

Draft. Not to be cited. Comments welcome.

E. Annamalai, University of Chicago

Class Notes. Spring 2018

(தொல்காப்பியம்: பொருளதிகாரம்: அகத்திணையியல்:
இளம்பூரணர் உரை)

Literary Theory of அகம் genre of poetry -3

Revisiting கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை

As seen above, கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை do not have முதல் பொருள் and கருப்பொருள் specific to them. The உரிப்பொருள் of them is a விகாரம் of it, and most commonly it is a விகாரம் of புணர்ச்சி, the உரிப்பொருள் of குறிஞ்சி. There is no உள்ளுறை உவமம் to reinforce the விகாரம். In the absence of முதல், கரு and a prototypical உரி, a question arises as to how a poem is identified as a கைக்கிளை or a பெருந்திணை poem. The words spoken, or not spoken, tell suggestively (குறிப்பு) a கைக்கிளை poem (S 53) and a பெருந்திணை (S 54). கைக்கிளைக் குறிப்பு and பெருந்திணைக் குறிப்பு in these sutras refer to the suggesting elements in a poem in the absence of a உரிப்பொருள், or கருப்பொருள் to construct உள்ளுறை உவமம். (It could be bodily manifestations of emotions (மெய்ப்பாடு), which the lists in the two sutras (53, 54), should be taken to indicate such emotions; the commentators mention the மெய்ப்பாடு of கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை more commonly than of ஐந்திணை).

The persuading words of praising (நன்மை; புகழ்தல் is the gloss of இளம்பூரணர்) and blaming (தீமை; பழித்தல் is his gloss) by

தலைவன், which by themselves give him pleasure when he meets the silence of தலைவி will suggest that the poem is கைக்கிளை. The words of shaming self by a public declaration of his love through the act of மடலேறுதல், words that are not of the youth (இளமைதீர் திறம்), words that are sexually over-charged (காமத்து மிகுதிறம்) and words from the overpowering of unfulfilled desire on the part of தலைவன் (காமத்து மிடல்) will tell a பெருந்திணை poem. These words are suggestive of the absence of mutual pleasure of love in both protagonists, which is love not deemed proto-typical. குறிப்பு in கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை is through words that point to the absence of ஒத்த அன்பு.

The mutual pleasure of the two protagonists (with no pain to anyone) is the pivot of குறிஞ்சி, according to நச்சினார்க்கினியர் (S 1, ஒத்த அன்பான் ஒருவனும் ஒருத்தியும் கூடுகின்ற காலத்துப் பிறந்த பேரின்பம் ‘the bliss during the union between the two who equally love each other’). The protagonists are of comparable love, birth, physique, character, wealth and youthfulness, according to இளம்பூரணர் (S 1, ஒத்த அன்பும் ஒத்த குலனும் ஒத்த வடிவும் ஒத்த குணனும் ஒத்த செல்வமும் ஒத்த இளமையும் உளவழி). The protagonists of கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை may not be matching in these and, in this sense, their love is not proto-typical. The kinds of words used by them will indicate this non-typical nature of love.

Absence of the expression of mutual love may be described between any man and woman irrespective of their status, as இளம்பூரணர் admits (S 29). நச்சினார்க்கினியர் does the same by claiming that இளையோள் is a generic word not specific to any particular social category (S 53, his 50). Nevertheless, there is a gender difference. The words that identify கைக்கிளை or பெருந்திணை are spoken by தலைவன். This exclusion of தலைவி is changed in later grammars. கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை become gender neutral in these grammars beginning from

பன்னிருபடலம். This change correlates interestingly with the change in the theoretical status of these two themes. They are not part of அகத்திணை, but are of புறத்திணை in the later grammars. Their ambivalent status as அகப்புறம் is indicative of an intermediate stage in their literary status. புறப்பொருள் வெண்பாமாலை divides கைக்கிளை into that of a male protagonist and of a female protagonist and பெருந்திணை into that of a male protagonist and that of both male and female protagonists. This division is based on the kinds of situations where different intensities of passion are expressed.

It must be noted that கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை are categorized under one of the five lands of ஐந்திணை in the Sangam anthologies of அகம் poems. They are integrated with the five land classification; they are not outside of this classification until the time of anthologizing. This was possible because categorization of poems into one of the five திணைs came to be made in terms of land (though its கருப்பொருள், see above) and so the problem of கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை not having any of the five உரிப் பொருள்s of the five திணைs did not arise. This would have been a problem if திணை classification had continued to be based on உரிப் பொருள், as in the classical period.

Classifying கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை under புறம் a consequence of the extension of the grammar of love between two humans to the love between a human and the god. தொல்காப்பியம் treats பாடாண்திணை, the category of praise, as the புறம் counterpart of கைக்கிளை. One part of பாடாண்திணை is காமப் பகுதி 'love as praise' (புறத்திணையியல் S 20). This காமப் பகுதி could be about god (காமப் பகுதி கடவுளும் வரையார்: புறத்திணையியல் S 23) and it could be by a woman expressing her love to god. It is கைக்கிளை when the god is silent and this comes to be categorized under புறத்திணை, as the god has a name and is identifiable.

The commentators imagine two situations of கைக்கிளை. One is when the girl is not sexually aware (காமஞ்சாலா இளையோள்) and the other is when the girl is sexually aware but love is not in her mind at the first encounter with தலைவன் (காமம் சான்ற இளையோள்). They take that the formulation புல்லித் தோன்றும் கைக்கிளை 'கைக்கிளை that correlates with the pleasure of தலைவன் in speaking to தலைவி about his love for her' in the Sutra (53) entails that there is also புல்லாமல் தோன்றும் கைக்கிளை 'கைக்கிளை that does not correlate with any pleasure (of தலைவி)'. This second situation is காட்சி 'seeing (for the first time)' (S 18) in குறிஞ்சி. It is உரி நிமித்தம், a prelude to புணர்ச்சி. It is momentary and has no scope for her to respond to his wonderment about her beauty at the time of encountering her by chance. In other words, her lack of response is not volitional. For this reason, one could argue that it is not appropriate to bring this situation of default under கைக்கிளை. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் (S 53, his 50) recognizes this when he says that காமஞ்சான்ற இளமையோள்வயின் நிகழுங் கைக்கிளை இத்துணைச் சிறப்பின்றாயிற்று 'absence of love (at the first encounter) in the young girl is to be taken as not superior'

One could take காமஞ்சாலா as a general term to mean 'loveless' (சாலா as a negative adjective marker with some semantic content (as in the positive adjective marker அறிவுசால், அறிவுசான்ற)). The absence of love may be found in any situation independent of the sexual awareness (correlated to the age) of the girl. To assume that a girl past puberty would do nothing but positively respond to the offer of love by a man is a misogynic view. She could volitionally be unresponsive. Furthermore, the தலைவி of the poem இளம்பூரணர் cites for கைக்கிளை (கலித்தொகை: குறிஞ்சிக் கலி 25) does not have to be a girl who is under-aged or in the first encounter. In the other கலித்தொகை poem (குறிஞ்சிக் கலி 24) of கைக்கிளை இளம்பூரணர் cites (S 24), in which தலைவி initially rejects the offer of love by தலைவன் before finally accepting it (see above). These suggest that

கைக்கிளை is not only about the relationship of girls who have not yet attained the age of becoming sexually aware.

பெருந்திணை may be viewed as post-union love relationship whereas கைக்கிளை pre-union relationship in the sense of the period of their happening of their உரிப்பொருள், which is புணர்ச்சி (see above). In the words of இளம்பூரணர் (S 54): கைக்கிளை புணராது நிகழும் என்றமையால் இது (பெருந்திணை) புணர்ந்தபின் நிகழும் என்று கொள்க 'since it is said that கைக்கிளை happens when there is no union, it is understood that பெருந்திணை takes place after the union'. The situations after the union include delay in marrying, delay in having a second union, denial of union because of separation etc. These are the situations when தலைவன் or தலைவி loses control of their passion. In post-classical theory, பெருந்திணை attributed to தலைவி gains new dimensions and extensions, as pointed out above. To give just one example, மடலேறுதல் is extended to தலைவி also adding to her excessive pining (காமத்து மிகுதிறம்). An உரிப்பொருள் for the latter is பிரிவு (பாலை) (S பொருளியல் ***) when தலைவன் does not return at the promised season; நச்சினார்க்கினியர் points, in his commentary of the above sutra, to a specific situation of பாலை in which தலைவன் leaves தலைவி on account of the call from the chieftain to the battlefield and he could not promise to her in honesty that he would return. Since there is no promise, தோழி could not console தலைவி using the words of தலைவன் to assure her of any time of his return. With no hope to cling on, தலைவி loses control. Losing control of passion is a crucial ingredient of பெருந்திணை (and also of கைக்கிளை, when he threatens her with மடலேறுதல் as she is not responding to his expression of love) as is the public exhibition of his or her passion.

