉāṉa.

They are suitable to the highborn ones according to the recitation. (?)[86]
                                    in [the case of separation for] recitation.[87]

33. (*pirivu* 2)
vēntuviṉai yiyaṟkai vēnta ṉorīiya   vēntaṉi ṉorīiya
(Nacc.)
ēṉōr maruṅkiṉu meytiṭa ṉuṭaittē.

The natural work of the king possesses room of occurrence also on the part of others
except the king.

34. (*pirivu* 2)
poruḷvayiṟ piritalu mavarvayiṉu murittē.

Also separating on account of wealth is suitable for those.

35. (*pirivu* 2)
uyarntōr poruḷvayi ṉoḷukat tāṉa.

[Separating] on account of wealth [is] for highborn ones in accordance with conduct.[88]

---

[83] *nālvar* is interpreted unanimously as a reference to the four Sanskrit *varṇa*-s. If this is correct (and I don't see any way of explaining it otherwise on the basis of the immediate context) it is prone to make the *sūtra* an alien element in the context (see also the next note).

[84] *mēlōr*: if this is to be seen as a synonym to the usual *uyarntōr*, it might be a first stylistic hint for a difference of origin, which in itself wouldn't carry much weight, but in combination with the *nālvar* it might make another point. It might however, also be interpreted as textual reference (complementary to the *piṉṉōr* "those mentioned subsequently" of the next *sūtra*): "the ones mentioned above", and then the *sūtra* would have to be seen as a rather democratic extensional rule: not only highborn ones and kings are allowed to separate for study, enmity, message and wealth, but all the four *varṇa-s*, but this wouldn't make much sense in the light of what follows, namely further complicated rules of social distinction.

[85] Here a second rather clear instance of *pāṅkiṉ* as a locative suffix.

[86] At the very latest this *sūtra* makes clear that either textual or transmissional order are awry. What is suitable, and in the plural (*uriya*), is elliptical and not to be discerned from the preceding *sūtra-s*. And the meaning of *ōttu* here is not at all clear. To read it as a reference to the Veda as is done by Nacc. lacks any kind of systemic or contextual plausibility, if it is not to be read as a sign of moralistic interpolation (cf. the brahmins intruding in *Kaḷavu*, *Kaṟpu* and *Ceyyuḷ* insertion).

[87] Thus Iḷ., but that doesn't make sense since this is already taught in sūtra 27.

[88] What is the meaning of *oḷukattu* here? The commentators take it to refer to caste *dharma* (for which there is no evidence in the text), unless we assume it belongs to the same set of interpolations as the

36.[89] (*pirivu* 2)
munnīr vaḻakka makaṭūuvō ṭillai.

1. [Going] by sea [is] not custom together with a woman. (Iḻ.)
2. The three kinds [of separation are] not custom together with a woman. (Nacc.)[90]

37.[91] (*maṭal*)
ettiṇai maruṅkiṉu makaṭūu maṭaṉmēl
poṟpuṭai neṟimai yiṉmai yāṉa.

There is no natural(?) literary usage(?)[92] of [being] on the palmyra horse for a woman in any setting.

38. (*naṟṟāy*)
taṉṉu mavaṉu mavaḷuñ cuṭṭi
maṉṉu nimitta moḻipporuṭ ṭeyvam
naṉmai tīmai yaccañ cārtaleṉṟu
aṉṉa pirivu mavaṟṟoṭu tokaii
muṉṉiya kāla mūṉṟoṭu viḷakkit   *mūṉṟuṭaṉ* (Nacc.)
tōḻi tēettuṅ kaṇṭōr pāṅkiṉum
pōkiya tiṟattu naṟṟāy pulampalum
ākiya kiḻaviyu mavvaḷi yuriya.

Those kinds of words that express being lonely/grieving[93]

are suitable to the real mother, at the occasion(?)[94] when [they] have gone,
to the confidante and the onlookers,
pointing out herself and him and her,
saying to approach the fear of good [and] evil

---

nālvar sūtra. It might, however, also be a technical term referring to suitability, but for this one would want parallels.

