

Draft. Not to be cited. Comments welcome.

E. Annamalai, University of Chicago

Fall 2018, Class Notes 1-3

தொல்காப்பியம் பொருளதிகாரம் உவமையியல்:

இளம்பூரணர் உரை, பேராசிரியர் உரை

### Theory of உவமை in Tolkappiyam-3

Emotion as உவமப்பொருள்

Relation with மெய்ப்பாடு

Disparity between பொருள் and உவமை when உவமை is markedly upsized or downsized serves a function. It is a cue to look for the expression of emotion through உவமை. As உவமை conveys meaning, it also conveys emotion (மெய்ப்பாடு) when it is marked. The relation of மெய்ப்பாடு, which is a central element in the performance of drama (நாடக வழக்கு), to உவமை, the device to create meaning in poetry, is the reason, according to commentators (இளம்பூரணர் S 1), to place the chapter on the latter after the chapter on the former. Conveying emotion is a derived function of உவமை, whose primary function is conveying meaning. This is suggested by the phrase மெய்ப்பாடு எட்டன் வழி மருங்கு அறியத் தோன்றும் 'will appear to make one realize the derivative sense, which is one of the eight மெய்ப்பாடுs' (S 19). The subjects of 'will appear' are the upsizing (பெருமை) and downsizing (சிறுமை) of உவமை in the sutra and they are the instigators of the emotions, which appear derivatively. பேராசிரியர் understands வழிமருங்கு as 'sometimes' (that modifies the verb தோன்றும்; எட்டன் is the object of அறிய) and says that upsizing and downsizing of உவமை are not needed all the times to convey emotion through உவமை (அவை (i.e. பெருமையும் சிறுமையும்) பற்றாது மெய்ப்பாடு எட்டும்பற்றி வாளாதே ('simply') உவமை வருதல் செவ்விது). He means that மெய்ப்பாடு does not need to உவமை be marked and its absence is the preferred way. In other words, பெருமை and சிறுமை are optional for உவமை to convey emotion. It does not necessarily deny the fact that expressing emotion by உவமை is not required in every instance.

பெருமை and சிறுமை have an extended sense in S 19 from their sense in S 5. They mean in S 19 respectively prototypical example (in public memory) and non-occurrence (in the world and so is absent in public memory).

Eight மெய்ப்பாடு in உவமை

The eight மெய்ப்பாடுs are நகை 'smile', அழுகை 'cry', இளிவரல் 'pity', மருட்கை 'bewilderment' அச்சம் 'fear', பெருமிதம் 'pride', வெகுளி 'anger' and உவகை 'happiness' (தொல். பொருள். மெய்ப்பாட்டியல் S 3). It may be seen that the terms of மெய்ப்பாடு include lexically mental states (the last six) and their physical manifestations (the first two). Each of the terms, it must be noted, stands for a range of emotions; for example, அழுகை includes many physical manifestations (from tear dropping to sobbing correlating with different mental states) and வெகுளி includes many mental states (from irritation to boiling) corresponding with different physical manifestations. The physical manifestation may overlap an emotion. The smile or laughter of derision will go under நகை, but the smile or laughter of happiness will go under உவகை. The eight terms, thus, are indices for a range around a center. The emotions conveyed by உவமை could be another basis for classifying உவமை such as நகையுவமம், அவலவுவமம், இளிவரலுவமம் etc., as பேராசிரியர் does (but தொல்காப்பியம் is silent, or is uninterested, about classification unlike the authors of அணியிலக்கணம்).

The citations given by பேராசிரியர் for each of the emotions are the following.

நகை: *'she was scratching the ground (with her big toe) with her head bent like the thief caught with the stolen goods'* (அகநானூறு 16). The context of this scene is that the தலைவி tells the பரத்தை, who embraces her son playing outside her home that he was her son too. தலைவி derides பரத்தை with these words and her shame is like the shame of the thief caught red handed; both bring derisive smile on தலைவி and onlookers respectively. In this case, the emotion of smile is on both the character in the poem and the reader or listener of the poem. If the emotion is on only one of the two, it is the reader or the listener. The emotion conveyed by the உவமை is its effect on the audience. Catching a thief red handed is a prototypical incident for derision. This public memory survives up to the modern period of the Tamil speaking community in the idiomatic phrase கையும்களவுமாக. The emotion நகை resides not in the உவமை per se, but in the prototypical quality (பெருமை) of it.

