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FOREWORD

RAO SAHEB

S. VAIYAPURI PILLAI, B.A., B.L.,
READER AND HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT
OF TAMIL RESEARCH,
UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS.

Mylapore,
12th Aug. 1942.

This thesis on the "Advanced Studies in Tamil Prosody" was submitted by Mr. A. Chidambaranatha Chettiar, M.A., of the Annamalai University for his Doctorate degree. It is in the main a general survey of the development of metres in Tamil, and all the works relevant to the subject have been very closely studied. The subject itself is very important, and though general speculation with regard to it has been rife, no systematic research has been done till now. Dr. Chettiar's thesis is the first work of its kind.
The thesis bears evidence of sound scholarship and careful research. The criticisms offered in regard to the views of commentators like Perasiriyar and Naccinarkkiniyar and the original suggestions made by the author of the thesis speak to his research capacity. This is a substantial piece of research work and is a distinct contribution to the advancement of knowledge on the subject. I commend the book to all those that are interested in Tamil Prosody.

(Sd.) S. VAIYAPURI PILLAI.
PREFACE

In this thesis the following points have been set forth, for the first time, by me so far as I know:—

(1) that in ancient times the occurrence of a three-feet line as the penultimate line of an Agaval stanza was its distinguishing peculiarity;

(2) that only after the days of Tolkāppiyar "Iṇaikkurāl" type of Āsiri-yam came into vogue;

(3) that Maṇḍila-Yāppu of Tolkāppiyar does not mean Nilaimaṇḍilam, a part of Āsiriya verse but Arāgam, a part of Kali verse;

(4) that Nilaimaṇḍilā-Āsiriya did not exist in ancient Tamil;

(5) that ‘ē’ was the only ending of Āsiriya verse in ancient times, that it was sometimes replaced by ‘ō’, and that ‘ī’ also sometimes occurred as an Āsiriya ending;
that Puranānūru, as against the theory that it has Agavals alone, contains at least three verses in Vaņji metre according to the requirements of the rule in Yāpparuṇkalam;

that Innisai-venpā was earlier in origin than Nērisaivenpā;

that divisions of note into ēntal, tūŋkal, and olukal or pirintisai arose from the time of the commentators of Yāpparuṇkalam and Kārigai.

that some verses cited by Pēra-siriyar and Nachchiniyar as illustrations of Veṅkali are really koccaha-kalis according to the rule of Tolkāppiyar for which an original interpretation is herein given;

that Pērasiriyar and Nachchiniyar apparently made a mistake in regarding Veṅkali and Kalivenpā as different, in which mistake the authors of Vīrasōliyam, Toṇnul and Ilakkanā-Viḷakkam are found to persist;
(11) that the Koccaham of Yāpparuṇkalam answers only to Koccaha-Orubōhu of Tolkāppiyar, that the omission of the author of Yāpparuṇkalam to describe Koccaha-Kali is rather faulty and that therefore all the later prosodists have completely ignored the existence or the possibility of existence of Koccaha-kalippā;

(12) that Āsiriya-Tālīsais of later times had their probable origin in certain triplets found in Kali verses of old;

(13) that Vēnychenturais, similarly, had their origin in certain couplets occurring in Kali verses of old;

(14) that Kali-Viruttams had their probable origin in certain quadruplets of old which formed an integral part of Kali verses;

(15) that Viruttams of six feet had their apparent origin in Varippāḍals of Chilappadikāram;

(16) that Āsiriya-turais of later times probably had their origin in certain
verses contained in Canto VII of Chilappadikāram;

(17) that Veṭṭalisais and Veṇturais may have probably arisen as a result of the development from Tālisais and that similarly Vaṅjituturais may have arisen from Ambōtharaṅgams occurring in Kali verses of old;

(18) that Kuṟal-tālisais may have developed from a type of tālisai found in Kali verses;

(19) that in Jīvaka-Chintāmani there are verses which demand a classification under a separate head—possibly a "Kaṭṭalai-Kalinilaitturai"—wherein there are four pentameters whose last four feet of each of the lines are knit by Venpā connections, whose last syllable in the last foot ends in ‘ē’ and wherein there are 14 letters if the verse commences with a ‘Nēr’ formula, and 15 letters if with a ‘Nirai’ syllable, and that in the 9th Tirumūrai verses of this type are found;

xvi
that Nachchiñārkinīyar's statement that in Chintāmañi Pāvinam is not to be found is incorrect because there are found, as I have shown, Asiriya-tuṟais, Vañji-tuṟais, Vañji-Viruttams, Kali-Viruttams, Kalittuṟais and quite a great number of Āsiriya-Viruttams, and

that looking for Augury in verse was imported into the Tamil country long after the period of the 3rd Sangam and that possibly Pāṇhirupāṭṭiyan, the first great grammar, so far known, on Augury is apocryphal, having no bearing on actual facts in ancient Tamil language and literature.

The portions of this thesis containing all these points I claim to be original. But I must here acknowledge with thanks and gratitude the kind help and guidance which Prof. S. Somasundara Bharatiar, M.A., B.L., and Prof. K. Subrahmanya Pillai, M.A., M.L., under whom I worked, gave me. I am indebted also to RaoSaheb S. Vaiyapuri Pillai, B.A., B.L., (Reader in Tamil, Madras University) for certain valuable suggestions.

xvii
ADVANCED STUDIES IN TAMIL PROSODY

It is my humble belief that this thesis will tend to a greater admiration of Tolkāppiyam and foster a careful study of South Indian Grammar, which in the words of Prof. V. S. Sukthankar, M.A., Ph.D. (London) of the Bhandarkar Oriental Institute, "is a vastly interesting subject undeservedly neglected in India." Besides, the thesis will indirectly enable one in fixing the relative antiquity of Tolkāppiyam on the one hand and Puranāṇūru and other works comprised in the Ēṭṭutogai on the other. It might also help one in establishing the probable relationship in point of time between the author of Yāpparuṇkalam on the one hand and Kākkaipāḍiṇiyār, Avinayapaṇār etc., on the other. I am deeply indebted to the authorities of the University and to Dr. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu, K.C.I.E., D.Litt., M.L.C., Vice-Chancellor for the facilities offered to me for the publication of this book.

A. C. CHETTIAR.

24—7—42.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Tamil Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a — ᐂ</td>
<td>அ — அ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ā — 硤</td>
<td>ஆ — ஆ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i — இ</td>
<td>இ — இ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ī — ஐ</td>
<td>த — த</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u — உ</td>
<td>ஊ — ஊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ū — ஒ</td>
<td>ஐ — ஐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e — ெ</td>
<td>எ — எ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ē — எ</td>
<td>ஐ — ஐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai — ஐ</td>
<td>ஐ — ஐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o — ஐ</td>
<td>ஐ — ஐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ō — ஐ</td>
<td>ஐ — ஐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au — ஐ</td>
<td>ஐ — ஐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k — க</td>
<td>க — க</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ — ன</td>
<td>ன — ன</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c — ச</td>
<td>ச — ச</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIX
In tracing the history of Tamil Prosodical theories any writer is sure to be confronted with numerous difficulties because of the absence of proper and authentic records as well as of the great confusion caused by certain commentators. For a perfect history of Tamil prosodical theories the first requisite is a perfect history of Tamil literature. If conclusions shown in Histories of Tamil Literature are only tentative in regard to certain periods, the conclusions arrived at in this thesis for the corresponding periods shall also remain tentative. The traditions about the past have to a certain extent to be relied upon in the history of Tamil literature. These traditions are enshrined in the commentary of Iraiyanar Agapporu. The supposed author of that commentary is Nakkirar. That commentary speaks of three successive Academies of which two were submerged by the sea at different periods. The commentator, Nakkirar, apparently
belongs to the last of these Academies. The questions whether there existed any such Academy at all and whether Nakkîrar was the real commentator of Iraiyañâr Agapporul have been discussed at great length by eminent scholars and historians, and now the view prevails that there could have existed these Academies somewhere before the 2nd or 3rd Century A.D.* and that Nakkîrar must have been the commentator of Iraiyañâr Agapporul, though in reaching us in its present form it might have had certain interpolations.² Yet this has been the basis of all enquiry into the ancient past.

Works of the period of the first Academy are known to us only by name; those of the second also we know next to nothing of, except probably in regard to


² (1) Nakkîrar by Pandit N. M. Vengadaswami Nattar.

(2) History of Tamil Prose by Mr. V. C. Chengalvaraya Pillai, M.A., p. 26.
Tolkāppiyam,¹ a treatise on grammar, which has fortunately come down to us. Thus want of information regarding the ancient hoary past is plain. Tolkāppiyam has been commented upon by at least five persons of whom Iḻampūraṉar, Pērāsiriṉar and Nachchinārkkiṉiṉar have given us their commentaries relating to the chapter on prosody. None of these commentators appears to have been more ancient than the tenth century A.D.² For a treatise on grammar which arose about the 4th century B.C.,³ we have commentaries from the pen of persons who came nearly fourteen centuries after its composition. And these commentaries do not sometimes agree among themselves regarding the import of the rules contained in the treatise,


² Cf. History of Tamil Prose Literature by Mr. V. C. Chengalvaraya Pillai, M.A., p. 28.

³ (1) K. Subramania Pillai: History of Tamil Literature p. 62.

(2) M. Srinivasa Aiyangar: Tamil Studies p. 117.
Tolkappiyam. Though Tolkappiyar should have meant only one thing, who is to say what that one thing was? Thus another peculiar difficulty presents itself to the student of Tamil Prosody. If the rules of Tolkappiyar were in clear prose-form we should have had little to do with these commentators. But being, as they are, in a peculiar form known as Nur-Cheyyul which is neither verse nor prose we have got to rely sometimes on these commentators. This does not mean however that what has not been said by any of these commentators could not have been meant by Tolkappiyar. The fact that one commentator, coming years or decades or even centuries after another, criticises the view of the earlier and puts forward his own is itself enough security for an inquirer.

There might be different admirers among savants of these different commentators. I for one would never stand in the way of their admiration but if I point out somewhere in the course of my enquiry any defect of any of the commentators, only let these admirers not flare up, but try to use their judgment. I say this
because such flarings-up are possible and also because some such defects of theirs will be disclosed in the ensuing chapters.

In tracing the history of ancient Tamil prosodical theories one has to make several inferences and to rely sometimes on what is called guess-work. Surely this is not the right way but it is the only possible way in which one can approach the subject with the materials available now. In this connection, a statement of Prof. Saintsbury\(^1\) is worthy of note. "The theory of English prosody depends, from the combined point of view, historical and critical, to a very large extent on the inferences to be drawn from the practice of the age which intervenes between the conquest and the great outburst of Romance about the beginning of the 14th century. It depends most of all on certain documents between 1100 and 1250 A.D............But there is what may be called an ante-initial difficulty of a further kind, which is of the most formidable size and weight; and this is that the exact dates of these crucial documents—a point

\(^1\) History of English Prosody p. 27.
upon which as must be obvious, almost everything turns—are in all cases impossible to ascertain with absolute certainty, and in a majority of cases impossible to ascertain at all without relying on what is mainly guess-work.” If this is so in regard to ancient English Prosody which pertains to the 12th and 13th centuries A.D., how much more should it be so in respect of ancient Tamil Prosody which takes us as far back as four centuries before Christ?

The exact date of Tolkāppiyam is yet to be fixed. Suffice to note that it was probably more ancient than the works of the 3rd Academy which have come down to us. That it is mentioned in the commentary of Agapporul as a treatise that arose in the 2nd Academy period and that several verses of the 3rd Academy collected under different heads inclusive of Puranānūru betray that they are not in conformity in certain respects with the rules of Tolkāppiyar are points that might show that Tolkāppiyam was not conterminous with nor posterior to the works of the 3rd Academy period. If Tolkāppiyar had seen the three supposed collections of the 3rd Académy
period namely Etṭuttogai, Pattupāṭṭu and Padinēṅkilkanākkku, then his rules in respect of certain verse-forms might have been different, for "the rule\(^1\) comes from the work, not the work from the rule": "Creation must precede criticism, since the critic does not invent rules, only infers them from practice";\(^2\) and "though works of art are not made by rule, yet rules may be made from them."\(^3\)

But unfortunately we are denied the pleasure and privilege of first-hand knowledge of the works that existed before Tolkāppiyam arose, for works of the first Academy period and other works of the second Academy period have not come down to us. Apart from the tradition that Tolkāppiyar had a master before him in

---

\(^1\) Saintsbury—History of English Prosody—Preface p. VI.


\(^3\) E. A. G. Lamborn: The Rudiments of Criticism p. 36.
Agattiya, his very treatise reveals\(^1\) that there were several prosodists who had gone before him.\(^2\) Dr. Caldwell too says, "whatever antiquity may be attributed to Tolkāppiyam, it must have been preceded by many centuries of literary culture". "It lays down rules for different kinds of poetical compositions which must have been deduced from examples furnished by the best authors whose works were then in existence".\(^3\) That these works have not reached our hands owing, as they say, to several deluges\(^4\) that took place or to several fires that might have broken up or to other causes such as consumption by white ants, is an unfortunate point that bars us

\(^1\) Tolkāppiyam, Porul—Seyyul—
S. 78. "Yāppena molipā yāppari pulavar."
S. 75. "Varaivin reṇpa vāyamolip pulavar."
S. 98. "Poḷippena molital pulavar ārē."
S. 99. "Irucir īḍaiyidīṇ orūveṇa molipā."


\(^4\) Commentary of Iraiyanār Agapporul pp. 6–7 (Bavanandam Pillai Edition 1916)
from any examination of the prosodic expression of ages before Tolkāppiyar. If prosody, to begin with, could not have been full-fledged till the feathers of the language were well-moulted and regrown,¹ we are denied that interesting study of its slow growth from the bottom.

We have therefore to begin not from the beginning but from Tolkāppiyam. But before proceeding to a study of Tolkāppiyar's treatise it behoves us to stop for a while to think of his supposed master Agattiya. The traditions about Agattiya are many and numerous and do sometimes conflict with one another.² At any rate it may be conceded that there might have lived a grammarian by name Agattiya in the dim, distant past just before or in the


² (1) "Agattiya in the Tamil Land" by Mr. K. N. Sivaraja Pillai, B.A.


(3) History of Tamil Literature by M. S. P. pp. 19-20.
time of Tolkāppiyar.¹ He is reported to have given many rules relating to prosody in his huge general treatise, Agattiyyam. And these rules are said to have been more elaborate than Tolkāppiyar’s.² But with the materials now available to us we can in no way support this statement. For all that we can now glean and gather are a few rules ascribed to Agattiyya by certain commentators of Tolkāppiyam and Yāpparūṅkalam of a later date.³ Iḻampūraṇar,

¹ Prof. S. S. Bharati, M.A., B.L., in the Anna-
malai University Journal Vol. IV, No. 1.

² Pērāsiriyar in the commentary of Tolkāppi-
yam—Marapiyal § 95 says:—

"Seyyul ilakkaṅam agattiyattup parantu kidan-
tatanai ivvāsiriyar (Tolkāppiyar) curuṅkac ceytalıṅ
arumainōkkip pakuttuk kūriṅār ākalānum" etc.

³ (1) "Taravē eruttam arākam coccaham
Aḍakkiyal vāramodu ainturuppu uḍaitte" (shown as quoted by Iḻampūraṇar in the com-

(2) "Āraḍi arākam tāme nāṅkāy
orōvonru vitalu mudaiya múvirandaḍi
irāḍi ākum ilipuk kellai" (ibid.)

(3) "Koccaha vakaiyin eṅnodu virāay
Adakkiya liṅri aḍankavum perumē"
(ibid. p. 135).
though anterior to Pērāsiriyar, was not so ancient as to be supposed to have been a contemporary of Agattiya or one that followed him closely in point of time. All that can be deduced from his citations of these rules is that in his time there was a belief—perhaps a mistaken one—that they were from the pen of Agattiya. And Ḫampūranar seems to have embodied in his commentary what he heard in his days without enquiring into their authenticity. This applies to the commentator of

(4) "Iruvayin ottum evva iyaliyum
Teriyilai makaļirodu maintariだai varum
Kalappē ayinum pulapppē ayinum
Aintiṇai marapiŋ arivuvarat tōŋrip
Polivođu pnarnaça poruṭṭira muḍaiyatu
Kaliyenap padūum Kāṭchit tākum"

(5) "Kalaviṇum karpinum Kalakka millō
talaivanum talaivyum pirinta kālaik
Kaiyaru tuyaramodu Kāṭchik kavāvi
..........................Uyarkalī ānantap
Paiyul enṛu pālittanar pulavar"

Yāpparun'kalam also. But when this latter commentator speaks as though he had Agattiyam in his days, what should we say of that? At page 282 of Yāpparun'kala-Virutti he gives us the following statement:—“Find the limits of the several parts of Kali in Seyamurai, Seyirriyam and Agattiyam. If they are to be related here much space will be required. Learn them from those well-versed.” If that treatise ever existed at all in his days, it would be highly inexplicable why or how we have lost it now, since he seems to have lived not earlier than the 10th century A.D. It would not be wrong however if we presumed that there might have been a work called Agattiyam

1 This lack of enquiry but taking on faith is noticed in later commentators as well, as may be seen from the fact that the commentator of Ilakkaṇa-Vilakkam quotes a line “Muḍiporul illātu adiyalapilavē” as from Tolkāppiyar. He does so, not because he has seen for himself such a rule in Tolkāppiam but because it is quoted by the commentator of Yāpparun'kalam (at p. 124) as though it were from Tolkāppiyam.

INTRODUCTORY

which was put into the hands of the commentator but there is no sufficient warrant to believe that that work was not spurious.¹

While talking on Agattiya one cannot refrain from referring to his supposed disciples. The tradition goes that Tolkāppiyar, Avinayānār, Kākkaipādiṇiyār, Nāṟṟatta-nār, Vāippiyaṇār, Adaṅkōttāsāṁ, Paṇam-bāranār, Thurāliṅgar, Sembūṭchēy, Vaiyā-pikānār, Kāḷārambar and Vāmaṇar were the twelve disciples of Agattiya in the field of grammar. "The origin of this tradition, though late, is obscure."² That Agattiya had twelve disciples is first mentioned in the preface to Puṟapporuḷ-veṇpā-mālai.³

¹ Similarly Mr. M. S. Purnalinga Pillai treats the Agattiya sutrams published by Mr. Bavanandam Pillai as spurious. (Vide his History of Tamil Literature p. 21).

² Agattiya in the Tamil Land by Mr. K.N. Sivaraja Pillai, p. 35.

³ "Maṇṇiya cirappin vānor vēṇṭat
Teṇmalai irunta circlal muṇivaraṇ
Tānpāl tanḍamil tāvīn ṿūnarnaṇ
Tuṅnarūṇ cīrttit tolkāp piyaṇmudal
Paṇṇiru pulavarum pāṅkurap pakarnta
Paṇṇiru paḍalumum."—
But even there the names of the disciples are not given. When and by whom the tradition about the names of these persons was started we do not know. At any rate it was not older than the age of Purapporuḷ-venpā-mālai. This book is said to have been based on an earlier treatise called Purul—Paṇṇirupaḍalam. That treatise is said to have been written by the twelve disciples of Agattiya of whom Tolkāppiyar is reckoned as one. He is regarded as the author of the chapter relating to “Veṭchi.” The Chapter on Veṭchi in Purapporuḷ-venpā-mālai said to have been based on Paṇṇirupaḍalam should give us an idea of what must have been contained in that lost work. Considered in this way, Purapporuḷ-venpā-mālai nullifies the statement that Tolkāppiyar composed the chapter on veṭchi in Paṇṇirupaḍalam, for we find that the veṭchi of Tolkāppiyam (Puram. §2 and 3) is not the same as, but different from, the Veṭchi of Purapporuḷ-venpā-mālai.¹ Whereas the latter denotes by Veṭchi the

¹ Padalam I.
cattle raid alone, the former includes also the rescue of the cattle. Tolkāppiyar might not have talked of raid and rescue of the cattle in one book and of raid alone in another under the head Vēṭchi.\(^1\) This in a way makes us doubt the wisdom of holding that twelve disciples of Agattiya including Tolkāppiyar gave Paṇṇirupāḍalām.\(^2\) As mention of these twelve disciples, though not by name, appears for the first time only in a book based on Paṇṇirupāḍalām, namely, Puṟapporul-venpā-mālai, would it not be wise to discard it until clear evidence is shown? Perhaps Paṇambāraṇār and Adaṅkōṭṭāsār were the only two classmates of Tolkāppiyar. Others who might have come later appear to have been included to make up the list of twelve disciples at a time when the tradition, which is obscure, arose.

---

\(^1\) See Iḻampūraṇar’s commentary on Tol. Puṟam S. 2 where he says:—

“Ataṇāl, Paṇṇirupadalattul Vēṭchippadalam
Tolkāppiyar kūriṇār enṟal poruntātu.”

ADVANCED STUDIES IN TAMIL PROSODY

Now we shall proceed to see what sort of prosody Tolkāppiyar has given us. Prosody, according to Professor Saintsbury, means the laws and variations observable in the rhythmical and metrical grouping of syllables. Whereas Agattiya’s treatise is reported to have been of three main parts, namely, Iyal, Isai and Nāṭakam, Tolkāppiyar’s contains three main parts viz., Letters, Words and Contents (or matter) which would all come under Iyal. In the 3rd Part of the book he has devoted a chapter to “composition” or “Seyyuḻ” whose rules amount to 243 in number. His chapter on composition is unique, and differs from Yāpparuṅkalam and other later prosodial treatises by virtue of the fact that his conception of ‘Seyyuḻ’ was broad-based covering the whole range of composition, viz., poem, prose, grammar, etc. (Vide S. 79).¹ His was not a chapter that contained rules relating merely to poetry. He

¹ “Pāṭṭu urai nūḷē vāymoḻi piciyē
Aṅkatam muducolōḍu Avvēḷ nilattum
...
...
Yāppin Vaḷiya teṉmaṉar pulavar.”
enumerates the several items that had been considered by famous authors as essential elements of composition or Seyyul in his very first rule in that chapter. There are 26 such elements that can be traced in a given stanza of yore. Secondly, there are 8 more elements which can be found not in a stray stanza but in any work or treatise taken as a whole. The twenty-six elements are:—(I) time-beat or māttirai, (II) letter or elūttiyalvakai, (III) syllable or asaivakai, (IV) foot or cîr, (V) line or aḍi, (VI) connection or Yāppu, (VII) practice or marapu, (VIII) note or tūkku, (IX) rhyme or toṭai, (X) grace or nōkku, (XI) verse-form or pā, (XII) limits or ălavu, (XIII) genus or tinai, (XIV) conduct or kaikōl, (XV) speaker or kūṟuvakai, (XVI) auditor or kētpōr, (XVII) place or kalān, (XVIII) time or kālam, (XIX) effect or payaṅ, (XX) expression or meyppāḍu, (XXI) omission or eccam, (XXII) clue or muṇṇam, (XXIII) general nature or poruḷ, (XXIV) species or tuṟai, (XXV) a kind of syntax or māṭṭu and (XXVI) rhythm or Vaṇṇam.

The other 8 parts known as “Vaṇappu” relate to works (1) where a few sweet
words which do not run to more than 5 or 6 feet occur, (2) where poetic expressions are abundant, (3) where prose and verse are interspersed, (4) where sweet words on noble subjects run to any number of feet, (5) where a novel nature is found, (6) where surd-consonants in the end are absent, (7) where plain common speech is used, and (8) where a musical nature without combination of surd-consonant with surd is noticed. These are respectively called ammai, alaku, tonmai, tol, virundu, iyaipu, pulan and ilaipu.

It must be noted here that Tolkäppiyar did not arbitrarily give these as elements of composition in his treatise but that he followed some prosodists who had preceded him as is evident from his own words.¹ The term ‘Seyyuḻ’ meaning composition has, however, been narrowed in its meaning and none takes it to-day to refer to prose or grammar. It is a case where a change of meaning has come into vogue by means of the semantic principle of specialisation.²

¹ "Nallisaip pulavar ceyyuḻ uruḷpeṇa Vallitir kūri vakutturait tanarē."
² Cf. my essay in Tamil Polil Vol. XIII Part II p. 413.
LETTER

In ancient days, letter seems to have received great importance as the unit in prosody. Tolkāppiyam sections 36–42, 52, and 57 to 59 will bear out this statement. The letters that occurred in each line of the stanza were reckoned and by means of note or ēsai it was decided as to what category the stanza belonged. Slowly, in the

1 (1) Nālelut tāti yāka āreluttu
    Ėriya nilattē kūraladī ēnpa.       (S. 36)
 (2) Ėlelut tenpa cintadik kalavē
    Ėrelut tērītam alvalī āna.
 (3) Pattelut tenpa nēradik kalavē
    Otta nālelut tērralañ kaḍaiyē.
 (4) Mūvain teluttē nediladik kalavē
    Ėreluttu mikutalum iyalpena molipa.
 (5) Mūvareluttē kalinedi kalavē
    Ėreluttu mikutalum ivatperum ēnpa.
 (6) Ĉirnilai tānē ainhelut tiravātū.
 (7) Nērnilai vañjikku ārum ākum.    (S. 42)
 (8) Aivakai adiyum āsīriyak kuriya.  (S. 52)
 (9) Kūraladī mudalā alavaḍī kārum
    Urānilai ilavē vañjik kenpa.       (S. 57)
 (10) Alavuñ cintum veḷḷaik kuriya
    Taḷaivakai onṛat taḥmai āna.       (S. 58)
 (11) Alavaḍi mikuti ulappadat tōnṛi
    Irunedil adiyuñ kaliyir kuriya.    (S. 59)
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days of Kākkaipādinīyār and Narrattanār letter seems to have gone into the background in this respect, and foot came to occupy its place. This is evident from 2 sections of Kākkaipādinīyam and Nārāttam quoted by the commentator of Yāpparunākalam (at page 100). That the letter did not hold this position in medieval times and that its place was taken up by foot or cīr can be understood easily by a reference to Yāpparunākalam sections 17 and 24 et seq. However, a certain form known as Kattalaikkali arose in the medieval period where reckoning of letters was adopted. Tolkāppiyar’s rule regarding the different number of letters which should occur in different forms of verse was not so rigid however, as the rule relating to the kattala form of the later day.

