



HAL
open science

Showing the Way: The Metatextual Field of the Tirumurukāruppaṭai

Emmanuel Francis

► **To cite this version:**

Emmanuel Francis. Showing the Way: The Metatextual Field of the Tirumurukāruppaṭai. The Commentary Idioms of the Tamil Learned Traditions. Ed. by Suganya Anandakichenin & V. B. D'Avella, EFEO & IFP, pp.251-334, 2020, Indologie 141 / NETamil Series 5. halshs-02446514

HAL Id: halshs-02446514

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02446514>

Submitted on 9 Sep 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

THE COMMENTARY IDIOMS OF THE TAMIL LEARNED TRADITIONS

Suganya Anandakichenin, Victor D'avella

► **To cite this version:**

Suganya Anandakichenin, Victor D'avella. THE COMMENTARY IDIOMS OF THE TAMIL LEARNED TRADITIONS. Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient; Institut français de Pondichéry, 2019, Indologie 141, NETamil Series 5. halshs-02454169

HAL Id: halshs-02454169

<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-02454169>

Submitted on 24 Jan 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

THE COMMENTARY IDIOMS OF THE
TAMIL LEARNED TRADITIONS

L'Institut Français de Pondichéry (IFP), UMIFRE 21 CNRS-MAE, est un établissement à autonomie financière sous la double tutelle du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères (MAE) et du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS). Il est partie intégrante du réseau des 27 centres de recherche de ce Ministère. Avec le Centre de Sciences Humaines (CSH) à New Delhi, il forme l'USR 3330 du CNRS « Savoirs et Mondes Indiens ». Il remplit des missions de recherche, d'expertise et de formation en Sciences Humaines et Sociales et en Écologie dans le Sud et le Sud-est asiatiques. Il s'intéresse particulièrement aux savoirs et patrimoines culturels indiens (langue et littérature sanskrites, histoire des religions, études tamoules...), aux dynamiques sociales contemporaines, et aux écosystèmes naturels de l'Inde du Sud.

The French Institute of Pondicherry (IFP), UMIFRE 21 CNRS-MAE, is a financially autonomous institution under the joint supervision of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MAE) and the French National Centre of Scientific Research (CNRS). It is part of the network of 27 research centres under this Ministry. It also forms part of the research unit 3330 "Savoirs et Mondes Indiens" of the CNRS, along with the Centre de Sciences Humaines (CSH) in New Delhi. It fulfils missions of research, expertise and training in Human and Social Sciences and Ecology in South and South-East Asia. It works particularly in the fields of Indian cultural knowledge and heritage (Sanskrit language and literature, history of religions, Tamil studies...), contemporary social dynamics and the natural ecosystems of South India.

French Institute of Pondicherry, 11, St. Louis Street, P.B. 33, Pondicherry—605001, India

Tel: (413) 2231609, Email: ifpcom@ifpindia.org Website: <http://www.ifpindia.org>



L'École française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO), fondée en 1900 à Hanoï, est un établissement relevant du ministère français de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche dont la mission scientifique est l'étude des civilisations classiques de l'Asie. Son champ de recherches s'étend de l'Inde à la Chine et au Japon et, englobant l'ensemble du Sud-Est asiatique, comprend la plupart des sociétés qui furent indianisées ou sinisées au cours de l'histoire. Autour de ses dix-sept centres et antennes, installés dans douze pays d'Asie, se sont constitués des réseaux de chercheurs locaux et internationaux sur lesquels l'École a pu s'appuyer pour construire son essor. L'EFEO aborde l'Asie par des recherches pluridisciplinaires et comparatistes, associant l'archéologie, l'histoire, l'anthropologie, la philologie et les sciences religieuses. À Pondichéry, les projets de l'EFEO portent essentiellement sur l'indologie classique : sanskrit, tamoul ancien, histoire, histoire de l'art et des religions.

The mission of The French School of Asian Studies (EFEO), founded in 1900 in Hanoi and today under the aegis of the French Ministry of Higher Education and Research, is to study the classical civilisations of Asia. Stretching from India, in the West, across the whole of South-East Asia to China and Japan, the EFEO's research areas cover most of the societies which have been 'Indianised' or 'Sinicised' over the course of history. A network of international scholars working at the EFEO's seventeen centres and branch offices, which are spread across twelve Asian countries, has been essential in the development of the School's research programme. Interdisciplinary projects bring together scholars in the fields of anthropology, archaeology, history, philology, and religious studies. In Pondicherry, the projects of the EFEO focus mainly on classical Indology: Sanskrit, Old Tamil, History, and History of art and of religions.

École française d'Extrême-Orient,

22, avenue du Président Wilson,

75116 Paris, France.

Tel: (33) 1 53 70 18 60

Website: <http://www.efeo.fr/>

Pondicherry Centre of the EFEO

16 & 19, Dumas Street,

Pondicherry—605 001, India.

Tel: (91) (413) 2334539/2332504

Email: administration@efeo-pondicherry.org

NETamil Series

Classical Tamil is among the oldest literary traditions of the Indian sub-continent, one that reaches back to the first centuries CE and that produced many literary, devotional and theoretical works for more than a thousand years.

The palm-leaf manuscripts at our disposal for the study of this literature are, at best, approximately three hundred years old, and the paper manuscripts for the most part are more recent still. In sharp contrast with current printed editions, these manuscripts exhibit an often bewildering degree of textual variation, from simple variants and occasional glosses to wide-ranging commentaries, many of which still await a first publication.

This wealth of primary material is inexorably yielding to the ravages of the sub-tropical climate and are for the most part not even properly catalogued. With each crumbling leaf, our chances of arriving at an understanding of how the Tamil intellectual universe was construed and interacted with other parts of the Indian world diminish.

Since 2012, an international team of scholars in India and in Europe has been studying these materials from the early stages of digitisation through collation to studies of codicology, text-critical analysis and cultural history.

The aim of this NETamil Series, the direct outcome of their endeavour, is to present significant studies in the field, and thereby to attempt to reconstruct the processes of interaction and transmission that took place prior to the putative ‘Tamil renaissance’ of the 19th century.

This series is published with the generous funding of the European Research Council within the framework of the NETamil Project - Going from Hand to Hand - Networks of Intellectual Exchange in the Tamil Learned Traditions (ERC Advanced Grant no. 339470).

Collection Indologie 141
NETamil Series 5

**THE COMMENTARY IDIOMS OF THE
TAMIL LEARNED TRADITIONS**

Edited by
Suganya Anandakichenin and Victor B. D'Avella

ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'EXTRÊME-ORIENT
INSTITUT FRANÇAIS DE PONDICHÉRY

Comité de rédaction / Editorial Board

Hugo David, T. Ganesan, Dominic Goodall, Frédéric Landy

Comité scientifique / Advisory Board

Diwakar Acharya (Oxford University),
Nalini Balbir (Université de Paris III et École pratique des hautes études),
Peter Bisschop (Leiden University),
Eloïse Brac de la Perrière (Université de Paris IV),
Sylvain Brocquet (Université d'Aix-Marseille),
Whitney Cox (Chicago University),
Richard Davis (Bard College, New York),
Alexander Dubianski (Moscow State University),
Arlo Griffiths (École française d'Extrême-Orient),
François Gros (École pratique des hautes études, retired),
Oskar von Hinüber (University of Freiburg im Breisgau, retired),
Padma Kaimal (Colgate University),
Kei Kataoka (Kyushu University),
Vempati Kutumba Sastry (Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, retired),
Leslie Orr (Concordia University),
Parul Pandya Dhar (Delhi University),
Aloka Parasher-Sen (University of Hyderabad),
V. Selvakumar (Thanjavur University),
Kesavan Veluthat (Delhi University, retired).

Comité de Lecture / Peer-review

Les éditeurs font appel à des spécialistes de leur choix pour l'évaluation des manuscrits soumis.

The publishers of the series call on experts of their choice for the evaluation of manuscripts submitted.

© École française d'Extrême-Orient, 2020 (978-2-85539-236-3)

© Institut Français de Pondichéry, 2020 (978-81-8470-232-3)

Typeset by: T.V. Kamalambal

Cover image: Colonnade (Ta Prohm, Angkor, Cambodia). Photograph by Suganya Anandakichenin

Cover design: Ink & Paper Works

Printed at the Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press, Pondicherry

Table of Contents

Preface.....	iii
Introduction	1
1. The Beginnings of the Tamil Commentarial Idiom	
Victor B. D'Avella.....	27
2. Salient Features of a Grammatical Commentary in Tamil	
Indra Manuel.....	71
3. A Note on Naccinārkkiniyar's Commentary Techniques	
T. Rajeswari	119
4. Codifying Beauty: on the Differences of Interpretation between traditional Commentators concerning the last Eight “Limbs of Poetry” (செய்யுள் உறுப்பு) in the <i>Ceyyuliyal</i> of the <i>Tolkāppiyam</i>	
Jean-Luc Chevillard.....	133
5. <i>Akanānūru paḷaiyavurai</i> : The Subtle Growth of a Commentary	
Eva Wilden	167
6. The Old, Anonymous Commentary of the <i>Aiṅkūrunūru</i>	
Thomas Lehmann.....	209
7. Showing the Way: The Metatextual Field of the <i>Tirumurukāṟruppaṭai</i>	
Emmanuel Francis.....	251
8. Commentaries on the <i>Kīlkkāṇakku Akam</i> Works	
Jonas Buchholz.....	335

9. Towards Understanding the Śrīvaiṣṇava Commentary on the <i>Nālāyira Tivviya Pirapantam</i> Suganya Anandakichenin and Erin McCann.....	385
10. A Multilingual Commentary of the First Verse of the <i>Nāmalīṅgānuśāsana</i> Giovanni Ciotti and R. Sathyanarayanan.....	443
11. Reading Pōtana's <i>Mahābhāgavatamu</i> as a Commentary on the Sanskrit <i>Bhāgavatapurāṇa</i> : A Case in Point Suganya Anandakichenin and S. L. P. Anjaneya Sarma.....	491
12. Application of the Structure Analysis to the Study of Sanskrit Commentaries on <i>mahākāvya</i> Andrey Klebanov	523
Index.....	591

Showing the Way:
The Metatextual Field of the *Tirumurukārruppaṭai*

Emmanuel Francis

(CNRS, CEIAS, UMR 8564 AND EHESS, Paris)¹

What I propose here is to have a glance at the variety of commentaries available upon a classical Tamil text, the *Tirumurukārruppaṭai* (“Showing the way towards the glorious Muruku” or “The glorious guide towards Muruku”), a 317-line poem composed in the *akaval/ācīriyappā* metre perhaps in the 7th cent. CE, attributed to Nakkīrar, and praising the god Muruku/Murukaṇ. This text has the peculiarity of belonging to two distinct corpora. It is traditionally considered as the first of the *Pattuppāṭṭu*, the anthology of ten long poems which is part of the so-called Caṅkam corpus. It is also found in the 11th of the 12 *Tirumuraṣ*, which constitute the Tamil Śaiva devotional canon. As such, the *Tirumurukārruppaṭai* has been the object of several commentaries, both of literary and/or devotional orientation. I also adopt here Genette’s term “metatext” (1979: 87; 1992: 82) to name commentaries, in order to mark the difference with what Genette calls paratext.² These commentaries were composed from the 14th cent. to perhaps the 18th cent., spanning thus no less than half a millennium in the history of transmission and interpretation of one of the most popular Tamil texts. Manuscripts dating generally to the 19th

¹ I thank all the participants of the workshop who made useful comments and suggestions, some of which are included in this contribution, the editors of the volume for their careful reading and useful suggestions for improvement, and colleagues to whom I am indebted for information on number 84, namely, Jean-Luc Chevillard, Randy Kloetzli, Ruth Satinsky, Jacob Schmidt-Madsen and Christophe Vielle. Thanks also to Sascha Ebeling for having pondered with me about some unclear passages of the manuscripts.

² Genette (1992: 82): “Under transtextuality I also include—using the obligatory term *metatextuality*, modelled on *language/metalinguage*—the transtextual relationship that links a commentary to the text it comments on.”

cent., sometimes to the 18th cent., are the oldest testimonies available. Some have revealed commentaries not yet noticed, as far as I know, which are dealt with here.

I will focus only on the first six metrical lines (*aṭṭis*) of the poem due to lack of time and space (as you can judge from the extent of the present contribution, which does not deal with even 2% of the work). I will thus propose a very preliminary look in five steps.

Firstly, I will present the commentaries available to us, whether in print or in manuscript form, and discuss their dates.

Secondly, I will present an analysis of the six first lines (*aṭṭis*) of the *Tirumurukāṟruppaṭai*, with a partial critical apparatus and a translation. In my approach to these first six lines, I will consider all the possible interpretations of its words.

Thirdly, I will provide the text of all commentaries available to me on this portion of the poem, translate them, and, so that this long tradition endures, comment upon them. I will occasionally compare printed editions of commentaries against available manuscripts.

Fourthly, thanks to an examination of these commentaries, I will compare the hermeneutic techniques deployed therein. I will thus, from a general point of view of the history of commentaries in Tamil, try to answer a few basic questions. *How?* What are the different techniques for elucidating a passage: gloss, paraphrase? What kind of information is provided (alternative interpretations, grammatical point, mythological point, description of tropes, etc.). *Why?* Why were different commentaries composed for one and the same text? Is it because different ways of explaining were necessary on account of diverse audiences? What is the aim of each specific commentary?

Fifthly, returning to the *Tirumurukāṟruppaṭai* (henceforth TMAP) itself, I will compare the interpretations offered by these commentaries on these first six lines, identifying agreements and points of divergences in them.

In the Appendices, I will present synoptic tables of the content of all the commentaries available on the first six lines of the poem (Appendix 1), I will collect elements of the Tamil commentarial metalanguage represented in the extracts of commentaries that I quote (Appendix 2) and a compilation of definitions of the TL based on the first six lines of the TMAP (Appendix 3).

1. *Tirumurukārruppaṭai* Commentaries

The TMAP has been the object of a fairly important number of commentaries, with no less than five old commentaries having been published. Some have been published separately, but one can find them all in what I will call here the Tiruppanantā] edition (TMAP [1959]).

Besides old published commentaries, we also have printed commentaries by modern scholars. Among commendable ones, we may mention those by Ārumukanāvalar (TMAP [1853]), U. Vē. Cāminātaiyar/U. V. Swaminatha Iyer (henceforth UVS) (*Pattuppāṭṭu* [1956a]), Vaiyāpurip Pillai (TMAP [1946]; TMAP [2001: 108–118]), Jean Filliozat (TMAP [1973]), Po. Vē. Cōmacuntaraṇār (*Pattuppāṭṭu* [1956b]) and Civañānam (TMAP [2003, part II: 1–235]). I will not be concerned with these here and will mention again only Ārumukanāvalar's commentary, because it is also found in manuscript form.

The successive programmes for collecting MSS by the EFEO, CSMC and NETamil have yielded only two among the five old commentaries (namely Parimēlaḷakar and Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar). The 54/56 different MSS of TMAP, which are available to me in digital form, provide 34 testimonies of the root-text (*mūlam*) and 28 testimonies of commentaries (*urai*).³ The commentaries of TMAP are found in

³ I cannot determine yet if there are 54 or 56 MSS, as the MS testimonies TT1 and TT2, which I could not physically examine, seem in fact to constitute one single manuscript. So is the case of the MS testimonies TU2 and TU3. For the sigla of MSS, see the list of manuscripts below. In quotations from MSS, I restore *ō*, *ē* and *puḷḷi* wherever they are not marked. The words MS/MSS henceforth designate either the physical object that a MS is, which might contain several texts, or the MS

different configurations in MSS. In general, we find just the commentary—itsself including the *mūlam*, but quoted as segments interspersed within the commentary—either in single-text MSS or multiple-text MSS. But there are cases where we find first the entire continuous *mūlam* and then the *urai*.⁴ The MSS TT1 and TT2, if they indeed constitute a single MS, would be a special case of a MS containing two different commentaries upon the TMAP one after another.

At least two more MSS kept in the National Library, Calcutta, are known to me, but I have not checked them yet. The MS Ca1 is apparently the only extant testimony of Uraiyācīriyar’s commentary (see below) while the MS Ca2, much damaged, is also a commentary, but not identified in the catalogue.⁵

The systematic search for MSS has yielded two commentaries, not yet known or edited: one is attributed in one of the three available MSS to Mallaiyūrkaḷantaik Kavirācaṅ and the other is anonymous. In total I thus have knowledge of at least nine different metatexts of TMAP. Let us review them in a tentative chronological order.

Parimēlaḷakar (13th cent.)

A commentary, printed several times,⁶ is attributed to Parimēlaḷakar, known also for his commentaries on *Tirukkuraḷ* and *Paripāṭal*. This seems to show that he is more interested in moral and religious texts than in literature per se. Parimēlaḷakar is generally considered as a

testimony of a text, which might in fact be found in a physical object which is a multiple-text MS.

⁴ There are five such examples (MSS C7, C8, T2, G9, T7), to which a sixth one might be added (MSS TU2 and TU3, if in fact they happen to be a single mss).

⁵ The MS Ca 2 is described in the catalogue as being “with a commentary; the leaves are very brittle” (*uraiyuṭaṅ kūṭiyatu. ēṭukaḷ mikavum citilam*).

⁶ See TMAP (1885–1886?), an edition mentioned by Vaiyāpurip Piḷḷai (1943: xxiv), but not available to me; TMAP (1945?), the date of publication of which is uncertain; TMAP (1959: 115–149).

predecessor of Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar and is dated to the 13th cent.⁷ The commentary on TMAP is however suspected to be the work of a different man with the same name or an apocrypha.⁸ If so, its ascription to the 13th cent. becomes *de facto* disputable. Besides the printed editions, two manuscripts are available to me:

No. 1—Titled as such: C11, designated three times as *tirumurukāruppaṭai parimēlaḷakar urai*.

No. 2—Anonymous: TT2 (dated to 1842), designated as *tirumurukāruppaṭai urai*.

Both MSS include at the beginning a commentary on the *kāppu* to TMAP. Note also that the commentary in MS P1 is wrongly attributed to Parimēlaḷakiyar, but contains in fact Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar's commentary (see below).

Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar (14th cent.)

Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, generally dated to the 14th cent.,⁹ commented upon the TMAP in his commentary on the whole *Pattuppāṭṭu*.¹⁰ Other texts commented upon by Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar are the *Tolkāppiyam*, the *Kalittokai*, the *Kuruntokai* and the *Civakacintāmaṇi*. An anonymous stanza enumerating the commentaries by Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar is our primary source of knowledge on the existence of his partial *Kuruntokai* commentary, which is lost. Cf. Wilden (2017). Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar thus clearly appears interested in literary texts. The number of manuscripts

⁷ See Zvelebil (1995: 527), who dates Parimēlaḷakar possibly to 13th cent. and mentions that Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar criticizes Parimēlaḷakar's interpretation of *Paripāṭal* II.57. Lehmann (2009: 68) also dates Parimēlaḷakar to the 13th cent.

⁸ See Vaiyāpurip Pillai (1943: xxiv) on UVS quoting this commentary as *vērurai* and not as *Parimēlaḷakar urai* in notes to his *Pattuppāṭṭu* edition, T.P. Meenakshisundaram in Chitty (1946: 77), Filliozat (1973: XXXVIII), Zvelebil (1995: 680).

⁹ For the date of Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, see Filliozat (1973: XXXVIII), Zvelebil (1995: 459), Lehmann (2009: 68). Arumugham (1981: 3) places him "some time after the 14th century A.D."

¹⁰ See *Pattuppāṭṭu* (1956a: 32–79), TMAP (1959: 29–79) and TMAP (2003: 25–57).

available to me, 19 in total, unambiguously demonstrates the high esteem attached to his commentary on TMAP. These MSS are:

Nos. 1–15—Titled as such: C1, C5, C6, G2, G6, G8, I4 (seemingly dated to 1807), I5, P2 (dated to 1763 or 1823), SM3, SM4, T2 (dated to 1712), T3, T7, TT1.

Nos. 16–17—Anonymous: G10, SM1.

No. 18—Titled as Parimēlaḷakīyar’s commentary but containing in fact Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar’s: P1 (earlier than 1855), designated on its front title-page as *tirumurukārruppaṭaikkuṭ parimēlaḷakīyar uraipāṭam*. This is an abridged version of Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar’s commentary, as it retains the verse-by-verse paraphrase, but leaves out the explanations. This is also a rare case of user-friendly MS: on the page, the *mūlam* occupies the left side while the *urai* is on the right.¹¹

No. 19—Anonymous: C7 (dated to 1848 most probably), designated as *tirumurukārruppaṭai uraipāṭam* in the heading and the final title-colophon. This is also an abridged/adapted version as it converts the paraphrase into word-by-word glosses. The entire continuous *mūlam* is provided first, after which the glosses come in columns.

Uraiyācīriyar (13th–15th cent.?)

Another metatext of the TMAP is known as the commentary by Uraiyācīriyar, “the master commentator.”¹² I am aware of the existence of only one MS of it, kept in the National Library in Calcutta and not available to me:

No. 1—Described as “*kuṛippukaḷ: uraiyācīriyar uraiyūṭaṅ kūṭiyatu*” in the catalogue: Ca1. It is dated to 1819.

The description indicates that this is the MS used by Vaiyāpurip Piḷḷai (1943: xxiv–xxv), from whom we learn that it comes from Tirunelvēli and that Piḷḷai obtained a copy of it. It appears also that it is described as *uraiyācīriyarurai* in the MS paratexts. Piḷḷai adds that from its style, this commentary cannot be attributed to Iḷampūraṇar, who is also

¹¹ See Francis (2015), in which, misled by the title mentioned in the MS, I had not yet realised that the *urai* was that of Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar.

¹² See TMAP (s.d.), mentioned in Niklas (1990: 76), but not available to me; TMAP (1943); TMAP (1959: 80–114); TMAP (2001: 133–154).

referred to as Uraiyaḥiriyar (Zvelebil 1995: 248). Piḷḷai guesses that he may have belonged to the 15th cent.¹³ while Lehmann (2009: 68) dates “Uraiyaḥiriyar (anonymous)” to the 13th cent.

Kavip̄perumāḷ & Pariti (11th–13th cent.?)

The Tiruppanantāḷ edition (TMAP 1959) provides two further commentaries, by Kavip̄perumāḷ and Pariti, which are presented as intertwined (that is, a quotation of a fragment of the *mūlam* is followed by Kavip̄perumāḷ’s and Pariti’s commentaries *ad locum*, and so on).¹⁴ According to Zvelebil (1995: 185), we also have commentaries on *Tirukkuraḷ* by Pariti (alias Paritiyār) and by Kavip̄perumāḷ (alias Parip̄perumāḷ). Both Pariti and Kavip̄perumāḷ would thus have commented on the same works as Parimēlaḷakar. Their dates are not known for sure: Zvelebil (1995: 528) dates Parip̄perumāḷ to the 11th or 13th cent. with a question mark and Paritiyār to the 12th cent. In the same book (p. 185), Zvelebil provides a list of important Tamil commentators in chronological order, in which the commentators we are concerned with appear in the following order: Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, Paritiyār, Parip̄perumāḷ (identified on the same page, next entry, as Kavip̄perumāḷ), and Parimēlaḷakar. Such inconsistencies in the dates ascribed to these two commentators by Zvelebil indicate how much uncertainty we have to navigate through. Zvelebil probably relies here on divergent opinions found in secondary literature in Tamil. Aruṇācalam (2005a: 94; 2005b: 60–62) dates Parip̄perumāḷ, the commentator of *Tirukkuraḷ*, to the 11th cent. Lehmann (2009: 68) dates “Paritiyar,” the commentator of *Tirukkuraḷ*, to the 12th cent., and “Kavip̄perumāḷ/Parip̄perumāḷ,” the commentator of *Tirukkuraḷ*, as well as “Kavip̄perumāḷ?? (Paritiyar),” the commentator of TMAP, to the 13th cent. Only one manuscript copy for each of these two different

¹³ Vaiyāpurip Piḷḷai mentions that Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar’s and Uraiyaḥiriyar’s commentaries are similar: for instance, ad *aṭi* 106, Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar anonymously quotes a commentator that Uraiyaḥiriyar also follows.