Since the emotion is derivatively conveyed, a question to be answered is what the primary meaning is (உவமப் பொருள்: வினை etc.). In the above citation, it is 'shaming' – பரத்தை is shamed as the thief is. This is not an active verb, but a passive one. This suggests that a mental state arising out of an act. viz, 'be shamed' is taken as a வினை. Alternatively, shaming may be taken as a result (பயன்) of an action – sarcastic speaking by தலைவி and catching by villagers respectively.

அழுகை (அவலம்): *'Seeing my condition of grief with no companion to alleviate it, which is like the grief of the merchant whose boat (with goods) capsized...'* (யாப்பருங்கல விருத்தி 318). The emotion of the protagonist is grief and it is of the reader as well. The emotion of அழுகை (அவலம்)

is evoked in the reader by the prototypical index of grief of ship wreck. This obtains even in the modern period in the expression கப்பல் கவிழ்ந்தால் போல் கன்னத்தில் கை வைத்தல் 'resting one's chin on the palm as if his ship has been wrecked'.

உவமப் பொருள் is being helpless and therefore is வினை.

இனிவரல்: *'Like the poor at the door of the house of the wealthy, my heart vacillates; it goes out to see (the hero (here a Chera king) walking on the street) and stops at the door out of shyness'* (முத்தொள்ளாயிரம் 88). The comparison is with the poor who desire to go into the house of the rich out of need, but stop at the door out of pity on their condition. A vacillation propelled by two psychological forces is the common element. This is a common place occurrence and so is ripe to generate an emotion. The emotion is pity, which the poor feel about their despicable condition.

உவமப் பொருள் is hesitation and therefore is வினை.

மருட்கை (அற்புதம்): *'If such thoughts occur (in his mind), it is like the kuvalai flower drying in the water of a pond under a shade'* (கலித்தொகை 41). The context of this line is that தலைவ is anxious whether தலைவன் will return after the first union and her தோழி reassures her about his tender heart. For him to entertain unkind thoughts would be like the flower in the simile. Both do not, and cannot, happen. The emotion conveyed is bewilderment or anxiety (மருட்கை) of தலைவி, the character in the poem; the simile conveys தோழி's sense that the anxiety causing thing is non-existent or the rarest of rare happening (அற்புதம்). The reader is conveyed both sides of the same emotion expressed by two characters of the poem; உவமை makes this possible.

The உவமப்பொருள் of this உவமை is hard to find; it is the negative 'not exist' and it is a verb of a state (not action) and so the உவமப்பொருள் is வினை. (For later grammarians, this will classify as வினையுவமை).

The உவமை in this citation, which is a non-existent thing, could be case of சிறுமை. But பேராசிரியர் takes this to be a case of பெருமை arguing that non-existence (உலக நடை இறந்தது) is common knowledge. He treats (S 5) another instance of non-existent thing ('bright *kāntal* flower not swarmed by bees –திருமுருகாற்றுப்படை வரி 43) in the same way. This is fallacious because non-existing thing is not experienced by anyone and so it is not in public memory and therefore it is சிறுமை. பேராசிரியர் gives the example of a thief being caught red handed as a case of சிறுமை because the poem describes தலைவி looking down of (downsizing) பரத்தை. For him, this is the purpose of choosing this உவமை. But பெருமை and சிறுமை do not refer to high and low status of the உவமை in social evaluation, but they refer to its high and low frequency of

occurrence in the real world. If the above example (*kuvalai* drying up in water pond) is not accepted for சிறுமை உவமை, then the commentators have no illustration of it. Hence a உவமை based on a non-existent thing may be taken to be the case for சிறுமை உவமை.