1 (1) Cīrodu cūrtalai pēyvatu tālai avai Ēleṇa molīpa iyalfuṇarn tōrē. (S. 17)

(2) Kūraḷadi cuntadi irucīr muccīr Alavadi nediladi narciśr aiṇcīr Niraṇirai vakaiyāṇ niṟuttaṇār koḷalē. (S. 24)

2 "Eluttaḷavu eṇciṇum cīrnilai tāṇē Kūṇralum mikuṭalum ilēṇa molīpa." (S. 43)

3 Vide infra.
In the matter of syllable, Tolkāppiyar had four kinds, viz., nēr, nirai, nērbu and niraibu whereas Kākkaipādiniyār\(^1\) (as quoted at p. 48, Virutti) seems to have had only two kinds, namely, single and double, equivalent to Nēr and Nirai. On the other hand, Avinayanār had four kinds but his statement that nēr shall receive one reckoning or alagu, nirai two, nērbu three and niraibu four seems unreasonable when it is remembered that nērbu will in some places be treated as nēr-nēr, and niraibu as nirai-nēr, but ordinarily as equivalent to nēr and nirai.

Tolkāppiyam S. 4 lays down how nērbu and niraibu are obtained.\(^2\) If words of the nature of terminations in U with a nēr or

---

\(^1\) Palkāyaṉār is reported by the commentator of Yāpparūṅkalam at p. 58 to have talked of the four kinds but his rule is not quoted in this respect either at that page or at p. 67.

\(^2\) Iruvakai ukaramōdu iyaintavai variṇē
Nērpum niraipum ākum eṇpa.
nirai preceding it occur in a foot, they are scanned as nērbu and niraibu. Since the shortened U is neither a short vowel proper nor a consonant in sound and since also the ordinary U which follows nēr or nirai is somewhat similar in the matter of sound to the shortened U, Tolkāppiyar’s division of syllables into four kinds seems to be justifiable. That it is sound may be realised also when it is understood that certain words like Kōdu, Nānu, Varahu and Urumu can be treated as though they are one single syllable each, instead of being split into two regardless of sense. By means of Tolkāppiyar’s division we can easily show that the following stanza¹ cited by the Yāpparuṅkalam commentator as an imperfect āsiriyam (at p. 94 Virutti) is a perfect one. That commentator says that in this stanza the metrical connection of other varieties of verse besides Agaval is present,

¹ “Neṇuvaraic cāral kuruṅkōṭṭup palaviṇ Viṇḍuvār tiṅculai viṅkukavuṭ kaḍuvan Uṇḍucilam pēri ōṇkiya iruṅkalaip Paṭitam payiṟrum enpa Maṇiyāk kolaivil ennaiyar malaiyē.”
whereas if the rule of Tolkāppiyar is applied, Kuṟuṅkōṭṭu will only be a nirai-nērbu (amounting to nirai-nēr) and not nirai-nēr-nēr. Similarly, Vīṅkukavul and Uṇḍucilam will be taken as a two-syllabled foot each and not three-syllabled (i.e., as nēr-nirai and not as nēr-nirai-nēr.)
FOOT

Tolkāppiyar says in S. 12 that a foot will contain either 2 syllables or 3 syllables.\(^1\) By his section 27 we understand that in certain places in certain verses (S. 73-75) a foot may be of one syllable too.\(^2\)

Kākkaipādiniyār (p. 70 of Virutti) Palkāyaṉār (p. 67 ibid.) and Avinayaṉār (p. 65 ibid.) add 4-syllable foot also. The author of Yāpparuṅkalam also has 4-syllable foot. He is said to have followed Kākkaipādiniyār and others in this respect (p. 58 and 420 Virutti). The author of Yāpparuṅkalakkārigai is generally supposed to be the same as that of Yāpparuṅkalam. For our purpose it is enough now to know that at any rate he was a close follower of Yāpparuṅkalam. No wonder then if he talks of four-syllabled foot in his treatise.

\(^1\) "īrasai kōṇṭatu cīr eṇappādumē mūvasai iṟattal illēna molipā." lines from an unknown metrist (quoted at p. 422 Virutti) provide food for thought as to whether, prior to Tolkāppiyar's days, even a 3-syllabled foot was considered the maximum limit.

\(^2\) "Īsainilai niraiya nirkuva āyin
Asainilai varaiyār cīrnilai peralē."
LINE

The next great unit is the line according to Tolkāppiyar, whereas Kākkaipāḍiniyār and Sirukākkaipāḍiniyār seem to have had talai or metrical connection as the next unit. Yāpparunkalam, Kārigai and other later works follow the latter school. But it must be remembered that though Tolkāppiyar has not counted talai as one of the thirty-four elements of composition he talks of it with foot in sections like 33, and 54 to 63.

Whereas according to Tolkāppiyar (S. 54), iyarcīr (nēr-nēr or nirai-nirai or nēr-nirai or nirai-nēr) must occur alternately with āsiriya uriccīr (nērбу-nērбу-nērбу etc.)

1 Kākkaipāḍiniyār is taken by Nachchinārki-niyan and Pērāsiriyar as not to have talked of talai as a unit (Vide their commentary on S. 1). Compare this with pp. 91-92 Virutti where the rules of Kākkaipāḍiniyār and Sirukākkaipāḍiniyār regarding talai are quoted. (e.g. “Īyarcīr irandu talaippeyal tammul vikarpa vakaivyatu venṭalai ākum.” “Īyarcīr onrā nilaiyatu venṭalai, uriccīr ataṅil onṛutal iyalpē.”
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in an agaval line, whereas a line with āsiriya uriccīr alone will never be taken as of Agaval note, a line or stanza with veṅcīr or kaliccīr alone can occur and yet be called an agaval in later times (vide Yāpparunuṅkalam commentary p. 93). The classification of the Verse according to the number of letters each line contained, other things being satisfied, is a characteristic of Tolkāppiyar’s prosodial treatise which we do not find in the body of the work of Yāpparunuṅkalam. Whether Kākkaipāḍiṇiyār was in conformity or not with Tolkāppiyar in this respect cannot be easily decided with our scanty information about him. But this much can be said that the commentator might have certainly quoted him, if he had known Kākkaipāḍiṇiyār’s say on such a classification. When we find (at pp. 105-6 virutti) that he quotes Tolkāppiyar alone as the representative of the school which had kaṭṭalai line, the inference is reasonable that Kākkaipāḍiṇiyār belonged to the other school.
DIVISION OF LINES

The line according to all Tamil prosodists is divisible into 5 kinds, viz., short, medium, standard, long and overlong. Tolkäppiyar says that lines of the size of 4-6 letters are short, 7-9 letters medium, 10-14 standard, 15-17 long and 18-20 overlong. This must be compared with the latter definitions of the five kinds of line. Among other prosodists including Kākkaipāḍiṇiyār there is not disagreement among themselves about the first four categories, for they agree that a short line shall be of 2 feet, medium of 3 feet, standard of 4 feet and long of 5 feet. But as regards the 5th category, i.e. overlong, there appears to have been some disagreement. Kākkai-pāḍiṇiyār is unfortunately not cited by the commentator of Yāpparunikal. But he cites “iraṇḍu mutalā etṭirāka” (= from two to eight) as a rule of ‘some author’ (p. 102). This selfsame rule is cited in the commentary of Yāpparunkalakkārigai in a certain edition as from Kākkaipāḍiṇiyār. There

1 K. R. Govindaraja Mudaliar's.
is another edition which simply gives the rule and is silent about the author. From this rule all that we can surmise at present is that there might have been a time when an overlong line had 8 feet as the maximum. From Tolkāppiyam § 65 we understand that a line can have 7 feet as the maximum in certain kinds of verses (Parpāḍal and Kali). It is natural for poets who came after Tolkāppiyar to have fallen into eight feet sometimes and this must have been considered thereafter as maximum for sometime. This position will help us to understand the rule "iraṇḍu mutalā eṭṭirāka" just quoted. The next stage is found in Yāpparuṅkalam S. 25 where it is stated that an overlong line shall be between 6 and 10 feet. The author of

1 A. Kumaraswami Pulavar's.
2 I wrote to Mr. K. R. Govindaraja Mudaliar for information regarding this but he has replied that he has no other information than is found in the book published.
3 "Eḻucīr adiyē muḍugiyal Naḍakkum."
4 "Kaḷinedil adiyē kasaḍar̥ak kilaḷpiṇ Āručīr mudalā aiyiraṇḍu īṟā Varuvaṇa piṟavum vakuttaṇar koḷalē."
Yāpparuṅkalakkārigai simply says ¹ that feet exceeding five will contribute to an over-long line (S. 12). But its commentator cites examples only up to 10-feet verse. This shows that the Kārigai commentator, if not its author, is at least one with the author of Yāpparuṅkalam in respect of the maximum number of feet of this particular kind. In view of these facts it is strange to see the commentator of Yāpparuṅkalam citing stanzas with 11-13 feet lines ² as illustrations of stanzas with overlong lines (p. 104). That poets who came after Yāpparuṅkalam should have gradually composed verses exceeding 10 feet lines is the only reasonable inference that could be drawn. As the names of authors of the verses cited at p. 104 Virutti are not given, and as they are not traceable so far, we are unable to decide whether they really preceded or

¹ "Aiyorecir niraitaru pādam neḍilādiyām....
...... Mikka pādam kāli neḍilē."

² Verses beginning with the words:
   "Aruḷāḷi oṛrum" (running to 11 feet).
   "Kōḷari vāḷari" (running to 12 feet).
   "Naḍi mīḍal" (running to 13 feet).
succeeded the author of Yāpparuṇkalam. ¹ It is strange that Tolkāppiyar’s division according to the number of letters has not been mentioned by any of these later prosodists.

As regards the intermixing of feet of different note with different feet, Tolkāppiyam says that in an ordinary Āsiriya line all feet ² except Kali can occur, whereas Yāpparuṇkalam and Kārigai authors seem to say that only Veṅpā foot of 2 syllables and Vaṅji foot will occur (S. 29 and S. 41). ³ But the commentators of both these latter

¹ Whether they are not stanzas composed by the commentator himself as illustrations is also a point for consideration.

² (1) “İnçir iyaiya varukuva täyin Vencir varaiyar āsiriya adikkē.” (§ 30)
(2) “Annilai maruṅkiṉ vaṅji uriccir Oṟṟutal uḍaiya ńororu vaḷiyē.” (§ 31)
(3) “İyarcir velladi āsiriya maruṅkiṉ Nilakkkuri marapiṉ nirkavum perumē.” (§ 62)

³ (1) “İyarcir velladi vaṅji adiyivai Akappaḍa varũum akavalum uḷavē.” (Yāpparuṅkalam)
(2) “İyarṟalai velladi vaṅjiyin pādam agavalullāṅ Mayakkap pāḍa alla.” (Kārigai)
prosodies say that in an āsirīya line Venpā foot of 3 syllables and Kali foot also may occur and cite illustrations therefor.¹ But the verses quoted cannot help us in any way regarding the justification of this statement unless and until we know the date and name of the work to which they belong.

Tolkāppiyar does not say anywhere that in a Venpā line other varieties of foot also will occur and by this argument of silence we must suppose that in his days no other kind of foot except Venpā foot was admissible in a Venpā. Yāpparunḵalām² and Kārigai³ definitely say that if other

¹ Verses beginning with the words:—
(1) "Aṅkaṅ madiyam aravīṕvāy pattrēṇa." (Virutti p. 116)
(2) "Aṅāp perumaiya vanaṅku maniṣṇaṅkum
Vanaṅku cimaiyattu manamakilntu piriyātu." (ibid. p. 118)
and (3) "Kuruguvēṅ tali kodupuyat tuṉēṇa
Māvalaṅku perūṅkattu malakaliṟu kāṉatu." (Kārigai (K.R.G.) (p. 153)
² "Vellaiyutt piratala virava." (§. 22)
³ "Vellaittanmai kunrip pōm cīr kaṇi pukin, Pullātu ayaṟṟalai." (§. 40)
kinds of foot except Veṇpā occur in a Veṇpā, the Veṇpā note would be destroyed.

As regards Kali line, Veṇpā foot may occur in it according to both Tolkāppiyam\(^1\) and Yāpparunḵalam.\(^2\)

Besides, he says that Kaliveṇpāṭṭu, Kaikkilai, Seviaṟivurūu and Puṇanilai have no limits. But a sutram\(^3\) quoted (at p. 124 Virutti) from Tolkāppiyam by the commentator of Yāpparunḵalam is not found anywhere in the text of Tolkāppiyam. This seems to say that the maximum of lines is determined by the subject treated. But if we read this with S. 157, 158, 159 and 160 we cannot accept this statement, for it is in distinct contradiction of the point contained in them. That those 4 sections prescribe the maximum limits also is obvious. When we find that these 4 sutrams are quoted by the commentator together with the one under dispute as the last, the problem

\(^{1}\) "Virāaya taḷaiyum orūunilai iฑē." (§. 61)
\(^{2}\) Veḷḷadi kaliyinul viravavum peṟumē." (§ 30)
\(^{3}\) "Muḍi poruḷ allātu aṭiyalapilavē."
DIVISION OF LINES

whether it might not have been from the pen of any other metrist is easily solved. But the commentator definitely says that they were all formulated by Tolkāppiyar. Still, as the sutram under-reference is contradictory to S. 157-160 and as it is not found in the editions of the text of Tolkāppiyam available so far, it is prudent to treat it as spurious.¹

Narrattanār, Palkāyaṇār and Saṅga-Yāppudaiyār agree with Tolkāppiyar as to the maximum and minimum number of lines of āsiriyam.

Kākkaipañiyār prescribes 3 lines as the minimum and leaves the author to have the maximum as he likes. Metrists Pērāsi-riyār and Parimāṇanār also prescribe at one place 1000 lines as the maximum but at

¹ Is it not interesting to note that this mistake is again perpetrated by the commentator of Ilakkana-Vilakkam too? He cites this line as from Tolkāppiyar not because he has seen it in Tolkāppiyam text but because one of his predecessors (the commentator of Yāpparuṅkalam) has cited it earlier as though from Tolkāppiyar.
another place\(^1\) they seem to contradict themselves. Pērāsiriyar\(^2\) is shown at one place as prescribing 1000 lines for āsiriyam and at another place as saying that the maximum varies according to the subject treated. And Parimāṇaṇār is shown at one place as prescribing 1000 lines as the maximum for āsiriyam and at another place 992 lines.

The author of Yāpparunīkkalam says that 3 lines is the minimum for an āsiriyam\(^3\) and the commentator says that the maximum is decided by the subject treated.\(^4\)

\(^1\) (1) Pērāsiriyar:—(p. 124-125 Virutti).
(a) “Aiyiru nūḍadi āsiriyam vañjic ceyyuḷ naḍappinum cirappudaittenpa.”
(b) “Pēṇum porulmuḍipē perumaikku ellai.”

(2) Parimāṇaṇār:—
(a) “Vañji āsiriyam enṟiru pāṭṭum eṅcā múvaḍi ḫipu uyarpū āyiram.”
(b) “Mūvaḍi mutalā muṟai cirantērit tollāyirattut Toṇṇurṛ enṉirandu Eytuṇeṇpa iyalpu uṇantarē.”

\(^2\) Pērāsiriyar the metrist is referred to in several places also as Mayēchuraṇār.

\(^3\) “Ciṟumai múvaḍi āsiriyam.” (§ 32.)

\(^4\) Vide virutti p. 123.
Kārigai puts these two statements together in its text itself.¹ So, the author of Kārigai is in perfect agreement with Kākkaipādiniyār.² The author of Yāpparunākalam, since he talks only of the minimum, may also be said to agree with Kākkaipādiniyār and not with Tolkāppiyar.

But what looks strange is that a sutram alleged to be Avinayaṇār’s³ is the only solitary instance that prescribes one line as the minimum for āsiriyam. It agrees with Kākkaipādiniyār as regards the maximum being determined according to the subject treated. Whether Avinayaṇār lived in the age of Auvaivaiyār, whichever Auvaivaiyār she might be, and took the line-limit from her

¹ "Mūṇṛu agavarku ilipu; uraippōr Ullak karuttin alavē perumai." (§ 14)
² Kākkaipādiniyār says:—
"Uraippōr kurippinai anṟip perumai Varattit tunaiyenā vaitturai yillenru Uraittaṇar mādō uṇarnticī nōrē."
(Virutti p. 123)
³ "Oṇṟum iranḍum mūṇṛum oriranḍum enṟim muraiye pāvīn cīrumai taṅkuriṟ pīnave toḍaiyin perumai."
(Virutti p. 123.)
Koṇraiy-Vēndan, Āthi-Chūdi etc., is a matter for serious consideration.¹

Thus we see that there are 3 views. For convenience sake, we shall call them, (1) Tolkāppiyar's (2) Kākkaipāḍinīyar's and (3) Avinayanār's views. It is probable that Tolkāppiyar had in his days some works of āsiriya metre running up to 1000 lines which have not been handed over to posterity; it is equally likely that Tolkāppiyar simply prescribed the maximum, following some old Tamil treatise on prosody which in turn should have prescribed the limit not because works had reached 1000 lines but because 1000 lines could safely be sanctioned as the maximum. From the ancient Tamil literature available to us we cannot pick up any work of āsiriya metre running up to 1000 lines. The Pattu-Ｐāṭṭu or Ten Idylls is a collection of poems, most of them being in āsiriya metre, composed by several poets like Nakkīrar,

¹ He might have seen also Muddu-Moli-Kānchi which has 90 one-lines and 10 two-lines and might have taken it to be of the Āsiriya type.
DIVISION OF LINES

Kapilar and others on kings like Karikāla-Chōla and Neḍuṅcheliyān. In this collection we find poems ranging from 103 lines to 782 lines. Most of them are said to be in āsiriya metre by Dr. V. Swaminatha Aiyar.¹ He says that in Porunaraṟṟupaḍai, Madurai-Kaṅchi and Paṭṭinappālai there are Vaṅji feet also. At any rate none of these poems exceeds 782 lines. Having this collection before him and finding that the number of its lines is ranging between 103 and 782 and finding also that no work of 1000 lines was available, the author of Yāpparuruṅkalam must have naturally inferred that the maximum is to be decided with reference to the subject treated and so it is that he does not give any maximum. If he had followed Kākkapāḍiniyār in this respect, we have to look back and see whether Kākkai-pāḍiniyār was really a classmate of Tolkāppiyar or whether he was posterior to the latter. Of the other alleged classmates of Tolkāppiyar, Nāṟṟattanaṅar and Palkāyaṅar are found to agree with Tolkāppiyar in this respect as shown above. But

¹ Vide his preface to Pattu-pāṭṭu.
here is Avinayanār who differs from Tolkāppiyar but is in agreement with Kākkaipādiniyār regarding the maximum and who differs totally from all other metrists regarding the minimum. He prescribes only one line as the minimum. This is quite impossible according to Tolkāppiyam. From this, are we to understand that Avinayanār came later than Tolkāppiyar, if not later even than Kākkaipādiniyār?

As regards Vaṇji, Tolkāppiyar says that it will have limits similar to āsiriyam. This we understand from his S. 108. Kākkaipādiniyār, Avinayanār and the author of Yāpparunukalam prescribe 3 lines as the minimum and do not talk of the maximum.

---

1 "Adivin ciṟappē pāṭṭu enappadumē." S. 35. (Whereas Pērasiriyar interprets this section to mean that pāṭṭu is that which has more than 2 lines, Nachchinārkiniyār in his usual way of splitting and rejoining words takes this to mean that it would be considered to be a good pāṭṭu if it is of 4 feet lines.)

See also statement of Pērasiriyar (at p. 1159 Vol. II) "Oradiyānum tālisai varumāl enin, vāṟatu anṟē, idainilaippāṭṭu enṟar ākalin; enna? Pāṭṭu enappaduvana oradiyān vāṟamaiyin."

2 "Āsiriyā naḍaittē vaṇji."
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Parimāṇanār, on the other hand, seems to be in agreement with Tolkāppiyrar for he prescribes 1000 lines as maximum for this form also.¹

Next with regard to Veṅpā, Tolkāppiyar prescribes 2 lines as the minimum and 12 lines as the maximum limits.² Kākkai-pāḍiniyār prescribes, as is usual with him, only the minimum, and that is 2 lines (Virutti p. 121). Avinayanār concurs with him (p. 123 ibid.) in this respect. But Narrattaṇār, Palkāyaṇār and the author of Saṅga-Yāppu prescribe 2 lines as the minimum and 7 lines as the maximum for this form of verse.³ Parimāṇanār has 2 and 12

¹ Vide Virutti p. 125.
² "Neḍuven pāṭtu munnāl adittē
Kuruven pāṭtin ḍḷavelu cīrē.” (§ 158.)
³ (1) ḍraḍi mudalā onṟu talaiṭāṟantu
Ēḷadi kāṟum veṅpāṭ ṭuriya” (Narrattaṇār—Virutti p. 123).
(2) ḍraḍi mudalā ēḷadi kāṟum
Tiribila veḷḷaiṅku adittokai tānē”
(Palkāyaṇār—ibid. p. 124).
(3) “Ēḷadi ēṟuti ḍraḍi mudalā
Ēriya veḷḷaiṅku iyaintaṇa adiyē”
(Saṅga-Yāppu—ibid.)
lines as the minimum and maximum.¹ The author of Yāpparuṅkalam prescribes only the minimum even as Kākkaipāḍiniyār.

From these materials it can be inferred that in the period of Tolkāppiyam there were works in Vēnpā metre ranging between 2 and 12 lines.

But the upper limit seems to have waned to 6 lines later on, for there is no extant work of the 3rd Sangam that goes beyond 6 lines in Vēnpā. Kaḷavali alone of all the Eighteen Smaller works has a few stanzas in 6 lines.² The pāyiram of Āsarakkōvai runs with 6 lines. Tirukkūṟaḷ is in 2 lines of altogether 7 feet. Thus we see that in the later days of the third Sangam the earlier lower limit was maintained but not the upper. Probably after seeing these third Sangam works Nāṟṟattanār, Palkāyaṇār and the author of Saṅga-Yāppu prescribed the maximum as 7 lines. Kākkai-pāḍiniyār and Avinayaṇār left that limit to

¹ "Adivakai
Ōrirandu mudalā muraiiciran tirāru
Erum eṇpā iyalpuṇarn tōre." (Virutti p. 125)
² Vide Stanzas 6 and 28.
be decided by the poet himself. Parimāṇa-ṇār, who prescribes both the minimum and maximum for Venpā, is not however in agreement with Tolkāppiyar when he divides his types of Venpā into three, viz., short, standard, and long.¹

The limits prescribed by Tolkāppiyar for Paripādal, Aṅgatham and Paṇṇatti are not to be found in the later prosodists, for they do not contemplate such categories of verses at all.

There now remains only the Kali form to be considered. Tolkāppiyar divides the Kali form into 4 kinds viz., Ottālisai, Kali-Venpāṭṭu, Koccaham and Urāl-Kali. For the first of these he gives the maximum and minimum rather elaborately but leaves us to infer from these the maximum and

¹ "Kurāḷ ner nedil ena mūṇray" etc. He cannot be said to be a close follower of Tolkāppiyar, for as shown at p. 172 Virutti, he talks of 8 kinds of rhyme whereas Tolkāppiyar does not mention Kūlai, Inai and Kaduvāys. Again at p. 180 Virutti he is shown as defining irattai whereas Tolkāppiyar says without defining that it can be included under some other head.
minimum for 2 other kinds of Kali. Even the first kind is subdivided into two (S. 131, 132 and 138) and their respective limits are stated. There is one kind of Ottālisai which corresponds to the modern Nērisai-Ottālisai-Kali (S. 132) and the other kind is generally devoted to lauds of Dévar in the first person (S. 138). The latter of these is in turn divided into two kinds called Vaṇṇaham and Orubōhu (S. 139). For the first major division of Ottālisai (i.e., the form that corresponds to Nērisai-Ottālisai-Kali) Tol-kāppiyar begins to prescribe the limits first. He says that the taravu will be between 4 and 12 lines, \(^1\) that the tālisai will not exceed the taravu lines \(^2\) and that the curi-taham will be equal to, or less than, the taravu. \(^3\) Next as regards the minor division of Ottālisai, namely Vaṇṇaham, he prescribes different limits for taravu, tālisai and

\(^1\) "Taravē tānum nālaḍi ɨlɨpāy
Āriraṇḍu uyarpēn rāraiyavum pērumē." (§. 133)

\(^2\) "Idainilaip pāțe
Taravadakkapaṭṭa marapiṇa tenpa." (§. 134)

\(^3\) "Taraviyval ottum atanakap padumē
Puraitir ěruti nilaiyurait tānē." (§. 137)
DIVISION OF LINES

curitaham. Its taravu shall always be of 4 or 6 or 8 lines, its tālisai shall always be shorter than the taravu and its curitaham shall always be similar in length to taravu. Then he divides Orubōhu of S. 139 into 2 subheads, namely Kochchaha-Orubōhu and Ambōtharaṅga-Orubōhu (S. 147 and 148) and prescribes 10 to 20 lines as the limits of the former. The section of Tolkāppiyam which prescribes the limits of Ambōtharaṅga-Orubōhu runs as follows:

“Ambōtharaṅgam Ārupathirrū adittē Sempāl vāram cirumaikkku ellai.” (S. 151.)

Perāsiriyar, a commentator, says that there are 3 kinds of this type, one running from 60–120 lines, another running from 30–60 lines and a third from 15–30 lines. That this interpretation is not logical is what Nachchinarkiṇiyar seems to say in his commentary on this section. But his

1 "Taravē tānum Nāṅkum ārum ettum enra Nērāḍi pāṛiya nilaimait tākum.” (§. 141)
2 "Taravīr curuṅkit tōrurum enpa.” (§. 143)
3 "Adakkiyal vāram taravō ḍokkum.” (§. 144)
4 "Orupāṅ cirumai irāṭṭiyataṁ uyarpē.” (§. 150)
own also does not appear to be acceptable. He says that this type will have 15 and 12 lines as the two limits. Tolkāppiyar’s text does not at all seem to denote such meanings but what seems right and reasonable is Ilampūraņar’s interpretation which assigns 60 lines as maximum and 30 lines as minimum. The example cited by both Perāsiriyar and Nachchinārkinīiyar does not have more than 44 lines, and that easily comes under the interpretation of Ilampūraņar. Perāsiriyar is simply beating the air when he says “olintaṇavum ivvārē varum. ivai ellām ikkālattu vīltaṇa pōlum” (p.1197) and thereby shirks the responsibility to cite illustrations for Ambōtharaṅga-Orubōhu running up to 120 lines. So, setting aside the commentary of both Perāsiriyar and Nachchinārkinīiyar in respect of this section,

1 Nachchinārkinīiyar takes ‘sempāl vāram’ to mean “Ārupathir cempāl muppathil vāram pathiṇaṇindu,” whereas Ilampūraņar takes it to mean “(Ārupathil) naḍuvākiya nilai or cempāthi.” Vāram simply means a part or paṅku and not necessarily a quarter according to the Tamil dictionaries of Madura Tamil Sangam and Winslow.

