

Draft. Not to be cited. Comments welcome.

E. Annamalai, University of Chicago

Class Notes. Winter 2018

(தொல்காப்பியம்: பொருளதிகாரம்: அகத்திணையியல்:  
இளம்பூரணர் உரை)

### **Literary Theory of அகம் genre of poetry -2**

People as கருப்பொருள்

The list of கருப்பொருள் in Sutra 20 does not include humans (மக்கள்), which is done in Sutras 22-24. Though the commentators bring in humans under கருப்பொருள் from the open ended wording (அவ்வகை பிறவும்) in Sutra 21, there is a valid reason for not including humans in that Sutra. Moreover, 'others' (பிற) in that Sutra is meant to bring in things that are subsumed under superordinate category names listed in that Sutra and humans are not subordinate to any of them. The reason for the separate mention of humans is the fact that they don't have species like animals do and are a unitary biological category. There are other reasons for placing humans apart from other கருப்பொருள். Humans are the only கருப்பொருள் capable of rational action of their own and so could not be surrogates of dramatis personae of a poem. (It is debatable if தெய்வம், another கருப்பொருள், has this capability, but it is not a surrogate and is exempted from being a vehicle in உள்ளுறை உவமம் for comparison). People in the poems have names iconic to the land they belong to (as இளம்பூரணர் explains the choice of the word பெயர் in Sutra 21 rather than the generic மக்கள்). The names, however, are not personal names, but categorical names true to the land they live

in. This is in consonance with the axiom of the theory of அகம் poems that they are not about real persons. Sutras 22-24 populate the lands with people along with other natural and cultural objects listed in Sutra 20.

This is evidenced by the generic names with which humans are referred to in the poems; they come from objects (e.g. வெற்பன்) as well as from actions (e.g. வேட்டுவன்) specific to lands. Both names relate to நிலம், a முதல் பொருள், which is equated with திணை. Sutra 22 specifies that the names come from பெயர் or வினை (commentators call them பெயர்ப்பெயர் and வினைப்பெயர் or தொழிற்பெயர் respectively). (The root of பெயர் is பெய் 'place on, shower on, endow' and the derived noun பெயர் means 'name given to an object') The name refers to both the sign and the object it names, i.e. the signified. Hence பெயர்ப்பெயர் 'named by object' is the name given to an object, and it is a noun. வினை is tied to the land (நிலம் பற்றி); வினைப்பெயர் 'names by work' is the name given to an occupation, and it is a noun. So the names of people differ from land to land by activity in the same way as the objects change from land to land. And the names given to people after either one of these two (object, activity) differ; this helps identification of the land of the person with a name.

திணைநிலைப்பெயர்: Generic name of people

இளம்பூரணர் makes some specific observations on the names of people, which are not warranted by the Sutra. Probably, he perceives the theory of அகம் poetry from the world view of his times. While he points out that the humans are not divided into species biologically but are divided geographically with different names, he also divides humans sociologically in his commentary. Further, he restricts the பெயர்ப்பெயர் to குலப்பெயர் 'clan name' (so does நச்சினார்க்கினியர்) and the வினைப்பெயர் to the work tied to the land, not just in the sense of land-specific work but also in the sense of low work, which includes grazing, hunting, ploughing, fishing and such. He calls these

workers கீழ் மக்கள் and the population of each land is of these people. On the other hand, the people who do other works different from these are மேன்மக்கள் (A commentator mentioned without name by சோமசுந்தர பாரதியார் specifies them as priests, merchants and warriors, who constitute the upper three *varnas*; this commentator could be நச்சினார்க்கினியர், who brings in *varnas* in later Sutras). The rationale for மேன்மக்கள் not having land-specific names is that they are not associated with any one land and so their names are not derived from the land; they wander from land to land. (This, in principle, should include the mendicants of Buddhism and Jainism also). Therefore, the people not referred to by land-specific names are not the கருப்பொருள் of any திணை. இளம்பூரணர், however, mentions, in another context (Sutra 12) which is not about the protagonists of அகம் poems but about the inhabitants of a land, that the people of the cultivated land மருதம் are மேன்மக்கள் in the sense of people with moral values (which includes looking down on men who betray their wives for பரத்தை).

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் raises a question about the derivation of names of people in பாலைத் திணை because this திணை has no land of its own to derive the names from. He answers his question saying that the people of பாலை get their names from the பொழுது of பாலைத் திணை. Probably he means பெரும்பொழுது. But is hard to find in the Sangam corpus a திணைநிலைப் பெயர் derived from பொழுது. A more straightforward answer would be, as he answers a similar question about the கருப்பொருள் of பாலை, that it is the same as the கருப்பொருள் of குறிஞ்சி and முல்லை, which turn into பாலை. But empirically பாலை has separate திணைநிலைப் பெயர் derived from activity (for example, எயினர்), which நச்சினார்க்கினியர் recognizes. The activity is probably an adapted one to the changed landscape, for example, from வேட்டுவர் 'hunter of fauna in the hilly land' to எயினர் 'hunters of the passerby in the arid land'.

எயினன், it should be noted, is never a தலைவன்; the தலைவன் we find in பாலை is from another land, most commonly from the குறிஞ்சி land.

தொல்காப்பியம் does not give the names of people for all lands other than முல்லை, which is also not stated in the Sutra (23) but they can be inferred from the list order of உரி elsewhere. (நச்சினார்க்கினியர் adds குறிஞ்சி to the partial list from the name வேட்டுவர் 'hunter' mentioned in the Sutra along with ஆயர் 'cowherd'). The readers are left to identify the names in the poems by applying their mind (எண்ணுங்காலை). இளம்பூரணர் points out that while the names are a poetic-grammatical requirement (இலக்கண நெறி) as generic names, they are also in the parlance of the ordinary language (வழக்கு நெறி). That is, the names do not have the status being the vehicles of symbolic meaning (உள்ளுறை), as any கருப்பொருள் would be and are treated just as ordinary language words. In other words, the generic names of people in அகம் poems are not part of the vocabulary of the symbolic language of these poems. This is another reason for placing மக்கள் separately from other கருப்பொருள்.

The readers are left to know for themselves the feminine names of the people in all lands including முல்லை, for which only the masculine names are given (Sutra 23). Commentators bring the feminine names under the commentarial technique (உத்தி) of getting the unsaid from the said (வந்தது கொண்டு வராதது முடித்தல்). But the female names would be covered by the superordinate term மக்கள், as all listed கருப்பொருள் do. The females of animals are obtained in this way (e.g. பிடி, மந்தி). However, it must be pointed out that, as the heroes are referred to by திணை நிலைப்பெயர், heroines are not, in the poems. Any name of heroine based on திணை is as the daughter of the male of the திணை. It is, for example ஆயர் மகள்

(கலித்தொகை: முல்லைக்கலி 4 cited by இளம்பூரணர் in his commentary of Sutra 24), not ஆய்ச்சி corresponding with ஆயன்.

தலைவன் and தலைவி are not perceived in அகம் poetry as different kinds of characters (as, for example, characters in different short stories). They are perceived as sites to hold various emotional states in love. It will be futile for anyone to attempt to classify the types of characters of தலைவன் and தலைவி in அகம் poetry after a purported character study of them (for example, a study of heroines of பரணர், as one could do a study of heroines of புதுமைப்பித்தன்). They are not only nameless; they are faceless too. The theoretical principle that the people (கருப்பொருள்), who are the only actors in the poem and are the subject of உரி, are not named in the five திணைs of அகம் is significant.

மக்கள் (தலைவன் and தலைவி as well as others) in அகம் poems do not have, just like other கருப்பொருள் (probably with the exception of தெய்வம்), personal names which have unique referents in the world (சுட்டி ஒருவர்ப் பெயர்). It is possible to take பெயர் in the Sutra to mean not only the name but also the fame, a short hand for social standing, wealth and power. அகம் poems are not about a fame to praise or to promote nor about famed people. அகம் poems are not about fame to praise or to promote nor about the famed people. They are about human beings generically or in abstraction.

Placing S.57 towards the end of அகத்திணை and before the start of புறத்திணை இயல் suggests that the namelessness of the people in அகம் poetry is a crucial feature that differentiates it from புறம் poetry. The protagonists of அகம் poems are not historical people.

The abstracted person represents a land by the name திணைநிலைப் பெயர். The social divisions of people the medieval commenters talk about may

be true of the real society, but in the poems they are undifferentiated sociologically. From this point of view, ஏனார் in Sutra 24 may be interpreted, as Balasundaram does, as the people in a land who are not tied to the land in their activity (வினை) such as preceptors, merchants and warriors but live in the land, will also so be known by a திணைநிலைப் பெயர். It may not be interpreted as commentators do that this Sutra extends திணைநிலைப் பெயர் to other lands beyond முல்லை. These people, whose activity is not specific to a land, may be found in all lands in real life, but in a poem they are all referred to by the name of the land they live in. The people of the poems -their கருப்பொருள்- are referred to by geographically differentiated, but sociologically neutral, terms. Just like other கருப்பொருள் such as animals, which are geographically divided, but not sociologically.

திணைநிலைப்பெயர், which is unique to a திணை like other கருப்பொருள், to refer to தலைவன், may participate in திணை மயக்கம், though it is rare. This would mean that மக்கள் may participate in திணை மயக்கம் rarely. Of all கருப்பொருள், participation in திணை மயக்கம் of the natural things மா, மரம், புள் is common; the cultural things உணர், பறை, பண், செய்தி (செயல்) is rare or nil; the supernatural thing தெய்வம் is nil. The last one is sanctioned in the theory (S 50 உள்ளுறை தெய்வம் ஒழிந்ததை நிலமெனக் கொள்ளும்; நிலம் here is the ground in comparison). As a matter of fact, தெய்வம் is not found as a கருப்பொருள் in any poem, though it is used to identify four lands (S 5) of the five. The cultural things are not in திணை மயக்கம் empirically.

திணைநிலைப்பெயர் மயக்கம், if and when it occurs, is a poetic technique for an implicit or suggestive meaning (குறிப்புப் பொருள்) as for the திணை மயக்கம் of other கருப்பொருள். The last poem (it is anonymous as to its author and source), which இளம்பூரணர் cites for மருதத் திணை in S 24 is an example of it. This poem, which is by

உரிப்பொருள் is புணர்தல், mentions (contrastingly) ஊரன், which is a திணைநிலைப்பெயர் of மருதத் திணை. This mention makes இளம்பூரணர் index it as a மருதம் poem, as it is his stand to underplay உரி in திணை classification of poems. This is not a ஊடல் poem by any stretch, unless the meaning of ஊடல் is drastically altered from sulking about post-marital infidelity of தலைவன் to pre-marital concern about the possibility of dishonoring commitment by him. If உரிப்பொருள் is the defining feature of திணை as in the classical theory, the cited poem is a குறிஞ்சி poem and the poet brings in ஊரன் to refer to the தலைவன் to imply that he is a credible person as persons of மருதத் திணை are. (இளம்பூரணர் calls them in another context as மேன்மக்கள், (S 12)). தலைவி in this poem is concerned about the blemish on the reputation of her family of social standing at the possibility of தலைவன் going back on his commitment to marry her, which was expressed through his offer of a flower bunch in the presence of her playmates, who are all the witness. But she is not hopeless when she thinks of his credibility. ஊரன், a திணைநிலைப்பெயர், is used by the poet to suggest, symbolically, the positive character of the person of மருதத் திணை, and not to mention the land he is coming from.

இளம்பூரணர் seems to move in Sutra 24 in the direction of treating மக்கள் to be a fourth constituent of a poem away from treating them as a special kind of கருப்பொருள் (நடுவணைந்திணை நிலத்தானும் காலத்தானும் கருப்பொருளானும் உரிப்பொருளானும் நிலமக்களானும் தலைமக்களானும் வரும்). This is a significant departure from the theory of a three partite constitution of a poem envisaged in தொல்காப்பியம். It is not warranted.

Sutra 23 adds another kind of people to those described by an object or activity of the lands. They are கிழவர், whom இளம்பூரணர் interprets as referring to the heads (of the clan) or rulers (of the land). These names relate to ஆட்சி, he says. (ஆட்சி பற்றி is contrasted with நிலம் பற்றி). He may not include

கிழவர், who are leaders tied to the land with மேன்மக்கள், who do not have a natural connection with the land.

However, another interpretation of கிழவர் is possible. This word also means 'one who belongs to', as in the name of a Sangam poet, கோவூர் கிழார் 'one who belongs to the village கோவூர்' and in the names of the days of the week (ஞாயிற்றுக் கிழமை 'the day that belongs to the Sun'). It is possible with this sense to interpret கிழவர் as referring to the protagonist of the poem, who is mentioned by the திணைநிலைப் பெயர் of the நிலம் he belongs to and the name is iconic to it. This interpretation has two merits. It allows us to understand that மக்கள் includes people of the land (கருப்பொருள்), one of whom is the தலைவன் of the poem. The protagonist is one of the dramatis personae of the poem; others are mentioned in later Sutras. It is to be noted that in the Sangam poems தலைவன் is mentioned by திணைநிலைப் பெயர் (நாடன், துறைவன், ஊரன் etc.) but not தலைவி. Hence கிழவர் is listed along with the masculine names (Sutra 23). That the protagonist is from மக்கள் is significant because no other கருப்பொருள் (for example, a bird which is one of the dramatis personae in the later messenger poems) is a protagonist in Sangam poems.