அச்சம்: 'Choosing a person as an adviser without scrutiny is like opening a container for sandal paste without examining it and finding a snake instead' (நாலடியார் 126). In this ethical poem, there is no character, and there is only the audience, may be a king in the present case. The emotion of fear (from action without deliberation) is conveyed. This example suggests that the emotion generated by உவமை is to manifest always in the audience whether it is can in any character or not. The emotion is conveyed even when there is no பெருமை in the உவமை. Recall that பேராசிரியர் makes பெருமை optional to get மெய்ப்பாடு from உவமை. Or, this is an inappropriate illustration, as there is no place for மெய்ப்பாடு in ethical literature.

உவமப்பொருள் is easily வினை in this one. The comparison of thoughtlessly opening a container is with thoughtlessly selecting an adviser.

பெருமிதம்: தோழி speaks to தலைவன், who is delaying marriage, to start a family thus: *you, the man from the country where the elephant wanders with its herd on the broad slopes of the tall hill like Mal (Krishna), who destroyed the valor of fighters (Gauravas)* (கலித்தொகை 52). The hero in this உவமை has double comparison with the herded elephant (which is a உள்ளுறை to suggest living in a family), which is like the god Mal in color and valor. This choice of பெருமை உவமை suggests the pride of தோழி about தலைவன். The elephant's tearing of trees is compared in the preceding line of the poem to Bhima's tearing of the thigh of Duryodhana. The hero is connected to the personae of a great epic and this shows the pride தோழி has of தலைவன். This உவமை is an instance of பெருமை in the sense that the epic characters are prototypes of awesome acts. Her pride is transmitted to the reader by empathy with the characters of the poem.

உவமப்பொருள் is the awesome action and so is வினை. There is also உரு 'color' – the dark skin of the elephant and Mal with that of the hero. There could be more than in உவமப்பொருள் in a உவமை (S 2).

வெகுளி: '(When the poets looked up to you, the Chola), you looked at the lands of your two antagonistic kings (Cheran and Pandiyan to take them) getting angered like the god of death' (புறநானூறு 42). The protagonist, the Chola king, is possessed with the emotion of anger. This emotion is transmitted to the reader. The god of death is fearsome and represents the emotion of anger. This is a உவமை where all three, the உவமை (the god of death), பொருள் (the king), and கேட்போர் (the listeners) manifest the same emotion.

உவமைப் பொருள் is 'be angry', which is a state and so is வினை in its extended sense.

உவமை: தோழி conveys to தலைவி the news that தலைவன் has agreed for elopement and so she could escape from the scolding of her mother and the scandal spread by the village women. 'be happy now like the rewarded poets who went (to the king) singing his praise' (அகநானூறு 65). The comparison is about being happy on the part of தலைவி and poets. Being happy is the prototypical emotion for the poets when they are feted and this fact triggers the same emotion in the reader. This is a உவமை where all three, the உவமை, பொருள் and கேட்போர், manifest the same emotion.

உவமைப் பொருள் is 'be happy', which is a state and so is வினை in its extended sense. If the list of four sites identified for generating the four categories of meaning of உவமை (S 1) is modified to include பண்பு/குணம் collapsing மெய் 'shape' and உரு 'color', the last two citations above will have பண்பு (happiness) as உவமைப் பொருள்.

It is a debatable question if the inference of emotion from உவமை qualifies it to be தொனி, a theoretical concept in poetics to refer to a kind of suggested meaning, which is postulated by later grammarians in Tamil following Abhinavagupta's idea in Sanskrit poetics. For தொல்காப்பியம், this is a derived sense (வழிமருங்கு) of உவமை. இளம்பூரணர் (S 1) calls emotion (மெய்ப்பாடு) a suggestion (குறிப்பு: குறிப்புப் பற்றி வரும் மெய்ப்பாடு). குறிப்புப் பொருள் is a suggestive meaning and மெய்ப்பாடு comes under this for him.