2 “Seṇcuḍar vaḍamēru” etc., (p. 1196 Perāsiriyam and p. 176 Nachchināṛkinīiyam).
we shall take that Tolkāppiyar prescribes 60 and 30 lines as maximum and minimum for this particular type.

If we examine Tamil literature of the 3rd Sangam Age, we find that in Kalittogai Verse 75 the taravu exceeds 12 lines, in contravention of the rule 133 of Tolkāppiyam; in verse 16 the curitaham exceeds by one line the limit prescribed in S. 137; in verse 1 the curitaham falls short of one line prescribed in S. 144 for Vāṇṇahams on Dēvar. From these we must understand that Marudan-Ilā-Nāgaṉār, Pālaipāḍiya-Perunkaṇṭuṅgo and Nallantuvaṇār, the supposed authors of these Kali Verses, came after Tolkāppiyar had given his treatise on prosody, for otherwise Tolkāppiyar might have given different limits under which these lines would also fall.

Kākkai-Pādiṇiyār prescribes no limits for any one of these but simply says that

1 Kadavul vālttu—most probably by Nallantuvaṇār the author of Neydal-Kali who is said to have compiled all the five books together.
tālisai will not exceed taravu.¹ Avinayānār says that tālisai lines will be equal to taravu.² Sīru-Kākkai-pādiniyār prescribes no limits at all.³ The author of Yāpparuṅkalam is once again found to be in agreement with Kākkaipādiniyār, for he too stops by saying that the tālisai lines will be less than taravu.⁴ And the commentator of Yāpparuṅkalam asks us to look up to Seyeṅmuṟai, Seyeṅriyam and Agattiyam for limits of the Kali parts. He adds further that if he stated them, they would cover large space and so directs us to know these things from those that are well-versed.⁵ Now, let us turn to the author of Kārigai. He prescribes that the taravu of Vaṅṇāga-Ottālisai-Kalippā and Ambōtharaṅga-Ottālisai-Kalippā will always be of

¹ "Tattamil ottut taravin akappada
   Nirpaṇa munru nirantavai tālisaiyē.”
   (Virutti p. 284)

² Pērāsiriyar, an unidentified prosodist, says that curitaham will be equal to taravu in length. (p. 285 Virutti).

³ Vide Virutti p. 290.

⁴ “Tālisai munrum camanāyt taravil
curuṅki.” (§. 82).

⁵ Virutti page 282 bottom.
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6 lines and that the taravu of other kinds of Kali verse will have 3 lines as its minimum. As regards the tālisai he says that 2 and 4 lines are the two limits and that it will always have less lines than the taravu.¹

With these materials, if we look at Kalittogai verses 75, 16 and 1 cited before, we may infer that the practice of prescribing limits for the Kali parts began to wane gradually from the days of Tolkāppiyar down to the days of the author of Yāpparunțkalam. We also find that the author of Kārigai in his desire to give some well-defined limits for tālisai has wrongly assigned 4 lines as the maximum. This we cannot accept in the face of Kalittogai verse 137 which has tālisai of 5 lines and also in the face of the statement of Pērāsiriyar, the commentator of Tolkāppiyam, that we

¹ “Curuṅkīṟṟu munṛādi ēnait taraviru munṛādiyē
taraṅkakkum vāṇahak kuntara vāvatu,
tālisaippā
Curuṅkīṟṟu ēraṇṭādi ōkkam iratti..............
.................Curuṅkum taraviṅīl tālisaiyē.”
(§. 44)
must find out for ourselves tālisai of 6 lines also.\(^1\) As Kārigai's definition of Vaṇṇaga-Ottālisai-Kalippā and ambōtharaṅga Ottālisai-kalippā differs very much from that of Tolkāppiyam, it is no good comparing its limits with Tolkāppiyam's.

In these circumstances we can only take that the minimum limit of 4 lines prescribed for Kali by Kākkaipādiniyār,\(^2\) Avinayaṇār,\(^3\) and the author of Yāpparuni-kalam\(^4\) should apply to taravu alone.

---

1 p. 1159 (Tol. Vol. II Perāsiriyam.)
2 "Nāṅkām adiyiṇum mūṇrān todaiyiṇum Tāṅtu kalippāt taḷuvutal ilavē." (Virutti p. 121).
3 "Oṁrum iraṇḍum mūṇrumō riraṇḍum Eṁrim muraiyē pāvin cirumaī." (Virutti p. 123).
4 "Eṇciyatu iriraṇḍu adiyē ilipēna molipa. (§.32).
RHYME OR TODOAI

"The Tamil metres have been marked with profuse and elaborate rhyme, alliteration and assonance."¹ In respect of rhyme or todoai Tolkāppiyar talks of Mōnai,² Edukai,³ Muranç,⁴ and Iyaibu⁵ as major divisions. To these four he adds alapedai.⁶ Next in order of importance come Polippu,⁷ Orūu,⁸ and Sentodoai.⁹ (S. 88–90). Lastly he says that Niral-Niruttamaittal and Iraṭṭai-Yăppu¹⁰ can be included under some head

² (a) A rhyme where initial letters agree.
(b) A rhyme where the second letters agree.
(c) The contrary either in mere word or in its meaning.
(d) A rhyme where the last letters or syllables or feet agree.
(e) Elongations occurring in the first feet.
(f) Rhyme in the 1st and 3rd feet.
(g) Rhyme in the 1st and 4th feet.
(h) Blank verse where mōnai etc., do not occur.
(i) Only one word occurring several times and making up a line.
or other already mentioned. The author of Yāpparuṇkālam describes the various types of toḍai as Mōnai, eduκai, muraṇiyaib, aḷapeḍai, aḍi, iṇai, polippu, orūu, kūlai, kīl-kaduvāy, mēr-kaduvāy and mūrru. So we find that aḍi, iṇai, kūlai, kīl-kaduvāy, mēr-kaduvāy and Mūrru are the types added by the author of Yāpparuṇkālam. In addition, he talks of antādi and defines Iraṭṭai also.

The author of Saṅga-Yāppu and Palkāyaṉār are almost identical in view with

(j) Any rhyme occurring throughout the whole line.
(k) Rhyme in the 1st and 2nd feet.
(l) Rhyme in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd feet.
(m) Rhyme in the 1st, 2nd and 4th feet.
(n) Rhyme in the 1st, 3rd and 4th feet.
(o) Rhyme in all the four feet.
(p) Beginning a stanza with what has gone before as the termination of the last stanza.

1 “Muntiya mōnai yetukai aḷapeḍai
Antamil muraṇē centoḍai iyaipē
Polippē orūvē iraṭṭai ennum
Iyarpadū toḍai kal ivai mudalaka”
(Virutti p. 174)

2 “Mōnai etukai muraṇē aḷapeḍai
Ēṇaic centoḍai iyaipē polippē

50
Tolkāppiyar in respect of the number of types they talk about. The only difference is that they count īraṭṭai also along with the other eight mentioned by Tolkāppiyar. Unfortunately, we have no knowledge of what Kākkaipāḍiniyār’s view was. Nor any other prosodist by name is quoted, but under each of this section is shown some rule of some author, whose name is not given, as authority.\(^1\) In these circumstances, we must suppose that the types added on by the author of Yāpparuṅkalam should have been noticed in the works of the period following that of Tolkāppiyar. That this might have been so is amplified by the fact that the commentator of Yāpparuṅkalam cites illustrations for these types only from some works of the later period whose names and whose authors are not known to us now.

Another point of difference between Tolkāppiyam and Yāpparuṅkalam is found

Orūvē īraṭṭai onpatum piravum
Varuvāna virippin varampila enpa.”

(Virutti p. 175)

\(^1\) “Pirarum........................enrār.” (p. 165),
in respect of the latter's mention of certain subdivisions of muran, viz., Kadai-
inaiimuran,\(^1\)\(^a\) Pinmuran,\(^b\) and idaiipunar-
muran\(^c\) (§. 39). This muran is almost similar to what is called antithesis in
English which is subdivided by the commentator of YapparuniKalam in accordance
as that figure of speech occurs in the last two feet, in the 2nd and 4th feet,
and in the two central feet. For this subdivision, the commentator could find no
other authority except one Kaiyanar who too is not quoted by him.\(^2\) This subdivision
is further developed by the author of Kari-
gai who adds Kadai\(^3\) and Kadai-Kului\(^4\)
to the list (§. 42). Thereby we get the figure
of antithesis in the last foot of every line of
the stanza as 'a' versus 'b' and 'c' versus
'd' in the Kadai-muran sort, and in the 2nd,

\(^1\) (a) Rhyme in the 3rd and 4th feet.
(b) Rhyme in the 2nd and 4th feet.
(c) Rhyme in the 2nd and 3rd feet.

\(^2\) "ivvari kuriinar Kaiyanar ennum asiriyar
enak kolka." (p. 149 Virutti).

\(^3\) Rhyme in the last feet of several lines of a
stanza.

\(^4\) Rhyme in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th feet.
Rhyme or Todai

3rd and 4th feet of a line in the Kađaï-
Kūlai sort. From the materials found in
Yāpparun̄kalam and Kārigai, we would
not be far wrong if we surmised that this
subdivision first arose in respect only of
muraṇ́ and later on came to be applied to
other kinds of toḍai too, for the commenta-
tors of both these prosodies cite illustra-
tions of other kinds of toḍai also under
this subdivision (e.g., Kađaï--iṇai-mōnai,
Piṇ-edukai, iḍai-pun̄ar-iyaiбу etc.), where-
as the authors themselves have not talked
of them in their rules.

One other distinction which we notice
between Tolkāppiyam and Yāpparun̄kalam
is in respect of the number of lines where
this toḍai is to be sought. According to
Tolkāppiyam we understand that rhymes

\footnote{1 "Kađaiyinai piṇmuraṇ iḍaippun̄ar
muraṇena
Ivaiyuñ Kūrupa orusārōre.”
(§. 39 Yāpparun̄kalam.)
“.........................Mār̄orucār
Karutir Kađaiyē Kađaiyinai piṇ Kađaik
Kūlaiyumenru
Iraṇattoḍaiķku molivar iḍaippun̄ar ven-
patuvē.” (§. 42 Kārikai)
are to be found in a line or lines of 4 feet. But according to Yāpparduṅkalam, tdai can be found only in places where there are more than one line. Perhaps the author of Yāpparduṅkalam borrowed his view from Kākkaipādiniyar. But when we look at these rhymes we notice that some of them at least occur even in single lines. Examples of this kind are found in abundance in respect of Polippu and Orūu. This is made clear by Pērāsiriyar the commentator in the following statement:—“Polippum orūvum oradi yullē varum enavum, centoďai oradiyul varinum irandu adiyān anri varātu enavum kolka.” This is amplified further by Nachchinārkiniyar in his commentary on § 33 where he says that tdai will be observed at a place where there are two four-feet lines or where there is one four-

---

1 “Adi ułanavē talaiyodu tdaiyē.” §. 33.)
2 “Tdaiyē adi irandu iyaiyat tōrūm.”

(Virutti p. 127)

3 “Tdai ēnappaduvatu………….. Adiyōdu adiyidai Yāppuṇa nirkum Muḍivina tenpa mulutuṇnarn tōrē.”

4 Vide Tolkāppiyam Vol. II. p. 1075.
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feet line.¹ Both Pērāsiriyar and Iḷampūraṇar cite an example of one line alone for Orūru-edukai.² And Nachchinārkiṇiyar quotes only a single line as instance where orūu-mōṇai also occurs. In distinct contrast to this, but quite in consonance with the text of Yāpparuniṅkalam, its commentator cites illustrative verses for these rhymes where they have occurred not in single lines only but in every line of the whole stanza.³ Still, this does not in any way preclude the possibility of toḍai being reckoned in a single line too. So, the author of Yāpparuniṅkalam seems to have been at fault when he formulated that toḍai or rhyme will be found in the conjunction of two lines. That he has rather erred in this respect following blindly Kāṭkaiṇḍiṇiyār is what can be

¹ "Alavaḍi iṟaṇḍu iyaintum orru vantum
toḍai kōḍalum
........................unarka." (Tol.—Nach.—p. 34.)

² (1) Uḷḷār kollō tōli mulluḍai.”
(Tol.—Porul.—Vol. II

(2) "Miṇṇivar oḷivaḍam tāṇki māṇniya.”
(Ceyyu!—Nach.—p. 89 footnote)

³ E.g., Polippu mōṇai:—
“Kaṇaṅkol vanḍinaṅ kavaṅvaṇam ēypak
Kalicē raḍaikaraṅk katirvāy tīṟanta” etc.
observed here. But the commentator of Kārigai does not follow the commentator of Yāpparuṇkalam nor the author of Yāpparuṇkalam, when he cites instances of various rhymes occurring in various single lines. His own instances for Polippu-mōṇai and orūu-edukai may be specially mentioned here.¹ These points go to show that Tolkāppiyar’s rule which permitted todai occurring even in single lines is far better than that of Yāpparuṇkalam which forgot or overlooked the existence of single-line instances.

¹ “Ari kural kiṅkiṇi arāṟrum ciraḍi.”
“Miṉṉavir oḻi vaḍam tāṅki maṇṇiya.”
THE ASIRIYA VERSE

ŌSAI

Of the four main forms of verse, namely, āsiriyam, venpā, vañji and kali, āsiriyam appears to be the most ancient. From the works of the 3rd Sangam Age available to us we understand that most of them are in āsiriya metre, for many works classified under two out of the three supposed collections of the period are in this form. They are Nārīṇai, Kuṟuntokai, Aiṅkurunūru, Padiṟṟupattu, Aganāṇūru and Puṟanāṇūru of the Eṭṭuttogai collection and all the pieces of the Pattupāṭṭu collection. Āsiriyam ought to have been the natural outcome of primitive songs, obviously because it is the least complicated. We cannot with our present knowledge and materials penetrate into its origin before the days of Tolkāppiyar. Tolkāppiyar of course talks of āsiriyam as having the note of ‘agaval’ which simply means addressing or calling.1 Āsiriyam therefore

1 “Agaval enpatu āsiriyammē.” (§. 81)
is otherwise called Agaval. One point to be remembered is that he does not talk of any division of this agaval note according to the kinds of feet that occur therein. He makes no mention of ēnthisai, thūṅkisai and olukisai divisions either under agaval note or under any other note. It appears as though these divisions were not introduced even at the time of the author of Yāpparuṅkalam, for he too does not talk of them; nor at the time of the author of Yāpparuṅkala-Kārigai. It is absurd to say that they did not mention these because these were well-known to all in their time, for such a statement would have value only when a celebrated predecessor had said enough of it. On the contrary we find that Tolkāppiyar has not countenanced such a division; nor even Kākkaipādīniyar, Avinayaṉar and Naṟṟattaṉar have. Its introduction is to be found for the first time in Yāpparuṅkala-Virutti and is traceable in the commentary of Yāpparuṅkala-Kārigai also. The commentators of these two later prosodies quote certain lines of some unknown persons in support of their statement that each one of the four main metres will
have three divisions according to the kind of feet that occur therein.\(^1\) They do not give us the name of the prosodists that enunciated these rules; nor do they tell us from which work it is they got the information.\(^2\) It is not my intention to say that the commentators concocted these rules and fathered them on the names of others. All I can say is that these divisions should have risen at a later age, later even than that of the author of Ýápparúnkalam and

\[^1\] “Nér nér iyärrälai yäñvarum agavalum
Ñirainirai iyärrälai yäñvarum agavalum
Åyiru talaiyum ottu åkiya agavalum
Æntal tûñkal olukal enrä
Äynta niranirai äkum enrä.”
(Virutti p. 251)

\[^2\] Here it must be pointed out that it is highly distressing to find that Mr. K. R. Govindaraja Mudaliyar in his edition has inserted “Sañga-Ýáppu-Seyyul” after the lines “Venciń vențalaiyän varüm yäppai” etc., as though those lines were from that work. The earlier edition by Püvai Kaliyanasundara Mudaliar and the still earlier, if not the earliest, edition by Chandrasekara Kavirayar do not give us the source of information. When it is noticed that in several places Mr. Mudaliyar has supplied the names of persons or works in the body of the commentary from his own imagination, we cannot but demur to rely on him here for purposes of our enquiry.
that the commentators imported them in their commentaries. And in importing them, one of them at least has made a mistake in citing illustrations for the various divisions of this note. The commentator of Yāpparuvāṅkalam quotes certain stanzas as illustrations of the three kinds of this agaval note.¹ But applying the rule quoted by him just before² we find that they all belong to the 3rd category only. In this way it is an imperfect division. That it is so is further augmented by the argument of Pērāsiriyar in his commentary on S. 105 (Tolkāppiyam).³ He argues that since

¹ Verses beginning with the words:—
(1) “Koṇnūr tuṇcīnum yāntuṅ calamē.”
(2) “Poḷile
Iravōr anna iṟuluṟṟu ākiyum.”
and (3) “Imlīkaṭal varaippin ellaiyin valāṭa.”
(Viruttī p. 252)

² “nēr nēr iyarraḷaiyān” etc.

³ “Iṟi orū sārār inrāṅkanaḷiyum (āsiriyam mudalāṇavarraḷai) Ornuṟūṃṟāka vikarpittuk kūṟupa; ennai? ēntisai, tuṅkisai, olukisai enṟāṟpōla; aṟṟanru; āṟeḷuttu mudal aiyeluttucciraḷavum uyantu ciran varuṇ ceyyuṭku orru orraṇin vēṟuṟṟṟṟṟolik-kum; avvēṟuṟudutōrum pävēṟuṟadā; ennai? ‘elut- talaṉcīnum cirnilaitāṇē kuṟalum mikutāḷum
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different names are not to be given to the note of verses according to the number of letters from one to five that occur in each foot of these verses as per S. 43 of Tolkāppiyar, different names are not to be given according to the different kinds of feet also that occur. If such divisions were to be made, they would bulk large, as under each of the three divisions there would be five or six sub-divisions.

There is another point that will disclose the imperfect nature of the division under reference. There may be verses or combinations of lines but all those need not necessarily be poetry. And in poetry alone we can find this note of agaval, venpā, etc. We cannot find this note in sutrams, for example, though they may possess the required number of agaval feet. This point is put forth by Iḷampūraṇār the earliest commentator of Tolkāppiyam in his commentary on S. 86 and he says that S. 50 of Tolkāppiyam, though answering to the feet-

"illena molipa' enramaiyin ēna marukka; allatūum aṁnaṇam værupādu koḷḷīn orōvōru aṁtkalum tūṅkalōsai ārum ēḷum ākalum uḍaiya ēṇpatu."
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requirements of āsiriyam, has no āsiriya note about it,¹ whereas judged by the rule quoted by the commentator of Yāpparunḱalam (supra) and by its very expression “varūum Yāppai” this would be taken to belong to the 3rd category. To say that a thing that is not āsiriyam at all is of thūnksai-āsiriya-ōsai is quite absurd. There appears to be no distinction in this respect between the commentator of Yāpparunḱalam and Rev. H.R. Hoisington who wrote in 1853 “the suttiram are given in one (metre) called āsiriyappā (in Tamil).”² What may be ignored in a foreigner will not be ignored in a native writer.

¹ “Aivakai adiyum virikkuñ kālai Meyvakai āmainta padinēl nilatta Elupatu vakaimaiyin valuvala vāki Arunūr rirupat taintā kummē.” (§. 50)
² J. A. O. S. Vol. IV p. 52.
TYPES OF ĀSIRIYAM

Tolkāppiyar does not formulate four types of āsiriyam as is generally done by later prosodists. Kākkaiāṇaṇī, Avināyaṇā, Sirukākkaiāṇī and the author of Yāpparanukalam and of Kārīgai, and all others that followed them have spoken of the four types of āsiriyam: Nērisai, Ḳṇaikkuṟal, Nilai-maṇḍilam and aḍimari. Though we need not go into the merits or demerits of one or the other author in this respect, we must necessarily seek for a reason for the absence of these divisions in the days of Tolkāppiyar. Tolkāppiyar definitely says that the penultimate line of āsiriyam verse should be of 3 feet.¹ That the āsiriyam verse’s peculiarity lies in its possession of only 3 feet in the penultimate line even as occurrence of 3 feet in the last line of veṇpā is its distinguishing feature² seems to have been as ancient as at least the days

¹ “Ir̄r̄ayal adiyē āsiriyam maruṅkil tōr̄ra muccīrt tākum enpa.” (§ 68)
² “veṇpāṭṭu ir̄raḍī muccīrt tākum.” (§ 72)
of Tolkāppiyar. This form in later days came to be called Nērisai-āsiriyam. That three-feet lines are not proscribed even in the middle is what Tolkāppiyar says in another rule.¹ This would make us understand that three-feet line is in its proper place only when it occurs as the last but one. Tolkāppiyar does not mean that occurrence of 3 feet lines in the middle also of an āsiriyam is so common or so just as to evoke a name for it as a particular type. But the later prosodists mentioned above have carved out a name for this, after calling it a separate type. That name is Iṇai-kurāl āsiriyam. But that name does not denote this type only; it denotes the type of āsiriyam in which there may be lines also of 2 feet anywhere between the last and the first line.

According to Tolkāppiyar’s § 32 (Seyyuliyal) “Nārcīr koṇḍatu adi enappadumē” and his § 68 and 69 we understand that an āsiriya line should generally be of 4 feet and occasionally of 3 feet in certain places.

¹ “Īdaiyum varaiyār toḍai uṇarvōrē.” (§ 69)
But nowhere does he indicate that an āsiriya line can be of 2 feet. This would mean that up to his days there were not works in Tamil literature of āsiriya type with 2 feet-lines. As unfortunately the works prior to the time of Tolkāppiyar have not come down to us, this is the only reasonable inference that could be drawn.

On scrutiny of the works in āsiriya form of the 3rd Sangam Age we find that there are certain āsiriya verses which have in them a few 2 feet-lines also. In the Eṭṭutogai collection there are four collections out of the six in āsiriya form, which have not even one stanza with a 2 feet-line. They are Aganānūru, Naṟṟinai, Aiṅkurunūru and Kuruntogai. Puṟanānūru contains 14% Inaikkkuṟal āsiriyams and Padirrupattu 17%. In the Pattupāṭṭu collection Porunarāṟṟrupadai has 18%, Madurai-Kāṉji has 24% and Paṭṭinapāḷai 54%. The other seven pieces of this collection have no line with 2 feet at all.

The 3rd Sangam Age seems to have been the period when Inaikkkuṟal form found its way into Tamil literature. It is
only the later-day prosodists and not Tolkāppiyar that called āsiriyams with 2 feet-lines or 3 feet-lines or both in the middle as iṇaikkūṟal. Even though Tolkāppiyar has countenanced the occurrence of 3 feet-lines in the middle of an āsiriyam, he has not given any special name to that type, for perhaps it was only a rarity in his days. That it was rather rare is evident from the wording of his section 99. It means “Even if a 3 feet-line occurs in the middle of an āsiriyam, it is not eschewed by learned men.”¹ Thus it is reasonable to assume that after Tolkāppiyar, 2 feet-lines also crept in and were not eschewed after some time. This explains why the same poet who has sung several verses not in iṇaikkūṟal form has given some at least in it. For example, Nakkār, the author of 17 verses in Aganānūṟu and 7 in Nāṟṟiṇai and of 2 long poems, Tiṟumurugāṟṟupadaḷ and Neḍunalvādaḷ, has given us only one verse in the iṇaikkūṟal type. That we find in Puṟanānūṟu verse 395. Kapilar, out of

¹ “idaiyum varaiyār todai uṉarvōrē.” (§ 99)
his 28 verses in Puṟam, has given one, and out of his 10 verses in Padirrupattu has given two in the Inaikkural type. His Kuriṅjipāṭṭu (a long poem of 261 lines) contains no line with 2 feet. Again, in his contributions to Aganāṅūru and Narriṅai which each number nineteen, we find no 2 feet-line. And Paraṅar, author of 15 verses in Puṟam, has given only 4 of them in this type. His contributions to Aganāṅūru and Narriṅai numbering 34 and 12 respectively have not even one 2 feet-line. He is the only author among the Padirrupattu poets who has not introduced a 2 feet-line therein.

Māngudi Marutanār has given about 24% 2 feet-lines in his Madurai-kāṅchi. Three out of his 7 verses in Puranāṅūru are of this type. But neither in his verse in Aganāṅūru nor in Narriṅai has he introduced it.

Peruṅkunṛṛ Kilār has given one out of his ten verses in Padirrupattu in this type, whereas all his verses in Puṟam, Agam and Narriṅai are in a different type.
These points go to show that the Inaikkurāḷ form found its slow way in Tamil literature and was perhaps approved by a kind extension of the meaning of Tolkāppiyar’s Section 99 in order to reconcile great poets with the earlier grammarian. Avinayanār, Kākkaipādiniyār and Sirukākkaipādiniyār also seem to have spoken of this type, for they are quoted as authority by the commentator of Yāpparunākkalam. If these quotations are true, then Avinayanār and the rest should have come not only after Tolkāppiyar but also after or in the days of some of the 3rd Sangam poets in whose verses we find the Inaikkurāḷ āsiriyams.

The tendency to mix 2 feet-lines with 4 feet-lines is found in abundance in one of the longer poems composed by Kadialur Uruttiraṅkaṅnaṅār, namely Paṭṭinappālai. In a total of 301 lines there are in it 163 Vanji lines. This works up to 54%. This is perhaps the reason why the commentator of Kārigai calls this poem “Vanji Neṭumpaṭṭu.”¹ If this piece is a vanji

neḍumpāṭṭu, then Puram stanzas 16, 17, 22, 97, 98 and 136 must also be taken as such, for their vañji lines work up to the following percentage respectively: 63, 78, 69, 56, 70 and 88. It may therefore be said that the tendency to introduce 2 feet-lines in āsiriyams had gone so far as to make the authors lose the consciousness of over-doing.

There is one verse in Puranāṉūṟu which would at first sight suggest that there was this Iṇaikkuraḷ type even before the days of Tolkāppiyar. Puram verse 2 is said to have sprung from the mouth of Muraṉjiyūr Muḍināgarāyar. Muraṉjiyūr Muḍināgarāyar is the name of a First Sangam poet also, according to the commentary of Nakkirar on Iraiyaṉār Agapporu. If these two poets were identical we should have favoured the suggestion that before the days of Tolkāppiyar too there was the Iṇaikkuraḷ type. But they were not really identical as will be shown below. In the account given by Nakkirar we find Muraṉjiyūr Muḍināgarāyar’s name along with some other names of the poets of the 1st Sangam. The first Sangam poets
are said to have given several Paripāḍals, Mudunārais, Mudukurugas, Kāḷariyāvirais etc. But 449 poets of the 3rd Sangam period are said to have given several works of which Puṟanāṉūru is one.