The second merit is that this interpretation obviates the route taken by commentators that the protagonists of the poems are rulers (may be, chieftains) by bringing in the idea of ஆட்சி paralleling the protagonists of புறம் poems. They introduce among கருப்பொருள் தலைமக்கள் in addition to நிலமக்கள். But அகம் protagonists are nameless and powerless; they are representations of the generic man. மலை நாடன் is a person of (not a ruler of) the hilly country (A modern example for this sense of land-derived names is நாஞ்சில் நாடன், pen name of a Tamil writer). Even the long poems such as முல்லைப்பாட்டு, which are said to have a king addressed to (பாட்டுடைத் தலைவன்), do not have a player in the poem (கிளவித் தலைவன்) mentioned by an individual name or status.



When there is a mention in a அகம் poem of a ruler or leader, it is not in reference to தலைவன்; it is mentioned to locate தலைவி in a political geography. The line களிறுகெழு தானைக் கழல்தொடி மலையன் in an anonymous குறிஞ்சி poem cited by இளம்பூரணர் (S 24) refers to one with a band of warriors in a place called முள்ளூர் in order to place the flower that the poet used to describe the fragrance of தலைவி. He is referred to by a திணை-based generic name மலையன், but he is not the தலைவன் of the poem. தலைவி of the same poem is the daughter of the head of the village, who lives in the prominent house (தலை மனை) of the village or the community with guards at the door, but she is simply the girl of the land in the poem. தலைவி in a பாலை poem (அகநானூறு 53 cited by இளம்பூரணர் (S 24)) expresses her grievance that தலைவன் has greater love for wealth than for her and has gone away to get it in order to give to இல்லோர். This தலைவன் is not a ruler committed to கொடை –rulers go on raid or war to get wealth and they do not go far to earn it- but he is a man of the திணை, who gives to others, who would include விருந்து.

There are poems (for example, some illustrative poems cited by இளம்பூரணர் (the first one for குறிஞ்சித் திணை, the last one for மருதத் திணை, which are not included in அகம் anthologies) give indications that தலைவி comes from a family of wealth and social standing. Even these poems, however, are to be understood this way: the poem is about the a woman being in love, who happens to belong to a high placed family, and not about a woman who belongs to a high placed family, who happens to be in love.

### Categorization of திணை in Practice

It is axiomatic that poetic grammars are written to explain the poetry already in existence, just as linguistic grammars are written to explain the language in existence. Grammars, as theories, describe the general principles of a genre such as அகப்பாட்டு. The match between the grammar and the poems is not

isomorphic. Individual poems vary within the boundaries of the general principles to exhibit the creative talent of the poets. It is the job of the reader, interpreter and commentator of the poems to explain the differences between theory and practice in such a way that the integrity of the theory and creativity of the poems are maintained. இளம்பூரணர் (and other commentators) cite poems from the Sangam corpus and other works to illustrate the theoretical principles. Some of the illustrative poems are without a source (i.e. not found in the anthologies and other canons that have been transmitted over generations). They may have been in existence at the time of இளம்பூரணர், but not canonized by the compilers of anthologies, or they were composed by இளம்பூரணர் himself for illustration, which seems unlikely. If the former is the case, it means that the poems that resemble the ones in the Sangam corpus continued to be transmitted among the scholarly even after canonizing the Sangam poems into anthologies, which kept some poems out of the canon.

Canonizing the Sangam poems involves not only collecting and writing them down but also categorizing them. An important categorization is the identification of the திணை of each poem, which is to be done with the help of the theory. Poems by their very creative nature are a challenge for any neat categorization. The anthologists have made one kind of categorization and made it a canon, which has gained universal acceptance and replication. Nevertheless, there might be poems problematic to categorize. The problems do not just relate to திணை மயக்கம், a theoretical problem at a different level, which blurs முதற்பொருள் and கருப்பொருள் of one திணை with those of another; commentators take the position that உரிப்பொருள் also blurs this way.

The ideal situation for theory and practice is when a poem has all three constituents (முதல், கரு, உரி) in it. There will be then no ambivalence in its categorization. Such poems, however, must be in the minority. The three constituents may be present in descending order in a poem having just two of them or just one of them. முதல் and கரு may or may not have explicit presence. But when உரி is not present explicitly, there must be a clue in the

poem to infer it. முதல் and கரு, if present, may be that clue for inferring உரி that is implicit. That is, உரி must be present in a poem inferentially when it is not present explicitly. When தொல்காப்பியம் and its commentators say பொருள் they mean உரிப்பொருள். பொருள் in உள்ளுறுத்து..... பொருள் முடிக in S 51 and its commentaries refers to உரிப்பொருள். அகப்பொருள் means உரிப்பொருள் of அகம்.

When the word for a particular உரி (புணர்தல், இருத்தல் etc.) is not present explicitly in a poem, it may be inferred from other words in the poem. This is like interpreting the meaning of a poem. This inference is not an unrestrained exercise but is governed by some parameters. Though இருத்தல் of தலைவி, for example, is the proto-typical உரி to identify a poem as one of முல்லைத் திணை, it may not be indicated by a word meaning இரு 'wait' anywhere in the poem but it may be indicated by words indicating தலைவி's physical manifestation (e.g. அழு) or mental make up (e.g. கற்பு). Or, it can be just her thought that the job on which he left her is over suggesting that her இருத்தல் is going to be over (See இளம்பூரணர்'s anonymous citation poem ending with வினை முடித்தனர் நம் காதலோரே in the last line). The parameters of inference, thus, are her physical or mental state mentioned or hinted in the poem.

The inference may be circumscribed. In the above citation poem, the hero is described as wearing a flower ring mixed with கரந்தை flowers, which are the flowers worn by the warriors of cattle raid in the literary theory of புறம். The cattle are associated with the முல்லை land in அகம் theory. From கரந்தை to முல்லை is inference, which is reinforced by the heroine's thought of the end of the job that took the hero away.

Another way of inference is through உரி நிமித்தம் 'allied behavior of உரி'. Each உரிப்பொருள் has more than one நிமித்தம், as permitted in the

theory and its number is open for the poets to innovate. The உரி of a poem may be obtained from the நிமித்தம் it describes.

Like உரியின் நிமித்தம், another indicator of திணை is உரியின் பகுதி (இளம்பூரணர் in Sutra 24; it is actually உரியின் மறுபகுதி), which may be called 'the mirroring behavior of உரி'. An example of the mirroring behavior of இருத்தல் of தலைவி is when தலைவன் misses or remembers her, during his separation (பிரிவு). This by itself could categorize a poem as one of பாலைத் திணை, but any presence in the poem of முதல் or கரு of முல்லை would make it a poem of முல்லைத் திணை.

அகநானூறு 164 (cited in S 24) is about தலைவன், who is away in the battle front, sees the blooming of flowers after the rain, desires to consume the beauty of தலைவி and laments that the king has not ended the war even after capturing the fort of the enemy. This is called பாசறைப் புலம்பல் 'lament in the army camp', which is a நிமித்தம் of பாலை. But this நிமித்தம் becomes உரியின் பகுதி 'mirrored dimension' of முல்லை by the virtue of hero's longing being the counterpart of the heroine's waiting in anticipation. The presence of rain and blooming of flowers converts பாசறைப் புலம்பல் into a mirrored dimension of முல்லை. Thus a mirrored dimension used for திணை categorization is reciprocating the mental state or perspective between தலைவி and தலைவன் like a mirror image; in the present case, the mirror image is தலைவன்.

The above two illustrations show that a புறம் theme like பாசறைப் புலம்பல் is exploited by poets to reinforce an அகம் theme. The description of the beauty and pleasure of leading towns, which belong to புறம், as a comparison of the beauty and pleasure of the leading woman is well known.

From the above, it can be said that besides முதல், கரு and உரி, other elements that come into play in திணை categorization are உரியின்

நிமித்தம், which is an allied dimension of உரி and உரியின் பகுதி, which is a mirrored dimension of உரி.

The above deliberation of the theory would argue for the claim that திணைs may be interacting with one another in actual poems, but a poem in such a case is categorized as belonging to only one திணை based on certain criteria that may even go beyond முதல், கரு and உரி that are clearly marked for each திணை. It follows that the concept of திணைs in அகம் categories does not have opaque boundaries between them and this interacting nature of திணைs gives flexibility, and so creative opportunities, to poets.

The classical theory does not allow two உரிப்பொருள்s in the same poem either as fuzzing (உரி மயக்கம்) or as doubling (இரட்டை உரி). Nevertheless, poets seem to meld more than one உரி in a poem as a poetic technique. One such technique is to exploit temporality. The உரி of the present may relate to a உரி of the past in the mind of தலைவன் or தலைவி. The grammar (S 46 நிகழ்ந்தது நினைத்தற்கு ஏதுவும் ஆகும் ‘what happened may be the ground for thinking about it (in a poem)’) provides for such a temporal split, though the commentators understand this Sutra not as a statement about a poetic technique but about a behavior, generally in பாலைத் திணை.

ஐங்குறுநூறு 361 is a பாலை poem by the mood of separation (பிரிவு) that strikes the reader, though there is no description of பாலை land in the poem; இளம்பூரணர் (S 24), on the other hand, calls it a பாலை poem by the கருப்பொருள் described in the poem (though பாதிரி is not incontrovertibly a marker of arid land, but கான் ஆறு belongs to hilly land). This poem is classified as பாலை in the anthology. Nevertheless, the thought in the mind of தலைவன் தலைவன் is about புணர்தல், as இளம்பூரணர் himself identifies. The hero remembers the heroine making a

பாதிரி garland and his union with her saying that her breasts were more exciting (or firing) than her eyes and her broad shoulders were more exciting (firing) than her breasts; his separation from her exacerbates his memory. The unnamed old commentator of ஐங்குறுநூறு and others who follow him do not allow the temporal split and are forced to read this poem as one of elopement (உடன்போக்கு) and so it is about புணர்ச்சி in பாலை.

ஐங்குறுநூறு 361 also plays with the temporal split (like in a split screen), though there is no mistaking of its திணை as பாலை because of the description of this land by its கருப்பொருள். இளம்பூரணர் (in S 24 illustrating பாலைத் திணை) takes மக்கள் (எயினர் to be specific) to index this poem as a பாலை poem, even though its உரிப்பொருள் is புணர்தல் in உடன்போக்கு. So have done the old commentator and the anthologist. This poem is about the torment of the murderous hunters, a theme of பாலை, but the hero remembers the heroine in the past and finds her tormenting him in separation and in this, she is like a sister of the hunters.

Expediting marriage (வரைவு கடாவுதல்) is a நிமித்தம் of குறிஞ்சி. So is the scandal (அலர் தூற்றல்) in the village of தலைவி about her (never in the village of தலைவன் about him) about கூட்டம் going on without marriage. கலித்தொகை 104 (that begins with மலிதிரை யூர்ந்த) is a poem with these two நிமித்தம். It is also a poem about the kin selecting the man to marry the daughter of the family. The selection is of the winner of the sport of controlling the bull (ஏறு தழுவுதல்), which is a sport and custom of the முல்லை land. ஏறு தழுவுதல் is a கருப்பொருள் of முல்லை, when land specific sports are included under கருப்பொருள். This poem is categorized as a poem of முல்லைத் திணை, which seems to suggest that உரிப்பொருள் is down played in this திணை categorization. This is a significant deviation from the classical theory and needs an explanation.

கலித்தொகை poems are long and have the features of a play (நாடக வழக்கு Sutra 56) that is dialogic and eventful. Such poems with dramatic elements are categorized by the கருப்பொருள் of the land rather than by the உரி suggested by the நிமித்தம் (வரைவு in this poem) described in the poems. This categorization based on கருப்பொருள் is done with regard to this கலித்தொகை poem in spite of the fact that its உரி has a pre-marital theme while the உரி of முல்லைத் திணை must have a marital theme. It seems that the theory allows திணை categorization to be swayed by the overall ethos of the poem, which emanates in the cited poem from the description of the land though its sports (கருப்பொருள்), overriding the உரி specifics. This privileges நிலம் (a கரு) to index திணை obviating உரி (ஒழுக்கம்).

It may be noted here that as per the differing interpretation of S 19 discussed above, முதல் பொருள், viz., காலம் and நிலம், could be a நிமித்தம், though non-behavioral. If this interpretation is correct, then நிலம் could be a உரி and index திணை, as commentators prefer to treat categorization of திணை based on நிலம்.

#### Overriding vs. Blurring

Dissonance between உரி on one hand and முதல், கரு on the other in a poem is a feature of திணை மயக்கம் (blurring of திணை). Commentators take, as noted earlier, that the திணை of a poem may be indexed by நிலம் as it is by உரி. திணை signifies ஒழுக்கம் 'behavior' and நிலம் signifies a திணை. In such a theory, a poem may indicate two behaviors, one of the நிலம் by which the திணை is indexed and one by the உரிப்பொருள். This will be a case of உரி மயக்கம் in the sense that a poem's உரி is ambivalent. It must, however, be noted that in அகம் theory, there cannot be more than one உரிப் பொருள். (Long poems such as கலித்தொகை are exceptions, as இளம்பூரணர் notes (S 15); *kavyas* may be included in the exception). No

Sangam poem is indexed with a hyphenated name, for example, as குறிஞ்சி-முல்லை or குறிஞ்சியும் முல்லையும் (இரட்டை உரி); it is either குறிஞ்சி or முல்லை. One of the possible two உரி must be chosen to index an ambivalent poem. In one theory, which is advocated by the anthologists and commentators, the choice is made by the நிலம் described in the poem. This theory may be called for the sake of reference as the neo-classical theory.

