III. PHILOSOPHICAL VIEWS OF NACCINĀRKKINĪYAR.

I.

Now that the Digambara view of Salvation denied to women had been referred to, one may proceed to discuss certain statements of Naccinārkkiniyar which probably are to be explained in terms of his philosophy and religion. When he, along with Ilampūranar refers to the eight aspects of phonological study, he asserts that vātīvū 'shape' is one of such studies, though, he hastens to add that it cannot be explained to us. What he means by the shape is made clearer when he describes the characteristic feature of the sounds later on.

He points out "There are people who asserts that the spoken sound are formless. These do not know the truth. We hold these having forms; they crowd and move on; and for crowding they come on; they are thrown in the middle (perhaps between other sounds. Others have explained these as referring to the sounds pressing into a vessel or instrument returning as an echo and pronounced in the vacant space). They press on the ears and there they create pleasure and șunte pain; they are born out of a mixture of forms and forms, it is also stated that they remain as taking them for their place of articulation in the head, the throat or the chest and they are articulate;
there, through a contact with teeth, lips, tongue and palate. Because of these, the sounds must be taken to have forms. If they are without forms they could not possess all the characteristic feature here enumerated. Even otherwise this fact is established by the statement that the sounds are hard, \textit{vali}, soft \textit{meli} and middling \textit{itai}. We have explained the reason for this already".

He continues "Tolkāppiyar has not defined the shape of these forms of the sounds thinking that it is difficult to explain to others. What particular shape, a particular sound would take out of the thirtytwo possible shapes. When analysed, the sounds are found to assume the shapes which they obtain then and there; if the sound is pronounced within a flute it takes the shape of the flute; if it is pronounced into a pot it assumes the form of the pot; it assumes, when pronounced in open space the shape of all the direction of the space, like the water waves which proceed an all sides."

After the classification of consonants into hard, soft and middling, he concludes "Because of these names, the spoken sound should be taken as having form. For the vowels also, the author speaks of shortness and length. Therefore they also have forms. This applies dependent sounds" also.
These statements are found in Ilampuramar also.

In defining the term **elutta** 'spoken sound' Naccinarkkiniyar states that the "sound is that which has a form is not visible to the eye and a shape which is visible to the eye and thus separately defined denotes itself and also becomes one with the words. The roar of the sea and the sound of the conch have no meaning. Hence, they are not spoken as sound. The noise made by a man whistling or coughing or straining himself though having meaning are not formed of spoken sounds and therefore they are not considered here. The form, here referred to is what is realised by mind, that is, a conception. The sound goes away when pressed and crowded together. It also comes just to crowd; it is also thrown out in the middle. It causes pleasure and pain; it is born because of a conjunction of form with another form. It starts from the navel and is articulated at eight different places. It has no visible nature, but it presses against and reaches the ear and in that way it is a matter of tectual sensation. It is born in the vicumpu or 'ākās' and has the nature of a movement. Therefore it has a form which is the quality or characteristic feature of the element of air; because one assumes the hardness, the softness and middling
mature of by forms vary, then the nature of the sound must have a form. The sound is the quality of the air. That is the opinion or conclusion of our author. There are others who will state that it is the quality of ākāśa (Nyayavaisesikas).

II.

It is only the Mīmāṃsika School of Philosophy that speaks of the sound as being the characteristic feature of the element air. The above definition of spoken sound reminds us of the Mīmāṃsikas who speak of three elements therein viz. (1) Nādā, a quality of the air (2) dvani, the sound as heard and (3) Spota or intelligible sound. Note the instance on signification in Naccinārkkīnīyar's explanations. He rejects the roar of the sea because it has no meaning. Sabara, the commentator on Jaimini's sutras considers Nādā as a wave motion of air, being the transmission of conjunctions and disjunctions in the minute particles of air. The air wave to him is not a vehicle of sound but sound itself. Note the comparison with the waves of the water which Naccinārkkīnīyar gives.

The question arises how Naccinārkkīnīyar comes to make the statement that Tolkāppiyar believes in the sound
being the characteristic feature of air. Tolkāppiyar speaks of the sound being breathed out or uyīrtal. In the chapter on Pirappiyal he speaks of air starting from the navel and ultimately coming out as various sounds. In the last sutram of Pirappiyal the term may teri vālīyicai is emphasised by Naccinārkkinīyar as the meaningful sounds which are but transformation of the air. Ilampūranar’s commentary is more explicit. Tolkāppiyar, instead of speaking of vāli speaks of vāli icai in the sutram. It is termed vāli so long as it resides in the chest. It assumes the characteristic feature of sound by being so transformed, after it leaves the chest.