மடல் திறம், which is the behavior of choosing to ride on a horse (மா could refer to a donkey, which is the animal on which the punished man is made to ride with his body pointed with black and red dots (கரும்புள்ளி, செம்புள்ளி) in

order to enact a public spectacle) made of the sharp edged stems of palmyra fronds in a public square to demonstrate his passion for the girl and to compel her people to marry the girl to him. This is a behavior that suggests that it is a case of பெருந்திணை. This is exclusively a male behavior. The grammar of love excludes women from doing this (S 38): எத்திணை மருங்கினும் மகடூஉ மடன்மேல் பொற்புடை நெறிமை இன்மையான 'In any திணை, a woman riding a palmyra horse does not take place because it is not a glowing behavior for her'. The negative 'does not take place' is taken from the previous sutra, which says that a woman does not accompany her man when his பிரிவு (i.e. கலத்திற் பிரிவு) takes him to cross the seas, probably to seek wealth. (Since this sutra is to be understood in the specific context of பிரிவு to seek wealth, its implication that she could accompany him in பிரிவு on account of participating in a war (போர்) and going as a messenger (தூது). It should further be noted that these two sutras are not about injunction, coding a social practice, against a woman's travel to a far off place or public display of love, but they are to point to the nature of கூற்று in poetry and to say that there will not be a கூற்று of தலைவி in these two circumstances.

When தொல்காப்பியம் (பொருளதிகாரம் S 99, களவியல் S 11) describes the contexts where மடலேறுதல் is placed in a poem, all of them relate to தலைவன் performing it. இளம்பூரணர் endorses this gender exclusion (S 54, ஏறிய மடற்றிறம் தலைமகற்கே உரித்து), though in his times திருமங்கை ஆழ்வார் has தலைவி (devotee) on palmyra horse expressing their passion of love of தலைவன் (god) in his பெரிய திருமடல் and சிறிய திருமடல். Such a shift engenders the new genre of மடல் as a category of சிற்றிலக்கியம் (பிரபந்தம்).

திருக்குறள், which has six couplets that specifically mention மடல் in the chapter நாணுத் துறவுரைத்தல் 'speaking with abandoned shame', says in one couplet, echoing தொல்காப்பியம், that there is no greater virtue of being feminine than not (speaking of) riding a palmyra horse even when she

suffers from passion as large as the ocean (கடலன்ன காமம் உழந்தும் மடலேறாப் பெண்ணின் பெருந்தக்கது இல்). மடலேறுதல் is a literary device to express some kind of passion of love; scholars differ if it was an actual social practice (Zvelebil and Friedhelm Hardy claim it was). This literary device, however, has come to be grounded on a cultural conception of the modesty of Tamil women.

ஐந்திணை vs. கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை

Commentators make a distinction between actual ride on the palmyra horse (ஏறிய மடல் திறம்) and threatening to ride a palmyra horse (ஏறா மடல் திறம் (இளம்பூரணர் S 55, which may be called கூறிய மடல் திறம்). In the second one, தலைவன் threatens that he would ride the horse in the public square if his love is not accepted by her or her people (to consummate marriage). The threatening words are spoken in கைக்கிளை poems and the public declaration of love made (see above and below), but actually riding the horse happens in பெருந்திணை (இளம்பூரணர் ***).

There are 13 poems in the Sangam corpus (குறுந்தொகை 4, நற்றிணை 4, கலித்தொகை 5: வ. சுப. மாணிக்கம், தமிழ்க் காதல் (The Tamil concept of love); ம.பெ. சீனிவாசன், வைணவ இலக்கிய வகைகள்), which have மடல் கூற்று. All of them are spoken by தலைவன். The eight poems in குறுந்தொகை and நற்றிணை have speaking of threat to ride, not of the actual ride. This is similar to தலைவி speaking of her death if தலைவன் does not return or marry her. The significant point to note is that தலைவன் and தலைவி are in mutual love and so the poems would belong to a core திணை (which in all probability குறிஞ்சி). The question is if the threat to ride is a speech in a கைக்கிளை. The answer is yes, though தொல்காப்பியம் (S 53) does not mention it directly; it should be covered under தீமை in S 37 on கைக்கிளை. Actual ride (ஏறிய மடல் திறம்) is the speaking in பெருந்திணை. The phrase எத்திணை மருங்கினும் in S 38 (see above, if there were a textual

variation as எத்துணை மருங்கினும் 'however much', the reading would be straight forward: no matter how much her passion is she will not ride a palmyra horse) is problematic. இளம்பூரணர் reads திணை in this sutra to mean குலன் from its meaning of category and the whole sutra to mean this: the woman of any clan (or caste) will not ride the palmyra horse. If திணை is used in its common meaning of அகம் classification, the horse riding act may take place in any land. This would be a problem because this act in all probability takes place in குறிஞ்சி to have union with her in subsequent meetings after the first meeting or in marriage by overcoming the resistance of her people.

The above discussion would show that பெருந்திணை is about certain kinds of speaking (supporting the interpretation of குறிப்பு as 'suggestion' in the phrase பெருந்திணைக் குறிப்பு in the sutra (as also in கைக்கிளைக் குறிப்பு in the preceding sutra), as other திணைs are about other kinds of speaking. கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை are defined more explicitly in terms of speaking than ஐந்திணை. The speaking (கூற்று) in ஐந்திணை is elaborated in தொல்காப்பியம் with regard to களவு (குறிஞ்சி) and கற்பு (முல்லை, மருதம்) in களவியல் and கற்பியல் respectively. The speaking in பிரிவு (பாலை) is elaborated in அகத்திணையியல் itself in the context of giving the dramatis personae associated with பிரிவு.

இளம்பூரணர், however, interprets the term பெருந்திணை (S 54), not in terms of speaking but in terms of physical manifestation of love (மடலேறுதல்) or in terms of physical and emotional differences between the protagonists (which could be looked at as expressing the underlying emotions of them, which would be மெய்ப்பாடு (see above). These are different from ஐந்திணை in the sense that the match between the protagonists fails in பெருந்திணை. The protagonists may not match in their age physically (இளமைதீர் திறம்) and in the intensity of their love emotionally (காமத்து மிகுதிறம்). பெருந்திணை is also of deviations from the norms of speaking in ஐந்திணை. பெருந்திணை is called by him by the collective term

ஒவ்வாக் காமம் or பொருந்தாக் காமம் 'mismatched love'. He could not find citation poems from Sangam corpus except for மடலேறுதல் and காமத்து மிகுதிறம்.

இளம்பூரணர்'s primary criterion to define பெருந்திணை is the lack of match between him and her. With regard to age, it could be one is younger and the other is older. He explains இளமைதீர் திறம் in this way; he cites illustrative poems from புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா மாலை, since he probably did not find any in the Sangam corpus. One could argue that is not about love making between two who do not mismatch in age, but it is about love between two who are past their youth. (This is only one of three instances of இளமைதீர் திறம் for இளம்பூரணர்). அகம் continues through one's life when the four stages of life were not leading to secluded life (வானப்பிரஸ்தம்) did not figure in the theory of அகம். The older couple's language of love will show that they are past their youth. Even if words are not the குறிப்பு to suggest that a poem is of பெருந்திணை, it is physical appearance in இளமைதீர் திறம். குறிப்பு in காமத்து மிகுதிறம் may be relatively of more verbal cue than the other three பெருந்திணை situations. It is an empirical question if there are அகம் poems in the Sangam corpus in which தலைவன் and தலைவி are past their youth. The கலித்தொகை poem (மருதம் 29) of love between a dwarf and a hunchback may be a possible candidate. The reading of this poem answers of the ambivalence of commentators (see above) about calling this a poem of கைக்கிளை or பெருந்திணை. It is பெருந்திணை by the age of the protagonists. This may be said of the கலித்தொகை poem (குறிஞ்சி 26), also cited by இளம்பூரணர் (S 26), from the fact that the argument by the protagonists of injunctions of ethical treatises indicates their relative older age. In spite of these readings, however, the possibility cannot be ruled out that the anthologists left out the poems of இளமைதீர் திறம்.