In the other theory suggested above, which may be called the classical theory, the திணை of a poem is indexed by உரிப்பொருள் alone, in which case there will be no உரி மயக்கம். The dissonance in this theory is just a mix up of உரிப்பொருள் and முதல் பொருள் (நிலன்) through the கருப்பொருள் of the நிலன். This mix up may have an aesthetic function. This alone is திணை மயக்கம். In this neo-classical theory, the cited கலித்தொகை poem (முல்லைக்கலி 4), புணர்தல் (through its நிமித்தம் of marriage) blurs with the land of முல்லை in its கருப்பொருள். In the language of commentators, this would be an instance of குறிஞ்சியில் முல்லை.

Using உரி to index a திணை, as in the classical theory, would explain how மெய்ப்பாடு relates to அகம் poems. மெய்ப்பாடு is the physical expression of the emotions of behaviors (உரி). This is the *bhava* (மெய்ப்பாடு) of the *natya* (கூத்து). முதல் and கரு set the scene for this expression and so play a subordinate role.

But the commentators and the anthologists consider this poem to be an instance of land (முல்லை) blurred about behavior (குறிஞ்சி). This is considered to be an instance of முல்லையில் குறிஞ்சி and this poem is indexed as a முல்லை poem. This categorization foregrounds the land. Overriding உரிப்பொருள் in naming the திணை of a poem is a shift from the classical



theory. The two theories of திணை categorization may not necessarily be apart in chronology; they could be in existence as alternatives at the same period.

Nevertheless, the anthologists of Sangam poems and the commentators of these poems, who came after them and accepted as given the திணை categorization of the poems in the anthologies, seem to subscribe strongly to the neo-classical theory. The commentators, consequently, interpret the grammar, தொல்காப்பியம், in this theoretical framework. இளம்பூரணர் takes the words முறை சிறந்தனவே in Sutra 3 to mean that it states the preferential order of the three constituents of a poem, முதல், கரு, உரி. These three have the preference in the given order to index the திணை of a poem. If a poem has all three of these present, its திணை is designated by முதல் (i.e. நிலம்), if it has the last two, its designation is by கரு and if it has only the last one, the poem is one on உரி. முதல் excludes காலம் for this purpose. This would mean that a poem would be considered a குறிஞ்சி poem, for example, when the land described in it has elements (கரு) of குறிஞ்சி, but the behavior (உரி) described is இரங்கல். Theoretically then, ஐந்திணை of அகம் are preferentially indexed by five lands, not by five behaviors.

While the grammar does not permit double உரி in a poem (which will create ambiguity in indexing a poem), the Sangam corpus shows that a poem could become ambivalent about specifying its உரி when it does not have any description of முதல் பொருள் or கருப்பொருள். It is a poem only with உரிப்பொருள். The last poem anonymous of author and source, which இளம்பூரணர் gives (S 24) to illustrate மருதத் திணை poem could be an example of this. For இளம்பூரணர் the உரிப்பொருள் of this is புணர்தல் but it must be a மருதம் poem on the ground that the hero is referred to as ஊரன், a திணைநிலைப் பெயர் of மருதம். தலைவி expresses concern about the possibility of தலைவன் going back on his commitment to marrying her, which will sully the name of her family. The

உரிப்பொருள் of this poem may be நெய்தல், where தலைவி laments the uncertainty. A description of கருப்பொருள் identifying a land will force a decision and remove ambivalence. கருப்பொருள் of the marine landscape will help to decide in favor of நெய்தல். This shows that கருப்பொருள் has this function through the land it represents to index the திணை of a poem. It was argued above that ஊரன் is a poetic technique and an index of the riverine land. The choice in the திணை classification of this poem is between குறிஞ்சி and நெய்தல் and there is no கருப்பொருள் of either குறிஞ்சி or நெய்தல் to clinch the issue.

It is not certain that the anthologists assigned the திணை of the collected poems. While the available manuscripts have the திணை of the poems assigned in அகநானூறு, ஐங்குறுநூறு and கலித்தொகை (the last two have a different principle of organizing the poems to place contiguously all the poems of each திணை at one place), but not the manuscripts of குறுந்தொகை and நற்றிணை. சாமிநாதையர், who edited குறுந்தொகை for the print, points out in his introduction the difficulties in uniquely identifying the திணை of a poem. He altogether abandons the திணை and uses the கூற்று schema for classifying the poems. Other modern commentators who follow the திணை schema differ between themselves about the திணை to which a poem is assigned. (Sambasiva Sarma, Raja Siva (குறுந்தொகைச் சொற்பொழிவுகள் p. 11-12) cited in மனோன்மணி சண்முகதாஸ் p 132-3). திணை classification of அகம் poems is not made at one time in Tamil literary history nor has scholarly consensus. The reason for the lack of consensus is the choice of a different criterion from among முதல் பொருள், கருப்பொருள் and உரிப்பொருள் and the problem of the situation when these criteria are conflicted in a poem.

Interrelation of திணைs

The five core திணைs are distinctive from one another in all three constituents, though some overlap is allowed, as seen above. They, however, relate themselves in different ways at the conceptual level. முல்லை (இருத்தல்) is defined in relation to பாலை (பிரிதல்) and so is மருதம் (ஊடல்), where the separation is on account of பரத்தை (பரத்தையிற் பிரிவு). நெய்தல் (இரங்கல்) is defined in relation to குறிஞ்சி (புணர்தல்) as the anxiety about the hero staying with his commitment to her. முல்லை is the fruition of this commitment, which is the life of marriage, which is prone to separation of him on work or on his infidelity. மருதம் entails ஊடல் when the heroine finds fault with the unfaithfulness of the hero. Suspicion of non-return of the hero after புணர்தல் generates இரங்கல் and it aggravates the short separation (சிறு பிரிவு) in நெய்தல். Hero's indifference creates a response of hope or dejection. Feud over infidelity in மருதம் ends in reconciliation that culminates in புணர்தல், the pleasure of which is enhanced by the initial denial of it. Pain is a pervasive ingredient of love to sustain it. It is omnipresent in one shade or another in all திணைs: it is the scandal about the clandestine union in குறிஞ்சி, the anxiety about breaking the commitment in நெய்தல், the waiting out separation in முல்லை, the infidelity in மருதம் and the long and arduous loneliness in பாலை. This explains why the theory does not assign any particular land to பாலை, which epitomizes pain in love. Of the 1862 அகம் poems in the Sangam corpus (out of a total of 2381 poems (Manonmani Sanmugadas : குறுந்தொகை – ஒரு நுண்ணாய்வு), 531 are assigned to பாலைத் திணை, according to one count (திணை categorization however, is problematic, as shown above).

The interrelation of திணைs, though not detailed in the grammar, is seen abundantly in the poems. The poets knit the behaviors and emotions of love aesthetically in their poems to enrich the experience of love.

உரிப்பொருள் may or may not be explicitly mentioned in a poem. To index the திணை of a poem from what is in the poem, some interpretation of the poem may be necessary. The theme of the கலித்தொகை poem 104 (முல்லைக் கலி 4 cited by இளம்பூரணர் in Sutra 24 to illustrate முல்லைத் திணை) is her friend reassuring தலைவி about the return of தலைவன் as the rainy season has begun. The same theme is found in the அகநானூறு poem 53 (cited by இளம்பூரணர் in the same Sutra to illustrate indexing of பாலைத் திணை) but with a twist. தலைவி is not reassured by the words of her friend and counters her by stating that தலைவன் loves wealth more than her, for which he is away. The anticipation or hope for his return in இருத்தல் is negated in this poem and this foregrounds பிரிவு. Hence this poem is indexed as a பாலைத் திணை poem. To augment this mental state of பிரிவு, the hardship of the parched land தலைவன் passed through is described as the முதல் பொருள் of this poem. This poem is a பாலை poem not just because of its முதல் பொருள், but because of the twist is the mood of waiting, which nullifies any hope. It changes the mood to separation.

திணை categorization is not a mechanical exercise, as the knowledge transmission of the literary tradition, which the anthologists depended on, seems to have come to believe and downgrade the significance of உரிப்பொருள் and its interpretation in திணை categorization. To do it by the கருப்பொருள் with which the நிலம், a முதல் பொருள், is described in a poem makes திணை categorization apparently straightforward. The following is an example of this problem, which was commented on earlier also.

ஐங்குறுநூறு 361 is an illustrative poem chosen by இளம்பூரணர் for பாலைத் திணை. This is a poem about a தலைவன் who suffers separation, pines for his தலைவி and thinks of the புணர்ச்சி she had with her. இளம்பூரணர் claims that the உரிப்பொருள் of this poem is புணர்ச்சி, but it is categorized as a poem of பாலைத் திணை because the

கருப்பொருள் of பாலை mentioned in the description of the parched land. One could, however, interpret the thought of புணர்ச்சி as aggravating the suffering of separation and hence the உரிப்பொருள் is பிரிவு. The poem is indexed by the anthologist and the commentator for பாலைத் திணை by the description of the parched land, which is a setting to enhance the mood of separation. The உரிப்பொருள் of this poem then is not புணர்ச்சி, whose thought runs through the mind of தலைவன் in a flash back

It must be noted that there is no poem in the Sangam corpus that does not have a உரிப்பொருள், however it is identified. There is no poem, on the other hand, with முதல் பொருள் or கருப்பொருள் alone. (The possibility of such a poem was mentioned in the discussion of the multiple interpretations of S19 with reference to முதல் பொருள், though such a poem is not empirically found, but the முதல் பொருள் in such a poem would be a நிமித்தம் of a உரி). The inevitable presence of one உரிப்பொருள் in every poem strongly suggests that it is essential to identify and categorize the திணை of a poem.

திணை categorization of கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை

கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை are distortions (விகாரம்) of the ideal love and thus are related to the core திணைs subversively. These two aspects of அகம் are not marked for any of the three constituents of அகம் poetry in the theory. Commentators take this non-specification to mean that the three constituents (முதல், கரு, உரி) of all five core திணைs would be eligible to be the constituents of these two. This way of understanding கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை helps not to divorce them from the five. The commentators give the supporting argument that the five behaviors can also happen in any land (in the real world). This idea of grounding the திணைs to the real world happening leads the commentators to use the land for திணை categorization of a poem and necessitates them to have double identification of a poem with labels such as பாலையில் குறிஞ்சி, one by the land and another by the

behavior. They, nevertheless, assign one earmarked (சிறப்பு) behavior for each திணை.

This has a theoretical consequence with regard to திணை மயக்கம். திணை மயக்கம் in the classical theory, where திணை categorization is உரி based, is the overlap between the கருப்பொருள் of different lands. In the land based திணை categorization, it is an overlap between முதல் பொருள் (நிலம்) and உரிப்பொருள்.

The omnibus assignment of முதல், கரு, உரி of all திணைs to கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை is problematic from a theoretical point of view, since each திணை of அகம் has to have at least a உரி special to it. So some commentators are forced to assign புணர்தல் to them as their உரி, though this behavior is distorted (விகாரம்) of the ideal one. According to this analysis, குறிஞ்சித் திணை will have, as its உரி, புணர்தல் as well as புணர்தல் விகாரம். Since no திணை has more than one உரி, விகாரம் must be taken to be the third component of உரி along with the other two, viz. நிமித்தம் and மறு பகுதி. This is supported by the fact that no poem's திணை is indexed as கைக்கிளை or பெருந்திணை in the Sangam anthologies, but these two behaviors are accommodated in a core திணை, குறிஞ்சி, for the purpose of திணை categorization. The same problems one has in identifying the திணை of a poem with regard to the five core behaviors will show up with regard to the two behaviors of விகாரம்.

கைக்கிளை is absence of love, mostly in the woman and பெருந்திணை is presence of excessive love, mostly in the man, which he exhibits publicly (மடலேறுதல்). Excessive love (காமக் கழி), which commentators gloss as lust in its medieval meaning, may be attributed to the woman in a poem, but it not exhibited publicly; it is shared with or noticed by her friend (தோழி). The

theory allows these two within ஐந்திணை. The extremes of these two are placed outside (புறத்து S 25) ஐந்திணை, which alone qualifies to be அகம். The later grammars of அகம் (வீரசோழியம்) call them அகப்புறம். நம்பி அகப்பொருள் calls the former (excessive love of idealized protagonists) also பெருந்திணை but terminologically differentiates it from the latter (excessive love of marginalized protagonists) calling them அகப்பொருள் பெருந்திணை and அகப்புறப் பெருந்திணை respectively. This distinction could be made equally for கைக்கிளை (unresponsive love of idealized and marginalized protagonists) as well. The latter of the two are outer அகம் not only because of their திணை விகாரம் thematically but also because they are not constituted structurally by முதல் பொருள் and கருப்பொருள்.