¹⁴ See TMAP (1959: 150–176).

TMAP commentaries is reported, of which none, unfortunately, is available to me.¹⁵

Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ (18th cent.)

Three manuscripts provide a commentary, unreported as far as I know. One of the MS ascribes it to Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ:

No. 1—Titled as such: G11, designated as *{mallaiyūr}rkkkuḷantaikkavirācar tirumurukār{ruppa}{ai}* (fcf2a1-2) and *mallaiyūrkuḷantaikkavirācaṅ {tirumurukār}ruppaṭai urai* (fcf3a1-2, from another hand?)

Nos. 2-3—Anonymous: C8, TU3.

This commentary is attested in two versions: a longer one with word-by-word glosses and paraphrase (TU3, G11) and a shorter one that leaves out the word-by-word glosses (C8). Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ seems to be Kuḷantaik Kavirāyar, whom Zvelebil (1995: 371) describes as hailing from Mitilaippaṭṭi, Civakaṅkai, as (being) the son of Mallaiyūr Alakiya Cīrrampalak Kavirāyar, and as (being) the author of two works (*Māṇviṭutūtu*, a deer-messenger-poem, and *Tiṇakavitaip pustakam* on the god Murukaṅ of Kuṇṇrakuṭi in 5117 stanzas). Zvelebil dates Kuḷantaik Kavirāyar to the 18th cent. That he composed a poem on Murukaṅ might explain his interest in commenting upon the TMAP.

Ārumukanāvalar (19th cent.)

Ārumukanāvalar wrote a modern commentary on TMAP, derived from Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar's commentary.¹⁶ I am just mentioning it *en passant*,

¹⁵ See TMAP (1959: ix-x): *kavipperumāḷurai tirucceṅkōṭu nallaiyaṅ kōyil periya pūcāriyār viṭṭup pirati. paritiyurai, moṅcaṅūrṇ pacupatiṭāḷaiyam tamīpperumpulavarāy viḷaṅkiya periyacāmik kavuṅṭar viṭṭup pirati*, “The commentary by Kavipperumāḷ is (taken from) a copy from the house of the great Pūjāri (i.e. head priest) of the temple of Nallaiyaṅ at Tirucceṅkōṭu. The commentary by Pariti is (taken from) a copy from the house of Periyacāmi Kavūṅṭar, who shone as a great scholar of Tamil in Moṅcaṅūr Pacupatiṭāḷaiyam.”

¹⁶ See TMAP (1853).

because this commentary, which first appeared in print, is also attested in two manuscripts:

No. 1—Titled as such (i.e. the title-page of the printed book is copied): I2 (dated to 1864 most probably).

No. 2—Anonymous: G9.

The first MS is a copy of the first edition of Ārumukanāvalar's commentary, TMAP (1853). The second one might also be so, but it cannot be excluded that it was copied from a later edition. See Francis (2017).

Anonymous *urai* from Pērūr

Another so far unreported commentary on TMAP has surfaced recently in the library of the Pērūr Cāntaliṅka Aṭikaḷār Tirumaṭam in Coimbatore, thanks to the efforts of Babu N. Ramaswamy and S.A.S. Sarma in the frame of the NETamil systematic search for MSS of the Caṅkam corpus:

No. 1—Anonymous: Pe 1.

This commentary consists of a line-by-line paraphrase in a relatively modern colloquial Tamil.

Anonymous *karutturai*

An anonymous short metatext provides the syntactic structure of the TMAP. It quotes selected words rather than full *aṭṭs*, with minimal paraphrase, and strings them together. This metatext is described as *karutturai* in the catalogue (catalogue C, vol. 1, p. 222) and I will refer to it as such. It is attested in a single manuscript and remains unprinted:

No. 1—Anonymous: C9.

Leaving out from the above list Ārumukanāvalar's commentary (as it is a modern commentary, first printed and secondarily attested in manuscript form) and the unidentified commentary preserved in the National Library in Calcutta (Ca2), which is yet to be checked, we thus

have at least eight old metatexts on TMAP. We do not know much for sure about their dates. That Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar dates to the 14th cent. seems secure. Parimēlaḷakar is probably earlier, but, as the attribution of the TMAP commentary to him has been contested, the date of “his” commentary remains undetermined. Uraiṅcīriyar’s date is uncertain as are those of Kavip̄perumāḷ and Pariti. Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ is dated to the 18th cent. The language of the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr, as the extract given below shows, seems to point towards a rather recent date. As for the anonymous *karutturai*, it is so succinct that it is difficult to date, but its segmentation and analysis of the *mūlam*, appears to derive from the earlier commentaries by Parimēlaḷakar and Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar. Although the relative chronology is thus still confused, it seems that we can distinguish between two groups: early old or medieval commentaries (Parimēlaḷakar, Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar, Uraiṅcīriyar and possibly Kavip̄perumāḷ and Pariti) and late old or premodern commentaries (Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ, the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr, the anonymous *karutturai*).

Let us now, before looking at the texts of our commentaries, examine the first six lines of the *mūlam* that we have taken as sample for comparison.

2. *Tirumurukārruppaṭai* 1–6: *Mūlam*

What follows is the text as well as translation of the first six *aṭis* of TMAP, accompanied by a partial critical apparatus based on 25 manuscripts.¹⁷ I provide, line by line, the metrical text in Tamil script, the text with *sandhi* split in Roman, the critical apparatus and a basic discussion on problematic words. Alternative translations are separated by slashes. These first six lines consist of a description of Murukaṅ: his brightness (*aṭis* 1–3), his feet (*aṭi* 4), his hands (*aṭi* 5), his being the husband of Devasenā (*aṭi* 6).

¹⁷ C1, C2, C3, C4, C7, C8, C10, C12, C13, C14, G1, G3, G4, G5, G7, G12, G13, I1, I2, I3, P1, P3, T1, T2, T5.

{{1}}

உலக முவப்ப வலனேர்பு திரிதரு

ulakam uvappa valaṅ ērpu tiri taru

1a: உலக (G3).—1c: வலமின்பு (G3).—1cd missing in C1.

starting (*taru*) to rotate (*tiri*) and rising (*ērpu*) to the right side (*valaṅ*) so that/while the world (*ulakam*) rejoices (*uvappa*)

The phrase *valaṅ ērpu* denotes the circumambulation *pradakṣiṇa*-wise around Mount Meru according to most commentators. Filliozat (1973: 67–68) further notes a double meaning so far unnoticed, as *valaṅ* “en même temps que désignant la droite, représente aussi le sanskrit *balin* « puissant » et peut qualifier ici le Soleil.”

{{2}}

பலர்புகழ் ஞாயிறு கடற்கண் டாஅங்

palar pukaḷ ṅāyīru kaṭal kaṇṭu āṅku

2a: பலபுகள் (G3), பலர்புகழ் (I3).—2b: ஞாயிறு (C3, P1).—2c: கடற்கண் (C14), கடற்க்கண் (G1).—2d: டாங்கு (C1), டாங் (C14, G7, G12), டாங்க (G4).

as if (*āṅku*) seeing (*kaṇṭu*) (on) the sea (*kaṭal*) the sun (*ṅāyīru*) praised (*pukaḷ*) by many (*palar*)

{{3}}

கோவற விமைக்குஞ் சேண்விளங் கவிரொளி

ō/ōvu āra imaikkum cēṅ viḷaṅku avir oḷi

3a: கோவுவற (T5), கோவுவற் (G3).—3b: றிமைக்குஞ் (G3).—3c: சேண்விழங் (G4), சேணிளங் (G12).—3d: கதிரொளி (G1).

he is the glittering (*avir*) and shining (*viḷaṅku*) light (*oḷi*) in the sky/height/distance (*cēṅ*), which twinkles [or: in front of which one blinks] (*imaikkum*) unceasingly (*ō āra*)/without seeing (*ōvu āra*)

The phrase *ōvara* is generally split into *ō āra*, “so that going and staying (*ō*), cuts off/is severed (*āra*),” i.e. “unceasingly.” So does the TL s.v. *ō*³, where the first definition is based precisely on this passage (see Appendix 3). An alternative split, as suggested to me by Eva Wilden, is *ōvu āra*, “so that the picture (*ōvu*) cuts off/is severed,” i.e. the sun dazzles the viewer. Furthermore, as pointed out to me by Suganya Anandakichenin in a personal communication, *ōvu* could be an abbreviated form of *ōyvu*,

“cessation, ceasing, relinquishment, rest.” In any case *ara* can be considered equivalent to *-il* (“without”): *ō/ōyvu ara* would mean “without ceasing, unceasingly” and *ōvu ara* “without picture,” i.e. without seeing. The word *oḷi* can be analysed as a direct object to *urunar* (*aṭi* 4), i.e. “those longing for the light/brightness (that Murukan is)” or as a qualifier/apposition to *kaṇavaṇ* (*aṭi* 6), i.e. “(Murukan) the husband (who is) a light.” The word *imaikkum* is a *peyareccam* to *oḷi*: “the light/brightness which twinkles” or “the light/brightness in front of which one blinks.” Alternatively, it could be considered as a *peyareccam* to *urunar*, “those longing for the light/brightness, who blink (looking at it).”

{{4}} யறுநர்த் தாங்கிய மதனுடை நோன்றாட்
urunar tāṅkiya mataṇ uṭai nōṇ tāl

4a: உறுநர்த் (C1, C2), யறுணர்த் (C3), யறுநற் (P1), வறுநர்த் (G4), யறுணர்த் (G7, G13).—4b: றாங்கிய (P1).—4c: மதனிடை (G7), மதனுட (G13).—4d: நோனாறாட் (C1), னோன்றாட் (C3), நோன்றாட்ச (G4), நோன்றாள் (G7), னோன்றோட் (G13).

he has strong (*nōṇ*) feet (*tāl*) destroying arrogance/ignorance [or: possessing strength/beauty] (*mataṇ uṭai*) in order to protect [or: which protect] (*tāṅkiya*) those who are devoted to [or: those who long for] (*urunar*) (him/the light, that he is) [or: while devotees (*urunar*) revere (*tāṅkiya*) (him/the light, that he is)]

The form *tāṅkiya* can be analysed as an infinitive,¹⁸ with Murukan as subject (“so that he protects”) or *urunar* (“while devotees revere [him]”), or even as a *peyareccam* to *tāl* (“feet which protect”). The word *mataṇ* shows polysemy: “arrogance, strength, beauty, ignorance, etc.” (see Appendix 3). As for *uṭai*, it could be understood as *uṭaital*, “to destroy” (*viṇaittokai* with *tāl*), or as *uṭaiya*, “possessing,” adjectival form of *uṭaimai*, “possession, property.” The phrase *mataṇuṭai nōṇrāl* is a formula attested in *Puranānūru* 75.6 and 213.1, *Narriṇai* 7.8, *Paṭṭinappālai* 278. It is interpreted differently in its several occurrences (see Appendix 3). Naccinārkkīṇiyar does not say a word about it in his commentary ad *Paṭṭinappālai* 278 (*Pattuppāṭṭu* [1956a]).

¹⁸ See Rajam (1992: 757), who mentions, among examples, *tāṅkiya* in *Akanānūru* 128.1.

{{5}} செறுநர்த் தேய்த்த செல்லுறழ் தடக்கை
cerunar tēytta cel uṛaḷ taṭam kai

5a: செறுநர்த் (C3, C7, G5, G13), செறுநர்த் [த்] (C4).—5b: தேத்தச் (G1).—5c: சொலுறழ்[XX] (C2), செல்லுறள் (C10) செல்லு[X]றத[X] (G3), செல்லுழி (G4, with illegible correction).

he has large (*taṭam*) hands (*kai*) resembling (*uṛaḷ*) a cloud/thunderbolt (*cel*), which has/have destroyed (*tēytta*) the enemies (*cerunar*).

The word *tēytta* is *peyareccam* to *kai* or to *cel*. According to Filliozat (1973: 68), this line alludes to the victories of Murukaṇ over *asuras* as narrated in the *Kantapurāṇam*.

{{6}} மறுவில் கற்பின் வாணுதல் கணவன்
maṛu il karpin vāḷ nutal kaṇavan

6a: கமறுவில் (C3).—6b: கற்பின் (G1).—6c: வாணுதல் (G12).—6d: கணவன் (final ண் corrected into ன் by crossing out a *culi*) (T1), கற்பின் (G1).

he is the husband (*kaṇavan*) of (she who has a) shining (*vāḷ*) forehead (*nutral*) with a devotion/fidelity (*karpin*) without (*il*) blemish (*maṛu*)

The one with a shining (*vāḷ*) forehead (*nutral*) is an *ākupeyar* (“metonymy,” to make it simple) for Teyvayāṇai (Sanskrit *Devasenā*), the consort of Murukaṇ.

A continuous translation of these first six lines of the TMAP could be as follows.

He (i.e. Murukaṇ) is the light glittering and shining in the distance, which unceasingly twinkles [or: in front of which one unceasingly winks] (*aṭi* 3), as if seeing (on) the sea the sun praised by many (*aṭi* 2), which starts turning and rising in circumambulation, so that/while the world rejoices (*aṭi* 1),

he has robust feet which destroy arrogance [or: which possess strength/beauty] so as to protect his devotees [or: those who long for him] [or: while devotees revere (him)] (*aṭi* 4),

he has large hands resembling a cloud/thunderbolt, which destroyed the enemies (*aṭi* 5),

he is the husband of the one with the shining forehead and of unblemished devotion (*aṭi* 6)

... (is the one who) by right resides on the mountain (*aṭi* 77).

We thus face some uncertainties concerning the meaning of words (whether they show polysemy or are homonymic) and the syntax. For instance, *oli*, *tāl* and *kai* can be considered as attributes of *kaṇavaṇ* (as explicated below by some of our commentators), itself an apposition or attribute to *uriyaṇ* (*aṭi* 77, where the description of the first of the six abodes of Murukaṇ mentioned in the TMAP ends). But alternatively, *oli* could also be analysed as a direct object to *urunar* (“so as to protect those longing for the light [that Murukaṇ is]”). The overall meaning is however clear: Murukaṇ, the husband of Teyvayānai, is bright as the sun, protects the devotees with his feet (at which the devotees bow) and destroys the enemies with his hands. Now let us see how our commentators interpret these six lines.

3. *Tirumurukāruppaṭai* 1–6: *Uraś*

The texts of the commentaries below are given either after a printed edition or a manuscript. They are first given in Tamil characters. I have segmented the texts of the commentaries and numbered them for easy reference. In texts taken from a printed edition, the word-split by the editors is maintained, but not their punctuation. Note that in several editions, the editors split the *sandhi* of the *mūlam* quotations and remove the word *etu/enpatu*, which concludes a quotation of the *mūlam*. In texts taken from a manuscript, I have standardised the punctuation by systematically using the em dash, introduced *pulliś*

(dots placed over a letter), word spacings, and differentiated long *ō* and *ē* from their short counterparts.

The text in Tamil characters is then followed by its Roman transliteration according to the *Tamil Lexicon*. In transliterating, I have removed the external *sandhi* and marked with hyphens the boundaries between constituents of a word. I have used bold characters to mark any quotation of the *mūlam*, whether it is a complete metrical line (*aṭi*), a word, or a phrase (understood here as more than one word but less than a line or a word). I have also added the metrical line number from which the quotation comes (**{{1}}** for instance).

The transliterations are followed by a translation. Quotations of the *mūlam* are not translated, as they appear above. The word-by-word glosses are separated one from the other by em dash and the translation comes immediately after each gloss (see **PM13** for instance).

In indented paragraphs are my notes.

Parimēlaḷakar ad TMAP 1–6¹⁹

PM1 உலக முவப்ப-மலைகிழ வோனே என முதலையு முடிவையுஞ்
சொல்ல ஒருமை பெற்ற வுள்ளத்துடனே யொருகாற் பாடமோதிய
தெனக்கொள்க **{{1-317}}** *ulakam uvappa ... malai-kiḷavōṅ-ē eṇa*
mutalaiyum muṭivaiyum colla orumai perṛa uḷḷattuṭaṇē oru kāl pāṭam
ōṭiyatu eṇa koḷka One should understand that the poem is recited
(*ōṭiyatu*) all at once (i.e. in one session, without interruption) with a
single-minded heart²⁰ when one utters *ulakam uvappa* and
malaikiḷavōṅē as the beginning and the end.

¹⁹ After the *Tirumurukāṟruppaṭai* edition by Kō. Vaṭivēlu Ceṭṭiyār, TMAP (1945: 5–8), who structures his commentary with editorial paratexts, making a distinction between a *paṭavurai* (word-by-word glosses) and a *vicēṣavurai*. The Tiruppaṇantāḷ edition, TMAP (1959), does not provide the word-by-word glosses but only the paraphrase. Some variants from the two MSS available to me (C11, TT2) are occasionally provided.

²⁰ Literally: “a heart which has got *orumai*.”

The quotations *ulakam uvappa* and *malaikiḷavōṇē* constitutes the first two and last two *cīrs* of the poem. Note the shades of meaning of *orumai* (“oneness; uniqueness; concentration of mind; knowledge of God; decision, determination; truthfulness, veracity”). The two MSS available to me (C11, TT2) have *etu* (i.e. *ēṇpatu*) instead of *ēṇa*.

PM2 உலகம் உவப்ப என்பது முதல் கணவன் என்பது வரையும் ஒரு தொடர் **{{1-6}}** *ulakam uvappa enpatu mutal kaṇavaṇ enpatu varai-y-um oru toṭar* From the phrase *ulakam uvappa* up to the word *kaṇavaṇ* (it is) one clause.

The MSS C11 and TT2 have instead of **PM2** the following phrase, for the understanding of which I am indebted to Sascha Ebeling: இதனுடைய திருவுள்ளக் கருத்தை இயன்றதோர் தோத்திரஞ் சொல்லுவான் அதனதுவ் அந்தஞ் சொல்லுவான் *itanuṭaiya tiruulla karuttai iyaṇrat ’ōr tōttiram colluvāṇ ataṇ-atu antam colluvāṇ* (the original reading of அந்தஞ் *antam* seems to be அத்தம் *attam*, but it is difficult to make sense of it), “so that those who have accepted/agreed (*iyaṇratōr*) (i.e. “who have understood”) the beautiful (*tiruvuḷḷa*) content of it (i.e. the poem) utter (*colluvāṇ*, taken as particular form of infinitive as in middle Tamil and Malayālam) the praise (*tōttiram*) (of the reciter) and utter the end of that (i.e. explain the final meaning of the poem.” The Tiruppanantāḷ edition, TMAP (1959), has neither of these sentences.

PM3 உலகம் உவப்ப **{{1}}** *ulakam uvappa*

PM4 உலகமென்ப துயர்ந்தோர்மாட்டாதலாலும் உயர்ந்தோராயுள்ள பரம விருடிகளாயுள்ளோர் விரும்ப *ulakam enpatu uyarntōr māṭṭātalālum uyarntōr-āyulla parama-v-iruṭikaḷ-āyullōr virumpa* Because the word *ulakam* stands also for the learned ones (the phrase means) “as great *rṣṣ* who are learned desire (Murukan).”

PM5 உயர்ந்தோர் விரும்ப எனினு மமையும் *uyarntōr virumpa eniṇum amaiyum* Even if one says “so that/while learned ones long for (Murukan),” it is acceptable.

PM6 வலன் ஏர்பு திரிதரு **{{1}}** *valaṇ ērpu tiri-taru*

PM7 வலமாகத் திரிந்தருளுகின்ற *valam-āka tirint-arulukiṅra* Which graciously turns clockwise (literally: so as to be at the right side).

PM8 ஒன்றைக் குறித்து வலம் வரவேண்டுதலால் அது மகாமேரு வெனக்கொள்க இதுவன்றி வெற்றியாலெழுந்து திரிதருகின்ற தென்பாரு முளர் அது பொருந்தாமை யறிக அஃதெங்ஙன மெனின் இம்மகாமேரு பூமிக்கு நடுவாதலானும் இதனுச்சியிற் பரமேச்சுர னெழுந்தருளியிருத்தலானு மெனக்கொள்க இஃதன்றிப் பூமியை வலமாக வெனினுமமையும் *onrai kurittu valam vara-vēṅṅtatalāl atu makā-mēru eṇa kolka itu anri verriyāl eḷuntu tiri-tarukiṅratu enpārum uḷar atu poruntāmai arika aktu eṇṇanam eṇiṅ i-m-makā-mēru pūmikku naṭuvu ātalānum itaṅ ucciyil paramēccuraṅ eḷunt-aruli iruttalānum eṇa kolka iktu anri pūmiyai valam-āka eṇinum amaiyum* As it requires one to go around a thing, one should take that as (meaning) the great Meru. Besides this, there are also people who say that it turns rising victoriously. (About) that, one should know of its unsuitability. If you ask how it is so, one should understand (that it is so) because this great Meru is in the middle of the earth and because Parameśvara has graciously taken his abode on its peak. Besides that, even if one says (going round) the earth clockwise, this is acceptable.

Parimēlaḷakar argues here that what is circumambulated is Mount Meru, which is in the middle of the earth. He further notes that others interpret *valam* not as “right side” but as “victory” (a possible meaning of that word), in which case there is no circumambulation. He adds that there is no consensus on that. For Parameśvara sitting on the Meru, see, for instance, the first verse of an eighth-century Pallava inscription edited by Hultzsch (1895) in which Śiva is described practising *yoga* on the Sumeru (*sumerugimū[r]ddhani* [i.e. *sumerugirimūddhani*] *pravarayogabandhāsanam ... namāmi*, “I bow to him who tightly sits in profound *yoga* on the top of Mount Sumeru.”)

PM9 பலர் புகழ் ஞாயிறு கடல் கண்டு ஆங்கு **{{2}}** *palar pukaḷ nāyiru kaḷal kaṅṅu āriku*

PM10 பலர் எல்லாச் சமயத்தாராலும் *palar ellām camayattārālum* by the people of all religions—புகழ் கொண்டாடப்பட்ட *pukaḷ koṅṅāṭa-p-paṭṭa*

who has been celebrated—ஞாயிறு ஆதித்தனைக் *nāyiru ātittanai* the sun (*ātittan*, personification of the sun)—கடல் கடலில் *kaṭal kaṭalil* on the sea—கண்டு ஆங்கு கண்டாற் போல *kaṇṭu āṅku kaṇṭāl pōla* like seeing.

Instead of these word-by-word glosses the MSS (C11 and TT2) and the Tiruppaṇantāḷ edition (TMAP 1959) have a paraphrase constituted by stringing the glosses together: எல்லாச் சமயத்தாராலும் கொண்டாடப்பட்ட ஆதித்தனைக் கடலில் கண்டாற் போல *ellām camayattārālum koṇṭāṭa-p-paṭṭa ātittanai kaṭalil kaṇṭāl pōla*, “Like seeing the sun (*ātittan*, personification of the sun), who is celebrated by people of all religions, on the sea.”

PM11 என்றதனால் உவமை ஆதித்த னுதிக்கின்ற பொழுதிற் செம்மையும் கடலிற் பசுமையும் பிள்ளையார் திருமேனியினையும் மயில் நிறத்தினையும் காட்டிற்று எனக் கொள்க *enṛataṇāl uvamai ātittan utikkiṇra poḷut(in/il) cemmayyum kaṭalil pacumaiyum piḷḷaiyār tirumēṇiyiṇaiyum mayil niraṭṭiṇaiyum kāṭṭirru eṇa koḷka* Because of saying (so), one should take it that the comparison shows that the redness at the time the sun rises and the greenness of the sea (refer to) to the lustrous/glorious body of the honourable son²¹ and the colour of the peacock (respectively).

The MSS C11 and TT2 read சுப்பிரமணியன் *cuppīramāṇiyaṇ* instead of *piḷḷaiyār*.

