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Criticism and Truth:

Truth is the ultimate end of all human endeavours. The histories of arts and science tell us that this search for truth has been vigorous and continuous down the ages and that it has been going on since the emergence of the discrete Home Sapiens. There have been countless observations made in laboratories and observatories and more and more artistic compositions worked out in order to reach at truth. Yet it has been elusive to human spirit. What was thought as truth yesterday is found to be untruth today forcing humanity to go on with its search for truth.

Truth is such an object of pursuit because it is the most essential factor for human survival. It is its ultimate hope. Falsehood or ignorance or untruth destines mankind to insecurity and therefore pursuit of truth has become peremptory for human survival. The various departments of human affairs are founded on this secure truth. Wherever there is untruth, there is threat of life; threat to development. The intuitive survival instinct in man urges him to grab at truth so that he may live. Thus truth for man is life. The idea of salvation also insists upon this. This aspect of the ontological philosophy of truth can be explained in a simple way. That is seeing truth in its actual mode of existence in relation to the various levels of human existence.

On the physical side, science discovers material truth. This discovery is not whole but in part, that is why we have innovations and modifications from time to
time. Such discoveries of the physical science are attempts of man to make him more and more physically secure from the material force of nature.

There are two other dangers also for man; the intellectual ignorance of Truth, viz., intellectual untruth and the spiritual ignorance of Truth, and spiritual untruth. Arts like architecture, sculpture, painting, music, poetry and philosophy, pursue Truth intellectually and aesthetically. The findings and attainments in these fields are not whole but in part; that is why we have ever so many corrections and improvements from time to time by artists and intellectuals of various kinds. They have all attempted to make man intellectually secure.

On the spiritual side, we have in every period ages and saints contemplating truth. Such endeavours are to make man spiritually secure. Hence, these three vital aspects of truth becomes the human kind contemplates for its survival.

Now, it becomes inevitable to find out the nearness of truth and literature. We can say the creation of literature is a part of the intellectual human endeavour to find truth. It is also a search for aesthetic truth and the truth of a higher order of things. It is a serious attempt to make humanity remain secure in the existing order of affairs, create and perpetuate a vital and valid order of values. From this, we can assert that this search for truth, and in consequence, attempting up a higher order of value systems becomes the primary purpose of literature.

This illustrates the point that truth lies secure in the care of literature. Having understood, we immediately turn to the question of effective creation of art. Now, it must be said that the efficiency of literature in championing the cause of truth depends on how effectively it is created. In other words, it ought not to have deviated
from the right course of effective creation. It must be free from all kinds of extravagances and vanities that might distract us from seeing the truth. It means that it must be free from prejudice and untruthful influences so that it produces the right effect in the mind of the reader. Now the right effect, of course, is of the highest order. However, it is not easy considering our human limitations to be free from short comings in creating literature. Therefore it ought to be agreed that and certain norms are inevitable to hold literature setting forth to guard literature with such interests as its highest obligation.

What criticism is?

Coombes defines literary criticism is "a disciplined relevance in response, comment and determination of significance" (9). Leavis' comment on literary criticism is great use to us in this context when we try to know what criticism in general means. It is simple and clear to the point and brief enough. In a broader sense it is a search for truth and in a limited way in its response. The critical activity we may say is a byproduct of any response. This activity is but natural. In other words it is the natural activity of any intellectual being. Here and how we must clear a misunderstanding the moment we think of a critical activity. Criticism is an orthodox sense we understood as "fault-finding" (Irmscher 300). More positively looking at it with Irmscher "it does not mean it propose to find fault with things, what it means is that we want to ask questions, try to understand and come to conclusions about things we like or do not like"(300). In brief as said earlier we ‘respond’. "We respond either consciously or sub consciously every time we hear a speech see a film or listen to a concert (300)". Therefore we may assert that a physical expression
of such abstract. Such a response can be called criticism. Hereby physical expression, we mean the expression in concrete terms.

We may further say that it cannot be a mere expression of response in concrete terms. It may prove disastrous if it is taken in the literal sense. Therefore, a qualifier is preemptory which Eliot supplies. According to him, “criticism must always profess an end in view which... appears to be elucidation of work of art and the correction of taste” (Lodge 48). The “end in view” Truth as it cannot be otherwise since the Truth is mankind’s archetypal pursuit, which cannot be obtained through any means other than a perpetual “correction of taste” to which “elucidation” become a means.