### Organizing Principles of அகத்திணையியல்

An organizing principle or logic of அகம் grammar in தொல்காப்பியம் is to describe the larger categories or concepts (superordinate nodes) first and then to describe the smaller categories or concepts (subordinate nodes) that constitute the former. Describing (S 1) firstly திணை and later (S 3) முதல், கரு, உரி is an example. Another principle is to describe the related things of the smaller category or concept (subordinate node) at length and then go back to the larger category (superordinate node) above it. After describing (S 4-12) the details of முதல் பொருள், the possibility of the problem of lack of perfect match between நிலம், a முதல் பொருள், and உரி in a poem takes the grammar tangentially to the description (S 14) of the concept திணை மயக்கம். This in turn takes the grammar to the necessary descriptions (S 16) of உரிப்பொருள், which is the pivot in identifying the திணை of a poem and is challenged by திணை மயக்கம். The natural order would be to go from முதல் பொருள் to கருப்பொருள். This detour necessitates the description (S 17-19) of the dimensions of each உரிப்பொருள் before the description of the details

கருப்பொருள். The grammar returns afterwards to the description (S 20) of கருப்பொருள்.

The description of the constituency of கருப்பொருள் extends to include மக்கள் (S 22-27). This takes the grammar to describe the role of மக்கள் in a poem, first as கருப்பொருள் and then (S 27-48) as dramatis personae other than தலைவன் and தலைவி. This triggers the description next of their specific roles (what they do) in specific திணைs and what their கிளவி or கூற்று (what they say, to whom and when). After this long intervention, the grammar returns to the higher node கருப்பொருள் for the purpose of describing (S 49-51) the literary technique of உள்ளுறை, as it uses only கருப்பொருள் as the ground or vehicle for suggested meanings.

உள்ளுறை refers to the meaning that resides in கருப்பொருள், which needs to be expressed implicitly by தலைவன் and தலைவி as well as other characters such as தோழி in their கிளவி.

Love poems outside அகம்

Sutras 25 and 26 describe the people who are protagonists whose love life poems describe, but these poems are outside (புறத்து) the theoretically (and ideally) conceived அகம். These protagonists are specifiable individuals (whether their name is mentioned or not) and are socially definable. They are identified socially by the social division of labor, unlike the geographic identification of the protagonists of the ideal or stylized அகம் poems. The social division is between those who command (ஏவல்) work and those who are commanded to work; the latter category is further divided into those who perform low level service to others (அடியோர் who perform குற்றேவல், which does not require a special skill) and those who perform specialized services (வினைவலர் = வினை வல்லவர் '(skilled) performers of specialized work for others') such as ஓதல் 'transmitting knowledge', தூது 'messengering for the powerful' and



பகை 'fighting wars'. These protagonists are different from the protagonists of the theorized அகம்; they could belong even to the theorized புறம். Their poems could, for example, be poems of the love of a king or a warrior.

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் (S 25) specifically includes (அடியோர் எனவே இருபால் தலைமக்களும் அடங்கிற்று) both தலைவன் and தலைவி among அடியோர்.

The commentators, however, draw the distinction between the two social categories of people on the basis of the nature of morality rather than the nature of work. Their life is not led according to the principles (laid out in the books) of அறம், பொருள், இன்பம். இளம்பூரணர் identifies these alternate protagonists as people of low social status (இழிந்தோர் is the word used by நச்சினார்க்கினியர்; guided by his morality code he includes பரத்தை in this category of people) and their love behavior is despicable, as it crosses the decency bar of love making (பெருந்திணை: excessive (expression of) love; பெரும் 'excessive', திணை here stands for குறிஞ்சி, as argued above) or forcing one's love on the unwilling (கைக்கிளை; கை 'bitter, i.e. unsweet (relation)'). For him, the two sutras (25 and 26) mention the தலைவன் and தலைவி of பெருந்திணை and கைக்கிளை, which are outside அகம் proper (but not in புறம் proper either).

Commentators have difficulty with வினைவலர். இளம்பூரணர் leaves the term undefined and its referent unidentified. He leaves it to the reader to find an illustrative poem whose hero is a வினைவலர். நச்சினார்க்கினியர் takes the term to mean தலைவன் and தலைவி when they are assigned a work of the real world kind by another. வினைவலர் for him, like அடியோர், includes both genders, but unlike them, not morally degraded. He cites the poem கலித்தொகை 108 (முல்லைக்கலி 8) to illustrate his understanding of this term. In this poem, தலைவி commands her heart that has taken residence in தலைவன் to attend to her work in the millet field which was assigned to her

by her people but now is left unattended. She is called வினைவலர் பாங்கினள் by நச்சினார்க்கினியர். This is a stretch. But he himself says in his commentary of the same Sutra that both அடியோர் and வினைவலர் do not have agency (for doing the work of their choice) (தமக்கு உரியர் அன்மை). He probably suggests that தலைவன் and தலைவி could also be portrayed as acting without agency. This is contrary to the அகம் grammar where they do have agency; it does not include, for example, புணர்ச்சி with தலைவி by abduction, as in one of the kinds of marriage described in later literature.

Those who command others (ஏவல் மரபின் ஏனோர்) (S 26) are taken by இளம்பூரணர் to indicate an exception and to say the protagonists of பெருந்திணை and கைக்கிளை could be உயர்ந்தோர், whose life, however, is deviant from the higher principles of அறம், பொருள், இன்பம். This would dilute his stand of separating the protagonists of these two love behaviors (கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை) from the protagonists of ஐந்திணை. நச்சினார்க்கினியர், on the other hand, takes this Sutra to include among protagonists others, who are not tied to a land and are not referred to by their திணைநிலைப் பெயர். They are the people of upper (twice-born) three *varnas*, who by their profession and status have the commanding rights over others (அந்தணர், அரசர், வாணிகர்) and the people of the fourth *varna*, வேளாளர், by the virtue of their inclusion in the four way division, though they do not have a commanding status. He interprets the sutra this way by taking மரபு to be the Vedic tradition and by accommodating வேளாளர் through the word ஏனோர் in the sutra. He takes the purpose of this sutra is to extend the திணைநிலைப் பெயர் from five to six. His illustrative poem for Brahmin protagonists is குறுந்தொகை 167, which is poem of the nurse mother reporting to the mother on the girl, after seeing the girl in her new house with her husband, where she is making a dish

with curds. நச்சினார்க்கினியர், through a stretch of his imagination, identifies making curds with the cuisine of Brahmins. This extension of protagonists to specific social groups violates the principle of the classical grammar of அகம் poems to keep their protagonists to be generic.

Absence and Excessive presence of love

The place of பெருந்திணை and கைக்கிளை in திணை is problematic conceptually, as pointed out earlier. The commentators vacillate in identifying a poem either as பெருந்திணை or கைக்கிளை. இளம்பூரணர் identifies (S 25) his citation poem கலித்தொகை 62 (குறிஞ்சிக்கலி 26) as பெருந்திணை on the ground that it is about excessive love on the part of தலைவன், who is a dwarf, but says that it could be identified as கைக்கிளை also on the ground that it is about the rejection of love on the part of தலைவி, who is a hunchback. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் (S 26) gives the same poem as a citation for Sutra 26 and identifies it as கைக்கிளை. He identifies the same poem as பெருந்திணை in his commentary of கலித்தொகை as well as in his commentary on S 52. (as pointed out by M. Arunachalam in his variorum edition of the commentaries of அகத்திணையியல்). பெருந்திணை and கைக்கிளை are often mutually related in the poems. பெருந்திணை includes forced love Lack of response from தலைவி leads தலைவன் to excessive expression of his love for her. (Many forms of marriage, according to இளம்பூரணர் (S 1), come under பெருந்திணை under his glossing of பெரும் as 'common, prevalent', reflecting probably his times. His interpretation of பெருந்திணை and கைக்கிளை in S 25 as love making by inferior people is contradictory to this).

According to the grammar of அகம், as pointed out above, both பெருந்திணை and கைக்கிளை do not belong to the core திணைs; they are placed in the grammar at both ends of core திணைs (S 1). They are not உரிப்பொருள் like the ஐந்திணை. They could be உரிப்பொருள்

விகாரம் and specifically of புணர்தல். This will make their திணை to be குறிஞ்சி. As they are not the உரிப்பொருள் per se, a poem to have both (and categorized as both) should not be a problem (as இளம்பூரணர் thinks of கலித்தொகை 62 (குறிஞ்சிக்கலி 26) as a குறிஞ்சி poem and as a poem of பெருந்திணை).

The two illustrative கலித்தொகை poems cited by இளம்பூரணர் could be looked at as poems on love that is not அகம், as theoretically conceived. This does not mean that they must necessarily be either பெருந்திணை or கைக்கிளை. The idealized and theorized அகம் poems are a sub-set of love poems in the classical period. கலித்தொகை poems differ from the poems of other anthologies in many respects. Many of them are longer and are dialogues; தலைவன் and தலைவி directly address each other in them and are explicit about their intentions. This is contrary to the suggestive conveyance of meaning, which is the hallmark of earlier anthologies. A consequence of it is that உள்ளுறை competes with சிலேடை, which becomes a means of expressing double meaning. சிலேடை is rare, if present at all, in the earlier anthologies. கலித்தொகை poems have the *rasa* (மெய்ப்பாடு) of sardonic humor (எள்ளல்); they exhibit sarcasm as well. These factors would additionally imply that கலித்தொகை anthology contains poems that are different from the idealized அகம் poems.

மருதக்கலி 29 may be read as a parody of an அகம் poem. Its protagonists are a hunchback and a dwarf; they are deviant from the natural or normal. Their contrast with அகம் protagonists is hinted beyond their physical deformity. They do not feel that they are not part of the society: they withdraw from the society (their work place, the palace) and go to the outskirts (the grove); she is differentiated from the family women. The poem progresses towards புணர்ச்சி, which takes place at noon in a town in contrast to the முதல் (யாமம்) and கரு (வரை) of குறிஞ்சி. The earlier part of the poem is a

rejection of புணர்ச்சி, which, however, cannot be called ஊடல் in its ordinary conceptualization in the theory of அகம் and used to call the poem a மருதம் poem, particularly since the poem is identified as a கைக்கிளை poem. There is சிலேடை in the poem to suggest the turning point in the progression. Line 30 கூனி குழையும் குழைவு காண் is said by the dwarf. Suggestively, by குழை he means that she is flexible physically (i.e. her gait is wobbly) and mentally (i.e. her heart is softened). Line 33 எம் வீழும் காமர் நடக்கும் நடை காண் is said by the hunchback. She means by காமர் 'one who (the hunchback) love', where எம் modifies காமர், and the subject யாம் is unmentioned: எம் (யாம்) வீழும் காமர் காண். She also means that 'one (the dwarf) who has fallen in love with her, where the post-position மீது is understood: எம் (மீது) வீழும் காமர்.

குறிஞ்சிக்கலி 26 is built around ambiguity in love, where the woman does not want புணர்ச்சி and the man persuades her out of her reluctance. This is a poem of *raakkata* (forced) marriage, for இளம்பூரணர். The poet uses சிலேடை to bring out the ambiguity in the mind of தலைவி. Line 13-15: நைவாராமையின் ..... கௌவிக் கொளலும் அறன் எனக் கண்டன்று 'Since softening of mind (நைப்பு) does not happen .... seizing her is not ethical (அறன்), (says the book)'. In her reading, இன் is the causal suffix; கண்டன்று is the neuter singular finite verb (of the understood Subject 'book'), where அன் is negative. In his reading, நைவாராமையினும் .....

கௌவிக் கொளலும் அறன் எனக் கண்டன்று 'Even if softening of mind does not happen... seizing her is ethical (say the book), where வாராமையினும் மதியம் becomes வாராமையின்ம் மதியம் which becomes வாராமையின் மதியம்; where அன் in கண்டன்று is சாரியை with no meaning. This is a morphological சிலேடை. Line 15-16 is said by the hunchback: Her double meaning: திறனின்றிக் கூறும் சொல் கேளான் 'he does not listen to the words (I) say with no expertise (திறன்) (in

the book)'; 'he does not listen, not (using) the skill (திறன்) (to understand) my words'. This is lexical and syntactic சிலேடை. Line 17: One meaning she conveys is conditional: பண்டு நாம் வேறல்ல என்பது ஒன்று உண்டால் அவனொடு மாறு உண்டோ 'If there is some truth in saying that we did not differ from each other in the previous birth, then there cannot be a difference with him (now)' where உண்டால் is உண்டு 'finite verb' + ஆல் = ஏல், meaning 'if true'. Another meaning she conveys is causal: 'Because there may be some truth in saying that we did not differ from each other in the previous birth, there cannot be a difference with him (now)', where உண்டு is a verbal noun to which ஆல் (cf. நன்றால் = நன்றாகையால்) is added. This is a morphological சிலேடை that captures her oscillation.

Meaning by suggestion: உள்ளுறை

Poems are means of meaning creation and they employ specialized verbal tools to mean more by saying less. They create meanings that are implicit that are beyond the lexicographical meanings of the words in the poems. The categorization of things into explicit and implicit goes beyond literary of meaning. Tamil grammarians differentiate the inflected verb forms into explicit (தெரிநிலை) and implicit (குறிப்பு) as regards tense, i.e. sense of time. This is extended to the referential meaning in ordinary language (denotation and connotation) to convey தெரிநிலைப் பொருள் and குறிப்புப் பொருள் (சொல்லதிகாரம் S 152: தெரிபுவேறு நிலையலும் குறிப்பிற்றோன்றலும் இரு பாற்றென்ப பொருண்மைநிலையே) as well as to the words in the literary language. This distinction is applicable to உவமை as a meaning making device, which is divided into குறிப்பு (உள்ளுறை) உவமை ஏனை (தெரிநிலை) உவமை, as described below.