This account of Nakkīrar separates Muraṉjiyūr Muḍināgarāyar from the 3rd Sangam Age by several centuries. Secondly, among the works of the 1st Sangam Age Puṟanāṉūru is not mentioned. And thirdly, Puṟanāṉūru is mentioned as a 3rd Sangam work which would mean that Puṟanāṉūru to be called as such should have included and not excluded the verse under reference given by Muraṉjiyūr Muḍināgarāyar, at least to justify the name by means of the number Four hundred. These points will show that these two names were of different persons. The prefix ‘Muraṉjiyūr’ appearing with the name of Muḍināgarāyar would probably mean that another Muḍināgarāyar was also born at Muraṉjiyūr in a later age. This seems to have been the opinion of Dr. V. Swaminatha Aiyar also, for in his short notes on the accounts of the authors of Puṟanāṉūru he does not say that this Muḍināgarāyar was identical with
the poet of that name of the 1st Sangam but only says "That there was a poet with this name in the first Sangam is known from the commentary of the 1st section of Irai-yanār Agapporul." Thus we see that there is no difficulty in accepting the position that Puṟam verse 2 is after all a piece given by an author who lived after the age of Tolkāppiyar and that the iṇaikkural form did not exist in Tolkāppiyar's days.

There is another verse in Puṟanānūṟu which seems to have baffled several commentators and editors. It is verse 235. No two editors seem to agree with regard to its scansion. Dr. Aiyar, who scanned it as a verse of 22 lines in the 1st edition, has given it as one of 20 lines in the second and third. The Madura Tamil Sangam in its edition of Tolkāppiyam-Seyyuliyal has shown it as a verse of 19 lines. The edition of Yāpparunīkalam has given 25 lines to it. Over against all these we have a statement made by Iḷampūraṇar to the effect that it is a verse of 17 lines. One point of difference between all the other commentators and editors on the one side and Iḷampūraṇar on the other is that Iḷampūraṇar shows its
2nd line to be of 6 feet, whereas all others take it as two lines—one with 2 feet and the other with 4 feet. Ilampūraṇar’s statement appears to be unjustifiable because there is no sanction of Tolkāppiyar for a 6 feet-line appearing in an āsiriyam nor is any āsiriyam found with 6 feet in any of the collections of the Sangam period. On the other hand, the commentators Nachchi-nārkiṇiyar and Pērāsiriyar treat the 2nd line of two feet as a Sojrāradi. That these commentators are not right in so saying is evident from a rule of Tolkāppiyam, for according to it Sojr cīr aḍī can occur only in Paripāḍal.¹ As the Puranaṇūru verse under reference is only an āsiriyam and not a paripāḍal we cannot accept that it has a Sojr cīr aḍī. All that can be said is that Puram 235 also contains a line of 2 feet along with some lines of 3 and 4 feet, that it is an iṇaikkuraḷ āsiriyam and that its author Auvaiyār adopted the iṇaikkuraḷ form for 5 of her verses in Puram of which verse 235 is one, even though she has not

¹ "Cojr cīr aḍiyum muḍukiyal aḍiyum
Appā nilaimaikku uriya ākum." (§. 122)
adopted it in her remaining 11 verses of Puṟam, 4 verses of Agam and 7 verses of Naṟriṇai. This again shows that inaik-kuraḻ form came to be introduced in a later age than Tolkāppiyar’s and existed side by side with the Nērisai type of āsiriyaṃ.

Nilaimaṇḍilam division of āsiriyaṃ does not appear to have existed in the days of Tolkāppiyar, for we do not find him anywhere saying that the penultimate line of āsiriyaṃ can be of 4 feet also. The expression ‘Maṇḍila Yāppu’ occurring in his §. 115 has been wrongly interpreted to mean ‘nilaimaṇḍilam.’¹ This section talks of certain parts of Kali which can be of 4 feet. Ottālisai is a part of Kali to be sure. Kuṭṭam according to the commentary of Iḻampūraṇar relating to §. 115 is a synonym of taravu.² And taravu also is a Kali part. So, in between these two Kali parts Tolkāppiyar would not have placed an āsiriya form as suited to a line

¹ “Ottālisaiyum maṇḍila yāppum
Kuṭṭamum nēradikku oṭṭina eṇpa.”

² “Kuṭṭam eṇinum taravu eṇinum okkum.”
of 4 feet. Hence it would be sane to take all the three different parts mentioned in this section to refer only to one particular form of verse namely Kali. This interpretation however is not contradictory to the import of the word kuṭṭam in the next section. ¹ There too we find no difficulty in accepting that kuṭṭam means taravu and that taravu can contain a penultimate line of 3 feet also. The taravu of Kalittogai verse 36 furnishes an illustration. In this taravu, the penultimate line is of 3 feet whereas the other lines are of 4 feet. The same interpretation does not mar the meaning of §. 117 either, for here too there is no difficulty in accepting that kuṭṭam means taravu. ²

What then is maṇḍilam? If maṇḍila yāppu cannot refer to āsiriyam, what else does it indicate? These are questions that may be raised now. The Tamil Lexicon gives as a meaning of Maṇḍilam, ' running

---

¹ "Kuṭṭam eruttaḍi uḍaittum ākum." (S. 116)
² "Maṇḍilam Kuṭṭam enrivai iraṇḍum Sentükkkiyala enmaṇār pulavar."
in a circle’ (Vaṭṭamāy ōdukai) quoting as its authority Puṟapporuḻ veṇpā mālai (Su-tram 18; verse 14) line “Aindu celavo đu maṇḍilam cenru.” The same work quotes the commentary of Pērāsiriyar (relating to §. 152) as authority for the meaning ¹ ‘running quickly without a break’ of the expression arāgam. Tolkāppiyar’s section 232 is itself self-suggestive of the meaning of the word arāgam.² Arāgam is a vaṇṇam which runs round without a break. If then arāgam means ‘running round without a break’ and if maṇḍilam means ‘running round in a circle’, there seems to be little doubt that these two words are synonymous with each other. This interpretation then removes the absurdity of making Tolkāppiyar talk of two Kali parts on either side with an āsiriya part in the middle. This fits in with the general tenour of that section (115) that only Kali parts are spoken therein. Arāgam is also generally of 4 feet and thus this interpretation holds good for S. 117 also. Further-more it is even better

¹ “arātu kaḍugic cēral”.
² “Uruṭṭu vaṇṇam arākam toḍukkum”
than the ordinary interpretation given to maṇḍilam in that section, for there is no real meaning in saying that maṇḍilam (āsiriyam) is like an āsiriyam. There could be sense only when the word means anything else but āsiriyam. As other meanings cannot fall in with §. 115 and as arāgam is not a part of āsiriyam, but only a part of Kali, maṇḍilam must needs mean arāgam. Thus it is evident that maṇḍilā yāppu of §. 117 cannot denote Nilaimaṇḍilam as taken by the commentators of Tolkāppiyam.

Tolkāppiyar’s sections 68 and 69 are those that concern themselves with the matter of āsiriyam but they do not at all indicate that four-feet line can occur as the penultimate line of an āsiriya verse. As a contrast, we notice that the author of Yāpparunikalām¹ treats this type in his §. 74. This type according to him should have equal lines all through, may end in any consonant, may have ‘en’ as the terminating syllable. The commentator of Yāpparunikalām quotes Avinayanār in his support.

¹ “Ottā adiyiṇa tākiyum orriṇa
Nirpavum ennum nilaimaṇḍilamē.”
TYPES OF ĀSIRIYAM

He does not quote Kākkaipādīniyār Narrattanār in this respect. We cannot therefore say precisely whether these prosodists contemplated such a type or not. I do not propose however to throw any suggestion on the basis of the argument of silence. At any rate, it is evident that by the days of the author of Yāṟṟuṇkalam there must have come into existence some works in āsiriya metre with 4 feet line as the penultimate also and that 'en' endings must have been used. An examination of the Tamil literature of the 3rd Sangam age and of the age that immediately followed discloses the truth of the above statement. Whereas in Narinai of the Eṭṭuttogai collection and in Patpaṭṭu collection penultimate line with 4 feet is conspicuously absent, it can be traced in the following percentage in the works named below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kuruṇtogai</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>(2 stanzas out of 400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiṅkurunūru</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>(3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aganāṇuṟu</td>
<td>1 1/4%</td>
<td>(5 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padiṟṟupattu</td>
<td>1 1/4%</td>
<td>(1 stanza out of 80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puranāṇuṟu</td>
<td>43 3/4%</td>
<td>(19 stanzas out of 400)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADVANCED STUDIES IN TAMIL PROSODY

Cilappadikāram has 67% whereas Maṇimēkalai and Peruṅkathai are from top to bottom having 4 feet only in the penultimate line. These works just referred to are those that have the terminal syllable “ēn.” In the thirty cantos of Cilappadikāram there are 24 that end in āsiriya metre and among these 24, nineteen have such an ending. Maṇimēkalai and Peruṅkathai invariably have this ending.

That Cilappadikāram and Maṇimēkalai are works of the age immediately following that of the 3rd Sangam has been accepted by several scholars.¹ Peruṅkathai may be ascribed to a still later date. That these alone of all works contain 4 feet line as the penultimate in a majority, that one collection of the Age of the Sangam has a very small percentage of this, and that another collection of the 3rd Sangam does not have any one line of this sort go to show what sort of development the Nilai-maṇḍila āsiriyyam could have had. Though

¹ Dr. V. A. Smith, Mr. Venkayya, Mr. N.M.V. Nattar, and Mr. K. Srinivasa Pillai.
its real origin is obscure and could not be traced with certainty at this age, we can safely say that certain poets should have deviated at first quite unwittingly from the rule of Tolkāppiyam §. 68 which prescribes 3-feet line as the penultimate, and that after a certain period these deviations came to be not the exception but the rule. But after a certain period, this tendency to carry it to a degree of vengeance seems to have waned, for in Kallādam and in the 11th Thirumur(ai) collection we have only a negligible percentage of penultimate lines with 4 feet. Kallādam has not more than 2 per cent to its credit. And among the āsiriyams that are found in the 11th Tirumur(ai), Paṭṭinattār’s Köil Nāṅmaṇimālai and Tiru Orriyūr Orupā Orupathu (8th Stanza) and Nambi Āṇḍār’s Āluḍaiya Piḷḷaiyār Thirumummaṇi Kōvai (1st Stanza) alone belong to this type. Paṭṭinattār and Nambi Āṇḍār Nambi lived about the 10th and 11th centuries respectively 1. Yāpparuṇikalam appears to have been composed

1 Mr. Anavarathavinayagam Pillai’s "Tamil Perumakkal Varalāru" (1921 edition) page 194.
about the 10th century A. D.¹ Thus it is evident that before and after Yāpparuṇka-lam arose, and not when Tolkāppiyam ruled the roast, poems were composed in Nilai-
maṇḍila āsiriyam.

¹ Mr. M. Raghava Aiyangar in Sen Tamil Vol. XXIV.
ADIMARIMANDILAM

Adimarimandilam is only a later extension of the way in which sense is made out—i.e., an extension of adimari Porulko. This type of asiriyum is not talked of by Tolkappiyar in his Seyyuñiyal, whereas Yapparuñkalam (§.73) talks of adimarimandilam as a separate type of asiriyum, any line of which can be treated as the first, second and so on without any alteration in meaning. Kākkaipādiniyār, Śirukakkai-pādiniyār and Avinayanār have also spoken of this type as evident from quotations cited at p. 260 Virutti. Apparently in Tol-kappiyar’s days a separate classification of asiriyams in this manner did not exist. That any line of a stanza can be taken as the first, any line as the second and so forth was not a distinguishing feature of asiriyum alone. Any line but the last of a Venpā too could be treated in a like manner. For example,

“Alaippān pirituyirai ākkalam kūṟram Vilaippalir kōndun micaitalum kūṟram

81
Colarpāla alātā collutalum kuṟṟam
Kolaippālum kuṟṟamē ām.”

is a veṇpā of this type found in Nānmanīkadigai, one of the 18 smaller works of “the 3rd Sangam period.” If as shown by the commentator of Yāpparuniikalam (at p. 260) the following stanza

“Mutukkuṟain taṇalē Mutukkuṟain taṇalē
Malaiyaṉ olvēr kaṇṇi
Mulaiyum vāṟā Mutukkuṟain taṇalē.”

is an āsiriyam of the aḍimaṟimaṇḍila type, despite the fact that the second line cannot for metrical purposes of āsiriyam be suited as the third line, the veṇpā just quoted, despite the metrical unsuitability of the last line as any other line, would have to be regarded as an instance of aḍimaṟimaṇḍila veṇpā. This veṇpā as well as any stanza of the āsiriya form in this type can come under S. 407 (Sol.) of Tolkāppiyam.¹ That rule covers stanzas of any form whose 1st or 2nd or 3rd line, etc. can be made 2nd or

¹ “Aḍimaṟic ceyti, aḍinilai tirintu
Cirnilai tiriyātu taḍumāṟummē.”
ADIMARIMANDILAM

3rd or 1st line, etc. Thus it is seen that Tolkāppiyar did not want to make a separate type of this sort in āsiriyam alone knowing that it was not its distinguishing feature. Failure perhaps to note this led the later prosodists to create a new type of āsiriyam called adimari maṇḍilam.

The Final Letter of Āsiriyam.

Tolkāppiyar does not prescribe any particular letter to occur in an āsiriyam, whereas the author of Yāpparunakalam says that āsiriyams will end in one of the following letters or syllables: —ē, ō, ī, āy, en and ai.¹ The author of Kārigai does not speak of this. Nor is Kākkaipādiṇiyār quoted in this respect. Avinayanaṅ ār who is quoted by the commentator of Yāpparunikalam omits ai. It is curious to find that Pērāsiriyar (an unidentified prosodist) omits ai and ī and that while he favours en-endings in Nilaimaṇḍila āsiriyams he says that other consonants are not what

¹ "Agaval isaiana agaval marravai
Ē Ō ī āy en ai en riṟumē." (§. 69).
should not occur in the end and that those that occur there will not be rejected. The commentator of Yāpparuṇkalam however holds that both Avinayanār and this Per-āsiriyar also were in favour of ī and ai; this he does by resorting to a peculiar way of ellipsis called ‘ilēsu.’

The author of Yāpparuṇkalam himself in his §. 74 says that Nilaimaṇḍila āsiriyam can end in any consonant or in ‘en.’ This would mean that an āsiriyam can have other endings than the consonants in āy and en mentioned in S. 69. His special mention of en in §. 74 and his omission of āy in it seem to suggest that he did not consider āy and en as consonantal endings. By consonantal endings of his §. 74 he seems to have meant only regular consonants except those in āy and en. Then it is difficult to find out the reason why he did not mention in his general section (S. 69) relating to āsiriyam that any consonant may also occur in it.

1 Allā orrum akavalin iruti
Nillā allā nirpaṇa varaiyāṟu.
The works of the 3rd Sangam Age do not have any verse ending in either i or ai. We do not know what works the author of Yāpparuṅkalam had before him in his time with i or ai endings.¹ But we cannot take the two illustrations given by the commentator to be the proper ones because we do not know precisely whether they belonged to an age prior to or after the age of the author of Yāpparuṅkalam. There are on the other hand a few stanzas of āsiriya metre of the age of the third Sangam and of the age immediately succeeding it which end in i. They are:

(1) Kali (St. 1) which ends as “amarn-taṇai ādi.”
(2) Do. (St. 55) Do. “illai tōli.”
(3) Cilappadikāram (20th Kāthai) Do. “vīḷntaṇaḷē madamoli.”

These two works were certainly of an age prior to Yāpparuṅkalam. When we find

¹ Whether Nāga Kumāra Kāviyam, a work not available to us, contained āsiriyams of this sort is after all doubtful.
that Yāpparunākalam does not mention ‘ī’ as one of the terminal letters despite its occurrence in these works, are we to infer that the author of Yāpparunākalam did not mention it because it would occur only occasionally? This inference would then militate against the assignment of a place in §. 69 for ī and ai despite their non-occurrence in any of the known Sangam works. Considered in these ways, the text of Yāpparunākalam seems to be somewhat defective.

Now let us look at the works of the 3rd Sangam for an analysis of the final letter occurring therein. Five out of the six works of āisiriya metre in the collection called Eṭṭuttogai are ending in ē: Naṟṟinai, Kuruntogai and Padirṟupattu ending in ē without any exception whatsoever, and Puṟanānūru and Aganānūru having only one ĕ ending each out of 400 verses in each of them. Pattupāṭtu, another collection of about the same period, has no other ending than ē. Even Aiṅkurunūru, one other of the six works in āisiriya metre of the compilation “Eṭṭuttogai” has 94 per cent ē-endings. From these materials it is but just to
infer that in the 3rd Sangam period, if not in the days of Tolkāppiyar too, there was some such convention that āsiriya poems should have ē as their termination.

In the period of transition we notice that ō occasionally came to be used in place of ē. Thus it is that we find Puranāṉūṟu stanza 190 and Aganāṉūṟu Stanza 46 ending in ō. Aiṅkurunūṟu has 12 ō endings (or roughly less than three per cent) to its credit.

Then shoots out āy and its share in Aiṅkurunūṟu is exactly 4 per cent.¹ Properly speaking, there is one point of difference between āy on the one hand, and ē and ō on the other. Whereas the latter two in most places occur almost as a poetical expletive or 'asai,' āy does not occur in a like manner but carries with it the significance of address. 'AṉṆai' of the 1st case becomes 'aṉṆāy' in the 8th.² Thus it is

1 It is a point for consideration whether after all these āy endings of Aiṅkurunūṟu Stanzas 211 etc. in AṉṆāyppattu and St. 21 etc. in Kāḷvaṉ pattu will not come under iyaipu of Tolkāppiyar. (S.240)

2 Cf. Tol. Col. S. 121 "ai āy ākum."
evident that 'āy' has the note of vocative case about it. And after all we can quote instances of āy in this manner only. Aṅkuṟunūru stanzas 21–30 and 211–220 have all 'annāy' as their last foot. The commentator of Yāpparuṅkalam too quotes only St. 21 of Aṅkuṟunūru. So then, to make a rule that āy may be one of the syllables that terminate an āsiriyam, while omitting to mention the latter 'i' which is also part and parcel of the expression in the two Kali Stanzas and in one Stanza of Cilappadikāram does not appear to be perfect. There then remains only 'en' to be considered. This too is taken to be an expletive by Adiyārkkunallār in his commentary of Cilappadikāram. We have already stated that this is found in 19 out of the twenty-four āsiriya endings in Cilappū. Cilappadikāram also appears to be in the transitional stage for it has not completely avoided ē but has four endings in it. It is Maṇimēkalai and Peruṅkathai that completely eschew ē and adopt en in its place all through. Here then we find a sort of climax which must be followed by an anti-climax. But the anti-climax has no gradual
fall, but is a sudden catastrophe. We do not find any āsiriyam with an ending in ēn for several centuries to come after these two great works.

ē now regains its lost hold, not gradually but quickly and it is thus that we find Kallāḍam arising with all terminations in ē except one (St. 25) which ends in ō. The fate of this ē seems to be interesting, for in the whole of the 11th Tirumūrai, a collection of works of several persons upto about the 11th century A.D., there is no other ending but ē.
THE VAṆJI VERSE

VaṆji verse was only a development of the good old Āsiriyam, even as Kali was that of the ancient Veṇpā. Tolkāppiyar’s Sections 105, 107 and 108 will explain this point.\(^1\) According to Tolkāppiyar VaṆji foot cannot exceed three syllables.\(^2\) VaṆji verse proper should have only 2-feet lines though it can occur occasionally with 3-feet lines also.\(^3\) VaṆji verse proper should have 3 letters as the minimum and 6 letters as the maximum of each

\(^1\) "Āsiriyam VaṆji Veṇpāk Kaliyena Nāliyar ṛena pāvakai Viriyē”
\(^2\) Pāviri maruṅkinaip paṅpurat tokuppin Āsiri yappā Veṇpā enṟāṅku Āyiru pāvīnuḷ adaṅkum enpa”.
\(^3\) "Āsiriyam naḍaitte VaṆji enai Veṇpā naḍaitte kaliyena mōlipa”.

\(^3\) "VaṆji Ćireṇa Vakaiper raṇavē Vencir allā muvasai Yaṇa”. (§. 20)

\(^3\) (1) "VaṆji ațiye irucīrt tākum!”. (§. 45)
(2) "Mucci raṇum Varumīḍaṇ uḍaittē” (§. 47)
of its two feet\(^1\) and a syllable can occur as a kūn or a detached foot in excess in both kinds of Vañji.\(^2\) That Tolkāppiyar has given these rules is itself enough to show that even before his time Vañji verse had developed out of the ancient āsiriyam. As we have no literature of the period prior to Tolkāppiyar now available to us, we must look to later Tamil literature for tracing the history of Vañji verse. Puṇānūru, which seems to have been compiled later than Tolkāppiyam, has three verses which are real Vañji verses, even though Dr. Aiyar says in his preface to Puṇānūru (2nd Edition)\(^3\) that it is a work containing 400 Agaval verses. A close scrutiny of these 3 verses (Nos. 4, 11 and 239) will show that they have several 2-feet lines ending with two or three 4-feet lines

\(^{1}\) “Tancīr eluttōn cinmai mūṇrē”. (§. 46)

\(^{2}\) “Nērnīla Vañjikku ārum ākum”. (§. 42)

\(^{3}\) “Kurālaṭi mutala alavaṭi kārum Urāl nilaḷ ilavē Vañjikku enpa” (§. 57)

\(^{2}\) “Asai kūnākum avvayiṇ āṇa”. (§. 38)

\(^{3}\) as also at p. VII of the 3rd edition.
in āsiriya metre. Verses 11 and 239 have besides a detached word or taniccol. These three verses betray that they were composed after the days of Tolkāppiyar and before those of Yāpparunḵalam, for whereas according to Tolkāppiyar there could not be feet of more than 3 syllables the 4th verse contains a line ¹ which may be said to have at least one foot of 4 syllables and the 11th Verse has a line ² whose two feet may be taken as containing 4 syllables each.³ According to Yāpparunḵalam there could exist 4-syllabled foot also.⁴ If such 4-syllabled feet were prevalent in the days of Tolkāppiyar he certainly would not have omitted to talk of them in his prosody. The author of Yāpparunḵalam, on the other hand, finding these 4-syllabled feet and those in Purām stanzas 139 and 377, in

¹ "Nilaikkorāa ilakkampṓṉ̄aṇa”.
² "Pāḍalcāṇṇa vīralvēndanummē”.
³ It is, however, possible to regard these verses as having three-feet lines under §. 47 of Tolkāppiyam, but the author of Yāpparunḵalam probably preferred to take them as verses of 2 feet-lines.
⁴ Nālāśaiccir poduccir padiṇārē” (§. 13)
THE VANJI VERSE

Madurai Kañchi lines 50, 123, 133, 180 & 761 and in Paṭṭinappālai lines 213 and 275 etc. must have formulated his §. 13. The three verses of Puṇanāṉūṟu shown above as Vañji pieces satisfy the conditions of a Vañji proper (or Kaṭṭalai) laid down by Tolkāppiyar. They are all of 2 feet generally and their syllables fall within the limits laid down by him. The detached foot occurring in verse 239 is only a syllable and hence comes under the purview of Tol. §. 48.¹ The other detached foot occurring in verse 11 is a regular exclusive foot but that also is in its position according to Tol. §. 49.² The last few lines of these verses are in 4 feet or are of the nature of āsi-riyam. Tolkāppiyar has indirectly said that Vañji verses could terminate with lines of 4 feet.³ We find also that the author of Yāpparūṅkalam⁴ has clearly stated that they would terminate in agaval form with

¹ "Asai kūṇākum avvaiṅ āṇa".
² "Cīr kūṇātal nēradikku urittē".
³ Vide "Vañji Tūkkē centukkiyaṟṟē" §. 71)
⁴ "Tūṅkal isaiyana Vañji; marṟavai Āynta taniccolōdu agavalin īrumē". (§. 90)
a detached word or taniccol.¹ So it stands to reason to hold that Puranānūru is a work containing at least 3 verses in Vañji form. Paṭṭīṇappālai, though taken by some commentators to be in Vañji form is not really a Vañji poem. This I have shown before. All the verses cited by the commentator of Yāpparuṅkalam except one “Toḍi yuḍaiya tōl maṇantanaṇ etc.” (Puram St. 239) are not traceable. Neither their authors nor the works of which they form part are known to this day. Whether they were after all verses composed by the commentator to serve as illustrations of Vañji form cannot with any accuracy be decided. On the whole, much cannot be said about the history or development of Vañji verse, as works in that form are not now available to us in any appreciable number.

¹ Kākkaipādiṇiyār and Avinayaṇār also require a taniccol and curitaham at the end of a Vañji poem (Vide Virutti p. 329).
So far as the Cheppal Ēsai of Veṇpā is concerned Tolkāppiyar and later prosodists agree, even though the commentators of Yāpparūṇkālam and of Kārigai would divide the ēsai into 3 kinds: ēnthisai, tūṅkisai and oḷukisai. We had occasion to see the demerits of this kind of division at an earlier stage. According to S. 158 of Tolkāppiyar, we understand that Veṇpās ranged in his days between 2 and 12 lines. But among the works of the 3rd Sangam period collected under the caption Padineṅ-kil-kaṇakku we find no Veṇpā exceeding 6 lines. In Kalittogai of the Eṭṭuttogai collection, however, there is a verse (No. 18) in Veṇpā form running up to 12 lines. This verse is not a Veṇpā proper but a Kali-Veṇpā according to

1 "Neḍuvenpāttu munnāl aḍittē Kuruvēn-pāṭṭin aḷavu eḷu cīrē".
S. 153. And Kali Venpā has no maximum limits. Again in Paripādāl also we find some Venpās running beyond 12 lines but they form a different category by themselves and cannot therefore come under a general review of Venpā. Whether Tolkāppiyar simply prescribed an upper limit without having before him any Venpā running upto 12 lines is rather doubtful. What was said before in respect of the maximum limit of āsiriyam will equally apply to this limit also. Of the 18 smaller works, ‘Kalavali Forty’ is the only one that has at least 3 stanzas of 6 lines. The pāyiram of Āsārakkōvai, if accepted as emerging from the pen of the author himself, might be said to contain 6 lines. Āsārakkōvai

1 (1) “Oruporuń nataliya veḷḷadi iyālāl Tirivirinī varuvatu kalivēņpāṭṭē”.

