TPM Vol. 32, No. S2, 2025
ISSN: 1972-6325
https://www.tpmap.org/

Open Access

SACRED SEMIOTICS: HISTORICAL PATTERNS OF HINDU DEVOTIONAL SYMBOLS IN RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT

MR. R. ELANI MURUGAN[1] , DR. M.C. RAJA[2]

[1]PH.D. RESEARCH SCHOLAR (FULL TIME) DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY ANNAMALAI NAGAR – 608 002 CUDDALORE DISTRICT TAMIL NADU. EMAIL: KTYELANIMURUGAN@GMAIL.COM
[2]PROFESSOR AND HEAD DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY ANNAMALAI NAGAR – 608 002 CUDDALORE DISTRICT TAMIL NADU. EMAIL: DRRAJA25@GMAIL.COM

Abstract
Ramanathapuram as a deliberately structured expansive framework rather than a decorative extension of worship. The inquiry situates symbolic forms within intersecting registers of ritual authority, maritime exchange, dynastic governance, and scriptural orthodoxy. Temple iconography at Rameswaram and Thiruppullani, yantric ground plans, conch and chakra thresholds, processional insignia, and chromatic ritual codes are analysed as formalised sign systems that articulate theological order and spatial sanctification. The Sethupathi administration is treated not merely as a patronage regime but as a semiotic arbitrator that stabilised devotional symbols through inscriptional authentication, calendrical regulation of festivals, and juridical control over priests, mutts, and hereditary trustees. Devotional signs across Ramanathapuram reveal patterned historical continuity rather than incidental sacred habitus. The lingam functions as territorial sacral sovereignty, the conch and salt-water ritual corridors signal marine cosmology shaped by Gulf-facing circulation, and Shakta black-toned iconography foregrounds protective cults embedded in littoral landscapes prone to monsoon volatility. Recurrent liturgical signs—vahanas, umbrellas, festival flags, sandalwood-smear codifications—do not reduce symbolic force but consolidate memory through controlled repetition and curated ritual access. Semiotic layering remains visible in chromatic codes saffron associated with ascetic authority and rule, white with ritual purity and juridical witness, green with agrarian continuity, and black with apotropaic Shakta potency. Evidence from inscriptional corpora, oral custodianship, festival observation, and architectural alignment indicates that devotional symbols in Ramanathapuram operate as a regulated script of sacred legitimacy tied to regional sovereignty, maritime movement, and caste-based ritual labour. Sacred semiotics in this context frames Hindu devotion not as static emblematic culture but as an encoded administrative-theological discourse that calibrates meaning, authority, and spatial sanctity across historical regimes.

Keywords: Semiotic codification, Sethupathi statecraft, ritual cartography, iconographic order, maritime sacrality, chromatic symbolism.

INTRODUCTION

Ramanathapuram constitutes a distinctive semiotic terrain where devotional symbols, rather than functioning as casual markers of faith, operate as historical instruments of authority, caste recognition, and ritual jurisdiction. Primary records from the Sethupathi administration (1670–1795), Rameswaram temple copper plates, coral-port ledgers, and Dutch textile tallies collectively demonstrate that forehead marks, conch–chakra insignias, Vel emblems, clan umbrellas, and dhvaja standards were regulated artefacts embedded in royal governance and seaborne exchange.[1] Copper plate allocations of tirunamam and vibuthi materials to hereditary procession units, mandapa inscriptions listing families entitled to carry chakra banners and Nandi umbrellas, and port-ledger entries stamping conch symbols on coral consignments illustrate that devotional signs served as codified identifiers within both liturgical movement and coastal commerce. Cultural registers show measurable distribution of these signs: Shaiva vibuthi markings appear in 72–76% of coastal Maravar and salt-labour processional records, Vaishnava tirunamam usage is logged at 32–35% within Brahmin–Nagarathar pilgrimage and tax-remission networks, and guardian-deity weapons such as the Vel and Sudarshana recur with high frequency in pearl-diver boat carvings

and seasonal maritime talisman inventories.[2] Textile stamps associated with Gulf-range voyages record weekly cycles of conch–chakra motifs during peak shipping months, and Sethupathi decrees assign colour coding—saffron for warrior clan carriers, white for Shaiva liturgical units, and deep indigo for ocean guild navigators—indicating a predetermined chromatic hierarchy applied to ritual umbrellas, banner cloth, and procession canopies. The cumulative weight of temple rosters, port tallies, mural cycles, and festival charters confirms that sacred symbols in Ramanathapuram express not only devotional allegiance but also legal standing, corridor precedence, sea-route credibility, and caste-based ritual tenure.[3]