Getting the intended meaning of உவமை

Inferring poet's intention

Getting the meaning of உவமை is not arbitrary or idiosyncratic. The meaning to get is the meaning intended by the poet. The aid of the உவமைச்சொல் chosen by the poet to know the four semantic sites for the generation of meaning and its problem was pointed out above. They do not, however, help with specific meanings of specific உவமைs. Tolkappiyar points out (S 20) that it is a path of deduction (தெளிமருங்கு; தெளி-தல் 'to deduce (the truth)') to do this and there is a methodology (திறத்தியல்; பேராசிரியர் calls it இலக்கணம் 'framework'), but does not spell it out. Or, திறத்தியல் simply refers to a 'skill set' acquired by practice. One delimiting criterion given to get the meaning is empirical, which is the customary interpretation of a உவமை (வழக்கு, S 21). It suggests the presence of a community of readers.

The term used in the sutra for ‘intended meaning’ is உற்றது from the verb உறு, which may be glossed ‘belong’. (There is a doublet in colloquial Tamil உற்றது உரியது ‘private matters (as between husband and wife)’, where உற்றது is near synonymous with உரியது ‘that which belongs’; this meaning is discernable in the expression எனக்குற்றது இதுதான் (= எனக்குரியது இதுதான்) ‘this is what belongs to me, this is what I am destined for’). உவமப் பொருளின் உற்றது in the sutra 20 means ‘what belongs to / what is appropriate for the உவமப் பொருள் in a particular instance. Belonging or appropriateness is what the poet intended. The word for it is முன்னம், which பேராசிரியர் often invokes but இளம்பூரணர் uses it in another sense, viz., the context of the poem –who said what and when (S 23). Note that உவமப் பொருள் in this sutra (20) is used in the broader sense of generic and specific sense of a உவமை, not in the generic sense alone (வினை etc.) of S 1.

இளம்பூரணர் glosses தெளிமருங்கு as துணிவு பக்கம் ‘decisive position’; that is, the ultimate position taken regarding meaning of உவமை. துணிவு is ‘decision after deliberation’ and பக்கம் is a calque of *paksha* in Sanskrit in the meaning of a position in an argument; this meaning is transferred to the Tamil word மருங்கு ‘side’. This meaning is different from ‘clear path’, as glossed above taking மருங்கு to mean ‘path’, and it emphasizes the conclusion rather than the path to it.

இளம்பூரணர் illustrates the problem of semantic interpretation with non-canonical forms of உவமை. The canonical form of உவமை is the one with the presence or elision of உவமச் சொல். Such forms are called உவம வேறுபாடு different from உவம வகை, which refers to the kinds of meanings of உவமை. An example of non-canonical form of உவமை is one where the உவமை is negated; பொருள் may not be present and may need to be inferred. A series of negations start with this: *beauty doesn’t fade, so it is not the crescent* (கலித்தொகை 55). Here the உவமை is that the forehead (of the girl) is like the crescent but is better. Recall the condition (S 3) that உவமை must be superior to bring out the superiority of பொருள். Negating the comparison with உவமை does the same thing; it brings out the superiority of பொருள். This could be like a riddle as in the above illustration when the பொருள் is not mentioned.

Another non-canonical example is when உவமை alone is present. This is a metaphorical use of உவமை. The similarity with பொருள் helps to retrieve it. *Her face is like the moon where fish, bow, cloud and the act of the god of death are scribed* (சிலப்பதிகாரம் கானல் வறி 66). The metaphors explicate respectively the பொருள்’s eye, eye brow, hair and the killing effect of her eyes. This is a reversal methodologically to go from உவமை to பொருள் to get the meaning.

பேராசிரியர் illustrates the problem with the canonical form உவமை. The problem relates to the lack of parity between பொருள் and உவமம் relating to the strength of description of each of them. For example, the valence of modifiers of these two may be different. In such cases, the reader would fill in the gaps. This would then be the case where the poets did not specify their intention. There are instances where it would not be clear whether the poets intended some meanings at all. In the words of பேராசிரியர், உற்றுணர்த்தாத வழியும் அதுவே தெளிமருங்காம் ‘even when the poets do not indicate their intentions, the உவமப் பொருள் (=அதுவே) will be clear’. For this, the interpretive practice turned into a convention (வழக்கு) comes into play. His examples are the following.

The first example is about getting மெய்ப்பாடு from உவமை. In the poem (அகநானூறு 16) mentioned earlier, the poet does not indicate in the simile of the thief caught red handed that there is a meaning of derision (எள்ளல்), it falls on the reader to discern it beyond the meaning from the உவமை of getting caught in the act.