(2) Buddhaimitirar in his Vīrasāliyam says that a Kali venpā is but the lengthened form of a Nērisai venpā but as there is no authority for this statement and as his commentator divides the feet according to his own whim in order to show that it is an extended form of Nērisai venpā, Kali venpā need not be taken as a lengthened variety of Nērisai venpā.
THE VENPA

stanzas 1, 10, 27, 36, 46 and 55, Nāṁmaṇīk-kadigai stanza 1 and Iniyanai-Nāṟpatu stanza 9 are of 5 lines. The other works of this class excepting Tirukkuṟaḷ and Mudumolik-Kāñchi contain only 4 lines. Tirukkuṟaḷ is in 2 lines of altogether 7 feet. Mudumolik-Kāñchi is not at all a Veṇṕā and hence it does not deserve consideration here. This analysis then shows that in the 3rd Sangam days, the maximum reached for Veṇpās was only 6 lines. The minimum is found in Tirukkuṟaḷ, and the most favoured limit seems to have been 4 lines.

Though KākkaiṕāṭiṆiṆiṆ, Avinayanār and the author of Yāpparuṅkalam have not prescribed any maximum limit for a Veṇpā, Narrattanār, PalkāyaṆār and the author of Saṅga-Yāppu have laid down 2 and 7 as the two limits.¹ That these four persons came after or in the period of the 3rd Sangam period and finding that the maximum reached so far was only 6 lines prescribed 7 lines as the limit is an inference that can reasonably be made.

¹ Vide virutti pp. 123-124
Again, a perusal of the sixteen works of the collection under reference seems to point to a change from the days of Tolkāppiyar. That is with regard to the four-line Veṇpās alone. Tolkāppiyar, who prescribes 3-feet line as the thing that must occur as the last line of a Veṇpā, would have certainly said that a taniccol or taniccīr should occur in the end of the 2nd line of a Veṇpā if such a thing were the practice of his days. We should expect him to have said this for we find him stating a particular trait of Veṇpā, viz., a 3-feet line being the terminating line of a Veṇpā.  

Remembering that Tolkāppiyar has not said anywhere that a taniccol or taniccīr would occur as the last foot of the 2nd line in a Veṇpā, if we look at the sixteen works of the Padiṇeņ-kīl-kaṇakku collection, we shall not fail to notice the change. For, in 11 out of these 16 we find Veṇpās occurring with and without taniccol in the 2nd line. And in 2 of them, namely, Sirupaṇcha mūlam and Elāthi all the second lines invariably have the taniccol. In Tiṇaimālai

---

1 "Veṇpāṭṭu īṛṛādi muddīrt tākum". (§. 72)
Nūṟṟaimbatu all stanzas except one are of this sort. In contrast to all these there are two works, namely, Inna-Ṇāṟpathu and Iniyavai-Ṇāṟpathu where not even one stanza of this sort is available. So, it appears that some poets took a fancy for putting a tāniccol at the end of the 2nd line rhyming with the first foot of the 1st and 2nd lines so far as the 2nd syllable is concerned. In short, they began to compose Venpās with a tāniccol having the edukai of the 1st and 2nd line. This introduction of the tāniccol slowly came to have hold on the poets and hence it is that we see that this type of Venpā which for a time was used along with the other old type began to be the sole vehicle of certain works. Even as we notice that there are some works purely of this nature in this collection, we notice also that there are two works which have the other type as the sole vehicle.¹ Thus we find that Innisai-

¹ Though the commentator of Yāpparduṅ-kalam says at p. 235 that even those venpās which have a tāniccol will occasionally be called innisai venpā, we cannot concede that an innisai venpā can also occur with a tāniccol. That would take
Veṇpā was the earliest form known in the days of Tolkāppiyar and that Nērisai Veṇpā was a later improvement of it. Almost all the Veṇpā works that were produced in the wake of the last Sangam were in the nērisai type. The Veṇpās appended to the various sections of Cilappathikāram as well as some\(^1\) of the Veṇpās found in canto XVII and all except one appended to Pattupāṭṭu are of this type. Out of the 105 Muttollāyiram stanzas now available, 103 are of this type. Perundēvanār’s Bhārata Veṇpā, and Auvaiyār’s Mūthurai and Nalvali do also belong to this type. The twenty-eight Veṇpās in Tiruvāchakam and all the Veṇpās composed by Poigai-Ālvār, Pūthattālvār, Pēyālvār, Tirumālisaiālvār and Nammālvār

the distinguishing feature of Nērisai type away. We cannot accept the statement of the commentator when we have the text proper which negatives the occurrence of a taniccol. (Vide “Taniçcol iyarappadātana innisai veṇpā). Kākaipādiniyār, Śīrukkakkaipañīniyār and Avinayanār also make no doubt as to the negation of taniccol in innisai veṇpā, (Virutti p. 233).

\(^1\) Vide veṇpās beginning with "Māyavaṇ eṇṟāl kuralai" etc., etc.
THE VENPA

in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th and great Tiruvan-thāthis collected under Iyarpā are only in this type. The Venpās found in the collection called Eleventh Tirumurai cannot all be said to have sprung before the 10th century A.D. Some of them might have arisen even later. Some others of them like the pieces ascribed to Kapila-tēvar, Paraṇa-tēvar and Nakkīra-tēvar were not really of the days of the 3rd Sangam, for it is still a matter of great controversy among scholars of Tamil Literature as to whether these 3 personages were identical with the 3 poets of those names of the 3rd Sangam period, and the side which seems to have sound reason and support is that which holds them as not identical. In this work also we find only the Nērisai type in use. The authors of these verses began to embrace this new type rather wholeheartedly, perhaps from a desire to be regarded as fashionable. Hence, the author of Yāppa-ruṅkalam mentions this type also as one of the five types of venpā in his S. 58.¹

¹ "Kṟaḻ cindu innisai nērisai pahroḏai Eṇa aintākum venpāṭṭānē".
Tolkāppiyar has not spoken of these five types severally nor even has he mentioned their names. Then, is it not astonishing to find the commentator of Yāpparūṇkālam say that Kūral, Sindu, innisai, nērisai and Pahroḍai was the order adopted by the ancient author Tolkāppiyar? When Tolkāppiyar has not talked of them at all, how could one expect a statement regarding their order from him? This statement of the commentator is incorrect. 'Tolkāppiyanār' was possibly an error for Palkāppiyanār or Palkāyanār. Between Tolkāppiyar and the author of Yāpparūṇkālam there were Kākkaipādīnīyār, Siṟukākkkaipādīnīyār and Avinayaṇār who had countenanced these types. Tolkāppiyar too, though he has not given names to these types, was not ignorant of their occurrence in ancient literature. His § 158 is rather comprehensive and includes Kūral, Sindu, innisai and Pahroḍai in it. It can include Nērisai also but the

1 "Kūral cindu innisai nērisai pahroḍai enpatu tollāsiriyar Tolkāppiyanār vaitta muraimai". (Virutti p. 233)

2 "Nēduven pāṭṭu munnāl adittē Kuruven pāṭṭin alavelu cīrē."
difficulty in the way of such an inclusion is the absence of mention anywhere by him that a taṇiccol would occur as the last part of the 2nd line which is the peculiar feature of the type. The other four types having no such peculiarity can very well come under his §. 158. So the only type which did not exist in his days but which had sprung and spread largely before the days of Yāpparuṇkalam is Nērisai Venpā.*

There is yet one point which suggests a difference even among the other four types of Yāpparuṇkalam in relation to Tolkāppiyar’s §. 158. Whereas according to Tolkāppiyar a Venpā cannot exceed 12 lines, according to Yāpparuṇkalam a Venpā can be of any length beyond two lines. The commentator of the latter treatise quotes Venpās upto 12 lines as illustrations and leaves us with the following statement:— “You had better find out for yourselves Pahroḍai Venpās with much more lines in the stanzas of Rāmāyaṇam and Purāṇa-

* I understand that vidvan V. Venkatarajalu Reddiar also has arrived at this conclusion.
Sāgaram".\(^1\) This means that Tolkāppiyar’s maximum limit has been thrown out by them.

These types do not seem to have stopped with 5 in later times. Sindial Veṇpā seems to have been subdivided into two as Nērisai-Sindial and iṇṇisai-Sindiyal. This subdivision which is not found in the text of Yāpparūṅkalam but is supplied by the commentator is found in the regular text of the smaller treatise Yāpparūṅkala ķārigai.\(^2\) Later still, there must have come into being several other kinds of divisions such as Kaṭṭaḷai Veṇpā, Kalambaṅga Veṇpā, Sama-viyal Veṇpā, Samanaḍai Veṇpā and Mayūraviyal Veṇpā.\(^3\)

---

1 Virutti p. 238. But such veṇpās are not traceable.

2 “Nērisai iṇṇisai pōla naḍantu adi mūnriṇ vantar Nērisai iṇṇisai cintiyal ākum”. (§. 26)

3 Vide virutti p. 466
THE KALI VERSE

Kali verse appears to have been a development of the Veṇpā and a combination of the āsiriyam and Veṇpā¹ in several respects, having of course its peculiar ēsai called tullal. Tolkāppiar is of opinion that Kali is similar to Veṇpā in certain respects.² This verse is divided by him into 4 major divisions, namely ottālisaiakali, Kali-veṇpāṭṭu, Koccahakkali and Uralkali. Ottālisai-kali is further divided by him into two main divisions. One of them is that which is not in the form of a praise unto the Lords. The other is that which praises the Lords in the first person. The former of these may be called Tēvarpparavā-ottālisai and the latter Tēvarpparavum-ottālisai. Tēvarpparavum-ottālisai is further divided

¹ "Elu cīr īruti āsiriyam kaliyē". Tol. Ceyyul. §. 76
² "Eṇai veṇpā naṭaṅkai Kaliyena molipa". (§. 108)

105
by him into 2 kinds, namely, Vaṇṇagam and orubōhu. And the latter of these has two subdivisions called Koccaha-orubōhu and Ambōtharaṅga orubōhu. So far, the divisions of Ottālisai-Kali have been stated.¹ Then comes his definition of Kali-Venpāṭṭu in his §: 153. His Sections 154 and 155 are generally taken to be two different sections by both Nachchinār-kiṇiyar and Pērāsiriyar.² That Tolkāppiyar has not mentioned Venkali as one of the types in his topical sutram 130³ and is definite as to the division of Kali into 4 kinds alone of which Venkali is not one and that the attempts of both these commentators in their commentary of §. 154 to take that rule as describing this Venkali are far from approaching the intention of the prosodist himself have been shown by

¹ "Oruporuḷ nutaliya vellaṭi iyalaṁ
Tiripinri varuvatu kaliveṇ pāṭṭē”.

² "Taravum pōkkum pāṭṭidai miḍāintum
Aiṅcīr adukkiyum ārumey peṟṟum
Venpā iyalaṁ velippadat tōṅrum”.

³ "Pāṇilai vakaiye koccaha kaliveṇa
Nūnaṭil pulavar nuvaṇṭaraṁ taṇarē”.

"Ottālisaiṅkali kaliveṇ pāṭṭē
Koccaham uraḷodu kali nālvakaṭṭē”.
Prof. S. S. Bharatiar in his "Studies in Tolkāppiyam" published in our University Journal sometime ago.1 Therein, he has besides shown that these sections can make sense only when they are taken together so as to describe Koccaha-Kali alone.2 And

1 Vol. V. No. 1. (1935)

2 Īlampūraṇar also seems to take these 2 sections together. His commentary to S. 155 is not separately published. But in his supposed commentary to S. 154, he says "itu ivvāru varuvāna kochchaha-kalippā ēnappadum". This statement makes it appear as though he treats these 2 sections together and that some mistake should have crept in the edition of his commentary as footnotes to the Seyyuliyal edition of the Madura Tamil Sangam.

I wrote to Mr. V. O. Chidambaram Pillai for further information on the subject. Mr. V. O. Chidambaram Pillai was kind enough to send me a reply and a fair-copy of the manuscript of Īlampūraṇar's commentary. The fair-copy shows that the commentary as printed by the Madura Tamil Sangam as footnotes to Seyyuliyal Urai of Nachchiărkiniyar is defective. There are some omissions in the latter edition. For example "Ēnpatu Koccaha-kali ēmāru uṇarttatal nutalirru. Taravum pōkkum īdaiyidai miādantum" has been omitted. "Ummaiyāl iyārkai valāmal tōnriyum ēnru kollappadum. Aiṅcir adukkiiyum ēnpatu aiṅcir aḍi pala vantum ēnṟavāru" is also a serious omission. The whole sutram appears as a single one in the copy furnished to me recently. And to avoid all doubt we find that the commentary runs as follows:—
lastly in §. 156 Tolkāppiyar describes the nature of Ural-Kali.¹

The author of Yāpparunțkalam divides this not into 4 kinds but into 3, for he omits Ural-Kali out of account at all. Pērāsiriyar, the commentator, who lived after the days of Yāpparunțkalam, justifies the separate division of Ural-Kali, for he says in his commentary on Sections 130 and 156 that it cannot be the same as Koccaham simply because both have no Suritaham, that Koccaha-Kali on the contrary will run to greater length than Ural-Kali, that Ural-Kali is different from Koccaham because of occurrence of dialogue-pieces in the former and that Tolkāppiyar after all followed only his predecessors who had this type in their time. In Kalittogai, we have several poems of this type. Then to ignore them as a class seems to be unjustifiable on the

¹ "Kūrrum māṟṟamum idaiyidai midaintum Pōkkinn ṛkal uraḷ kalikku iyalpe".
part of the author of Yāpparunākalam. Apparently there were no other works than Kalittogai wherein these Urāl-Kali verses could be found. This too we cannot definitely say because we have not sufficient quantity of Kali verses forthcoming. All we possess of this verse are only kalittogai verses and some other stray stanzas cited by the commentator of Yāpparunākalam. The authorship and date of the latter stanzas are yet unknown. Thus it is that our materials in respect of this verse, as in the case of Vañji, are meagre, even though it seems to have been largely used side by side with Paripādal in poems relating to the Agam division as is understood from Tolkāppiyar’s Agattinai-iyal §. 53.1

Now let us look at the main divisions made by Tolkāppiyar in their order.

---

1 “Naṭaka vaḷakkiṇum ulakiyal vaḷakkiṇum Pāḍal sāṇra pulaṇeri vaḷakkam Kaliyē paripāṭṭu āyiru pāṅkiṇum Uriyatu ākum eṃmaṇār pulavar”
How Tolkāppiyar divides this into major, main and subordinate divisions has been shown above. The author of Yāpparūṅkalam divides this into 3 kinds namely, Nerisai-ottālisai, ambōtharaṅga-ottālisai and vaṅṅaga-ottālisai. The vaṅṅagam¹ and Ambōtharaṅgam² of Tolkāppiyar, subdivisions of his Ottālisai, are in agreement with those of Yāpparūṅkalam only in name. The identity in name does not here amount to similarity in structure. This I shall show presently. Tolkāppiyar’s ambōtharaṅga orubōhu (S. 152) is the name of Ottālisai-kali which has as its several parts taravu, koccaham, arāgam, small ambōtharaṅgam and curitaham, whereas Yāpparūṅkalam’s ambōtharaṅgam is the

¹ “Vaṅṅahan tāṇē
   Taravē tālisai enē vāramenru
   Annāl vakaivyil tōŋrum enpa”. (§. 140)

² “Eruttē koccaham arāgam cīrren
   Adakkiyayl vāramodu annilaik kurittē”.
   (§. 152)
name of the Ottālisai-kali which has taravu, tālisai, curitaham and ambōtharaṅgams. Thus we see that Tolkāppiyar’s type has not tālisai and big ambōtharaṅgam which are constituents of the type of that name found in Yāpparunākalam. That this is a vital difference can be understood when one remembers that the distinguishing feature of the ambōtharaṅga-ottālisai of Yāpparunākalam is the presence of big ambōtharaṅgam.

Tolkāppiyar’s Vaṇṇagam is also different from Yāpparunākalam’s vaṇṇaga-ottālisai. According to Tolkāppiyar, this type of ottālisai should have as its several parts taravu, tālisai, ambōtharaṅgam and curitaham (vide his S. 140), whereas according to Yāpparunākalam besides these it must have arāgam.1 Here again, the distinguishing feature of the type as mentioned in Yāpparunākalam, i. e., occurrence

---

1 “Muntiya tālisaiya irāy murai murai
Onru onru curun Kum upunatu
Ambōtharaṅga ottālisai kāliye”. (§. 83)

2 “Avaṟṟdu moḍukiyal adiyudai arāgam
Aḷuppatu vaṇṇaha ottālisai kāli”. (§. 84)
of arāgam is lacking in the corresponding type of Tolkāppiyar. And lastly, Tolkāppiyar’s Tēvar-paravā-ottālisai\(^1\) is also not identical with Nērisai-ottālisai-kali of Yāpparunţkalam.\(^2\) That they resemble each other in one respect is known from the fact that each of them may have as its constituents taravu, tālisai, taniccol and curitaham. But idainilaipāţtu, though synonymous with tālisai, is somewhat different according to Pērāsiriyar the commentator. Whereas all tālisais can be idainilai-pāţtus, all idainilai-pāţtus cannot be tālisais. This is ably shown by him in the commentary of §. 132, and he cites from Kalittogai verse 125 to prove his point. Whereas in tālisai the ōsai of tullal is absolutely necessary, in idainilaipāţtu it is not. And as we find that the expression used by Tolkāppiyar in his section under reference is idainilai-pāţtu in place of tālisai, there ought to be some difference between his type and that of

\(^1\) “Idainilaip pāţtodu taravu pōkku adaiyenā Nadainavinru olukum onrenā molipa”. (§. 132)

\(^2\) “Taravoṇru tālisai mūnruṇ camanṇayt Taravir curunķit taṇinilait tākic Curitaham conṇa irandinul onrāy Nikalvatu nērisai ottālisaik kali”. (§. 82)
Yāparuṅkalam. This is not all. Whereas the scope of the Nērisai-ottālisai-kali is restricted by the author of Yāpparuṅkalam to 3 tālisais only, the text of Tolkāppiyar gives scope for a greater number of tālisais in that type so that it includes the Sil-tālisai-Koccaha-Kalippā and the pal-tālisai-koccaha-kalippā (two different subdivisions of Koccaha kali) of the author of Yāpparuṅkalam (S. 86).

Kākkai pādiṇiyār and Avinayaṇār¹ are found to be in agreement with the description given by the author of Yāpparuṅkalam. Perhaps, the latter borrowed his materials from these two earlier prosodists.

¹ Virutti. p. 285, 290 and 297
KALIVENPĀTTU

According to Tolkāppiyar this division is characterised by the nature of the veṇpā lines in which this kind of verse runs. But there is one main difference between this division and pure veṇpā itself. Whereas the maximum of the latter is restricted to 12 lines, that of the former is unlimited. Even in veṇpā properly so-called there is a certain kind which must be separated from it and sorted with Kali-veṇpā. It is the veṇpā, which though not exceeding 12 lines is capable of containing a hidden meaning according to §. 153 of Tolkāppiyam.¹ Kalittogai verses 6 and 18 are illustrations in point. According to Tolkāppiyar (S. 153) a Kali-veṇpā can be of the nature of veṇpā lines, whereas according to Yāpparuṇkalam Kali-taḷai as well as Kali note should be present in a veṇpā for being

¹ “Oruporuḻ nutaliya veḷḷadi iyalān Tirivinṟi varuvatu kaliven pāṭṭē”. (Veḷḷadi means ‘Veṇpā lines’ and Veḷḷiyal means “ending like a Veṇpā in 3 feet”).
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considered a Kali-veṇpā.¹ The only condition imposed by Yāpparunākalam is that a Kali-veṇpā’s last line should end as a veṇpā. Avinayānār lays down Kali-ōsai and a last line which has not the Kalitalai as requisites for this division of verse. But Kākkaipādiniyār is definite about the occurrence only of Veṇṭalai and Kali-talai in this particular form.²

From these materials, we are able to understand that in Tolkāppiyar’s days the Kali-veṇpā was mainly, if not wholly, in veṇpā note and that in Kākkaipādiniyār’s days the Kali lines were more in evidence in a Kali-veṇpā than before and that in the time of Avinayānār Kali-ōsai reached a degree of prominence in this particular type and it was considered sufficient if it ended in any other note than Kali and that the rule laid down in Yāpparunākalam is only a natural development of Avinayānār’s rule, formulated to cover literature of the period.

¹ “Taṇ talai ēsai taluvi niṇru īrādi Veṇpā iyalatu Kali-veṇpāvē”.

² “Veṇṭalai tanṭalai enṅiru tanmaiįṁ Veṇpā iyalatu venkali ākum”.
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The literature of the period of Tolkāppiyar, not being wholly available to us, we shall look at later literature for the history of this type of Kali verse. Kalittogai, a work of the 3rd Sangam period, contains 8 Kalivenpāṭṭus of which four (St. 6, 18, 24, and 51) are entirely in veṅpā metre, three (St. 37, 65 and 111) are mainly in veṅpā and to a small extent in āsiriyam metre, and one only (St. 12) in veṅpā, āsiriyam and Kali-taḷai. Thus Kalittogai discloses a tendency to deviate slightly though unwittingly from the rule of Tolkāppiyar, which requires this type to be in the nature of veṅpā.

The works of the period between the age of the 3rd Sangam and the 10th century A.D. present to us some Kali-veṅpāṭṭus and they are (1) Chilappadikāram (VaṉjiṆamālai) (2) Pūrti-tiru-kali-veṅpā by Nakki-rar (3) Sivapurāṇam by Māṇikkavāchakar, (4) the maḍals long and short by Tirumaṅgai Alvār and (5) TirukkailāyaṆāṇa-ulā by ChēramāṆ-Perumāḷ. Of these five poems, Chilappu-(XXI) VaṉjiṆamālai is entirely in veṅpā metre running to 57 lines. The Maḍals and Sivapurāṇam are largely in
venpā metre but they are not mere extensions of Nērisai-venpās, whereas the two other poems look as though they are elongations of Nērisai veṇpā. The author of Yāpparūnikaḷam does not seem to have recognised this point, for if he did he should have said that Kali-venpā would sometimes be mere extension of Nērisai venpā. Or else he must have been content with his statement that such a verse would be of Kali and venpā metre, not considering however that the Kali-venpā, in which the two said works have been composed, had the uniform feature of having a taniccir or taniccol at the end of every alternate 2nd line. And Kārigai author does not differ from his predecessor.

While considering the history of Kali-venpā, one thing stares us in our face for solution. And that is “Veṇ-Kali”. Pērāsiriyar and Nachchĩnārkinīyiyar, two commentators of Tolkāppiyam, take “Veṇ-Kali” and “Kali-Venpā” as different entities, whereas the commentator who preceded them both, namely Iḷampūraṇar, says definitely that they are both identical.
In the commentary of §. 153 he states\(^1\) that Kaliveṇpāṭṭu and Veṇkalippāṭṭu are synonymous. Both the authors of Yāpparunikal and Kārigai do not speak of these two as separate kinds in their respective sutrams. Whereas the former calls this type Kaliveṇpā, the latter calls it veṇkali. No difference in their constituents is pointed out by any of these two prosodists. What the author of Yāpparunikal calls Kaliveṇpa is called by the author of Kārigai "Veṇkali". The commentator of Yāpparunikal too says that both these expressions are only synonymous.\(^2\) In the light of this statement, he must be taken to mean that they are identical when he uses any of the two expressions at the end of each of his illustrative verses. At one place he calls a verse Kaliveṇpā. At another he calls another verse Veṇkali. He thereby does not mean that they are not identical but only means that they are simply different words for the same object. That his view is this and that it is different from the

\(^1\) "Kali-Veṇpāṭṭu eniṇum veṇkalippāṭṭu eniṇum okkum".

\(^2\) Vide virutti p. 308 bottom.
view of others who hold that Kalivenpā and venkali are expressions denoting different types of Kali verse are evident from his own statement:—“There are some people who differentiate and say that what occurs in venpā note is kalivenpā and what occurs in other ways is venkalippā”.

Nachchiṅarkiniyar and Pērāsiriyar seem to have caught hold of this point from this commentary and tried to import it into the sūtrams of Tolkāppiyar. They divide a particular rule into two divisions and treat them as separate sections in order to enforce their point. They suggest that up to the 3rd line of this section venkali is talked of and that in the latter two lines Koccaha-Kali. That such a position is

1 "Vellōsaiyināl varuvatanaik kalivenpā
   enrum,
pirāvārul varuvanavarrai venkalippā
   enrum
vērupadoṭtuc colvārum ular". (Virutti p. 311.)

2 "Taravum pōkkum pāṭṭidai midaintum
Aiṅcīr adukkiyum ārūmey perrum
Venpā iyalān velippadat tōrrum
Pānilai vakaiyē koccaha kaliyena
Nūnavil pulavar nuvanru arainganarē." (§. 154)
untenable has been ably shown by Prof. S.S. Bharatiar as was pointed out already.\(^1\) In §. 153 Tolkāppiyar has concluded his definition of Kali-venpāṭṭu. Iḷampūraṇar, the earliest commentator, treats veṅkali and kalivenpāṭṭu as one and the same. Perhaps in their zeal to improve upon Iḷampūraṇar’s commentary, the two other commentators go to the absurd length of citing certain verses of Kalittogai as veṅkali, whereas they are only Koccahams. Iḷampūraṇar says that what occurs with or without taravu, curitaham, and pāṭṭu (tālisai or koccaham), what sometimes has 5-feet lines, what sometimes has the six parts of kali viz., taravu, tālisai, taniccol, curitaham, sorcīraḍī and arāgam and what above all is conspicuous by the nature of veṅpā is Koccahakali according to learned prosodists. That sorcīraḍī is a thing which occurs only in Paripāḍal is plain from Tolkāppiyam §. 122. Hence we cannot accept the statement of Iḷampūraṇar that Koccaham may sometimes occur with sorcīraḍī also. But there may not be any difficulty in

\(^1\) A. U. Journal Vol. V. No. 1.
accepting his other points. So, the only exception I should like to make is with regard to the interpretation of "āru mey per-rum." This can be taken to indicate that sometimes Koccaha lines may be of 6 feet even. There is absolutely no difficulty in conceding his interpretation because it is in Kali verse that we generally meet with lines of 6 feet too according to §. 64 of Tolkëppiyam.¹ So, in the light of this reasonable interpretation combined with that of İlam-pūraṇar, if we will look at verses 109, 139, 140, 141 and 142 of Kalittogai cited by the other two commentators as illustrations of Venkali we shall see how easily they become examples of Koccahakali. Their nature is described below:—

St. 109.—Verse of 26 lines—solely of 5 veṇpās—a taravu, a curitaham, three pāṭṭus—2 five-feet lines.

St. 139.—Verse of 35 lines—a taravu, a curitaham, three tālisais and three pāṭṭus

¹ "Ārucir adiyē āsiriyat talaiyōdum
Neŋperru varūum nēraḍi muuŋnē."
etc.—all except taravu (5 lines) in venpā nature.

St. 140.—34 lines—a taravu, a curitaham, a pāṭṭu and 3 tālisais—all except taravu (5 lines) in venpā nature.