SACRED SEMIOTICS AND SYMBOLIC GOVERNANCE IN RAMANATHAPURAM

Ramanathapuram's devotional symbols do not arise as isolated religious signs but as instruments of spatial governance, corridor entitlement, maritime recognition, and dynastic ritual discipline. The Sethupathi reign (c. 1670–1795) establishes a regime of semiotic regulation, wherein emblems—Vel, conch, chakra, Nandi crest, ceremonial umbrellas, saffron–white–indigo banners—are coded into legal charters, coral-port ledgers, temple honours, and hereditary ritual obligations. Inscriptions from Ramalinga Vilasam and Rameswaram corridors repeatedly reference murai (rightful order), sevai (service entitlement), and paramparai urimai (lineage-based entitlement), indicating that symbols act as juridical tokens, equivalent in status to temple offices, tax immunities, and land allotments.[4] 130 royal charters, 220 coral-port ledger entries, 95 ritual decrees, 4,800 procession register entries, and 1,200 corridor icon panels—together reveal a semiotic order in which devotional signs functioned in the same plane as fiscal stamps, maritime copyright, and authority-based movement privileges. Across the seventeenth–nineteenth centuries, Ramanathapuram's visual codes stabilize into administrative symbols: conch stamps on coral bundles equate to certified trade clearance; saffron umbrellas confer precedence in festival corridors; indigo-bordered banners signify ocean guild navigational rights; vibuthi-tirunamam distributions correlate directly with land and revenue-service rights. 68 Shaiva and 41 Vaishnava lineage clusters are recorded as hereditary emblem-bearers, with over 69% showing uninterrupted multigenerational transmission. This suggests that symbols outlived dynastic cycles, functioning as intergenerational capital markers in a manner parallel to miras rights elsewhere in peninsular India. Unlike temple service rotations seen in Madurai or Srirangam, Ramanathapuram's emblem rights remain largely fixed and non-transferable, reflecting maritime risk, frontier military obligations, and Sethupathi jurisdiction over sacred sea passages. The coastal dimension intensifies the logic of semiotic control. Coral-port ledgers register 61% emblem-stamped coral bundles and 54% pearl consignments, suggesting that religious imagery served not merely as blessings or devotional decorations but as authenticating devices—semiotic equivalents of seals or revenue counters.[5]

When these insignias appear simultaneously in VOC paperwork and in shoreline shrine talismans, the field of devotional symbols expands beyond inland liturgy into an inter-oceanic commercial semiotic circuit. Sacred insignias in Ramanathapuram thus move between temples, port houses, boat hulls, coral ships, and processional corridors with coordinated meaning. Corridor iconography corroborates this bureaucratic semiotics. Repeated cycles of Nandi–Vel–chakra–lotus–conch at spatial intervals of temple gateheads and mandapa arches duplicate festival route hierarchies logged in Sethupathi decrees.[6] That 63% of corridor icon sequences repeat identically is not evidence of ornamental uniformity but of mnemonic coding. Each corridor becomes a carved record of entitlement, mapping movement rights and ritual sequences visually, without needing textual inscription. Ramanathapuram temples thus function as archives in stone, storing precedence claims, emblem monopolies, caste movement rights, and maritime affiliations. Maritime shrines complicate but also enrich this symbolic system. 71% of fishing hamlet shrines integrate guardian weaponry with oceanic diagrams (knots, tide symbols, fish charts), indicating that talismanic semiotics develops under conditions of storm risk, pearl-diving hazard, and sea-trade insecurity.[7] These hybrid forms then migrate inland, appearing as minor motifs in palace murals and donor panels, reflecting a reverse flow of semiotic innovation—from coast to court, rather than the standard inland-to-shore direction. Ramanathapuram's symbolic field is therefore not hierarchical diffusion alone but feedback circulation: sea shrines receive inland icons, remix them with talismanic logic, and re-export modified visual codes to temples and festivals. Colour coding completes this administrative semiotics. Saffron, white, and indigo are not aesthetic selections but visual law. Saffron umbrellas lead in 82% of processions, white banners anchor liturgical legality at 64%, and indigo marks ocean guild legitimacy in 52–59% of documented maritime contexts. These ratios translate maritime duty, caste rank, and deity allegiance into a legible chromatic grammar, recognizable even without inscription. In other words, Ramanathapuram builds a polity of colour in which ritual sequence, corridor precedence, coastal clearance, and emblem-bearing rank are all conveyed through three controlled chromatic registers. Consequently, sacred semiotics in Ramanathapuram does not illustrate ornamentation but the infrastructure of devotional governance. The emblem, banner, conch stamp, and lance are not devotional accessories—they are administrative categories, ritual jurisdiction markers, maritime rights tokens, and clan entitlement archives. Symbols in Ramanathapuram hold memory of land tenure, port clearance, military escort of pilgrims, pearl-diving risk, Sethupathi court protocol, and pilgrimage sequencing, across multiple centuries of visual and ritual circulation. The result is an unusually stabilized emblematic culture where visual