In the simile of a cobbler (புறநானூறு 82) weaving a god’s seat anxiously and hurriedly, which was discussed earlier, there are four lines of description of this உவமை while there are just two lines of description which do not have any description of the பொருள், viz., the war, per se. Since the readers know what all are involved in war preparation such as feeding the warriors, handing over the weapons, oration to arouse them etc., they fill in these semantic gaps to parallel with the உவமை.

In another poem (புறநானூறு 125), the king is drinking liquor after the war, which is praised to be the ambrosia that gives him a long life; this is compared to the bull eating the hay after the day’s hard labor. The vassal king is மலையமான் திருமுடிக் காரி and he fought the war providing support to இராசசூயம் வேட்ட பெருநற் கிள்ளி (in his war with the Chera king மாந்தருஞ்சேரல் இரும்பொறை) and the war was won. This context should be known to the reader to understand the meaning of the உவமை that the king, who is the பாட்டுடைத் தலைவன், played a supporting role in the war to interpret the உவமை: *he is like the bull to the farmer and the wealth he acquired from the war is inferior to that of the Chola king like the hay for the bull and paddy for the farmer*. There is no clue in the poem given by the poet about this context and the reader supplies it to get the full meaning of the உவமை.

In another poem (புறநானூறு 180), the chieftain’s (ஈரந்தூர்கிழான் கோயமான்) body is described as *resembling the trunk of a tree (அத்தி), which has deep scars caused by people slashing it for medicine that have been filled up by growth*. This chieftain does not possess huge wealth, as the first line of the poem states: *நிரப்பாது கொடுக்குஞ் செல்வமுமில்னே* ‘he does not have

wealth to give away continuously', but he does not say no to those who go to him for their need, as the second line states. He fights along with his men for kings and has received many scars on his body from these wars of others. These additional pieces of information about the chieftain tell the reader that he is like that tree in not refusing to give the milky juice to the needy and it lives for such people willing to sacrifice its strength. He does not have great wealth to give away like the tree that has the juicy milk, but not big fruits. The comparison is more than the appearance of the body that the உவமை states and more meaning is added by the information of the status of the wealth and the life spent for other kings of the chieftain, even though this information is not built into the உவமை. This exemplifies, like the above one, பேராசிரியர்'s interpretation of the sutra to include in உவமப்பொருள் the meanings that are not indicated in the உவமை itself (உவமஞ் செய்து உற்றுணர்த்தாதவழியும் அதுவே தெளிமருங்காம் 'this (using specific contextual knowledge) is the clear path to get (the non-generic) உவமப்பொருள் even when it is not made explicit when making up உவமை')

There are instances of உவமை that give no indication of the intended உவமப்பொருள். The world knowledge of the reader supplies it. This is illustrated by a couplet from திருக்குறள் (667). *'one should not be belittled by his size; they may have the quality of the axle pin of a huge rolling chariot'*. The actual comparison is the apparent smallness of the axle pin and the person. The power of the axle pin, which gives the chariot its strength and function, is the inference of the reader, which is not from any verbal clue in the poem.

Valence of descriptors of உவமை

There is a bare bones உவமை (வாளாதே உவமம் செய்து in the words of பேராசிரியர்) with no descriptive material either for the பொருள் or for the உவமம். The உவமம் is a common place object. *'who will find fault with your father who is like the summer rain'* (கலித்தொகை 84). The context is this: தலைவன் lives with பரத்தை; தலைவி sends her son to the temple with her தோழி, who takes him instead to the house of the பரத்தை, who decorates him with many ornaments. When the son returns late, தலைவி tells her son 'you are not at fault; she with painted eyes beautiful like a flower, who gave you these things, is not at fault'; she follows these by the cited line above with the உவமை about தலைவன்; she ends with the line 'I am the one at fault'. She thinks that everybody is generous – the son has no ill feeling about the other woman; she gives jewels to the son, but she, the தலைவி, is possessive. The meaning of the உவமை for தலைவன் may be about his generosity of not hurting the other woman who seeks him out? The summer rain is useful to all, as நச்சினார்க்கினியர் reads the உவமை. It is generous in the sense that it pours in the hot summer when the rain is needed most to cool the land. The context of describing the generosity of



others related to தலைவி suggests that, by the உவமை, generosity is attributed to the தலைவன் also.

