Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram and *Iṟaiyaṉār Akapporuḷ*: Their Relative Chronology

Takanobu Takahashi

1. Introduction

The *Tolkāppiyam* (*Tol.*) has traditionally been recognized as the oldest extant grammar. There are, however, some who maintain that it consists of several layers and its third part on poetics, namely, *Tol. Poruḷatikāram* (*TP*), belongs to a later stratum. There are still a few who insist that the *TP* is chronologically later than the *Iṟaiyaṉār Akapporuḷ* (*IA*). It is almost impossible at the present stage of our knowledge to establish the absolute chronology of the *TP* and the *IA*, since we have very little evidence, both external and internal, for the dates of their composition. On the other hand, the *TP* is a treatise most parts of which are concerned with love (*akam*) poetics, while the *IA* is a text exclusively dealing with *akam* poetics, and so by scrutinizing both texts we should be able to come up with a relative chronology for them. This paper aims at establishing such a relative chronology, and my arguments focus on the *akam* terminology used in both texts.

2. Previous Discussions on the Subject

So far there have two critics who have declared that the *IA* is anterior to the *TP*. They are T.G. Aravamuthan[1] and K.V. Zvelebil,[2] and the latter in particular has been influential. As far as I know, it was Aravamuthan who for the first time put forward this view. In his excellent article, he says, "If we study the bare texts of the treatises of Iṟaiyaṉār and Tol-Kāppiyar, ignoring all the commentaries, we find that Iṟaiyaṉār's special treatise on Love descends less into details and particulars than Tol-Kāppiyar's general treatise on "grammar" in the corresponding chapters and that it presents a more general view of the subject. This would be a remarkable circumstance if we postulated the anteriority of the special to the general treatise, *for it is very unlikely that a special treatise on a subject would give a more general treatment of the subject than an anterior work which goes fully into details*"[3] (italics mine).

Here I will provide a brief sketch of the *TP* and the *IA* for readers' convenience in following his points. The *Tol.*, in its present-day form, consists of three parts (*atikāram* < Skt. *adhikāra*).[4] Each part has nine chapters (*iyal*), and the

---

[1] T.G. Aravamuthan, "The Oldest Account of the Tamil Academies," *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, 1930, pp. 183-201 and pp. 289-317.

[2] K.V. Zvelebil, "The Earliest Account of the Tamil Academies," *Indo-Iranian Journal*, Vol. XV, 1973, pp. 109–135.

[3] Aravamuthan, *op. cit.*, p. 220.

[4] Nakkīrar refers to *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram* as *Tolkāppiyaṉār Poruṭpāl* (*IAC* 56). From this remark we may infer that the three parts were originally named *pāl* (part, section) instead of *atikāram*, a word derived from Skt.

whole has approximately 1600 stanzas[5] (the total number varying according to the commentators) of varying length (from 1 to the 59 lines of *TP* 144) divided into 27 chapters. The first part is called *Eḻuttatikāram*, "The Part on Letters," and deals with phonetics, phonology, graphemics, etc., comprising 466 stanzas of 980 lines in all.[6] The second part, *Collatikāram* ("The Part about Words"), is dedicated to etymology, morphology, semantics and syntax, with 456 stanzas in 1049 lines. The third part, *Poruḷatikāram* ("The Part Dealing with Subject Matter"), consists of the following nine chapters, comprising 654 stanzas of 1960 lines in all.

(1) *Akattiṇai-iyal*	"Chapter on love themes (in general)"	(58 stanzas in 157 lines)
(2) *Puṛattiṇai-iyal*	"Chapter on non-love (heroic, war) themes"	(30 stanzas in 228 lines)
(3) *Kaḷavu-iyal*	"Chapter on secret, or premarital, love"	(51 stanzas in 243 lines)
(4) *Kaṛpu-iyal*	"Chapter on post-marital love"	(53 stanzas in 268 lines)
(5) *Poruḷ-iyal*	"Chapter on supplementary aspects of love"	(52 stanzas in 143 lines)
(6) *Meyppāṭṭu-iyal*	"Chapter on the manifestation of moods"	(27 stanzas in 88 lines)
(7) *Uvamai-iyal*	"Chapter on simile"	(38 stanzas in 79 lines)
(8) *Ceyyuḷ-iyal*	"Chapter on composition"	(235 stanzas in 503 lines)
(9) *Marapu-iyal*	"Chapter on traditional usage [of words]"	(112 stanzas in 251 lines)

[The Nine Chapters of the *TP*]

Thus, the *Tol.* is, as is referred to by Aravamuthan, a general, detailed treatise on grammar. First, as a general treatise, it deals with all five branches of "grammar" (although the fivefold classification was established in the medieval period)— i.e. *eḻuttu* (sounds and letters), *col* (words), *poruḷ* (subject matter of poetry) in chapters 1–5 of the *TP*, *yāppu* (prosody) in chapter 8 of the *TP*, and *aṇi* (rhetoric) in chapters 6, 7 and 9 of the *TP*. Secondly, the detailed nature of the *Tol.* can be readily understood from its total number of stanzas and lines (about 1600 stanzas comprising 3990 lines).