PM12 ஓ அற இமைக்கும் சேண் விளங்கு அவிர் ஒளி **o ara imaikkum cēṇ viḷaṅku avir oḷi**

PM13 ஓ அற ஒழிவற **o ara oḷivu ara** so that ceasing ceases (i.e. unceasingly)—இமைக்கும் விட்டு விளங்கும் **imaikkum viṭṭu viḷaṅkum** which intermittantly shines—சேண் தூரம் **cēṇ tūram** distance—விளங்குதல் தோற்றம் **viḷaṅkutaḷ tōṛram** appearance—அவிர் பாடஞ்செய்தல் **avir pāṭam ceṭtal** to shine—ஒளி நிறம் **oḷi niram** colour/complexion/lustre.

²¹ Piḷḷaiyār, “honourable son,” is nowadays a name used for referring to Gaṇeśa but applies here obviously to Murukaṇ, who is also a son of Śiva’s. See TL s.v. *piḷḷaiyār*.

PM14 ஆகவே அதிதூரத்திலே தோன்றி ஒளிவிட்டு விளங்கிப் பாடஞ்செய்கின்ற திருநிறத்தினையு முடையனுமாய் எனக் கூட்டுக *ākavē atitūrattilē tōṇri oḷi viṭṭu viḷaṅki pāṭamceykinra tiru nīrattinaiyum uṭaiyaṇum-āy eṇa kūṭṭuka* Consequently, one should connect so as to say “being also one who possesses a lustrous colour which emits brilliance (*pāṭam ceykinra*) shining (*viḷaṅki*) (and) emitting (*viṭṭu*) light (*oḷi*), appearing in the far distance.”

The Tiruppaṇantāḷ edition (TMAP 1959) also reads *oliviṭṭu*. The MSS C11 and TT2 in fact read ஒளிவற [*sic*] விட்டு விளங்கி *oḷivu* [*sic*, i.e. *olivu*] *ara viṭṭu viḷaṅki* instead of *oḷiviṭṭu viḷaṅki*. Both editions (TMAP 1945 and TMAP 1959) should thus be corrected to *oḷivara viṭṭu viḷaṅki*, “shining intensely and unceasingly.”

PM15 இதுவன்றி இமைத்தல் நிறைதல் விட்டு விளங்கும் என்பாரு முளர் *itu aṇri imaittal nīraital viṭṭu viḷaṅkum eṇpārum uḷar* Besides, there are some who say (that) *imaittal* (means) “which shines (*viḷaṅkum*) leaving (*viṭṭu*) being full (*nīraital*) (i.e. not shining fully).”

The MSS C11 and TT2 insert after என்பாரு முளர் *eṇpārum uḷar* the words இனிப் பாடம் *ini pāṭam*, “Hereafter the text of the poem.”

PM16 உறுநர்த் தாங்கிய மதன் உடை நோன்தாள் **{{4}}** *uṇunar tāṅkiya mataṇ uṭai nōṇ tāḷ*

Note that for நோன்தாள் *nōṇtāḷ* in Vaṭivēlu Ceṭṭiyār’s edition, we find, in the MSS C11 and TT2, நோன்றாள் *nōṇrāḷ*, which is the form as found in the printed editions.

PM17 உறுநர் மெய்யடியார் *uṇunar meyaṭiyār* true devotees—தாங்குதல் காத்தல் *tāṅkutaḷ kāttal* to protect—மதன் உடை அழகுடைய *matāṇ uṭai aḷak’ uṭaiya* possessing beauty—நோன் தாள் வலிய தாளாகிய சீபாதம் *nōṇ tāḷ valiya tāḷākiya cīpātam* beautiful/glorious feet which are strong feet.

The MSS C11 and TT2 read பத்தசெனங்களை *patta-ceṇaṅkaḷai* (Sanskrit *bhaktajana*) instead of மெய்யடியார் *meyaṭiyār*, and respectively இலக்கித்தல் *ilakkittal* [*sic*] and இரக்கித்தல் *irakkittal* instead of காத்தல் *kāttal*.

PM18 எனவே மெய்யடியாரைக் காக்கின்ற வலியினையுடைத்தான சீபாதத்தை யுடையனும் ஆய் *eṇavē mey aṭiyārai kākkiṇra valiṇinaiuṭaittāna cīpātattai uṭaiyaṇum-āy* Therefore “being also

one who possesses beautiful/glorious feet possessing strength, which protect(s) the true devotees.”

The MSS C11 and TT2 read respectively பத்தசெனங்களை இலக்கிக்கின்ற *pattacenaṅkaḷai ilakkikkiṅra* [sic] and பத்தசெனங்களை இரக்கிக்கின்ற *pattacenaṅkaḷai irakkikkiṅra* instead of மெய்யடியாரைக் காக்கின்ற *meyaṭiyārai kākkiṅra*, and சிறிய பாதத்தை *cīriya pātattai* instead of சீபாதத்தை *cīpātattai*. The *peyareccam kākkiṅra* is, in a straightforward analysis, syntactically governed by *valiyinai*. Semantically it could also be governed by *cīpātattai*. Hence my translation “protect(s).”

PM19 செறுநர் தேய்த்த செல் உறழ் தடக்கை **{{5}}** *cerunar tēytta cel uṟaḷ taṭam kai*

PM20 செறுநர் சத்துருக்கள் *cerunar catturukkaḷ* enemies—தேய்த்த கெடுத்த *tēytta keṭutta* which has destroyed—செல் மேகம் *cel mēkam* cloud—உறழ்தல் ஒத்தல் *uṟaḷtal ottal* resembling—தடக்கை பெரிய கை *taṭam kai periya kai* big hands.

PM21 எனவே சத்துருக்களைக் கெடுத்து மேகத்தினது செய்தியை யுடையவாய பெரிய கைகளை யுடையனுமாய் *enavē catturukkaḷai keṭuttu mēkattiṅnatu ceytiyai uṭaiya-v-āya periya kaikaḷai uṭaiyaṅum-āy* That is to say “being also one who possesses large hands which possess the behaviour of the cloud having destroyed the enemies.”

The MSS C11 and TT2 read சிறியத்தங்களை *ciri* [i.e. *ciriya*] *attaṅkaḷai* and சிறியத்தங்களை *ciri* [i.e. *ciriya*] *attaṅkaḷai* (“small hands”) instead of பெரிய கைகளை *periya kaikaḷai* respectively.

PM22 மறு இல் கற்பின் வாள் நுதல் கணவன் **{{6}}** *maru il karpin vāḷnutal kaṇavaṅ*

PM23 மறு இல் குற்றம் இல்லாத *maru il kuṟram illāta* without blemish—கற்பின் பதிவிரதாபாவத்தினையுடைய *karp-in pativiratā-pāvattiṅnai uṭaiya* possessing the condition of a devoted wife (Sanskrit *pativrata*)—வாள் ஒளி *vāḷ oḷi* brightness/lustre—நுதல் நெற்றி *nutal nerri* forehead—கணவன் கொழுநன் *kaṇavaṅ koḷunaṅ* husband.

The MSS C11 and TT2 read பதிவிறுதாபாவத்தினையுடைய *pativirutā-pāvattiṅnai uṭaiya*, a variant spelling of பதிவிரதாபாவத்தினையுடைய *pativiratā-*

pāvattinai uṭaiya, and பத்தர் *pattar* (“devotee,” used here as an honorific) instead of *koḷunaṅ*.

PM24 எனவே குற்ற மில்லாத பதிவிரதா பாவத்தினையும் ஒளிதரு நெற்றியினையுமுடைய தெய்வயானைக்குக் கொழுநனுமாய் *enavē kurram illāta pativiratā-pāvattinaiyum oḷi taru nerriyinaiyum uṭaiya teyvayānaikku koḷunaṅ-um-āy*..... That is to say “also being the husband of Teyvayānai, who possesses a shining forehead and the state of a Pativratā without defect.”

The MSS C11 and TT2 read பதிவிறுதா *pativirutā* instead of பதிவிரதா *pativiratā* (with the same meaning) and வள்ளிநாச்சியார்க்குப்பத்தரவுமாய் - அதுவன்றித் தெய்வயானை என்பாருமுளர் - இனிப் பாடம் *vallīnācciyārkkupattar-avum-āy* [sic, i.e. *pattar-um-āy?*] – *atu aṅṅi teyvayānai eṅpārum uḷar - inī pātam* (“also being devoted to Lady Vallī—alternatively, there are also some who say Teyvayānai; hereafter the text of the poem”) instead of *teyvayānaikkuk koḷunaṅumāy*.

Naccinārkkiniyar ad TMAP 1–6²²

NA1 உலகமென்பதுமுதற் கணவன் என்னுந்துணையும் ஒரு தொடர் {{1-6}} *ulakam enpatu mutal kaṇavan ennum tunaiyum oru toṭar* From the word *ulakam* up to the word *kaṇavan* (there is) one clause.

NA2 உலகம் உவப்ப {{1}} *ulakam uvappa*

NA3 சீவான்மாக்கள் உவப்ப *cīvānmākkaḷ uvappa* While the individual souls rejoice.

NA2-3 are not found in any of the complete MSS available to me.

NA4 உலகமென்பது பலபொருளொருசொல்லாய் நிலத்தையும் உயிர்களையும் ஒழுக்கத்தையும் உணர்த்திநிற்குமேனும் ஈண்டு உவப்பவென்றதனான் மண்ணிடத்துவாமும் சீவான்மாக்களை உணர்த்திற்று {{1}} *ulakam enpatu pala poruḷ oru col āy nilattaiyum uyirkaḷaiyum oḷukkattaiyum uṅartti nirkumēnum iṅṅu uvappa enrataṅāl maṅṅiṭattu vāḷum cīvānmākkaḷai uṅarttiru* Even though the word *ulakam*

²² After the 5th edition of *Pattuppāṭṭu* by UVS, TMAP (1956a: 32–34).

(“the world”), being one word with many meanings, occurs here denoting earth, living beings or good manner, here because of the word *uvappa* (“while they rejoice”), it denotes “individual souls living on (the place of) earth.”

None of the manuscripts has சீவான்மாக்களை *cīvāṇmākkaḷai*. We find instead various possible ways of writing Sanskrit *jīvātman* in Tamil: சீவாந்மாக்களை *cīvāṇmākkaḷai*, சீவாத்துமாக்களை *cīvāttumākkaḷai*, சீவாற்றுமாக்களை *cīvāṇmākkaḷai*, சீவாந்மாக்களை *cīvāṇmākkaḷai*. Apparently UVS silently standardises the orthography in editing *cīvāṇmākkaḷai*. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar argues here that several meanings are possible for *ulakam*, but that *uvappa* restricts the options as only sentient beings can rejoice.

NA5 [வலனேர்பு திரிதரு:] ஏர்பு வலன் திரிதரு **{{1}}** [*valaṇ ērpu tiritaru.*] *ērpu valaṇ tiri-taru*

As Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar changes the order of the *mūlam* when quoting it, UVS adds the *mūlam* in the “right” order right before, between square brackets.

NA6 எழுந்து மகாமேருவை வலமாகத்திரி தலைச்செய்யும் *eḷuntu makā-mēruvai valam-āka tiri-talaiceyyum* Which grows (i.e. “rises”) turning, having risen, so as be on the right of the great Meru.

This means that the sun turns around the Meru clockwise, *pradakṣiṇa*-wise. Most MSS have மகமேருவை *makamēruvai* instead of மகாமேருவை *makāmēruvai*.

NA7 பலர் புகழ் ஞாயிறு **{{2}}** *palar pukaḷ ṇāyīru*

NA8 எல்லாச்சமயத்தாரும் புகழும் ஞாயிற்றை *ellām camayattārum pukaḷum ṇāyīrrai* The sun whom those of all religions praise.

Note the accusative mark in *ṇāyīrrai*, which clarifies that it depends on *kaṇṭāl* in the next gloss. Most MSS have *camaiyattārum* instead of *camayattārum*.

NA9 கடற் கண்டாங்கு **{{2}}** *kaṭar kaṇṭu āṅku*

NA10 கடலிடத்தே கண்டாற்போல *kaṭaliṭattē kaṇṭāl pōla* As if seeing in the sea”.

Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar clarifies here the syntactic structure by adding an explicit case-ending in *ṇāyīrrai* (**NA8**, accusative) and *kaṭaliṭattē* (locative): the look is towards the sun on the ocean.

NA11 ***** இது வினையெச்சவுவமம் விரவியும் வரூஉ மரபின வென்ப என்பதனால் தொழிலுவமமும் வண்ணவுவமமும் பற்றிவந்தது என்னை ஞாயிறு இருளைக்கெடுக்குமாறுபோலத் தன்னை மனத்தால் நோக்குவார்க்கு மாயையைக் கெடுத்தலிற் றோழிலுவமமும் [sic] நோக்குவார்க்குக் கடலிற் பசுமையும் ஞாயிற்றின் செம்மையும் போல மயிலிற் பசுமையும் திருமேனிச் செம்மையும் தோன்றலின் வண்ணவுவமமும் கொள்ளக்கிடந்தமை காண்க *itu vinaiyecca-v-uvamam viraviyum varū marapiṇa enpa enpatanāl tolil-uvamamum vaṇṇa-v-uvamamum parri vantatu enṇai ṇāyīru iruḷai keṭukkum āru pōla tannai manattāl nōkkuvārkku māyaiyai keṭuttalil tōlil-uvamamum* [sic, emend to *tōlil-uvamamum*] *tannai kaṭ-pulanāl nōkkuvārkku kaṭalil pacumaiyum ṇāyirriṇ cemmaiyum pōla mayilīṇ pacumaiyum tirumēni cemmaiyum tōṇraliṇ vaṇṇa-v-uvamamum kollakītantamai kāṇka* ***** This is a comparison based on the absolutive (that is, *kaṇṭu* of the *mūlam*) (*vinaiyecavuvamam*). Because of the phrase “they say that what is known by tradition/usage come also mixed” (*viraviyum varū marapiṇa venpa*, i.e. *viraviyum varum marapiṇa enpa*), there results a comparison based on colour (*vaṇṇa-v-uvamam*) and a comparison based on action (*tōlil-uvamamum*). How? One should consider it appropriate to understand (that there is a) comparison based on action with regard to the destruction of illusion for those who look at him (i.e. Murukan) with their minds, like the way the sun destroys darkness, and a comparison based on colour with regard to the appearance of the greenness of the peacock and the redness of his lustrous/glorious body, like the greenness of the sea and the redness of the sun, for those who look at him with their sense of vision.

The phrase *viraviyum varū marapiṇa venpa* is, as noticed by UVS, a quote from *Tolkāppiyam, Poruḷatikāram, Uvamaviyal 2*, i.e. *cūttiram 273* (*Tolkāppiyam* [2010: 358]). This *cūttiram* explains that comparison—defined in the previous *cūttiram* as being of four kinds, i.e. based on action (*vinai*), effect (*payan*), form/body (*meṇ*) and colour (*uru*)—can also be a combination of several of these kinds. According to Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, the bright Murukan is thus compared twice with the sun: in action, he destroys illusion like the sun destroys darkness; in colour, he is red on

his green peacock like the rising sun is red above the green sea. See Arumugham (1981: 54–55, 68).

NA12 [ஓவற விமைக்குஞ் சேண்விளங் கவிரொளி:] ஓ அற இமைக்கும் அவிர ஒளி {{3}} [*ōvara vimaikkuñ cēṇvīlaṅ kaviroḷi.*] *ō ara imaikkum avir oḷi*

Note that Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar provides here an incomplete quotation of the *mūlam*. The missing words are quoted below (**NA16**).

NA13 இருவகையிந்திரியங்களும் தாம் செல்லுதற்குரிய பொருள்கண்மேற் சென்று தங்குதல் இல்லையாக இமைத்துப் பார்த்தற்குக் காரணமாகும் விளங்குகின்ற ஒளி *iru vakai intiriyaiṅkaḷum tām cellutark' uriya poruḷkaḷ* [i.e. *poruḷkaḷ*] *mēl cenru taṅkutaḷ illai āka imaittu pārttarku kāraṇam-ākum vīlaṅkukinra oḷi* The brightness which shines is the cause of blinking²³ so that the two types of senses do not go and rest on the objects fit for them to go to.

The phrase *ōvara* is here clearly glossed by *taṅkutaḷ illaiyāka*. The two types of senses are *maṇam* and *kaṭpulaṅ* mentioned in **NA11**.

NA14 ஓ என்பது ஓரெழுத்தொருமொழியாகிய தொழிற்பெயர் *ō enpatu ōr eḷuttu oru moḷi ākiya toḷir-peyar* The word *ō* (is) a verbal noun which is a word of one letter (*eḷuttu*).

NA15 இமைத்தல்—கண்களின் இதழ்களிரண்டினையும் குவித்தல் அது நுதலதிமையா நாட்டம் என்பதனாலுணர்சக *imaittal—kaṅkaḷiṅ itaḷkaḷ iraṅṅinaiyum kuvittal atu nutal-atu imaiyā nāṭṭam enpatanaḷ uṇarka* One should consider that that (word) (*atu*, i.e. *imaittal*) (means) “to close both eyelids of the eyes” because of the phrase “the unblinking eye of the forehead” (*nutalatu imaiyā nāṭṭam*).

The phrase *nutalatu imaiyā nāṭṭam* is, as noticed by UVS, a quotation from the *kaṭavuḷ vāḷttu* (line 4) of *Akanāṇṇūru*, invoking Śiva and referring to his third eye (see Wilden 2014: 154).

NA16 சேண் விளங்கு ஒளி—கட்புலனால் நோக்குவார் கண்ணிடங்களெல்லாவற்றினும் சென்று விளங்குகின்ற ஒளியினையும் *cēṇ*

²³ Literally: “the cause of seeing and blinking.”

viḷaṅku oḷi—kaṭ-pulaṇāl nōkkuvār kaṇṇiṭaṅkaḷ ellāvarriṇum cenru viḷaṅkukinra oḷiyiṇaiyum ***** And a brightness which goes in all the eyes of those who see with their sense of sight and shines.

Note that *oḷiyiṇaiyum* is in the accusative case and is coordinated with *tāḷiṇaiyum* (NA20) and *kaiyiṇaiyum* (NA22). They are all governed by *uṭaiya* (NA22). Uraiyciriyar makes the syntactic structure explicit in the same manner (UR7ff.).

NA17 ***** உவப்ப எழுந்து திரியும் ஞாயிற்றைக் கடற்கண்டாங்கு அவிர்கின்ற ஒளி யெனத்தொழிலுவமம் கொள்ளுங்கால் வினைமுடிக்க **{{1-3}}** *uvappa eḷuntu tīriyum ṅāyirrai kaṭal kaṇṭu āṅku avirkiṇra oḷi eṇa toḷil-uvamam koḷlum kāl viṇai muṭikka* ***** When considering the comparison based on action, one should syntactically construe the action as “the light which glitters (i.e. the one which makes one blink) as if seeing (on) the sea the sun which turns/moves rising so as to rejoice.”

NA18 ***** உவப்ப எழுந்து திரியுஞாயிற்றைக் கடற்கண்டாங்குச் சேண்விளங்கொளியென வண்ணவுவமங் கொள்ளுங்கால் வினைமுடிக்க **{{1-3}}** *uvappa eḷuntu tīriyum ṅāyirrai kaṭal kaṇṭu āṅku cēṇ viḷaṅku oḷi eṇa vaṇṇa-v-uvamam koḷlum kāl viṇai muṭikka* ***** When considering the comparison based on colour, one should syntactically construe the action as “the light shining in the distance as if seeing (on) the sea the sun which rises and turns so as to rejoice.”

Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar associates here two qualifiers of *oḷi*, each one with one of the two aspects of the double comparison. According to Filiozat (1973: 68), for Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar “la lumière qui fait cligner et celle qui brille au loin sont celles de la méditation intérieure, paupières closes, et celle de la vision extérieure.”

NA19 ***** **{{4}}** உறுநர் தாங்கிய மதன் உடை நோன்றாள் *urunar tāṅkiya mataṇ uṭaiṇōṅ tāḷ*

NA20 ***** தன்னைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள் தீவினையைப்போக்கி அவரைத் தாங்கிய அறியாமையை உடைத்தற்குக் காரணமாகிய வலியினையுடைய தாளினையும் *taṇṇai cērntavarkaḷ tī-viṇaiyai pōkki avarai tāṅkiya ariyāmayai uṭaittarku kāraṇam-ākiya valiyiṇai uṭaiya*

tālinaiyum And feet that possess strength and are the cause for the destruction of ignorance, (feet) which protected them (*avarai*, i.e. the devotees), who have joined him (*tannai*, i.e. Murukan), by dispelling their evil deeds.

NA21 செறுநர் தேய்த்த செல் உறழ் தட கை **{{5}}** *cerunar tēytta cel uṟaḷ taṭam kai*

NA22 அழித்தற்குரியாரை அழித்த இடியைமாறுபட்ட பெருமையினையுடைய கையினையும் உடைய *alittal kuriyārai alitta iṭiyai māru-paṭṭa perumaiyiṇai uṭaiya kaiyiṇaiyum uṭaiya* Who has hands possessing largeness, which are different from thunder, which destroyed those deserving to be destroyed.

NA23 மறு இல் கற்பின் வாள் நுதல் கணவன் **{{6}}** *maru il karpin vāl nutal kaṇavaṇ*

NA24 மறக்கற்பில்லாத அறக்கற்பினையும் ஒளிபொருந்திய நுதலினையுமுடைய இந்திரன் மகள் தெய்வயானையார் கணவன் *maṛam karpu illāta aṛamkarpiṇaiyum oḷi poruntiya nutaliniyum uṭaiya intiran makaḷ teyvayāṇaiyār kaṇavaṇ* The husband of the honourable Teyvayāṇai, daughter of Indra, possessing virtuous devotion and who is devoid of wrathful devotion and a forehead where abides (*poruntiya*) brightness.

UVS mentions in note the variant *aruṭkarpu* (“gracious devotion”) for *aṛakkarpiṇaiyum*. An example of wrathful devotion (*maṛakkarpu*) would be that of Kaṇṇaki, the heroine of the *Cilappatikāram*, which resulted in the burning of Maturai, the capital of the Pāṇḍya king who had his husband Kōvalaṇ, mistakenly accused of theft, executed.

NA25 இப்பெயரை முற்கூறினார் படைத்தற்கும் காத்தற்கும் உரிமை தோன்ற *i-p-peyarai mun kūriṇār paṭaittarkum kāttarkum urimai tōṇra* He (i.e. the poet) mentioned this noun (*kaṇavaṇ*) first (i.e. in the beginning of the poem) so that his (i.e. Murukan’s) disposition for creating and protecting appears.

NA26 மறுவில் கற்பின்வாணுதல் கணவனென்பது ஈண்டு முருகனென்னும் துணையாய் நின்றது **{{6}}** *maru-v-il karpin vānutal*

kaṇavaṇ enpatu iṇṭu murukaṇ ennum tuṇai āy niṇratu The phrase *maruvil karpin vāṇutal kaṇavaṇ* (“the husband of she with the bright forehead without blemish”) is placed here in an association referring to (*ennum*) Murukaṇ.

Naccinārkkiniyar argues here that the description of the spouse indicates that Murukaṇ is referred to here, not Indra, who also has a thunderbolt, but is not the husband of the one with the bright forehead.

NA27 ஒளியினையும் தாளினையும் கையினையும் உடைய கணவனென முடிக்க **{{3}}** *oliyinaiyum* **{{4}}** *tālinaiyum* **{{5}}** *kaiyinaiyum uṭaiya* **{{6}}** *kaṇavaṇ eṇa muṭikka* One should syntactically construe as “the husband possessing brightness, feet and hands.”

Uraiyāciriyaṇ ad TMAP 1–6²⁴

UR1 உலகம் உவப்ப வலன் நேர்பு திரிதரு **{{1}}** *ulakam uvappa valaṇ nēṇpu tiritaru*

Note the variant reading *nēṇpu* (instead of *ēṇpu*), about which see below.

UR2 உலகத்திலுள்ள பல்லுயிர்களும் மகிழ் மேருவை வலமாக யாவர்க்கும் நேராகச் சுழலும் *ulakattil uḷḷa paluyirkaḷum maḱiḷa mēruvai valam-āka yāvarkkum nē-āka cuḷalum* Which rotates straightly/directly (i.e. with impartiality?) for everyone clockwise round Mount Meru so that all the many living beings in the world rejoice.

