T. P. MEENAKSHISUNDARAN

FOREIGN MODELS

IN

TAMIL GRAMMAR

FOREIGN MODELS IN TAMIL GRAMMAR

By

T. P. MEENAKSHISUNDARAN

NOTE BY THE DRAVIDIAN LINGUISTICS ASSOCIATION

Research in general – linguistic research in particular, is at a low ebb in India due to want of communication between specialists to share their findings and to render honest criticism of others' work. The Indian researcher when compared to his western counterpart devotes more time in academic pursuits, single-handedly and in isolation which very often results in monographs and papers which are not uniform in quality, though occasional flashes can be detected hither and thither in their outputs.

Experiments of bringing together mature scholars for a period of one or two years to read, discuss, think and research in the company of like-scholars in Stanford, California and in the continental countries have paid a rich devidend. The Dravidian Linguistic Association chalked out a programme of offering highly - paid fellowships to mature researchers with facilities of assistants for a period of twelve months. Its aim is to ensure the payment of the followships on the first of every month and to give the fullest freedom to the researcher to do what he desires in the chosen subject.

Prof. T. P. Meenakshisundaran, the well - known scholar, who has a unique capacity in synthesizing the finding in several disciplines, was invited to be the first fellow under this programme to investigate the commonness in the traditional grammars in the Dravidian Languages with reference to Tamil. The Sri Venkateswara University, especially its enlightened Vice-Chancellor, Dr. D. Jagannatha Reddy, and its Professor of Telugu, Dr. G. N. Reddy, we are happy to record, offered him all facilities to pursue his research. The present monograph is the result of Prof. T.P. Meenakshisundaran's research as a fellow of the D. L. A.

R. C. Hiremath (Dharwar)

Trivandrum,   K. Mahadeva Sastri (S. V. University)
22-9-1974.   V. I. Subramoniam (Kerala)

NOTE :

The editions used in preparing this book are follows :

(1) PUTTAMITTIRANĀR :	...	Vīracōḷiyam with commentary, Bavanandar kaḷakam edition 1942.
(2) CUPPIRAMAṆIA DĪKSHITAR	...	Pirayōka Vivēkam Nāvalar's edition Rattakshi year edition.
(3) SWĀMINĀTA DĒSIKAR	...	Ilakkanak Kottu with commentary Nāvalar's edition, IV edition, Rattakshi year

All the illustrations and passages are given only partially. The quotations are not identified nor explained in full. The Sanskrit grammatical terms, principles and illustration of words etc., are given as in the texts without being elucidated or explained.

The transliteration followed is that of the Tamil Lexicon.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

A HISTORY OF TAMIL GRAMMAR

Introduction

Amongst the grammatical works available in Tamil, the earliest so far known is Tolkāppiyam. That work, however, speaks about other views on grammar, thereby suggesting the existence of earlier grammatical works. This is but natural. The story often told about Tolkāppiyar is that he was a disciple of Akattiyar. But it is significant that in no place in his book, Tolkāppiyar mentions the name Akattiyar, as pointed out by the author of Pirayōkavivēkam. There was a grammarian by name Akattiyar. A few quotations from his book are even now available. A careful study will suggest that these so-called Akattiya sūtras could not but be later than Tolkāppiyam. For instance, Tolkāppiyar states that the coming of the glides in between the vowels is not prohibited, thereby suggesting the coming in of the age of glides after the age of no-glides. Naccinārkkiniyar commenting on this sūtra, therefore, refers to a source book of Tolkāppiyam as its mutalnūl, evidently meaning Akattiyar, and quotes the latter's sūtram which gives y̱ and v̱ as the glides, a detail not given in Tolkāppiyam, which fact clearly shows that Akattiyam must have been written after the glides have become well established. It is also significant that in all the length and breadth of the Caṅkam works there is no mention of Akattiyar except as the name of a Southern star in Paripāṭal. Akattiyar, therefore, may be taken as a later writer who composed not only a grammar but also a Pāṭṭiyal, a book on poetic genres, another one on astrology relating to the patron and other works on him. This latter topic is unknown to the age of Tolkāppiyar. The work of Akattiyar may be dated to the middle of the Pallava period.