Literary criticism

We respond when we hear a speech, watching a film or listening to a concert and while reading. When this response is produced in relation to literature it becomes literary criticism. A clear idea of literary criticism is essential in order to comprehend fully what evaluatory criticism means and how it becomes relevant to our study. It finds certain systems of approach in raising to a literary question. When we look at criticism in this way, we are confronted with D.H Lawrence’s approach to literary criticism as a science, which appears in the opening paragraph of his essay on John Galsworthy. “Literary criticism can be no more than a reasoned account of the feeling produced upon the critic by the book he criticizes. Criticism can never be a science. It is in the first place, much too personal and in the second, it is concerned with values which science ignores. The touchstone is emotion not reason. We judge a work by its effect on our sincere and vital emotions and nothing else. All the critical twiddle twaddle about style and form, all this pseudo scientific classifying and analyzing of
books in limitation botanical fashion is mere impertinence and usually dull jargon” (121).

Lawrence’s view on criticism has an “anti-academic temper” (121) and is sentimental and impressionistic. Criticism is no more a product of emotion as Lawrence believes. It has in fact, objectively speaking not much to do with emotion. It has emerged into an intellectual system of thought and it is generally approved by all right thinking persons that no truth is arrived at without an objective system of exploration. Thus it has to be a science. Mere emotional reactions to a work of art denigrate criticism taking it to be a subjective level of love-hate complexities that, in consequence, cloud truth. Emotion is valuable in the sense it helps to develop an aesthetic relationship with the work of art. It is never primary. Going back to Leavis’ observation on criticism that it is “a disciplined relevance in response, comment and determination of significance” (Leavis 95). We will try to answer the latter part of Lawrence’s ridicule.

We say that criticism could not be a science. We may add wherever there is the idea of discipline as asserted by Leavis, there are an order, system and method. And the presence of these three makes a study scientific. In the critical activity, there is an identification which means distinguishing which is not possible without a stock jargon of convenience. Therefore Lawrence’s disgust at “dull jargon” in criticism is not justified. What would have happened to the world of ideas if there were no distinguishing terrors to identify every individual thing? Obviously it would be an unintelligible bolus of chaos. So would criticism end up if it were not to have a specialist’s jargon of identification?
In a world of confusion we must pit our protest against any kind of sanction towards subjectivity and leaving decision-making to individuals. In dealing with literature we must be all the more cautious that individuals do not become law makers. In a liberal world where ideas and philosophies are everyone’s individual right what we need is more and more order and discipline and unstinting systems of values and judgement. It alone implies the fate of the world that depends upon the type of evaluation we make. It is true to literature also. So as to establish the excellence in literature we must have an aid and that aid, obviously is the evaluatory system of criticism.

**The evaluatory system of criticism:**

Before we actually come to the evaluatory system of criticism, we are forced to redeem the overlapping implications of ‘valuation’ and ‘evaluation.’ The distinction is very essential to have a perfect understanding of evaluation to make out our study effective and easy. To begin with, we shall try to understand the distinction by Austin Warren’s recommendation that “men ought to value literature for being what it is they ought to evaluate it in terms of its literary value” (Wellek and Warren 142).

Valuing literature is appreciating it for what it is worth. Mankind has ‘valued’ literature either oral or printed, i.e., it has taken interest in it and has assigned positive worth to it through history. People value literature when it corresponds and coheres with their culture cluster of song, dance and religious ritual in which it seems to originate. Another implication of valuing literature is attachment to literature. Attachment simply means valuing literature in relation to its component parts (238).
There is a discussion of valuation and evaluation in some detail by Warren in his chapter, ‘Evaluation’. He registers the various labeling of literature in an answer to “what as a matter of fact, have men valued literature for? What kinds of value or worth or interest they found in it” (238). The more ancient valuation is that of Horace. The value he attached to literature was “dulce et utile” which might be translated as “entertainment” and “edification” or “play” and “work” or “terminal value” and “instrumental value” or “art” and “propaganda” or as Warren puts it, it may be understood as “art an end in itself and art as communal ritual and culture blunder” (238).