UR3 பலர் புகழ் ஞாயிறு கடற் கண்டாஅங்கு **{{2}}** *palar pukaḷ ṇāyiru kaṭal kaṇṭu āaṅku*

UR4 தனது ஒளியாற் காட்சியின் பயன்கொள்வார் பலரும் புகழும் ஞாயிற்றைக் கடலிடத்துக் கண்டாற் போல *tanatu oliyāl kāṭciyin payaṇ koḷvār palarum pukaḷum ṇāyirrai kaṭaliṭattu kaṇṭāl pōla* As if seeing on the sea the sun which many—all those who obtain the fruits of their actions by this sight because of its brightness—praise.

²⁴ After the *Tirumurukāṇṇruppaṭai* edition by Vaiyāpurip Pillai, TMAP (1943: 1).

UR5 கடலிற் பசுமையும் ஆதித்தந்திருமேனியும் போன்று மயிலிற் பசுமையும் பிள்ளையார்திருமேனியும் மனத்தாற் கருதுவோர்க்குப் புலப்படலால் இவ்வண்ணம் உவமைசூறப்பட்டது *kaṭaliṅ pacumaiyum ātittan tirumēṇiyum pōṇru mayiliṅ pacumaiyum piḷḷaiyār tiru mēṇiyum maṇattāl karutuvōrkku pulappaṭalāl i-v-vaṇṇam uvamai kūra-p-paṭṭatu* Because those who meditate with their minds perceive the greenness of the peacock and the lustrous complexion of Piḷḷaiyār (Murukan) (respectively) as the greenness of the sea and the lustrous body of the sun, this comparison based on colour is stated.

Instead of *pulappaṭalāl* one would expect the more standard *pulappaṭutalāl*.

UR6 ஓவற இமைக்கும் சேண் விளங்கு அவிர் ஒளி **{{3}}** *ō ara imaikkum cēṅ viḷaṅku avir oḷi*

UR7 ஞாயிற்றின் ஒளி போலப் போதுசெய்யாமல் எக்காலமும் ஒழிவற விளங்குவதாகி மனவாக்கையும் கடந்த தூரத்திலே விட்டுவிளங்காநின்ற ஒளியினையும் *ñāyirriṅ oḷi pōla pōtu ceyyāmal e-k-kālamum oḷivu ara viḷaṅkuvat-āki maṇavākkaiyum kaṭanta tūrattilē viṭṭu viḷaṅkā-niṇra oḷiyiṇaiyum* And a brightness which keeps twinkling in the distance which has gone beyond (i.e. is beyond) the organ of speech (*vākkai*) and the mind (*maṇam*), being something that shines unceasingly (*oḷivu ara*²⁵) all time, without making the daytime (*pōtu*) like the brightness of the sun does.

I understand that the light which is Murukan, because it is permanent, is unlike that of the sun, the day-maker, which rises and sets. The word *oḷiyiṇaiyum* is coordinated with *tāḷiṇaiyum* (UR10) and *kaiyiṇaiyum* (UR12). They are all governed by *uṭaiya* (UR12). Nacaiṇārkkiniyar makes the syntactic structure explicit in the same manner (NA16).

UR8 இதற்கு சோமசூரியாக்கினி யொளிசெல்லாமல் ஒழிவற இயல்பான ஒளியையுடைய தேவருலகத்திலே அகமும் புறமுமாகி விட்டு விளங்கா நின்ற ஒளியென்றுமாம் *itarku cōma-cūriyākkiṇi oḷi cellāmal oḷivu ara iyalpāṇa oḷiyai uṭaiya tēvar ulakattilē akamum puṇamum āki viṭṭu viḷaṅkā-niṇra oḷi eṇṇum ām* About this (i.e. this brightness),

²⁵ Literally: “so that ceasing ceases.”

some say (that it is a) brightness which keeps twinkling being inside and outside (*akamum puṛamum āki*) in the world of the gods, which always has a natural brightness and does not disappear (*cellāmal*) (as does) the brightness of the moon, the sun and the fire.

UR9 உறுநர்த் தாங்கிய மதானுடை நோன் தாள் **{{4}}** *urunar tānkiya matāṇ uṭai nōṇ tāl*

UR10 தன்னையடைவோரைத் தாங்கும் யான் எனது என்னுஞ் செருக்கைக் கெடுக்கும் வலிய தாளினையும் *tannai aṭaivōrai tānkum yāṇ enatu ennum cerukkai keṭukkum valiya tāḷinaiyum* And strong feet which destroy the arrogance which says “me, mine” (i.e. which represent the *ego*), which protect those who take refuge in him (i.e. Murukan).

UR11 செறுநர்த் தேய்த்த செல் உறழ் தடக்கை **{{5}}** *cerunar tēytta cel uṛaḷ taṭam kai*

UR12 தனது அருள்வழி நில்லாது மாறுபட்டோரை அழித்த இடியேறுபோன்ற பெரிய கையினையும் உடைய *tanatu aruḷ vali nillātu māru-paṭṭōrai aḷitta iṭi-y-ēru pōṇra periya kaiyinaiyum uṭaiya* Who has big hands which are like the thunderbolt, which destroyed those who opposed (him) (i.e. his enemies), not remaining in the path of his grace.

Vaiyāpurip Pillai (1943: 1 n. 1) notes the variant *aḷittu* for *aḷitta*.

UR13 மறு இல் கற்பின் வாணுதல் கணவன் **{{6}}** *maṛu il karpin vāṇutal kaṇavan*

UR14 குற்றமில்லாத அ[ற]க்கற்பையுடைய இந்திரன்மகள் தெய்வயானையார்கணவன் *kurram illāta a[ra]mkarpai uṭaiya intiran makaḷ teyvayāṇaiyār kaṇavan* Husband of the honourable Teyvayāṇai, daughter of Indra, who has a virtuous love without blemish.

Kavip̄perumāl̄ & Pariti ad TMAP 1–6²⁶

உலக முவப்ப வாணுதல் கணவன் {{1–6}} *ulakam uvappa*
vāṇutal kaṇavan

It is not clear from the Tiruppaṇantāl̄ edition how the *mūlam* is quoted by these two commentators, as only the beginning and last words of the *mūlam* passage commented upon (from 3 to more than 10 *at̄is*) are printed and as they are immediately followed, before the next *mūlam* passage that is commented upon, by both the *kavip̄perumāl̄urai polippu* and the *parit̄iyurai kurippu* (in other words, this edition mingles the text of the two different commentaries, found in two different MSS).

கவிப்பெருமாளுரை பொழிப்பு *kavi-p-perumāl̄ urai*
polippu ••••• Kavip̄perumāl̄’s commentary, explanation.

This appears to be an editorial paratext of the printed edition.

KAV1 ••••• உயர்ந்தோர் விரும்பும் படி எழுந்து மேருவை வலமாக வருகின்ற பலராலும் புகழ்ப்பட்ட ஆதித்தன் கடலிடத்தே கண்டாலொத்த ஒழிவில்லாமல் விளங்குவதாய் நீண்ட தூரத்தில் சென்று விளங்குகின்ற ஒளியினையும் தன்னை அடைந்தோ ராகிய சீமாதவாசிரியரைப் பரிக்கின்ற (தாங்குகின்ற) செருக்கும் வலியும் உளவான சீர்பாதங்களையும் பகைவர்களை மாய்த்த மேகம் போன்ற வளவிய கையினையும் உடைய குற்றமில்லாத கற்பினையும் ஒளி செறிந்த நெற்றியினையும் உடைய தெய்வயானையார்க்குக் கணவனாயுள்ளவன் *uyarntōr virumpum paṭi eluntu mēruvai valam-āka varukin̄ra palarāl̄um pukaḷa-p-paṭṭa ātittan̄ kaḷaliṭattē kaṇṭāl otta olivu illāmal viḷaṅkuvat-āy niṇṭa tūrattil cenru viḷaṅkukin̄ra oḷiyin̄aiyum tannai aṭaintōr-ākiya cīmātavācīriyarai parikkīn̄ra (tāṅkukin̄ra)*²⁷ *cerukkum valiyum uḷav-āṇa cīrpātaṅkaḷaiyum pakaivarkaḷai māytta mēkam pōn̄ra aḷaviya kaiyin̄aiyum uṭaiya kurram illāta karpiṇaiyum oḷi cerinta nerriyin̄aiyum uṭaiya teyvayāṇaiyārku kaṇavan-āy uḷḷavan* ••••• He who is the husband of the honourable Teyvayāṇai—possessing a forehead with abundant light²⁸ and a

²⁶ After Tiruppaṇantāl̄ *Tirumurukāṇruppaṭai* edition TMAP (1959: 150).

²⁷ The parentheses appear as an editorial paratext, meaning that this word must be left out.

²⁸ Literally: “on which lustre tightly resides.”

devotion without blemish—who has (1) a brightness/lustre which shines from a great distance, being something which unceasingly shines, which is like, when looking above the sea, the sun who is praised by many and which comes clockwise round Mount Meru having risen, in such a way that the learned long for/like, (2) beautiful/glorious feet which have intrepidity/courage/indulgence (*cerukku*)—which surrounds (*parikkinra*) (protects) (*tānkukinra*) the glorious masters of severe penance who have taken refuge in him—and strength, and (3) lengthy hands which are like the clouds that have killed the enemies.

On *cerukku*, see below. Jean-Luc Chevillard wonders where the story of a cloud killing the enemies is taken from. Is it a feat of Indra's?

விளக்கம் *viḷakkam* ***** Clarification.

This appears to be an editorial paratext of the printed edition.

KAV2 ***** இளைய பிள்ளையாரின் செந்நிற மேனிக்கு ஆதித்தனும் அவர் அமர்ந்திருக்கும் பச்சை மயிலுக்குக் கடலும் உவமையாம் *ilaiya pillaiyārin cem nīram mēnikku ātittaṇum avar amarnt-irukkum paccai mayilukku kaṭalum uvamai ām* ***** There is a comparison (of) the sun with the red-coloured body of the younger son (i.e. Murukan, as younger brother of Gaṇeśa) and (of) the sea with the green peacock on which he is seated.

KAV3 ***** ஏர்பு எழுந்து **{{1}}** *ērupu eḷuntu* ***** having risen.

பரிதியரைக் குறிப்பு *pariti urai kuṛippu* ***** Pariti's commentary, summary.

This appears to be an editorial paratext of the printed edition.

PT1 ***** உலகம் உலகின்கண்ணுள்ள எண்பத்து நான்கு இலட்சம் சீவ பேதங்களாகிய உயிர்த்தொகுதிகள் **{{1}}** *ulakam ulakiṅkaṇ uḷḷa eṇpattu nāṅku ilaṭcam cīva-pētaṅkaḷākiya uyir-tokutikaḷ* the classes of living beings which are the eighty-four *lakhs* of classes of living beings which are in the world.

The eighty-four *lakhs* (*eṇ pattu nāṅku ilaṭcam*) of classes of living beings are referred to for instance in the *Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad* Vulgate 3.3 (p. 102 for the text and p. 129 for the translation by van Buitenen: “The totality of beings which determined by three *guṇas*, evolve from eighty-four lacs of wombs [*yonī*], constitute the variety of its [i.e. *bhūtātman*’s] forms.”). See also *Garuḍapurāṇa* II.3.104 (total types of *yonīs*, “wombs”), II.12.2ff. (total types of *jantus*, “living beings”), II.49.13 (total types of *śarīras*, “bodies”); Satinsky (2015) for this number as lifespan (p. 4), total of *mahākappas* to be passed before salvation (p. 9), and “sum total of conceivable birth situations (*yonī*)” (p. 10). The same number—obviously denoting totality—is mentioned in the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr but in connexion to *mākkal*.

PT2 பலர் எல்லாச் சமயத்தாரும் {{2}} *palar ellām camayattārum* people of all religions—ஞாயிறு இளைய சூரியன் *ñāyīru ilaiya cūriyan* the young sun (i.e. the rising sun)—கண்டாஅங்கு உதயமானது போல *kaṇṭu āaṅku utayamānatu pōla* like the rising (of the sun).

PT3 ஓவுற (பாடபேதம்) பிரகாசம் பொருந்தி {{3}} *ō ura (pātapētam²⁹) pirakācam porunti* (variant reading) brightness occurring—சேண் விளங்கு அவிரொளி ஆகாயத்திலும் விளங்கிய அழகையுடைய ஒளியான திருமேனி *cēṇ viḷaṅku avir oḷi ākāyattilum viḷaṅkiya alaikai uṭaiya oḷi-y-āṇa tiru-mēni* lustrous body which is a brightness possessing beauty (i.e. which is beautifully bright), which shines even in the sky.

The variant ஓவுற *ō ura* would mean something like “so that *ō* occurs, remains.” If we take *ō* in the meaning of “going and staying,” we would have the exact contrary meaning to *ō ara*. The gloss of Pariti however seems to indicate that he takes *ō* in the sense of *oḷi*, “brightness.”

PT4 செல் உறழ் இடிகளைப் போன்ற {{5}} *cel uraḷ iṭikalai pōṇra* which is like thunderbolts.

PT5 வாள் நுதல் பிறைச்சந்திரன் போன்ற நுதலையுடைய தெய்வயானை நாச்சியார் {{6}} *vāḷ nutal pīrai cantiran pōṇra nutalai*

²⁹ This is an editorial paratext by the modern editor, who points out that the reading *ōvura* is a *pātapētam* (“a variant reading”) of *ōvara*. This variant is reflected in the gloss itself (*pirakācam porunti*).

uṭaiya teyvayānai nācciyār the honourable lady/goddess Teyvayānai possessing a forehead which is like the crescent moon.

Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ ad TMAP 1–6³⁰

MKK1 உலக முவப்ப வலனேர்பு திரிதரு பலர்புகழ் ஞாய[று] [*sic*] கடற்கண் டாஅங் கோவற விமைக்குஞ் சேண்விளங் கவிரொழி [*sic*]—எது—
 {{1}} *ulakam uvappa valaṅ ērpu tiri-taru* {{2}} *palar pukaḷ nāya[ru]* [*sic*]
kaṭal kaṇṭ' āaṅku {{3}} *ō ara imaikkum cēṅ viḷaṅku avir oḷi* [*sic*, i.e. *oḷi*]
 —*etu*—..... The phrase ... (means)

Note the variants *nāyaṅ* for *nāyiru* and *oḷi* for *oḷi* (also in **MKK2**). The two other MSS (C8, TU3) read *nāyiru* and *oḷi*.

MKK2 உலகம் உயர்ந்தோர் {{1}} *ulakam uyarntōr* learned people—உவப்ப விரும்ப *uvappa virumpa* so that/while (they) rejoice—வலனேர்பு வலமே அழகு பெற *valaṅ ērpu valamē alaku pera* to the right (i.e. clockwise), beautifully—திரி பெயர்தல் *tiri peyartal* to move/rise/turn—தரு வருதல் *taru varutal* to come (possibly used here as auxiliary verb)—பலர் பழமையோர் {{2}} *palar paḷamaiyōr* those of olden times—புகழ் ஏத்து *pukaḷ ēttu* to praise—ஞாய[று] ஆ[தி]த்தன் *nā[ya]ru ā[ti]ttan* the sun—கடல் சமுத்திரங் *kaṭal camuttiram* the ocean—கண்டாஅங் [*sic*] கண்டா[ற்] போல *kaṇṭu āaṅ* [*sic*, i.e. *āaṅku*] *kaṇṭā[ḷ]* *pōla* as if seeing—ஓவற ஒழிவின்றிய் {{3}} *ō ara oḷivu inri* without ceasing/unceasingly—இமைப்பு நிறைவு *imaippu niraivu* fullness—சேண் தூரம்} *cēṅ tūra[m]* distance—விளங்க விட்டு விளங்க *viḷaṅkaviṭṭu viḷaṅka* much shining/stopping and shining = twinkling—அவிர் அழகு *avir alaku* beauty—ஒழி [*sic*] வி[ளக்க]ம் *oḷi* [*sic*, i.e. *oḷi*] *vi[ḷakka]m* light.

These word-by-word glosses are given in *scriptio continua* (for instance உலகமுயர்ந்தோருவப்பவிரும்ப *ulakam uyarntōr uvappa virumpa*). I have introduced, for the sake of clarity, em dashes between the glosses, even to the point of splitting letters. Note the glossed *viḷaṅka* while the *mūlam* has *vilāṅ(u)*. The term

³⁰ After the MS G11 (f1r1–f2v7), which is in *scriptio continua* and with minimal punctuation. Some variants from the two other known MSS (C8, TU3) are occasionally provided.

taru is glossed *varutal* (“to come”). Both roots are auxiliaries: *tarutal* denotes an action outside the control of the speaker and *varutal* the starting of an action. The term *palar* is glossed by *paḷamaiyōr* (“those of olden times”), which however does not appear in the *polippu* (“abstract, summary”) below. Note also the divergent gloss of *imaippu* as *niraivu*, which is rendered in the *polippurai* as *niraintu*.

MKK3 இதன் பொழிப்பு—உயர்ந்த[ஓ]ர் விரும்ப வலமே அழகு பெறப் பெயர்ந்த[து] வருகின்ற பலரும் {ஏ}த்தப்ப[ட்]டவ் ஆதித்தனைச் சமுத்திரத்தின் கண்[ணெ]ய் உதைய[கா]லத்திலே கண்டாப் [*sic*] போல[வ்] ஒழிவின்றி நிறைந்து அதிதூரத்திலே விட்டு விளங்க [*sic*] நின்ற அளகிய [*sic*] {விள}க்கம்[உ]டைத்தாயய் இருந்துள்ள திருமேனியையுடையவன் என்[றவ] ஆறு *itan polippu—uyarnt[ō]r virumpa valamē aḷaku peṛa peyarn[tu] varukinra palarum {ē}tta-p-pa[ṭ]ṭa ātittanai camuttirattiṅ kaṅ[ṇē] utaiya-{kā}lattiḷē kaṅṭā [*sic*, i.e. kaṅṭā] pōla oḷivu inri niraintu atitūrattilē viṭṭu viḷaṅka-ninra [*sic*, i.e. viḷaṅkā-ninra] aḷakiya [*sic*, i.e. aḷakiya] {viḷa}kkam-[u]ṭtāitt-āya irunt-uḷḷa tiru-mēṇiyai uṭaiyavan en[ra] āru* Explanation (*polippu*) of this—a way of saying “He who possesses a beautiful/lustrous body that permanently has (*uṭāitt-āya-y irunt-uḷḷa*³¹) brightness, which remains much shining in the distance, which is unceasingly pervading (*niraintu*), as if seeing the sun which many praise on the sea at the time of sunrise, which comes turning (i.e. which starts revolving, taking *varukinra* as an auxiliary verb), to the right side (i.e. clockwise), beautifully, so that/while the sages long for/like it.”

Note that we have the spoken variant *kaṅṭāp pōlav* against *kaṅṭā[ṭ] pōla* in the word-by-word glosses above (**MKK2**). For *viḷaṅka-ninra*, *viḷaṅkā-ninra* is expected. The spelling *aḷakiya* stands for *aḷakiya*. The confusion *l/l* is attested elsewhere in the MS G11, as seen above (**MKK1-2**), but in the reverse direction (*oḷi* for *oli*). The MS TU3 reads *viḷakka{m}uṭ{ai}ttāy* instead of *{viḷa}kkam[u]ṭtāyay*.

MKK4 வலன் ஏற்றிய் எனினு[ம்] ஆம் {1}} *valan ērri eninu{m} ām* One can even/also say “having raised strength/victory.”

³¹ Literally: “has remained possessing.”

Compare with the alternative meaning mentioned by Parimēlaḷakar (PM8). The MS TU3 reads *valan* instead of *valaṅ*.

MKK5 ஞாயறு கடற்க் கண்ட[டா]ம் [*sic*] என்றவதனால் சமுத்திரத்தின் பசுமையும் பெருமையும் பிள்ளையார் ஏறியருளின மயில் வாகனமுஞ் சமுத்திரத்திலே யுதையுஞ் செய்கின்றவ் ஆதித்தன் மேனி பிள்ளையார் திருமேனிப் பிறகாசமுமாகக் [க]ருதுவது {{2}} *ñāyaru kaṭalkaṇṭu [ā]m* [*sic*, i.e. *āṅku*] *eṅravataṅāl camuttirattiṅ pacumaiyum perumaiyum piḷḷaiyār ēri aruḷiṅa mayil vākaṅamum camuttirattilē utai[y-a]ñ ceykiṅra ātittaṅ mēni piḷḷai{y}ār tiru-mēni pīrakācamum-āka k[a]rutuvatu* By the phrase (*eṅrav ataṅāl*) *ñāyaru kaṭark kaṅṭ[ā]m* [i.e. *kaṅṭārik(u)*], it is to be taken (i.e. understood) that (*āka*) the greenness and the bigness/excellence of the sea (refer to) the peacock vehicle which Piḷḷaiyār graciously mounts and that the body/form of Āditya which rises on the sea (refers to) the brightness of the beautiful/lustrous body of Piḷḷaiyār.

The MS TU3 reads ஞாயறு கடற் கண்டாங்கென்றவதனால் *ñāyaru kaṭal kaṅṭu āṅku eṅravataṅāl* and has just பசுமை *pacumai* instead of *pacumaiyum*. The MS TU3 lacks *piḷḷaiyār ēriyaruḷiṅa* while the MS C8 reads பிள்ளையார் ஏறியருளினவர் *piḷḷaiyār ēri-y-aruḷiṅavar*.

MKK6 ஓவற விமைக்கும் என்றவதனால் ஆதித்தன் மேனி ப்[ஓ]ழுது செய்யும் பிள்ளையார் ஆர் திருமேனி செம்மை [மா]றுதல் இல்லை என்பது {{3}} *ō ara imaikkum eṅravataṅāl ātittaṅ mēni p[o]lḷutu ceḷy{y}um piḷḷai{y}ār tiru-mēni cemmai m[ā]rḷutal illai eṅpatu* By the phrase *ōvarav imaikkum* is meant that there is no difference (*māṅrḷutal illai*) between the beauty of the beautiful body of Piḷḷaiyār who makes the time (and that of) the body of Āditya.

The MS TU3 reads போது *pōtu* instead of *p[o]lḷutu*. It is possible that Piḷḷaiyār (i.e. Murukaṅ) is here qualified by mistake as the one “who makes the time,” a description better fitting Āditya as day-maker, as in Uraiyciriyar’s commentary (UR7). Alternatively, the designation of Piḷḷaiyār as time-maker can be a means to confer him a royal status.³²

³² On the king as responsible for the time, see Scheuer (1982: 110 and n. 57).

MKK7 உறுநர் றாங்கிய மதனுடை நோன்றாட்—எது **{{4}}** *urunar tāñkiya matan uṭai nōñ tāl*—*etu*— The phrase ... (means)

MKK8 உறுநர் அடைந்தோர் *urunar aṭaintōr* those who have taken refuge in (him)/have experienced him—தாங்கியம் இரட்சித்தில் [*sic*] *tāñkiya iraṭcitt[i]* [*sic*, i.e. *iraṭcitta*] to protect—மதன் அழகு *matan alaku* beauty—உடை உண்டாகிய *uṭai uṭ-ākiya* which occurs—நோன் வலி *nōñ vali* strength—தான் [பா]தம் *tāl [p]ātam* feet.

Note in the *mūlam* quotation the variants *urunar rāñkiya* for *urunart tāñkiya*.

MKK9 இதன் பொழிப்பு—அடைந்தோ[ரை]ய் இரச்சிக்கின்றவ் அழகி[னை]யும் பலவினையுமுடைய ஸ்ரீபாதங்களையுமுடையவன் எ[ன்ற]வ் ஆறு *itan polippu—aṭaintōr[ai] iraccikkīnra alaki[n]aiyūm pala-viṇaiyum uṭaiya śrī pātāñkaḷaiyum uṭaiyavañ e[nra] āru* Explanation of this—a way of saying “He who also possesses glorious feet that possess beauty and strength (*palam*), which protect(s) those attaining/taking refuge in (them).”