A basic question is how கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை relate to ஐந்திணை. They are peripheral to, or at the boundaries of, ஐந்திணை, as indicated by their placement at both ends of the enumeration of திணைs, where ஐந்திணை is in the middle (and so is called நடுவண் ஐந்திணை ‘the central five திணைs’). They are also contrastive of ஐந்திணை; they are what ஐந்திணை are not. As pointed out above, the peripheral two are not equal to the central five in that the behavior (ஒழுக்கம்) of the peripheral two does not have the status of உரிப்பொருள். கைக்கிளை doesn’t even have the tag திணை attached to it. The behavior in them is subordinated to உரிப்பொருள், most commonly to the உரிப்பொருள் of குறிஞ்சி, but there are exceptions as பாலை (or முல்லை, its reverse mirrored dimension), as pointed out above. The two peripheral concepts are necessary to account for some of the poems in the Sangam corpus, most of them in கலித்தொகை; they cannot be brought under ஐந்திணை, where also கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை behaviors take place, because of the mismatch between தலைவன் and தலைவி. It means that the need for கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை to separate behaviors from ஐந்திணை arises because the way ஐந்திணை is defined ideally as true of perfectly matched தலைவன் and தலைவி. The peripheral two, however, were main-streamed theoretically and elaborated by the post-Sangam poets and their grammarians; this gave rise to new minor genres.

The later developments in the theory relate the pragmatics to the marriage system as conceived in the literary imagination of the Sanskrit tradition and a part of that system came to be practiced socially. The latter grammars equate the marriage placed within the ஐந்திணை schema with one kind of marriage named கந்தருவம் and they distribute the remaining seven kinds of marriage between கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை. Union by marriage comes to take the central place relegating to the status of one of the many the self-selected union between protagonists viz., இயற்கைப் புணர்ச்சி (also called தெய்வப் புணர்ச்சி: these two terms refer respectively to the union that is

naturally happening, that is, it is happening by the intervention of a superior force, which could be god or even fate; see இளம்பூரணர் ***, நச்சினார்க்கினியர் ***). Love in relation to the kinds of marriage is a social phenomenon and is explained in terms of human intervention, which might include parents.

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் interprets கைக்கிளைக் குறிப்பு and பெருந்திணைக் குறிப்பு as referring to two kinds of கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை. குறிப்புக் கைக்கிளை and குறிப்புப் பெருந்திணை are these two behaviors that might be suggestively exhibited in ஐந்திணை to achieve their goal of perfect marriage; they are suggestive in the sense that the behaviors are exhibited privately or to persuade one; the behaviors are not exhibited publicly or performed really. சிறப்புக் கைக்கிளை and சிறப்புப் பெருந்திணை are of elaborate kind and they are public performances, which are the kinds of marriages. However, நச்சினார்க்கினியர் reads குறிப்பு in S களவியல் 12 (முன்னைய மூன்றும் கைக்கிளைக் குறிப்பே) as not சிறப்பு (it is சிறப்பின்மை), while leaving un-interpreted the same word குறிப்பு in S 53 in அகத்திணையியல். This helps him to say that கைக்கிளை in this அகத்திணையியல் sutra is சிறப்பு, not the three marriage forms. (This contradicts his view that this is not சிறப்பு (S 53, his 50, see above), but he means that only pre-puberty கைக்கிளை is not சிறப்பு (அத்துணைச் சிறப்பின்று). This makes the relating the kinds of marriage with பெருந்திணை and கைக்கிளை conceptually incoherent. The only rationale for this thinking on the part of நச்சினார்க்கினியர், one could guess, is that the following களவியல் 13 about பெருந்திணை does not have the word குறிப்பு in it (பின்னர் நான்கும் பெருந்திணை பெறுமே). A theoretical explanation would be that நச்சினார்க்கினியர் places கைக்கிளை in களவு, which the tradition considers to be

quintessential of அகம் '(Tamil) love') and does not want to say it is not சிறப்பு in the sense of not being a good representative.

The love affair between him and her may become public knowledge when it becomes the subject of gossip or scandal (அலர் 'blooming (opening up like flowers)' கௌவை or கவ்வை 'make sound (like birds or animals; this words cognate in Kannada is *kappe*, which means 'frog'))'. This development from private to public is not பெருந்திணை because this is not by a voluntary action by the protagonists. Hence it falls under ஐந்திணை. தலைவி might pour out her pining for தலைவன் at the time of separation and this is recognized as one of speeches (கூற்று) of தலைவி (S களவியல் 19). This sutra lists situations when தலைவி speaks; one of them is when she has excessive passion, which is referred to காமம் சிறப்பினும் 'when the passion is pronounced'. This phrase is standardized into a technical term as காமக் கழிபடர் கிளவி 'Excessively expressed words of love' in இறையனார் அகப்பொருள் (S களவு 30). தலைவி pours herself out to a non-human thing such as a river (அகநானூறு 368), as a bird (நற்றிணை 70) etc. (Pouring out to a bird lays the foundation for the later தூது poems, though in Sangam poems தலைவி does not send a message but pours out her feeling to a dumb thing; furthermore, pouring out is not by தலைவன் whereas in தூது poems, he sends message to தலைவி). Talking to non-human things is different from தேறுதல் ஒழிந்த காமத்து மிகுதிறம் (S 54), which belongs to பெருந்திணை, though both are intended to lead the relationship to marriage. இறையனார் அகப்பொருள் makes this intention of marriage clear. The difference is that expressing excessive passion in ஐந்திணை is between தலைவி and her non-human addressee, as the commentators see it; it is not made public.

The eight kinds of marriage, which தொல்காப்பியம் mentions and attributes to the practices of the North (மறையோர் தேளம், S களவியல் 1), as they are named by commentators, are: பிரமம் 'giving a girl in marriage by parents

to a man adhering to the prescribed pursuit of learning', பிரசாபத்தியம் 'giving a girl in marriage by parents with payment of dowry', ஆரிடம் 'giving a girl in marriage by parents to a man seeking her with receipt of bride price', தெய்வம் 'giving a girl in marriage by parents to a man who performs Vedic rituals, கந்தருவம் 'a girl and a man meeting, falling in love and marrying', அசுரம் marrying a girl winning a competition set as a condition for marrying her, இராக்கதம் 'marrying a girl by abducting her', பைசாசம் 'marrying (having sex with) a girl who is not conscious. One can see a new way of thinking about love in a marriage that is forced in one way or another. This reflects the way of thinking in Kamasutra. A theoretical shift that is obtained from the explanations of commentators is this. The way of treating அகம் shifts from spontaneous love leading to marriage to love by (if not after) marriage.

Of the eight kinds of marriage, கந்தருவம் is the middle one (as the ஐந்திணை, but the peripherals are expanded) and is equated by தொல்காப்பியம் (§ களவியல் 1) and its commentators with களவு (which falls under குறிஞ்சி thus reducing the five திணைs of the classical அகம் theory into one). The first four kinds of marriage are brought under கைக்கிளை because the involvement of the girl is nil and the last three kinds of marriage are brought under பெருந்திணை because the limited choice and absence of choice for the girl and they are also forced in one way or another. (There are however literary works in the later period that speak of the girl falling in love with a man whom she has not seen in person (காட்சி is imagined in a dream or in some other way) and getting to choose and marry him in a சுயம்வரம் (as தமயந்தி marries நளன் in நள வெண்பா and நைடதம்)). This is the stuff of காவியம், not of சங்கச் செய்யுள். This instantiates mainstreaming of பெருந்திணை.