Coming to evaluation we may make the following elucidations. To say a literary work only, “I like it” or “I don’t like it” is not actually an evaluation, it is a dismissal. Personal response is an important beginning, but in some way it must be pushed further to say what the worth of a literary work is or what is lacking that would make it valuable. Evaluations therefore extend over a range of possibilities from formal considerations to private ones (Irmscher 392). Here Irmscher has put it in a nutshell what evaluation generally means. Though much abused the evaluatory system of criticism is very real and very useful to distinguish the good from the back the excellent from the mediocre. It is, no doubt, a valid approach to criticism.”Study of Criticism and Valuation of Literature,” makes the following observation, “… every reader should regard it part of his duty to encourage what is good and discourage what is bad…”(Hudson 309) and he further cautions us to be discriminative since “literature is enormous in quantity and of varying degrees of excellence” that “it is of fundamental importance that we should read the new works of new days” with a
constant sense of relative values and a desire always to discriminate so far as possible between what is genuine and what is fictitious”(312). Thus Hudson tells us that discrimination is reading with a constant sense of relative values. Without the sense of relative values we are prone to err giving too much credit to our own wisdom and ability to judge. The question of relative values necessitates the speculation of normative to evaluation of which we will see in the latter part of his chapter. Before we come to certain standard evaluations of literature we will do well to see common kinds of evaluations as they are essential to justify the usefulness of this criticism later by way of contrast.

In the first place, a work may be considered in terms of itself. It is in other words evaluating with a view to total effect produced. It contemplated what a work of art should do, namely, “that all of its part should be working towards the total effect” (Irmscher 392). Such a kind of evaluation analyses how each part relates to the whole and how the parts relate to each other. In this process, the epistemological mode of existence or the “Ontological Situs” of the literary work of art and the reason of the principles of arrangement are questioned.

In such considerations we must caution, as said early not to slip into personal whims and affinities. “Arnold’s touchstone method can be easily discredited as too infinitive, too limited or too backward looking”(392). To Hudson, this method was “rather fantastic and unconvincing” (Hudson 15). Yet we to approve of what Irmscher or Hudson says do not seem to set our thinking on “what criteria we are using when we are moved to praise a work of art” (Irmscher 392). What is common with most of the evaluators as complained above is as they have no outside criteria. “Their decision
about worth depends on themselves alone" (392). Such evaluations depending wholly upon one's personal engagement with a work it purely private kind of criticism and is of little value. It must be added here for our considerations that mush of the critical bulk of the past has gone down in esteem because of such private considerations. This is what we are known as use of misuse of a work of art. As Warren quotes "As some to church repair / not for the doctrine but the music there" (392), one may miss the vital part in a work of art. Bearing all these in mind we may briefly understand it in the way Irmscher does that "evaluation is simply a way of considering the merits and limitations in a work in separate terms" (392). There are so many separate terms according to the evaluator's idea of evaluation. When we focus our attention on the usefulness of evaluatory criticism in a study such as this one, we must try to gather all kinds of views expressed by the evaluators of the past so that we may be fully justified in agreeing or disagreeing with them when we pass our own verdict.

In evaluating literature, older advocates clamour for "pure literature" and condemn "didactic heresy" some evaluate it as "aesthetic experience" which Warren would say, "is a loving attention to qualities and quantitative structures". Some see it as "aesthetic value" or "an intermediate between "knowledge" and "action" (Wellek 239-240). Accepting it as a fine art Kant stresses in his Critique of Judgement "the purposiveness without purpose" (241). T.S Eliot in his evaluation calls it an "Objective Correlative" and suggests to evaluate the literariness of literature by aesthetic criteria and the greatness of literature by extra aesthetic criteria" (241). Yet another look in for imaginative integration and evaluate its worth by the amount
(and adversity) of material integrated. Formalistic criticism attaches value to a work of art by the degree of tightness of organization (243).

Diversity of materials is another qualifier for the greater value of literature. Bosanquet’s (Three Lectures on Aesthetic) distinctions of ‘easy beauty’ form ‘difficult beauty’ with its ‘intricacy’ ‘tension’ and ‘width’ also are evaluations of a different character. “We might express the distinctions as between a beauty achieved out of tractable materials (euphony, pleasing visual images, the poetic subject) and beauty wrested from materials which as materials are recalcitrant the painful the ugly the didactic the practical”(243-244).