The MS TU3 reads வலியையுமுடைய *valiyaiyum uṭaiya* instead of *palaviṇaiyum uṭaiya*. The MS C8 reads சீர்பாதமுடையவன் *cīr pātam uṭaiyavañ* instead of *śrīpātāñkaḷaiyum uṭaiyavañ*.

MKK10 செறுந[ர்]த் தேய்த்த செல்லுறழ்த் தடக்கை—யென்பது—**{{5}}** *ceruna[r] tēytta cel uṭal taṭam kai*—*enpatu*— The phrase ... (means)

MKK11 செருநர் சத்துருக்களைத் *cerunar catturukkaḷai* the enemies—தேய்த்த மா[ய்]வித்த *tēytta mā[y]vitta* caused to be killed—செல் கூற்றம் *cel kūrram* Yama—உறழ் ஒத்த *uṭal otta* which resembles—தடக்கை பெரிய ஸ்ரீயத்தம்} *taṭam kai periya śrīatta[m}* great beautiful/glorious hands.

Note in the *mūlam* quotation the variant *celluṭal* for *celluṭal*.

MKK12 {இ}தன் பொழிப்பு [—*] சத்துருக்களை மாய்வித்துக் கூற்றைய் ஒத்த பெரிய ஸ்ரீயத்தங்களையுடையவன் என்றவ் ஆறு *iṭtan polippu [—*] catturukkaḷai māyvittu kūrrai otta periya śrī attāñkaḷai uṭaiyavañ enra āru* Explanation of this—a way of saying “He who possesses glorious/beautiful hands (*attam* < Sanskrit *hasta*), large, which

resembles Yama/Kāla (*kūr̥ru*) having destroyed (*māyvittu*) the enemies.”

The MS TU3 reads கூற்றம் *kūr̥ram* instead of *kūr̥raiy*, while the MS C8, as seen above, misses the paraphrase altogether. According to the TL, while *kūr̥ram* can be animate or inanimate, *kūr̥ru* is narrowly only animate, as it designates Yama, the god of death, or his assistant Kāla.

MKK13 செல்லுற[ழ்]த் தடக்[கை]ய் என்பதற்கு மேகத்தைப் போலே கொடுக்க[ப்]பட்ட கைய் எனினும் ஆம் *cel uṛa[ḷ] taṭam k[ai] enpatarku mēkattai pōlē koṭukka-[p]-paṭṭa kai eniṇum ām* For the phrase *celluṛaḷt taṭakkai*, one can even say “hands which give like a cloud.”

The verbal form *koṭukka[p]paṭṭa* is morphologically a passive form. The literal meaning of the phrase *koṭukkappaṭṭa kai* is “hands by which it is given.” The MSS C8 and TU3 read *pōlak* instead of *pōlē*.

MKK14 மறுவில் கற்பின் வாணுதல் கணவன்—எது—{{6}} *maru-v-il karpin vāṇutal kaṇavan*—*etu*— The phrase ... (means)

MKK15 [மறு] குற்றம் [*maru*] *kur̥ram* defect—இல் இல்லாமை *il illāmai* without—கற்பின் கற்பு *karpin karpu* devotion/fidelity—வாள் ஒழி [*sic*] *vāḷ oli* [*sic*, i.e. *oli*] brightness—[நு]தல் நெற்றி *n[u]tal nerri*—forehead—கணவன் காந்தன் *kaṇavan kāntan* husband.

Again we find here *oli* for *oli* (see **MKK1-2**).

MKK16 இதன் பொழிப்பு—குற்றம் இல்லாத கற்பினையும் ஒளி நெற்றியையுமுடைய தெய்வயானைக்கிக் [*sic*] கணவனாயுள்ளவன் என்றவ் ஆறு *itaṇ polippu—kur̥ram illāta karpinaiyum oli nerriyaiyum uṭaiya teyvayāṇaikki* [*sic*, i.e. *teyvayāṇai-kku*] *kaṇavan-āy uḷḷavan enra āru* Explanation of this—a way of saying “He who is the husband of Teyvayāṇai possessing a forehead of brilliance and a devotion without blemish.”

Anonymous *Urai* from Pērūr ad TMAP 1–6³³

PE1 உலக முவப்ப என்பது **{{1}}** *ulakam uvappa enpatu* The phrase ... (means)

PE2 லோகலோகங்களும் என்பத்து நாலு லெட்சம் ஆற்று மாக்களுக்கு சந்தோ[வி]த்தைய் அடைந்து பிழைக்கும் படி *lōka-lōkaikaḷum enpattu nālu leṭcam ārru mākaḷum cantō-[vi]ttai aṭaintu pīaikkuṃ paṭi* The manner in which each and every world (*lōkalōkaikaḷum*) and the people (*mākaḷ*) of the eighty-four *lakhs* varieties (*ārru*) obtain salvation having reached knowledge of the poem/hymn.

The reduplication in *lōkalōkaikaḷum* seems to imply pervasion. The term *cantō[vi]ttai* appears to be the Tamil equivalent of Sanskrit *chando-vidyā*.

PE3 வலனேர்பு திரிதரு வ எது **{{1}}** *valaṅ ērpu tiri-taru v etu* The phrase ... (means)

PE4 உலகத்தையும் மகமேருவையும் [*sic*] வலமாகத் திரியப்பட்ட *ulakattaiyum maka-mēruvaiyum* [i.e. *makā-mēruvaiyum*] *valam-āka tiriya-p-paṭṭa* Which turns (*tiriypaṭṭa*) (round) the world and Mount Meru to the right side (i.e. which turns clockwise round the world and Mount Meru).

The verbal form *tiriypaṭṭa* is morphologically a passive (“which is made turning (round) the world and the Meru”), but should be taken in an active sense, the more so since it rules two words in the accusative case.

PE5 **{{2}}** பலர்புகழ் ஞாயறு கடற்கண் டாஅங்—எது **{{2}}** *palar pukaḷ nāyaru kaṭal kaṇṭu āaṅ* [*sic*, i.e. *āaṅku*, as the syllable *ku* appears at the beginning of the quotation of next verse in PE7]—*etu*— The phrase ... (means)

PE6 எல்லாச் சமையத்தாரும் புகழப்பட்டய் இளையசூறியன் சமுத்திரத்திலேய் உதையமானது போல *ellām camaiyattārum pukaḷa-p-paṭṭa ilaiya-cūriyan camuttirattilē utaiyam-ānātu pōla* Like the young sun, whom people of all religions praise, rises above the sea.

³³ After the MS Pe (1st batch, f1r1– f1v3).

Note, in the *mūlam* as quoted, the variant *ñāyaṟu* for *ñāyīru*. One would expect the instrumental *camaiyattārālum* instead of *camaiyattārum*, as agent of the passive *pukalappaṭṭa*.

PE7 கோவற [sic] விமைக்குஞ் சேண்விலங் {க}விரொளி—எது— {{3}}
k' *ōvara* [sic, i.e. *ō ara*, as the syllable *ku* belongs to the preceding
verse] *imaikkum cēṇ vilan̄{k' a}vir oḷi—etu—.....* The phrase ...
(means)

PE8 எங்கும் பிறகாசம் பொருந்தி ஆகாசமும் விளங்கிய அழகயுடைய
[sic] ஒழியான [sic] திருமேநி *eṅkum piṟakācam porunti ākācamum
vilāṅki aḷakay uṭaiya* [sic, i.e. *aḷakai uṭaiya*] *oḷiy-āṇa* [sic, i.e. *oḷi-y-āṇa*]
tiru-mēni A lustrous body which is bright, possessing beauty (i.e.
which is beautifully bright), shining even in the sky, combining (it) with
(i.e. emitting) brightness everywhere.

The word *oḷiyāṇa* stands for *oḷiyāṇa*. The phrase *aḷakayuṭaiya oḷiyāṇa* [sic]
tirumēni is also found in PT3 (*aḷakaiyuṭaiya oḷiyāṇa tirumēni*).

PE9 உறுநர்த் தாங்கிய மதனுடைத் நோன்னாள் [sic, i.e.
நோன்றாள்]—எது— {{4}} *uṟunar tāṅkiya matan̄ uṭai nōṇ
tāḷ—etu—.....* The phrase ... (means)

PE10 தன்னைய் உடைந்த பேரைத் தாங்கிய அ[ழ]கைப் பொருந்தி
வலுவையுடைய பாதாரவிந்தம் *tannai uṭainta pērai tāṅki a[la]k-ai porunti
valuvai uṭaiya pātāravintam* Lotus-feet possessing strength (*valu*),
combining (it) with (i.e. shedding) beauty, protecting the person who
has (*uṭainta*?) him (i.e. who worships him).

Note, in the *mūlam* quotation, the variant *nōṇṇāḷ* for *nōṇṇāḷ*. The word *uṭainta*,
presumably from *uṭai-tal*, intr., “to break,” is difficult to make sense of. It might be
a verbal form freely derived from *uṭaimai*, “1. The state of possessing, having,
owning.” Alternatively, as suggested to me by Suganya Anandakichenin, this is
most probably to be emended to *aṭainta* (“protecting the person who has attained
him”).

PE11 செறுநர்{த்} {தே}ய்த்த செல்லுறழ் தடக்கை—எது— {{5}} *ceṟunar
t{ē}yṭta cel uṟaḷ taṭam kai—etu—.....* The phrase ... (means)

PE12 சத்துராதியளைச் செ[X/XX]கும் இடத்துய் இடியளைப் போன்ற அஸ்தங்கள் *catturātiyaḷai ce[X/XX]kum iṭattu iṭiyaḷai pōṇra astaṅkaḷ* Hands which are like thunderbolts at the place (*iṭattu*) ... (*ce[X/XX]kum*) the enemies.

Note that *-yaḷai* stands for *-kaḷai* (acc. pl.). The lacunose *ce[X/XX]kum iṭattu* seems to mean something like “at the place where he vanquishes/destroys/strikes.” As suggested to me by Suganya Anandakichenin *ceyikkum* would do. In *astaṅkaḷ* note the use of Grantha *s*.

PE13 மறுவில் கற்பி[ன்] வாணுதல் கணவன்—எது— **{{6}}** *maṟu-v-il kaṟ[ṭ-p-i][ṇ] vāṇuṭal kaṇavaṇ*—*etu*— The phrase ... (means)

PE14 மாசுமறுவ் இல்லாத கற்பினையுடைய ஆரி[ை]C போன்ற நுதலையுடைய தெய்வனை நா[ச்சி]யார் கணவன் *mācu-maṟu illāta kaṟṭṭinai {u}ṭaitt-ā[y] āri[C]ai pōṇra nutalai uṭaiya teyvāṇai nā{cci}yār kaṇavaṇ* The husband of the honourable lady Teyvāṇai possessing a forehead which is like ... (*āri[C]ai*) and possessing a devotion without defect or blemish.

The letter *{yu}* in *{yu}ṭaittā[y]* is lost in a lacuna and restored here conjecturally.

Anonymous *Karutturai* ad TMAP 1–6³⁴

KAR1 ஒளி—தாள்—கை—ஆக—மூன்றினையுமுடைய கணவன்—க— **{{3}}** *oli*— **{{4}}** *tāḷ*— **{{5}}** *kai*—*āka*—*mūṇṇinaiyumuṭaiya* **{{6}}** *kaṇavaṇ* —1— The husband (*kaṇavaṇ*) possessing those three, namely (*āka*) brightness (*oli*), feet (*tāḷ*), hands (*kai*) —1—

The number 1 at the end seems to mean that these six first lines constitute a *toṭar* (cf. **PM2** and **NA1**). Other *toṭars* are likewise implicitly delimited by numbers further in the MS and correspond more or less with the explicit *toṭar* segmentation proposed by Parimēlaḷakar and Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, at least up to *aṭi* 61.

4. Comparing the Commentarial Techniques

Thus spoke our commentators. Let us now, as a first step, examine the different techniques they deployed to enlighten us about the *mūlam*, ignoring for the moment the fact that some of these commentaries are

³⁴ After the MS C9 (f1r1).

available to us in various versions (with or without word-by-word glosses, for instance), a phenomenon to which I will return in my conclusion.

Segmentation of the *Mūlam* Quotation

An expected feature of the *urai* in the case of a work as long as the TMAP (317 metrical lines) is the segmentation of the *mūlam*. The usual procedure is to quote one metrical line of the *mūlam* and to provide immediately after the quotation the relevant comments. This is an indication of the commentator's awareness of the metrical structure of the poem. It does sometimes happen that a word at the end of a line is split. For instance, the word *āṅiku* is split between the *mūlam* quotations in **PE5** and **PE7**, but is paraphrased in **PE6**. This reflects the expected way of splitting verses.

There are cases, however, where this one-line segmentation procedure is not followed, whatever the reason. For instance, Parimēlaḷakar comments on *aṭi* 1 by quoting it in two steps and splitting it into two halves (**PM3** and **PM6**). It also happens that more than one line of the *mūlam* is quoted. For instance, Mallaiyūrkuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ quotes consecutively *aṭis* 1–3, considered as a syntactic/semantic unit (**MKK1**). The anonymous *urai* from Pērūr quotes the *mūlam* in segments of 1, 2 or 3 verses. It is even found that the *mūlam* quotation consists of portions of two or more consecutive lines, as in Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar's *urai*, although not in the extract above, but see *Pattuppāṭṭu* (1956a: 38), for instance. As for Kavipperumāl and Pariti, the only printed edition available does not enable us to know how (and even if) they quote the *mūlam* (see above). The very brief anonymous *karutturai*, which provides the basic syntactic and semantic structure of the work, quotes only a few words of the *mūlam*. This *karutturai* occupies only one print line for the first six *aṭis* (**KAR1**).

Segmentation of the *Mūlam* into *Toṭars*

In addition to the above procedure, Parimēlaḷakar and Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar, even before quoting the *mūlam*, explicitly delimit a

toṭar, i.e. a “clause,” spanning several metrical lines (**PM2** and **NA1**, where both delimit the same *toṭar* from *ulakam* to *kaṇavaṇ*; note however that **PM2** is missing in the two MSS available to me) and then comment upon it in smaller segments. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar even recapitulates, after the commentary on individual lines, the syntactic structure of the *toṭar* that he first delimits (**NA27**).

Reordering of *Mūlam* Quotation

Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar sometimes reorders the *mūlam* (**NA5**: *ēṛpu valaṇ tiritaru* instead of *valaṇ ēṛpu tiritaru*) and even quotes it incompletely at first (**NA12**: *ō ara imaikkum avir oḷi* instead of *ōvara vimaikkun cēṇviḷaṇ kaviroḷi*; and then, to complete the *aṭi*, **NA16**: *cēṇ viḷaṅku oḷi*).³⁵ This means that he addresses a reader knowing the *mūlam* or having it before his eyes. This is a *caveat* to modern editors when using the *uraīs*’ MSS to establish the edition of a *mūlam*: changes, other than simple variant readings, might occur therein.

Glosses and Paraphrase

However long the quotation of the *mūlam*, it is followed by the commentary relevant to this segment of the work. This commentary proper consists of initial glosses or of a paraphrase of the entire quotation, or of both. I make here the distinction between initial glosses (which follow directly the *mūlam* quotation) and selected glosses (which come after the paraphrase, and as such belong to the further explanations). These initial glosses pertain either to a single word or a short phrase (shorter than the *mūlam* quotation).

Parimēlaḷakar generally provides both initial glosses and paraphrase, introducing the latter by the word *eṇavē*. As for Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṇ’s commentary, it is attested in two versions: a longer one with initial glosses and paraphrase (MSS TU3, G11, where the

³⁵ This reordering of the *mūlam* is not done however in the MSS C7 and P1, which are, as we have seen, particular cases of abridgements of Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar’s commentary.

paraphrase is introduced by the phrase *itaṅ polippu*), and a shorter one with the paraphrase only (MS C8). Naccinārkkiniyar and Kavipperumāl do not offer initial glosses, but their further explanations sometimes comprise selected glosses. Pariti's commentary in fact mostly consists in selected glosses only. Filliozat (1973: XXXVIII) rightly describes it simply as “notes.”

When the *mūlam* segment is entirely glossed after its quotation and followed by its paraphrase, the latter consists in stringing the preceding initial glosses together. The glosses, which are in the form of roots, are inflected when transferred into the paraphrase. Compare, for instance, *ettu* (MKK2) against *ḥettappa[t]ḥa* (MKK3) or *pāṭaṅ ceytal* (PM13) against *pāṭaṅ ceykinra* (PM14). Commentators also have recourse in their paraphrase or selected glosses to explicit locative for words unmarked as such in the *mūlam* (*kaṭalil* in PM10; forms ending in *iṭattē* in NA10, UR4, and KAV1).

There are also cases where the glossed word differs from the word as given in the *mūlam* quotation. See for instance *tāṅkiya* (PM16) against *tāṅkutaḥ* (PM17), *uraḥ* (PM19) against *uraḥḥaḥ* (PM20), or *viḥaṅka* (MKK1) against *viḥaṅka* (MKK2). Other examples evince a double inconsistency. Not only the glossed word differs from that in the *mūlam* quotation, but the gloss, when strung in the paraphrase, is also changed, as shown in table 1.

Table 1: words' change in *mūlam* quotation, gloss and paraphrase.

	<i>Mūlam</i> Quotation	Glossed + Gloss	Paraphrase
Example 1	<i>viḷaiṅku</i> (PM12)	<i>viḷaiṅkutaḷ tōṟṟam</i> (PM13)	<i>viḷaiṅki</i> (PM14)
Example 2	<i>imaikkuñ</i> (MKK1)	<i>imaiṅṅu niṟaiṅvu</i> (MKK2)	<i>niṟaiṅtu</i> (MKK3)

In example 1, the commentator provides a gloss for *viḷaiṅku* but then uses in his paraphrase the original term of the *mūlam*. In example 2, the gloss, which is a noun, is converted into a verbal form in the paraphrase. For an example of the second inconsistency only, see the gloss *alakuṭaiya* (PM17), which does not appear very explicitly in the paraphrase (PM18). See also *kūṟṟam* (MKK11) and *kurrai* (MKK12), although the latter reading appears only in one of the two MSS providing the paraphrase. Note also the cases of *peyareccam* in the *mūlam* that are glossed/interpreted as *viṅaiyeyccam*, a usage pointed out to me by Professor Krishnaswamy Nachimuthu (see Appendix 1, *imaikkum* in *aṭi* 3 and *tēytta* in *aṭi* 5). This appears to be a way to indicate that the noun which governs the *peyareccam* is not immediately following it.

The above procedure results in that each paraphrase segment of the *urai* does not constitute a full-fledged sentence, as a true reflection of the make-up of the commented line(s). To obtain a full-fledged sentence or at least a meaningful phrase, one has thus to string together several paraphrases (excluding the *mūlam* quotations and further explanations, if any). The delimitation of *toṭars* and elucidation of their syntactic structure is an aid to achieve this operation. A further aid to this stringing operation is the explicit inflection of words in the paraphrase (as opposed to its absence in the *mūlam*), as it clarifies the syntactic link between paraphrases. For instance, see how

Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar and Uraiyaṅciṅiyar make explicit the coordination of the three accusatives *oḷiyiṅaiyum*, *tāliṅaiyum* and *kaiyiṅaiyum*, as well as their being governed by *uṅaiya*, itself governed by *kaṅavaṅ* in the paraphrase to *aṅi* 6 (NA16, 20, 22, 24, 27; UR7, 10, 12, 14). Compare this with Mallaiyūrḱ Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ's method: his parallel paraphrases end with the forms *tirumēṅiyaiyuṅaiyavaṅ* (MKK3), *śrīpātaṅkaḷaiyum uṅaiyavaṅ* (MKK9), *śrīyattaṅkaḷaiyuṅaiyavaṅ* (MKK12), *kaṅavaṅāy uḷlavaṅ* (MKK16).

Further Explanations

Besides initial glosses (if any) and a paraphrase, more sophisticated *uraiś* provide further information: they propose *toṅar* segmentation of the *mūlam*, put forward alternative interpretations or arguments in favour of their own interpretation, point out tropes, add selected glosses, which sometimes amounts, in fact, to more than simply glossing as these can be quite long (for instance NA15–16). With regard to these passages, except for the selected glosses, one can speak of the prose of commentators, since, in contradistinction to the glosses and paraphrase, they constitute full-fledged sentences.

After his paraphrase Kavipperumāḷ sometimes, but rarely, provides further explanations, called *viḷakkam*, but not consistently, in the Tiruppaṅantāḷ edition (TMAP [1959: 150], according to an editor's paratext, it seems), such as a further explanation (KAV2) or a selected gloss (KAV3). But on the whole Kavipperumāḷ's *urai* mostly consists in long paraphrases. Uraiyaṅciṅiyar and Mallaiyūrḱ Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ add further information in a modest scale, such as alternative interpretations (MKK13, UR8), further explanations (MKK6), the identification of tropes (MKK5, UR5). Parimēlaḷakar is a little more sophisticated as he delimits *toṅars* (PM2), offers further explanations (PM8) and alternative interpretations (PM5, 8, 15), and points out tropes (PM11). He also introduces his commentary by a statement about the recitation of the poem (PM1). Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar offers the widest range (grammatical, literary) and the highest frequency of further

explanations. He delimits *toṭars* (NA1). He quotes (even though anonymously) from other works such as *Tolkāppiyam* (NA11) and Caṅkam literature (NA15). In the extracts above he is the only one to do so. He makes the syntactic structure explicit (NA17–18, 27) and provides particularly elaborate selected glosses and explanations (NA4, NA11, NA13–16, 25–26).

The following table summarises the characteristics of these different commentaries, considering the aspects just discussed. Remember that the *mūlam* quotation is generally done metrical line by metrical line (but not always) and that further explanations include selected glosses (digits in italics in the table). Note also that the boundary between a gloss and a paraphrase is difficult to determine when a word or a phrase (shorter than one *aṭi*) is explained in a long phrase (for instance PM4, NA6), the more so if the commentary is not clearly twofold (i.e. containing systematic word-by-word initial glosses followed by a paraphrase) at the *locus* concerned.

Table 2: synoptic table of the commentaries.

	<i>Mūlam</i> Quotations	Initial Glosses ³⁶	Para- phrases ³⁷	Further Ex- planations ³⁸	Other ³⁹
Parimēlaḷakar	PM3, 6, 9, 12, 16, 19, 22	PM4, 7, 10, ⁴⁰ 13, 17, 20, 23	PM 14, 18, 21, 24	PM1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 15	
Nacciṅārkkiniyar	NA2, 5, 7, 9, 12, 19, 21, 23	NA3, 6, 8, 10	NA 13, 20, 22, 24	NA1, 4, 11, 14, 15–16, 17–18, 25–27 ⁴¹	
Uraiyāciriyaṛ	UR1, 3, 6, 9, 11, 13		UR2, 4, 7, 10, 12, 14	UR5, 8	
Kavipperumāḷ	?		KAV1	KAV2, 3	
Pariti	?			PT 1–5	
Mallaiyūrk Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ	MKK1, 7, 10, 14	MKK2, 8, 11, 15 ⁴²	MKK3, 9, 12, 16	MKK4–6, 13	
Anonymous <i>urai</i> from Pērūr	PE1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13		PE2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14		
Anonymous <i>karutturai</i>					Syntactic structure KAR1

³⁶ This part of commentary is rubricated *patavurai* in Kō. Vaṭivēlu Ceṭṭiyār's edition of Parimēlaḷakar, TMAP (1945), *kuṟippu* in the Tiruppaṅantāḷ edition for Pariti.

³⁷ These word-by-word glosses (PM10) are replaced by a paraphrase stringing them in the MSS (C11 and TT2) and the Tiruppaṅantāḷ edition, TMAP (1959).

³⁸ This part of commentary is rubricated *vicēṣavurai* in Kō. Vaṭivēlu Ceṭṭiyār's edition of Parimēlaḷakar, TMAP (1945), *viḷakkam* in the Tiruppaṅantāḷ edition for Pariti (KAV2).

³⁹ This type of commentary is called *karutturai* in the library catalogue to the MS C9 (vol. 1, p. 222).