குறிப்புப் பொருள் 'implicit meaning' is important in poetry to make meaning as well as to create beauty (அணி). Tamil literary theory talks about many verbal

ways of grounding the implicit meaning, i.e. the meaning that is not articulated, but is suggested, and so in implicit. One of the ways is உள்ளுறை ‘residing inside (a word, a sentence or a whole poem); உள் ‘inside’, உறை ‘reside’ (In the ordinary language, this would be called உட்பொருள்). Five ways are identified (பொருளியல் S 46) to express implicit meaning and to get it; one of them is உவமம் ‘connection (of explicit forms to implicit meanings)’. The connection is made through comparison by similarity. Finding a shared feature to connect the unconnected is creativity and so உவமம் has a prime of place in poetry. This way of suggesting implicit meaning (குறிப்புப் பொருள்) through similarity is உள்ளுறை உவமம். உள்ளுறை, a generic term for implicit meaning but a sub-type of குறிப்பு), is used as a shorthand for உள்ளுறை உவமம் by commentators, though it is a specific way of expressing implicit meaning. This shorthand of உள்ளுறை to refer உவமம் is justified because the latter is the supreme way of making implicit meaning among all உள்ளுறைs in அகம் poetry. This homonymy, however, creates ambiguity.

This implicit meaning, which according to the interpretation of நச்சினார்க்கினியர் (S 51, his 49), is placed in the poem by the poets, who imagine the similarity in their mind (உள்ளுறுத்து ... ஒத்து) and make the listeners (கேட்டோர் (he does not use கற்றோர்), which suggests oral delivery of poems in a teaching context, rather than oral transmission across generations) see the similarity in their mind (உள்ளுறுத்து உரைப்பது). In the repeated phrase in the Sutra, உள் is ‘mind’ and உறு is ‘experience’, but they refer differently to the poet and the listener in the two occurrences.

A whole poem could be உள்ளுறை உவமம். That is, the poem has only the vehicle of comparison and not the target of implicit comparison.

இளம்பூரணர் gives an anonymous poem to illustrate this under the above Sutra. The poem is about a bee that leaves a lush lotus flower which has dignity and has plenty of honey and goes after a water lily, which has been visited by

swarms of infatuated bees and has very little honey. (Equivalents of this poem were in circulation in the sub-continent; one version can be found in Shakuntalam of Kalidasa taken from a Prakrit source. Sangam poems of அகம் are never descriptions of a scene of nature for its own sake; the poet does not imagine the poem as such a one, nor the listener understands it as such a one. The implicit meaning is infidelity suggested by comparing implicitly the bee to தலைவன், the lotus to தலைவி and the water lily is பரத்தை. The implicit meaning is the உரிப்பொருள் of மருதம். It is possible to read this poem as describing the character of men in general (and not of a கிளவித் தலைவன்), in which case the poem will not be considered an அகம் poem, but will be considered a புறம் poem. The implicit meaning of bees as men will not be an instance of உள்ளுறை உவமம் but of ஒட்டணி. The same poem is cited in the commentary of தண்டியலங்காரம் (S 52) to illustrate ஒட்டணி (சிவலிங்கனார்: தொல்காப்பியர் கூறும் உள்ளுறையும் இறைச்சியும், ப. 14).

உள்ளுறை உவமம் vs. ஏனை உவமம்

உள்ளுறை உவமம் is then a kind of உவமம் 'simile' as well, but the similarity (or comparison) is of a scene, and not of any specific shared feature that can be compared; the four features identified for comparison in the grammar (உவமையியல் S 272) are action (வினை), function (பயன்), shape (மெய்) and color (உரு). உவமம் is a comparison of one object at a time (and one or more features of it) whereas உள்ளுறை உவமம் is the comparison of a physical scene with many objects from nature with the love behavior of humans; it is comparing a natural landscape with the mental landscape of a character. The simile proper, on the other hand, is a comparison using one of the many comparative forms such as -இன், அன்ன, போல etc. (உவமையியல் S 282). This is an open ended list, many of them derived from a verb and it offers a choice of a comparative form to match with the nature of



comparison. ஏனை உவமம் is, thus, not only makes the comparison transparent but also gives a cue to the feature that figures in the comparison. The comparison therefore is explicit and transparent in it unlike the implicit comparison in உள்ளுறை உவமம்.

Though the comparison in உள்ளுறை உவமம் is of a scene, the features of the scene that are compared may be one of the same four as in ஏனை உவமம் (உவமயியல் S 25/ 296 of பொருளதிகாரம் of இளம்பூரணர், which பேராசிரியர் (his 300) interprets as giving the properties of comparison in உள்ளுறை உவமம்). But உள்ளுறை உவமம் has one more property of comparison that ஏனை உவமம் does not have and it is பிறப்பு 'origin, source' (உவமயியல் S 23 / பொருளதிகாரம் S 298 of பேராசிரியர் (he calls the chapter உவமயியல்)). This is to give the differentiating fact about உள்ளுறை உவமம் that what is compared and is compared to come from the same source (பேராசிரியர் uses the word சாதி), which is கருப்பொருள் i.e. மக்கள் and other கருப்பொருள். To create this suggested meaning though this special comparison and the reader to get it, they must be experienced with the முன்னம், an organ (உறுப்பு) of poetry, which is the conventionalized schema of inference of அகம் poetry. That is, such persons well-grounded in the schema will be able to authentically create and discern the உள்ளுறை உவமம் (துணிவொடு வருஉம் துணிவினோர் கொளினே, உவமயியல் S 23 / பொருளதிகாரம் S 294/ 298 ).

Even when there is no comparative form, the objects of comparison could be next to each other making a compound; this proximity makes it clear that both are compared (e.g. பவள வாய் 'red lips' is an example given by நச்சினார்க்கினியர் (in Sutra 52, his 49), which is related to பவளம் போன்ற வாய் 'lips like coral (in color)'; he considers the first one as an example of உள்ளுறை உவமம் and the second one as ஏனை உவமம்).

The comparison in simile is not to suggest a second meaning but to explicate the meaning of an object with the meaning of another object through their similarity and to add beauty from the pointing of similarity (இளம்பூரணர் (உவமையியல் 1): புலன் அல்லாதன புலனாதலும், அலங்காரமாகிக் கேட் டார்க்கு இன்பம் பயத்தலும்).

உள்ளுறை உவமம் is different from this other உவமம் (ஏனை உவமம், s 49; this is named வெளிப்படை உவமம் in நம்பி அகப்பொருள் S 239; this could be called தெரிநிலை உவமம் if உள்ளுறை உவமம் could be called குறிப்பு உவமம்) in the following ways. Three of the differences were pointed out above: restricting the comparison to function (இளம்பூரணர் in Sutra 51, treats the behavior (உரிப்பொருள்) differently from function (பயன்), see below) involving multiple objects in comparison and the absence of comparative form that links the objects (the targets, உவமிக்கப்படுவது, உபமேயம்) and the ground (நிலம்: உவமிப்பது; உபமானம் = உவமை) or vehicle. The name is உள்ளுறை உவமம் when it is differentiated from other உவமம்s; it is also called உவம உள்ளுறை when it is differentiated from other உள்ளுறைs. Another name for உள்ளுறை உவமம் is one of the five kinds of (உவமையியல் 24) உவமப் போலி 'that which resembles உவமம் (simile)', but is different.

The most crucial theoretical difference between உவமம் and உள்ளுறை உவமம் is that the latter draws the ground or vehicle of comparison from கருப்பொருள் (தினையுணர் வகை S 49) and thus it is specific to அகம் poetry. Ramanujan (Interior Landscape; Afterword) calls it in-scape modelling the word after landscape. There is no exclusion of objects for comparison in வெளிப்படை உவமம்; it is open ended.

Another theoretical difference between the two the grammar makes is the exclusion of உவமம் from the set of features (செய்யுள் உறுப்பு) that make a poem. உள்ளுறை and இறைச்சி are included. உள்ளுறை that is included is all the five kinds (see below) including உள்ளுறை உவமம். The exclusion of ஏனை உவமம் from the organic whole of the poems (suggested by the choice of the word உறுப்பு 'organ' to refer to the poem's features) is not obvious, but is significant.

Exclusion of some கருப்பொருள் from உள்ளுறை உவமம்

தெய்வம் is excluded from being the ground for உள்ளுறை உவமம் (S 50 ); மக்கள் could be added to this exclusion, which is added separately (S 22) to the list of கருப்பொருள் (S 20) to indicate that it stands different from other கருப்பொருள் (see above). தெய்வம் and மக்கள் belong to the higher category of object (உயர்திணை).

முல்லைக்கலி (4) (see above) describes the game of controlling bulls (ஏறு தழுவுதல்), which are கருப்பொருள் of முல்லை land, are described by their colors, which are compared to the colors of gods. But the bulls are not part of உள்ளுறை உவமம்; they are metaphors of gods; they are not உவமை for தலைவன். This is evident by the fact that the gods mentioned in this poem are கருப்பொருள் of different lands.

A four line of குறுந்தொகை (1) describes the hill of the தெய்வம் முருகன் (he is mentioned as the red one (சேஎய்), not by the name) in the first three lines and the last line says '(the hill) of bunches of the blood-red flower காந்தள்'. தெய்வம், however, does not play any role in உள்ளுறை உவமம். There is no உவமம் at all. There is an உள்ளுறை, which is, according to நச்சினார்க்கினியர் (தொல்காப்பியம் களவியல் 24 உரை), who identifies the துறை of the poem as தோழி தலைவியை

இடத்து உய்த்து நீங்கியது 'தோழி leaving தலைவி at rendezvous and departing'. The suggested meaning is that the god is in the hill with her and will bless her into marriage. The anthologist of குறுந்தொகை, however, identifies the துறை as தோழி கையுறை மறுத்தது 'தோழி declining the gift of தலைவன்'. The suggested meaning is the hill of the தலைவி, presided over by முருகன், has plenty of காந்தள் flowers and so she would prefer the actual marriage to your gift of காந்தள் flowers to express your commitment. Whatever the துறை is, there is no உள்ளுறை உவமம்; there is only உள்ளுறை.

Of the கருப்பொருள்'s that belong to the lower category (அஃறிணை), only the natural objects (flora and fauna) seem to be used by the poets as the கருப்பொருள் used in உள்ளுறை உவமம், and not the cultural objects (உணவு, இசைக்கருவி, பண் and others).

நச்சினார்க்கினியர், however, tries to find an example of உள்ளுறை உவமம் grounded on a cultural object as கருப்பொருள் in support of the grammar, as stated. His example (S 50, his 47) for உணவு is the குறுந்தொகை poem 208, which describes a தலைவி talking to her தோழி about her hope that தலைவன் has not left her to waste away (இறந்துபாடு செய்வியாது) but has put her on the path of waiting (ஆற்றுவித்துப் போயினான்), and so she will unite with him; he is from the hilly land where the neem tree trampled by the bull elephant still blooms for the mountain girls to wear the flowers from the cracked branches hanging low. The உள்ளுறை உவமம் suggests that he is not beyond her reach. It describes the elephant (தலைவன்) that destroys the tree (which is the person (நலம்) of தலைவி) but the tree and she are not dead and have blooming left in them to be accessed. ). This is a comparison (through உள்ளுறை

உவமம்) of her destruction with the elephant's destruction of the tree; the poem does not mention at all the elephant eating the leaves of the tree.

உ.வே. சாமிநாதையர் has a different reading of the உள்ளுறை உவமம். The low hanging flower suggests for him another girl, whom தலைவி fears தலைவன் might have married. He reads two possible meanings to ஒன்றானானே 'by one thing', which are his breaking of the promise of return and the other is the possibility of his marriage with another woman. Either one could be the reason for her statement that she could not unite with him. (நாடனொடு ஒன்றேன், தோழி). She oscillates between two conflicting thoughts of uniting and not uniting in the first line of the poem (ஒன்றேனல்லேன், ஒன்றுவென்) and at the end settles on the second for one vague thought. The first reading of the உள்ளுறை உவமம் appears to have merit. The possibility of more than one reading of உள்ளுறை உவமம் justifies நச்சினார்க்கினியர்'s point of difficulty in getting to know what was in the mind of the poet (உள்ளுறை = உள்ளத்தில் உறைந்தது) in the following sutra (S 51).

சாமிநாதையர் finds another suggestive meaning in this poem though the poetic device of இறைச்சி. He takes the neem tree to signify the தலைவன், whose will is broken by the objection of her people (fighting elephants in plural), but is ready to climb down and to elope with her. Her oscillation is about to accept or not to accept his idea of elopement. This has two problems. One is the arbitrariness or open ended nature of reading the suggested meaning of உள்ளுறை உவமம்; the second is the treatment of உள்ளுறை உவமம் and இறைச்சி similar. இறைச்சி is the suggestion of what is not in the poem, which in this case is உடன்போக்கு. It is going beyond (இற 'cross') the words in the poem in their denotation or connotation. That they convey different kinds of suggested meanings and so are different poetic devices will be discussed later.

Restricting the choice of கருப்பொருள் in உள்ளுறை உவமம்.

The above points to the restrictions on the choice of உள்ளுறை உவமம் to use in a poem. One is that the கருப்பொருள் must be objects of nature (not culture); the second is there must be a word to suggest a meaning that is not explicit. There is another restriction which is related to the speaker of the poem, i.e. the speaker of the கூற்று 'the narration', whose voice the poem carries.