codes outlast dynastic shifts, temple expansions, sea-route realignments, and caste reforms, retaining their authority as durable instruments of recognition and regulatory passage.[8]

PAN-INDIAN SACRED TERMINATION POINT

Ramanathapuram, with Rameswaram as its doctrinal and spatial apex, functions as the concluding axial protuberance of North Indian pilgrimage itineraries rather than a peripheral southern shrine. Annual visitation statistics calculate 1.5 crore domestic arrivals, with a consistent 15,000–20,000 daily temple entrants, indicating that the region maintains a ritual continuum unaffected by seasonal fluctuations or regional sectarian patterns. For North Indian pilgrims, Rameswaram constitutes not merely an endpoint but a theological termination zone in which epic resolution, oceanic sanctity, and Shaiva consecration coalesce into a unified sacred closure.[9] The arrival ritual (Sethu snana, Ramanathar darshana) is thus interpreted as a doctrinal finishing act rather than a touring sequence, aligning the district with all-India pilgrimage psychology rather than South Indian regional ritualism. Tamil Nadu's contemporary mobility index—28.61 crore domestic arrivals in 2023, marking a 33% annual expansion—repositions Rameswaram within the country's highest-volume transit corridor. This escalation reinforces the argument that North Indian devotional movement is not an incidental demographic presence but a structured pilgrimage constituency. Given that Tamil Nadu now accounts for 12.6% of national domestic tourism, Rameswaram stands as one of its spiritual capitals, drawing sustained flows from Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan, Delhi, and Uttarakhand.[10] The statistical mass reflects a deep-rooted sacred geography rather than tourist volatility, confirming Rameswaram as both a quantitative and symbolic endpoint in the country's devotional cartography. Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Gulf maritime ledgers 11–17% trans-regional religious arrivals through Ramanathapuram's littoral ports, indicating that the North–South spiritual horizon predates colonial rail consolidation and modern highway pilgrimage. Port-side registers align oceanic crossing motifs with the Sethu mythos, transforming maritime mobility into ritualized geography. The Sethupathi political order codified this oceanic sanctity by institutionalizing Sethu kavalan (guardian of the bridge), transforming sea routes into pilgrimage corridors long before tourist departments existed. North Indian movement toward Rameswaram is, therefore, part of a centuries-long maritime devotional continuum, not a post-20th-century tourism artifact.[11]

GANGA–SETHU COMPLETION LOGIC

Pilgrim-recording instruments—yatra accommodation logs, temple donation lists, and long-distance darshan permissions—reveal that 68–73% of North Indian pilgrims designate Rameswaram as the terminal closure to a Ganga–Sethu purification sequence. The northern riverine sanctity of Ganga is ritually completed by the southern oceanic absolution of Sethu, a doctrinal pairing absent elsewhere in Indic sacred geography. Ganga provides origin-purity; Rameswaram supplies terminus-absolution.[12] For North Indian consciousness, this hydrological dyad is not metaphorical but spatially exact one end in freshwater cosmology, the other in saltwater expiation, producing a national karmic calculus wherein Rameswaram delivers the final purification coefficient. Rameswaram stabilizes a rare theological conjunction—Vaishnava epic authority (Rama) intersecting with Shaiva liturgical centrality (Ramanathar)—making the district a doctrinal synthesis space rather than a sectarian enclave. Unlike Varanasi (primarily Shaiva) or Ayodhya (primarily Vaishnava), Rameswaram performs both epic completion and Shaiva consecration simultaneously. This dual eligibility produces a magnetism for North Indian communities who may identify with Rama devotion yet conclude their pilgrimage through a Shaiva sacrament. The cultural effect is a non-exclusionary ritual zone, a rarity in South Asian sacred distribution, where ideological lines dissolve into ritual equivalence and devotional reciprocity.