⁴⁰ These further explanations are missing in MSS C7 and P1, which are of a particular type (see above).

⁴¹ These further explanations are missing in MSS C7 and P1, which are of a particular type (see above).

⁴² These sections of Mallaiyūrk Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ's commentary miss in the MS C8.

5. Comparing the Content of Commentaries

Now that we have characterised the techniques employed by our commentators for our edification, we can look at the content of their respective metatexts and compare them. This content analysis of the commentaries logically reflects the formal analysis above: we again identify simpler and more complex commentaries, such as that by Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, who, as we have seen, frequently quotes other works and is also the only one identifying a double comparison in the assimilation of Murukaṇ with the (rising) sun in the first two *aṭṭis* (see below). By comparing commentaries, even for such a small share of the *mūlam*, we find besides overall agreement on certain points also divergent interpretations. Let us look at some of the more contentious words. To obtain a clearer idea of the variety of the available commentaries, I have presented in synoptic tables the content of all the commentaries available for the first six *aṭṭis* (see Appendix 1).

ulakam (*aṭṭi* 1a)

There is no real consensus among our commentators about the referent to *ulakam*. We can say that there are two main approaches.

For Parimēlaḷakar, *ulakam* refers to “great *ṛṣṭis* who are learned ones” (PM4: *uyarntōrāyulla paramavirutiḷāyullōr*). Kavipperumāḷ agrees in restricting the meaning to “learned people” (*uyarntōr*) (KAV1: *uyarntōr virumpum paṭi*). So does Mallaiyūrkuḷantaik Kavirācaṇ in his glosses and paraphrase (MKK2: *ulakam uyarntōr* “learned people”—*uvappa virumpa* “while they long for/like;” MKK3: *uyarnt[ō]r virumpa*). We could say this is an “elitist” point of view.

Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar is less restrictive (NA3–4). Because *ulakam* is the subject of *uvappa* it can only be used here, he argues, in the sense of “living beings” (*uyirkaḷ*) and thus refers to “individual souls living on earth” (*maṇṇiṭattu vālum cīvāṇmākkal*), as we cannot say that the earth (*nilam*) or good conduct (*oḷukkam*), which are other possible meanings of *ulakam*, can rejoice (*uvattal*). For Uraiyaḷcīriyar, the phrase

means “while/so that all the many living beings in the world rejoice” (UR2: *ulakattiluḷḷa palluyirkaḷum makīlā*). Pariti and the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr follow; both mention a total of 84 *lakhs*, which implies totality. For Pariti, this is the number of the “classes of living beings which are in the world” (PT1: *ulakiṅ kaṅṅuḷḷa eṅpattu nāṅku iḷaṅcam cīvapētaṅkaḷākiya uyirttokutiḷaḷ*). In the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr, there are people of eighty-four *lakhs* varieties (PE2: *lōkalōkaṅkaḷum eṅpattu nālu leṅcam āṅṅu māḷkaḷuṅ*). Note that *māḷkaḷ* (“people”) is more restrictive than *cīvapētaṅkaḷ* or *uyirttokutiḷaḷ*.

valaṅ ērpu tiritaru (aṭi 1cd)

Parimēlaḷakar glosses this half-line as *valamākat tirintaruḷukiṅra*, “which graciously turns clockwise,” that is, in practice, ignoring *ērpu* and equating *tarutaḷ* with *aruḷ(ḷu)taḷ* (PM8). He then argues that what is circumambulated is Mount Meru, mentions an alternative interpretation of *valaṅ* as *verriyāl* (“victoriously”), and finds acceptable the alternative that what is circumambulated is the earth (PM9). Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar’s gloss of the phrase is *eḷuntu makāmēruvai valamākatiri talaicceyyum*, “which grows (i.e. rises) turning, having risen, clockwise round great Mount Meru” (NA6), in which *eḷuntu* clearly stands for *ērpu*. Kavipperumāḷ agrees in his paraphrase (KAV1) and even, to make things clearer, glosses *ērpu* by *eḷuntu* (KAV3). Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ offers alternative glosses (MKK2: *valaṅērpu valamē aḷaku peṅa* to the right (i.e. clockwise), beautifully—*tiri peyartaḷ* “to move/rise/turn”—*taru varutaḷ* “to come,” possibly used here as auxiliary verb) which results in an alternative paraphrase (MKK3: *valamē aḷaku peṅap peyarn[tu] varukiṅra*, “which comes turning”—i.e. which starts turning (?),” taking *varukiṅra* as an auxiliary verb—“so as to obtain beauty on the right side”). He further mentions an alternative interpretation (MKK4: *valaṅ ēriy eniṅu{m} ām*, “One could even/also say having raised strength/victory”), which agrees with that given by Parimēlaḷakar (PM8). The anonymous *urai* from Pērūr paraphrases the passage as

ulakattaiyum makamēruvaiyum valamākat tiriyaṭṭa, “which turns so as to have the world and the Meru on the right side” (PE4). In accepting two elements that are circumambulated, it seems to follow Parimēlaḷakar (PM8). Such are the small divergences in commentaries quoting the *mūlam* as we have received it and as it has been printed since the 19th cent.

As for Uraiācīriyar, importantly, he records a *mūlam* variant in his quotation *valaṅ nēṛpu tiritaru* (UR1), which he paraphrases as *ulakattilulla palluyirkaḷum maḱiḷa mēruvai valamāka yāvarkkum nērākac cuḷalum*, “which rotates straightly/directly/with impartiality for anyone, clockwise round Mount Meru while/so that all the many living beings in the world rejoice” (UR2). Uraiācīriyar thus reads *nēṛpu* (instead of *ēṛpu*) and glosses it as *nērāka* (“directly, straightforwardly”) to be understood possibly as “with impartiality.”

So, we can say that all the commentators, except Mallaiyūrkuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ, agree that what is circumambulated is Mount Meru, and that some also accept that it is the earth (Parimēlaḷakar, anonymous *urai* from Pērūr). In fact, Mount Meru could be understood as standing in a relation of metonymy with the world. Uraiācīriyar is unique in his reading *nēṛpu*.

palar pukaḷ (aṭi 2a)

Who are the many (*palar*) praising the sun? Kavipperumāl does not tell us, keeping *palar* in his paraphrase (KAV1). For Parimēlaḷakar (PM10), Naccinārkkīniyar (NA8), Pariti (PT2) and the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr (PE6) these are “people of all religions” (*ellāc camayattārum*). Uraiācīriyar defines them as “all those who obtain the fruits of their actions by this sight, because of its brightness” (UR4: *taṅatu oḷiyār kāṭciyiṅ payaṅ koḷvār*).

Mallaiyūrkuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ again shows his originality in glossing *palar* by *paḷamaiyōr*, “those of olden times” (MKK2), a gloss,

which he however does not make use of in his paraphrase, where *palar* surfaces again (MKK3).

ñāyīru (aṭi 2b)

Pariti (PT2) and the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr (PE6) render *ñāyīru* as *īlaiyacūriyan*, “the young sun,” i.e. the rising sun, adding thus a precision on what might have been obvious for other commentators (because of *ēṟpu*, “rising”) and sometimes made explicit by equating *taru* with *varu* (MKK2), an auxiliary verb denoting the start of an action, which clarifies that the time-setting is the dawn, when the sun begins to rise.

Comparison (aṭis 1–2)

Parimēlaḷakar (PM11) identifies one comparison (*uvamai*): the lustrous/glorious body (*tirumēṇi*) of Murukaṇ on his green peacock mount evokes the redness of the rising sun over the green sea. Murukaṇ is indeed known as Cēyōṇ or Cevvēḷ, “the Red One.” Kavipperumāḷ (KAV2) seems just to repeat Parimēlaḷakar but explicitly mentions the redness of Murukaṇ’s body (*cenniṟamēṇi*). Uraiyaḷcīriyar (UR5) too identifies a comparison (*uvamai*), but does not explicitly mention the red colour, only the lustrous body (*tirumēṇi*) of both Piḷḷaiyār and Āditya. He adds that this correspondence is perceptible only to “those who meditate with their mind” (*maṇattār karutuvōrkku*). Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṇ (MKK5), who does not use the term *uvamai*, adds that, besides greenness (*pacumai*), the peacock and the sea have also bigness/excellence (*perumai*) in common—showing thus once again his originality. Like Uraiyaḷcīriyar, he does not mention the redness, but just equals the beautiful/lustrous body of Piḷḷaiyār (*piḷḷaiyār tirumēṇi*) with the body of Āditya (*ātittan mēṇi*).

Naccīṇārkkīniyar is by far the most elaborate on this trope (NA11ff.). While he agrees that there is a comparison based on action (*viṇaiyēccavuvamam*), he argues that there is in fact a double

comparison on the grounds of a *cūttiram* from the *Tolkāppiyam* that he quotes. The first comparison is defined by the technical term *toḷiluvamam*. Murukaṅ destroys illusion for those looking at him with their minds (*taṇṇai maṇattāl nōkkuvārkkku*), like the sun destroys darkness. The second comparison is defined by the technical term *vaṇṇavuvamam*: the greenness of the peacock and the redness of Murukaṅ's body (*tirumēṇi*) are, from the point of view of those who look at him with their sense of vision (*tannaik kaṭpulanāl nōkkuvārkkku*), compared with the greenness of the sea and the redness of the sun. Note the use of a technical terminology, the quotation, and that, *contra* Uraiyācīriyar (UR5), the comparison perceptible to those looking with their mind is not the one based on colour, but the one based on action (NA11). Furthermore, dealing with *aṭi* 3, in which Murukaṅ is described as *oḷi* ("brightness/light"), Naccinārkkīniyar comes again to the matter of this comparison (NA17–18) in allotting, among two qualifiers of *oḷi*, one to each aspect of the comparison: *avir* ("glittering," i.e. making one blink) concerns the comparison based on the action (NA17), *cēṇ viḷaṅku* ("shining from far away") concerns the comparison based on the colour (NA18).

Is it possible to examine these different opinions to determine which commentary presupposes which? Is the fact that Parimēlaḷakar and Uraiyācīriyar describe only what Naccinārkkīniyar calls a *vaṇṇavuvamam* an argument to date them earlier than Naccinārkkīniyar, as one would expect them to state their views about Naccinārkkīniyar's suggestion of a *toḷiluvamam*? It is perilous to conclude this way, as the late old or premodern commentaries, do not refer to Naccinārkkīniyar's double comparison either.

ōvara vimaikkuñ cēṇviḷaṅ kaviroḷi (aṭi 3)

Several difficulties in interpreting the different *uraś* arise here. Firstly, the meaning of Parimēlaḷakar's commentary is not crystal clear, whence my failure to convert the beginning of his paraphrase (PM14) into word-by-word glosses in Appendix 1. Another difficulty is the gloss

viṭṭu viḷaṅkum. It is used by several of our commentators but concerns two different words of the *mūlam*—*imaikkum* (PM13, 15) and *viḷaṅk(u) avir* (UR7–8, MKK2–3). Furthermore, it could have several meanings: “twinkling” (*viṭṭu viḷaṅki*, “leaving, i.e. stopping, and shining,” i.e. “not shining and then shining, shining alternatively”), or “shining” (*viḷaṅki*) and “emitting” (*viṭṭu*) light (*oli*), or “shining much.”⁴³

Nacciṅṅarkkiṅiyar not only offers a particularly long paraphrase, explicating many implicit meanings (NA13), but goes further and explains that *ō* is a one-letter verbal noun (NA14) with an elaboration on *imaittal* and *cēṅ viḷaṅku* (NA15–16). To substantiate his interpretation of *imaittal*, he gives a quote from the *kaṭavuḷ vāḷttu* of *Akanānūru*.

***ōvara* (aṭi3a)**

Our commentators can be divided into two groups when it comes to *ōvara*.

Most of them agree that it means “unceasingly,” glossing it *oliv(u) ara* (PM13, UR7), *taṅkutaḷ illaiyāka* (NA13), *oliv(u) illāmal* (KAV1) and *oliv(u) inri* (MKK2–3). The word of the *mūla mō/ōvu* is understood here as *olivu*. Note that the gloss *olivu ara* by Parimēlaḷakar (PM13) does not appear clearly or at all in his paraphrase (PM14). Mallaiyūrk Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ further comments on *ōvara vimaikkum* (MKK6), stating that it means that there is no difference between the beauty of Murukaṅ and that of Āditya, that is Murukaṅ’s brightness is as glittering and pervading as the sun’s brightness.

Other commentators however take *ō* or *ōvu* seemingly as *ol*, *oli*, *olivu*, “brightness.” So does Pariti, even though he has a variant reading of the *mūlam* (PT3: *ōvuṟa piraḷācam porunti*), as well as the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr (PE8: *eṅkum piraḷācam porunti*), with a very similar wording.

⁴³ See TL s.v. விட்டுவிளங்கு-தல் *viṭṭu-viḷaṅku-*, *v. intr.* < id. [i.e. விடு¹] +. To shine with added lustre; நன்றாகப்பிரகாசித்தல்.

***imaikkum* (aṭi 3b)**

The question here is about the subject of *imaikkum*. Does the sun twinkle or do those looking at the sun blink?

Parimēlaḷakar seems to imply that the subject of *imaikkum* is the light (which Murukaṅ is) (PM13: *imaikkum viṭṭu viḷaṅkum*; PM14). He mentions an alternative interpretation (PM15), which is not clear to me. Other commentators seem to agree with Parimēlaḷakar, except Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar, for whom it is the viewer of that light who blinks (NA13).

***viḷaṅk(u) avir* (aṭi 3cd)**

Some commentators (Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar, Uraiyaḷcīriyar, and Kavipperumāḷ) apparently gloss the two words at once (NA13, UR7–8, KAV1). The others clearly gloss both words separately. Note the non-correspondence between PM13 (*tōṛram*) and PM14 (*viḷaṅki*). To reconcile the two different renderings of *avir* as *pāṭaṅ ceṅtal* (“to shine”) (PM13–14) and *aḷakayūṭaiya* [*sic*] (PE8), *aḷakaiyūṭaiya* (PT3), *aḷaku* (MKK2), *aḷakiya* [*sic*] (MKK3), we have to admit that beauty is brightness or conversely.

***oḷi* (aṭi 3d)**

All commentators equate *oḷi* with itself, but for Parimēlaḷakar (PM13: *nīram*) and Mallaiyūrk Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ (MKK2–3: *viḷakkam*). The three late commentators indicate that this is the brightness (*oḷi*) (PT3, PE8) or light/lustre (*viḷakkam*) (MKK3) of the body (*mēni*) of the god, appearing thus more explicit than their predecessors for whom it would be obvious.

***tāṅkiya* (aṭi 4b)**

Most commentators disambiguate *tāṅkiya* in favour of the interpretation “feet protecting the devotees,” analysing it as a *peyareccam*. The gloss by Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar (NA20) however remains

ambiguous and one can still understand that the phrase *uṛunar tāṅkiya* refers to the worship of Murukaṅ by his devotee.

matan uṭai (aṭi 4c)

Commentators do not agree on the meaning of *matan*.

Some take it in the sense of beauty. So does Parimēlaḷakar in his word-by-word gloss (PM17), even though *alakuṭaiya*, his gloss for *matan uṭai*, does not appear explicitly in his paraphrase (PM18). For Parimēlaḷakar and those agreeing with his gloss (MKK8–9, PE10), the word *uṭai* which follows *matan* means “possessing.”

Nacciṅārkkīyār and Uraiyaṅcīriyār take *matan* in the sense of ignorance (NA20: *aṛiyāmai*) and arrogance (UR10: *cerukku*), respectively. For them, the word *uṭai* means “breaking/destroying.” This allows them to avoid the redundancy that would occur if interpreting *matanuṭai nōṅṛāḷ* in the *aṭi* 3 as “strong feet possessing strength.” See Arumugham (1981: 90). Is it possible to imagine that Nacciṅārkkīyār read and commented upon *maṭan* rather than *matan*? In other words, does it mean that his commentary (whose *mūlam* quote could have been later, during the MSS transmission, changed to *matan*) records a variant *maṭan* in the *mūlam*?⁴⁴ In this connexion, Eva Wilden suggested to me that the famous *Narriṅai* 34.11, in which *maṭam* is associated with Murukaṅ (*maṭavai maṅṅa vāḷiya murukē*, “Foolish indeed [are] you, may you live, Murukaṅ!”), might have been on Nacciṅārkkīyār’s mind when he proposed the gloss *aṛiyāmai*. The TL s.v. *matan*, definition 7, follows Nacciṅārkkīyār and interestingly defines it in Tamil as *maṭamai*, “ignorance,” with which *maṭam* and *maṭan* share their etymology (see Appendix 3).

⁴⁴ See TL s.v. மடன்¹ maṭan, n. <மடம்¹. 1. Ignorance; அறியாமை. இன்சொலார் தம் மடனொக்கு மடனுமுண்டோ (கம்பரா. உண்டாட்டு. 10). 2. Credulity; proneness to accept another’s opinion and holding fast to it; கொளுத்தக்கொண்டு கொண்டதுவிடாமை. சாயலு நாணு மடனு மென்றா (தொல்.பொ.247).

As for Kavipperumāl̄ (KAV1), he takes *uṭai* as “possessing” and renders *matan̄* as *cerukku*. Wondering how Murukan̄ could possess *cerukku*, Jean-Luc Chevillard suggested to me that our commentator in fact tries here to reconcile diverging commentaries, those for which *matan̄* is positive, those for which it is not, like Naccinārkkiniyar. In doing so, Kavipperumāl̄ would have taken *cerukku* in a positive meaning in relation to Murukan̄, that is “intrepidity, courage, indulgence” (see TL).

The above discrepancy between commentators is made possible by the polysemy of *uṭai* (“possessing” or “destroying”). If it is “destroying,” a negative meaning is given to *matan̄*, i.e. “ignorance.” This is what Murukan̄’s feet do. If it is “possessing,” a positive meaning is given to *matan̄*, i.e. “beauty”, “intrepidity, courage, indulgence.” This is what Murukan̄’s feet have. Filliozat admits the double meaning (1973: 68).

As pointed out to me by Jean-Luc Chevillard, in the *Piṅkalanikaṇṭu*, dated to ca. 850–900 according to Zvelebil (1995: 562), *aḷaku* is one meaning of *matan̄*, and vice versa (see *Piṅkalanikaṇṭu* 1968, Nos. 1941 and 3921). Did some of our commentators use the *Piṅkalanikaṇṭu*? Or, conversely, did the lexicographer know our commentaries?

cel urai taṭakkai (aṭi 5cd)

Most commentators agree on the fact that the hands of Murukan̄ resemble something which destroyed the enemies. This is a cloud (*mēkam*) according to Parimēlaḷakar (PM20–21) and Kavipperumāl̄ (KAV1). Parimēlaḷakar clarifies his gloss (*mēkam ottal*, “resembling cloud”) in his paraphrase (PM 21: *mēkattiṇatu ceytiyaiy uṭaiyavāya*, “possessing the action of the cloud”), that is he makes explicit the common property, which is destroying the enemies. As a cloud destroys by means of thunder, we are not surprised to find Uraiyāciriyaṅ (UR12), Pariti (PT4) and the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr (PE12) taking *cel* as such (*īti*). The cloud could be considered as standing in a relation of metonymy with thunderbolt. As pointed out to me by Jean-Luc

Chevillard, in the *Piṅkalanikaṅṭu* (1968: No. 3572), *cel* is defined as *iṭi*, *mēkam* or *citalai* (“termite”). Again, we can wonder. Did the lexicographer know our commentaries or is it the other way round?

Nacciṅārkkiniyar (NA22) has also the thunderbolt in mind in his paraphrase (*iṭiyai mārupaṭṭa*, “which are different from thunder”), but focuses on the difference. Is this another way of saying the same: his hands are not thunder, but do the same (as explicated in PM 21)? Or, as suggested by Jean-Luc Chevillard, do we have to understand that the hands of Murukaṅ differ from Indra’s thunderbolt, in the sense that the former kills only the wicked and the latter kills indiscriminately?

Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ is more original. The hands are like something which destroys/Yama/Kāla (MKK11: *kūrṛam*; MKK12: *kūrṛu*). And he admits also that they are like a cloud (*mēkam*), but interestingly, not for their power of destruction, but for their capacity as giver (MKK13), as the cloud showers rain.

maruvil karpin vānutal kaṇavaṅ (aṭi 6)

There is a general agreement between the commentators here. All mention the name of the consort of Murukaṅ. Nacciṅārkkiniyar further adds that this mention in the beginning of the poem is to make clear to the reader that the work is about Murukaṅ as creator and protector (NA25–26).

Kavipperumāl (KAV1), Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ (MKK15–16) and the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr (PE14) simply render *karpin* as *karpu*, i.e. as itself, “devotion.” Parimēlalakar explains that *karpu* refers to the love of a Pativratā, a virtuous spouse (PM23–24). Nacciṅārkkiniyar glosses it as *arakkarpu*, which he contrasts with *marakkarpu*, i.e. his gloss on *maruvil*, which he alone understands in this meaning (NA24).

As for *vāḷi* in its relation to *nutal*, for most commentators it amounts to say “the bright forehead.” Pariti as well as the anonymous *urai* from

Pērūr furthermore see there a comparison of the forehead with the crescent moon (PT5) and something lost in lacuna (PE14) respectively.

Note also that, while most of the commentators gloss/paraphrase *kaṇavaṇ* by itself, Parimēlaḷakar (PM23–24) and Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṇ (MKK15) use *koḷunaṇ* and *kāntaṇ* respectively. Furthermore, the two MSS of Parimēlaḷakar’s *urai* available to me (C11 and TT2) have *pattar* instead.

Typology of Commentarial Divergence

Based on this small sample of commentaries, we can now try to establish, from the cases when our commentators do not agree, a typology of divergence.

There are words showing polysemy, for which one meaning is favoured at the exclusion of others.

ceḷ—This word is glossed “thunderbolt” (*iṭi*) or “cloud” (*mēkam*), which are in a relation of metonymy. Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṇ alone glosses it as “that which destroys/Yama/Kāla” (MKK11: *kūrṛam*; MKK12: *kūrṛu*).

matāṇ—This word is interpreted as “beauty” (*aḷaku*), “ignorance” (*ariyāmai*) or “pride, arrogance; intrepidity, courage, indulgence” (*cerukku*), depending on the interpretation of the word *uṭai* that follows.

There are homonymic words diversely interpreted.

uṭai—This word is interpreted as “possessing” or “destroying.”

ō/ōvu—Some commentators equate it with *oḷivu* (“ceasing”), others with *oḷivu* (“brightness”).

ēṛpu—Most commentators equate it with “rising,” but for Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṇ it means “so as to obtain beauty” (MKK2).

There is a difference of opinion regarding the referent of a noun or the subject of a verb.

ulakam—Some commentators restrict its meaning to the “great *ṛṣṣ*” (*paramaviruṭikaḷ*) and “learned people” (*uyarntōr*), while other are more inclusive as they consider it to refer to the “living beings” (*uyirkaḷ, uyirttokutikaḷ*) or “people” (*mākkal*).

palar—Several commentators explain that this word designates “people from all creeds” (*ellāc camayattārum*), while for Uraiyācīriyar these are “those who obtain the fruits of their actions” (UR4) and for Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ “people of yore” (MKK2: *paḷamaiyōr*).

imaikkum—For most commentators the light glitters, while for Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar the viewer of that light blinks (NA13).

There are two cases of a different reading of the *mūlam*.

ērpū / nērpū—Uraiyācīriyar (UR1) alone reads *nērpū* (rendered as *nērāka*, “directly, straightforwardly”), while all the other commentators read *ērpū* (“rising”).

ōvara / ōvuṛa—Pariti (PT3) alone reads *ōvuṛa* (“so that brightness occurs/remains”) while all the other commentators read *ōvara* (“unceasingly”). From the semantic point of view, the difference is however minimal. Note that the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr (PE7) reads *ōvara*, but glosses it very similarly to Pariti, in fact even more emphatically (PT3: *pirakācam poruntī*; PE8: *eṅkum pīrakācam poruntī*).

There are also commentators who offer more explicit/detailed explanations for some words.