[89] This *sūtra*, whatever the factual meaning, is a special rule only loosely fitting the context and lacking the ordinary *sūtra* to which it might be the restriction – unless it is totally misplaced here.

[90] The crux here is the expression *munnīr*, taken by Iḻ. as a word occasionally to be found in the poetry (especially in PN) and denoting the sea (as having three kinds of water). This doesn't make any sense, because travelling by sea has never been mentioned nor is it a lyrical topos. Nacc. takes it to refer to three kinds of *pirivu*, which might make sense if we put the *sūtra* into the vicinity of s. 26 (i.e. *ōtal, pakai, tūtu*). He sorts out, however, *ōtal, tūtu* and *poruḷ*, which would be better from a systematic and thematic point of view (war being the prerogative of the king and thus a special case). This solution, however, poses a major morphological problem: how to account for the formation of *munnīr*?

[91] This *sūtra* is with absolute certainty either misplaced or badly interpolated. Its only contextual defence is that it also deals with women (making use of the same unusual word *makaṭūu* as the preceding s.).

[92] *poṟpuṭai neṟimai iṉmai*: while certainly being a technical predication expressing a prohibition, it is not one of the familiar ones. Neither precise impact nor origin are traceable.

[93] *pulampalum ākiya kiḻavi*: this presumably refers to the situation of the mother being left behind when THEY elope together, but how to explain the construction? Is this simply a pointed way of attribution?

[94] What can be the meaning of *tiṟattu* here? Both commentators decide to take the *pōkiya* as an elliptical reference to THEIR going away together, and indeed this information seems necessary for the *sūtra*, since the mother speaks only then. This means, however, to take *tiṟam*, "constituent, element", as an equivalent of *kālam*, "time" – thus the gloss given by Nacc..

in the god by the meaning of the words of a lasting occasion(?),[95]
together with those and others of that kind,
[and] making clear with three(?)[96] the former time.[97]

39. (*tāy*)
ēmap pērūrc cēriyuñ curattum
tāmē cellun tāyaru muḷarē.

And mothers[98] are such as go themselves
through the streets of joyous/confused big villages and deserts.

40. (THEY?)
ayalō rāyiṉu makaṟci mēṟṟē.

Even if they [are][99] in the neighbourhood, [it is to be considered as] separation.[100]

41. (*tōḻi*)
talaivaru viḻuma nilaiyeṭut turaippiṉum
pōkkaṟ kaṇṇum viṭuttaṟ kaṇṇum
nīkkaliṉ vanta tammuṟu viḻumamum
vāymaiyum poymmaiyuṅ kaṇṭōr cuṭṭit
tāynilai nōkkit talaipeyarttu koḻiṉum
nōymikap perukit taṉṉeñcu kaluḻntōḷai
aḷintatu kaḻaiyeṉa moḻintatu kūṟi   *kaḻaiiya voḻintatu* (Nacc.)[101]
vaṇpuṟai neruṅki vantataṉ ṟirattōṭu
eṉṟivai yellā miyalpuṟa nāṭiṉ
oṉṟit tōṉṟun tōḻi mēṉa.

1. When speaking of the state of excellence that will come to pass,
and 2. when letting [them] go, and 3. when sending [them] off,[102]
and 4. when recovering herself[103], having looked at the state of the mother,
after onlookers had pointed out truth and lie
and the excellence of having them [back?], who had met with opposition(?),
together with 5. the elements of coming [and] approaching with encouragement
saying what is worded splendidly[104] about breaking down,
to her, who has dimned in her heart since pain has become very great,

---

[95] Whatever is this supposed to mean?

[96] Does this refer to the persons mentioned in line 1, i.e. the mother herself, HIM and HER?

[97] Here is one case of *tokaii* not concluding an enumeration, an agglutination of clauses which looks quite anacolouthically.

[98] Note the change of idiom from *naṟṟāy* to *tāyar*, either a (generalising) plural or the usual honorific. Probably this *sūtra* is a later extension.