Many evaluations on literature are of personal insights into a work of art. It is coloured by individual love and hate, influenced by the background and composition of the evaluating personality. Therefore an irrational undisputed subscription to such whims would be disastrous to the well being of the world of letters. Milton’s theology in Paradise Lost is unpalatable to an unorthodox Protestant, and therefore the work according to him, is an inferior kind. But it is true not all poems are the same kind. A distinction between superior and inferior is possible. “Each new poet contributes to the stream of poetic tradition. All contributions of course are not equally valuable”(246).

Before the nineteenth century, evaluations centered “upon the rank and hierarchy of the authors” with the firm belief that “that classics who always have been and always will be admired”(246). Such a belief we know has become obsolete with the new awareness of earlier classics that existed in earlier times as the Medieval, the Celtic, the Worse the Hindu and the Chinese (246).
The history of human thought might tell us that there has been no obsolete opinion that is not revised in the passage of time. All critical opinions change as a mean to continue to be conscious of his inadequacies and complexities of life and the extensiveness of vision of Truth. No subject under the sun has been exhaustively discussed and no eternal conclusions reached. As we stated earlier, what was hailed as truth and magnificent discovery of yesterday is an obsolete today. The various recommendations by different critical approaches prove their own inadequacy as the truth of art. It seems to elude absolute human comprehension as it is as complex and mysterious as life itself. No one has told us, this is truth and it lives thus.

All human thoughts have been revised, all human conclusions doubted.

From the various kinds of evaluations and the non-final inconclusive nature we learn that we have to decide upon some standard that will be self-evident and irrefutable in assessing a work of art as great or not. And Eliot’s idea of the function of criticism viz. “elucidation of works of art and the correction of taste” also simply means a need for a standard. We also understand that the evaluatory system of criticism though inadequate in itself, is by far the best we have to assess the worth of literature. But truly on what depends the evaluatory system is the pressing question we have to finally answer. This question takes us to searching out the final standard. Any work of art requires having some standard in general, and the artists possess science of literature consciously or unconsciously for making of literature.

In this perspective, Tholkappiyar has discussed the poetical use of words as Eliot involved in poetic drama as his medium and the occasion for such uses in the
chapter called \textit{Porul}. It means that which is important into the making of literature and emphasis the fact that it is a Science of Literature.

If language is intended for expressing our thoughts, the literature is meant for the experience of life. Abercrombie says: “Literature exits not only in expressing a thing; it equally exists in the receiving of a thing expressed” (Abercrombie 23). So literature must express anything in such a manner as to enable others to understand clearly what is intended and expressed but the author in the literature. It is the duty of the poet or the writer to have this object in his mind while he creates literature. While doing so, the words were made to express the meanings other than those which are found in the dictionary. The function of the words in the poems is not only to emotions, sensuous impressions and psychological intuitions. “A very large part of literary skill consists in vividly liberating for its effect on imagination on just that particular secondary meaning in words which is not only appropriate to the immediate occasion, but which will make the occasion come to life the readers mind”(41).

In poetical language, Tholkāppiyar points out, the imagination reigns supreme. All the objects of neuter gender are endowed with the power of speech and act, thought and emotion. They seem to excel in all activities of human being. They are elevated to the place of high intellectuals.

A love addresses his heart, “Oh my heart! Toughest gone in search of the lovely little lass, endowed with sweet words, bright forehead and chastity intermixed with modesty”. “Has it enjoyed her embrace made with her hands adorned with bangles? It having gone with folded hands, shutting her eyes and standing behind her touching her plait of hair which looks like the trunk of she-elephant” (\textit{Aham} 41(158).
In this poem, a heart is addressed as though it has hands and legs and power of enjoyment. Such mode of addressing is restricted to only the lady friend, the foster-mother; the mother and male friend. The lady-love must be portrayed in her capacity of possessing life, modesty and feigned ignorance (Porul 201(204).

The feigned ignorance is called *madan* in Tamil, *Madan* is taken to have denoted actual ignorance in the later centuries. Tholkāppiyar says that "self-restraint, chastity, uprightness, impartiality, knowledge and dearness are characteristics of the female" (Porul 209(205). The heroine must be portrayed in the possession of these qualities and not otherwise.

The divulgence of the secret love to the parent is called "Araththodu nirral" which means "the standing by moral code". This is a theme which would reveal the firmness of the lady-love in marrying one whom she loved, the high regard the ancient Tamils had for chastity, the decorum and decency they expected in love affairs and the dexterity of the woman folk.