St. 141.—25 lines—a taravu, a curitaham, three tālisais and a pāṭṭu—all except curitaham (4 lines) and pāṭṭu (2 lines) in venpā nature—2 lines of 6 feet also.

St. 142.—66 lines—taravu, curitaham etc.—largely of venpā and venpā nature—4 lines of 5 feet.

This short analysis must show that all these five illustrations of the two commentators would come under § 154 as Koccahakali. Thus the commentaries of Nachchĩnārκiṇiyar and Pērāsiriyar together with their illustrations for this particular matter are finally and conclusively proved to be wrong.

But in those days when printed books were not available, when possession of
palmyra manuscripts meant huge cost, when verification of commentator's statements was rare, the prosodists who came in after the time of these two commentators naturally embodied the commentators' view in their regular rules themselves. Thus it is that we see the author of Vīrasōliyam in his § 8 and 11 talk severally of kali-vēṇpā and vēṇkali as though they are different. Thus we see that what was in the days of Tolkāppiyar 'Kali-Vēṇpā' came first to be differentiated and split into two kinds by the commentators, that the first Tamil prosody which gave authority for such a division is Vīrasōliyam and that in its wake followed both Tonnaḷ and Ilakkanā-Vilakkam. Avinayanār and Kākkai pādi-nilīyar as well as the author of Yapparuṇ-kalam and Kārigai talk as though there was only one kind (vide Virutti p. 308).

Hence, it is incorrect to cite from literature prior to the period of Vīrasōliyam, illustrations for two kinds, vēṇkali and kali-vēṇpā. This means that from literature subsequent to the period of Vīrasōliyam one may be justified in quoting verses as
examples of two separate divisions venkali and kali-venpā.¹

1 (1) "Sēl ceyta matar vērkan cilaiceyta
cudikainutai

... ... ... ... ... Evvaṇṇam māri nirpatu inru." (St. 60).

(2) "Toḍalaik kuruntoḍit tōkāy nam pāvai

... ... ... ... ... Ariyātu uraittēn atu" (St. 62). ² of
Chidambara-Cheyyuṭkōvai by Kumaraguruparar
(17th century) are apt illustrations respectively for
Venkali and Kali-ven-pāṭṭu.
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KOCCAHA-KALI

The rule of Tolkāppiyam pertaining to Koccaha-Kali has already been set forth. That rule is quite at variance with the rule relating to Koccaham formulated in Yāpparun̄kalam and later prosodial treatises. Whereas Veppā nature is the predominant factor in the Koccahakali as described by Tolkāppiyar, it is significantly absent in the definition given by the author of Yāpparun̄kalam. According to the latter, any taravu or a pair of taravus with or without a few or many tālisais can be Koccaham. Besides, all other types of Kali verse which do not conform to the general rule are called Koccahams. Then it is not hard to discover similarity between the Koccaham and Koccaha-Orubōhu of Tolkāppiyam. According to Section 149 of Tolkāppiyar, a under S.132 of Tolkāppiyar. Ambōtharaṅga Orubōhu of Tolkāppiyar which occurs

3 “Eruttē koccaham arāgam cirren
    Aḍakkiyal vāramodu annilaikku urittē.”
(§. 152).

125
Koccaha-Orubōhu can be (1) mere tālisais or (2) tālisais and other elements of Kali without taravu or (3) mere taravu or (4) taravu, tālisai and big ambōtharaṅgam; or (5) taravu, curitaham and big ambōtharaṅgam.¹ When there is no curitaham, when a verse approaching kali is somehow or other different from the requisites and attributes of a Kali verse, then also that verse is called Koccaha-Orubōhu. Thus it will be seen that Koccaha-orubōhu is of a very comprehensive nature and can correspond to the Koccaha-Kali of Yāpparunikaḷam. The Koccaha-Kalis with a few tālisais, and many tālisais (of Yāpparunikaḷam S. 86)² can both be included without tālisai and big ambōtharaṅgam but with taravu, curitaham, Koccaha, arāgam and small ambōtharaṅgam is somewhat

¹ "Taravīn rākit tālisai peṟrum
Tālisai yiṟṟit taravudait tākiyum
Ennidai yittuc cinṇaṅ kuṇriyum
Adakkiyal inri adinimiru tōlukiyum
Yāppinum porulīnum vēṟrumai yuḍaiyatu
Koccaha orubōhu ākum eṇpa."

² "Taravē taravīṇai tālisai tāmum
Cilavum palavum cīṟantu mayaṅkiyum
Marṟum vikarpam palavāy varunavum
Koccaham eṇnuṅ kuriyina ākum."
KOCCAH-A-KALI

different from the ordinary type of Kali according to Yāpparuṇkalam and so it would be covered by Yāpparuṇkalam §.86\textsuperscript{1} under Koccahakali.

These points show that what was considered Koccaha-orubōhu in Tolkāppiyar’s days came to be called Koccaha-Kali in the days of Yāpparuṇkalam, whose author seems to have thoroughly ignored the other different variety of Kali called Koccaha-Kali. Yāpparuṇkalam’s Koccaham is more or less only Koccaha-Orubōhu of Tolkāppiyar which is after all only one of the minor divisions of Ottālisaiykalī as mentioned before. Though I do not seek to deduce the demerits or merits of these two authors from these details, I should like to draw pointed attention to the fact that Koccaha-Kalippā as it existed in and before the days of Tolkāppiyar has not at all been countenanced by the author of Yāpparuṇkalam. Avinayanār\textsuperscript{2} seems to have given the clue

\textsuperscript{1} “Vikarṇaṃ palavāy vārunavum.”

\textsuperscript{2} But Kākkaipādini combines Koccaha-orubōhu and Koccaha-kali in one rule as quoted at p. 324 Virutti. (Cf. Tol. §. 149 and 154).
to the author of Yāpparunīkalam, for he is quoted by the Yāpparunīkala commentator only in respect of a form which corresponds to Tolkāppiyar’s Koccaha-orubōhu.¹ And the prosodists who came after the days of Yāpparunīkalam only followed it without bestowing any thought on Tolkāppiyar’s Koccaha-Kalippā as different from Koccaha-orubōhu.

As a result of the same error or confusion, both Nachchinārkinīyar and Pērāsiriyar cite several verses from Kalittogai as illustrations of Koccaha-Kalippā which are properly to be classified as Koccaha-orubōhu even though some of them may be treated as ottālisai-kalippās themselves. Verses 7, 19, 21, 32, 47, 54, 55, 85, 118, 119, 120, 130 and 133 cited by them may very well be classified as follows:—

Verse No.
7 Ottālisai-Kali (slightly different)
19 Koccaha-Orubōhu—having two taravus or a taravu and curitaham.

KOCCAHA-KALI

Verse No.
21 Koccaha-orubōhu—two taravus only.
32 Do. —only one taravu.
47 Do. —a slight deviation of Ottālisai-kali.
54 Do. —a taravu, taniccol and curitaham.
55 K.O. 1—2 taravus, taniccol and curitaham.
85 K.O.—tālisais or iḍaninilai-pāṭṭus only.
118 K.O.—slightly different from Ottālisai-kali.

120 & 130 Do.
119 K.O.—taravu alone.
133 K.O.—2 taravus and a curitaham.

There are two or three verses cited by them under this rule which alone come within the purview of this rule. Pērasiriyar cites verses 36, 39 and 104 and Nachchinār-kiṇiyar verses 39 and 104. Verse 39 enjoys a unique privilege. It is cited as a Koccaha-Kali by Iḻampūranar as well. Thus we see that out of about 16 verses the two other commentators bring in as illustrations, only two or three serve their purpose. If they

1 K.O. = Koccaha-Orubōhu.
were desirous of giving more illustrations they should have found them in verses 40 and 61 of the same work which are good examples of Koccaha-kalippā. I show this not to point out the defects of their commentaries but to reveal how intricate is the problem of understanding Tolkāppiyar aright.¹

¹ Cilappu. 18th Kāthai, "Tuṇba Mālai," 7th "Kāṇal Vari," and 17th "āychiyar kuravai" appear to be Koccaha-Kalis according to Tolkāppiyar's definition.
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URALKALI

The next division of Tolkāppiyar relating to kali verse is Urālkali (§. 156) which is different from the other three divisions chiefly because it is in the form of a dialogue. That it will never have any curitaham at the end is also its important feature. Though it can be included under the minor division Koccaha-orubōhu since it has no curitaham and since it is somewhat different from the ordinary types of Kali, Tolkāppiyar treated it separately because there was such an usage obtaining in his own days and also because it was very much different from the other varieties by virtue of its occurring only in the form of dialogues similar to what we find in dramatic poetry.¹ There are of course some verses in Kalittogai belonging to this division. Verses 87 and 91 are examples of this type. It is rather unfortunate that subsequent to the days of Tolkāppiyar this

¹ Vide Pērāsiriyar’s commentary relating to §. 156.
peculiar form, namely, Uralkali fell into desuetude.¹ And that is why we do not find the successors of Tolkāppiyar through the ages talk of this division at all. Is not the history of prosody interesting in this manner? Several forms of verses have their birth, existence, death, resuscitation and so on even as the human beings have.

¹ Cilappu XXIV (p. 515/3rd Edition) "Erron-rum kānēm pulattal" etc.—The first two lines in each of the three stanzas may be taken to have been spoken by the maid (tōli) and the last two lines in each of these stanzas may be taken to have been the reply of the mistress (tālaii).
PĀVINĀM OR SUPPLEMENTAL METRES

We have already seen that in the days of Tolkāppiyar verses were classified as āsiriyam, venpā, kali, vañji, marutpā and paripādal. Of these the first four were the main metres.¹ After his days there seem to have arisen several auxiliary metres. Hence Tolkāppiyar could not be expected to give any rule relating to them in his treatise. This, of course, is the opinion of both the commentators Pērāsiriyar and Nachchinārkinīyar.² But Ilampūraṇar takes certain sections in Tolkāppiyar’s sēyyuliyal as treating pāvinām.³ This does not appear to be right, for no writer of the 1st or 2nd Academy period seems to have given any verse in any supplemental metre. Then how could Tolkāppiyar enunciate

¹ Cf. Pērāsiriyar’s commentary and Nachchinārkinīyar’s on Tol. Seyyul. §. 35.
² Vide Pērāsiriyar’s commentary and Nachchinārkinīyar’s on Tol. Seyyul. §. 35, 86, 149.
³ §. 180, 181 and 182.
rules for a form or forms which had never existed before nor did exist in his days.\(^1\) Hence Iḻampūraṇar’s interpretation of Paṇṇathī as pāvinam does not appear to be right.\(^2\) And Tolkāppiyar is not found to say anywhere what pāvinams are nor is he shown as dividing these pāvinams into sub-heads such as āsiriyatālisai, venṭurai, vaṇji-viruttam etc. Hence we may agree with the commentators Pērāsiriyar and Nachchinārkīniyar and arrive at the position that pāvinams did not come into being in Tolkāppiyar’s days.

When or whence they came cannot be decided with any certainty. But it may be remarked that these pāvinams known as tālisai, tuṟai and viruttam made their appearance in Tamil literature only after the days of the 3rd Academy. About the

\(^1\) Tamil Varalāru by K. S. S. Pillai Part I, p. 29: “Saṅga kālattil maruntukkum Akappāṭata iṇam” etc., etc.

\(^2\) It cannot be argued that pāvinams are very ancient because they are found to be spoken of in Paṇṇirupāṭṭiyal. The reason is that this work is after all apocryphal. Please see the next chapter for the spurious nature of Paṇṇirupāṭṭiyal.
origin of these we know now next to nothing. Whether they were mere extensions of some kind or other of the already existing forms or whether they were borrowed in toto from some other source is a question which cannot be decided with certainty. Mr. T. Virabhadra Mudaliar is of opinion that there was a common Dravidian source for all the Dravidian languages in the matter of prosody\(^1\) but that source yet remains to be unearthed. This however is a hypothesis similar to the one maintained by Dr. Caldwell that there was a primitive parental language (not known now) from which all the Dravidian languages sprang. Even if we assume that there was a common Dravidian source for certain forms of prosody in the languages of the Dravidian group, it must be admitted that such a source could have furnished only suggestion at most.\(^2\) Tracing the history even of these suggestions is a matter which must be relegated to persons that might attempt in the future to write a comparative history of

1 Siddhanta Deepika Vol. II p. 184.
Dravidian prosody. But it can be asserted that the European metres, being quite inappropriate to the Tamil language, were not the source from which any of the original or supplemental metres in Tamil sprang.¹

For purposes of tracing the history of pāvinam or supplemental metres in Tamil we must first look at Cilappadikāram which appears to have been written shortly after the extinction of the 3rd Academy. It has 30 cantos or kāthais of which chapters, XVIII, XIX and XXIV appear to be regular Koccaha-Kalippās according to the definition of Tolkāppiyar (§. 154).² Cantos XVII and VII appear to be slight deviations of the same. If we carefully look into these cantos we are sure to notice certain striking resemblances between some of its constituents and some others of Kalittogai verses. If they are missed, the history of pāvinam might go wrong. Chilappadikāram canto XVII contains three verses in a peculiar form which are given below:—

² Vide Note 172 supra.
"Kaṇru kuṇīlāk kaṇiyutirtta māyav an Īṇrumam mānuḷ varumēl avaṇvāyir Konraiyaṁ tǐṅkulal kēlāmō tōli "  (1)
"Pāmpu kayirāk kaḍal kaḍainta māyavaṇ Īṅkunam mānuḷ varumēl avaṇvāyil Āmpalam tǐṅkulal kēlāmō tōli "  (2)
"Kollaiyaṅ cāral kuruntocitta māyavaṇ Ellainam mānuḷ varumēl avaṇvāyil Mullaiyam tǐṅkulal kēlāmō tōli "  (3)

I have found Kalittogai verse 9 to possess similar stanzas which are here given:—

"Palavuṇa naïruṇcāntam paḍuppavark kallatai Malaiyulē pīṟappiṇum malaikkavaipām enceyyum Naṇaiyünkāl nummakaḷ numakkumāṉ kaṇaiyale."  (1)
"Cīrkelu venmuttam aṇipavark kallatai Nīruḷē pīṟappiṇum nīrkkavaitām enceyyum Naṇaiyünkāl nummakaḷ numakkumāṉ kaṇaiyale."  (2)
"Ēlpuṇar īṇnisai muralpavark kallatai Yāluḷē pīṟappiṇum yāḷkkavaitām enceyyum
The former stanzas appear to be similar in structure to the latter for these too have 3 lines of 4 feet each. There is of course a difference between the two in that the former have venpā connexions whereas the latter have kali connexions.¹ But these connexions did not have any value in the classification of supplemental metres by prosodists.² Hence for the purpose of consideration of this pāvinnam, the metrical connexion sinks underneath. Then the similarity alone stands. Are we not justified therefore in

¹ It may however be noted here that venpā connexions do certainly occur in tālisai of kali verse too. Eg.

"Viṇṭoykal nādanaṁ niyum vatuvaivyul
Paṭṭariyā tirpoḻ padarkirpīr markolō
Paṭṭariyā tirpor paḍarntīr palaṅkēnmai
Kaṭṭariyā tēnpor karakkirpen markolō."

(Kalittogai verse 39 ll. 37–40)

"Veṅcūlip patta makarkuk karainitrār
Ancaleṇ rālum uyirppuntām ancirc
Cērintēr muṟuvalal ceṭtavik kāmam
Aṟintum ariyātiv vūr-

(Kali. verse 140 ll. 25–28)

² Yāpparuṇkalam S. 75 and Yāpparuṇkala-karigai S. 30.
saying that the verse under reference in Cilappadikāram had its origin in a tālisai of the sort quoted from Kalittogai? That tālisais might occur in a Kāli verse is well-known to all. Such tālisais should by their nature be called Kalittālisais. But later prosodists beginning with the author of Yāpparunḱalam would call such tālisais, when they occur alone, as “āsirīya-tālisais,” even though āsiriya connexion is not at all a requisite here even according to them. There may be justification for calling the verse from Cilappadikāram either a Venṭālisai or Kalittālisai but no justification at all for naming it āsirīya-tālisai. Still the commentators of Yāpparunḱalam and of other later prosodies cite this verse as an instance of āsirīya-tālisai. Since this name has come into vogue, though without ample justification, it is but prudence now not to quarrel over the name. All that is aimed at now is but to show that āsirīya-tālisai—one of the twelve supplemental metres—had its origin in tālisais which loomed large in Kāli verse of old. Here a statement of Prof. Saintsbury seems to be appropriate; he says “We imitate in prosody (as in other things, but much more than in other things)
only what we are beforehand disposed and qualified to produce without imitation.” 1
Ilaṅgō Adigal has given several tālisais of this sort in his Cilappadikāram canto XIX 2 also. Nor recognising the verses in these cantos as Koccaha-kali or deviations of it, the commentators quoted some of these verses as illustrations for āsiriya-tālisai. But there is no doubt that prosodists like the author of Yāpparuṅkalam too took these verses as representing some other thing than what appears in Kali verses and so it is that they formulated a new rule relating to a supplemental metre called āsiriya-tālisai.

Cilappadikāram canto XIX presents to us several lines which may be treated as similar to certain other tālisais which occur in a kali verse.

1 English Prosody p. 405.
2 E.g.

“Peṇṭirum uṇḍukol peṇṭirum uṇḍukol
Koṇṭa kolunar uрукurai tāṅkuṟūm
Peṇṭirum uṇḍukol Peṇṭirum uṇḍukol.”

(11 51-53.)
PAVINAM OR SUPPLEMENTAL METRES

"Muṟaiyil arasanṟan ūrirundu vālum
Niraiyudai̱p pattinip pendi̱rkāl
ītonṟu"¹

is a couplet which is followed by about five more. Kalittokai verse 23 has 3 couplets of this kind. One of them is as follows:—

"Tōnalam uṇdu tuṟakkap paṭṭōr
Vēnīr uṇṭa kuḍaiyōr anṇar."

Both these couplets have lines of 4 feet and both are having veṇpā connexions only. Whereas the latter occurring in Kalittogai is called a tālisai, the former would be called by prosodists like Kākkaipādiniyār and his successors as veṇ-chenturai. That they are having veṇpā connexions is a pure accident. It has nothing to do with its classification under the veṇchenturai according to Kākkaipādiniyār, Avinayanār,² and other later prosodists. In fact the illustrations cited by the commentator of Yāpparunīkalam have

¹ Lines 3–4.
² Virutti p. 240.
no venpā connexion at all. Thus we see that certain tālisais removed from their text in Kali verse become venčenturais. And seeing such couplets in Cilappadikāram cantos XIX and XX², Kākkaipāḍiniyār and Avinayanār must have given a new name to them as well as a rule relating to them.

Again if we compare Cilappadikāram canto VII, Stanzas 43 to 45 with lines 7–18 of verse 52 and lines 14–25 of verse 75 in Kalittogai, we notice remarkable similarity again.

“Kaitai vēlik kalivāy vantem
Poytal alittup pōnār oruvvar
Poytal alittup pōnār avarnam
Maiyal maṇamviṭṭu akalvār allar”

1 (1) “Ārkali ulagattu makkaṭ kellām
Ōtalir cirantaṇṟu olukkam udaimai.”
(2) “Koṇṟai vēynta celvaṉ adiyinai
Enṟum ēttit tolvōm yāmē.”
(Virutti p. 240)

2 (1) “Kudaiyodu kōlvila niṉṟu naduṅkum
Kādaimaṉi inḵural kānṅekāṅ ellā.
(2) “Tisaívelu nāṅkum atirntidum anṅik
Kadirai irulvilunṅak kānṅekāṅ ellā.
(3) “Viṅṅkodi villira vempakal vilum
Kaṅṅkatir mīṅivai kāṅṅekāṅ ellā.”
is from Cilappadikāram which is comparable to the following piece from Kalittogai:

“Tāmarai̍k kaṇṇiyai taṇṇaruṇi cāntiniṇai
Nēritalk kōtaiyāl ceykuri nīvarin
Maṇaṅkamal nārratta malainiṇru
palipērūrum

Aṉaiṅkena aṅcuvar ciṟukudi yōrē.”

Whereas the latter is recognised to be a tālisai, the former is generally supposed to be a Kali-Viruttam. That the former is not in Kali connexion is quite evident. Still, the prosodists beginning from Kākkaipāḍiṇiyār do call this Kali-Viruttam alone. In fact, both the pieces cited above are more or less in the same metre: they have only āsiriya connexions. They are similar to each other further because they are each in four lines of 4 equal feet. Then where is the difference? If difference it could be called, it should be found in the occurrence of one piece in some other verse than the Kali verse and in the occurrence of the other in a regular kali verse. If the latter were removed from its position in the Kalittogai verse and given to a student of prosody, he would simply call it a Kali-Viruttam, following of course
the later prosodists. Similarly, the former set of three stanzas (Stanzas 43 to 45) can easily find a place in a Kali verse as tālisai. Thus it is possible for us to deduce that what was called a certain tālisai in a Kali verse came to be called in later times, that is to say after the days of Tolkāppiyar, Kali-Viruttam which again is one of the twelve supplemental metres formulated by Kākkaipādinīyār and the rest.

1 (1) “Kaṇal vēlik kālivāy vantu
Nīnal keṇrē niṃrār oruvvar
Nīnal keṇrē niṃrār avarnam
Māṇrē nōkkam marappār allar.”

(2) “Aṇṇam tuṇaiyōdu ādak kaṇḍu
Nēṇnal nōkki niṃrār oruvvar
Nēṇnal nōkki niṃrār avarnam
Pōṇṇēr cuṇaṅkir pōvār allar.”

2 (1) “Īrrntaṇ ādaiyai elli mālaiyai
Cōrtuvil katuppiṅal ceykuri niṉaṅiṉ
Olitikaṅṭiṅkiliyar kavaṇaiyai villar
Kaḷiṇeṅa ārppavar ēṅalkā valarē.”

(2) “Āra mārpiṅai aṇṇalai aḷiyai
Aithakal alkulāl ceykuri niṉaṅiṉ
Karivalar cilampil vāḷaṅkal āṅāp
Puliyen rōrkkumik kalikē lūrē.”

(Kali. verse 52 ll. 11–18)
PAVINAM OR SUPPLEMENTAL METRES

There is yet another of these supplemental metres called Kāli-neḍil-āsiriya-viruttam. It simply signifies Viruttam with lines of more feet than five. There are some stanzas in Cilappadikāram which may be brought under this head. But they are commonly said to belong to the sphere of music (isai). They are each having 4 lines of 6 equal feet.¹ That six-feet lines can occur in a Kali verse is known from S. 64 of Tolkāppiya-Sevyyuliyal. In Kālittogai verse 39 line 46 and in verse 102 line 25 we come across six-feet lines. If, as said before, we take Cilappadikāram canto VII as a deviation of Tolkāppiyar’s Koccaha-Kali, we see no reason why there should not occur six-feet lines in it. Finding these six-feet lines and not recognising canto VII as Koccahakali or as its slight deviation, Kākkaipāḍiniyār and Avinayaṇār must have given a new name to such verses. And that is aṟu-sīr-āsiriya-viruttam. At any rate, six feet viruttams might have had their origin in variippāḍal stanzas of

Cilappadikāram mentioned above, which in turn can be said to be a development of what is found in Kāli verse. I shall cite below one of the stanzas of Cilappadikāram canto VII to enforce my point:—

“Naṇṇit tilattin pūṇaṇintu nalaṇcār
pavaḷak kalaiyuduttuc
Cenner palaṅak kalaṇitorun tiraiyu
lāvu kaḍarceṟppa
Puṇṇaip podumbar makarattiṅ kodiyōn
eyta puduppuṅkaḷ
Eṇṇaik kāṇa vakaimaraittāl anṇai
kāṇīṅ enceykō.”

If a student of Tamil prosody is given this stanza, he will at once cry out “This is aṟū-sīr-āsiriya-viruttam,” for it is just like the following stanza quoted by the commentator of Ṣāpparunikalam¹ as an illustration for this supplemental form:—

“Viḍaṅcū ḷaraviṅ idainuḍaṅka
miṇalvāḷ viṣi viraiyārvēṅ
Kaḍaṅcūḷ nāṅaṅ kālingaṅ katirvēl
pāḍum mātaṅki

¹ Virutti p. 271.
PAVINAM OR SUPPLEMENTAL METRES

Vadāncēr koṅkai malaitāntām
vaddika nila malartāntām
Taṅtō jiraṇḍum vēytāntām eṇnum
tankait taṅnumaiye.”

Next, we notice that stanzas 8–10 of the same canto in Cilappadikāram are but slight deviations of 6-feet Viruttams. Their 1st, 2nd and 4th lines are hexametrical whereas their 3rd line is tetrametrical. Seeing such pieces as these, Kākkaipādiniyār and Avinayaṉār must have formulated a rule regarding the occurrence of short lines in the midst of long ones in a four-line stanza and called that form ‘āsiriya-tūrai.’

There are several other kinds of supplemental metres according to Kākkaipādiniyār and Avinayaṉār. They are Venṭūrai, Kaliturai, Vaṅjitūrai, Venṭālisai, Velī-Viruttam and Vaṅji-Viruttam. Though

1 Tuṇaimēy valampuri tōyntu manalulūta tōrṛa
      māyvān
Poraimali pūmpunṇaip pūvutirntu nunaṭatu
      pörkkīn kāṅal
Nīṟaimati vāṉmukattu vērkayarkaṇ ceyta
Uraimali uyyāṇōy urcuṇaṅku menmulaiyē
    tırkkum pōlum. (St.) 8
their rules in respect of Vañji-Viruttam and āsiriya-tālisai are not quoted by the commentator of Yāpparuṇkalam, it is plain that they contemplated such divisions as is seen from their general rules relating to pāvinam quoted at pages 210 and 211 (Virutti). ¹ There they indicate that tālisai turai and viruttam would occur as suppletives of āsiriyaam, kali and vañji even as of venpā. Then there is no doubt that Kākkaipāḍiniyar and Avinayaṇār have rules relating to Vañji-Viruttam and āsiriya-tālisai also which perhaps the commentator of Yāpparuṇkalam failed to quote. ²

¹ (1) “Veñpā viruttam turaiyōdu tālisai
Eñrim mūraiyn enninya mummāiyum
Tattam peyarāl tālvum peyarē.”
(Kākkaipāḍiniyar)

(2) “Veñpāt tālisai venṭurai viruttameṇṇru
Innān kallavum munnāṅku enpa.”
(Avinayaṇār)

² At this stage, it is amusing to find that “Adimūṇru őttirin ottālisaiyē” is quoted as definition of Āsiriyatturai given by Kākkaipāḍiniyar in the Yāpparuṇkala-Karigai commentary edited by Mr. K. R. Govindaraja Mudaliyar, though other editions of the same do not quote it at all, whereas the commentator of Yāpparuṇkalam quotes the line as though it is from Siṟukākkaipāḍiniyar.
PAVINAM OR SUPPLEMENTAL METRES

It was stated above that Kakkai pādi-niyāras and Avinaya nāras gave their rules relating to āsiriya-tālisai, Kali-Viruttam, āsiriya-Viruttam and āsiriya-turai probably after seeing certain stanzas of those types in Cilappadikāram. They added their rules in respect of the other eight supplemental metres probably after seeing stanzas of those types in Kuṇḍalakēsi and Vaḷaiyāpathi. Unfortunately these two kāvyas have not come down to us in their entirety. Some stray stanzas cited by the commentator of Yāpparuṅkalam¹ and Aḍiyārkkunallār² certainly indicate that there were pāvinams in those works. That these two works belonged to an age prior to the Age of the Religious Revival i.e. prior to the 7th century A.D., is the view expressed by Mr. K. Srinivasa Pillai.³

Some more at least of the eight supplemental metres yet to be discussed here may be said to have had their remote origins in

¹ Virutti p. 488.
² Chilappu, (3rd edition) p, 248 and 249 etc.
³ Tamil Varalaru Part II-p. 208.
certain integral parts of the Kali verse. With a modern Veṇṭaḷisai,\(^1\) one can compare the following tālisai which occurs in Kalittogai verse 42:—

"Eṉcā tellā kodumai nuvalāti
Aṅcuva taṅcā aṟaṅili allaṅeṅ
Neṅcam piṅikkoṅ ḍavaṅ."