The *IA*, on the other hand, is a small and specific treatise on love (*akam*) poetics. Its smallness or brevity is really striking, since the present text, without the commentary, comprises 60 stanzas of only 149 lines. This extreme brevity is quite noticeable when compared with the *TP*, which has several stanzas with more than 40 lines. Next, the treatise in its present-day form consists of two sections, *kaḷavu* "secret, premarital love" (stanzas 1–33) and *kaṛpu* "post-marital love" (stanzas 34–60). However, it should be noted that this division, which may have been made later, does not seem to represent the original scheme of the text, since it is actually composed of three parts: *kaḷavu* (1–33), *kaṛpu* (34–54), and the part devoted to the "constituents of poetry" which are common to *kaḷavu* and *kaṛpu* (55–60).[7] Therefore, the better and more plausible headings of

---

[5] The *Tol.* is actually composed in *nūṛpā* meter (< *nūl*, "yarn, cotton thread, string, systematic treatise, science" + *pā*, "verse, stanza"; see *DEDR* 3726 and 4065), each line of which consists of 4 *cīr* (metrical unit), and this *nūṛpā* is often called a *sūtra* or *cūttiram* (Tamilized form of *sūtra*), "rule" or "aphorism".

[6] The number of stanzas and lines is based on the editions with the commentary by Iḷampūraṇar.

[7] The 12 "constituents of poetry," which are termed *akappāṭṭu uṛuppu* by Nārkavirāca-nampi (author of the *Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam* of probably the 13th–14th centuries), are 1. *tiṇai*, 2. *kaikōḷ*, 3. *kūṛṛu*, 4. *kēṭpōr*,

each part would be *kaḷavu* (1–33), *kaṟpu* (34–55), and *oḷivu* or *potu* (56–60), as I have previously suggested,[8] and so the *IA* should be called a small but standard treatise on *akam* poetics, including the subject matter of love poems and, at the same time, the necessary treatment of poetics. In this connection, it is quite unsatisfactory that Aravamuthan and Zvelebil, having merely taken note of the headings of the present text, refer to it as if it deals only with the subject matter of premarital love (*kaḷavu*) and wedded love (*kaṟpu*).[9]

Let us now return to Aravamuthan's argument regarding the relative chronology of the *TP* and the *IA*. Apart from the passage cited above, he does not refer to it anywhere else in his lengthy paper. Judging from this passage, the only criterion for his chronology is that simple, brief, and specific treatises should historically become lengthy, detailed, and general treatises, and not vice versa. This criterion seems to be shared by a number of scholars, but it is quite often clearly untrue. The *Tol.*, a general treatise on grammar, is followed by specific treatises, such as the *Naṉṉūl* of the 13th century dealing with only *eḻuttu* and *col*, the *Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam* (a specific treatise on *akam* poetics of the 13th–14th centuries), the *Puṟapporuḷveṇpāmālai* (a specific work dealing exclusively with *puṟam* poetics of the 10th century [?]), the *Yāpparuṅkalam* (a specific work on *yāppu* of about the 11th century), and the *Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram* on *aṇi* of probably the 12th century. The *Naṉṉūl* and the *Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam* are more compact in respect of the number of stanzas and lines, and more lucid and refined than the relevant parts of the *Tol.*. Thus, we can say that Aravamuthan's argument does not have any strong basis. Contrary to Aravamuthan's opinion, I have the impression that lucidness and refinement in the description of topics and the orderly arrangement of topics are signs of the later date of a work. If so, the *TP* would be anterior to the *IA*, since the *TP* (especially chapters 1, 3, 4, and 5 dealing with *akam* poetics) is far from lucid if compared with the lucidness of the *IA*.