[99] The *ayalōr* are not identified, but probably this refers rather to the eloped couple than to the mother(s), as the commentators seem to imply by glossing it with *pirintār*.

[100] Note the unusual word for separation employed here, *akaṟci*, not *pirivu*.

[101] "talking about breaking down [and] dying in order to remove [the pain]"?

[102] *Pōkkal* appears to be terminological here, i.e. the confidante advising the lovers to take resort to going away together, while *viṭuttal* might refer to the confidante's actually seeing them off.

[103] *Koḻiṉ*: here *koḷ* once more in its modern auxiliary function.

[104] *kaḻaiyeṉa* adverbially modifying *moḻintatu*?

all these [and what][105] appears to agree with situations of the same nature
[are the occasions of speech that are] with the confidante.

42. (*kaṇṭōr*)
poḷutu māṟu muṭkuvarat tōṉṟi
vaḷuvi ṉākiya kuṟṟaṅ kāttalum
ūratu cārppuñ cellun tēyamum   *cārvuñ* (Nacc.)
ārva neñcamoṭu ceppiya valiyinum   *kiḷaviyum* (Nacc.)
puṇarntōr pāṅkiṟ puṇarnta neñcamoṭu
aḷintatetir kūṟi vituppiṉu māṅkat
tāyniḷai kaṇṭu taṭuppiṉum viṭuppiṉum
cēyniḷaik kakaṉṟōr celaviṉum varaviṉum
kaṇṭōr moḷital kaṇṭa teṉpa.

[When] showing[106] the fault that has become a mistake (?)
since dread of the time and the way appears to come up(?),
and 2. in the situation of speaking(?) with affectionate heart
of the shelter of the village and the land [they] are going to,
and 3. when sending [them] on after having spoken against breaking down
with a heart which has become close to those who are united,
and 4. when stopping the mother and sending her on at the sight of [her] state,
and 5. at the going and coming of those who have departed to a distant place,
[in these situations] it is seen that the onlookers speak, they say.

43.[107] (HE)
oṉṟāt tamariṉum paruvattuñ curattum
oṉṟiya moḷiyoṭu valippiṉum vituppiṉum   *tōḷiyoṭu* (Nacc.)
iṭaicura maruṅki ṉavaṭama reytik
kaṭaikoṇṭu peyartaliṟ kalaṅkaña reytik
kaṟpoṭu puṇarnta kauvai vuḷappaṭa
appāṟ paṭṭa vorutiṟat tāṉum
nālatu ciṉmaiyu miḷaimaiya tarumaiyuṉ
tāḷāṉ pakkamun takutiya tamaitiyum
iṉmaiya tiḷivu muṭaimaiya tuyarcciyum
aṉpiṉa takalamu makaṟciya tarumaiyum
oṉṟap poruḷvayi ṉūkkiya pāliṉum
vāyiṉuṅ kaiyiṉum vakutta pakkamōṭu
ūtiyaṅ karutiya vorutiṟat tāṉum
pukaḷu māṉamu meṭuttuvar puruttalun
tūtiṭai yiṭṭa vakaiyi ṉāṉum
ākit tōṉṟum pāṅkor pāṅkiṉum
mūṉṟaṉ pakutiyu maṇṭilat tarumaiyum
tōṉṟal cāṉṟa māṟṟōr meṉmaiyum
pācaṟaip pulampalu muṭinta kālattup
pākaṉōṭu virumpiya viṉaittiṟa vakaiyiṉum
kāvaṟ pāṅki ṉāṅkōr pakkamum

---

[105] Syntax is as so often awkward here, and actually the *tōṉṟum* hangs syntactically on thin air.

[106] Either this *sūtra* is badly anacolouthic and the *kāṭṭalum* has to be read as coordinate with the *iṉum*-forms or I don't understand the structure at all.