இளம்பூரணர் (also நச்சினார்க்கினியர்) treats (§ பொருளியல் 41) பெருந்திணை (this is நச்சினார்க்கினியர்'s குறிப்புப் பெருந்திணை) as a deviation (வழு) within ஐந்திணை. By extension,

other marriages are deviation from கந்தருவம். Deviation is from the norm. The purpose of the பெருந்திணை sutra (54) is to legitimize the deviation (வழுக்காத்தல் or வழுவமைதி). This sutra makes பெருந்திணை poems legitimate literary creations by this special provision. The commentators extend the grammatical concepts of வழு and வழுவமைதி of the ordinary language to poetic concepts. வழு in the linguistic grammar is one kind of deviation from the norm or the general (the other two kinds of deviations are மயக்கம் and புறநடை) to the general rules and வழுவமைதி is a new rule to bring the deviation within the grammar. The same is true of பெருந்திணை regarding the poetic grammar. காமத்து மிகுதிறம், for example, is out of the norm (வழு) but is legitimate. This extension of a linguistic concept comes from a view that poetry is normative, but its grammar would admit some deviations into its orbit. This betrays a deductive approach to the grammar of poetry on the part of the commentators. This approach expands and brings more of the norms into exceptions; i.e. more of situations in ஐந்திணை to பெருந்திணை, as seen in புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா. One of the new norms is woman's modesty, which includes concealing sexual feelings. Even expressing these feelings by தலைவி in private is categorized as பெருந்திணை behavior. பெருந்திணை in புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா (S 16, 17) lists situations of தலைவி speaking (கூற்று or கிளவி) to exemplify பெருந்திணை, all of which could be found under one or other of ஐந்திணை in the Sangam corpus.

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் reads பொருளியல் S 40 differently from இளம்பூரணர் and cites கலித்தொகை poem நெய்தல் 25 for this sutra (and explains in his கலித்தொகை commentary of the same poem) to show that this poem is an instance of காமத்து மிகுதிறம் because தலைவி exceeds modesty (மடமை இறந்த '(one that) crosses modesty'. இளம்பூரணர் (S 54) reads மிக்க காமத்து மிடல் in the sutra (along with இளமைதீர் திறம்) in alignment with the பெருந்திணை of

புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா மாலை (S 16, 17), which brings ஐந்திணை situations to பெருந்திணை. This alignment of ஐந்திணை with பெருந்திணை on the basis of absence of modesty is a great literary shift. This is the likely times when the near synonyms in Sangam poems நட்பு, கேண்மை, காதல், காமம், whose core meaning is 'relationship', diverge in meaning to refer respectively to 'friendship, kinship, romantic love and sexual passion'. The love of a woman with god, which exceeds the boundary of modesty as it is conceived in this period, will probably be placed under பெருந்திணை, rather than under ஐந்திணை, by the theoreticians. பெருந்திணை changes its status of a peripheral திணை to have the status of a most prevalent திணை.

To illustrate this point of shift in the status of பெருந்திணை, பொழுது கண்டு இரங்கல் 'pining when the season (e.g. evening in the rainy season) is sighted' in S 16 of புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா மாலை on பெண்பால் பெருந்திணை and பருவம் மயங்கல் in S 17 on இருபால் பெருந்திணை. குறுந்தொகை 66 is an example of the latter. It is a speech of தோழி addressing தலைவி, who mistakes the blooming of கொன்றை to indicate the arrival of the rainy season, to tell her that it was the unseasonal rain that fooled the கொன்றை. This poem belongs to முல்லை of ஐந்திணை in குறுந்தொகை. இளம்பூரணர் cites the verse cited in புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா மாலை for பருவ மயங்கல் as an instance of பெருந்திணை. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் (பொருளியல் S 41) takes such a poem to illustrate a situation of காமத்து மிகுதிறம் and therefore an instance of பெருந்திணை, when தோழி could not console தலைவி because தலைவன் left to fight a war and did not give assuring words of return because of his possible death and so தோழி could not use his words in earnest to console தலைவி that leaves her to pour out her sexual desire. Similarly, a poem which is about தலைவி going in the woods in the night to the place marked for meeting தலைவன் is a ஐந்திணை poem under குறிஞ்சி.

Such a poem is considered a பெருந்திணை poem under the situation named இரவுத் தலைச் சேறல் 'going to the night joint' in புறப்பொருள் வெண்பாமாலை (S 16). இளம்பூரணர் cites the same poem from this work in his illustration of மிக்க காமத்து மிடல் mentioned as an instance of பெருந்திணை in தொல்காப்பியம் S 54. This is because this risky journey is in violation of the modesty of a woman.

The fourth situation in பெருந்திணை is மிக்க காமத்து மிடல் (S 54). This is different from the third situation, which is காமத்து மிகு திறம். இளம்பூரணர் illustrates this with poems from பெருந்திணைப் படலம் of புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா மாலை and not from the Sangam corpus. This is true to his alignment of his understanding of அகம் with that of புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா மாலை, i.e. to the understanding of அகம் in his times. மிக்க காமத்து மிடல்² suggests that this particular situation of பெருந்திணை is outside ஐந்திணை (may be even outside அகம்). மிடல் means 'strength', which may be extended to have the meaning 'force, violence'. This is the reading of this phrase by நச்சினார்க்கினியர் (S 54, his 51, his gloss is வலிந்து புணர்தல் 'sex by violent means'). Then மிக்க காமத்து மிடல் would refer to making love by force or violent means against the will of the woman. (In கைக்கிளை, the woman who does not show interest is not forced into sex or marriage). In the commentators way of thinking, மிக்க காமத்து மிடல் would relate to the last two kinds of marriage known as இராக்கதம் 'marriage by abduction' (this could be non-consensual on the part of the woman or consensual when her parents object to the marriage while she wants it, which is உடன்போக்கு by force) and பைசாசம் 'violent non-consensual sex'. These two behaviors are manifestations of excessive sexual passion (மிக்க காமம்). மிக்க காமத்து மிடல் is the behavior of தலைவன் whereas காமத்து மிகுதிறம் is the behavior of தலைவி. பெருந்திணை may be understood as 'excess behavior (in love making)';

பெரும் has the meaning 'excessive' in compounds such as பெருந்துயரம் 'excessive distress'.

Unlike ஐந்திணை, கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை do not have any நிமித்தம் allied to them. They have more than one manifestation but that they are not நிமித்தம் (called சார்புரி by Balasundaram) in the sense that they are not enabling or accompanying behaviors of the main behavior. They are different manifestations of the same excess behavior. ஏறிய மடல் திறம் and காமத்து மிகுதிறம் of பெருந்திணை are signs of happening in கைக்கிளை, but not actual happenings. They are warnings in கைக்கிளை in order respectively to persuade தலைவி to accept his love and தலைவன் to return as promised. இளமைதீர் திறம் and மிக்க காமத்து மிடல் are, respectively, about தலைவி coming of age to accept his love and forced புணர்ச்சி when தலைவி does not accept his love for ever. Thus the பெருந்திணை features play a role in one way or another in altering the unresponsive behavior of her (the first and the third), of him (the third), and using violence (the fourth).

This kind of intrinsic relationship between கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை (S 55) reinforces the relation between the two discussed earlier. This sutra may be read as saying that four manifestations of பெருந்திணை are relevant (உரித்து) to கைக்கிளை also. It becomes necessary to find feature common to கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை rather than simply saying that they are peripheral to ஐந்திணை and different from it. This is particularly necessary when பெருந்திணை is expanded and many situations that would be called situations of பெருந்திணை as seen in புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா மாலை and இளம்பூரணர்'s commentary (see above). பெருந்திணை has changed from being in the periphery during their times. இளம்பூரணர் (S 1) maintains the position that in the real world பெருந்திணை is in the majority and this gets to be reflected in the 'reanalysis' of the ஐந்திணை poems. No actual reanalysis is done, but many of the situations that will fit

ஐந்திணை poems are defining situations for பெருந்திணை poems. This is made possible by evaluating the poems on the measurement of lack of modesty of தலைவி (such as pining during prolonged separation) or stoic character of தலைவன் (such as dropping his departure on his own).

இளம்பூரணர்'s reading of S 55 reflects this different way of looking at அகம் poetry as organized in terms of situations rather than behaviors (உரி). The situations are tied to speaking (கிளவி or கூற்று). So does his reading of S 54 with regard to மிக்க காமத்து மிடல். He includes, as citation, verses from the காமத்துப் பால் of திருக்குறள் (S மெய்ப்பாட்டியல் 22, which lists மெய்ப்பாடு of பெருந்திணை) making them பெருந்திணை poems.