Twelve names are given as those of the twelve disciples of Akattiyar: Tolkāppiyar, Ataṅkōṭṭācāṉ, Turāliṅkaṉ, Cempūṭcēy,

Vaiyāpikaṉ, Vāyppiyaṉ, Paṇampāraṉ, Kaḷārampaṉ, Avinayaṉ, Kākkaippāṭiṉiyār, Naṟṟattaṉ, and Vāmaṉaṉ. These are not mere names. We have a few quotations from some of these authors. There is a work called Paṉṉirupaṭalam, each chapter of which was written by each one of these disciples respectively. Even as the Iṟaiyaṉār Akapporuḷ elucidates the theory of Akam poetry, this Paṉṉirupaṭalam explains and illustrates the theory of Puṟam poetry. Though this book is not now available, a book which was written to illustrate this theory, i.e., Puṟapporuḷ Veṇpāmālai by Aiyaṉāritaṉār is fortunately available in all its entirety. It gives us an idea of the older work Paṉṉirupaṭalam. One can easily find that this work speaks of Puṟam poetry in terms of its twelve aspects, whilst Tolkāppiyam explains this aspect in terms of its seven aspects only. It will be noted that the first disciple of Akattiyar is Tolkāppiyar who therefore is taken to have written the first chapter in Paṉṉirupaṭalam on veṭci. Therefore, we are relying not merely on an anecdote but on concrete evidence of books and sūtras written by the twelve disciplies.

But Tolkāppiyar cannot be contradicting himself. Therefore Ilampūraṇar questions the authorship of the first chapter in Paṉṉirupaṭalam by Tolkāppiyar. We cannot deny the existence of Paṉṉirupaṭalam or its first chapter 'Veṭci-p-paṭalam' nor the story about the twelve disciples. Therefore what is denied by the commentator Ilampūraṇar is the authorship of the first chapter in Paṉṉirupaṭalam by the author of Tolkāppiyam.

In the History of Tamil literature, various authors have the same proper names, for example, Nakkīrar, Kallāṭar, and Auvaiyār. One has to assume therefore that there was an earlier Tolkāppiyar and a later Tolkāppiyar, that the latter alone was the disciple of Akattiyar, writing the first chapter in Paṉṉirupaṭalam. The name of the sage Akattiya known to traditional scholars, by the time of the vēḷvikkuṭi grant, another Akattiya, the patron saint and teacher of Tamil is known. The Akattiya tradition was strong in the Eastern seas and the story about the Tamil saint Akattiya was somehow the result of the intimate contact of the Tamil land with

the land of the Eastern seas. The Jains and the Buddhists along with the Hindus vied with each other in claiming Akattiya, the Tamil teacher and the saint, to their respective folds.

Evidently, Tolkāppiyar of the older age is different from the Tolkāppiyar of the later age, not only with reference to the theory of Puṟam poetry but also with reference to the other aspects of grammar and poetics. An author coming later, naturally takes note of the developments in literary and colloquial usages. But when both the authors are identified as one, the readers are naturally perplexed to find inconsistencies in the work which is really a combination or rather confusion of the works of the earlier and later authors. The shock is greater when the earlier author, reputed to be the disciple of Akattiyar differs from his teacher. The puranic story comes to their help. Akattiya when he came to the South, ordered Tolkāppiyar to bring Akattiya's wife Lōpamudra, always keeping her at a respectable distance. But according to the story this promise could not be kept when a flood was about to wash away Lōpamudra; for then Tolkāppiyar had to save her by handing over a stick and dragging her out of the danger. This was the cause of the misunderstanding between the student and the teacher, according to the older tradition. The teacher, out of this anger, requested Ataṅkōṭṭācāṉ, another professor, not to preside over the meeting where Tolkāppiyam was to be published. This story does not redound to the glory of Akattiya, but popular folk mythology takes pleasure in mocking at great men in its own way.

Unlike Paṉṉirupaṭalam, the grammatical works of the earlier and later Tolkāppiyar could not be kept separated, and one therefore finds the contribution of both the authors in what now goes by the name of Tolkāppiyam. Of course, inconsistent sūtras could have been removed, but sūtras showing later developments could have been repeatd from generation to generation, and when people forgot that the authors were different, it would have been easier for any scholar to introduce them into the earlier work. This introduces a complication in fixing the age of the earlier Tolkāppiyam because of the

later additions. For instance, the sūtram on Āṟṟuppaṭai in Puṟattiṇaiyiyal must have been written after the appearance of āṟṟupaṭai's in Pattupāṭṭu. But on other grounds, the earlier Tolkāppiyar is considered to have lived in the beginning of the Caṅkam Age. If the Āṟṟuppaṭai sūtram is a later addition, no difficulty arises on this score. One has to examine all such sūtrams in detail to find out whether they are later accretions. This means that the whole of Tolkāppiyam has to be studied with a view to find out the older work as distinguished from the later work. It is a new point of view which has to be pursued in the future.

History of the Tolkāppiyam tradition

Iḷampūraṇar, the earliest commentator on Tolkāppiyam, is referred to by Aṭiyārkku Nallār of the 12th century A. D. and therefore he must be earlier. Iḷampūraṇar quotes puṟapporuḷ veṇpāmālai, which Thiru M. Arunachalam, in his "History of Tamil Literature", places him on available evidence in the 9th century A. D. Thiru Arunachalam places Āttireyar Pēraciriyar, the author of potuppāyiram on Tolkāppiyam in the 10th century. Iḷampūraṇam must have come immediately after this, i. e. in the 10th or 11th century A. D. The puṟapporuḷ veṇpāmālai belongs to the 9th century. Paṇṇirupaṭalam should have at least preceded it by two or three centuries for allowing time to the development of anecdotes around Akattiyar and his disciple and around paṇṇirupaṭalam. The earlier Tolkāppiyam, as I have pointed out in my 'History of Tamil Language', belongs to the pre-Caṅkam or to the early Caṅkam Age. In the essay on "Orthography', I have referred to the theory of puḷḷi and arrived at the same conclusion about the age of earlier Tolkāppiyam.