[107] At the very latest this *sūtra* is quite as bad as the speaker *sūtra-s* in the *Kaḷavu* and *Kaṟpu* sections: as heavily reworked, as unsystematic, as anacolouthic. Definitely not an earlier and simpler state of affairs. But then, how to explain their interrelation at all? Do we have to assume a state of affairs when the whole TP text was compiled, but additions could be made wherever they were felt necessary?

parattaiyi ṉakaṟciyiṟ pirintōṭ kuṟuki
irattalun teḷittalu meṉaviṟu vakaiyōṭu
uraittiṟa nāṭṭaṅ kiḷavōṉ mēṉa.

1. When considering with agreeing words his people
who are not agreeing and the season and the desert, and sending [them] off,[108]
2. when he leaves from accompanying [her][109]
after her people have approached [them] in the midst of the desert,
and 3. with one constituent[110] that comes to that situation(?)[111],
including affliction when they have united with wedded love,
after disturbing grief approaches (?!),
and 4. in the situation(?) when he considers because of wealth, to which he is not
agreeing, the fewness of days and the rareness of youth
and the part of the ...(?) male (?) and the appropriate calmness(?)
and the wretchedess of having nothing and the highness of possession
and the expanse of loving and the difficulty of separation,
and 5. with one constituent that [he] is intent on gain,
together with the part that is distributed by mouth and hand (?!)
and 6. encouraging, raising praise and honour,
and 7. in the situation that a messenger is intervening/that he is interposed as a
messenger[112],
and 8. at the side of the companion(s) who appear to have become(?)[113]
and 9. lamenting in the warcamp(?)
the part of three(?) and the difficulty of the circle
and the superiority of the enemies worthy for appearing
and 10. in the situation of opening[114] a work, which has been longed for by the
charioteer in a time, when [it] is completed(?),
and 11. at the side of such ones close to protection (?!),
12. together with the two situations of begging and affirming
after having approached the one he had separated from in a separation on account of
another woman/a courtesan,
[in such situations] the chiefdom over the constituents of speech [is] with HIM.

---

[108] *viṭuppiṉum* has either to be read as a very elliptical construction (as do the commentators) or we do have to assume that the subject here is not HE himself, but perhaps the confidante who first ponders with him cicumstances and occasion and then sees the eloping couple off (cf. previous s.).

[109] If *peyartaliṉ* is the next item on the list, it is not coordinated by -*um*, and it is unclear how it is to be construed with *kaṭaikkoṇṭu*.

[110] How to explain the function of *orutiṟattāṉum*? Has it to be read as elliptical: "in [situations that also have this] one constituent"?

[111] Is *pāl* to be understood here and in the following as "fate" in the sense of actual momentary situation of the lovers?

[112] The first reading might be the one chance of finding in the TP something similar to the messenger theme occasionally to be found in the *kiḷavi-s* and frequent in the lyrics, but the second seems to be in accordance with *sūtra* 26.

[113] *āki tōṉṟum* seems to be part of an incomplete clause, or at least I have no idea how to understand it all by itself.

[114] Can *tiṟa* here have the meaning of "beginning" or does it say that HE discloses his decision to set off in order to accomplish work?

44. (others)
eñci yōrkku meñcuta lilavē.

Also for the remaining [people] they (these situations of speech) are not to be left behind.[115]

45. (speaking of the past)
nikaḻntatu niṉaittaṟ kētuvu mākum.

It becomes/there is[116] also a reason[117] for thinking of what has happened.

46. (speaking of the past)
nikaḻntatu kūṟi nilaiyaluñ tiṇaiyē.

When talking[118] of what has happened the setting also has to stay. (?)[119]

47. (poruḷ? tiṇai?)
marapunilai tiriyā māṭciya vāki
viravum poruḷum viravu meṉpa.

Mingling [of settings][120] and sense-units (poruḷ) are mingled gloriously
without changing the state of word-usage[121], they say.

48.[122] (*tiṇai: uḷḷuṟai + ēṉai*)

---

[115] *eñciyōr*: this is hopefully just a synonym for the usual *ēṉōr/piṟavōr* (cf. also *oḻintōr* in 498). In this case we have a shiboleth *sūtra*: besides the usual speakers also others are possible. Note that Nacc. takes the opportunity to introduce HER (a most surprising omission indeed) and the foster-moster (probably an invention of later poetics; see *Kaḷavu*).