The four manifestations of பெருந்திணை true of கைக்கிளை in the following sense for இளம்பூரணர். The prior stages of the four பெருந்திணை manifestations are true of கைக்கிளை. He visualizes the four prior stages in terms of four situations represented by four கிளவிs . The prior stage is characterized as the absence of the manifestation, i.e. the onset of the manifestation is not there yet. His equations, drawing four from the nine of ஆண்பாற் கூற்றுs in a கைக்கிளை situation that are listed in புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா மாலை, are: ஏறா மடல் திறம் is வெளிப்பட இரத்தல் 'beseeching her to respond', இளமை தீராத் திறம் is நலம் பாராட்டல் 'praising her youthful beauty to get her shed her non-response', காமத்து மிகாத் திறம் is புணரா இரக்கம் 'self-pity from not having union as she is unresponsive' and மிக்க காமத்தின் மாறாகாத் திறம் is நயப்புரைத்தல் 'explicit seeking of union with her, when she is still not responding'. All these are a sub-set of கிளவிs of தலைவன் to break the silence of the uninterested and unresponsive தலைவி. The selection of a sub-set of four கிளவிs out of nine is arbitrary to match the four manifestations of பெருந்திணை. Or the list may have a

growing list of possible கிளவிய் of தலைவன், from which poets or commentators choose the ones of their liking.

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் makes a different selection but shares the view of using situations to explain the overlap in பெருந்திணை and கைக்கிளை. His four situations are காட்சி 'first sighting', ஐயம் 'vacillating about her identity', தெரிதல் 'deciding on her identity (as a human, not an angel) and தேறல் 'getting clear in his mind about his love for her' (the last one is not in the list of புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா மாலை). நச்சினார்க்கினியர் makes this selection because he considers these four are necessary steps in good love (i.e. ஐந்திணை love; நற்காமத்துக்கு இன்றியமையாது are his words). He needs to take this position because he takes கைக்கிளை of களவு is superior (சிறப்பு, see above) to the first three forms marriage with which கைக்கிளை comes to be identified). Another significant point about this selection of நச்சினார்க்கினியர் is that these four would qualify to be நிமித்தம்s as they qualify to be கிளவிய். The relation between நிமித்தம் and கிளவி needs examination from theoretical and developmental points of view.

The imaginative and the worldly

The description so far is about அகம் poetry as formulated in the chapter on அகத்திணை, where theorization is based on love behavior and the sentiments associated with it (உரி). It is formulated differently in the chapters on களவு and கற்பு, whose approach is to have the situations in love-making and the speak (கூற்று or கிளவி) in those situations as the foundation for theorization. The situations may be organized as a narrative sequence, which makes அகம் poetry a drama with scenes composed independently but arranged in a progressive order. This develops into the literary genre called கோவை later. (Takahashi (p.221) argues that the sequencing of the situations can be traced to தொல்காப்பியம் itself; களவியல் S 24, for example, gives a long list of situations where தோழி speaks and one could see a chronological

sequence of situations from their order in the list). This approach to அகம் poems as a narrative sequence is different from the approach அகம் poems as standalone poems (or cameos).

இளம்பூரணர்'s reading of sutra 56 is amenable to the sequence understanding of அகம் poems. But his reading could be understood differently also, as it is done by scholars. The difference depends on the interpretation of the phrases நாடக வழக்கு and உலகியல் வழக்கு in the sutra.

இளம்பூரணர் defines the former as சுவைபட வருவனவெல்லாம் ஓரிடத்து வந்தனவாகத் தொகுத்துக் கூறுதல் 'to compose collating at one place all that is tasteful'. This could be understood as referring to the narrative sequence of scenes in a way that keeps one's interest. The example of நாடகம் he gives illustratively is a sequence (ஒருங்கு வந்தன): two people, a man and a woman, of perfect match meet in a secluded place away from their people, have sex with no one sanctioning it nor fighting over it, follow through the steps of clandestine love as prescribed (இலக்கண வகையான்) and end in marriage.

இளம்பூரணர் is understood as referring to the view of literature that it should be about the best of things (Rm. Periyakaruppan p.97). With regard to அகம் poems, it is about the perfect description even of desertion, infidelity and such things. It is bettering even ugly things. Perfection comes from the ideal settings like the five dimensions of love being described as situated in five ideal landscapes and timescapes. Ugly things like the above find a place in poetry because they represent the actual happenings in the real world (உலகியல் வழக்கு). அகம் poetry is a combination of the perfect that is imagined and the real that is observed. The two phrases நாடக வழக்கு and உலகியல் வழக்கு in the sutra are understood in this reading not as two conjoined literary practices, but as the first one elevating the second one to a sublime level in poetry. Poetry transforms உலகியல் வழக்கு into நாடக வழக்கு.

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் endorses the conjoined reading of the two phrases to explain the dual aspect of அகம் poetry, viz., being imaginative (புனைந்துரை) and being worldly (உலக வழக்கு). நாடக வழக்கு refers to the practice of making up thing; உலகியல் வழக்கு refers to the natural practice of the world. He, however, makes this distinction go farther than இளம்பூரணர். He specifies that the making up or imagination in அகம் poetry is the setting up of முதல், கரு and உரி and the harmony between them. This is consistent with his view (S ***) that in the real world உரி is not land-specific. Land specificity is poetic imagination. In other words, it is a literary theoretical construct. To give an example, பாலை 'desert', a land non-existent in the Tamil land, is a theoretical construct to foreground பிரிவு 'separation' but is grounded in முல்லை 'pastoral land' and குறிஞ்சி 'hilly land' during a period of drought. The idea of imaginative construct in literary theory equally should apply to the fixity of association of the கருப்பொருள் of the lands and of the time, one of the two முதல் பொருள், with உரிப்பொருள்.

One could try to understand the theoretical concepts comparatively in relation to similar concepts in Sanskrit literary theory. சுவை is used as a synonym of ரசம் in Tamil and so the question may be raised if சுவைபட in இளம்பூரணர்'s interpretation above relates this sutra to ரசம் as a technical term. Other questions would be if நாடக வழக்கு relate, at least partially, to அலங்காரம் (அணி) or வக்யரோத்தி in particular; if நெறி (புலனெறி) in the sutra relates in any way to ரீதி in Sanskrit literary theory (தண்டியலங்காரம் uses நெறி as the technical equivalent of ரீதி). Such comparisons have the presumption that they are theoretically similar a priori. Such a presumption would hamper the understanding of these theoretical terms in their own terms in the Tamil literary context and would preempt the questions if these words are used in a technical sense or in the ordinary language sense. For example, is சுவை used by இளம்பூரணர் in the ordinary language sense of

ருசி or in the technical sense of ரசம்? Comparison comes later after an independent understanding of the things compared.

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் points to the complex relationship between imagination and realism; between free flying and being grounded. His example of both being present in a poem is ஐங்குறுநூறு 11 (மருதம்), which is the speak of தலைவி to தோழி: we, wanting to avoid his getting blame, say that he, who is from the village where purslane creeper grown inside home climbs on to the bamboo outside, is a good man, but my wearing shoulders tell otherwise. In this poem, the set up (நாடகம்) is the land of infidelity and the relation between a creeper and the bamboo, but her sublime anger at his betrayal is a worldly feeling (உலகியல்). Even the natural thing like the creeper climbing on to the bamboo is termed as imagined because its mention in the poem comes from the imagination of the poet. The human relations and emotions that are natural, on the other hand, are real.

There are many aspects of the real in a poem, but they are not beyond real (Shulman about later poetry). That the people of a land (not any other கருப்பொருள், for example) are the protagonists (தலைவர்) of an அகம் is one aspect of the reality aspect of the poem, according to நச்சினார்க்கினியர். அகம் poems are not allegories.

There could be a total absence of set up (முதல், கரு, உரி) in a poem. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் cites குறுந்தொகை 167, categorized as a முல்லை poem by its உரி alone, viz., இல்லிருத்தல் but not in the context of பிரிவு, to illustrate this: the nurse mother reports to the birth mother of தலைவி, who was just married and had left home to live with her husband, that her girl's face brightened up in happiness when the husband praised the taste of the meal she had cooked after toiling with her tender fingers that had become red from kneading the curds and with her dark eyes filled with smoke from the hearth and with her clothes soiled from the cooking hands. This poem is

a straightforward description of a home scene to illustrate the relation between the wife, her husband and her mother without any set up or frill.