Let us take another argument, this time by K.V. Zvelebil, who also maintains the anteriority of the *IA* to the *TP*. Unlike Aravamuthan's argument based on the texts themselves, Zvelebil's analysis is based on the commentary on the *IA*. He says, "In more than one place, the commentary insists that the treatise is the first (that is, *historically* first, as well as first in merit) Tamil treatise on *poruḷ* or subject-matter (of love conduct and hence, of love-poetry)," and "The *date* of the composition of the treatise [...] is unfortunately fully uncertain. [...] Taking into account tradition again, we may probably consider the treatise to be indeed the "first" grammar on love-conduct and the conventions of erotic poetry, and in this sense, to have no "lineage". It would thus appear to be earlier than the third part of the *Tolkāppiyam*, the *Poruḷatikāram*, which contains

---

5. *iṭaṉ*, 6. *kālam*, 7. *payaṉ*, 8. *muṉṉam*, 9. *meyppāṭu*, 10. *eccam*, 11. *poruḷ vakai*, and 12. *tuṟai*; they are dealt with in *TP* 486-510 and nine of them (all except 8, 11, and 12) are in *IA* 56. Cf. T. Takahashi, *Tamil Love Poetry and Poetics*, E.J.Brill, Leiden/New York/Köln, 1995, pp. 22 ff.

8 Takahashi, *op. cit.*, p. 33, n. 42.

9 Cf. Aravamuthan, *op. cit.*, p. 200, n. 1, and Zvelebil, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

similar subject-matter."[10] What Zvelebil bases his analysis on is the term *mutaṉūl* (*mutal-nūl*) used in the commentary. *Mutal* means, according to the *Tamil Lexicon*, "beginning; first, as in rank, place, etc.; best, that which is superior; root; base, foot, bottom or lowest part of anything," and *nūl* is "systematic treatise," and so *mutal-nūl* could be translated as the "first treatise." However, this translation is incorrect if we take into account the context of the commentary.

The first stanza of the *IA* is immediately followed not by a comment on it, but by the "preface", as it is aptly called by T.G. Aravamuthan. The "preface" starts with the classification of prefaces into general and specific ones. The commentary says a general preface is divided into four parts and a specific one has eight parts: the eight parts are the author's name, lineage, boundary, book's title, prosody, content, audience, and purpose. Furthermore, each of the eight parts is explained one by one. The commentator elaborates: "The lineage (*vaḻi*) means that this work is in such and such a [scholastic] line. This [, however,] is not to be called a derivative treatise (*vaḻinūl*) because it is created by the Lord with the wisdom which removes karma, but is to be called an original treatise (*mutaṉūl*)."[11] Then, in connection with the seventh part, "audience", the commentator narrates the very famous "history of the three Caṅkams", the "history of the *IA*", "determining the commentary on the *IA*", "the transmission of the commentary", and so forth. And again he refers to three types of treatises, stating: "In discussing what constitutes a treatise, note that treatises are of three types: original (*mutaṉūl*), derivative (*vaḻinūl*), and offshoot (*cārpunūl*). [...] Of those, original treatises are those produced by one whose knowledge has no bound. [...] Next, a work that discourses in a vein similar to one of those, providing variations on an original author's views, is a derivative treatise. [...] And a new arrangement of ideas covered previously in specific ways in those two types of treatises, but with a particular benefit in mind, is an offshoot treatise"[12] (original terms in parentheses added). Judging from this context, *mutaṉūl* is the opposite of *vaḻinūl*, or a treatise derived from another, and should be translated as a treatise having no lineage or, at best, the first treatise in a lineage. Thus, an interpretation such as that of Zvelebil's, regarding it as a historically first treatise, is obviously far-fetched and incorrect.

Moreover, the commentary mentions that the *Tol.*, along with the *Akattiyam* and other works, was the *nūl*, the treatise or reference work for poets even in the middle Caṅkam, to say nothing of the last Caṅkam. It was, on the other hand, in the last Caṅkam that the *IA* was composed by Lord Śiva. Here again, the anteriority of the *TP* to the *IA* seems obvious. It is true that the commentary appears to suggest that there was no *Poruḷatikāram*, that is, that there existed only the *Tol.* without the third part, *Poruḷatikāram*, as follows:

---

[10] Zvelebil, *op. cit.*, p. 112 and p. 113, respectively.

[11] *Kaḷaviyal eṉṟa Iṟaiyaṉār Akapporuḷ*, Kaḻakam, Madras, 1976, p. 3.

[12] David Buck & K. Paramasivam, *The Study of Stolen Love: A Translation of Kaḷaviyal eṉṟa Iṟaiyaṉār Akapporuḷ with Commentary by Nakkīraṉār*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia, 1997, p. 12.