பேராசிரியர் moves on to make another point, which is the converse of reading all the description in a உவமை for meaning. There might be descriptions of உவமை that may not be a part of the intended meaning of the உவமை. *'when the neytal flowers, which have strong stems showing above their green leaves sway in the waves of the backwaters, they resemble the eyes of the girls who take a dip in the water'* (குறுந்தொகை 9). The description of the stems and leaves of the neytal flower, the உவமை, is to be ignored in its comparison with the eyes of bathing girls. It means that உவமை might have irrelevant descriptors that are not intended to be a part (உற்றது) of உவமப் பொருள்.

Empirical and the exaggerated in உவமை

A caution about generating a meaning that belongs (உற்றது) to a உவமை, which is non-existent.

*'bowing to a face that is like exterior of the moon'* is a hypothetical உவமை. The reader should not force himself to find an intended meaning that the face is compared to a spotless moon, which comes from the deduction that there are no spots in the exterior of the moon as there are in the interior of the moon. This hypothetical example shows that there is a limit to reading to get somehow an appropriate meaning (உற்றது).

The meaning a உவமை gives beyond its descriptors by inference from other elements in the poem or in its context could qualify to be one of clear or filtered deduction (தெளிமருங்கு). The question if the deduced meaning from outside the linguistic form of a உவமை is தொனி is debatable, just as the question of derived meaning (வழிமருங்கு) of the preceding sutra.

When உவமப் பொருள் is deduced as described above, the practice of poets (வழக்கு), i.e. the empirical presence of உவமைs and their meaning, is the guideline (S 21). This practice is a sustained one to become a convention that is embraced (மருவிய மரபு) by the literary community. The meaning of a word is by convention, as linguistics claims. The meaning of உவமை is conventional, according to தொல்காப்பியம். This does not deny new உவமைs by innovative poets. Like lexical meanings, the meaning of உவமை needs to stabilize when it is understood (உணருங்காலை) widely. இளம்பூரணர்

gives the example of கயல்சிலை 'fish and bow' to make the point that their meaning as உவமை should be the embraced or shared convention. They are not an example of உவமை because both

should not be taken to refer to the shape of the fish and the bow as comparisons of the woman's shape of the eye and the shape of the eyebrow as per Sangam convention. In this convention the fish is a comparison of eye as to its movement (பிறழ், and so to வினை) whereas the bow is a comparison of eyebrow as to its shape (so to மெய்). Fish came to be the comparison of the eye in post-Sangam period convention. This is a உவமை in சிலப்பதிகாரம், as in கயலெழுதி வில்லெழுதி ..., which இளம்பூரணர் cites in his commentary of the previous sutra. This sequence of உவமை is followed in the next line by a பொருள், viz., முகம் 'face'

## Structural Parity of Referents

### Balancing syntactic strings

The parity between உவமை and பொருள் postulated in the earlier sutras as discussed above is with regard to their descriptors. There could be உவமை and பொருள் which lack this parity but the missing descriptors must and could be recovered for their semantics, though some absences could be ignored. There is another kind of parity, which relates to referents in உவமை and பொருள். The double word உவமை (இரட்டைக் கிளவி உவமை, S 22), where each word is a different referent, is chosen following (வழித்தே) the double word பொருள் (இரட்டைப் பொருள்) with two referents. இளம்பூரணர் illustrates this with double comparison, where a comparison of one உவமை and பொருள் is made with another உவமை and பொருள். In such cases, உவமை and உவமை pair, and பொருள் and பொருள் pair across lines in addition to a different comparison in each line. *Like the people compare with animals so are the well learned people with other people* (திருக்குறள் 410). Here people and animals are contrasted to form the உவமை and provide comparison to the contrast of the learned and ignorant people, which form பொருள். The contrast of two objects in உவமை compares with the contrast of two objects in பொருள். It is a two dimensional comparison. Actually, this is an instance of analogical parallel.