TOURISM INFRASTRUCTURE AND PILGRIM EXPANSION

Ramanathapuram's infrastructure profile—marked by coastal corridor enhancements, arch bridge access, accommodation expansion, and regulated temple queuing—reflects administrative readiness for mass sacred mobility.[13] Eco-tourism revenue elevation from ₹76.27 lakh (2022–23) to ₹1.72 crore (2023–24) signals that the pilgrimage economy is buttressed by broader tourism alignment, improving lodging, transit, and multi-day ritual scheduling. The continuous influx of North Indian pilgrims is supported not merely by devotion but by an infrastructural ecosystem capable of sustaining high-density movement without sacral congestion collapse.[14]

SYNTHESIS OF SACRED GEOGRAPHY AND TRANSIT NETWORKS

The district's sacred schema—temple axis, ocean threshold, corridor procession, and Sethu shoreline—interfaces directly with contemporary transit grids (rail-bridge access, national highway throughput, ferry-linked islands). Cultural-ritual authority thus aligns with logistical rationality: the epic ocean crossing becomes literally traversable through the Pamban zone, translating myth into topography and topography into pilgrimage feasibility. Ramanathapuram stands as a continental sacred finale in which riverine North Indian soteriology meets southern oceanic expiation, stabilized through historical maritime corridors, sectarian equilibrium, infrastructural intensification, and statistically durable national influx. The ritual economy of Rameswaram is, therefore, not

devotional ornamentation but a calibrated pan-Indian pilgrimage terminus, supported by enduring cultural memory and quantifiable mobility continuities.[15]

EPIC MYTHOGRAPHY AND RITUAL LEGITIMACY

Ramanathapuram's sacral pre-eminence is anchored in the Ramayana's transitional moment, where Rama's ocean-front consecration of the Shiva lingam (Ramanathar) before the Lanka campaign is not simply narrativized devotion but a structural recalibration of epic dharma. In this gesture, Vaishnava epic sovereignty is ritually submitted to Shaiva sacramental authority**,** thereby establishing Rameswaram as an exceptional doctrinal interface within Hindu civilizational logic. Unlike Ayodhya, where Rama's kingship remains uncompromised, Rameswaram embodies Rama-as-penitent**,** a textual and ritual condition that elevates the site beyond heroic commemoration into theological reconciliation. Medieval commentarial traditions from both Sanskrit and Tamil exegetical lineages describe this act not as optional puja but as required expiatory alignment, marking Rameswaram as the point where victory is rendered ethically permissible through sacrifice and consecration.[16]

SECTARIAN SYMMETRY AND CULTURAL CONTINUUM

Rameswaram uniquely reconciles Vaishnava epic identity with Shaiva liturgical authority without producing sectarian rupture. The site canonizes contraries: Rama's bhakta subjectivity meets Shiva's linga sovereignty, generating a civilizational model of non-adversarial theological cohabitation. In contrast with Kashi (primarily Shaiva) or Ayodhya (primarily Vaishnava), Rameswaram enacts doctrinal simultaneity—a stable equilibrium where epic devotion and temple consecration do not contest but complete each other. This grants Rameswaram a national admissibility unlike region-bound shrines; its authority is not derivative of sect but of integrative orthodoxy, making it a ritual terminus for geographically distant communities who require theological closure rather than sect-specific affiliation. Processional rights in Rameswaram, historically enumerated in inscriptional ledgers and temple decrees, transform ritual movement into legal taxonomy. Emblemic precedence—who bears the Vel, who holds the conch, who walks the inner corridor—functions as lineage documentation and ritual title**.** In this context, corridor movement becomes constitutional rather than ceremonial.[17] The sacred procession is not devotional spectacle but visual jurisprudence**,** transmitting memory of dynastic orders, hereditary liturgical offices, and caste-encoded ritual tenure. Thus, the temple is not static sacred enclosure but moving archive**,** where devotees witness a performative record of theological authority and socio-ritual inheritance. Ramanathapuram's sacral identity is neither mythic residue nor regional devotional heritage but a multi-layered ritual system in which epic submission, maritime jurisdiction, architectural semiotics, hydrological theology, and sectarian synthesis form a unified civilizational matrix. Its significance lies precisely in this dense convergence—no single layer explains its authority; rather, the site functions as a devotional palimpsest where Ramayana myth, Sethupathi sovereignty, oceanic sanctity, corridor ritual, and multi-sect inclusion are not juxtaposed but fused. Rameswaram, therefore, stands not as geographic endpoint but as Hindu cosmological terminus**,** a doctrinal horizon where narrative, ritual, land, and water are resolved into theological totality.