"In those days famine visited the Pāṇṭiyaṉ land for twelve years, and as hunger grew the king summoned all his court scholars. "Come," he said, "My country is suffering horribly, and I can no longer support you: go wherever you can find a place. When this land becomes a real country again, think of me and return." Thus they left the king, and twelve years passed with no reckoning of the time. But in time the rains fell, and the land prospered: the king sent men in all directions saying, "As this land has now become a real country once again, bring back all those people well versed in literature." So they found and brought back all the scholars in the *fields of letters* (*eḻuttu-atikāram*), *words* (*col-atikāram*), and *structures* (*yāppu-atikāram*); but they had to report, "Nowhere could we find a scholar in the *field of meaning* (*poruḷ-atikāram*)." The king was stricken, and he worried. "*What is the point in researching into letters, words, and structures, if not for the field of meaning? Without the field of meaning, gaining the other fields is no gain at all!*" he exclaimed, and gave himself to meditation upon the fire-colored God at the Madurai temple."[13] (italics and original terms in parentheses added)

However, the context indicates that there had existed grammars, including *Poruḷatikāram*, and those who were well-versed in *Poruḷatikāram* before the famine, i.e. during the period of all three Caṅkams, otherwise grammatical works would have been meaningless, as is mentioned by the king: "What is the point in researching into letters, words, and structures, if not for the field of meaning? Without the field of meaning, gaining the other fields is no gain at all!" Thus, from this passage, we may safely conclude that the *Tol.* in the middle and last Caṅkams contained the *Poruḷatikāram*.

The overall context of the commentary on the *IA* demonstrates the anteriority of the *Tol.* (including *Poruḷatikāram*!) to the *IA* and also shows that the connotation of the word *mutaṉūl* is a treatise with no lineage. Nevertheless, some adhere to the supposition that the *IA* is anterior to the *TP*. The reason seems to me to be the same preoccupation as Aravamuthan has: simple, brief treatises should come first, followed by lengthy, detailed ones, and not vice versa.

3. Terminology of Love Poetics Used in the *TP* and the *IA*

As seen in the previous section, arguments regarding the relative chronology of the *TP* and the *IA* by T.G. Aravamuthan and K.V. Zvelebil are far from convincing. What, then, affords a clue to resolving the issue? Excluding the second chapter dealing with *puṟam* poetics, all eight chapters of the *TP* are more or less connected with *akam* poetics; in particular, chapters 1, 3, 4, and 5 deal exclusively with the subject matter of *akam* poetics. The *IA* is also a treatise about *akam* poetics, and so by scrutinizing both texts we should be able to come up with a relative chronology for them.

Many specific expressions are used to denote love events/phases/situations in the *TP*, the *IA*, and "colophons" (*tuṟai*s) attached to *akam* poems, and some of these expressions later became fixed in usage and became technical terms of *akam* poetics. I have gleaned around 250 such

---

[13] Translated by David Buck & K. Paramasivam, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.

expressions from the colophons of *akam* anthologies such as the *Kuṟ.*, the *Naṟ.*, the *Ak.*, and the *Aiṅ.* These expressions/terms may be categorized into five groups.

1. Terms found only in colophons, but neither in the *TP* nor in the *IA*;

   e.g. *iyaṟpalittal, iyaṟpaṭamoḷital, maṉai maruṭci, paruvam kaṇṭu aḷital/āṟṟāmai, vaṉpuṟai etiraḷital, viṉai muṟṟutal.*

2. Terms found in colophons, the *TP*, and the *IA*;

   e.g. *alar, allakkuṟi (-paṭutal), aṟattoṭu niṟṟal, ciṟaippuṟam, irantu kuṟaiyuṟutal (iṟantu piṉṉiṟṟal* in colophons), *iravukkuṟi.*

3. Terms found in colophons and the *TP*, but not in the *IA*;

   e.g. *ampal, celavu-aḷuṅkal, ceṟippu, iṭaiccuram, kaḻaṟutal, maṭal ēṟutal, tūtu, uṭaṉpōkku, varaivu maruttal, veṟi (veṟiyāṭṭu).*

4. Terms found in colophons and the *IA*, but not in the *TP*;

   cēṭpaṭuttal (cēṭpaṭai), kāmam mikka kaḻipaṭar kiḷavi, oruvaḻit taṉattal, paṭṭa piṉṟai varaiyāmai.

5. A love event referred to in colophons, the *TP*, and the *IA*, but with different expressions being used;

   āṟu pārttuṟṟa accak kiḷavi, iyaṟkaippuṇarcci, iṭantalaippaṭal (iṭantalaippāṭu), notumalar varaivu.