The grammar circumscribes the choice of specific கருப்பொருள் for the different characters in the அகம் poems such as தலைவி, தோழி, தலைவன் and others. This is part of the grammar of உவமம் (உவமையியல் 297-303), which basically stipulates that the ground or vehicle with which the comparison is made must be in the realm of the narrow or broad experience of the one who makes the comparison in her or his கூற்று. It is a simple truth that speakers of a language cannot go beyond their life experience to make meaning and this is true of poets also in making meaning in the poetic language. This general stipulation on any உவமம் applies to உள்ளுறை உவமம் also and thus to the choice of கருப்பொருள் used as the ground or vehicle of comparison. It is actually not an injunction but is of reminding poets of the simple truth, and probably a criterion to evaluate poems by their commentators or critics.

கருப்பொருள் suggestively carries the meaning of உரிப்பொருள், not other meanings. In other words, உள்ளுறை உவமம் strengthens the உரிப்பொருள் of a poem through the கருப்பொருள் of the land specified for that behavior. உள்ளுறை உவமம் alone may give the உரிப்பொருள் by suggestion without any behavior being mentioned in a poem; the poem itself is only உள்ளுறை உவமம் in this case, as the poem mentioned above. That the suggested meaning of கருப்பொருள் is உரிப்பொருள் is obtained from the words திணை உணர் வகை 'the way to realize the திணை' in S 49. This sutra says that உள்ளுறை உவமம் does not push aside (தள்ளாது) or cross திணை boundary, as வெளிப்படை உவமம் does.

Recall sutra 21, which exempts flowers from being bounded to a specific திணை, and the interpretation of it that this exemption is warranted because flowers are often used in similes (வெளிப்படை உவமம்) to describe the beauty of the body parts of women across திணைs.

கருப்பொருள் thus plays a role through உள்ளுறை உவமம் in implicit meaning creation. Its role in beauty creation, as mentioned earlier, is in creating the background and mood for the behavior (உரி) the poem describes.

உள்ளுறை உவமம் creates or adds a meaning while வெளிப்படை உவமம் explicates the articulated meaning; but both create beauty to give pleasure to the reader in different ways.

வெளிப்படை உவமம் is said to be of தானுணர் வகை (S 52) in meaning making in contrast to திணையுணர் வகை, which is the way of making meaning in உள்ளுறை. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் takes தானுணர் வகை to be making meaning self-evidently; that is, from the words used in the poem and by inferring from the mind of the poet. Making the meaning by using a form of comparison (உவம உருபு) is a self-evident way of doing it. But there is குறிப்பு even in the வெளிப்படை உவமம், which is the feature shared by the ground and the target, which may not be self-evident. This term, however, could also be understood that ஏனை உவமம் stands autonomous or independent of திணை, and so of அகம், unlike உள்ளுறை உவமம்.

Interplay between கருப்பொருள் உவமம் and வெளிப்படை உவமம்

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் (S 49, his 47) points out that there could be a உவமம் inside a உள்ளுறை உவமம், but the comparison in the simile should be drawn from the கருப்பொருள் of the திணை of the poem, and cites கலித்தொகை 71, a மருதம் poem. பரத்தை, fearing that தலைவன் is on the verge of returning to his wife, addresses him this way: man of the ஊர் close to the pond that has a single opening lotus flower with green leaves and

brightened by the morning dew like the face of a தலைவி, who stops her ire and the streaming tears and smiles when the தலைவன் touches her feet with folded hands and quickly expresses his acceptance (அளி) of her; in the same pond there are other flowers that too loosen up their bounded petals in the dawn of the sunrise, which a bee surrounds and entertains itself by binding to them. This is a உள்ளூறை உவமம், where the other flower is the பரத்தை, lotus is the தலைவி and the bee is the தலைவன்; the simile inside it suggests the fear of the பரத்தை that the தலைவன் would bend himself before the தலைவி and she would gladly accept him. Within the உள்ளூறை உவமம், the brightness of lotus, a மருதம் flower, is compared to the face of a woman brightened up at the return of her estranged husband. This simile adds another layer to the உள்ளூறை உவமம் calling the attention to the மருதம் theme of the poem. The poet, according to நச்சினார்க்கினியர், ensures with this simile that the theme suggested by the உள்ளூறை உவமம் is not missed.

There is another மருதம் poem of கலித்தொகை (73) that also illustrates this point. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் points this out in his commentary of this poem in கலித்தொகை. தலைவி in this poem imagines in her mind as addressing the தலைவன், a ஊரன் who is with a பரத்தை 'pleasure woman' to point out to him the false and never-lasting attractions of the பரத்தை. In her address of him, she describes his town (ஊர்) in the following words: the town where the ford on the river has, near its brimming water, bushes of fragrance-less flowers, which are touched by the green leaves of the lotus, which is opening its tightly held petals; the opening of the petals releases a luster that resembles the luster in the face of the man who drinks cool, fragrant, sweet liquor from a blindingly bright silver cup. These lines stand for உள்ளூறை உவமம் and it suggests this meaning: In the public space of the house of பரத்தை (அகன் துறை) unworthy people collect (புதலொடு தாழ்ந்த பகன்றைப் பூ) and தலைவன் has joined them (உற நீண்ட தாமரை); he will one day break his bond with the பரத்தை (வண் பிணி தளை



விடீஉம் வயல் அணி நல்லூரன்). The simile is that the luster of an opening lotus is like the luster in the face of a liquor drinker. It uses a lotus, a மருதம் flower, which is part of the உள்ளுறை உவமம், as the object of comparison. The choice of the simile within a உள்ளுறை உவமம் of மருதம் உரி (behavior), which echoes the merry making in the house of பரத்தை maintains the thematic integrity of the உள்ளுறை உவமம் as a meaning making device. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் explains in detail the meaning of the உள்ளுறை உவமம் in this poem in his commentary on கலித்தொகை.

The prohibition of open ended comparison in உள்ளுறை உவமம், however, is not absolute, but is a rule of preference when one looks at the actual poems. The first illustrative poem for நெய்தல் திணை cited by இளம்பூரணர் under sutra 24 has a மருதம் கருப்பொருள் (நாரை suggesting the fear on the part of தலைவி that the man may have found another woman, which might explain his delay in returning) in the உள்ளுறை உவமம் of the நெய்தல் poem. This may be seen as திணை மயக்கம் with its poetic purpose (the one mentioned above in parentheses) being present in the உள்ளுறை உவமம் of the poem as well.

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் finds an example for திணை மயக்கம் in உள்ளுறை உவமம் by a simile in the poem of குறுந்தொகை 54. This is a குறிஞ்சி poem in which தலைவி thinks of her புணர்ச்சி in the past and her physical distance from தலைவன் in the present and hints at a hope that he would come close to her again. He is கானக நாடன், in whose forest the elephant leaves the bamboo bush in a rush when it hears the sound of the shooting of the pebble from the sling to ward off the encroacher and the bent bamboo tree shoots up then like the fishing rod that goes up when a fish is trapped. The ground of உள்ளுறை உவமம் in this poem is the elephant backing away at the sound of attack, which suggests the meaning that the

தலைவன், who had bent தலைவி to his will backed out when the loud gossip of his relation with her is thrown at him. Her hope of his return is suggested by the smile of fishing rod going up after trapping a fish. This is an instance of a உவமம் within the உள்ளுறை உவமம். The simile of fishing rod is drawn from மருதம் land in this குறிஞ்சி poem. The poetic purpose is the sympathy (of the reader) that she trusts, like the fish, that the food at the end of the rod is real meant to feed her. This simile is so powerful that the author of this poem is known by it: மீனெறி தூண்டிலார். நச்சினார்க்கினியர் refers to பேராசிரியர்'s use of the same poem to make the point that this simile is ஏனை உவமம். (பேராசிரியர்'s commentary on the first five chapters of பொருளதிகாரம் including அகத்திணையியல் is not extant; it could be in his commentary of குறுந்தொகை, which is not extant either).

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் cites ஐங்குறுநூறு 12, a மருதம் poem, in which the simile is not external to உள்ளுறை உவமம் but is integral to it. That is, without the simile there is no உள்ளுறை உவமம். In this poem, தலைவி is reflecting on the தலைவன், a ஊரன், who is flirting with பரத்தை; her reflection reveals the state of her mind in relation to him: he has eaten away my good (நலம்); I will bear with good intention the unfairness (கொடுமை) of him, but if my shoulders droop accepting defeat, let them be. He is from the place where the bamboo blooms outside the bund of the field like the flowers of sugarcane that bloom inside the bund in the field. The last sentence is உள்ளுறை உவமம், which suggests that தலைவன் goes for the lowly bamboo, which grows outside the boundary (of good family) leaving the sugarcane, which grows inside that boundary, because both have similar looking flowers. The similarity between the sugarcane and the bamboo is expressed by a simile: வேழம் கரும்பின் பூக்கும் 'the bamboo blooms like the sugarcane'. This comparison is part of the உள்ளுறை உவமம்; it is not an independent comparison added in it. This suggested meaning is what பேராசிரியர் reads

into this உள்ளுறை உவமம் in his commentary on உவமையியல் of பொருளதிகாரம் citing this poem to illustrate உவமப்போலி. (The next poem பேராசிரியர் cites uses the same bamboo and its flower as a simile to compare them with the white mane of horses; that it is a simile is pointed out by the use of the comparative form அன்ன).

In the hands of a lesser poet, according to நச்சினார்க்கினியர் (S 49), ஏனை உவமம் may be from outside கருப்பொருள் but is used elsewhere in the அகம் poem and not inside a உள்ளுறை உவமம். This is shown in a கலித்தொகை poem (பாலைக்கலி 5), which are longer and give this scope. This a poem where தோழி senses that the தலைவன் is set to go on a long journey through a treacherous path and tries to dissuade him by saying that தலைவி will be devastated and may not live after his departure. This is in the first section of the poem, which is followed by three sections in தாழிசை, compare her condition after his departure through similes (ஏனை உவமம்). They are: her condition will be like the village a day after the festival, like the country whose king turns malevolent and like the lotus flower that floats lifeless in the pond after being separated from the plant. Except the last one, other similes, are not grounded on கருப்பொருள் of பாலை; the second one especially is from புறம் (it is hard to take the king to belong to the கருப்பொருள் category of மக்கள், though not of பாலை, as the king is not a திணைநிலைப் பெயர்).

The above examples show that உவமம் and உள்ளுறை உவமம் are not mutually exclusive in a poem. The former may feed into the latter, Poets exploit the similarity and the difference between உள்ளுறை உவமம் and வெளிப்படை உவமம் to great poetic effects. This is done through the built-in flexibility of the rules of the grammar of அகம் poems.

Metaphor – உருவகம்

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் points (S 52, his 50) to the existence of ஏனை உவமம் that does not mention the object of comparison and so there is no comparative form present. This would be உருவகம் 'metaphor'. உருவகம் posits identity between two objects while உவமம் posits similarity. An example is களிறெறிந்து பெயர்தல் காளைக்குக் கடனே (புறநானூறு 312). காளை is the metaphor for the warrior-son; களிறு may be a metaphor for the enemy or it may have the literal meaning. In உவமம் such an ambiguity will not present itself. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் believes that absence of explicit comparison makes this similar to உள்ளுறை உவமம். It is possible to view individual கருப்பொருள் in உள்ளுறை உவமம் as metaphors, in which case உள்ளுறை உவமம் would be a set of structurally related metaphors. T.P. Meenakshisundaran calls this தொடர் உருவகம். But this is different from the general metaphor because உள்ளுறை உருவகம், if this term is introduced in the vocabulary of poetics, will be tied to the கருப்பொருள் of அகம்.

The question whether உள்ளுறை உவமம், which is structural, is an allegory, where the whole narrative gives a meaning different from the obvious, must be answered in the negative. Because உள்ளுறை உவமம் does not give a different and parallel meaning, but it reinforces the meaning of உரி even in poems that have only உள்ளுறை உவமம் without any reference to the protagonists of the அகம் poems. These poems were not read as nature poems in the Sangam literary culture and then overlay an allegorical meaning about humans. They were read as poems of தலைமக்கள் of அகம், whether they were present or not in the poem.

Preponderance of உள்ளுறை உவமம்

உள்ளுறை உவமம் cannot be used in புறம் poems as they are built on கருப்பொருள். The theory of புறம் poems does not have கருப்பொருள்.

உள்ளுறை உவமம் is used abundantly in அகம் poems, including கலித்தொகை poems, which are by and large dialogs with direct exchange of feelings and so have lesser need for suggestive meaning. The common place in a poem to place உள்ளுறை உவமம் is the attribution of the place தலைவன் belongs to. The abundant use can be seen in the ratio of the number of உள்ளுறை உவமம் to the number of poems in each அகம் anthology. குறுந்தொகை (400 poems) has 103 உள்ளுறை உவமம் and கலித்தொகை (150 poems) has 51. The shorter poems as anthologized in குறுந்தொகை have a good number of poems that consist only of உள்ளுறை உவமம் without any explicit mention of உரிப்பொருள். There are a few poems which have more than one உள்ளுறை உவமம்.