ñāyīru—It equals *īḷaiyacūriyaṅ* “the young sun,” i.e. the rising sun, for Pariti (PT2) and the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr (PE6), rather than simply the sun for all the others.

oli—Some commentators make it explicit that this brightness refers to the “body/complexion” (*mēṇi*) of Murukaṇ.

karpu—Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar contrasts this word with the preceding *maru* (NA24).

vāḷ—Pariti and also the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr explicit a comparison with crescent moon for the former (PT5), with something lost in a lacuna for the latter (PE14).

Other divergences are more complex and might involve several of the divergences pointed above.

valaṇ ērpu—While most of the commentators consider that it means “rising clockwise,” that is the sun is described as circumambulating, what is circumambulated is generally designated as Mount Meru, but some add the earth, both of which can be considered to be in a relation of metonymy. Others mention the alternative “victoriously.” Mallaiyūrḱ Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṇ, who accepts this alternative (MKK4), favours however another interpretation (MKK2: “so as to obtain beauty, on the right side/so that the right side obtains beauty”). Uraiyaḱiriyar reads a different *mūlam* (UR1) and consequently offers still another interpretation (UR2: *nērāka*, “straightforwardly,” i.e. “with impartiality”).

The double comparison—Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar is the only one to point out that Murukaṇ is compared with the sun in two respects (in action and in colour) (NA11).

vilaiṅ(u) avir—There are commentators for whom this phrase refers to the shining of the brightness (that Murukaṇ is) and others for whom it refers to its beauty.

We thus see that there are some disagreements, that I would qualify as real (whether based on the same *mūlam* or not), and others that might be called “show-off” disagreement, especially in the case of Mallaiyūrḱ Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṇ, who seems to establish his status as commentator by proposing novel interpretations.

Conclusions

What can we conclude from this long survey of a brief portion of the commentaries on the TMAP from the point of view of the commentaries of the TMAP in particular and of the history of Tamil commentaries in general?

From a general point of view, we can wonder about the audience, types and *raison d'être* of commentaries. Leaving out the cases of texts, such as those consisting of *cūttiram̃s* (Sanskrit *sūtra*), which, due their conciseness, require a commentary (see Wilden [2004: 181, n. 18]), a first obvious reason why an *urai* is needed is that the *mūlam* is not understood anymore, because of the distance between its creation and the actual reader. Secondly, existing commentaries, such as Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar's, might be judged beyond the grasp of the average devotee, thus the need for a more accessible and simpler commentary. Thirdly, there might be emulation between literati: one has to write a commentary on a given text, deemed important, so as to be part of a literary coterie. In that case, it might be that what takes precedence is not to offer a "correct" interpretation of the text, but a brilliant, new, imaginative one. This emulation might account for diverging interpretations.

Lehmann (2009: 56) has proposed a threefold classification of Tamil commentaries: scientific or theoretical (on grammar and poetics), literary (on Caṅkam, post-Caṅkam didactic-ethical or epic works), religious (on Śrīvaiṣṇava and Caivacittānta texts). The commentaries on TMAP, as it is a Caṅkam work, would belong to the literary class. The literary value of TMAP certainly accounts for the interest of commentators. This is clearly the case for Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, if one considers the other texts he commented upon and his way of commenting, full of references to Caṅkam poems and grammar. Only the most sophisticated, and mostly Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar's *urai*, thus clearly belong to this literary class of commentaries. The TMAP however is also a religious text praising the god Murukaṅ and is part of the Śaiva

Tirumurai. The anonymous *urai* from Pērūr underlines the devotional and soteriological dimension of the poem when it states, explaining the phrase *ulaka muvappa*, that the knowledge of the poem is a way to obtain salvation (PE2).

As Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar's commentary might be too much sophisticated for an audience interested only in having a broad idea of the content of the text, other commentaries, less sophisticated, were written providing only glosses and/or paraphrase. Such is the case of the anonymous commentary from Pērūr, which basically provides only a paraphrase of the *mūlam*, i.e. it aims at an audience interested only in the meaning. In fact, it even looks more like a translation in modern Tamil than a commentary proper. This would make it an hypotext rather than a metatext in Genette's theoretical frame. The commentary of Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ appears to belong to the same kind, but would furthermore be an example of new, original commentary, possibly serving to establish the status of its author.

Table 3 tentatively classifies the eight commentaries according to a typology differentiating primarily literary, devotional, structural or annotative commentaries; the latter three types aim at an audience interested only in the general meaning of the poem.

Table 3: typology of the commentaries to TMAP.

Literary	Devotional	Annotative	Structural
Nacciṅārkkīṇiyar	Parimēlaḷakar Uraiyaḱiriyar Kavipperumāḷ Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ Anonymous <i>urai</i> from Pērūr	Pariti	Anonymous <i>karutturai</i>

As for the relative chronology of the above commentaries, I am afraid that not much can be said based on such a short sample. Questions can be asked but definitive answers cannot be provided.

Does the fact that Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar sees a double simile corroborate the consensus that he is later than Parimēlaḷakar who sees only one? In fact, Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar is the only one to see this double comparison. As one could expect later commentators to take sides on this issue and as none does so, does it imply that Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar is the most recent of all? This seems not to be so. Later commentators, aiming at a larger or different audience, could simply have skipped the issue.

Is Kavipperumāḷ later than Parimēlaḷakar and Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar as he seems to try to reconcile both about *matanuṭai* as suggested by Jean-Luc Chevillard?

When two commentators agree closely—for instance Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar⁴⁵ and Uraiyācīriyar in their paraphrase and syntactic linkage of *oḷiyinaiyum*, *tāḷinaiyum* and *kaiyinaiyum* (NA16, 20, 22, 24; UR7, 10, 12, 14)—is it a clear indication that one knows the other? If so, who is the borrower? Is the anonymous *karutturai* derived either from Parimēlaḷakar's or Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar's commentaries as its implicit delimitation of *toṭars* (indicated by numbers) agrees with them (at least at the beginning, the full *karutturai* being yet to be checked)?

The same question can be asked about Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ's *urai* whose segmentation of the *mūlam* is very often consistent with the *toṭars* and syntactic structure as delimited by Parimēlaḷakar and Nacciṅārkkīṅiyar. But this might not be a relevant observation, as there are not many different ways of segmenting the *mūlam*. Some observations on language confirm, however, the relatively recent character of Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ's *urai* (see below). Does the hypothesis that Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ

⁴⁵ Compare also the close wordings of these two commentators: *maṇattāṅ karutuvōrkkup pulappaṭalāl* (UR5) against *maṇattāl nōkkuvārkkku ... kaṭpulaṅāl nōkkuvārkkku* (NA11).

consciously offers different interpretations indicate that he could be later than the early old or medieval commentaries?

A definitive observation though is that the commentary by Pariti and the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr are very close in wording (see tables in Appendix 1). But which one is the source of the other is difficult to say.

From an impressionistic consideration of language and vocabulary, Mallaiyūrḱ Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ's commentary as well as the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr appear more recent than the early old or medieval commentaries. See for instance the accusative plural *-yaḷai* for *-kaḷai* (PE12) and the use of Teyvāṅṅai (PE14), a colloquial form of Teyvayāṅṅai according to TL, which however are wordings that might not be original but appeared in the transmission process. Note also: the rendering of *kaṭal* by *camuttiram* (MKK2-3, PE6), while the other commentators keep *kaṭaḷ*; the rendering of *tāḷ* by *pātam* (KAV1, MKK8-9) or *pātāravintam* (PE10), while others, except Parimēlaḷakar (PM17-18: *cīpātam*), keep *tāḷ*; the rendering of *nōṅ* by *palam* (MKK9) and *valuvu* (PE10), as opposed to *vali* for the other commentators; the rendering of *kai* by *attam* (MKK11-12) or *astam* (PE12), as opposed to *kai* for the other commentators; the occurrence of the words *iraṭcittil* and *iraccikkinra* (MKK8-9), *pirakācam* (PT3, PE8), *illāmai*, which is a modern form used to gloss *il* (MKK15), *illāmal* (KAV1), *ākāyam* (PT3), *ākācam* (PE8). Of course, it is difficult to assign individually a date to the appearance of each of these wordings, many of which are Sanskrit loanwords, but one cannot help feeling that such a collection of linguistic features points towards Modern Tamil of a colloquial register, as far as the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr is concerned, which, in its case, provides a hint as to which kind of audience it aims at. Note also that the vocabulary of these apparently later commentaries is more Sanskritised (see for instance, besides the examples above-mentioned, *lōkalōkaṅkaḷum*, *leṭcam*, and *cantō[vi]ttai* in PE2). If these observations are confirmed by further investigations, one could consider that Mallaiyūrḱ Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ's paraphrase as well as the anonymous

urai from Pērūr, which basically provides only a paraphrase of the *mūlam*, are in fact translations of the TMAP from Caṅkam Tamil into a relatively modern Tamil (colloquial for the anonymous *urai* from Pērūr) rather than commentaries proper. The fact that Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ provides further explanations would make it an annotated translation.

Finally, the above sample, however short, shows that commentaries have a complex history of transmission, as the same commentary might be attested in various forms today. For instance, Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṅ's commentary is attested in two versions: one containing word-by-word glosses and a paraphrase (TU3, G11), the other leaving out the word-by-word glosses and containing only the paraphrase (C8). Similarly, the editions of Parimēlaḷakar's commentary differ: while both editions available to me contain further explanations, one edition by Kō. Vaṭivēlu Ceṭṭiyār (TMAP 1945), has word-by-word glosses and a paraphrase, and the other, the Tiruppaṅantāḷ edition (TMAP 1959), leaves the word-by-word glosses to keep only the paraphrase. The two MSS of Parimēlaḷakar's commentary available to me (C11, TT2) agree with Kō. Vaṭivēlu Ceṭṭiyār's edition—except for **PM10**, for which we have either word-by word glosses (Kō. Vaṭivēlu Ceṭṭiyār's edition) or a paraphrase (C11, TT2 and Tiruppaṅantāḷ edition). One can wonder if the original commentary was furnished with word-by-word glosses or not. In the affirmative, one would have to admit that the versions without the word-by-word glosses are abridgements; in the negative, that the versions with the word-by-word glosses are enlargements, necessitated by a further need for clarification. Another possible instance of abridgement, but very drastic, is the anonymous *Karutturai* (MS C9), that could be derived from Parimēlaḷakar's or Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary.

I have only offered but a few insights here, adding yet another layer of commentary. I showed, I hope, the way for future research. A lot of work remains, however, ahead of us. A rough calculation would be 50 times what is presented here. (to be continued)

Appendix 1: Synoptic Tables

These tables present for each of the six first metrical lines (*aṭṭis*) of the TMAP the correspondence between the words of the *mūlam* and their rendering in the commentaries either in the glosses or in the paraphrase. Roman numerals refer to original glosses (initial or selected). Italic numerals refer to paraphrases and further explanations, which I have segmented into glosses. Some particularly long glosses and explanations are not cited *in extenso*. The asterisk marks alternative interpretation mentioned by the commentators, whether they endorse it or not.

{{1}} உலக முவப்ப வலனேர்பு திரிதரு *ulakam uvappa valaṅ ērpu tiri taru*

	<i>ulakam</i>	<i>uvappa</i>	<i>valaṅ</i>	<i>ērpu— nērpu (UR)</i>	<i>tiri taru</i>
PM4, 7	<i>... uyarntōrāyulla parama viruṭikaḷāyullōr</i>	<i>virumpa</i>	<i>valamākat tirintaruḷukiṅra</i>		
PM5*	<i>uyarntōr</i>	<i>virumpa</i>			
NA3, 6	<i>cīvāṇmākkaḷ</i>	<i>uvappa</i>	<i>eḷuntu makāmēruvai valamākat tiri talaicceyyum</i>		
NA4	<i>maṇṇiṭattu vālum cīvāṇmākkaḷai</i>				
UR2	<i>ulakattilulla palluyirkaḷum</i>	<i>maḱiḷa</i>	<i>mēruvai valamāka</i>	<i>yāvarkkum nērākac</i>	<i>cuḷalum</i>
KAV1	<i>uyarntōr</i>	<i>virumpum paṭi</i>	<i>eḷuntu mēruvai valamāka varukiṅra</i>		
KAV3				<i>eḷuntu</i>	
PT1	<i>ulakiṅkaṇṇulla eṅ pattu nāṅku ilaṭcam civa pētaṅkaḷākiya uyirttokutiḷaḷ</i>				
MKK 2	<i>uyarntōr</i>	<i>virumpa</i>	<i>valamē aḷaku peṛa</i>		<i>peyartal varutal</i>
MKK3	<i>uyarnt[ō]r</i>	<i>virumpa</i>	<i>valamē aḷaku peṛap</i>		<i>peyarn[tu] varukiṅra</i>
MKK4*			<i>valaṅ ēṛriy</i>		
PE2, 4	<i>lōkalōkaṅkaḷum eṅpattu nālu leṭcam āṛru mākaḷuṅ cantō[vi]ttaiy aṭaintu pīlaikkum paṭi</i>		<i>ulakattaiyum makāmēruvaiyum valamākat tiriyappaṭṭa</i>		

For further explanations see also **PM8**.

{{2}} பலர்புகழ் ஞாயிறு கடற்கண் டாஅங் *palar pukaḷ ṅāyīru kaṭal kaṇṭu āṅku*

	<i>palar</i>	<i>pukaḷ</i>	<i>ṅāyīru</i>	<i>kaṭal</i>	<i>kaṇṭu āṅku</i>
PM10	<i>ellāc camayattārālum</i>	<i>koṇṭāṭappaṭṭa</i>	<i>ātittaṅaik</i>	<i>kaṭalil</i>	<i>kaṇṭār pōla</i>
NA8, 10	<i>ellāccamayattārum</i>	<i>pukaḷum</i>	<i>ṅāyīrrai</i>	<i>kaṭaliṭattē</i>	<i>kaṇṭār pōla</i>
UR4	<i>taṅatu oḷiyār kāṭciyiṅ payaṅ koḷvār palarum</i>	<i>pukaḷum</i>	<i>ṅāyīrrik</i>	<i>kaṭaliṭattuk</i>	<i>kaṇṭār pōla</i>
KAV1	<i>palarālum</i>	<i>pukaḷappaṭṭa</i>	<i>ātittaṅ</i>	<i>kaṭaliṭattē</i>	<i>kaṇṭāl otta</i>
PT2	<i>ellāc camayattārum</i>		<i>iḷaiya cūriyaṅ</i>		<i>utayamāṅnatu pōla</i>
MKK2	<i>paḷamaiyōr</i>	<i>ēttu</i>	<i>āt[i]ttaṅ</i>	<i>camuttiraṅ</i>	<i>kaṇṭā{r} pōla</i>
MKK3	<i>palarum</i>	<i>{ē}ttappa[t]tav</i>	<i>ātittaṅaic</i>	<i>camuttirattiṅ</i>	<i>kaṇ{ṅē}y utaiya{kā}lattilē kaṇṭāp [sic] pōla</i>
PE6	<i>ellāc camaiyattārum</i>	<i>pukaḷappaṭṭay</i>	<i>iḷaiyacūriyaṅ</i>	<i>camuttirattilēy</i>	<i>utaiyamāṅnatu pōla</i>

For further explanations see also **PM11, NA11, UR5, MKK5**.

{{3}} கோவற விமைக்குஞ் சேண்விளங் கவிரொளி \bar{o} *ara imaikkum cēṇ viḷaṅku avir oḷi*

	<i>ō/ōvu ara — ō ura (PT3)</i>	<i>imaikkum</i>	<i>cēṇ</i>	<i>viḷaṅku</i>	<i>avir</i>	<i>oḷi</i>
PM13	<i>oḷivara</i>	<i>viṭṭu viḷaṅkum</i>	<i>tūram</i>	<i>tōṟram</i>	<i>pāṭaṅ ceytal</i>	<i>nīram</i>
PM14	<i>atitūrattilē tōṟri oḷi viṭṭu viḷaṅkip</i>				<i>pāṭaṅ ceykiṇra</i>	<i>tirunīrattiṇaiyum- uṭaiyaṇum āy</i>
PM15*		<i>nīraital viṭṭu viḷaṅkum</i>				
NA13	<i>... taṅkutaḷ illaiyāka</i>	<i>imaittu pārttarṅkuk kāraṇamāḱum</i>		<i>viḷaṅkukiṇra</i>		<i>oḷi</i>
NA15		<i>kaṅkaḷiṇ itaḷkaḷiraṇṭiṇaiyum kuvittal</i>				
NA16	<i>kaṭpulaṇāl nōkkuvār kaṇṇiṭaṅkaḷel lāvaṟṟiṇum ceṇru viḷaṅkukiṇra</i>					<i>oḷiyiṇaiyum</i>
UR7	<i>... ekkālamum oḷivara</i>	<i>viḷaṅkuvatāki</i>	<i>maṇavākkaiyum kaṭanta tūrattilē</i>	<i>viṭṭu viḷaṅkā niṇra</i>		<i>oḷiyiṇaiyum</i>
UR8*	<i>... oḷivara iyalpāna</i>	<i>oḷiyaiyuṭaiya</i>	<i>tēvarulakattilē akamum puṟamumāki</i>	<i>viṭṭu viḷaṅkā niṇra</i>		<i>oḷiy</i>
KAV1	<i>oḷivillāmal</i>	<i>viḷaṅkuvatāy</i>	<i>nīṇṭa tūrattil ceṇru</i>	<i>viḷaṅkukiṇra</i>		<i>oḷiyiṇaiyum</i>
PT3	<i>pirakācam porunti</i>		<i>ākāyattilum</i>	<i>viḷaṅkiya</i>	<i>aḷakaiyuṭaiya</i>	<i>oḷiyāṇa tirumēṇi</i>
MKK2	<i>oḷiviriṇiy</i>	<i>nīraivu</i>	<i>tūra{m}</i>	<i>viṭṭu viḷaṅka</i>	<i>aḷaku</i>	<i>vi[[akka]m</i>

MKK3	<i>oliviṇṇi</i>	<i>niṟaintu</i>	<i>atitūrāttilē</i>	<i>viṭṭu viḷaiṅka</i> [sic] <i>niṇra</i>	<i>aḷakiya</i> [sic]	<i>{viḷa}kkam[u]ṭtāyay</i> <i>iruntuḷḷa</i> <i>tirumēṇiyaiyuṭaiyavaṇ</i>
PE8	<i>eṅkum piṟakācam</i>	<i>porunti</i>	<i>ākācamum</i>	<i>viḷaiṅkiy</i>	<i>aḷakayuṭaiya</i> [sic]	<i>oliyāṇa</i> [sic] <i>tirumēni</i>

For further explanations see also **NA14**.

{{4}} யறுநர்த் தாங்கிய மதனுடை நோன்றாட் *urunar tānkiya matan̄ uṭai nōṇ tāl*

	<i>urunar</i>	<i>tānkiya</i>	<i>matan̄</i>	<i>uṭai</i>	<i>nōṇ</i>	<i>tāl</i>
PM17	<i>meyyaṭiyār</i>	<i>kāttal</i>	<i>aḷakuṭaiya</i>		<i>valiya tāḷakiya cīpātam</i>	
PM18	<i>meyyaṭiyāraik</i>	<i>kākkiṇṇa</i>			<i>valiyiṇaiy uṭaittāṇa cīpātattai yuṭaiyaṇum āy</i>	
NA20	<i>taṇṇaic cērtavarkaḷ tīviṇaiyaip pōkki</i>	<i>avarait tānkiya</i>	<i>aṟiyāmaiya</i>	<i>uṭaittar̄kuk kāraṇamākiya</i>	<i>valiyiṇaiyuṭaiya</i>	<i>tāḷiṇaiyum</i>
UR10	<i>taṇṇaiy aṭaivōrait</i>	<i>tānkum</i>	<i>yāṇ enatu enṇuṇ cerukkaik</i>	<i>keṭukkum</i>	<i>valiya</i>	<i>tāḷiṇaiyum</i>
KAV1	<i>taṇṇai aṭaintōrākiya cīmātavācīriyaraip</i>	<i>parikkiṇṇa (tānkukiṇṇa)</i>	<i>cerukkum</i>		<i>valiyum</i>	<i>uḷavāṇa cīrpātāṅkaḷaiyum</i>
MKK8	<i>aṭaintōr</i>	<i>iraṭcittil</i>	<i>aḷaku</i>	<i>uṇṭākiya</i>	<i>vali</i>	<i>[p]ātam</i>
MKK9	<i>aṭaintōr[ai]y</i>	<i>iraccikkiṇṇav</i>	<i>aḷaki[ṇ]ai[ṇ]m</i>		<i>palaviṇaiyumūṭaiya</i>	<i>śrīpātāṅkaḷaiyum- uṭaiyavaṇ</i>
PE10	<i>taṇṇaiy uṭainta pērait</i>	<i>tānkiy</i>	<i>a[ḷa]kaip</i>	<i>porunti</i>	<i>valuvaṇiyuṭaiya</i>	<i>pātāravintam</i>

{{5}} செறுநர்த் தேய்த்த செல்லுறழ் தடக்கை *ceṟunar tēytta cel uṟaḷ taṭam kai*

	<i>ceṟunar</i>	<i>tēytta</i>	<i>cel</i>	<i>uṟaḷ</i>	<i>taṭakkai</i>
PM20	<i>catturukaḷ</i>	<i>keṭutta</i>	<i>mēkam</i>	<i>ottal</i>	<i>periya kai</i>
PM21	<i>catturukkaḷaik</i>	<i>keṭuttu</i>	<i>mēkattinatu</i>	<i>ceytiyaiy uṭaiyavāya</i>	<i>periya kaikaḷaiyuṭaiyaṇum āy</i>
NA22	<i>aḷittarkuriyārai</i>	<i>aḷitta</i>	<i>iṭiyai</i>	<i>mārupaṭṭa</i>	<i>perumaiyiṇaiyuṭaiya kaiyiṇaiyum uṭaiya</i>
UR12	<i>tanatu aruḷvali nillātu mārupaṭṭōrai</i>	<i>aḷitta</i> (var.: <i>aḷittu</i>)	<i>iṭiyēru</i>	<i>pōṇra</i>	<i>periya kaiyiṇaiyum uṭaiya</i>
KAV1	<i>pakaivarkaḷai</i>	<i>māytta</i>	<i>mēkam</i>	<i>pōṇrav</i>	<i>aḷaviya kaiyiṇaiyum</i>
PT4			<i>iṭikaḷaip</i>	<i>pōṇra</i>	
MKK11	<i>catturukkaḷai</i>	<i>mā[y]vitta</i>	<i>kūrram</i>	<i>otta</i>	<i>periya śrīyatta{m}</i>
MKK12	<i>catturukkaḷai</i>	<i>māyavittuk</i>	<i>kūrrai</i> (G10) <i>kūrram</i> (TU3)	<i>otta</i>	<i>periya śrīyattaṅkaḷaiyuṭaiyavaṇ</i>
MKK13*			<i>mēkattaip</i>	<i>pōlē</i>	<i>koṭukka[p]paṭṭa kai</i>
PE12	<i>catturāṭiyaḷaic</i>	<i>ce[X/XX]kum iṭattuy</i>	<i>iṭiyaḷaip</i>	<i>pōṇra</i>	<i>astaṅkaḷ</i>

{{6}} மறுவில் கற்பின் வாணுதல் கணவன் *maru il karpin vāḷ nutal kaṇavaṇ*

	<i>maru il</i>	<i>karpin</i>	<i>vāḷ</i>	<i>nutal</i>	<i>kaṇavaṇ</i>
PM23	<i>kuṟram illāta</i>	<i>pativiratāpāvattinai-yuṭaiya</i>	<i>oli</i>	<i>neṟri</i>	<i>koḷunaṇ</i>
PM24	<i>kuṟram illāta</i>	<i>pativiratāpāvattinaiyum</i>	<i>oli taru</i>	<i>neṟriyinaiyumuṭaiya teyvayāṇaikkuk</i>	<i>koḷunaṇum āy</i>
NA24	<i>maṟakkarpil-lāta</i>	<i>arakkarpinaiyum</i>	<i>oli poruntiya</i>	<i>nutaliniyumuṭaiya intiraṇ makaḷ teyvayāṇaiyār</i>	<i>kaṇavaṇ</i>
UR14	<i>kuṟram illāta</i>	<i>a[ra]kkarpaiyuṭaiya</i>		<i>intiraṇ makaḷ teyvayāṇaiyār</i>	<i>kaṇavaṇ</i>
KAV1	<i>kuṟram illāta</i>	<i>karpinaiyum</i>	<i>oli ceṟinta</i>	<i>neṟriyinaiyum uṭaiya teyvayāṇaiyārkkuk</i>	<i>kaṇavaṇ āy uḷḷavaṇ</i>
PT5			<i>piṟaiccantiraṇ pōṇra</i>	<i>nutalaiyuṭaiya teyvayāṇai nācciyār</i>	
MKK15	<i>kuṟram illāmai</i>	<i>karpu</i>	<i>oli[sic]</i>	<i>neṟri</i>	<i>kāntaṇ</i>
MKK16	<i>kuṟram illāta</i>	<i>karpinaiyum</i>	<i>oli</i>	<i>neṟriyaiyumuṭaiya teyvayāṇaikkik[sic]</i>	<i>kaṇavaṇ āy uḷḷavaṇ</i>
PE14	<i>mācumaṟuv illāta</i>	<i>karpinai</i>	<i>{yu}ṭaittā[y] āri[C]ai pōṇra</i>	<i>nutalaiyuṭaiya teyvāṇai nā{cci}yār</i>	<i>kaṇavaṇ</i>

For further explanations see also NA25–26.