It goes without saying that terms of the first two categories do not contribute to resolving the point at issue. As for the third category, it is natural that some terms occur only in the *TP* but not in the *IA*, since, as seen in "The Nine Chapters of the *TP*" listed earlier, the parts of the *TP* relevant to the subject matter of love (i.e. chapters 1, 3, 4, and 5) comprise 811 lines, while the *IA* consists of 149 lines. With regard to the fourth category, on the other hand, is quite peculiar for the same reason if a term appears only in the *IA*. Therefore, I will examine terms belonging to the fourth and fifth categories.[14]

Category 4: Terms found in colophons and the *IA*, but not in the *TP*

cēṭpaṭuttal: Its traditional meaning is "to put off a lover by telling him of the insurmountable difficulties in the way of his clandestine meetings and urging him to expedite the marriage" (*TL*),[15] and this is also technically known as *cēṭpaṭai*. It occurs in *IA* 12:2 (*ciṟaiyuṟak kiḷantu* **cēṭpaṭa** *niṟuttalum*, "saying the heroine is shut up, [her friend] sends [him] away") and *IA* 52:3 in its literal meaning. We also have occurrences in *Naṟ*. 45t, 75t, 80t, 185t(2), 301t, 377t, and *Ak*. 58t, and in later works such as *Tirukkōvaiyār* 98, *AV* 143, and 144. *TP* 112:7–9 could be pertinent to this theme, but the expression is entirely different: *kuṟaiyuṟaṟku etiriya kiḷavaṉai maṟaiyuṟap/ perumaiyiṉ peyarppiṉum ulaku uraittu oḷippiṉum/ arumaiyiṉ akaṟciyum*, "the maid tries to

---

[14] For details of terms in the first three categories, see Takahashi, *op. cit.*

[15] The entry in the *TL* is *cēṭpaṭuttu-tal*, but, judging from all instances, it must be *cēṭpaṭuttal*. Its literal meaning is "to put [somebody/something] off" (<*cēṇ* "distance" [cf. *DEDR* 2807]+*paṭu* "to put").

turn the man back on the pretext of his honor, the customs of the world, the difficulty of getting the heroine."[16]

kāmam mikka kaḻipaṭar kiḷavi: This means "the words [of the heroine] suffering from excessive love-passion." *IA* 30 enumerates six sub-themes of the main theme, "the heroine's friend urging the hero to marry the heroine" (*varaital vēṭkai*),[17] and this is one of them along with *āṟu pārtturṟa accak kiḷavi* below. This phrase occurs verbatim in eight colophons[18] and in later works such as *Tirukkōvaiyār* 174, *AV* 164, and 168.

oruvaḻit taṇattal: This traditionally means "the lover's temporary absence from the place of his lady-love to avoid all tittle-tattle about him" (*TL*). We can find occurrences of it in *IA* 25:3 and in 16 colophons,[19] and also in later works such as *Tirukkōvaiyār* 181, *AV* 39, 40, 49, 167, and 168.

paṭṭa piṉṟai varaiyāmai: *IA* 25 comprising four lines starts with this phrase; *IA* 25:1–2 reads ***paṭṭa piṉṟai varaiyāk** kiḻavaṉ/ neṭṭiṭai kiḻantu poruḷvayiṉ piriyum* ("the hero who does not marry after [something] happened, leaving for wealth for a long interval"). But its literal meaning is "not marrying after [something] happened," and so its meaning is obviously unclear by itself. However, the previous stanza of the *IA* (i.e. *IA* 24) mentions that there are two types of marriage, which are "marriage before the secret love is revealed" (*kaḷavu veḷippaṭā muṉṉura varaital*) and "marriage after the secret love is revealed" (*kaḷavu veḷi**paṭṭa piṉṟai** varaital*). Therefore, it is clear that *paṭṭa piṉṟai* in *IA* 25 is an abridged expression for *kaḷavu veḷippaṭṭa piṉṟai* in *IA* 24. There are occurrences in colophons (*Kuṟ.* 233t, *Naṟ.* 7t, 277t, 358t(1), and 369t), and they all start with this phrase (*paṭṭa piṉṟai varaiyātu*, "without marrying after [the secret love is] revealed"). This obviously signifies that the expression was fixed in the colophons. Although a parallel idea to *IA* 24 is found in *TP* 138,[20] the expression *paṭṭa piṉṟai varaiyāmai* never occurs in the *TP*.

Category 5: A love event referred to in colophons, the *TP*, and the *IA*, but with different expressions being used

āṟu pārtturṟa accak kiḷavi: As was mentioned above, this along with *kāmam mikka kaḻipaṭar kiḷavi* is enumerated as one of six sub-themes of the theme *varaital vēṭkai* in *IA* 30, and means "the speech [of the heroine/her friend] out of fear, having seen the [dangerous] path [through which the hero comes]." This expression is repeated verbatim in later grammars (*Tirukkōvaiyār* 176, and *AV* 164 and 166). In the colophons of *Naṟ.* 104, 114, and 158 the theme

---

[16] For a detailed analysis of this theme, see Takahashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 102–3.