It is on this ground that Naccinārkkinīyar speaks of Tolkāppiyar as holding this view that the sound is ultimately nothing but the element air.

III.

Naccinārkkinīyar is said to belong Bāratvaja Gōtra of Brahmans of Madurai. He does not seem to be a Vaishnavite; probably he was an Advidic. His interpretation on the term kantali in Tolkāppiyam and his interpretation of Tirumurukārruppatai and to his reference to Gīta and its teachings in māturaikkāṇḍi make him an advaidin. As
already stated his monism comes in when he denies that there is anything like number two whilst explaining the short-vowels which as one unit precedes the long vowel of two units.  

IV.

His explanation of \( \underline{\text{c}} \ a \ \underline{\text{J}} \) further brings out this philosophical aspect and also his knowledge \( \underline{\text{g}} \) of Gita. In the first sutram he speaks of two kinds of vowels; one is the ordinary vowel, and the other is that which occurs with the consonants.

In his interpretation of ff. 8 he explains the conception of the term \( \underline{\text{vyik}} \). "Even as the body is removed by like or soul, the (inert) consonants are moved by the vowel which is formless and shapeless". As Naccinarkkiniyar has asserted in so many places that sounds have a form or \( \underline{\text{uru}} \) though not a shape it may at first seem that he could not have stated that it is \( \underline{\text{aru}} \). But, it will be seen that he is differentiating the \( \underline{\text{aru}} \ \underline{\text{c}} \ a \ \underline{\text{J}} \) and \( \underline{\text{uru}} \ \underline{\text{c}} \ a \ \underline{\text{J}} \); the casual \( \underline{\text{c}} \ a \ \underline{\text{J}} \) and the resulting \( \underline{\text{c}} \ a \ \underline{\text{J}} \). Because of these, the vowels are called life or soul that is, vowel alone makes possible the movements of consonants. This will amounts to
saying that there is no such thing as vowel per se standing separate. This is the problem. Having raised it, Naccinärk-
kiniyar answers that the vowel which stands with a consonant and the vowel as such which stands separate are two different things. When it is stated that the sound of \( \text{k} \) is material cause of consonants it means that \( \text{k} \) stands not only as an individual and separate vowel, but also as the life of the consonants like \( \text{k} \) etc. thus assuming two conditions or forms; that is, \( \text{k} \) stands alone; in addition to its harmonising with the various consonants to effect the various sounds. These two aspects are thus different. Naccinärkkiniyar takes the \( \text{k} \) as having the characteristic feature of being both the one and the many. This is like God standing apart all alone as unique and also standing as the one for all souls and as such taking the forms of these souls.

There is the sutram which states that it is the nature of the consonant to stand with dot or pulli. Naccinärkkiniyar writes on this thus: "This means that before the dot is placed the consonant stands with \( \text{k} \) which is one with it. It is this which is made into an independent consonant with the dot. Because of this Naccinärkkiniyar continues \( \text{k} \), \( \text{n} \) etc. stand always with the natural \( \text{k} \) and
therefore when they got their dots the natural $\sim a \,
\tilde{\iota}$ goes away. When this dot is removed and when the
vowels comes to form a syllable with the consonant the natural
$\sim a \,
\tilde{\iota}$ having completely disappeared, the vowel can combine with the
consonants. 21 He further refers to in ff. 46.

In his commentary on ff. 17 he further elucidates these points. 22
Consonants have got two characteristic features (1) Standing
separate from its natural $\sim a \,
\tilde{\iota}$ and (2) Combining with any one vowel. So also the vowel has got
two characteristic feature (1) one of remaining as the natural
$\sim a \,
\tilde{\iota}$ standing inside the consonant though not becoming
patent and (2) the other becoming patent as a proper vowel.