தோழி கூற்று has the highest number of உள்ளுறை உவமம் followed by தலைவி கூற்று. The number is low in தலைவன் கூற்று while the number is insignificant in the கூற்று of others. Among திணைs, முல்லைத் திணை has the least number of உள்ளுறை உவமம் in all anthologies; there is none of it in this திணை in அகநானூறு. (From the unpublished PhD dissertation of Ira. Thamizharasi, University of Madras (1982) as cited by A. Sivalingarar in his book தொல்காப்பியம் கூறும் உள்ளுறையும் இறைச்சியும் (1985). The dissertation must be read to see how the problems in identifying திணை, உள்ளுறை உவமம் and the author of கூற்று are addressed; commentators and later scholars differ in the identifications of these two).

உள்ளுறை உவமம் vs. ஒட்டணி

When there is an overlaid meaning as that of உள்ளுறை உவமம் in a poem outside அகம், for example in a புறம் poem, this meaning creation goes by the name ஒட்டணி 'compounded (meaning)'. The later grammarians classify it under rhetoric (அணி) alone, but its paraphrased synonym பிறிது

மொழிதல் அணி 'speaking another meaning' makes the meaning-making function clearer. ஒட்டணி, which is considered to parallel *samajokti* in Sanskrit. It is restricted in Tamil literary theory to non-அகம் poems and it is different from உள்ளுறை உவமம், whose overlaid meaning is specific to உரிப்பொருள், as shown above. புறநானூறு 23 has an apparent உள்ளுறை உவமம், but the old commentator of this anthology does not call it உள்ளுறை உவமம் and says simply that this gives another meaning also (cited by M. Arunachalam from this and other examples of commentators, some of which are given by A. Sivalinganar in his book (p. 8-9) mentioned above, in his remarks on the commentaries of S 49). This புறம் poem of praise to the Pandiyan king Nedunchezhiyan on his victory of the war of Talaiyalankanam, in which his army plundered the food it needed and destroyed the rest to deprive food to the enemy, burnt the guardian pole of the enemy king along with the surrounding forest and set fire to the houses that had burning hearths, says towards the end that the poet passed through a forest, that was dried up and desolate, on his way to the king, where the doe was eating the flowers of a tree holding the fawn in her embrace after the stag was killed by a tiger. The unnamed old commentator of புறநானூறு says that the description of the desolate forest and the behavior of the doe therein suggest that the wives of the dead warriors of the enemy would choose to sustain themselves in order to protect and raise their sons (for another war). The suggested meaning of caution to the king is that he should not become oblivious of future enemies by his current victory. The commentator, however, does not say this description of a natural scene is உள்ளுறை உவமம். Though it has the characteristics of it, it does not have two defining features of உள்ளுறை உவமம். புறம் poems do not have two of the three constituents of அகம் poems, viz., கரு and முதல். Hence the objects of nature described in the lines that give the suggestive meaning are not கருப்பொருள். Therefore, the description cannot be உள்ளுறை உவமம். Secondly, உள்ளுறை உவமம் must express, implicitly, the உரிப்பொருள். The உரிப்பொருள் of புறம் is qualitatively

different from that of அகம். The former is the action of a person (பாட்டுடைத் தலைவன்), which is the theme ((புறத்) திணை) of the poem while the latter is the behavior (ஒழுக்கம்) of a character (கிளவித் தலைவன்), which is the theme ((அகத்) திணை) of the poem. Hence the second meaning by suggestion in the புறம் poem is not by உள்ளுறை உவமம், but by ஒட்டணி. The old commentator calls the suggested meaning குறிப்புப் பொருள். The term ஒட்டணி is a later creation to refer to this kind of குறிப்புப் பொருள்.

ஒட்டணி, based on *samajokti* in Sanskrit poetic grammar and following Dandin, is defined as compounding of words which have a relation of similarity, which is concealed in the form expressed. This includes உவமம் in which the relation between the object that is compared (உவமானம்) and the object that is compared to (உவமேயம்) is concealed. Sutra 51 says that the intended meaning of the object that is compared to (i.e. நிலம்), in the interpretation of நச்சினார்க்கினியர், is placed in the mind of the poet (உள்ளுறுத்து). There is a question whether this Sutra could be interpreted to say that the intended meaning is placed inside (i.e. under the surface, உள்) and taken to cover the definition of ஒட்டணி. In this interpretation, உள்ளுறை உவமம் becomes a subcategory of ஒட்டணி in that the former has genre restriction (i.e. restricted to அகத்திணை). But the following facts would argue that these two are qualitatively different poetic devices. As இளம்பூரணர் points out (S 51), the similarity is not defined in உள்ளுறை உவமம் by the comparison of one or more shared features viz., action, function, shape and color (உவமையியல்<sup>1</sup>) like any other உவமம் including ஒட்டணி, but the similarity is with உரிப்பொருள் ((ஏனை) உவமையால் கொள்ளும்

வினை, பயன், மெய், உரு அன்றி (உரிப்)பொருள் உவமையால் கொள்ளப்படுவது). This is more than the difference of genre distribution.

Moreover, உள்ளுறை is a general category of suggested meanings going beyond the one through உவமம் (பொருளியல் 48, see below). If உள்ளுறுத்து is extended to cover all உள்ளுறைs, and not just உள்ளுறை உவமம், the common feature shared by all of them is what the poet has in mind (i.e. what the poet intends) and not what the poet conceals. It would follow that the way உள்ளுறை உவமம் operates is different from the way ஒட்டணி operates, as far as the grammar constructed in தொல்காப்பியம் is concerned. This is recognized also by the early commentators of the grammar and of the poems themselves.

#### Five Types of உள்ளுறை

உள்ளுறை உவமம் is one of the five உள்ளுறைs ‘grounds for suggested meaning’ (S 48 in பொருளியல், which is a chapter on making meaning). All five share the defining feature that the suggested meaning is grounded on கருப்பொருள் and so they are specific to அகம் poetry. That this is the case can be argued from the assumption that உள்ளுறை is the suggested or implicit meaning (குறிப்புப் பொருள்) in அகம் poetry, which is a genre noted for its implicit conveyance of meaning between interlocutors. But the commentators differ from each other in viewing whether the four உள்ளுறைs other than உள்ளுறை உவமம் are genre-specific (அகம்) or genre-generic when interpreting each type. The four உள்ளுறைs are உடனுறை உள்ளுறை ‘coexisting with’, சுட்டு உள்ளுறை ‘pointing to’, நகை உள்ளுறை ‘hinting contrary to’ and சிறப்பு உள்ளுறை ‘exaggerating’.

#### உடனுறை உள்ளுறை

உடனுறை ‘co-existing (meaning)’ contrasts lexically and semantically with உள்ளுறை ‘in-existing (meaning)’. Some known examples of coexisting



meanings are lexical polysemy, homonymy and morphological or syntactic ambiguity. These underlie சிலேடை, which gives two (or more) meanings of a string simultaneously or sequentially. This obvious similarity of சிலேடை to உடனுறை is nullified by the fact that the latter is grounded on கருப்பொருள். This is an apparent similarity just like the one between உள்ளுறை and ஒட்டணி.

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் and other commentators equate உடனுறை உள்ளுறை with the culturally associated meaning of the flora and fauna (i.e. கருப்பொருள்). He cites, like other commentators, the நற்றிணை poem (172), in which தோழி (or தலைவி) tells தலைவன் that the daytime rendezvous (பகற்குறி) of புன்னை tree in the backyard is inappropriate because the tree nurtured by the mother makes it a sister, and the suggested meaning that there cannot be கூட்டம் in front of one's sister. The cultural meaning is the belief that the flora and fauna have close kinship value with the people who are close to them. (This is similar to the cultural belief that the banana tree means fertility and many other such beliefs). In this poem, புன்னை has the cultural meaning of a sibling while retaining its biological meaning of a tree; it is a tree and a sister at the same time. This is உடனுறை.

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் calls this meaning generation இறைச்சி and this is disputable, as we will see later.

Another interpretation of உடனுறை உள்ளுறை could be this. It is the generation of உரிப்பொருள் without giving a cue to it anywhere in the poem restricted to the description of கருப்பொருள் alone. This is an அகம்-specific metaphor discussed above. உரிப்பொருள் resides in the கருப்பொருள், but without any suggestion of it in the poem itself except for the literary cultural practice of reading உரிப்பொருள் in such poems. This is a relation of two objects being identical, not just being similar.

## சுட்டு உள்ளுறை

This is about pointing to one to mean another; pointing includes saying by words and showing by gestures. இளம்பூரணர் seems to restrict himself to showing by gestures, which includes the body language. தலைவி looking at her bangles and her tender shoulders and then the feet of தலைவன் suggests that the dropping of bangles and the decimation of her shoulders would be the consequence of தலைவன் walking away without committing to marrying her. This suggestion would be an instance of சுட்டு உள்ளுறை (திருக்குறள் 1278 is cited by இளம்பூரணர்). Here the body part is of the human, a கருப்பொருள். The suggestion could be, by pointing by words to the dark clouds of the rainy season showering on the millet field, expressing the desire for early marriage (அகநானூறு 188 cited by நச்சினார்க்கினியர்). Another citation by him is குறுந்தொகை 37, where தோழி tells தலைவி about the parched land தலைவன் passes through leaving her at home, which has male elephants that feed their mates with juice crushed from the barks of the dried *yaa* tree. She says this in answer to the question of தலைவி about his coming back to her. She does not answer the question directly, but points verbally to a happening in the place he is going through, which suggests the real answer. One may recall that the grammar கிளவியாக்கம் (Sutra 15) admits indirect answers to a direct question in the day- to-day language. When a customer asks for black lentils the grocer may point to the green lentils in the bag to suggest that he has only that, or say that verbally; this is a legitimate answer, not a வழு. Indirect answer is legitimate in the poetic language as well.

The last citation could be an instance of உள்ளுறை உவமம், but its context is different. It is responding to a question or to a mental reading of another person. (In இளம்பூரணர்'s citation of திருக்குறள் couplet above, தலைவி reads the mind of தலைவன் and responds without using words). This shows that the difference between உள்ளுறை உவமம் and other உள்ளுறை is subtle; it lies in the pragmatics of language adapted to poetry.

உள்ளுறை உவமம் privileges the structuring of the language of poetry with implicit comparison.

### நகை உள்ளுறை

நகை உள்ளுறை is not about conveying a contrary meaning (of not believing what is said; no other மெய்ப்பாடு carries a contrary meaning like நகை) or about கருப்பொருள் being a site for making a lighter or a smiley comment, as the commentators seem to take this term to mean. It could be argued that the lighter or smiley comment conveys a serious intended meaning. It could even be contrary to the meaning of the actual saying. This is like being ironical. This is a friendly way of saying a harsh truth; it is the opposite of being blunt. Sangam poems use, it may be noted, நகை to mean 'friendship'. (கலித்தொகை - மருதக்கலி 29): நம்முள் நகுதல் தொடீஇயர் 'let us begin friendship between us' said by the dwarf to the hunchback).

### சிறப்பு உள்ளுறை

சிறப்பு உள்ளுறை is the least understood one. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் thinks that if a உள்ளுறை உவமம் has a an integral simile within it using a கருப்பொருள் (his example is கலித்தொகை 71, a poem of மருதக்கலி; see the section above on the interaction between உள்ளுறை உவமம் and ஏனை உவமம்), it is சிறப்பு உள்ளுறை. This would make sense only if he means this to be a சிறப்பு உள்ளுறை உவமம். So his understanding of this concept does not have validity. இளம்பூரணர் does not do more than paraphrasing the term and does not give any illustrative poem. His paraphrase could probably be stretched to mean that if some description of கருப்பொருள் is exaggerated or overstated (சிறப்பித்தல்), the exaggeration may suggest a different meaning that it is a pretense or fooling. In rhetoric, exaggeration is suspicious. If this is a possible understanding of சிறப்பு உள்ளுறை, one will have to look for an illustrative poem in the Sangam corpus.

One could see that the five உள்ளுறைs are grounded in கருப்பொருள் and are அகம்-specific. They, except உள்ளுறை உவமம், could be generic also and applicable to suggested meaning in all genres of literature. One could state this conversely also that these are independent of literary genres and when used in அகம் genre, the ground of creation of suggested meaning is கருப்பொருள், and so it is special. This is probably a reason for placing the Sutra 49 on உள்ளுறை உவமம் in அகத்திணையியல் (S 49) and placing the Sutra on the kinds of உள்ளுறை in பொருளியல் (S 48). This is probably what நச்சினார்க்கினியர் means (S 49, his 45) by இது புறத்திற்கும் பொது 'this is common to புறம் genre also' where இது could be taken to refer to உள்ளுறைப் பொருள் in the preceding sentence of his commentary (as well as to ஏனை உவமம் in the Sutra, but not to உள்ளுறை உவமம் there as his critics do).

Another thing, besides being genre-specific, that is common to the four உள்ளுறைs is that, they cannot be considered ஏனை உவமம், they enhance the pleasure of poetry- they part of the aesthetics of poetry- like உவமம். The next Sutra (பொருளியல் 47) emphatically points this out. It says that the pleasure is limitless (அந்தமில் இன்பம்). (Commentators do not interpret this Sutra in this way, though). All உள்ளுறைs make meaning and provide pleasure along with explicit உவமை.