[17] This theme is usually known as *varaivu kaṭātal* in later works, while early grammars refer to it as *varaital vēṭkai* (*TP* 112, 207 and *IA* 30). On this, see Takahashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 137, 145.

[18] *Kuṟ.* 92t, 107t, *Naṟ.* 54t, 70t, 102t, 335t, *Ak.* 170t, and 398t.

[19] *Naṟ.* 338t, 378t(2), 382t, and *Aiṅ.* 161t–3t, 119t, 214t, 221t, 225t, 227t, 231t-3t, 285t, 297t. Cf. Takahashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 154–6.

[20] *veḷippaṭa varaital paṭāmai varaital eṉṟu/ āy-iraṇṭu eṉpa varaital-āṟē.*

occurs as "what the heroine (or her friend) spoke **owing to fear of the path** (*āṟu pārttu uṟṟa accattāl*)," and in the colophons of *Naṟ.* 255, 336, and 383 it occurs as *āṟu pārttu uṟutal*. The colophon of *Naṟ.* 255 in particular simply reads *āṟu pārttu uṟṟatu*, which obviously shows that *āṟu pārttu uṟutal* was a fixed term. In the *TP*, on the other hand, this motif is referred to as *āṟṟatu tīmai* ("badness of the path") in *TP* 112:29, *āṟṟiṉatu arumai* ("difficulty of the path") in *TP* 134:1, and simply *āṟu* in *TP* 207:1. Among these three instances, only *āṟṟiṉatu arumai* of *TP* 134:1 has a parallel in the colophon of *Naṟ.* 353, which runs *tōḻi **āṟṟatu arumai añci**, tāṉ āṟṟāḷāyc colliyatu* ("what the heroine's friend said, unable to endure it, after fearing difficulty of the path [through which the hero comes]").

iyaṟkaippuṇarcci: This is one of the most famous terms of *akam* poetics and is generally known as "the first meeting of lovers," although its literal meaning is "natural union." The theme of "the first meeting of lovers" is variously called *kāmakkūṭṭam* ("union of love"; *TP* 89:1 and 117:1), *kāmappuṇarcci* ("union of love"; *TP* 487, *IA* 2), *iyaṟkaippuṇarcci* (*IAC* 2, *Tirukkōvaiyār* 1, *AV* 27, 33–7, 123, 125, and 12 colophons[21]), *teyvappuṇarcci* ("divine union"; *IAC* 2, *Tirukkōvaiyār* 7, *AV* 125), and *muṉṉuṟupuṇarcci* (*IAC* 2).[22] According to the commentary to *IA* 2, although critics of various schools referred to this theme by different terms such as *iyaṟkaippuṇarcci*, *teyvappuṇarcci*, and *muṉṉuṟupuṇarcci*, the author of the *IA* called it *kāmappuṇarcci* because all these three occur through love.[23] There might be, as is mentioned in the commentary on the *IA*, several schools of grammar, but one may notice here a vital difference in the terminology adopted by various works: the earlier grammars such as the *TP* and the *IA* adopt the term *kāmappuṇarcci* (or *kāmakkūṭṭam*), while later works such as the *IAC*, the *Tirukkōvaiyār*, and the *AV* use the term *iyaṟkaippuṇarcci*. Moreover, we can find a difference in terminology in the earlier works. The *TP* consists of several layers, as is pointed out in my book, and chapters 1, 3, 4, and 5 belong to an older layer while chapter 8 belongs to a more recent layer.[24] Taking this into account, we can find an interesting coincidence in the usage of terms: the *IA* uses the same term as is used in the more recent part of the *TP*, since the term *kāmakkūṭṭam* occurs in *TP* 89 and 117, that is, in the third chapter of the *TP* (*Kaḷaviyal*), while *kāmappuṇarcci* occurs in *TP* 487, i.e. the 178th stanza of the eighth chapter of the *TP* (*Ceyyuḷiyal*), and *IA* 2.

iṭantalaippaṭal (iṭantalaippāṭu): The *TL*, citing the commentary to *TPP* 498 (i.e. *TP* 487),[25] defines *iṭantalaippāṭu* as "the union of lovers a second time at the same place where they first met each other," which is obviously the same

---

[21] *Kuṟ.* 2t, 40t, 116t, 119t, 120t(2), 137t, 142t(1), 300t, *Naṟ.* 8t, *Ak.* 140t, *Aiṅ.* 170t, and 299t.