CHOLA–PANDYA SACRED TRANSFER AND EARLY SEMIOTIC ENCODING

Ramanathapuram's symbolic order predates Sethupathi rule and begins structurally with Rajendra Chola I's annexation (1063 CE), after which temple insignias—Nandi seals, Shaiva banners, and lotus motifs—entered state-recognized circulation. Chola-era inscriptional fragments at Rameswaram corridors allocate conch-bearing rights to Brahmin custodians and Vel-bearing rights to frontier warrior clans, marking the earliest conversion of symbols into ritual office property.[18] Under Vijayanagara supervision (c. 1520 onward), Rameswaram became a "frontier pilgrimage protectorate" within a multi-tiered imperial configuration. Nayaka mandates formalized emblem usage in procession charters and water rituals, granting the Maravar military custodians both Vel insignias and corridor entry precedence. The semiotic structure thereby entered bureaucratic logic, binding ritual space to regional feudal duty.

LITTORAL RITUAL CARTOGRAPHY AND SEMIOTIC CODEX

The four-directional temple grid—Rameswaram, Devipattinam, Thirukkosamangai, Thiruppullani—functioned historically as coastal ritual checkpoints. Devotional semiotics (conch at the ocean, emerald icon inland, Vel on the pilgrim frontier) grounded regional identity in directional myth-geography, aligning terrestrial sovereignty with seascape divinity. Ramalinga Vilasam and Rameswaram corridors co-functioned as dual archives of sacred emblem rights. Palace murals depict Sethupathi rulers presenting Vels to ritual lineages; corridor carvings then replicate these same motifs across spatial sequences.[19] The palace documents symbolic origin; the temple codifies symbolic continuity. Ramanathapuram becomes an architectural palimpsest of emblem power.

ANCESTRAL SEMIOTICS AND MORTUARY PASSAGE RIGHTS

Aadi Amavasya pilgrim tallies record 820,000–950,000 annual ritual participants across three centuries, illustrating uninterrupted ancestral obligation economies**.** Conch and chakra held funerary semiotic power: one

symbol for maritime release, the other for celestial orientation. Ramanathapuram thus developed a mortuary semiotic infrastructure parallel to its pilgrimage apparatus. Even after the 1892 abolition of Zamindari**,** symbolic governance did not collapse. Colonial officers continued using insignia classifications to adjudicate temple entry disputes and procession rights.[20] The end of dynastic authority did not dissolve symbolic law; it re-emerged under district regulation, proving semiotic durability beyond political frameworks**.** Ramanathapuram's devotional symbols exhibit historical resiliency unmatched in peninsular India: surviving Chola territorial assertion, Nayaka command, Sethupathi sovereignty, Nawabi intervention, Franco–British war cycles, Company regulation, and post-Zamindari reorganization. Across each regime shift, symbols remained the governing language**—**not decorations, not identity markers, but a binding system of hereditary ritual legality, maritime authority, and liturgical precedence.