Like Paṇṇirupaṭalam, Iraiyaṇār Akapporuḷ was written for explaining the theory of Akam poetry which became difficult to grasp, on account of the absence of students of that subject, probably after the Kalabhra interregnum. The study of the theory of puṟam poetry also must have suffered an eclipse in that age, and this must have led to the writing of Paṇṇirupaṭalam by a whole school of scholars. It must be remembered that it is the eclipse of the study of Tolkāppiyam

in the Kalabhra Age that had led to the revival later, in the way narrated above. The commentary on Iraiyaṇār Akapporul is attributed to Nakkīrar, one bearing the name of a great poet of the Caṅkam Age. The quotations from Paṇṭikkōvai on Arikēsari of the 7th century are found in this commentary. The commentary itself refers to nine generations of commentators. Thiru Arunachalam accepts the view that it was reduced to writing finally in the 10th century. This commentary is also important from the grammatical point of view.

Yāpparuṅkala virutti, the great commentary on Yāpparuṅkalam, is a great landmark in the history of grammatical works. Yāpparuṅkalam, on which the commentary was written, was by one Amitacākarar, who also wrote Yāpparuṅkalak kārikai. Inscriptions of the years 1108 and 1116 A. D. in the reign of the Kulotunga - I refer to one Kaṇṭan Mātavan, who built a temple at Nītūr, and who was the descendant of the great patron, who got the Yapparuṅkalak kārikai written by Amitacākarar. The inscription speaks of the lord of Kārikaikuḷattūr, that is, the Kuḷattūr of the kārikai fame, in Toṇṭaimaṇṭalam, called Cayaṅkoṇṭa cōḷamaṇṭalam after, Rajaraja the Great. Kuḷattūr must have been named Kārikai Kuḷattūr in memory of the book Yapparuṅkalak kārikai. This event was of such great importance that a part of the country was named as Kārikaippēr Nāṭu, that is the region where lies the great city of Kārikai fame. This latter name is found in the inscriptions of the Age of Rajendra, who ruled from 1012 to 1044 A. D. Amita Cākarar was the disciple of one Kuṇacākarar, who is identified with the donor of lands for the propagation of Jaina faith, in the Kaḷugumalai inscription of the Age of Māṟaṇ Caṭaiyaṇ, son of Raja Simha Pāṇṭiyaṇ, who ruled from 946 to 966 A. D. This will take Amita Cākarar to the age of Rajaraja. Amita Cākarar must have written the book at the end of the tenth century, from the metrical point of view. Sounds are studied in this work and in the commentary. Therefore they are important in any study of Tamil Phonology.

The next great work in grammar is Vīracōḷiyam, named after the great Vira Rajendra Chola, who ruled from 1063 to 1070 A.D. The author is Putta Mittiraṇṇār, who refers to the

Yāpparuṅkalam. This book is important as introducing the Sanskrit method and technical terms in studying Tamil grammar. It is also important for emphasising what came to be later considered as a conception of Pañcalakṣaṇā. Thiru Vaiyapurippiḷḷai has tried to bring this book to 12th century by trying to show that Vīracōḷa was one of the sons of Kulottunga. This has not been successful. Its commentary by Peruntēvaṉār, a disciple of the author, belongs to the age of Vikrama Cola, who ruled from 1120 to 1133 A.D.

The next landmark was in the reign of Kulotunka-III, who ruled from 1178 to 1218 A.D. A summary of the Eḻuttu and Col of Tolkāppiyam by Kuṇavīrapaṇṭitar in veṇpa meter was considered to be an important grammatical work. It was named Nēminātam, and was commented on by one Vairamēkam, after whom the commentary came to be called vairamēka virutti. As its author quotes from Tirunūṟṟantāti of the 14th century, it should belong to the 15th century or later. This work is however of grammatical importance, because it is referred to by the commentator on Takkayākapparaṇi of Oṭṭakkūttar. The Nēminātam is also called Ciṉṉūl. Kuṇavīra Paṇṭitar has also written a book on pāṭṭiyal called Vaccananti pāṭṭiyal.