Note that this poem has உவமம் (காந்தள் மெல்விரல், குவளை உண்கண்), but it does not make the poem to have நாடக வழக்கு, which is புனைந்துரை according to நச்சினார்க்கினியர். புனைந்துரை does not mean 'imaginative or aesthetic expression' as it excludes வெளிப்படை உவமம். It does include உள்ளுறை உவமம் as the ஐங்குறுநூறு poem above given to illustrate நாடக வழக்கு shows. Hence நாடக வழக்கு is a poetic construct of முதல் and கரு to reinforce the meaning of உரி

For நச்சினார்க்கினியர், புறம் poems are only about real happenings in the world or in the minds of the people in the world (உலகியல் வழக்கு). It is clear that நாடக வழக்கு is not about poetic imagination; புறம் poems are full of such imaginations. But these are about real people and their thoughts and actions and they are described without any set up like in the அகம் poems. In other words, புறம் poems do not have the prop of முதல், கரு and உரி.

அகம் and புறம் do have உரி, i.e. themes of human actions, thoughts and emotions. When நச்சினார்க்கினியர் includes உரி in the set up, it is not the theme per se but it is about associating the theme with முதல் and கரு, which is present in அகம் poems but not present in புறம் poems. This contrasts these two differently themed genres of poetry. When நச்சினார்க்கினியர் claims that புறம் poetry is poetry of உலகியல் வழக்கு he means that the themes happen in the real world with real people. They may have names (S 57) and historical presence, unlike அகம் poems. அகம் poetry is a poetry that has நாடக வழக்கு to prop up உலகியல் வழக்கு. These poems are neither biographical, nor historical. They are about love, not about lovers.

One could raise a question whether அகம் poems could just be a நாடகம் 'set up', which would be poems of முதல் and கரு but the உரி is inferred through treating the description as உள்ளுறை உவமம் (see above the discussion under ஒட்டணி). நச்சினார்க்கினியர் does not entertain this possibility. For him, probably, உலகியல் through inference alone does not make an அகம் poem. He reads the phrase மக்கள் நுதலிய அகனைந்திணையும் 'the five behaviors (திணை in the sense of ஒழுக்கம்)' in the following sutra (S 56) as reiterating the fact that அகம் poems speak of people explicitly.

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் talks about the limits of imagining or set ups and refutes இறையனார்'s position in his அகப்பொருள், which is that imagining or set ups could be from nothing (இல்லது) in the world. He probably wants to accommodate mythological poems. நச்சினார்க்கினியர்'s counter argument is twofold: இல்லது 'nothing (that which is not in one's sensual experience)' cannot generate மெய்ப்பாடு in the listeners and so enjoyment; this would obviate (ஒழித்தல்) the need to mention உலகியல் வழக்கு in the sutra. He has no place for magical realism in அகம் poetry! Nevertheless, நச்சினார்க்கினியர் finds it acceptable to exaggerate a bit the reality (... நல்லோர்க்கு உள்ளனவற்றில் சிறிது இல்லனவும் கூறுதலன்றி, யாண்டும் எஞ்ஞான்றும் இல்லன கூறார்... 'a poet can say some untrue positive things about the people of good disposition, but cannot say untrue things every time and everywhere (i.e. cannot have totally fabricated characters)'). வழக்கு in the phrase நாடக வழக்கு restrains any unbounded imaginary description of people by an அகம் poet.

He, however, allows the generation of the universal from the particular. That is, உலகியல் வழக்கு does not have to have the restrictive sense of empirical attestation. He shows that the particulars in the poems represent the universal. The universal is not a theoretical construct like the நாடக வழக்கு. It is உலக வழக்கு, but abstracted. In his words, நாடக வழக்கு என்பன

புணர்ச்சி உலகிற்குப் பொதுவாயினும், மலை சார்ந்து நிகழும் என்றும், காலம் வரைந்தும், உயர்ந்தோர் காமத்துக்கு உரியன வரைந்தும், மெய்ப்பாடு தோன்றப் பிறவாறும் கூறும் செய்யுள் வழக்கம். நாடக வழக்கு refers to செய்யுள் வழக்கு 'poetic practice', which is, for example, the practice of describing the universal union (புணர்ச்சி) between a man and a woman as happening between two individuals in the hilly region, in prescribed season and time, in terms of how it happens among the best of the people (உயர்ந்தோர் காமம்) and through the appearance of மெய்ப்பாடு in individuals; this is in spite of the fact that union is universal (புணர்ச்சி உலகிற்குப் பொது) geographically and socially and emotionally. உலகியல் வழக்கு, mentioned as one of the two characteristics of அகம் poetry, is about the universal truth that is represented in the specifics of the world that are used in poetry.

The word வழக்கு is used three times in the sutra. It means 'that which is in practice'. This practice is taken in Tamil literary theory as the practice of உயர்ந்தோர், whose worldly practice is உலகியல் வழக்கு. This is clear from the sutra மரபியல் 92: வழக்கெனப்படுவது உயர்ந்தோர் மேற்றே, நிகழ்ச்சி அவர்கட்டாகலான 'practice is that of 'higher' people since they are the subject of description (in poetry)'. Hence உலகியல் வழக்கு is உயர்ந்தோர் உலகியல் வழக்கு. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் takes this to be the Vedic practice (வேத வழக்கு) in S பொருளியல் 21, his 23), for which there is no indication in the above மரபியல் sutra. When this practice is represented in poetry, உலகியல் வழக்கு is superior to நாடக வழக்கு. He goes beyond the context of S 56 and claims that the poetry that describes the Vedic practice is superior (உலகியல் சிறத்தல்) to the poetry that describes the அகம், which is uniquely defined by நாடக வழக்கு. He however pin down the earthiness of உலகியல் by grounding the protagonists to the five lands, as the theory requires (அவ்வந் நிலத்து மக்களே

தலைவராயக்கால் அவை உலகியலேயாம்; அவை refers to உயர்ந்தோர் கிளவி)

இளம்பூரணர் also, in his reading of S பொருளியல் 21, goes beyond defining அகம் in contrast to புறம். He frames the literature in terms of அறம், பொருள், இன்பம். The poetry that describes the உலகியல் வழக்கு that relates to அறம் and பொருள் (in consonance with his extension of poetic content in S 1) is superior to the poetry that describes இன்பம் (i.e. அகம்). He does not extend this reading of உலகியல் வழக்கு, as நச்சினார்க்கினியர் does, but the implication could not be denied. Regarding his reading of S பொருளியல் 21, his intension is to include அறம் and பொருள் as the themes of poetry using the argument that they relate to உயர்ந்தோர் உலகியல் வழக்கு and description of உலகியல் வழக்கு is one of the two dimensions of poetry.

The poems need not mention the specifics explicitly. பாடல் சான்ற புலனெறி வழக்கம் ‘poetic convention that spells the poem’ is a description for அகப்பொருள் in the sutra. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் gets (by the உத்தி called இலேசு) the additional meaning of பாடல் சாலாத from the restrictive modifier phrase பாடல் சான்ற (as he did with காமம் சாலாத to get காமம் சான்ற (S 53)) by the logic that the specific mention of restriction implies that the opposite of it is also true). உலகியல் வழக்கு may be said or unsaid in a poem. The example for the latter (பாடலுள் அமையாதன) is this. கலித்தொகை 104 (முல்லைக்கலி, see above) describes men fighting the bull (ஏறு தழுவுதல்) as a கருப்பொருள் of முல்லை. உலகியல் வழக்கு is the custom that the girl gets to marry the man who subdues the bull. But this is not said in the poem. Because of the knowledge of this உலகியல் வழக்கு, the reader or listener of this poem would understand that the bull fight takes place during களவு (கந்தருவம்) and leads to marriage by winning a competition (அசுரம்) and so understands

that this poem has an element of கைக்கிளை in the sense that the marriage (வரைந்து கோடல்) is contingent on winning the bull fight. Only with this understanding the practice of the world of ஆயர், the singing at the end of this poem about crushing the scandal in the village about the களவு would make sense. This is a way of structuring the poem and understanding it from the knowledge of a worldly practice that is not mentioned in the poem. That is, உலகியல் வழக்கு may be unsaid but it is in any அகம் poem.