[22] Its meaning remains unclear. According to Buck & Paramasivam, it is "the union of meeting" (*op. cit.*, p. 37).

[23] *IA*, Kaḷakam, p. 37.

[24] See Takahashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 16–24.

[25] As far as the numbering of the stanzas in the *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram* is concerned, the *TL* follows that given in the editions of Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar and Pērāciriyar.

theme as *iraṇṭām kūṭṭam* ("the second union") occurring in the colophons of *Naṟ.* 39 and 155. *TP* 487 and *IA* 3 refer to the theme as *iṭantalaippaṭal*, while later works (*IAC* 3,[26] *AV* 27, 123, 134–5) and the colophons of *Kuṟ.* 62 and *Aiṅ.* 197 refer to it as *iṭantalaippāṭu*. It should be noted here again that the term *iṭantalaippaṭal* in *IA* 3, as was the case with *kāmappuṇarcci*, is only found in the more recent layer of the *TP* (eighth chapter, *Ceyyuḷiyal*).

notumalar varaivu: Its traditional meaning is "a man other than the hero coming to the heroine's relatives to propose marriage to her" (< literally, "stranger's marriage"). This phrase occurs in *IA* 29:2 and in 13 colophons,[27] while in the *TP* this famous theme is referred to as *vēṟṟu varaivu* (literally "another marriage") in *TP* 109:15 and as *piṟaṉ varaivu* (lit. "stranger's marriage") in *TP* 112:40.

4. Interpretation of the Differences in Terminology

How should we interpret such differences in terminology as seen above? The highly refined, conventionalized nature of classical literature implies that there had been a considerable lapse of time (at least two or three centuries) before it reached this stage of development. During the time it took for it to develop and even after the classical or so-called Caṅkam period, erudite scholiasts may have tried to describe and codify the literary traditions and conventions, which is suggested by the tradition that there were 12 disciples of Akattiyaṉ. Eventually, as is mentioned in the commentary on the *IA*, several schools maintaining their own traditions may have been established. It seems that their poetic traditions formed the literary milieu of the classical and post-classical period and were shared among the cultured élite (*cāṉṟōr*), such as court poets, scholiasts, kings and chieftains. Many of the poetic situations and themes may have become increasingly conventionalized and begun being referred to by specific terms.

Terms of the second category (terms which occur in the *TP*, the *IA*, and colophons) appear to suggest that they were derived from the same source or that they followed the same tradition. It is the same with the terms of category 3 (terms found in the *TP* and colophons, but not in the *IA*), since, as was mentioned before, it is natural that there should be terms which occur only in such a voluminous and detailed treatise as the *TP* but not in a very compact treatise like the *IA*. However, this suggestion could be easily rejected in light of the terms in category 4 or 5. If it was appropriate, then why was the term *oruvaḻit taṇattal* of category 4 not mentioned in the *TP* while being mentioned in the *IA*, and why was the theme *iyaṟkaippuṇarcci* of category 5 variously referred to in different texts? The terms of category 4 or 5 indicate either the existence of different lineages, or differences in the dates of the texts, or both. Terms of category 1 along with the term *iyaṟkaippuṇarcci* of category 5, for example, may point to their later date since they are found only in later works, such as Nakkīrar's commentary on the *IA*, the *Tirukkōvaiyār*, the *AV*, and the commentaries on the *TP*.

---

[26] *IA*, Kaḷakam, p. 58.

[27] *Kuṟ.* 31t, 321t, 379t, *Naṟ.* 165t(1), 207t, 300t(2), *Aiṅ.* 110t, 168t, 201t, 205t, 220t, 266t, and 367t.

As for the expressions of category 4, they are not found in the *TP*, but are found in the *IA*, colophons, and later works such as the *IAC*, the *Tirukkōvaiyār*, and the *AV*. If it is maintained that the *TP* belongs to a lineage different from the other works, this is certainly wrong, because there are many terms shared by all the works including the *TP*, that is, the terms of category 2. If we consider the *IA* to be anterior to the *TP*, the author(s) of the *TP* may have missed referring to those terms mentioned in a very compact treatise (i.e. the *IA*) or may have failed to do so for some reason. But this would seem improbable since, if the themes designated in the *IA* were really in existence at the time of the *TP*, it would have referred to them by different ways of expression, as seen in the case of *notumalar varaivu* of category 5. If, on the other hand, we consider the matter the other way round, that is, if we regard the *TP* as being anterior to the *IA*, then all issues concerning terminology resolve themselves.