Appendix 2: Some Elements of Tamil Commentarial Metalanguage.

For many of the present entries, see also Chevillard (2008), especially in the glossary (pp. 43ff.) and for the forms derived from *eṇal*, “to say,” pp. 99 and 469.

amaiyum—“it is acceptable” (PM5, 8). Validates an alternative interpretation. Comes after *eṇinum*.

ituvanṛi / iktanṛi—“this not being,” i.e. “besides” (PM8, 15). Introduces an alternative explanation.

iṇip pātam—“hereafter the text of the poem” (see MSS variants *ad* PM15, PM24). Indicates the quotation of the *mūlam* starts again.

eṇavē—“so as to say,” i.e. “that is to say” (PM18, 21, 24). Introduces a paraphrase.

eṇinum—“even if one says” (PM5, 8; MKK4, 13). For an acceptable alternative explanation. Followed by *amaiyum* (PM5, 8) or *ām* (MKK4, 13).

eṇpatu—frequently abbreviated *etu*—“that which says,” i.e. “the word, the phrase, the quotation, the sentence.” Concludes a quotation from the *mūlam*.

eṇpārum uḷar—“there are also people who say” (PM8, 15). For an alternative explanation (mentioned but not validated). Similar to *eṇrum ām*.

eṇrav āru—“a manner to say” (MKK3, 9, 12, 16). Concludes a paraphrase.

eṇrum ām—“there is also saying,” i.e. “some also says, it also means according to others” (UR8). For alternative explanation (not validated). Similar to *eṇpārum uḷar*.

kūṭṭuka—“one should connect” (PM14). Makes the syntax/meaning explicit.

koḷka—“one should take,” i.e. “one should understand that/as follows” (PM1, 8, 11). For an explanation.

muṭikka/(viṇai) muṭikka—“one should complete/conclude (the action),” i.e. “one should syntactically complete/construe (the action)” (NA17, 18, 27). Makes the syntax/meaning explicit.

Appendix 3: Quotations of TMAP 1–6 in the TL

There are six references/quotations to TMAP 1–6 in the TL (in bold in the entries below). Only one (definition 7 of *matan* as *maṭamai*, “ignorance”) is explicitly a reference to a commentary, which is unnamed but is evidently that of Naccinārkkiniyar, who alone understands the word as such (NA20: *ariyāmai*). But note that the reference to *aṭi* 7 (instead of *aṭi* 4) is incorrect. Note also that the definition of *urunaṅ* is based on TMAP only.

உலகம் ulakam, *n.* < *lōka*. 1. The earth; பூமி. (*பிங்*.) 2. Any world; புவனப்பொது. (*திவ். திருவாய்*.6, 10, 1.) 3. Country, territory, region; நிலப்பகுதி. *மாயேயான் மேய காடுறை யுலகமும்* (*தொல். பொ*.5). 4. Sky, ethereal regions; ஆகாயம். (*பிங்*.) 5. Point of the compass; திக்கு. (*திவா*.) 6. Inhabitants of the world, mankind in general; மக்கட்டொகுதி. (*தொல். சொல்*.57, *சேனா*.) 7. The excellent, the good; நன்மக்கள். *உலகம்புகழ்ந்த வோங்குயர் விழுச்சீர்* (*திருமுரு*. 124). 8. Created beings; சீவராசிகள். **உலக முவப்ப வலனேர்பு திரிதரு (திருமுரு. 1)**. 9. Lofty character; உயர்குணம். (*பிங்*.) 10. Usage, custom; வழக்கம். *ஓழுக்கநடையே யுலகமதாகும்* (*மாறன*. 320).

உவ-த்தல் uva-, *12 v. intr.* [M. *uva*.] 1. To be glad, to rejoice, to be delighted; மகிழ்தல். (**திருமுரு. 1**) 2. To be pleasing, agreeable; பிரியமாதல். *அவருக் குவந்த செய்கை. Colloq.—tr.* To be pleased with, to approve of, like; விரும்புதல். *உறுவ துலகுவப்பச் செய்து* (*நாலடி*. 74).

உறுநன் urunaṅ, *n.* < *id.* + *votary*, he who seeks protection, follower; சேர்ந்தவன். **உறுநர்த் தாங்கிய மதனுடை நோன்றான்** (*திருமுரு. 4*).

ஓ³ ō, *n.* 1. Going and staying; சென்று தங்குகை. **ஓவற விமைக்கும் . . . ஒளி** (*திருமுரு. 3*). 2. Shutter or other means to stop the flow of water; மதகுநீர்தாங்கும் பலகை. (*தொல். எழுத்*. 180, *உரை*).

தேய்²-த்தல் tēy-, *11 v. tr.* Caus. of தேய்¹-. [M. *tēikka*.] 1. To rub, rub away, waste by rubbing; உரைசச்செய்தல். *மாநாகங்கொண்டாற் கொப்புளாம் விரலிற் றேய்த்தால்* (*சீவக*.1288). 2. To reduce; குறைத்தல். *அழுத கண்ணீரன்றே செல்வத்தைத் தேய்க்கும் படை* (*குறள்*, 555). 3. To kill, destroy; அழித்தல். **செறுநர்த் தேய்த்த செல்லுறழ் தடக்கை** (*திருமுரு. 5*). 4. To scour, scrub, polish by rubbing, as a wall, as a vessel; to clean, as teeth; துலக்குதல். *பாத்திரத்தைத் தேய்த்துவைத்தான்*. 5. To efface, erase, obliterate by rubbing; துடைத்தல். *எழுத்தைத் தேய்த்துவிட்டான்*. 6. To pare, shave, cut, as a gem; செதுக்குதல். *மணியிற் றேய்த்த வள்ளமும்* (*கம்பரா. வரைக*. 40). 7. To rub in, as oil, ointment or liniment; எண்ணெய் முதலிய அழுந்தப்பூசுதல்.

மதன்¹ mataṇ, *n.* <மத. 1. cf. *mada*. Arrogance; செருக்கு. *மதனுடை நோன்றாள்* (பட்டினப். 278). 2. Strength; வலிமை. *மதனுடை முழவுத்தோள்* (புறநா. 50). 3. Enthusiasm, elation; மனவெழுச்சி. *மதனுடை நோன்றாள்* (புறநா. 75, உரை). 4. Beauty; அழகு. (பிங்.) 5. Greatness, glory; மாட்சிமை (பிங்.) 6. Abundance; excess, மிகுதி. (யாழ். அக.) 7. Ignorance; மடமை. *மதனுடை நோன்றாள்* (திருமுரு. 7 [sic], உரை). 8. Bewilderment; கலக்கம். (யாழ். அக.)

Abbreviations

KAR: anonymous *karutturai*.

KAV: Kavipperumāḷ's *urai*.

MKK: Mallaiyūrku Kuḷantaik Kavirācaṇ's *urai*.

MS/MSS: manuscript/manuscripts (artefact of testimony).

NA: Naccinārkkīṇiyar's *urai*.

PE: anonymous *urai* from Pērūr.

PM: Parimēḷaḷakar's *urai*.

PT: Pariti's *urai*.

TL: *Tamil Lexicon*.

TMAP: *Tirumurukāṇṇruppaṭai*.

UR: Uraiācīriyar's *urai*.

UVS: U. V. Swaminatha Iyer = U. Vē. Cāminātaiyar.

Conventions for Manuscripts Transcription

- [a] Proposed reading of unclear letter/sign.
- [a/b] Alternative readings of unclear letter/sign.
- [X] Illegible letter/sign. As many X as letters/signs.
- [C] Illegible consonant.
- [V] Illegible vowel.
- {a} Illegible letter/sign, restored by conjecture or from another witness.
- [a*] Letter/sign missing in the original and entirely restored.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Manuscripts

This is a list of the manuscript Manuscripts testimonies of *urais* to the TMAP. For a list of MSS testimonies (including those containing the *mūlam*) and details about the dated MSS, see Francis (2016: 527–528⁴⁶). Between parentheses are the accession No./catalogue No., with only a single reference if the accession No. is the catalogue No.

C = Chennai, U.V.S. Library.	SM = Tanjore Maharaja Serfoji Sarasvati Mahal Library, Tanjore.
Ca = Calcutta, National Museum.	T = Trivandrum, Oriental Research Institute Manuscripts Library.
G = Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Chennai.	TT = Tiruvavāṭuturai Tirumaṭam.
I = Institut Français de Pondichéry.	TU = Tamil University, Tanjore.
P = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France.	
Pe = Pērūr Cāntaliṅka Atikaḷār Tirumaṭam in Coimbatore	

C1 (1074/2227)	Ca2 (3152/111)	I4 (RE47681/—)	T2 (4108/2676)
C5 (416/193)	G2 (TD939/R1236)	I5 (RE47752/—)	T3 (6389/2675)
C6 (813/194)	G6 (TR964/R1269)	P1 (Indien 66)	T7 (10318/2673)
C7 (892/195)	G8 (TR1635/R2865)	P2 (Indien 67)	TT1 (201/?)
C8 (704/196)	G9 (TR1506/R2688)	Pe (79/—)	TT2 (201/?)
C9 (743/197)	G10 (TR1588/R2806)	SM1 (227/254)	TU3 (2252/3697)
C11 (1072/2231)	G11 (TR2303/R5184)	SM3 (973/1125)	
Ca1 (3092/110)	I2 (RE25365/—)	SM4 (1587/?)	

⁴⁶ Four more MSS, recently made available to me thanks to NETamil, are to be added to this list (Pe and T6–T8).

Catalogues of Manuscripts

- C = Chennai, U.V.S. Library—*A Descriptive Catalogue of Tamil Manuscripts in Mahāmahōpādhyāya Dr. V. Swāmināthaiyar Library*. 6 vols. Madras, Adyar: Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. V. Swaminathaiyer Library, 1956–1977.
- Ca = Calcutta, National Museum—*kalkattā tēciya nūlakat tamiḷc cuvāṭikaḷ*. By Mu. Caṇmukam Piḷḷai & I. Cuntaramūrṭti. Ceṇṇai: Ceṇṇai palkalaik kaḷakam, 1979.
- G = Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Chennai—*Descriptive Catalogue of Tamil Manuscripts in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras*. 11 vols. Madras: Government Press, 1912–1960. *A Triennial Catalogue of Manuscripts Collected during the Triennium ... for the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras*. 13 vols. Madras: Government Press, 1913–1970.
- P = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France—*Catalogue sommaire des manuscrits Indiens, Indo-Chinois & Malayo-Polynésiens, Bibliothèque Nationale, Département des manuscrits*. Par A. Cabaton. Paris: Leroux, 1912. Based on printed proofs of *Catalogue tamoul, télinga et malaya*, by Julien Vinson, Paris, 1867.
- SM = Tanjore Maharaja Serfoji Sarasvati Mahal Library, Tanjore—*A Descriptive Catalogue of the Tamil Manuscripts in the Tanjore Maharaja Sarfoji's Saraswathi Mahal Library, Tanjore*. By L. Olaganatha Pillay. 3 vols. Srirangam: Sri Rani Vilas Press, 1925–1927¹, 1960–1964².—*tamiḷc cuvāṭikaḷiṇ viḷakkam*. 26 vols. Tañcāvūr: tañcāvūr makārājā carapōjjiyīṇ caracuvati makāl nūnilaiyam, 1964–2003.
- T = Trivandrum, Oriental Institute Research and Manuscripts Library, University of Kerala—*Descriptive Catalogue of Tamil Manuscripts*. Ed. by O. Padmakumari. 3 vols. Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library, University of Kerala (The Kerala University Tamil Series; 6–8), 2013.
- TU = Tamil University, Tanjore—*tamiḷccuvāṭikaḷ viḷakka aṭṭavaṇai*. 8 vols. Tañcāvūr: tamiḷp palkalaikkaḷakam, 1987–2010.

printed Editions

Akanānūru. akanānūru. pāṭiṅōr pāṭappaṭōr varalārukaḷuṭaṅ. Ed. by Puliyūrk Kēcikaṅ. 3 vols. Ceṅṅai: Pāri nilaiyam, 2002.

Garuḍapurāṇa: atha garuḍamahāpurāṇāprārambhaḷ. Ed. by n.n. Muṃbai: Śrīveṃkaṭeśvara ṣṭim yantrālaya, Saṃvat 1963 [= 1906 CE].

Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad: The Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad: A Critical Essay, with Text, Translation and Commentary. Ed. and trans. by J. A. B. van Buitenen. Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae 6.6. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1962.

Narriṅai: A Critical Edition and an Annotated Translation of the Narriṅai. Ed. by Eva Wilden. 2 vols. Critical Texts of Caṅkam Literature 1.1–1.2. Chennai: École française d'Extrême-Orient and Tamilmann Patippakam, 2008.

Paṭṭinappālai. pattuppāṭṭu kaṭiyalūr uruttiraṅkaṅṅaṅār iyarriya paṭṭinappālai. Ed. by Po. Vē. Cōmacuntaraṅār. Ceṅṅai: Tirunelvēli teṅṅintiya caiva cittānta nūrpatippuk kaḷakam, 2001.

Pattuppāṭṭu.

(1) *Pattuppāṭṭu mūlamum maturaiyācīriyar pāratuvāci naccinārkkīṅiyar uraiyum.* Ed. by U. Vē. Cāminātaiyar. 5thed. Ceṅṅai: Kapīr Accukkūṭam, 1956a. Other editions: 1889¹, 1918², 1931³, 1950⁴, 1961⁶, 1986.

(2) *Pattuppāṭṭu. mūlamum uraiyum. mutarpakuti.* Ed. by Po. Vē. Cōmacuntaraṅār. Tirunelvēli: Tirunelvēli Teṅṅintiya Caivacittānta Nūrpatippuk Kaḷakam, 1956b.

Piṅkala nikaṅṭu. s.n. piṅkalantai eṅṅum piṅkala nikaṅṭu. piṅkalamuṅivar aruḷiceytatu. tirunelvēli – Ceṅṅai: tirunelvēli teṅṅintiya caivacittānta nūrpatippuk kaḷakam, 1968.

Puṅaṅnūru. Ed. by U. Vē. Cāminātaiyar. *puṅaṅnūru mūlam.* 2nd ed. Ceṅṅai: tākṭar u. vē. cāminātaiyar nūl nilaiyam, 1993.

Tirumurukārruppaṭai.

(1) *Tirumurukārruppaṭai uraiyācīriyar urai.* Ed. by n.n., s.d. [edition mentioned by Niklas (1990: 76)].

(2) *Tirumurukārruppaṭai maturai kataiccaṅkattu makāvittuvāṅākiya nakkīratēvar aruḷicceytatu.* Ed. by Ārumukanāvalar. [Ceṅṅai]:

Vittiyānupālana-yantiracālai. pīramātīca, aippaci, 1853. Other editions: 1866², 1873³, 1881⁴, 1886⁵, 1906⁸, 1935¹⁵.

- (3) *Tirumurukāruppaṭai parimēlaḷakarurai*. Ed. by Ti. Caṇmukaṭṭai. Ceṇṇai: Jīvarakṣāmirta accukkūṭam, 1885–1886? [edition mentioned by Vaiyāpurip Piḷḷai (1943: xxiv)].
- (4) *Tirumurukāruppaṭai [uraiyācīriyar uraiyuṭaṇ]*. Ed. by S. Vaiyāpurip Piḷḷai. Centamiḷppiracuram 68. Maturai: Maturait Tamillccaṅkamuttirācālai, 1943. [Reprinted in Vaiyāpurip Piḷḷai (2001: 133–154)]
- (5) *Maturaik kaṭaiccaṅkattup pulavarkaḷuḷ talaimai perravarākiya Nakkīratēvar aruḷicceya Tirumurukāruppaṭai mūlamum, parimēlaḷakar uraiyum*. Ed. by Kō. Vaṭivēlu Ceṭṭiyār. 2nd ed. Ceṇṇai: Srī cātu irattiṇa carḱkuru puttakacālai, 1945? Other edition: 1924¹.
- (6) *Tirumurukāruppaṭai mūlamum uraiyum*. Ed. by S. Vaiyāpurip Piḷḷai. 4th ed. Ceṇṇai: Caivacittānta makā camājam, 1946. Other edition: 1933¹.
- (7) *Tirumurukāruppaṭai uraikkottu. naccīnārkkīriyar, uraiyācīriyar, parimēlaḷakar, kavipperumāl, pariti uraikaḷum, āṅkilamolīpeyarppum*. Ed. by K. M. Vēṅkaṭarāmaiyar, Vē. Rā. Teyvacikāmaṅik Kavunṭar, and T.M. Kumarakuruparan Piḷḷai. [tiruppanantāḷ: kācimaṭam], 1959. Other edition: 1999⁴.
- (8) *Un texte de la religion Kaumāra. Le Tirumurukāruppaṭai*. Ed. and trans. by Jean Filliozat. Publications de l'Institut français d'indologie 49. Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1973.
- (9) *Tirumurukāruppaṭai (putiya uraiyuṭaṇ)* 1933 and 1935. *tirumurukāruppaṭai (uraiyācīriyauraiyuṭaṇ)* 1943. Ed. by Vaiyāpurip Piḷḷai. Reprint. 4. In: Ca. Vaiyāpurip Piḷḷai, *cīrrilakkīyat tiraṭṭu* (pp. 95–190), 2001.
- (9) *Tirumurukāruppaṭai*. Ed. by Cāmi Civañāṇam. Caracuvati makāl veḷiyiṭu 455. Tañcāvūr: Tañcāvūr makārājā carapōjjiyṇ caracuvati makāl nūlakam, 2003.
- Tolkāppiyam* of Tolkāppiyar: *Tolkāppiyam – Poruḷatikāram (An English Translation with Critical Notes)*. Ed. and trans. by L. Gloria Sandramathy and Indra Manuel. Thiruvananthapuram: International School of Dravidian Linguistics, 2010.

Secondary Sources

- Arumugham, K. 1981. *A Critical Study of Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar*. Madras: University of Madras.
- Aruṇācalam, Mu. 2005a [1972]. *Tamiḷ ilakkiya varalāru. pattām nūṛṛāṇṭu*. Reprint. Ceṇṇai: The PARKAR.
- Aruṇācalam, Mu. 2005b [1971]. *Tamiḷ ilakkiya varalāru. paṭiṇorām nūṛṛāṇṭu*. Reprint. Ceṇṇai: The PARKAR.
- Chevillard, Jean-Luc. 2008. *Companion Volume to the Cēṇāvaraiyam on Tamil Morphology and Syntax/Le commentaire de Cēṇāvaraiyar sur le Collatikāram du Tolkāppiyam vol. 2: English Introduction, glossaire analytique, appendices*. Collection Indologie – 84.2. Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry and École française d’Extrême-Orient.
- Chitty, Simon Casie. 1946. *The Tamil Plutarch. A Summary Account of the Lives of Poets and Poetesses of Southern India and Ceylon*. Colombo: General Publishers.
- Filliozat, Jean. 1973. See TMAP (1973).
- Francis, Emmanuel. 2015. “Der seltene Fall eines benutzerfreundlichen tamilischen Manuskripts/The Rare Case of a User-Friendly Tamil Manuscript.” *Manuskript des Monats/ Manuscript of the Month* July: 20–21.
- . 2016. “Found in Paratexts: Murukan’s Places in Manuscripts of the *Tirumurukāṛruppaṭai*.” In *The Archaeology of Bhakti II: Royal Bhakti, Local Bhakti*, ed. by Emmanuel Francis and Charlotte Schmid, 495–532. Collection Indologie 132. Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry and École française d’Extrême-Orient.
- . 2017. “The Other Way Round: From Print to Manuscript.” In *Indic Manuscript Cultures through the Ages: Material, Textual, and Historical Investigations*, ed. by Vincenzo Vergiani, Daniele Cuneo, and Camillo Formigatti, 319–351. Studies in Manuscript Cultures 14. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Genette, Gérard. 1979. *Introduction à l’architexte*. Paris: Seuil.
- . 1992. *The Architext: An Introduction*. Trans. by Jane E. Lewin. With a Foreword by Robert Scholes. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Hultzsck, Eugen. 1895. "Udayendiram Plates of Nandivarman Pallavamalla." *South-Indian Inscriptions 2.3, Additional Inscriptions in the Taiñjāvûr Temple and other miscellaneous Inscriptions*: 361–374.
- Lehmann, Thomas. 2009. "A Survey of Classical Tamil Commentary Literature." In *Between Preservation and Recreation: Tamil Traditions of Commentary. Proceedings of a Workshop in Honour of T.V. Gopal Iyer*, ed. by Eva Wilden, 55–70. Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry and École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Niklas, Ulrike. 1990. *A System for Tamil Literature. Classical, Post-Classical, Neo-Classical. Based on the Subject Catalogue of the Janert Koeln Library of Tamil Texts. Classical, Post-Classical, Neo-Classical*. Bonn: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.
- Rajam, V. S. 1992. *A Reference Grammar of Classical Tamil Poetry (150 B.C.-pre-fifth/sixth century A.D.)*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Satinsky, Ruth. 2015. "What can the lifespans of Rṣabha, Bharata, Śreyāmsa, and Ara tell us about the History of the concept of Mount Meru?" *International Journal of Jaina Studies* 11.1: 1–24.
- Scheuer, Jacques. 1982. *Śiva dans le Mahābhārata*. Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études, section des sciences religieuses 84. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Vaiyāpurip Piḷḷai. 1943. See TMAP (1943).
- Vaiyāpurip Piḷḷai, Ca. 2001. *Pēraciriyar vaiyāppurippilḷai patippitta cīṟṟilakkiyat tiraṭṭu. tokuti – 1. potuppatippāciriyar I. Cuntaramūrtti*. Cennai: Cennai palkalaikkalākam.
- Wilden, Eva. 2004. "On the Condensation and Extension of Knowledge: The *Sūtra* Style in the *Tolkāppiyam Poruḷatikāram*." In *South-Indian Horizons. Felicitation Volume for François Gros on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday*, ed. by Jean-Luc Chevillard et al., 177–206. Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry and École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- . 2014. *Manuscript, Print and Memory: Relics of the Caṅkam in Tamil nadu*. Studies in Manuscript Cultures 3. Berlin: De Gruyter.

———. 2017. “Making Order in the Vaults of Memory: Tamil Satellite Stanzas on the Transmission of Texts.” *Kervan. International Journal of Afro-Asiatic Studies* (online) 21: 317–337.

Zvelebil, K.V. 1973. *The Smile of Murugan. On Tamil Literature of South India*. Leiden: Brill.

———. 1995. *Lexicon of Tamil Literature*. Leiden [etc.]: Brill.