There is no such occasion in literature to show the disposal of the lover towards his love. But there is a theme in which the lover is known to have been despised by his love-lady-love because of his relation with other women. It is called *Marutham* where the lady will not hate her lover or husband openly. The form of literature which is used to display her hate towards her love is called *iraichi* which will appear to be a new language to the laymen.

"What a wonder, mountain of one who has not kept his word is resplendent with shining falls. It has shining falls! It has shining falls!" (Kali 41) It is said that this
stanza contains iraichi for; it implies the lover is a liar and the mountain of a liar must have neither rain nor river. The fauna and flora of the region are employed to interweave the form of iraichi in stanzas of Aham literature.

Literary conventions of such are employed in Aham literature whereas the themes other than love belong to Puram. Literature of Puram is divided into seven main themes. Each theme of Aham has a counterpart in Puram as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aham</th>
<th>Puram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kuṟiñji</td>
<td>Vētići</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullai</td>
<td>Vañji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marutham</td>
<td>Ulinai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neythal</td>
<td>Thumbai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pālai</td>
<td>vāhai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perundhinai</td>
<td>Kāñji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikkilai</td>
<td>Pādān</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Aham is concerned with love, Puram is with all activities which are needed for conducting the family born out of love. Yet five out of seven themes of Puram are mainly concerned with war. Love and war are the two sides of a coin of life from the very olden days in all countries. Both need courage and valour. Where there is love there is war; where there is war there is love. Both go hand in hand. Ancient Tamil Nadu is not an exception to it. These two aspects of life serve as themes of literature even today.
Tholkappiyar, after discussing the *Aham* literature enters into the discussion of *Puram* giving equal importance to it. These themes of *Puram* and the poems composed on the basis of them serve as sources of the history of Ancient Tamil Nadu. He has systematized the age-old conventions of war and it is described as themes of literature.

*Vētci* leads the list. *Vētci* is said to be the act of the cattle raiding which is the first act of war. Acting stealthily during the night and achieving the object even at the face of opposition are the characteristics of *Vētci* as well as of *Kurinjī*. So, they are put as counterparts of one another. Cattle-raiding is the first and foremost act in *Vētci*. When a king declares war against his enemy king, he is bound to protect the cows, the innocent animals, from the clutches of war and so he sends his men to the country of the enemy to bring the cattle to a safe place. So, on the pretext of cattle raiding, the war will flare out. There are fourteen stages for completing the cattle raid successfully (*Puram*-58 (163). When the raid is made, the enemy king who owns the cattle will put resistance which also involves fourteen stages. So, there are twenty eight incidents in *Vētci* to serve as themes of literature. The worship of *Kotravai* the Goddess of victory finds a place as theme of *Vētci*. The singing of God starts here. The act of invoking God to help man has produced a large quantity of literature which is styled as Devotional Literature.

There are given twenty one themes which are considered as common to all the divisions of *Puram* (*Puram* 164). The erecting of stone (*Nadu Kal*) which has six
stages, it is included in these divisions. It is for perpetuating the memory of the warriors who fought for the Country and died in the battle.

*Vanji* is said to be the counterpart of *Mullai* for both have the forest as the place of action and the winter season as suitable time. It is the theme of conquering a king who is ever bent upon having expansion upon the land of others. It has thirteen stages which serve as fine subjects of original compositions. *Māṟṟāyam, Peruntjorjinilai, Korravallai,* and *Thailiṭi* are notable among them.

Next comes, *Ulinai* which is to besiege a well-guarded fort of a city and conquer it. It is the counterpart of the *Marutham* of *Aham*. Both are similar in having their place of action among the fields, the leaders being shut up inside the houses or places and having the early morning as time of action.

It has twenty stages which concern the invader and the invaded; these have served as sources of inspiration for the poets for producing original poems which are found to be numerous in the anthology of Sangam Poets.

*Thumbai*, the counterpart of *Neythal* is the culmination of war. Both *Thumbai* and *Neythal* have the sandy and muddy places of action, the sunset as time of action and the suffering and sorrow for women folk. *Thumbai* is aimed at destroying a king who comes to fight for displaying his might to others. (70 (167). It is systematized into twelve stages which form the theme of composition (72 (168).