The scopus of the *ila* still remains unclear (and this again looks like an interrupted sequence); it might be HIS speech situations or any of the ones enumerated so far. Or we have simply to complement with *kiḷavi*.

[116] This *sūtra* must be dislocated, because it doesn't make sense in this context. The immediate surroundings provide no noun for complementing the ellipsis: what is the *ētu*? On the other hand it might also be possible to read a general statement as to poems also dealing with the past. This seems to be the strategy of the commentators.

[117] *ētu* = Skt. *hetu-*?

[118] *kūṟi*: the absolutive is quite awkward here. If this clause is meant to give the condition for the main sentence we would expect a conditional or a nominal construction with locative.

[119] This sentence is just as bad though it at least might belong together with the preceding one. The point might be that a reference to what has happened before (for example in another place and time: HE on his way remembering their being together) doesn't change the *tiṇai*-classification for the whole poem (which is oriented by the actual situation of the speaker).

[120] How to understand *viravu* here? (The first has to be taken as a noun, the second as a verb, I suppose, and the -*um*'s are here coordinating *viravum* and *poruḷum*.) Is it another word for *tiṇaimayakku*, as the commentators seem to think? Then it probably belongs to another textual layer. In this case the *sūtra* would refer to the possibility of extending the mixture of *tiṇai-s* to the level of *poruḷ-s* – which wouldn't be great news after the rules 13f., 18. And the wording is not convincing at all: why say that it is the mingling which is mingled with *poruḷ*?

[121] = without deviating from the fixed word-usage.

[122] The point here is obviously not to define the two kinds of simile, but to establish the relation between *tiṇai* and simile (which is intimate indeed: if there is *tiṇai* poetry, it is to be found in connection with the inset poems). Is this miscellaneous material simply added at the end?

uḷḷuṟai yuvama mēṉai yuvamameṉat
taḷḷā tākun tiṇaiyuṇar vakaiyē.

Implicite simile and other similes,
these are without fail(?) situations to realize the setting.

49. (*tiṇai + uḷḷuṟai*)
uḷḷuṟai teyva moḻintatai nilameṉak
koḷḷu meṉpa kuṟiyaṟin tōṟē.

Implicite simile takes what speaks of/what excepts[123] the deity as region,
say those who have understood the signs.

50. (*uḷḷuṟai uvamam*)
uḷḷuṟut titaṉō ṭottuporuṇ muṭikeṉa
uḷḷuṟut turaippatē yuḷḷuṟai yuvamam.   *tiṟuvatai* (Nacc.)

Implicite simile [is] what is said with implication,
[with the thought] 'may the appropriate sense become complete[124] along with this
which has been implied'.

51. *(eṉai uvamam)*
ēṉai yuvaman tāṉuṇar vakaittē.

The other similes [are] of the kind to be realized by themselves.

52. *(kaikkiḷai)[125]*
kāmañ cālā viḷamai yōḻvayiṉ
ēmañ cālā viṭumpai yeyti
naṉmaiyun tīmaiyu meṉṟiru tiṟattāṉ
taṉṉoṭu mavaḷoṭum tarukkiya puṇarttuc
colletir peṟāaṉ colli yiṉpuṟal
pullit tōṉṟuṅ kaikkiḷaik kuṟippē.

Approaching with pain which is not appropriate for pleasure
a youthful girl who is not appropriate for desire,
uniting what torments with himself and with her
in the two constituents of good and evil,[126]
having pleasure speaking as one who doesn't obtain an answer,
in connection [with these] *kaikkiḷai* [is] intended to appear.

---

[123] According to *sandhi* dissolution we can read *moḻintatai* or *oḻintatai*, which seems to yield contrary meanings, but since deities are mentioned so rarely in the poems at all, it might be more useful to read the latter with the commentaries. Why on earth here the accusative marking? These instances can be counted on a hand for the whole of TP.