A more straightforward understanding of பாடல் சான்ற would be that the poetic convention selects some aspects (not all) of அகம் to be included in அகம் poetry. That is, the அகம் poems in the Sangam corpus do not exhaust all love themes but describe the ones selected to make செய்யுள் by the literary convention. The themes of the poems in the corpus have a status similar to பாடல் பெற்ற தலம்! The significance of the poetic sanction of selected love themes will be clear when compared with the broader array of love themes in Kamasutra, Satyasayi and புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா மாவை.

அகம் vs. புறம்

அகம் poems have another special property, which is that they have a metrical language that is not shared by other literary genres of the Sangam period. ஆசிரியம் is the metrical language used commonly for the themes of both அகம் and புறம். The two meters specific to அகம் themes are கலி and பரி, which are also more suitable for musical performance (S 56) . This performance aspect relates to the fact that மெய்ப்பாடு is closely integrated with அகம் poems. நச்சினார்க்கினியர்'s observation that கலிப்பாட்டு prefers the themes of கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை, which are more pronounced in உலகியல் வழக்கு among the அகம் poems (கலி...கைக்கிளை, பெருந்திணையாகிய உலகியலே பற்றிய புலனெறி வழக்கின் காமம் பற்றி வரும்...). The two are, however, a minority (சிறுபான்மை) in the அகம் poems of the Sangam corpus (which

changes later as seen from புறப்பொருள் வெண்பா மாலை, as shown above). Since the preferred meter for கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை is கலிப்பா, this meter is marked for the presence of உலகியல் வழக்கு (i.e. the presence of நாடக வழக்கு (set up of முதல், கரு, உரி) is less marked in கலிப்பா). The twin facts of performance suitability of கலி meter and its preference for உலகியல் வழக்கு reinforces the fact the நாடகம் in நாடக வழக்கு is not about performance or drama. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் further points out that பரிபாட்டு has only உலகியல் வழக்கு (i.e. has no நாடக வழக்கு, like some அகம் poems are, see above) and that there is a special relationship of பரிபாட்டு with devotional poems (தேவபாணி). Devotional poems are noted for their musicality. The theme of devotional poems is the extension of the theme of love poems and hence is included under the meter specified for அகம் poems.

The preferred correlation between the meter and the theme of the verse described above is generally true of the Sangam corpus. But the grammar (தொல்காப்பியம்: செய்யுளியல்), when it lists four kinds of metrical forms (S 1362, ஆசிரியம் வஞ்சி, வெண்பா and கலி), says, in the next sutra (S1363), that all four meters are suitable of the three themes of அறம், பொருள் and இன்பம்; the first two are the recast of the theme of புறம். This same chapter on prosody earmarks கலி for singing the praise of gods (S***), but empirically this is not the preferred meter of bhakti poems. Thus, the grammatical sanction and the empirical preference are not in line.

Another difference between and புறம் is in indexicality (S 57). The dramatis personae of அகம் poems are not named; they cannot refer (சுட்டி) to a unique person in the world. இளம்பூரணர் restricts this requirement to தலைமகன், but நச்சினார்க்கினியர் rightly includes all dramatis personae based on Sangam poems. This is true not only the humans but also of நிலம்; நிலம் of a poem is not indexed to a specific village or town or kingdom. அகம் poems are defined by the absence of indexicality, and so historicity, in

them. They are not located in identifiable persons or lands. Their identification is generic as the man of the hills, which இளம்பூரணர் calls பொதுப்பெயர் (S 57) or the land of hills,

The differentiation in naming the protagonists in அகம் and புறம் is not just a matter of categorization of a poem under அகம் genre or புறம். Indexicality has theoretical significance. It differentiates the literary genre that is about the real world and so about the actions of real people and the values of them to live by (புறம்) from the literary genre that is about impersonalized and stylized experience of conjugal love. Nevertheless, classification by the presence or absence of names is taken algorithmically to identify the திணை of a poem by commentators. நச்சினார்க்கினியர், picking on the fleeting reference to the neem flower, the insignia of Pandyas, argues that நெடுநல்வாடை is a புறம் poem. One could compare the significance of indexicality to the taxonomic and theoretical significance of கருப்பொருள் and the lands they are situated in அகம் poetry discussed above. கருப்பொருள் and its land (their constructed or choreographed nature (of நாடகம்)) are not just for categorizing a poem into one of the five lands and the திணை associated with them. They are also to enrich the meaning of உரி through உள்ளுறை உவமம், which is their theoretical significance.

A question arises as to what constitutes அகம் given the ambivalent position of கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை in it. S 57 mentions only ஐந்திணை, which excludes கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை that are in the periphery in the theory of அகம். இளம்பூரணர் includes them in his reading of the next sutra (58) in the category of absent indexicality. For நச்சினார்க்கினியர், their exclusion in S 57 means that the absence of naming or indexicality is not absolute for கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை. There could be poems of these two which have names of people and place. But his illustrative poems for this are not from the Sangam corpus, but are from காப்பியம், specifically an unsourced Ramayana text where Rama, Sita and Mithila are mentioned. This

exemplifies கைக்கிளை, as Sita longs for yet unseen Rama, who just entered the capital. This is not the கைக்கிளை of Sangam poetry, which attributes unresponsiveness only to தலைவி whereas in the citation verse தலைவன் could not respond and there is no காட்சி of தலைவி for தலைவன் to initiate expressing his love.

The same is the case with the பெருந்திணை poem that gives the name of தலைவி (பாண்டியன் மடமகள்) and தலைவன் (விசயன்), which is cited by நச்சினார்க்கினியர். This text is also unsourced.

It is possible to read this sutra (57) in this way. ஐந்திணை poems are about the people (மக்கள் நுதலிய 'which address people'). கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை may include non-humans (In the scheme of நச்சினார்க்கினியர், they are நரகர் and தேவர்). The love of people (women in particular) towards them could be non-responding (கைக்கிளை) and excessive passion (பெருந்திணை), specifically relating to தேவர் in both cases. The case of marriage by abduction, for example, may relate to நரகர் (who include அசுரர்). These protagonists are usually named. The border-sitting nature of கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை between human love and divine love or between natural love and forced love sets them apart from ஐந்திணை. What sets them apart includes naming of the protagonists.

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் points out intriguingly that the absence of indexicality is not true of நாடக வழக்கு (நாடகவழக்குப் பற்றி விலக்கியது 'this sutra excludes நாடக வழக்கு from this characteristic'). Here he seems to mean dramatic practice by நாடக வழக்கு. In his reading of the next sutra, where he says that there could be two protagonists in புறத்திணை and extends this characteristic to கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை, he mentions that this is a characteristic of நாடக வழக்கு (நாடக வழக்கில் உளது 'this is found in drama'). Here he contrasts the dramatic and poetic forms of அகம். This has implication to the manifestation of மெய்ப்பாடு in a poem

and in its performance, which is a movement from generic, nameless characters to specific, named characters.

The above deliberations by நச்சினார்க்கினியர் suggest a theoretical migration of கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை from அகம் to அகப்புறம் to புறம், from being a definitive category in அகம் to an ambivalent category between அகம் and புறம் to a definitive category in புறம். This correlates with the migration of literary themes from the Sangam themes.

The boundary between அகம் and புறம் is solidly drawn in theory and practice. The last sutra in அகத்திணையியல் takes up the question of this division. இளம்பூரணர் and நச்சினார்க்கினியர் read this sutra differently. For இளம்பூரணர், this sutra is about reinforcing the fact that கைக்கிளை and பெருந்திணை indeed belong to அகம் and the protagonists of them are not named either. For நச்சினார்க்கினியர், this sutra is about the fact that புறப் பாடல் is different from அகப் பாடல். Among the other differences, புறப் பாடல் may have more than one protagonist in a poem ((which, for example, describes two kings fighting in a war or the allies in a war,); புறநானூறு 158 mentions the seven munificent patrons (வள்ளல்), as pointed out by நச்சினார்க்கினியர்)), but அகப்பாடல் does not. He finds an exception in கலித்தொகை (முல்லை) 101, in which a group of pleasure seeking men and women go to a grove seeking fun after the bull fight is stopped when the bulls were exhausted and the men were wounded. Desolate தலைவி is consoled by her friend that when the bull fight is resumed her man will subdue the bull unlike the other fallen men and that she encountered good omen for his victory. The group of men and women who seek pleasure are not the protagonists; they are பொது மகளிர். They are in the poem for the contrast with the தலைவி deprived of that pleasure. This is not a அகம் poem that exemplifies multiple protagonists. There is no exception to the characteristic of அகம் poems that they do not have more than a single protagonist, male or

female in a poem. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் probably has in mind the later காப்பியம் such as சிலப்பதிகாரம், where there are two lead women and சீவகசிந்தாமணி, where there are eight wives (types of marriage come under அகம் for him, see above).