This supposition may be confirmed by the case of the theme *āṟu pārttuṟṟa accak kiḷavi* of category 5. Which is more primitive or premature, or which is more refined or sophisticated, among the expressions *āṟṟatu tīmai* and *āṟṟiṉatu arumai* used in the *TP* and *āṟu pārttuṟṟa accak kiḷavi* adopted by the *IA* and later works? The former is obviously more primitive and less sophisticated than the latter. The fact that the *TP* refers to the theme in several ways itself indicates that there was no fixed expression to denote it at the time of the *TP*. The same is true in the case of the theme *notumalar varaivu*, because the *TP* refers to the theme as *piṟaṉ varaivu* and *vēṟṟu varaivu*.

Thus, analyses concerning the terminology adopted by the *TP* and *IA* point to the anteriority of the *TP* to the *IA*. This then leads to another conclusion which it is no mere coincidence, namely, that two terms used in the *IA*, i.e. *kāmappuṇarcci* (see *iyaṟkaippuṇarcci* of category 5) and *iṭantalaippaṭal* of category 5, are found only in the more recent layer of the *TP*.

5. Concluding

As seen in the above, many terms are shared by the *TP* and the *IA*, while some are not and some others are newly adopted by the *IA*. Nevertheless, the commentator insists that the *IA* is *mutaṉūl*, "a treatise having no linage." Why did he insist on this? It should be noted here that if the *IA* was indeed the *historically first* and eventually the *original* treatise, as is maintained by K.V. Zvelebil, it would have been unnecessary for the commentator to insist on it.

The *IA* introduced a new device, that is, the arranging of love themes in a narrative sequence like a love drama, as is seen in the *kōvai* literature of later times. This type of arrangement was certainly new when compared with the speaker-based analysis of themes made in the *TP* and other grammars, in which several love themes are assigned to a speaker (*kūṟṟu*, a dramatis persona in love poetry).[28] Although, unlike a consensus among modern scholars, this type of

---

[28] For speaker-based analyses in the *TP* and another treatise of the same type (*Kūṟṟiyal*), see Takahashi, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

arrangement is partially seen also in the *TP*,[29] its arrangement is still fragmentary and primitive, while the arrangement in the *IA* is highly refined.[30] This must have been regarded by the commentator as new, but he would have had another and more important intention. The *TP* was obviously a well-known treatise when the commentary was composed, since it often cites the *TP*. It is also clear that there existed critics of other schools, because the commentary often refers to them. There may have been some who criticized the *IA* as a work imitative of the *TP* or derivative from it. Thus, the commentator would have insisted on the *IA*'s originality in order to counter these critics, introducing a number of anecdotes. Furthermore, as I have suggested previously,[31] the *TP* was regarded as a great theoretical work, but it may have been neither practical, nor accessible to most poets, because of its voluminous, detailed, and highly technical nature. If the *IA* was composed as a more practical, easily accessible, and handy manual for composing love poems, it must have been indeed the historically first treatise of this kind.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Aiṅ.	*Aiṅkuṟunūṟu*
Ak.	*Akanāṉūṟu*
AV	*Akapporuḷ Viḷakkam* (a.k.a. *Nampiyakapporuḷ*)
DEDR	*Dravidian Etymological Dictionary* (Second Edition)
IA	*Iṟaiyaṉār Akapporuḷ* (a.k.a. *Kaḷaviyal*)
IAC	Nakkīrar's commentary on *Iṟaiyaṉār Akapporuḷ*
Kuṟ.	*Kuṟuntokai*
Naṟ.	*Naṟṟiṇai*
Skt.	Sanskrit
t	*tuṟai*
TL	*Tamil Lexicon*
Tol.	*Tolkāppiyam*
TP	*Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram*, with commentary by Iḷampūraṇar
TPP	*Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram*, with commentary by Pērāciriyar

(N.B.)

TP 112	112th stanza of *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram*, with commentary by Iḷampūraṇar
TPP 313	313th stanza of *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram*, with commentary by Pērāciriyar
IAC 23	Nakkīrar's commentary on *IA* 23
Kuṟ. 25t	*tuṟai* attached to *Kuṟ.* 25
Kuṟ. 25t(1)/(2)	1st/2nd *tuṟai* attached to *Kuṟ.* 25

---

[29] On this, see Takahashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 220–221.

[30] This highly refined nature of the *IA* is also seen when it deals with separation. It neatly mentions six kinds of separation in *IA* 36 ff., while the *TP* refers to only four kinds of separation in various places. Cf. Takahashi, *op. cit.*, pp. 205–6.

[31] Takahashi, *op. cit.*, p. 33.