Kulottunga-III is great because of the appearance of the great Naṉṉūl, during his reign. Pavaṇanti (who wrote his famous work under the protection and patronage of a chieftain of Kulottunga-III, a chieftain of Kolalapuram, the modern Kolar). The chieftain's name is Cīya Kaṅkaṉ, whose inscriptions are available from 1181 to 1212 A.D. Therefore Pavaṇanti must have written the book at the beginning of the 13th century. Naṉṉūl soon eclipsed all other works except perhaps Tolkāppiyam.

Nārkavirāca Nampi who wrote his famous Nampi Akapporuḷ, also belongs to this century, and was patronized by the great Māṟavarma Kulacēkara Pāṇṭian, who ruled from 1268 to 1311 A.D. But his work is not imporant from a grammatical point of view. Ilampūraṇar was perhaps the first to revive the Tolkāppiyam tradition, and probably for that reason, he is always gratefully remembered by the later generations as the commentator (uraiasiriar).

The next landmark in this tradition is Cēṉāvaraiyar. Whilst Ilampūraṇar wrote his commentary on all the three parts of Tolkāppiyam, Cēṉāvaraiyar. well-versed in Sanskrit grammar, especially in Phartṛhari and others, wrote only on Col, the second part of Tolkāppiyam, that being according to him the most important part from a grammatical point of view. He has followed the methodology of the Sanskrit grammarians. Cēṉāvaraiyar means a commander of an army. Probably he belongs to a family of commanders. He belongs to the Tenpāṇṭi country. He refers to Ilampūraṇar with respect and regard. There is an inscription recording the gift of his own lands to the temple at āttur, lands which he had inherited curiously through generations of teachers and students. Cēṉāvaraiyar is referred to as the new immigrant to Parāntakanallūr in Naṭuvirkūru in Miḷalaikkūṟṟam in the Pāṇṭiya country. He, himself is called Aḷakappirāṉ Iṭaikkarai Āḷvāṉ, Cēṉāvaraiyaṉ. The inscriptions are dated 1275 and 1281 A.D., the 7th and 13th regnal years of Māṟavarmaṉ Kulacēkara Pāṇṭiyan, who ruled from 1268 to 1311. A D. It is also believed that he followed Pavaṇanti in many places while writing his commentary. Therefore he belongs to the second half of the 13th century.

Parimēlaḷakar, though he has written commentaries on Tirukkuṟaḷ and Paripāṭal only, his grammatical remarks are of great importance in a study of Tolkāppiyam. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar has probably Parimēlaḷakar in his mind when interpreting the word 'Vacintu'. Thiru Arunachalam thinks that Parimēlaḷakar uses the phrase 'Oru poruḷ Paṉmoḻi' following Naṉṉūl. Parimēlaḷakar refers to Pora Sunkara Prakasan, who belongs to the 11th century. These lead us to identify one Parimēlaḷakar mentioned in an inscription of the year 1271 A. D. belonging to the 22nd regnal year of the Telugu king Vicayakanta kōpālaṉ. He is mentioned there as Parimēlaḷakiya Perumāḷ Tātar alias Nīlakaṇṭaraiyaṉ Vantuvaraip Perumāḷ of Āmur. The inscription refers to the purchase of lands from Parimēlaḷakar for a temple garden. This will place Parimēlaḷakar in the last quarter of the 13th century and perhaps later than Cēṉāvaraiyar.

The next great important figure in the Tolkāppiyam tradition is Pērāciriyar, who has written a commentary on the

Poruḷatikāram of Tol, and also on Kuruntokai except for the 20 verses therein for which Naciṉārkkiṉiyar later wrote his explanations. Unfortunately his commentary on the last five chapters in poruḷatikāram alone is available. Naciṉārkkiṉiyar refers to Pērāciriyar, who perhaps belongs to his school of thought, though because of his individuality, differs in many places from his predecessors. Thiru Arunachalam points out that Pērāciriyar is referring in one of his illustrations to 'Vallapaṉ,' a Nulampa chief and a commander under Vikrama Chola. An inscription dated 1206 A.D. refers to this chief having captured Kōṭṭāru and Kollam belonging to the Pāṇṭiyās. Thiru Arun achalam also points out that in his commentary on one Kuraḷ 'vaṉkaṉ kuṭi kāttal', Parimēlaḷakar is probably having Pērāciriyar in mind who had interpreted the phrase 'karraṟital' therein as 'karral' and 'aṟital'. This will place Pērāciriyar before Parimēlaḷakar in the 13th century.

The climax of Tolkāppiyam tradition is reached in the commentaries of Naciṉārkkiṉiyar written for all parts of Tolkāppiyam. The whole of Tamil literature was before him as in a vision when he wrote his commentary. He refers to Iḷampūraṇar, Cēṉāvaraiyar and Pērāciriyar by name. He is probably referring to the author of Naṉṉūl as 'Piṉṉūlār' as the later day authors. In the commentary on Cintāmaṇi (verses 2463), he quotes the Kabardin's kārika, who is the father of the great Sanskrit commentator Mallinātha Sūri, who belongs to the latter half of the 13th century. We should place Naciṉārkiṉiyar at the earliest in the 14th century.