In his commentary on the ff. 46 that is, the
movement or behaviour of the consonants occurring in combina-
tion to $\sim a \,
\tilde{\iota}$ he explains thus: "Here the consonant is the
independent consonant as different from the consonant in
syllable. The consonant in the former place harmonises and
moves with an $\sim a \,
\tilde{\iota}$. Therefore when one puts in motion
through or with the tongue the independent consonants as a
concept with a mental form, the movement occurs harmonised
with natural $\sim a \,
\tilde{\iota}$. Where the consonant is moved, that is,
used as having the three kinds of forms visible to the eye, there also, it moves harmonised with the $\text{a} \, \text{/}$. As a concept the consonants as such are found to move harmonised with $\text{a} \, \text{/}$. See the ff. 16 and 89. When we write down the consonants etc., we first write them with their forms in which there is an $\text{a} \, \text{/}$ or vowel and thereafter denote with a dot which makes it into an independent consonant. Therefore even when the script is used, the $\text{a} \, \text{/}$ etc., have the form harmonised with $\text{a} \, \text{/}$. In this way Tolkāppiyar has stated that the $\text{a} \, \text{/}$ is found one with the consonants. In a similar way he has not stated the $\text{a} \, \text{/}$ stands one with each of the eleven other vowels. That is, because it is apparent only to him and also because it is difficult to explain and teach that truth to others. In this way God stands inside the things which moves the things which move not and in other things, becoming one with them and assuming their respective special characteristic features. This is a conclusion which has been accepted by all. Even so, the $\text{a} \, \text{/}$ is found mixed with the other vowels and independent consonants becoming one with them and assuming their respective characteristic features. This is also a common ground to all great man. In the Tirukkural which begins with $\text{akara mutala eluttu ellam}$ there is a simila
viz. "all the sounds have $\tilde{\eta}$ a $\tilde{\eta}$ for their primary cause, even so, the world has for its primary cause God."

Thus, Tiruvalluvar expresses the simile. Krishna also states "I am $\tilde{\eta}$ a $\tilde{\eta}$ in all the sounds". The statement here made, may be realised thus by a reference to Tirukkural and Gita and other works. In this manner Tolkappiyar states in a way the characteristic feature of the truth about the sound.

V.

Maccinārkkāniyar speaks of two kinds of $\tilde{\eta}$ a $\tilde{\eta}$ one what is called the natural $\tilde{\eta}$ a $\tilde{\eta}$, the aru 'the casual stage' as distinguished form from uru the result or evolved stage.

The formless natural or casual shape of all the sounds is spoken of as $\tilde{\eta}$ a $\tilde{\eta}$ which will write as Parimēlakkar will speak of as Nāda. To use a different term like Nāda for the casual $\tilde{\eta}$ a $\tilde{\eta}$ will clarify the position. Therefore we shall speak of natural $\tilde{\eta}$ a $\tilde{\eta}$ as Nāda and $\tilde{\eta}$ a $\tilde{\eta}$ which is said to have evolved a form and which is the $\tilde{\eta}$ a $\tilde{\eta}$ we pronounce may be denoted by ordinary term $\tilde{\eta}$ a $\tilde{\eta}$. It is the Nāda which is said to be moving all the other sounds, consonants and vowels. It is this Nāda which is found to become one with the sounds.
And again it is this Nādā which is symbolised in the script form of consonants which we write before putting the dot. It is this Nādā which assumes or which is transformed into various sounds of the language. It is the material cause of all the sounds. This Nādā is different from the \( \sqrt{a} \) which we pronounce. Nādā underlies even this pronounced \( \sqrt{a} \) as well. The letter \( \sqrt{a} \) is like other sounds evolved out of this Nādā.

It is this Nādā, according to Nacciṅarkkiniyar that is, meant by the word \( \sqrt{a} \), both in Tirukkural and Gita. The various sounds are not different from the Nādā. They are but its variations. Even so, God is also one and all; the rest are but mere reflections or refractions. In this way, once again, Nacciṅarkkiniyar injects advaitic theory into his commentary.

**VII.**

There is one other place in which Nacciṅarkkiniyar reveals his philosophy. The Mīmāṃsikās believe that the Vēdās are eternal and therefore the spoken sounds which make up the Vēdās are also eternal. But, if one believes in one's perception, it looks as though the sounds are born
when the words begin to pronounce but die when we cease to pronounce. But as already stated the sound have a casual uru or nada stage and also a uru or evolved stage. The uru may appear to die but it is only an withdrawing into its cause.

In explaining the coming together of two words in sandhi, Naccinārkkiṇiṇiyar writes thus: "The last sound of the standing word or first word is born first and dies. After that, the initial sound of the coming word or the second word is born and then it dies. Therefore, that which are born or dead one after another cannot come together; therefore there is no such thing as sandhi. This problem is raised by others and Naccinārkkiṇiṇiyar having stated proceeds to answer it. Those who utter those words and those who listen to them realise in their mind those sounds without any break what so ever; Therefore those sounds without any trace of destruction being well established and permanent in the mind, these sandhi occurs there, in the mind itself. The sandhi which is seen with the eye, later on, is also made possible.

He is not a follower of Mīmāṃsāka’s philosophy so as to deny God. There was an older tradition as revealed in Manimēkalai that both the pūrva Mīmāṃsāka and Uttra Mīmāṃ-
śāka formed one whole and interpreted by one stage sage
Kirutakōdi. The advaitins, especially this Smarthas
believe in Advaita Philosophy though continuing to believe
in the Karma Kānta.
Philosophical views of Naccinarkkiniyar.
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