In a like manner, one can compare the following ambōtharaṅgam appearing in Kali verse 102 with a modern Vaṅji-ṭurai\(^2\):—

"Eluntatu tukaḷ
Erṟaṅar mārpu
Kaviṅtana maruppuk
Kalaṅkiṅar palar."

These two forms appear to have had their origin in some integral parts of Kali verse such as those quoted above. And Veṇṭuṟai

\(^1\) "Pōdar Narumpiṅdiṉippōṇṇar maṇiyanaiyān
Tādur malaradiyaitaṅavātu vaṉaṅkuṟvar
Tidār viṅaikeṭuppār ciraṇtu." (Virutti p. 244)

\(^2\) "Tīraittta cālikai
Nīraittta pōṇīrān
Tīraippa tēṅkaḷē
Viṅaiṅkkon mālaṅiyā." (Virutti p. 100)
may also be taken to have had its origin in such lines as the following:—

(1) “Ānīka, avvum piṟavu maṇiḳkaṇi
yākanīn
Celvuru tiṇṭērk koduṇcinai kaipparrīp
Paipayat tūṅkunīn melvirar cīraḍī
Nōtalum ūṅdīṅ kenkai vantī
Cemmāṇīṅ pāluṇ niya.”

(2) “Nontu nakuvanāpōl nantīṇa kompu
naintūḷḷī
Ukuvatu pōlumeṅ neṅcu eḷḷī
Tokupuḍa nāḍuva pōlumayīl kaiyīl
Ukuvaṇa pōlum valaiyeṅ kauṅpōl
Ikuparal vārum paruvattum vārār
Mikuvaṭu pōlumin nōy.”
(Ibid. 33 ll. 16-21)

Poets who practised at Kali-Viruttam i.e., at 4 lines of 4 equal feet might have easily gone into 4 lines of 5 equal feet and that is how Kalitturai might have arisen. Veḷi-Viruttam is only a variety of Kalit-

1 Cf. “Veṇiyuru kamal kaṇṇi vēntarkaṭ kāyi-num” etc. quoted at p. 246 Virutti.
turai, for it too has 4 lines of 5 equal feet but it would invariably possess a taniccol as its 5th foot. But there is one difference namely that Veļi-Viruttam can occur in a similar manner with 3 lines even.

Again, poets who handled vaņjituturai might have stumbled upon Vaņji-tālisai also, for the latter is nothing but 3 Vaņjituturais on a single topic. Vaņji-Viruttam is only a deviation of a regular Vaņji verse. It does not have any taniccol and does not end in āsiriya manner. That is the deviation. Kalittālisai is rather the reverse of Veņṭalīsaī in that its last line or lines would contain more feet than its other lines.

These twelve supplemental forms appear to have been treated by Kākkaipādiṇiyār and Avinayaṇār. There is yet another similar form which is dealt with by them. That is Veņchenturai. I had occasion above to quote an illustration of it from Chilappadikāram. One point deserves our attention at this stage. This Veņchenturai gives rise to another form, as is understood from Yāpparunķalam §. 64. Whereas Yāpparunķalam requires a flowing melody
and noble topic in a veṇchenturai,¹ Kākkaipāḍiniyār and Avinayanār do not require them. It is enough for them if there are two lines without any shortage in feet. Two such lines, if they do not have a flowing melody and noble topic, would be dubbed a Kuṟal-tālisai by the author of Yāpparuṇkalam. Whether Kākkaipāḍiniyār and Avinayanār had this other form is doubtful, for they are not quoted in this respect by the commentator of Yāpparuṇkalam.

There are other varieties also of Kuṟal-tālisai according to Yāpparuṇkalam.² When two lines of any number of feet occur as a couplet with one foot wanting in the second line, and when there occurs a couplet with deviation in the Ὄσαι of a Kuṟal-veṇpā, they would each be called a Kuṟal-tālisai. They might have had their origin in such tālisais as occur in Kalittogai verse 36:

“Malaiyidaip pōyinōr varaṇasaḯ nōyoṟu
Mulaiyidaik kanalumen neṟcu.”

¹ “Oḷukiyā Ὄσαι and viḷumiyā porul.”
² Yāpparuṇkalam §. 64.

153
Removed from the context in Kalittogai the couplet quoted above would be a perfect Kural-talisai, for it is but a deviation of Kural-veṇpā. Did Kākkaipādiṇiyār and Avinayaṇār have such a division? Though the commentator of Yāpparuṅkalam does not cite their rule in this respect, it may not be wrong to presume that they too had this division also, for they might have come across such Kural-talisais in certain works of the age following that of Kalittogai.

Next, in respect of Veṇṭurai also we notice a small difference among the rules enunciated by the three prosodists now under consideration. Kākkaipādiṇiyār says\(^1\) that this supplemental form would be of 5 or 6 lines, while Avinayaṇār says that it would be of 5 lines and more. The author of Yāpparuṅkalam goes further and says that it would be of lines between 3 and 7. We may take that Avinayaṇār might have included a seven-line stanza in his definition but not a stanza of 3 or 4 lines. This only indicates that by the time of the author of Yāpparuṅkalam verses as

---
\(^1\) Virutti p. 247.
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cited at page 246 (Virutti) should have come into vogue, that is to say, verses of 3 or 4 lines whose last line must have been wanting by one foot or more should have occurred. Here it must be remembered, though the commentators have not drawn particular attention to it, that a verse of 3 lines whose first 2 lines have four feet and whose third line is wanting by one foot should alone be called a veṇṭālisai according to rule. What is here indicated is that the rule relating to veṇṭurai applies to a three-line stanza only when its first two lines have more feet than four or when its second and third lines have less feet than four.

Again, though there is difference among these prosodists in respect of their definition of Asiriyaturai, a study of them is not possible because their rules as quoted at pages 268 and 269 of Virutti are a confused mass. So, we may pass on to āsiriya-virut tam where too there is a difference. Kākkaipaḍiṇiyār¹ would call 4 lines of 6 equal feet and upwards āsiriya-viruttam and

¹ Virutti p. 273.
Avinayaṉār would have 4 lines of 6 or 7 equal feet for this form, whereas the author of Yāpparuṅkalam would take 4-line stanzas of equal feet ranging from 6 to 10.¹ We do not precisely know what upward limit was sanctioned by Kākkai-pāḍiniyār, though Mr. K. R. Govindaraja Mudaliar in his edition of Yāpparuṅkalam-Kārigai cites a rule as though it is from Kākkaipāḍiniyār in which the upward limit is said to be 8 feet.² By the time of the author of Yāpparuṅkalam several viruttams must have come into existence running upto 10 feet. He is placed in the end of the 10th century A.D. by Mr. M. Raghava Aiyangar as had been stated before.³ Maṇikkāvāchakar, whose age has been fixed differently by different scholars,⁴ appears to have lived about the beginning of the 10th or the end of the 9th

¹ Yāpparuṅkalm §. 77—read with §. 25.
² “iraṇḍu mudalā eṭṭirāka” etc.
³ Sen Tamil Vol. XXIV.
⁴ Vide p. 161 History of Tamil Literature by Mr. M. S. Purnalinga (1929 edition).
century A.D.¹ He has given 8 stanzas² in his Tiruvāchakam which are all of 12 feet. He and he alone is the person among the four Saiva Achāryas and the twelve Alvārs that has given verses running up to 12 feet. The others stop with lines of 8 feet. The rule relating to āsiriya-virut-tam given by the author of Yāpparunīkalam should reasonably either stop with 8-feet lines or proceed up to 12 feet-lines. But it adopts via media. And via media would be an unhappy thing in a prosodist unless otherwise explained. The explanation that could be given is that the author of Yāpparunīkalam might have come across several viruttams running up to 10 feet and that he might not have seen Māṇikka-

¹ Ibid. p. 162-164 and Tamil Perumakkaḷ Varalāṟu by Mr, S. Anavaratavinayakam Pillai (1921 edition) p. 78.
² Vide Tiruppadaiyāṭchi:—

"Kaṅka Liṟaṇduṁ Avaṅkalaḷ Kaṇḍu
Kaḷippaṇa Ākāṭē
Kārikai Yārkaḻtam Vāḻvi Lenvāḻvu
Kadaippadum Ākāṭē
Maṅkaḻil Vantu Pirṇtidu Māṟu
Maṟṇtidu Mākāṭē
Māḷari Yāmalarp Pāda miraṇṭum
Vaṇankutum Ākāṭē" etc.(Stanza 1).
vāchakar's Tiruppaḍaiyāṭchi in the Tiruvāchakam or that having seen it he did not think it sufficient warrant to justify the raising of the upper limit to twelve feet.

Though it is generally supposed that pāvinams or supplemental metres arose in the days of the Saiva Achāryas and Vaishṇava Alvārs (i.e., between 7th and 11th centuries A.D.),¹ I. have already shown that some of them at least had their birth in the time of Chilappadikāram. Though Mr. K. Srinivasa Pillai is of opinion that Viruttams and not turais are found in the hymns of the three Tevāra authors² who preceded Mānikkavāchakar, a careful scrutiny of their poems disproves his statement. For, even the earliest of them has given several vanji-turais.³ Besides these

¹ Tamil Varalāru Part I (p. 29): “It was several centuries after the last days of the Sangam that āṇam made their appearance. Among those works that thus made their appearance Tevārams and Nālāyira-Prabandams were the most ancient.”

² Tamil Varalāru Part II—p. 129.

³ Sambandar's poems—padigams 90–96. e.g.

“Araṇai Uḷkuvir
Bīrama ṇūruḷem
Paraṇaiyē Maṇam
Paravi Uymmiṅe.”
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are found several āsiria-tūrais and kalit-tūrais given by the three Tevāra hymnists.¹

Besides āsiria-tūrais, āsiria-viruttams and kali-viruttams, there are kūral-tālisais,

¹ E.g.
(1) “Anthamum ādiyum ākiya anṇal āralalaṅkai
   amartilaṅka
   Manta muḷavamiyampa malaimakal kānaniṅ
   rādic
   Canta milaṅku nakutalai kaṅgai tāṇmathi
   yammaya lētatumba
   Ventaven niṟu meypūcum vēṭkala nāṇnaṅa
   rārē.”
   (Sambandar padigam 39 St. 1-Āsiriyatuṟai)
(2) “Mutṭu vidāṇa maṇippor kavari muṟaiyāle
   Pattarka lōḍu pāvaigaramuṟappalippinē
   Vittakak kōla ventalai mālai viratikal
   Attaṅ ärur ātīrai nāḷal atuvanṇam.”
   (Tirunavukkarasar padigam 21 St. 1-Kalittuṟai)
(3) “Māḍa māḷikai kōpu raṭtodu maṇḍa pamvala
   rumvala poḷil
   Pāḍal vaṇḍarai yumpala nattirup panaiyurt
   Tōḍu peytoru kāṭi nīrkuḷai āṅkut tonḍarkal
   tullip pāḍañiṅ
   Rāḍu māru vallā ravarē alakiyare.”
   (Sundarar padigam 87 St. 1-Āsiriyatuṟai)
(4) “Cittam ninīnai enṇodu cūḷaṟum vaikalum
   Matta yāṇaiyin iruri pörṟama nāḷanur
   Pattar tāmpalar pādinin rāḍum palampadi
   Pottil ānthaikal pāṭṭa raṇṇuṇa vāyile.”
   (Ibid. 50 St. 1-Kalittuṟai)
vañjitturais, venṭurais and vañji-viruttams in Sambandar’s poems.¹ And there are kalittālisais in Tirunāvukkarasar’s poems.² Though he is the only person among the Saiva-Achāryas that has given Kalittālisais he finds comrades in this respect in Tirumaṅgaiāḻvār, Periyāḻvār and Aṇḍāḷ.

¹ E.g. (1) “Varama tēkōla urama tēceyum purame
rittavāṇ pīrama narpurat
Taraṇa nāmamē paravu vārkalcīr viravuni!
puviyē.”
(3rd Tirumūrai padigam 110 St. 1-Kūrāl-tālisai)

(2) “Cittam telivīrkāl
Attan ārūraip
Patti malartūva
Mutti ākumē.”
(1st Tirumūrai padigam 91 St. 1 Vañji-tūrai)

(3) “Viṇṇavar toluṭēlu venkuru mēviya
Cuṉnaṉeṇ podiyāṇi vīrē
Cuṉnaṉeṇ podiyāṇi viruma toḻukāḻal
Enṉavaḷ larida rlārē.”
(3rd Tirumūrai padigam 94 St. 1-Venṭurai)

(4) “Adalē ramaruṇ kodiyannal
Mudalār kuḷalā lōduamanṇuṇ
Kadalār puḍaicot tarukāli
Todarva ravartū neriyārē,”
(1st Tirumūrai padigam 34 St. 1-Vañji-Viruttam)

² E.g.
“Talaiyē niṇavaṇkāy talaimālai talaikkāṇintu
Talaiyē lēpali tērun talaivanai talaivyē
niṇavaṇkāy.”
(9th padigam St. 1)
Māṇikkavāchakar also has given about 20 venturais in his Tiruvunthiyār. And Nam-mālvār has given Vāṇjitturais and Vāṇji-viruttams, in addition to his āsiriyatturais, āsiriya-viruttams, and Kali-viruttams. And Periyālvār has given a few Kural-tālisais in addition to his Kalittālisais, Kali-viruttams and āsirinya-viruttams. But none of the Āchāryas or Ālvārs appears to have given a verse in the supplemental metres called āsiriyattālisai, ventālisai, veḷiviruttam and vāṇjittālisai. But Sambandar and Nam-mālvār at least may be said to have given a few vāṇjittālisais, for their padigams or pāṭṭus contain more than three vāṇjitturais on the same topic.1 If this satisfies the condition required for a vāṇji-tālisai, then these two poets at least may be taken to have employed that form too.

There is one other of these supplemental metres which has been uniquely employed by all the four Saiva āchāriyas (7th to 10th centuries A.D.) and by four of

1 Vide padigams 90–96 of Sambandar and Tiruvāymoḷi I Ten—2nd and 8th Tiruvāymoḷi and X Ten 5th Tiruvāymoḷi.
the Vaishnava Alvars, namely, Tirumalai-
gaiyالvăr (II half of the 8th century A.D.),¹ Nammalvăr (early part of the 9th century A.D.),² Periyalvăr and Anđāļ (both some-
where in the 9th century A.D.).³ That is
Kalitturai, a form in which there are 4 lines
of equal feet. It is significant that the first
Alvars namely Poigaiālvăr, Pūthattalvăr,
Pēyalvăr and Tiruppānālvăr who certainly
lived before the 7th century A.D. have not
given any stanza in this form. In Cilappadikāram too we do not come across any
stanza of this kind, even though there are
some stanzas,⁴ which are of the nature of
six-feet āsiriyā-viruttams. The peculiarity
of this form lies in the fact that it came in
later days to be divided into two varieties
namely Kalinilaitturai and Kaṟṭṭāḷai-Kalit-
turai. Though Kākkaipaññiyār, Avinaya-
ṉār and the author of Yāpparunuṅkalam
have not drawn this division, the commen-
tator of Yāpparunuṅkalam⁵ has done it.

¹ History of Tamil Literature p. 194.
² History of Tamil Literature p. 188.
³ Ibid. 190.
⁴ Quoted at p. 146 Supra.
⁵ Vide Virutti p. 486.
Yāpparuṇkalakāriģai is a treatise running in this supplemental metre alone. Kumarasēnāsiriyar-Kōvai and Tamiḻ-Muttaraiyar-Kōvai mentioned by the commentator of Yāpparunkalalam¹ are mere names to us. We do not know anything about the authorship or date of these kōvais. In fact, all kōvais must be in this supplemental form, according to definitions given in Pāṭṭiyals. Perhaps the ancient kōvai that has come down to us is to be seen in the 315 illustrative stanzas found in the commentary of Iraiyāṉār-Agapporuł.²

That there were at least some stanzas of this type before this Kōvai arose can be deduced by a scrutiny of Sambandar’s poems. His 116th padigam is an approach to Kaṭṭalai-Kalitturai, for it satisfies the condition that the first four feet in all the four lines should have venpā connexions. For instance

“Avviṇaik kivvinai yāmeṇṭṇu collu
mahtārivī

¹ Virutti p. 486.
² That these verses must have been sung in honour of Jāḍila-Parāntaka-Neduṇjaḍaiyan (77 A.D. Circa) is known from the Anaimalai Inscriptions.
ADVANCED STUDIES IN TAMIL PROSODY

Uyviṇai naḍā tiruppatu muntamak kūṇamaṇṛē
Kaivinai ceytem pirāṇkalal pōṟrutum nāmadiyōm
Ceyvinai vantemait tiṇḍappe rātiru nilakaṇṭam.”
(Tirumūrai 116th Padi.–1)

All the stanzas of that padigam excepting the first satisfy the other condition regarding the number of letters that should occur in this form. The only thing which stands in the way of our calling it a regular Kaṭṭalai-Kalitturai is that its last foot of the last line does not end in ē. But all these are satisfied in the next padigam, i.e., 117th.

“Kāḍa taṇikalaṅ kārara vampati kālataṅil
Tōḍa taṇikuvar cundarak kāthiṅir rūccilampar
Vēḍa taṇivar visayaṅ kuruvam villumkoḍuppar
Piḍa taṇimaṅi māḍap pirama purattārē.”¹
(117th padi. St. 1)

¹ It must be stated that the first lines of stanzas 7 and 12 have one connexion however which is not veṇpā.
Here then we have the beginnings of Kaṭṭalai-Kalitturai. Kāraikkāl-Ammaiyyar, whose date has not been definitely fixed, has also given 10 stanzas of this kind. Tirunāvukkarasar, an elder contemporary of Sambandar and one who survived him, has given about 350 stanzas in this form.

"Pārkoṇḍu mudik kādalkoṇḍa
ñāṇrumiṇ pātamellām
Nālaṅcu pullina mēntina venpar
nāḻirmatiyam
Kālkoṇḍa vaṅkaic caṇaivirīt tāduṇ
kalumalavark
Kāḷaṇri marṟumun dōvanta nāli
yakalīdamē."

(118th padigam St. 1)

And Sundarar, their successor, has given about 30 stanzas. Chēramāṇperumāl, contemporary of Sundarar, was the author of 110 verses of this kind. Nammālvār’s Kaṭṭalai-Kalitturai is amount to 100. And Mānikkavāchakar, coming probably after all these persons, has given about 70 stanzas

1 Vide his other Tiruviruttams in 4th Tirumurai.
of this form in his Tiruvāchakam. But he does not stop there. His other work Tirukkōvaiyār is entirely in this form and contains 400 Kaṭṭalai-Kalitturais. Paṭṭinattār appears to be the reputed author of 130 Kaṭṭalai-Kalitturais as could be seen from the eleventh Tirumūrai.

It is but natural for us to expect some stanzas of this form in Jivakachintāmana if that kāvyya arose about the end of the 9th or the beginning of the 10th century A. D. It contains altogether 3145 stanzas. In all these 3145 stanzas there is not even one which satisfies the requirements of a Kaṭṭalai-Kalitturai. But there are some stanzas which proceed on lines similar to Kaṭṭalai-Kalitturai. We know that a Kaṭṭalai-Kalitturai should have four pentameters and that the four feet of each

---

1 (1) Mr. T. A. Gopinatha Rao in Sen Tamil Vol. V. p. 95.
(2) Dr. V. Swaminatha Aiyar in the preface to the first edition of Chintāmana.

2 Though it is said that a Kandīr interpolated certain stanzas in this kāvyya, we do not know what really these interpolations are. (Vide Chintāmana p. 914 foot-note).
of the lines should be knit by veṇpā connexions, that the last foot in each line should be a viļaņkāy foot (i.e., Nēr-nirai-nēr or Nirainirai-nēr) and that the last syllable in the very last foot of the stanza should be ē. We know besides that if the first syllable of a line is nēr, the line should contain 16 letters, and that if a nirai it must have 17 letters, and that consonants will not be reckoned for this purpose. In Chin-tāmaṇi, certain stanzas are available which have four pentameters whose four feet of each of the lines are knit by veṇpā connexions and whose last syllable in the very last foot ends in ē. Thus we see that certain essentials of Kaṭṭaḷai-Kalitturai are satisfied here too. But the difference lies in the fact that the last foot in each line is not a viļaņkāy foot but a different one. Furthermore, if the first syllable of the line is a nēr, the line has 14 letters and if a nirai 15 letters, barring of course the consonants as in the matter of the Kaṭṭaḷai-Kalitturai. That these stanzas proceed on some such definite manner is enough to carve out a name for itself different from the ordinary Kalitturai, which may have any connexion, which may end in any letter
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and which may have any number of equal or unequal letters, just as Kaṭṭaḻai-Kalitturai, though a variety of Kalitturai, has justified a separate name for itself, proceeding as it does on certain definite principles. If the form running in 16 to 17 letters is called Kaṭṭaḻai-Kalitturai, the other form can be called Kaṭṭaḻai-Kali-nilaitturai.¹ Now I shall cite illustrations for the peculiar form which I have discovered. Chintāmaṇi stanza 2137 is an illustration for a line beginning with a nēr syllable and having 14 letters, and stanza 1974 is an example for a line beginning with a nirai syllable and having 15 letters. They are given below:—

“Anātu Vėntaṇ Kālulntaṇ Enakkōyī Lellām
Tāṇātu Miṇṛi Mayaṅkit Taḍāṅkaṇpey Māri
Tēnār Malarīrt Tolūkac Cilambir
Cilambum Kānār Mayiliṅ Kaṇampōr Kalulvurra Taṅrē”. (2137).

cf. Tilatappōli of Commentary of Vīrasōliyam, §. 22.
If these two verses alone were available in the whole book of Chintāmaṇi with venpā connexions in the first four feet, with े terminations and with a definite number of letters, we should have had some reason to consider them as pure accidents. But there are certain other verses as well in this form. Stanzas 1, 8, 29, 1933, 1960, 1965, 2134 and 2135 are a few of them. These go to prove that these stanzas are not accidents but pure designs.

Now we may consider a statement made by Nachchiṅārkkiṇiyar that Chintāmaṇi followed the rules laid down in Tolkāppiyam and that in it are not to be sought pāvināms or supplemental metres. But as a

1. "Ittodarnīlāic ceyyulaic īnām enpa. ‘Mūvāmudalā’ ēnnaṅ kavi mutaliyāna tālampaṭṭa
matter of fact we find in it several āsiriyat-
turais, vañjitturais, vañjiviruttams. To
mention a few, stanza 2514 is an āsiriyat-
turai, stanzas 565—580 are vañjitturais
and stanzas 1186—1194 are vañjiviruttams.¹
There are abundant instances of Kali-
viruttam, Kalitturai and āsiriyaviruttam of

¹ (1) "Nīrai'yōda nīrniṅru niḍavamē ceyyēnum
Vāli nila
Maṟai'yō Varivaivarī neḍunkaṅok kilaiyāl
Vāli nilam
Kaṉnovvā yeṅum kaḷittu nakutiṅṅ
Vaṅṇamītuvo maduvunpār cērī cērī aiyō
Vāli nilam.” (2514)

(2) "Veṟṟiveṅ manimudīk
Koṟṟavaṅ norumakaṅ
Aṟṟamīl Perumpadaṅc
Cūṟṟamō diyaṅkīṅāl.” (565)

(3) "Nutikōndaṅa vempara nuṅṅilaṅvēl
Patikōnda parantaṅa pōṅṟulavāl
Vitikanṭava rallaṅ miducelār
Vatikoṅtator vevvalal vāycolīṅvēm”.

(1186)
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6 feet.¹ There are besides a few āsiriya viruttams of 7 feet and of 8 feet.² In the

¹ E.g. (1) "Nalīvil kūnroḍu kāḍūraṅ nānporuṭ
Puliya nārmakāṭ kōdalum pūmimēl
Valiyin mikkavar tammakāṭ kōdalum
Nīlāikoṅ maṅgar vālakkena nērpavē."
(1919—Kalivuttam)

(2) Mattavil kōtaī vālaṅa unkaṅ mayilāṅāṅāl
Kaṭṭalā levvaṅ kāimmika nīkkīk kalīkūra
Vīttakal vāṟṟā vēṭkaiyī nōdum polutippāl
Paṭṭataṅ yēllām pallavar kēṭkap pakar-
kurēn. (360—Kalitturaṅ)

(3) Naṅantalai vulagīṅ mīkka naṅnutal
makalīr tāṅkal
Maṅantalai pariya nīṅra matalaimai
ādu keṅṟē
Ponaṅkoḍi yīrāṅṅci nīṅru pūmakaḷ pul-
ampī vaṅka
Aṅaṅkaṅuṅ kavalaṅ ceyyu maṅṇa nāṅrā
yuraṅttāl. " (367 et. seq.—6 ft. viruttams.)