There are three other commentaries on Tolkāppiyam. All the three are on Collatikāram. One of them, unfortunately, is without the name of the author. It is also incomplete. It is however valuable for giving us the meaning of the words 'Veṅkaḷamar' and 'Karuṅkaḷamar'. Of the other two, one is by Kallāṭaṉār. This commentary also is incomplete. [It has been edited by me for the government manuscript library after collating ten different manuscripts.] The commentator bears the name of the Caṅkam poet Kallāṭar. We know that this name continued to be current in the age of 'Patiṉōrām Tirumuṟai' It was current, perhaps, even in the 11th century A.D. when another Kallāṭar wrote the Akam literary work Kallāṭam.

Kallāṭar's commentary on Tolkāppiyam has passages from Iḷampūraṇam, Cēṉāvaraiyam and Naciṉārkkiṉiyam. Thus he begins the school of eclectic thought in Tamil grammar. A deeply-read scholar of the 17th century, Cuppiramaṇiya Tīkṣitar of Pirayōka Vivēkam fame, refers in many places to this Kallāṭar with as much respect and regard as he shows generally for the early commentaries on Tolkāppiyam. These references cannot be to a contemporary or to an immediate predecessor. Kallāṭar has to come after Naciṉārkkiṉiyar of the 14th century. Therefore he has to be placed at the earliest somewhere in the 15th century, A. D. probably towards the end of it.

The commentary by Teyvaccilaiyār edited by Venkatachalam Pillai of Karantai Tamiḷ Caṅkam has appealed to the minds of many scholars. He has in mind the principles of Sanskrit grammar, but uses them as far as possible as linguistic universals, which will help him to elucidate Tamil grammar. To him goes the credit for explaining 'kiḷaviyākkam', the first chapter in Collatikāram, as an important chapter in Syntax. He also made it clear that uriccol refers only to root morphemes. He is not referred to by Cuppiramaṇiya Tīkṣitar or by any other later grammarians. If Pirayōkavivēkam has known the existence of this commentary, then it would have used it to support many of its views. Thiru M. Arunachalam places him in the 15th century, but that seems to be too early because Cuppiramaṇiya Tīkṣitar has not quoted him. We cannot bring it later, for, Cuppiramaṇiya Tīkṣitar might not have known the existence of this work though written earlier. People must have been oblivious of this important commentary, and that is surprising. Perhaps it arose in the 17th century when Sanskritists showed a great interest in Tamil grammar.

After Naṉṉūl, there began a new tradition or a school of thought, which tries to harmonize Naṉṉūl and Tolkāppiyam in one great grammatical tradition. We have already referred to Naciṉārkkiṉiyar and Cēṉāvaraiyar as probably having Pavaṇanti in their minds when they wrote their commentaries. And it is this tradition that became powerful and popular in Tamil land. But before examining the history of this tradition, one must, in fairness, refer to the non-Tolkāppiyam tradition

which probably supplanted the old Tolkāppiyam tradition, which suffered an eclipse during the Kalabhra interregnum. Perhaps the revival of Tolkāppiyam tradition was itself due to a confusion between the older Tolkāppiyar and the later Tolkāppiyar. The school of Akattiyar was a very strong one. His disciples have written on various aspects of Tamil, and their tradition became powerful and vigorous. It is a pity that many of these works disappeared from Tamil land, perhaps, due to the fall of the Tamil kingdoms, and the confusion which intervened after the invasion of Malikkafur. There remain only a few quotations preserved in a few commentaries, which escaped the ravages of time. One great master mind was Avinayanār, one of the disciples of Akattiyar. His was a great school of grammar almost competing and even supplanting for a time the great Tolkāppiyam tradition even after the latter has intermingled with the Akattiyar tradition by incorporating itself in the midst of the sūtras of the later Tolkāppiyam. His grammar was in akaval metre; but he prepared a handbook or guidebook in venpa metre even as Amitacākarar writing Yāpparuṅkalam is akaval metre, prepared the guidebook Yāpparuṅkalak Kārikai in kaṭṭalaik-kalitturai metre. The available sūtrams on eluttu have been collected and reviewed by G. Vijayavenugopal in his M. Litt. thesis, 'A Modern Evaluation of Naṉṉūl'. That study makes it clear that Avinayam was a great source-book for Naṉṉūl, especially on the various kinds of dependent letters or Cārpeluttu, which have been studied in detail by this school of Akattiyar along with others, whose names are fortunately preserved in Yāpparuṅkalavirutti. Unfortunately, Yāpparuṅkalavirutti is not interested in the study of Col, and therefore we have not many sūtrams from the collatikāram of Avinayam except those quoted in Vīracōliyam, Nēminātam, and in the commentary on Naṉṉūl by Mayilainātar. Mayilainātar refers to Naccinārkkiniyar in his commentary, and therefore Thiru Arunachalam places him after Naccinārkkiniyar of the 14th century in the 15th century. Caṅkaranamaccivāyar's commentary on Naṉṉūl had eclipsed other commentaries on Naṉṉūl but; fortunately Dr. Swaminatha Aiyer has successfully prevented the disappearance of this commentary of Mayilainātar by publishing it in his life time. It is through this commentary that we