In the மருதம் poems of Sangam, there are two women (தலைவி vs இற்பரத்தை or சேரிப்பரத்தை) in relation to தலைவன். But there is a crucial difference in that the speaker of a poem is only one and so is the listener. There are no collective speakers and the collective listeners are only the kin or the village folks, who are not protagonists. அகம் poems are about dual relationship and not about three-some relationship. There is no triangular love in Sangam poems!

A different reading of this sutra gives an answer to the question whether the boundary line between அகம் and புறம் is impenetrable. That is, whether there is திணைமயக்கம் at the higher level between அகத்திணை and புறத்திணை. The answer to the question is that a poem may be set in அகம் conventions but, if the protagonists are real people identifiable by name, it is a புறம் poem with அகம் theme. On the other hand, when the name of a person or place of the real world is found in a அகம் poem, it could only be in a simile at the most. குறுந்தொகை 19 is a மருதம் poem, where a historical person எவ்வி (whose munificence is praised after his death in a battlefield in புறநானூறு 223) is mentioned in a simile: தலைவன்'s heart is empty when தலைவி becomes a stranger to him after his infidelity, like the barren head of impoverished பாணர் with no decorative flowers after the death of எவ்வி.

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் notes that the historical names, if mentioned, are often collective names like பாணர் in plural. He further points out that பாணன் is also a கருப்பொருள் (i.e. மக்கள்) of மருதம், a land in அகத்திணை. அகநானூறு 1, a பாலை poem, about தலைவி, who loses hope of தலைவன் returning at the promised time, who went through the arid land

where, because of the burning sun, the ground is not green, the trees give no shade, the springs are so dry to fry the fallen grains of the bamboo, but the white flowers of முருங்கை are strewn by the whirling summer wind, and who went in order to get new ornaments to wear on her wearing shoulders. His promise at the time of leaving was like the adhesive that sticks together the stones of the leather worker, who works on the slope of the hill presided over by முருகன். This குறிஞ்சி scene is an inset to describe her memory of her union with him before separation. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் points out that the name முருகன், though is of unique reference, is the கருப்பொருள் (i.e. தெய்வம்) of the குறிஞ்சி land. (This is a rare instance of தெய்வம் being கருப்பொருள் in an actual, see above). He thus circumscribes the mention of a unique referent by name by relating it to the கருப்பொருள், which links it to அகம். Another circumscription is to point to the generic reference the name, which is a collective name, as pointed out above. All this means that the use of a name which has a unique referent, and so real, is rare in அகத்திணை even if the name is not of a protagonist of a poem. The real life (உலகியல்) love is set in a non-referential world of poetic imagination (நாடக வழக்கு).

There are poems where the beauty of தலைவி is compared with a named town, whose chief may also be mentioned by name. அகநானூறு 93, a பாலை poem, is the speak of the returning தலைவன். He is driven by the desire, after he acquired wealth comparable to the wealth of the உறந்தை of Cholas, to press his chest against the ornaments of தலைவி lying in the large house on the bed, as soft as the foam of oil, whose hair has fragrance like the fragrance of the shopping square of the கூடல் of the Pandyas.

நச்சினார்க்கினியர் uses this poem to make also his point that the names in the world in the similes of அகம் poems cannot be actual proper names and they are commonly collective names such as சோழர், வழுதி, as in this poem.

An interesting case of blurred boundary between அகம் and புறம் is when the poet is identified with a protagonist in a poem (the only known cases are female

poets identified with தலைவி; the logical possibility of a male poet being identified with the தலைவன் of a poem is not raised by the commentators, the reason being the absence of poetic evidence in the Sangam corpus). The two poems cited by நச்சினர்க்கினியர் are குறுந்தொகை 27 by வெள்ளிவீதியார் (this poem is attributed to கொல்லன் அழிசி in some manuscripts and the previous poem is attributed to வெள்ளிவீதியார் in those manuscripts) and குறுந்தொகை 31 by ஆதிமந்தியார் (which is spelled ஆதிமருதியார் in some manuscripts). குறுந்தொகை 27 is a தலைவி speak: the paling yellowish skin desires to eat up my beauty marked by the brownish skin and the lined under-waist, which is like wasting the sweet milk of a great cow by not feeding its calf nor storing it in a pot, but letting it fall on the ground. This poem could be about any தலைவி who is anonymous and could be composed by any poet, female or male. குறுந்தொகை 31 is also similar. It is a poem of a தலைவி speak also: he, who made my bangles made of conch shells slip away, is also a dancer like me when he joined my hand with his hand in the dance at festivities of warriors or of women, but is not to be seen now anywhere.

The reason for the identification of the poet with the தலைவி of the poem is the mention of the name of the poet in a simile in அகம் poems. These poems are other instances of அகம் poems that mention historical persons in a simile. அகநானூறு 147, a பாலை poem by அவ்வையார் (interestingly, she is not identified with the தலைவி of the poem by the tradition), is a தலைவி speak: I wish I had gone with him, like வெள்ளிவீதி, through the arid land where the male tiger is looking to hear the sound of a stag to feed his mate who is resting after giving birth to three cubs, but I am here listless having no antidote to the pain of separation, and am suffering with hating everything, eating nothing, wearing out shoulders, losing beauty and lamenting the departure of the one who left me. அகநானூறு 236, a மருதம் poem by பரணர், is also a தலைவி speak: I didn't recognize the greatness of the love of him, who is of the town where there are mango trees blooming in the rain, which support the piles of rice

stalks harvested by the farmers who catch by hand and eat the fish in the water; now I blame myself for not knowing the place of the woman beautified with sandal he is hiding and suffer with the crushed heart and excruciating agony like ஆதிமந்தி, who goes in tears everywhere in search of ஆட்டனத்தி, who has the gait of a bull and wears jasmine on his curly hair, fearing that he was swept by the river or swallowed by the sea but asking if anyone saw him. These two poems probably reflect tales in circulation.

These poems, however, need not be, and should not be, read as describing the personal life and emotions of the poets because of the coincidence of their names and the names in the tales. அகம் poems are not autobiographical as they are not biographical. They are not self-referential or self-indexed. The poets do not have a presence in the poem with its protagonists (கிளவித்தலைவன் or கிளவித்தலைவி or others); only their voice is in the poem. The poets of the புறம் poems, on the other hand, are present along with their protagonist (பாட்டுடைத் தலைவன்) in the poem, and their voice is also there.

The two genres of அகம் and புறம் are distinct not only in their themes but also in their thematic specificities such as the above. They nevertheless share some literary theoretical vocabulary (திணை and துறை are two examples) and some literary devices (these are, however, common to any genre) such as உவமம், அணி and the literary features that go to make up the organics of a poem (செய்யுள் உறுப்பு; செய்யுளியல் S 1). தொல்காப்பியம் asserts that அகம் and புறம் are parallel genres; புறம் is the converse side of அகம்.

அகத்திணையியல் may be read as a theoretical description of அகம் based on உரிப்பொருள் embedded in முதல் பொருள் and கருப்பொருள். களவியல் and கற்பியல், on the other hand, present another approach to theorizing அகம் based on கூற்று. This approach looks at the various sub-themes of அகப்பொருள் from the point of view of who speaks what, to whom and when. The available manuscripts of குறுந்தொகை,

unlike the manuscripts of அகநானூறு, do not classify the poems by உரிப்பொருள் (or by the land it is located) under what circumstances. The modern editor of this anthology சாமிநாதையர் classifies the poems on the basis of கூற்று. This ethnographic approach to theorize அகம் poetry is unavailable to theorize புறப்பொருள்.