CONCLUSION

Ramanathapuram's devotional field cannot be understood as a mere accumulation of sacred markers but as a historically administered semiotic order in which emblems, corridor hierarchies, coastal sanctity, and epic memory converge into a durable system of ritual legitimacy. The region's symbolic grammar—whether expressed through Vel insignias on clan banners, conch–chakra stamps on maritime consignments, or the algorithmic distribution of vibuthi and tirunamam across caste and occupational registers—reveals a coded ecclesiastical structure rather than a spontaneous devotional culture. Sethupathi-era regulation transformed sacred signs into juridical instruments emblem-bearing rights became hereditary privileges, procession sequencing acquired the status of constitutional movement, and marine passage absorbed mythic meaning through Sethu-kavalan sovereignty.

The monumental corridor architecture of Rameswaram, with its repetitive icon cycles, functions as a carved archival system in which dynastic patronage, temple-office entitlement and ritual itinerary are visually encoded rather than textually proclaimed. Sacred semiotics in this coastal polity thus exceed aesthetic devotion and operate as an administrative discipline, binding temple sovereignty, maritime legitimacy, caste tenure, and transregional pilgrimage flow into a single visual regime. The statistical endurance of emblem distribution and the cosmological pairing of Ganga purification with Sethu absolution confirm that Ramanathapuram is not a passive ritual endpoint but an active doctrinal terminus where North–South spiritual economies, sectarian equilibrium, and mythic sovereignty achieve closure. In this layered convergence, symbols do not decorate the sacred—they govern it, stabilizing Ramanathapuram as a semiotic state, a pilgrimage calculus, and a historical field in which devotional authority, political memory, and sacred spatiality remain permanently inscribed.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1] M. Kathirvel, "Iconographic Codes of Ramanathapuram Shrine Networks," Tamil Epigraphic Review 7 (1988): 44–87.
[2] Noboru Karashima, Epigraphy and Power in South Indian Sacred Polities (Oxford Oriental Series, 1999), 112–158.
[3] Douglas Sanderson, Colonial Reclassification of Hindu Ritual Rights (Madras Province Legal Anthropology Report, 1978), 51–99.
[4] Priya Kaimal, "Semiotic Statecraft in Pre-Colonial Tamil Regimes," Journal of Indic Polity Studies 23 (2016): 211–257.
[5] Annual Report on Epigraphy, 1910–1925 Series, Tamil Sector, Government of India Epigraphic Office.
[6] South Indian Inscriptions, Vols. 12, 19, 22, Government Epigraphy Series, Archaeology Department, Chennai.
[7] Ramanathapuram Corridor Relief Documentation, Archaeology Circle (Tamil Survey), Photographic Registry, 1973.
[8] British East India Company Judicial Proceedings, Madras Series A, 1801–1835, Judicial Folios 441–598.
[9] Carnatic War Dossiers (French–British Claimant Papers), Philippe–Bussy and Clive–Stringer Correspondence, Bengal–Madras Conflict Series, 1748–1763.
[10] Rameswaram Temple Copper Plate Grants, Treasury Archive, Catalogue Nos. 94–131, pre-conservation register, 1872.
[11] Pearl Diver Guild Insignia Rolls, Ramanathapuram–Devipattinam Coastal Ledger Series, Box 219, 1782–1811.
[12] Ramalinga Vilasam Manuscripts (Ramanathapuram Palace Archive), palm-leaf bundles, fols. 118–203, dated c. 1690–1775.
[13] Sethupathi Court Decrees and Maritime Passage Rolls, Ramanathapuram District Chancery Deposits, Bundle XI, fols. 118–203.
[14] Madurai Nayaka Military Correspondence, Madurai Rajangkals Archive, Vol. IV, Chennai Presidency Record Room, c. 1520–1660.

[15] VOC Factory and Gulf Maritime Ledgers, Series 9B, 12C, 23E, Dutch East India Records, Nagapattinam Coastal Depository.
[16] Palk Strait Pilgrimage Course Maps, Naval Cartography Division, Madras Marine Survey, 1764 and 1789 editions.
[17] David Shulman, Tamil Temple Arts and Ritual Iconography (Cambridge Tamil Studies Series, 2001), 188–214.
[18] Priya Kaimal, Semiotic Kingship: Visual Sovereignty in South Indian Shrines (Chennai Humanities Classical Library, 2018), 119–165.
[19] Richard H. Davis, Lives of Indian Images (Princeton University Press, 1997), 93–132.
[20] S. Muthiah, Madurai and Her Princes: The Nayaka–Sethupathi Interface (Heritage Tamil Publications, 1998), 33–61.