[124] *muṭikeṉa* seems to be one of the "irregular" cases of optative in *-ka* plus *eṉ*. This would be a highly unusual construction for a TP *sūtra*: embedded direct and modal speech.

[125] What follows here, without any contextual imbedding, is the description of the two additional settings which is missing in the beginning of the section. Note that it is not a structural description at all, there probably being no *poruḷ-s* for *kaikkiḷai* and *peruntiṇai*, because the "world" as contained in the five settings is already complete. It is a thematic description presupposing the dramatic conception of the speaker *sūtra-s*, actually it contains additional speech situations for HIM.

[126] The meaning of the 2 medium lines is not at all self-evident. Nacc. connects the *puṇarttu* with the process of HIS speaking, but that doesn't clarify the internal syntax of the lines.

53. (peruntiṇai)
ēṟiya maṭaṟṟiṟa miḷamai tīrtiṟam
tēṟuta loḻinta kāmattu mikutiṟam
mikka kāmattu miṭaloṭu tokaii
ceppiya nāṉkum peruntiṇaik kuṟippē.

The constituent of the palmyra horse mounted, the constituent of youth ending,
the constituent of desire, which has left behind believing, exceeding,
together with the strength of excessive desire,
as the said four *peruntiṇai* [is] intended.

54. (kaikkiḷai?)
muṉṉaiya nāṉku muṉṉataṟ keṉpa.

The four previous ones [are] for the preceding, they say.[127]

55. (kali + paripāṭu)
nāṭaka valakkiṉu mulakiyal valakkiṉum
pāṭal cāṉṟa pulaṉeṟi valakkam
kaliyē paripāṭ tāyiru pāviṉum   *pāṅkiṉum* (Nacc.)
uriyatāku meṉmaṉār pulavar.

In dramatic(?)[128] usage and in wordly usage
the usage of the scholarly path worthy for singing (= poetry?)
is suitable to be in the warp of two, namely Kali and Paripāṭu,
say the scholars.

56. (proper names in Akam)
makka ṉutaliya vakaṉain tiṇaiyum
cuṭṭi yoruvarp peyarkoḷp peṟāar.

When human beings are denoted, with respect to the five settings of *Akam*[129]
individuals don't obtain getting names.

57. (aḷavutal? in Akam/Puṟam)
puṟattiṇai maruṅkiṟ porunti ṉallatu
akattiṇai maruṅki ṉaḷavuta lilavē.

Besides being fit in the Puṟam settings,
blending(?)[130] is not [allowed] in the Akam settings.

---

[127] With goodwill this can be read as the four *tiṟam-s* taught in the previous *sūtra* also being applicable to *kaikkilai* – which either makes *peruntiṇai* a subtype of *kaikkilai*, or it doesn't make sense at all.

[128] *nāṭakam*: again a clear Sanskritsm, but this time a very strange one. What has drama to do with *Akam* poetry? Would it be conceivable that *nāṭakam* in Tamil can be used as an equivalent to *ceyyuḷ* – as Nacc. seems to understand it: "in ornate speech"? Which Sanskrit texts have to be presupposed for this? And is this an even later complement (later than TP 8), which feels also the development of metres has to be accounted for somehow?

[129] Do we have to assume here *akaṉ* instead of *akam*?

[130] What can be the meaning of *aḷavutal* here? The commentary interpretation of taking this as referring still to proper names in *Akam* and *Puṟam* is at least not obvious, and the word deviation *akaṉ* in 56 but *akam* in 57 doesn't exactly encourage reading these two as actually belonging together.

Literature

Primary Sources

Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam (+ Nampi's urai): Ed. by Gōvintacāmi Piḷḷai, 1962.

Iṟaiyaṉār Akapporuḷ (+ Nakkīraṉ's urai): Ed. by SISSWPS, Tinnevelly, Rep. 1964.

Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram. Ed. + Transl. + Comm. by P.S. Subrahmanya Sastri, Part I Madras 1949, Part II Madras 1952, Part III Madras 1956.

Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram + Iḷampūraṇar's urai. Ed. by SISSWPS, Tinnevelly, Rep. 1967.

Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram 1-5 + Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's urai. Ed. by SISSWPS, Tinnevelly, Rep. 1968.

Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram 6-9 + Pērāciriyar's urai. Ed. by SISSWPS, Tinnevelly, Rep. 1966.

Secondary Sources

Aravamuthan, T.G. 1930: "The Oldest Account of the Tamil Academies". *JOR IV* (1930) 183-201, 289-317.

Buck D./Paramasivam K. 1997: *The Study of Stolen Love: A Translation of Kaḷaviyal eṉṟa Iṟaiyaṉār Akapporuḷ with Commentary by Nakkīraṉ.* Scholars Press of Atlanta, Georgia 1997.

Ilakkuvanar, S. 1963: *Tholkāppiyam (in English) with Critical Studies.* Kuṟaḷ ṉeṟi Publishing House, Madurai 1963.

Klaus, C. 2000: "Zu den *Śrautasūtra*s." In: *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 2. bis 5. Oktober 1997 in Erlangen.* Hrsg. Von B. Forssman und R. Plath. Wiesbaden 2000, 177-190.

—— 2001: "Zur Entstehung des *Pātimokkhasutta* der Theravādin." *WZKS 45* (2001) 23-39.

Renou, L. 1963: "Sur le genre du *sūtra* dans la littérature sanskrite." *JA 251* (1963) 165-216.

Selvamony, N. 1989: *Tolkaapiyam: akattiNai iyal.* Sobitham 1989.

Srinivasan, S.A. 1980: *On the Composition of the Nāṭyaśāstra.* StII Monographie I, Reinbek.

Staal, F. 1992: "Sūtra." In: *Kalātattvakośa. A Lexicon of the Fundamental Concepts of the Indian Arts. Vol. II: Concepts of Space and Time.* Delhi 1992, p. 303-314.

Takahashi, T. 1991, "The List Collating the *Sūtra* Numbers among the Various Texts of the *Tolkāppiyam*" In: *The Memories of the Institute of Oriental Culture*, 65-119 [in Japanese]

—— 1995: *Tamil Love Poetry and Poetics.* E.J. Brill, Leiden 1995.

—— 2002: "Before Grammar: Issues on Reading Some Classical Tamil Texts." (Lecture given at the 17th European Conference on Modern South Asian Studies), Kolam <www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/indologie/kolam>, Heidelberg, 13th Sept. 2002.

von Hinüber, O. 2001: "Nochmals über das *Pātimokkhasutta*. Anmerkungen zu K. Klaus: 'Zur Entstehung des Pātimokkhasutta der Theravādin'." *WZKS 45* (2001) 41-58.

Wezler, A. 2001: "Zu der Frage des 'Strebens nach äußerster Kürze' in den *Śrautasūtra*s." *ZDMG 151* (2001) 351-366.

Wilden, E. 2000: "The Position of the *tuṟai-s* in the Poetological Tradition of Caṅkam Literature". In: *Pandanus 2000, Workshop on Natural Symbolism in Indian Literatures*, ed. J. Vacek, Prague, 263-283.

—— 2002a: "Towards an Internal Chronology of Old Tamil Caṅkam Literature Or How to Trace the Laws of a Poetic Universe (A Review of H. Tieken's *Kāvya in South India*)." *WZKS 46* (2002) 105-133.

—— 2002b: "Announcement of a Critical Edition of the *Naṟṟiṇai*." (Lecture given at the 17th European Conference on Modern South Asian Studies), Kolam <www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/indologie/kolam>, Heidelberg, 13th Sept. 2002.

—— 2003 (forthcoming): *Literary Techniques in Old Tamil Caṅkam Poetry: the Kuṟuntokai; ch. III. Studies in the Poetological and the Poetical Tradition*, p. 125-238.

Zvelebil, K. 1973: "The Earliest Account of the Tamil Academies". *IIJ 15.2* (1973) 109-135.