learn how much Pavaṇanti was indebted to Avinayanār, a jain like himself. It is through this commentary that we learn, that even as Tolkāppiyam was given its proper place by the untiring efforts of the great saint and scholar Ilampūraṇar, a chieftain and a scholar 'Raja Pavittirap Pallavataraiyar', by his studies and scholarly commentary on Avinayam made the study of Avinayam popular. A comparative study of eccams, with the help of the Ilampūraṇar's commentary on Tolkāppiyam and with the commentary of Raja Pavittirap Pallavatarayam on Avinayam is available in Mayilainātar's commentary. A gulf yawning between the traditions of the old Tolkāppiyar and Avinayanār has been bridged to a certain extent by the absorption of the sūtrams of later Tolkāppiyam into the earlier Tolkāppiyam. But still the existing difference is explained by this comparative study. It would be of immense importance if one had Avinayam and his commentary preserved in full. Even in the study of Collatikāram, Vīracōliyam points out two different approaches to the study of Col, the approach made by Tolkāppiyar and the approach made by Avinayanār. But unfortunately details are not available. Thiru Arunachalam suggests 15th century as the age of Raja Pavittirap Pallavatariyar. But the way in which Mayilainātar mentions Ilampūraṇar and Raja Pavittirap Pallavataraiyar together suggests not only respectability but also a distant hoāry age. One may be tempted to read between the lines and state that Mayilainatar implies that Naṉṉūl followed Tolkāppiyam, and Avinayam, and their respective commentaries named by him. This may place Raja Pavittirap Pallavataraiyar anterior to Pavaṇanti, perhaps in the 11th or 12th century. A.D.

Coming now to the tradition which combines Naṉṉūl and Tolkāppiyam, one first meets Mayilainātar, though he himself refers to previous commentaries on Naṉṉūl. Aṇṭippulavar, who was the author of Āciriyanikaṇṭu, is said to have composed a commentary on Naṉṉūl. This is not available. Thiru S. A. Ramasamy Pillai quotes a verse and states that the book was in āciriya metre. He places it in the 15th century but Thiru Arunachalam assigns 17th century which seems to be reasonable. If the commentary was in verse form, then it is a real loss that the book had disappeared.

The next important commentary is that of Cankaranama-ccivāyar. He was the disciple of Īcāna Tēsikar, the author of Ilakkaṇakkottu, which belongs to the 17th century. Since he was influenced by his master a note about the 17th-century grammatical works will not be out of place. By this time, the Siddhānta Kaumudī became rightly famous and made Sanskrit grammatical knowledge popular. We have seen that in the 11th century Vīracōḷiyam introduced Sanskrit grammatical terms and principles for studying Tamil, especially its compounds, its derived nouns, verbs, and cases. But it did not take deep root. In the 17th century a similar attempt was made but much more successfully. The Pirayōkavivēkam was written by Cuppiramaṇiya Tīkṣitar of Āḻvār Tirunakari. He was a great scholar in both Tamil and Sanskrit. He refers to his contemporary, the great Sanskrit scholar Rāma Bhadra Dīkṣitar, who was patronized by Sahai Raja of Tanjore (1684-1712). Pirayōkavivēkam was published in an assembly presided over by this Rama Bhadra, known as the modern Patañjali. Cuppiramaṇiya Tīkaṣitar is deeply read in Tamil and Tamil grammar and, he profusely quotes from the Tamil commentaries and from Tamil literature. Though the technical names are Sanskrit, the examples are all from Tamil literature. In many places he points out that the earlier Tamil commentators have held the same view.

Īcāna Tēcikar. the author of Ilakkaṇakkottu, perhaps much more openly advocated the greatness of Sanskrit and Sanskrit grammar, whilst Pirayōkavivēkam held that the Sanskrit grammar represents the universal grammar applicable to all languages. Īcāna Tēcikar went further and stated that in spite of the vastness of Tamil literature, there was no single work, which could be called absolutely Tamil, and that when doubts arise, one had to go to the great sea of Sanskrit learning, and that one would be ashamed of a language like Tamil, which has only five sounds peculiar to it. But the Ilakkaṇakkottu uses only Tamil technical terms, but most of the materials contained there in is only a Tamilized version of Pirayōkavivēkam giving almost the same examples. He, of course, has added his own grammatical discoveries and elucidations. But on the whole it can be said that he was influenced to a great extent by Pirayōkavivēkam.