*Thar nilai, Erumai, Nallisai nilai* and *nulil* are the remarkable themes which describe the individual valour and devotion to the country and its king. Thus the ancient war-fare was systematized into a fine art of the purpose of using it as source
of literary themes, pertaining to Puram. There are many poems of this sort which are very interesting and instructive in the collection of the Sangam period.

Vākai which is said to be the Puram of Pālai, is the name given to the theme which describes the success not only in war but also in other walks of life. The definition Vākai as given by Tholkāppiyar in the verse Porul-74 clearly indicates that war was not considered as a life-long profession. It was one of many activities which engaged the attention of the king and the people. According to Tholkāppiyar, success in all walks of life must serve as theme of literature (75 (168). It proves that the Puram Literature must be based upon the life of the people as of Aham.

The people portrayed in literature are given as the seer, king, wise man, sage, and artiste. Each consisting of nine divisions are given as themes. Here, it is to be noted that the strength of mind is taken into account as par with the bravery of the physical body. The abdication of the throne, the virtuous nature of the member of a great assembly, the possession of good conduct, the giving away of the wealth for the good cause, the forgiving of the misbehaved people, the earning of the wealth, the renunciation of power and wealth and the disinterestedness in worldly affairs are considered as activities, which concern the mental strength. When this forms the theme of literature, there is no doubt that they will ennoble the minds of the readers.

Kanji is the Puram of Perundhinai. Both have no particular places of action. They belong to all divisions of land and they resemble one another in the depiction of the opposite nature of ideal life. Kanji brings to our mind the ephemeral nature of the three virtues, ‘aram, porul and inbam’ as perundhinai describes the unnatural love.
Both are not conducive to the progress of the people. Yet they are useful to remind the people of their true purpose in life.

*Kāṇji* has twenty sub-divisions divided into two groups, each having ten. These themes give the opportunity to the poets for voicing forth their philosophical ideas to the world. Philosophy beings when the ephemeral nature of the world is known. It is a turning point in the evolution of Tamil literature. Love and war begin to lose its ground and the philosophy sets in.

These themes of *Kāṇji* are all of tragedy which is the starting ground for epic according to Aristotle. “He supposes poetry to begin in two kinds as the originating motive of all poetry tended by its very nature to diverge in two directions. Poetry namely, begins either as heroic or as satiric poetry; but out of heroic poetry develops tragedy, out of satire comes comedy” (Abercrombie 66). Heroism and tragedy go hand in hand.

Themes of the *Kāṇji* serve as good illustrations of this fact. They have formed as themes of many poems found in the anthology of *Puṟam* and of the Epics of tragedy.

*Pādan* means the song of the great and the might. The songs which are devoted to praise the kings, the patrons, the heroes and the God, come under this group. It is said to be the counter part of *Kaikkilai* in *Aham* for both resemble in offering praises to those who are loved, respected and honored without expecting reciprocations. In *Pādān* the poet addresses the Lord and in *Kaikkilai* the lover, the lady whom he loves, both have no limitations of time and place.
It is said to have eight primary divisions which are based upon the previous six groups concerning Puram and Aham. The songs which sing the praise of child, lord of particular town and family, God and the kodinilai, kandhal and valli come under this group. And, there are different of opinion in interpreting it. According to Ilampuranar, they are the flag of the king, the destruction of the fort and the praise of the benefactor. According to Naccinarkkiniyar they denote the sun, the God which is formless and the moon respectively. But Prof. S. Somasundhara Barathiyar, having kandhal instead of Kandhal, says that these belong to Vētcī and they are the themes in which the flag of the king and Lord Murukan are praised. When Lord Murukan is praised by males it is termed as kandhal and when praised by females it is called Vallī.

Of these three interpretations, Naccinarkkiniyar’s seems to be worth having though the meanings of kodinilai and valli appear to be far-fetched. The interpretation of Ilampurnar is simple and he is plain and that of Prof. Barathiyar lose its value because of his reading of Kandhal as kandhal.

Tholkāppiyar has formulated twenty six themes concerning Pādān and these are based upon the life of the people of his age. (Puram 90 (173). This Pādān is a fertile ground for producing various kinds of literature. The poets are expected to serve as the unacknowledged legislators of the country, to critics those who are not beneficial to the people, to foresee the things to come and produce literature of all kinds.
Thus *Tholkāppiyam* is systematized the conventions to be observed in the making of literature bearing in mind that the Literature is an interpretation of life through imagination and the feelings as how Eliot outpours poetic drama.