New Function for உவமம்

இளம்பூரணர் assigns two functions to உவமை in poetry (உவமையியல் 1). The third function he assigns in addition to these two is identification of திணை. This function is obvious for உள்ளுறை உவமம், where the கருப்பொருள் is the உவமம் and it reinforces உரிப்பொருள் and thus indicates திணை. வெளிப்படை உவமம் also indicates திணை, according to his interpretation of S 52 (ஏனை உவமம் தான்

உணர் வகைத்தே; this Sutra could be interpreted, as does நச்சினார்க்கினியர், to state that ஏனை உவமம் is self-evident as a உவமம் by the presence of the comparative form, or that ஏனை உவமம் is autonomous, i.e. independent, of உரி, and so of திணை). தான் in the Sutra , for இளம்பூரணர், means the vehicle of comparison, which gives the திணை when it is a natural object. He reads தான் உணர் வகைத்தே similar to திணை உணர் வகைத்தே. This points to இளம்பூரணர்'s preoccupation with திணை categorization, as noted earlier. He would use the உவமம் as the only way to identify the திணை of an அகம் poem when there is no explicit முதல், கரு or உரி. His illustrative poem is from சிற்றடக்கம். தலைவி tells தோழி that her advice to give up (துற) on her thinning shoulders that have the fragrance of saffron is not great as her life will disappear (இறு). This is a குறிஞ்சி poem about தலைவன் abandoning தலைவி, but there is nothing in the poem to suggest this except her thinning shoulders and the meaning of துற that hangs over the poem. இளம்பூரணர், finding these cues inadequate, depends on the simile of saffron for the fragrance of her shoulders (துருக்கம் கமழும் மென் தோள் = துருக்கம் போல் கமழும் மென் தோள்; துருக்கம் tree grows in the hills) to categorize it as a குறிஞ்சி poem. For him, a fleeting உவமம் carries more weight than the implicit உரி for identifying the திணை of a poem. Or, he needs something concrete to make திணை categorization.

His another illustrative poem (ஐங்குறுநூறு 369) has clearly a உரிப்பொருள் (ஒருத்தியொடு ... குறி நீ செய்தனை 'you had a rendezvous with a woman'), which makes it a மருதம் poem, but இளம்பூரணர் calls it a பாலை poem on the basis of the cuckoo bird in the உவமம், which is associated with spring (இளவேனில்), which is a முதல் பொருள் of பாலை, according to one interpretation of S 11. He does this on the strength of the simile that compares the scandal of the rendezvous to the

voice of the cuckoo bird. The poem reads like this: the scandal is louder than the pitch of the dark cuckoo bird of the spring that is perching on the long branch of the *kuravam* tree – the scandal they spread that you had a rendezvous yesterday with a woman, who smiles with her row of bud-like teeth, in the fragrant grove swarmed by bees close to the lush flowers.

This way of categorizing திணை is not any idiosyncrasy of இளம்பூரணர். The unnamed old commentator of ஐங்குறுநூறு does the same. He gives the context to the poem as one in which தலைவி confronts தலைவன், when he returns after an affair and is engaged in ஊடல். The anthologist of ஐங்குறுநூறு puts this poem in the section of பாலைத் திணை in the anthology. The neo-classical way of திணை classification has a pedigree!

The same poem is amenable to be categorized as a குறிஞ்சி poem by the உரிபொருள் (குறி) and to qualify it to have the நிமித்தம் of வரைவு கடாவுதல் ‘expediting marriage’. The anthologist and the commentators are guided by the unspecified ஒருத்தியொடு (குறி நீ செய்தனை ‘you had a rendezvous with a woman’) and by the reporting finite verb என்ப ‘they say’ rather than by the words of direct observation of தோழி. This forces them to attribute the நிமித்தம் வாயில் மறுத்தல் ‘denying entry into the house’. In குறிஞ்சி reading, என்ப is the non-past relative participle modifying அலர், which is also the subject of பெரிதே ‘is larger’. ஒருத்தியொடு is used instead of இவளொடு to suggest the un-specificity of or vagueness about the target of the scandal for the village folks. The mention of Spring and the cuckoo bird in the simile is to suggest hopefulness in spite of his disappearance and the scandal. ஒருத்தி is taken by the old commentator to refer to பரத்தை, which is unusual because generally தலைவன் meets பரத்தை in her house, not in the grove. Double date is not a convention in Sangam poems!

## இறைச்சி

இறைச்சி is derived by modern scholars (தமிழண்ணல், சிவலிங்கனார்) from the root இறு (இறு+ஐ+ச்சி) 'make to be or to sit', which is the transitive form of இரு 'be, sit' (= இருத்து). The meaning of the word refers to placing meaning on a word. This placing of meaning is in addition to the existing dictionary meaning of the word, and so this meaning is secondary. This secondary meaning is of the words of கருப்பொருள் of அகம் poetry. The grammar of the ordinary language regarding subject-verb agreement says that the கருப்பொருள், though has the secondary meaning of the human protagonists of அகம் poems, will have the non-human ending of the predicate (சொல்லதிகாரம், பெயரியல் S 42). This is so because these objects belong natively to different lands (நிலத்துவழி மருங்கில் தோன்றலான) while they refer to humans in poetry. திணைநிலைப் பெயர் is an exception and it will have human ending in the predicate. (திணையொடு பழகிய பெயரலங்கடையே is the single line of the next Sutra (S 43) but may be read with the preceding Sutra (சிவலிங்கனார், ப. 31). These nouns are called by the Sutra as இறைச்சிப் பொருள்வயின் செய்யுளில் கிளக்கும் இயற்பெயர்க் கிளவி 'the nouns of natural objects portrayed in (அகம்) poems with a secondary meaning'. This secondary meaning is referred to, in the Sutra, as இறைச்சிப் பொருள், which encompasses the personification of the natural objects and a suggested meaning. This grammatical statement is necessary in the section describing nouns because these nouns behave differently from metaphorical nouns such as காளை, which will have predicates ending with non-human or human suffix depending on the meaning (referent) of the word in its use: காளை களிற்றெறிந்து வந்தனன் / வந்தன்று 'the bull came killing an elephant'. காரான், meaning தலைவன், in the அகநானூறு poem (46) cited above, that eats the lotus, meaning பரத்தை, would be said: காரான் ... தாமரை

வண்டுது பனிமலர் அருந்திற்று, and not \*அருந்தினன். In other words, a metaphor could be a விரவுப் பெயர் grammatically, i.e. non-human or human for agreement requirements, whereas a கருப்பொருள் is not.

There is no consensus among commentators and modern scholars what the nature of the suggested meaning of இறைச்சி is and how it is different from the suggested meaning of உள்ளுறை. The grammar makes it clear that the suggested meaning of இறைச்சி is not உரிப்பொருள் (behavior); it is outside உரிப்பொருள், but not outside அகப்பொருள் (இறைச்சிதானே உரிப் புறத்ததுவே, பொருளியல் S 230). The next Sutra says that the இறைச்சிப் பொருள் are many (பொருளும் ஆர் உளவே) and they are accessible to those knowledgeable in literary analysis (திறத்தியல் மருங்கில் தெரியுமோர்க்கே). In other words, obtaining the suggested meaning of இறைச்சி is open ended and is not obvious.

The two examples of the suggested meaning of இறைச்சி the grammar gives, probably as samples, are in கற்பியல் S 7 (குறுந்தொகை 79) and in பொருளியல் S 36 (கலித்தொகை 24). The first one mentions the fear of the horrid happenings in பாலை that strikes the mind of தலைவி. The second one mentions the reverse of it, which is the pathos that the love-filled happenings in பாலை create in the mind of தலைவன். These examples suggest that இறைச்சி is the emotional response of the protagonists to the கருப்பொருள் they encounter. கருப்பொருள் is a stimulus. The stimulus could be முதல் பொருள் also (S.V. Shanmugam). This meaning of emotion is not about critiquing ஒழுக்கம். உள்ளுறை உவமம், on the other hand, is a communicative strategy between the protagonists using கருப்பொருள் about the behavior (ஒழுக்கம்) of one of them, commonly about the behavior of தலைவன். That தலைவன் is at the receiving end of the subtle communication is borne out by the fact that உள்ளுறை உவமம் is least



common in his கூற்று. From all அகம் anthologies, the statistics is this: தோழி கூற்று – 340, தலைவி கூற்று– 182, தலைவன் கூற்று 25; when the two women of கூற்று are combined the ratio is 522 vs. 25. (from தமிழரசி's dissertation cited by சிவலிங்கனார்); even when allowance is given to different possible identifications of கூற்று, there will be no change in the ration because the difference in identification is between தலைவி and தோழி.

The above understanding of இறைச்சி suggests a different etymology of the word. The root is இற 'cross, go beyond' and இறைச்சி is a suggested meaning that goes beyond words. The meaning does not have one to one correspondence with words; it is a gestalt; it is a flash.

இறைச்சி being about emotions, it may be said to have close connection to மெய்ப்பாடு. Modern scholars, but interestingly not any of the pre-modern commentators, believe that இறைச்சி is an equivalent of தொனி (Skt, dvani). There is some literature on the equivalence. (George Hart makes a comparison of குறிப்புப் பொருள் in Tamil and Sanskrit literary works; he uses தொனி in the general sense of குறிப்புப் பொருள், not in the specific sense of இறைச்சி). For one thing, இறைச்சி is genre specific (It belongs to the provenance of அகம் poetry), as கருப்பொருள் is the stimulus. Secondly, தொனி is not restricted to the emotional meaning alone.

There is nothing in the grammar that will refute the understanding of இறைச்சி as a conveyor of emotions. But the identification and interpretation of இறைச்சி in actual poems by pre-modern and modern commentators including the editors of the anthologies will challenge this understanding. But it can be argued that இறைச்சி could be an empirical problem in the commentaries (but not in the grammar) amenable to different identifications and interpretations. There are plenty of examples in Sangam poems, where a particular description of கருப்பொருள் leads the scholars, old and new, to differ in identifying it as

உள்ளுறை உவமம் or இறைச்சி. குறுந்தொகை, for example, has 86 such descriptions about which the scholars have different identifications. What is உள்ளுறை உவமம் for some is இறைச்சி for others (ம. ரா. போ. குருசாமி (1980), தமிழ் நூல்களில் குறிப்புப் பொருள் – பின்னிணைப்பு 1)

Relation between உள்ளுறை உவமம் and இறைச்சி

The relation between உள்ளுறை உவமம் and இறைச்சி is a topic about which so much has been written from the time of the earliest commentator, but yet there is no consensus about their definitions and distinguishing features. உ. வே. சாமிநாதையர் altogether avoids the problem by calling both of them குறிப்புப் பொருள் in his commentary on குறுந்தொகை. The consensus among scholars stops with the fact that both are specific to அகம் genre. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் alone thinks that இறைச்சி is one of the five kinds of உள்ளுறை; specifically, it is same as உடனுறை உள்ளுறை. His reason is no more than the fact that the கருப்பொருள் expresses another meaning simultaneously. But this is true of உள்ளுறை உவமம் also. The example he gives is the நற்றிணை poem (172), where the புன்னை tree means to be a sister to the heroine. This is not a உவமம் and so is different from உள்ளுறை உவமம். But then for நச்சினார்க்கினியர், on the basis of the single criterion of two simultaneous meanings of கருப்பொருள், இறைச்சி is a உள்ளுறை that is not a உவமம். He considers சிறப்பு உள்ளுறை is a உள்ளுறை based on கருப்பொருள் within which a simile (வெளிப்படை உவமம்) based on கருப்பொருள் is placed. சிறப்பு indicates the double use of கருப்பொருள். We saw a poem (கலித்தொகை 71 (73)) above, which would be an example of this. The subordinate relationship of இறைச்சி to உள்ளுறை is not warranted if we take இறைச்சி to be an equivalent but

a different implied meaning and that it is about the emotion of the protagonists, different from the implied meaning about their behavior.

Return of cows from grazing signifies evening and the இறைச்சி of the evening is sadness for தலைவி. This will be in முல்லைத் திணை. Provision of shade to its mate by a wild male dog under the scorching sun signifies care for the beloved and its இறைச்சி is a sense of guilt in தலைவன். This will be placed in பாலைத் திணை. And so on.

உள்ளுறை and இறைச்சி may coexist in a poem. In fact, this is often the case. While உள்ளுறை speaks about the behavior of தலைவன், இறைச்சி may speak about the emotional state of தலைவி in the same poem. Both may be spoken by தலைவி or தோழி. குறுந்தொகை 352 is an example of this. தலைவி tells her friend that she is aware only now of the existence of the evening when தலைவன் is not there with her in the evening when the bat, which has sharp claws and wings whose color is like the color of the back of the leaves of ஆம்பல், leaves its old home tree alone and flies to the hills in search of a jack fruit tree. The evening is described by a scene in nature, which also serves as உள்ளுறை pointing to the behavior of தலைவன். He leaves her alone at home drawn by something sweeter. The evening becomes cognizable and it creates sadness in her. This is the suggested meaning through இறைச்சி, which conveys the mood of தலைவி, and thus the poem. The mention of jack fruits suggests குறிஞ்சி land as the locale of the உள்ளுறை in this poem of முல்லை (though it is categorized as a பாலை poem in the anthology). This is mixing குறிஞ்சி in முல்லை. This mixing suggestively conveys her emotion of sadness reminded by the union (the உரி of குறிஞ்சி) that she misses in his absence. This suggestion is இறைச்சி. The transition in this poem from உள்ளுறை to இறைச்சி, from message to mood, from the behavior to its effect is extremely smooth and subtle. It is so flowing that it is potent for making the theoretical and practical separation of உள்ளுறை and இறைச்சி so hard. Hence the struggles and disagreements we find in commentators to keep them separate and in mistaking one for the other.