Īcāna Tēcikar had a great regard for Naṉṉūl. He states in one place that leaving aside the ancient works the conviction should grow in our minds that no later book is equal to Naṉṉūl. In another place he refers to the criticism of Naṉṉūl, evidently from Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam. It is no wonder therefore his student Cankara Namaccivāyar came to write an almost inspired commentary on Naṉṉūl. Perhaps a deeper knowledge of a language like Sanskrit, blessed with a systematized grammar, gives one a grasp of the linguistic universals, so as to help one to understand and explain the grammatical structure of one's own language.

The third author in the seventeenth century who was equally well known for his literary creations is Vaittiyanāta Tēcikar or Nāvalar. He was the son of Vānmikanāta Tēcikar of Tiruvārūr. Vaittiyanāta lost his mother during his young age. But one Agora Deva, a disciple of Vaittiyanāta's father took him up and educated him. Vaittiyanāta has written a number of purāṇas. He was patronized by Civañāṉapālaiya Cuvāmikaḷ, on whom he composed his allegorical and metaphysical work, Pācavaraipparaṇi. He was the tutor to the sons of Matai Tiruvēṅkata Nātar, a Brahmin officer of Tirumalai Nayakar. There is an inscription of the year 1653 wherein Tiruvēṅkaṭanāta relieves a tampirāṉ from the responsibility of paying twenty gold pieces for the land assigned to him. He is the reputed author of Pirapōta Cantirōtayam, a vedantic and allegoric drama, written in Tamil in an epic form. Some are of the view that it was really composed by Vaittiyanāta. But his tutorship to the sons of Matai Veṅkaṭanāta resulted in his composing a modern version of Tolkāppiyam full of quotations from Naṉṉūl and other later authors like Daṇḍi. The commentary of Mayilainātar has its own defects, which in its turn minimize the greatness of Naṉṉūl. Because of these defects Vaittiyanāta went back to Tolkāppiyam and its commentaries, though he absorbed a major portion of Naṉṉūl in his work. It is a voluminous work. Its Ceyyuḷiyal was probably written by his son, Cadāciva Tēcikar, and its pāṭṭiyal by his another son Tiyākarāja. Īcāna Tēcikar points out that the commentary was written by Vaittiyanāta for the portions composed by him. Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam was called

the junior Tolkāppiyam, and it contains also a detailed criticism of Naṉṉūl. Vaittiyanāla, belonged to the 17th century, and Īcāna Tēcikar was his younger contemporary. Īcāna Tēcikar must have considered Vaittiyanāta's elaborate criticism of Naṉṉūl with suitable explanation. He was in a position to convince his younger student Caṅkara Namaccivāyar about the perfection of Naṉṉūl. The student has, therefore, succeeded in writing a great commentary on Naṉṉūl which is even now praised by scholars.

Caṅkara Namaccivāyar succeeded in showing Naṉṉūl as more or less a perfect grammar for Tamil. He has incorporated in his work the valuable contributions of Īcāna Tēcikar. In this way, the major contributions of Cuppiramaniya Tīkṣitar were presented in a peculiarly Tamil garb without any of the repelling remarks of Īcāna Tēcikar or Cuppiramaniya Tīkṣitar. Caṅkara Namaccivāyar probably lived in the closing years of the 17th century and in the opening years of the 18th century.

The influence of these works is felt on Beschi, called Vīramāmuṉivar, who came from Italy to live in Tamil land in the first half of the 18th century. He wrote Toṉṉūl along with a commentary thereon, where illustrations were not repetitions of the old examples. He had tried to introduce new ideas. They have not taken deep root in Tamil. He wrote a book on colloquial Tamil or Koṭuntamiḻ and another on Centamiḻ in Latin. These were later translated by others into English. Perhaps the former work is much more important in explaining the colloquial language of the age.

It is learnt that one Kuḷantait Tampirāṉ, with a debilitated arm, died in 1795. He was a Saiva Siddhantin, but later immigrated to Ceylon, and in the latter half of his life became a Christian and composed Joseph Purāṇam, who it is said, has written a commentary on Naṉṉūl which is not available.

In the second half of the 18th century another luminary. Civañāṉa cuvāmikaḷ who was also a famous poet, philosopher, prose writer, and translator. He revised Caṅkara Namaccivāyar's commentary and in that way improved it, removing the defects. He was also much aggrieved by Vaittiyanātar's attack on Naṉṉūl and as a counterblast he wrote a criticism of Ilakkaṇa viḷakkam

and named it Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkaccūrāvaḷi, often arguing for argument's sake. In his elaborate commentary on the introductory verse of Tolkāppiyam he has introduced new ideas and interpretations criticising the earlier commentators. Similarly in his commentary on the first sūtra of Tolkāppiyam, he has brought together many miscellaneous grammatical contributions of his. He answers some of the points raised by Īcāna Tēcikar and Cuppiramaniya Tīkṣitar. He argues for the acceptance of an independent and distinct structure for Tamil language, though he himself in his turn points out certain common features in phonological and grammatical principles of Sanskrit and Tamil.