Tholkāppiyar, after having discussed the contents of literature, enters into the channeling of emotions which we experience while enjoying the literature into the concept of Eliot’s impersonal theory. Emotions are exhibited by physical actions without which they remain unknown. So Tholkāppiyar calls the experience of the emotion or the feeling *Meyppādu* means that it appears in the body.

He has given eight kinds of *Meyppādu* which are laughter, weeping, despised ness, wonder, fear, fortitude, anger, and delight. Then he points out the sources from which they spring. Each *Meyppādu* has four sources. Because of their sources, they amount to thirty two.

In *Aham* literature, love plays prominent role. So the experiences of a lady-love are graphically analyzed and put forth in order for the convenience of the poet. “What is poetry” asks Mill, “But the thought and words in which emotion spontaneously embodies itself” (Hudson 64). So it is the duty of the poets to be well versed in the art of displaying emotions in the literature. Further, it is to be known that the critical study of literature in his branch was as well advanced in the age of Tholkāppiyar. Very many poems, plays, novels, and songs owed their popularity in his age, solely to the skill of the writers to play on the feelings of audience and readers.

“In true art, the emotions are not only stirred they are also brought into artistic relation with other elements of the experience by the power of the poet’s words. The
emotions are held to the experience and worked into its utility because they go to intensify the thought and imagination and thus vitalize those activities" (Gurrey 38).

The chapter on Meyppâdu serves this purpose well. Use of figures of speech in poems is a great device employed by poets to light up the imaginations with pictures. So Tholkâppiyar has paid his attention to the treatment of the figures of speech in literature. He has named it Ūvama Iyal the chapter on Smile.

“Simile is the simplest of the figures, and I supposed philologists would tell us it is the oldest; the easiest way to give an idea of an unknown thing” (Lamborn 87). The fact, what Tholkâppiyar has treated simile supports this view. There are metaphor, hyperbole and personification found used in poems of the post-Tholkâppiyar age. No mention is made about them in Tholkâppiyam. Simile is to be considered as the mother of all figures of speech. Comparison is the origin of using simile, from which other figures of speech are developed in course of time. Comparison is made mainly on the basis of four which are action, result, body and color (Porul 276 (218). It is pointed out that comparison is made to denote either excellence, or goodness or love or strength or inferiority (279,280 (218). When comparison is made, the following principles are found to be observed:

* The while and the part of one object may be compared with the same of another object or with one another.
* The object of comparison and the object compared must be in the similar nature.
* Compared object may be used as object of comparison.
* Object of comparison must be superior to those of compared.
* Hyperbole is not desirable (285(219).

* Use of many similes in succession is to be avoided.

* Indication of similar nature between the object of comparison and the object compared is not compulsory.

* Using of words of comparison (uvama urupu) must follow the traditional way.

* There are some rules to be observed when uvamappoli is employed in Aham literature.

_Uvamappōli_ is another name for Ullurai. Tholkāppiyar has not included metonymy in the figures of speech but he has mentioned it in the book on Sol for it is used not only by poets but also by all. He has indicated that the use of the personification belongs to poetry.

Thus simile or_Uvam_ is given prominence and treated separately in chapter. This indicates its popularity in the age of Tholkāppiyar and its role in the making of literature. It lends style to the poem. F.L. Lucas views style without metaphor and simile is a day without sun or a wood-land without birds.” Tennyson laid down the first canon of poetry when he said speaking for all true poets it does not matter what we say, if people only knew; but it matters everything how we say it. _Uvamam_ influences the form of saying and makes literature a thing of beauty.

Besides, the artists must be conversant with books of Geography, Astronomy, Zoology, Ethics, Religion, Agricultural Sciences, Theology and Sociology. Only such learned scholars could produce immortal works of art. In this, _Seyittam_ written by Seyittianar is remembered for a few sutras, _Guna-Nool_ by an unknown author, a few
stanzas available in Sayanthanam and Mathivanam, a Nāttaka, (drama) a Tamil book in Sūtrās and Venbā metres serves a great service to the generations. Only they could excel either in imaginative pieces (where persons and events are purely imagined) or realism based on the day-to-day life of the people. These two categories may be called the romantic works and the realistic works. Such works could be composed only by the greatest scholars. Many of the poets who lived before and just after Tholkāppiyar were thus noted for their matchless erudition.