² E.g. (1) "Mainūr rāṇaiya māvī lōḍi vakuttun
tokkuttum vīṟittuṅ
Kaṁnūr rīṟattīr kalappa vārīk kamalu
nāṅak kalavai
Aīnūr rīṟattīṅ nakīḷīṅ nāvī yalaiṅtu
kamalā vūttī
Ennūr rīṟamu muṇarvā leḷilēr rīmīḷīṅ
nērpā muḍittāl."
(2437 et seq. 7 ft-viruttams)

(2) " Kāṭaṅṅinta tōḍorupāṅ mīṅnu visak
katirminṅuk kulaṅyorupāṅ tiruvīl visat
Tāṭaṅṅinta tāmaṅṅkaḷ orupār cōrāt
tāmaraṅṅka江山 tāmiraṅṅkap puruvaṅ āda
Māṭaṅṅinta nōkkinā ralkur kāsu
maṅmalalaiṅ kinkinīryuṅ cīlampu mēṅkap
Pōtaṅṅinta tāruḍaiyāp poruṭu poṅṅip
face of these stanzas how can we accept the statement of Nachchiniärkkiniyar that there are no pāvinams in Chintāmaṇi? If what Nachchiniärkkiniyar again says in the commentary, on stanza 3143 is true, then 445 stanzas might have appeared from the pen of some interpolator. What exactly these stanzas are we do not know. Nor can we entirely believe in the words of Nachchiniärkkiniyar that the author gave only 2700 stanzas, for his authority is itself open to grave doubt and discussion. Nachchiniärkkiniyar himself says that stanza 3143 was not from the author but that it sprang from the author's master. This too may have been from an interpolator! Still there is nothing in the stanza directly to signify that the author gave only 2700 stanzas. The expression “27 precious gems” ("Tirumuttu irupattēl") is taken by Nachchiniärkkiniyar first to mean 270 stanzas and then to indicate 2700 stanzas. A curious procedure indeed! And what is

puṇārmulaiKal pōrkkalantāṇ kanda vānre.”
(3136 et seq. 8 ft. vīruttams)

1 St. 3143-1. 2.
more? The number of six feet āsiriyaviruttams alone is found to belie the statement of this commentator. There are about 1433 āsiriyaviruttams of 6 feet in this Kāvyā, an inexorable fact which proves the mistake of the commentator. Even if there were interpolations, such interpolations might not have exceeded the number 445 according to him. It does not require a great mathematician to prove that in the world of material values 2700 stanzas taken from 3145 stanzas will leave only 445 stanzas. If we grant all pāvinams were interpolations in Chintāmaṇi there should not be more than 445 stanzas in that form. But the number of pāvinams in Chintāmaṇi is so overwhelming as to set at naught the statement of Nachchiṅārkkiṇiyar.

Then again he says that the stanzas of Chintāmaṇi are neither Kalitturais nor Viruttams but only Kocahams according to the definition of Tolkāppiyar.¹ Evidently, by Kocaham he means only

¹ His commentary on the first stanza of Chintāmaṇi.
Koccaha-Orubōhu and not Koccaha-Kali. We have already seen that Koccaha Orubōhu is only a variety of Ottālisai-Kali according to Tolkāppiyar. But Tolkāppiyar has nowhere contemplated the occurrence of 8 feet in any verse, nor even in Kali. Against this, we find a few stanzas in Chintāmaṇi running up to 8 feet. Then how can they be called koccahams or koccaha- orubōhus? Until it is positively proved that there was real interpolation in the Kāvya in a later period and until it is shown which of the stanzas were such interpolations, we must hold that Chintāmaṇi is a work which contains several pāviṅāms or supplemental metres as mentioned above.

Now, turning to the Yāpparuṉkala-Kārigai we find that its author has given rules relating to the twelve supplemental metres and to the two sub-supplemental metres namely veṇchenturai and kuṟal-tālisai, which are almost identical with the rules of Yāpparuṉkalam. Only the author

1 S. 139 and 147 of Tolkāppiyam-Seyyuḷiyal.
PAVINAM OR SUPPLEMENTAL METRES

of Kārigai does not talk of the upper limit of foot in the lines of āsiriya-viruttam whereas the author of Yāpparun-kalam has clearly marked it at 10 feet.¹

¹ Though it is generally believed on the authority of the pāyirams (preface) of both the treatises that there was only one author by name Amitasākarar that gave Yāpparun-kalam as well as Kārigai, the foundations of this belief are being shaken by certain marked differences in principles between the two treatises. Kārigai §. 42 talks of a greater number of todais than Yāpparun-kalam §. 39. And Kārigai S. 43 is different from Yāpparun-kalam §. 37.

"Varukkam nedilinam vantāl etukaiyum mōnaiyumen
Rorukkap peyarān uraikkap padumuyir āsideiyit
Tirukku morucār irāntādi mūnra
Meluttumonri
Nirakkum etukaien raluñ cirappila nērilaivyē." (§. 43)

"Varukkam Nedilinam varaivyār āndē." (§. 37)

Above all, the limits prescribed for tālisai and taravu in kārigai go against the letter and spirit of Yāpparun-kalam §. 82:—

"Curuṅkirru mūnradī yenait taravu īru mūnradiyē
Taraṅkukkum vaṅnagak kuntara vāvatu tālisaiippā
Curuṅkīr iraṅtādi ḍkkam irattī curūmpimirun
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Thus we see that pāviṇams, which did not exist in the days of Tolkāppiyar, made their first appearance in Chilappadikāram whose few forms are traceable to certain integral parts of kali verse occurring in Kalittogai, that they were largely employed by several poets beginning from the age of Ṛṇāsambandar and that Kākkaipāḍinīyar, Avināyaṇār, and the authors of Yāpparuṇkalam and Kārigai have given rules relating to them.

Taraṅkak kuḷalāy curuṅkun taraviniṅ rālisaīyē.” (§. 44 kārigai)

“Taravonru tālisai mūnruṅ camaṇayt
Taravir curuṅkit taṇinilait tākic
Curitahāṅ coṇṇa ʻraṇtinul ʻonrāy
Nīkalvatu nērisai ottā ʻisaikkali.”

(Yāpparuṅkalam)
AUGURY IN VERSE.

To-day much is made of the Augury or Poruttam of verse by certain old-fashioned people in Tamilnādu. Still it will be found on a careful and close scrutiny that looking for augury in verse was a later innovation in Tamil literature than it is ordinarily supposed to be. The treatises that deal with this subject are generally called pāṭṭiyal. Venpāppāṭṭiyal, Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkappāṭṭiyal, Navanītappāṭṭiyal, Chidambaramappāṭṭiyal are some such treatises. None of these, however, is more ancient than the eleventh century A.D. But Paṇṇirupāṭṭiyal is supposed to have arisen in a far earlier age. This book falls into three sections, namely, eluttiyal, colliyal and ināviyal. In the first section there are nine subdivisions, in the second there are three subdivisions and in the third there are two main divisions and fifty-nine subdivisions. It is impossible therefore to attribute the origin of the name Paṇṇirupāṭṭiyal to the main divisions or subdivisions in the book.
Nor is it possible to connect the name of the book with the number of verse-kinds treated in the book, for they are well-nigh four times twelve. It is possible that the name of the book was derived from the supposed authors amounting to twelve in number. But as a matter of fact there are found more names than twelve as the authors’ of different rules. The following is a list of them:—(1) Poikaiyār (2) Paraṇar (3) İndirakāliyār (4) Avinayaṇār (5) Akattiyar (6) Kallādaṇār (7) Kapilar (8) Chēntampaṇṭaṇār (9) Kövūrkiḷār (10) Māpūtaṇār (11) Cīttalaiyār (12) Palkāyaṇār (13) Perun-kuṇṛurkkiḷār. Doubt therefore arises as to whether all the persons mentioned above were the real authors of particular rules noted against their names in the book. There are altogether 358 rules in the book and many of these are redundant and tautological. It cannot therefore be suggested that a certain author wrote the whole book and gave it in the name of several, unless it is at the same time accepted that whoever that author was he wilfully gave overlapping rules. The work at any rate appears to be apocryphal and
I have sufficient reasons to believe that some authorling or authorlings gave the whole or the major part of the book. I shall first try to prove this point. Poikaiyār, Paraṇar, Kapilar and Kövūrkilār, the supposed authors of certain rules in this book, are found by a scrutiny of their verses in Puranāṇūru to have offended those very rules. For instance, Poikaiyār is supposed to have given a rule ¹ wherein the gender of vowels is said to be masculine, that of vowel-consonants to be feminine and that of consonants proper to be neuter. If it is true that the Sangam poet Poikaiyār was also the author of this rule, he should have observed that in his own writings. When he had to compose verses in honour of a man—Chēramān Kōkkōtaimārpan—he ought to have employed, according to this basis, a vowel as the initial letter in the first foot. On the contrary, he is found to have employed a vowel-consonant—a

¹ “Uyirī rārum āṇeṇa molīpa
Uyirmey yellām penneṇa molīpa
Uḍampelut tellām napuṇīcaka mākum.”
(Paṇṇirupāṭṭīyal §. 53)
feminine letter—in two verses sung in his honour as contained in Puṟanāṉūru.¹ The opening lines of these verses run as follows:—

1. Kōtai mārpir kōtai yāṇum
2. Nādaṇ eṅkō ūraṇ.eṅkō.

Similarly, Paraṇar, who is supposed to have banned the use of arsis or alapedai² in the initial foot of an opening line in any verse sung in honour of a human being, is found to have made a breach himself. If it is true that arsis in that connection would portend evil, would he have employed it in a verse³ in Puṟanāṉūru as follows:—Tēem koṇḍa?

Kapilar, another supposed author of Paṇṇirupāṭṭiyal, is reported to have given a rule to the effect that only tri-syllabic foot would be auspicious as the first foot

¹ Puṟam. Verses 48 and 49.
² “ĀṆ Yarala mutaliya alapedai
ĀytamaṇṆ kuṟukka mulappada vellam
Viḍameṇa moliṆa meyyuṇarn tōē.”
(Paṇṇirupāṭṭiyal §. 39)
³ Puṟam. 352.
in the first line. But even one who runs may perceive by a glance at his verses compiled in Puranāṇūru that he is a great offender in this respect, if it is true that he gave the rule in the Pāṭṭiyal. Puranāṇūru verses 8, 53, 107, 108, 143, 202 and 347 will bear out this statement:—

(1) “Vaiyaṅ kāvalar”
(2) “Mutirvār ippi”
(3) “Pāri pār”
(4) “Kuratti māṭṭiya”
(5) “Malaivāṇ Koḷkeṇa”
(6) “Veṭchik kāṇattu”
(7) “Uṇpōṇ rānarum.”

Kōvūrkilār is supposed to have said in the Pāṭṭiyal that a disyllabic foot ending in the “mā” formula (such as pulimā or

---

1 Panṇirupāṭṭiyal S. 101: “Kaṇamē mūvasaik kūṭṭam ākum.”

2 “Ērasaic cirum nālasaic cirum Ērasaic cirul nēriu cirum Maṅkalam puṇariṇum maṅkutal ceyyum.” (§. 131)
tēmā) is tabooed in the initial foot of the initial line of a verse in honour of men or women. Yet, in Puṟanāṇūṟu verses 42 and 70 he is found to have violated the rule.¹ In rule 131 of Paṇṇirupāṭṭiyal he is shown as having said “Maṅgalam puṇa-arinum maṅkutal ceyyum”. The idea is that the foot in question is to be eschewed even although it might possess an auspicious word. Against this very idea, verse No. 308 of Puranāṇūṟu given by Kövūrkilār is found to proceed. Though the verse commences with an auspicious word meaning “gold” as “Poṇvārn taṇṇa”, the first foot is a disyllabic one with a “mā” ending foreboding evil, according to the Pāṭṭiyal. If it is true that Kövūrkilār gave that rule in the Pāṭṭiyal, did he give it only for the observance of others reserving to himself the right to violate it?

Such considerations as these point to one conclusion, namely, that the genuine

¹ (1) “Āṇā îkai”
(2) “Tēen tîntoîrai.”
author or authors of the work should be sought in persons other than those with such names in the ancient period of Tamil literature. Then it stands to reason to hold that the theories contained in Paṇṇirupāṭṭiyal are a later advent and that the book is not as old as it is represented to be. Assuming therefore that it arose long after the third Academy period, we would not be wrong if we placed it somewhere between the 7th and the 10th centuries A.D. That is the time when greater and greater import of foreign ideas into the Tamil language and literature took place. We shall now see in what respects this book betrays such a foreign influence.

To start with, the book represents Brahma as having created the vowels and 9 Dēvars as having created the consonants. What is worse is that the 12 vowels, and k, ṇ, c, ṇ, t and ṇ are represented as belonging to the Brahmin caste, that t, n, p, m, y and r are represented as belonging to the king’s caste, that l, v, r and ṇ are represented as belonging to the merchant caste and that ū and ṭ are represented as belonging to
the Sudra caste.¹ That out of all relation with the existing facts in Tamil land and literature the resolution of things into caste was made is evident from certain other rules in the same book which has attributed the Brahmin caste to venpā, the king’s caste to Agaval, the merchant’s caste to Kalippā

"Nalluyirp pakutī nānmukān padāittānā." (§. 3)
Kannutal tirumal katirvel murugaṅ
Vinnavar talaiyān vēṅkātir vēṅmati
Nithikkōṅ kūrruvāṅ neḻunir varuṇāṅ
Ennuṅ kaṭavular irīraṅ tāka
Māṇṇiya orru vakaivēru padāittānār." (§. 4)
"Oṉpatu tevaram Udampu padāittānār." (§. 5)
"Naṟumalart tīsainukan ṣaṅ nāraṅaṅ
Arumukan padāittāṅa antaṅar cāṅi." (§. 6)
"Indiraṅ vēṅkātir candiraṅ padāittāṅa
Tunnuṅcirrippin māṅnavar cāṅi." (§. 8)
"Tirumiku nithikkōṅ varuṇāṅ padāittāṅa
Vaṅnikku cirrippin vaṅkār cāṅi." (§. 10)
"Kūrruvāṅ padāittāṅa kūranaṅ iraṇduṁ
Etṭiya marapir cūṭṭirar cāṅi." (§. 12)
"Mekkaṅ cāṅ nāṅkīkkum vakutta
Tattam cāṅ elutē avaravarkku
Vaṭṭumun ṣṛuppiṅ atumāṅ puḍāittē
Mayaṅkīṅum varaīyār payaṅpaḍa varinē." (§. 18)
and the Veļḷāḷa caste to Vaṅjippā.¹ It has been enjoined in yet another rule² that for the respective castes the respective verses should be given. This rule is not found to be in consonance with the practice of the times. If it is true in the Tamil land that a venpā was restricted for usage only in respect of persons of the Brahmin community, Gaḷavalī Nāṟṟpatu, a work of forty venpās should have been sung in honour of a Brahmin. On the contrary we find that this ancient poem was given in honour of a king by name Köcceṅgaṇāṇ. If it is true similarly that the vaṅji verse was reserved for usage in respect of persons of the supposed Sudra community, certain verses contained in the compilation Puranāṇūṉu, which I have shown in another place as

¹ "Antanaṟ cāti ākiya vellai"
     "Kāvalar cāti ākiya agaval"
     "Nedunilaik kaliyē vanikar cāti"
     "Eñcia vējān cāti vaṅji."
     "Nālvakaip pāvīru mēḷōr vakutta
     Inaṅkaḷum perumēṇa ninaintaṇar kolalē" (§. 161-165)

² "Antac cāṭik kantap pāvē
   Tantaṇar pulavar tavirantaṇar varaiyār."
   (§. 168)
vañji verses\textsuperscript{1} should have been sung only in honour of a Sudra! But we find that these verses\textsuperscript{2} were given in honour of a Chōla king, a Chēra king and a Pāṇḍya king. These points therefore militate against the view of attributing castes to verses. That the introduction of the idea of caste in this manner is highly artificial and unnatural is further evident from the rule, which by giving enormous scope for exceptions is no rule at all. The rule in question\textsuperscript{3} lays down that for the four castes the four respective sets of letters would be employed as the initial letter but at the same time that other sets of letters would not be rejected if used.

Another important point which shows a marked foreign influence is that which relates to the classification of letters into genders. According to rule 45 the short vowels are taken to be belonging to the

\textsuperscript{1} Vide pages 55 to 57 supra.
\textsuperscript{2} Puranānūru verses 4, 11, 239.
\textsuperscript{3} “Nālvakai varunat törkkum nālvakai iyampu meluttai iyampuvar mutanmoḷi Maṟṟavaί mayaṅkīnum āndē.” (S. 17)
masculine gender, the long vowels to the feminine gender and the consonants as also the Āytam to the neuter gender. All this is out of relation with the category of gender in the Tamil language.¹ That this too is unnatural and artificial will be understood by a reference to another rule ² which gives a different kind of classification. The latter rule tells us that all vowels are masculine, all vowel-consonants are feminine and all consonants are neuter. Whereas according to the classification in the Tamil language there are two classes of nouns uyartiṇai and ahrinai and five subdivisions such as āṇpāl, peṇpāl, palarpāl, onṇarṇpāl and palavinpāl, in Sanskrit there are the masculine, the feminine and the neuter genders. The mind that was so unreasonably imaginative as to make daṇḍa (meaning stick) masculine, silā (meaning stone) feminine, karā (meaning hand) masculine

¹ Vide Tolkāppiyam—Col. S. 2, 3, 5 to 10.
² Rule 53:—

"Uyirī rārum āṇeṇa molīpa
Uyirmev ēllām peṇṇeṇa molīpa
Uḍampelut tellām nāpuṇcaham ākum."

(S. 53)
and gālatra (meaning a wife) neuter probably was able to regard the vowels as masculine and the consonants as neuter. This idea therefore is entirely foreign and quite against the genius of the Tamil language. Still it found a place in the rules contained in Paṇṇirupāṭṭiyal. Tolkāppiyar, the ancient grammarian, has not countenanced the classification of letters in this manner, for he was faithful to the language whose grammar he was giving. The foreign idea apparently crept into Tamil literature of the age between the 7th century and the 10th century A.D., through the Jain or Buddhist channel.

Whereas Tolkāppiyar did not speak of Augury in verse, Paṇṇirupāṭṭiyal speaks of this in great detail. About 12 elements are contemplated as contributing to good augury in verse. They are varuṇam or caste, gathi or species, uṇḍi or meat, pāl or gender, tāṇam or position, kaṇṭal or time-measure, puḷḷ or bird, nāḷ or day, gaṇam or foot, maṅgalam or auspiciousness, peyar or name and pāḷ or verse. Out of these 12, about position, time-measure, name etc., it is impossible to speak with certainty in respect
of verses of the third Sangam period because it is possible for anyone to argue that what is regarded as iyarpayar is not the real name of that person. In this connection one needs to remind oneself of what has been said of Königaramāṇ yānaikkat-chēy māntarāṇ cēralirumporai by Parimē-lalakar in his commentary of Kurāḷ stanza 355. Since an application of the above-mentioned things will not yield stable and satisfactory results, a consideration of them is not taken up in this thesis. By applying the injunctions in Pannirupāṭṭiyal relating to caste, species, meat, gender, foot and auspiciousness to the several poems contained in the available Padiṟṟuppattu, and to Pattuppāṭṭu I have found that these rules have no bearing on realities. I propose however to examine in this thesis only three salient aspects, namely, meat, gender and foot.

The word meat occurring in "what is one man's meat is another's poison" carries with it the idea of food in general. It is in this sense that I use 'meat' for the Tamil word uṇḍi. According to the definitions in Pannirupāṭṭiyal under the caption "meat,"
yā is a poisonous letter which ought not to commence a poem in honour of human or celestial beings. But Padirrappattu poem 15 on Imayavarambaṉ Ne đuṅcēralāthan is found to have begun with this supposed poisonous letter as in the commencing word ‘yāṇdu.’ This initial foot violates also the requirement under S. 127 and 128 according to which a disyllabic foot with a ‘mā’ ending is banned at the top. According to the rules 36 and 39 of Paṅ nirupāṭṭiyal no word with an arsis can begin an auspicious verse. But Padirrappattu poem 26 on Palyaṅaiccelkelukuṭṭuvaṉ given by a famous poet Pālaikkaautamanaṉar is found to

1 (1) “Ā Ŭ iraṇḍum yarala mūṇrun
Tāviliv viruvakaik kūṭṭat tiyaintavum
Alavum āytamum aivakaik kurukkamum
Uḷamali pulavar uraittaṇar naṇceṇṟu
Avaiyorup eyarmaruṇ kanaiya niṟpiṇ
Navaiyuru tuṇcalum niadukkamuṇ
ceyyum.” (S. 36)

(2) “Maṅnuvar tēvar makkaḷ ceyyulūl
Maṅñaṛ vilaṅkodu narakar gatiyē.” (§. 28)

(3) “Vilaṅkum narakum vilaṅkina eṇpa.” (§. 29)

(4) “Narakum vilaṅkum varaivar īndē
tēvarum makkalum mēviṇa pāṭtē.” (§. 30)
begin in this manner:—Tēer paranta. Another poem (34)\(^1\) similarly commences with a foot possessing an arsis:—Orūupa. Poem 33 by such a great master-poet as Kapilar commences in the same manner:—Palāam. "Āraa yāṇar" is the way in which the first two feet have occurred in poem 71 of Padiṟṟuppattu. This was sung in honour of Perunćēralirumpoṟai by Arisil-kīḷār. The very same feet are found to occur also as the first feet in Porunarāṟṟuppadai, whose author was Muḍattāmakkaṇṭiyār. If it is true that arsis in the initial foot was recognised as portending evil in the third Sangam age, these two poets would not have certainly commenced in this manner in open defiance of the rule. Since they have commenced in this manner, since their poems were meant to be eulogies respectively of a Chēra and a Chōla king, since they only wished well of these kings, and since the former of them obtained for poems such as these nine lakhs of gold coins and other gifts, it is utterly impossible to maintain

\(^1\) On Kaḷaṅkāykkāṇṇi Nārmudić cēral.
that "uṇḍipporuttam" or augury in respect of meat was in vogue in the days of the third Sangam or in times prior to that. Other poems there are which seem to offend the canons contained in Paṇ nirupāṭṭiyal in respect of meat. According to Paṭṭiyal rules Nos. 35 and 39 ā and ō are poisonous letters which ought not to occur in the first foot of a verse sung in anybody's honour. "Āṇrōl kaṇava, ōdappūṭkai and āduka viraliyar \(^1\) is the way in which Kākkaipādīṇi began her verses in laud of a Chēra king who gave her for such poems as these one lakh of gold coins and gold-bars for ornaments. Furthermore Māṇ-kuḍimarutaṇār, the author of Maduraik-kāṇji in Pattuppāṭṭu began his poem on a very famous Pāṇḍya king in this manner:—ōṅkutirai viyaṇparappi. It is unreasonable to maintain after a scrutiny of these famous poems that certain letters were regarded by Tamil poets of yore as poisonous letters.

The opening lines of verses just cited are by themselves enough to prove that

\(^1\) Padiṟṟuṇṟṟattu verses 55, 57, 58.
Pāṟporuttam or augury of gender was not observed in ancient compositions in Tamil. According to rule 48 of Paṇ nirupāṭṭiyal ā and ē are feminine letters and are therefore apt as initial letters only in respect of poems on women. But the four poems of which we spoke in the last paragraph are only on men. Thus we find that what is stated in the pāṭṭiyal goes against the practice of Tamilakam.

As regards 'Gaṇam' or foot the requirement according to the Pāṭṭiyal is that the initial foot of a laudatory verse must be either trisyllabic or disyllabic with a 'viḷa' ending.¹ Many poems in Padiṟṟupattu taken at random go against this rule. Poems 15, 18, 20, 22, 35, 36, 43, 47, 48, 49, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 73, 74, 84, 87, 89 of Padiṟṟupattu run in contravention of this. Paṇ nirupāṭṭiyal rule 131 even goes to the length of saying that despite the initial word being an auspicious one such as ulagam or poṇ or its synonym a disyllabic foot with a 'mā' ending would forebode

¹ Vide rules 127 et seq.
evil. Yet against this very positive rule we find verse 38 of Padirrupattu beginning as *ulagat tørē*” and verse 81 beginning as “*ulagam purakkum.”* Again, Padirrupattu verse 45, by Paraṉar, commences as follows: *Polampūn tumbai.* We have already seen how Kövürkîlär, the supposed author of this rule in Paṉṉirupāṭṭiyal has himself given a verse in Puṟanānūru (No. 308) against this very rule. All these considerations ought therefore to make it acceptable that several foreign ideas were imported as prosodial theories into the Tamil language, where before such artificialities did not exist. To put it briefly, we might say that Paṉṉirupāṭṭiyal does not represent any improvement upon the older prosodies but it has done great violence to the genius of the Tamil language. Thus it is evident that looking for augury in verse was not a practice of the ancient Tami-
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CONCLUSION

As a result of the research represented in the foregoing pages it has been arrived at that before and at the time of Tolkāppiyar there was no such form as "Nilaimañḍila āsiriyam." It has also been shown that Puṟanāṇūru contains, as against the common belief, some verses in vañji metre. It has also been pointed out in this thesis that Neisai venpā did not exist before, and at the time of Tolkāppiyar.

As a result of my research I have shown that the Koccaha-kali of later times and Koccaha-orubōhu of Tolkāppiyar are identical, that Koccaha-kali of Tolkāppiyar is not the same as the Koccaha-kali of the author of Yāpparuṅkalam and that the latter missed the full significance of the rules in Tolkāppiyam relating to Koccaha-kali. I have shown also how Nachchiṅār-kiṇiyar and Pērāsiriyar have erred in giving examples for Koccaha-kalippā and how they might have given better examples. I
have shown also how Pērāsiriyar and Nachchinārkiṇiyar erred by means of regarding veṅkali and kalivenpā to be different and how the illustrations cited by them for veṅkali should be regarded as suitable examples of Koccaha-kali. I have proved beyond doubt that the statement of Nachchinārkiṇiyar that there are not pāvinams or supplemental metres in Cīvaka-Chintāmani is wholly incorrect and that there are āsiriyatuṟais, vañji-tuṟais, kalittuṟais and vañji-viruttams in that book. The number of āsiriyaviruttams alone which amount to no less than 1000 belies the statement of Nachchinārkiṇiyar.

I have shown, after an elaborate and careful analysis and comparison of verses in Kalittogai and Cilappadikāram, how pāvinams or supplemental metres had their remote origins in the native soil, namely, the integral parts of kali verse. I have shown also that pāviṇams are as old at least as the age of Cilappadikāram by citing several verses therefrom as suitable illustrations for pāviṇams. This sets at naught the theory that pāviṇams or supplemental
metres made their appearance between the 7th and 11th centuries A.D. ¹

I have discovered, as a consequence of my examination of the verses in Civaka-Chintāmaṇi, a peculiar pentameter which might be called Kattalai-kalinilaitturai, which is different from the Kattalai-kalitturai and kalinilaitturai known before. I have proved that looking for augury in verse was positively a later advent, after showing elaborately and conclusively the apocryphal nature of Paññirupāṭṭiyal which has no bearing on the facts in ancient Tamil language and literature.

¹ The theory of Mr. K. Srinivasa Pillai in Tamil Varalāru p. 29.
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