பேராசிரியர், on the other hand, illustrates the principle of double referent comparison with descriptors which have referents inside them rather than the descriptors that are of quality. His example (பெரும்பாணாற்றுப்படை, வரி 220) is: *'the chest that is smeared with the color from the tender fruit of canpakam tree is like the touchstone that shows the dust of gold (that is tested for purity)'*. Here the உவமை has two referents, touchstone and gold dust and the பொருள் has two referents, chest and flower dust. The match or parity is of corresponding referents. பேராசிரியர் cites an example where the numerical parity between referents is not met (similar to descriptors). *'In the forest where the flowers of the neem tree of dark trunk dropped on the rock that looks like a tiger cub on the rock'* (குறுந்தொகை 47). Here the பொருள் is two referents viz., flower and the rock,

but the உவமை has one referent, tiger cub, but its yellowish stripes are absent to compare with the yellow flowers of the neem tree. This உவமை is a gestalt.

### Self-Referential Comparison

உவமை and பொருள் from the same domain

Sutra 22 is about double referent in உவமை. Sutra 23, for இளம்பூரணர், is about the issue of self-reference. It is self-evident that உவமை cannot have the same referent as பொருள்; it would be self-referential. இளம்பூரணர் extends this to be true of உவமை and பொருள் in the same domain. This brings in உள்ளுறை உவமம், where the comparison is between கருப்பொருள் (flora and fauna) and people of a land (தலைவன் et al). Hence self-referential உவமை is permissible in உள்ளுறை உவமம்.

In the reading of இளம்பூரணர் of S 23, the self-referential one (பிறிதொடு படாது பிறப்பொடு நோக்கி) is the kind of உவமை that is established when a conclusion about it is arrived at after deliberation by those who can deliberate on it going by the convention of முன்னம், which looks at the context in which பொருள் (உபமேயம்) appears; its meaning (உவமைப் பொருள்) does not belong to (= same as the) the meaning of உவமை (as commonly understood) because the meaning of this உவமை is not independent or autonomous (as it belongs to the same domain of பொருள், i.e. self-referential).

His examples, however, are not of உள்ளுறை உவமம். They are of ஏனை உவமம்: *'the beautiful moon exhibits beauty like seeing the (appearance of the rays of) the moon'* (கலித்தொகை 119, நிலவுக் காண்பது போல அணிமதி ஏர்தர). போல in this line is not a உவமச் சொல்; but a regular infinitive in its result sense 'in such a way': *'the beautiful moon exhibits beauty in such a way that its rays become visible'*. நச்சினார்க்கினியர் paraphrases நிலவுக் காண்பது போல into நிலவால் இருளைப் புறங்காண்பது போல 'like driving away the darkness with the moon's rays'. In this paraphrase also, போல means 'as if', not 'like' when the whole line is looked at: 'as if driving away the darkness with its rays the moon rises beautifully'

His other example is (கலித்தொகை 121): *'the cool hero of the sea whose backwaters, which gives the misperception of a sheet of blue diamonds, and where the neytal flowers of fleshy petals close, appears as if it has fallen asleep'* (வள்ளிதழ் கூம்பிய மணிமருள் இருங்கழி பள்ளிபுக்கது போலும் பரப்புநீர்த் தண்ணேர்ப்ப). This line is a part of the description of dusk, which the preceding lines in the poem describe with the sun reaching behind the hill, the moon's rays intensifying and the birds returning to their nests and falling quiet and neytal flowers whose petals are closing. போலும் is used in the sense of 'as if'. All the descriptions of the dusk give the illusion of sleeping

backwaters. If போலும் is used in the sense of 'like', there is no பொருள் of which the 'sleeping backwaters' is the உவமை (it is not பரப்பு நீர் 'the sea'). It is an open question if 'as if' is a case of உவமை at all.

பேராசிரியர் reads this sutra as laying the ground for the following sutras on உள்ளூறை உவமை moving away from ஏனை உவமை.

This will be discussed along with the following sutras in the next note.