He had his own disciples, one of whom was Cōmacuntara Kavirāyar, and under the latter studied Ramanuja Kavirāyar of Ramanātapuram. He came and settled in Madras in the first half of the 19th centry. It is said that Visākapperumāḷ Aiyar and his brother Saravaṇapperumāḷ Aiyar, along with Tāṇṭavarāya Mutaliyār and Vīrāsamy Chettiyar, had studied under him. He taught also Europeans like Dr. G. U. Pope. His great commentary on Naṉṉūl goes by the name of Rāmānuja Kāṇṭikai.

Visākapperumāḷ Aiyar wrote a commentary for the biginners. Then came Ārumuka Nāvalar from Jaffna. He also wrote a Kāṇṭikaiurai for the beginners which is still popular. Following the English example, he added exercises at the end of every chapter. He gives the morphological analysis of various words.

19th century was the century of guides to textbooks prescribed for university examinations. Every guidebook attempted at giving morphological and syntactical analysis and other grammatical peculiarities of Tamil. A study of these guidebooks will be valuable as showing the development made in the 19th century. Saṭagōpa Rāmānjācāriyār wrote a commentary on Naṉṉūl for use by the students. Other commentaries and catechisms were published by Kumarasamy Pillai of Cunnagam, Ceylon, Bavanandam Pillai of Madras, Mututtambi Pillai of Ceylon, etc.

In 1952, an old commentary on Naṉṉūl was published by the Oriental Manuscript Library. It is incomplete. In the 19th century and in the 20th century various grammatical works and commentaries, which we have been describing as available, have been published by great scholars like Mahalinga Aiyer, Aṭṭavatanam Subrāya Chettiyar, Ārumuga Nāvalar,

C. V. Damotaran Pillai, Dr. Swami Natha Aiyar, Bavanandam Pillai, Vaiyapurippillai, etc. The grammatical handbooks also came to be written for the use of the students. Mahalinga Aiyer's grammar, Catechisms by Tantavaraya Mudaliyar and Jagarao Mudaliyar, a small introductory grammar by G. U. Pope and a host of others, have given such helps to the children and students. A book which gives the list of suffixes for finite verbs, etc. was also published in the 19th century.

Grammatical works came to be written in the verse form even in the 19th century. Muttuvīriyam by Muttuvīrappa Upāttiyāyar in Akaval Yāppu, discussing 1. phonology, 2. morphology and syntax, 3. literary context and convention, 4. prosody, and 5. rhetoric, the so-called pañcalakṣaṇā appeared in the 19th century, and this avoids long sūtrams and uses modern phrases instead of the older terms. In the journal Tamiḷ Poḷil, in the 20th century, was published a portion of another work on grammar called Swāminātam, in āciriya viruttam. The author is Swāmikkavirāyar. He states in his introductory verses that he composed this work at the command of Cuppiramaniya Tēcikar of Tiruvāvaṭu Turai of the 19th century. There is nothing important to note about this work.

In English, appeared a handbook of Tamil language by Dr. G. U. Pope. 'A Progressive Grammar of Common Tamil' by Arden (which in its third edition includes the phonetic analysis of Tamil by Firth) appeared for the first time in the 19th century, as an introduction to Tamil for foreigners. Caldwell's 'Comparative Grammar of Dravidian languages' starts a new era in the study of Tamil as a Dravidian language. 'The Linguistic Survey of India' is another great landmark, and the volume, in the series, which is dealing with the Dravidian languages, is very important. Jules Bloch's 'Grammatical Structure of Dravidian Languages' is another important work. 'The Etymological Dictionary of the Dravidian Languages' is important from this point of view. The works of Prof. Emeneau, Prof. Burrow, and others in the West, and of Prof. L. V. Ramasamy Aiyer, and others in India are also to be noted. A Younger group of scholars is working on various problems in connection with Dravidian Studies in the Universities of Madras, Madurai, Annamalai and Kerala whose contributions were responsible for my History of the Tamil Grammars.

CHAPTER II

AGE OF TOLKĀPPIYAM

Tolkāppiyam and Sanskrit:-

Tolkāppiyam contemplates Sanskrit words being Tamilised and used in the literary language of Tamil (Tol. 880, 884, and 885, Kalakam edition of the text 1954.) Pirayōkavivēkam had pointed out that the Sanskrit words are used by Tolkāppiyar himself. In spite of differences, as already pointed out elsewhere, there was a pan-Indian school of phonology and grammar, and there can be no two opinions about Tolkāppiyar following this pan-Indian school rather than the Western or Chinese school. The order of the Sanskrit alphabet has already been discussed in another essay. The articulation of the sounds is also peculiarly Indian, though reminding us of modern phonetics. They are all linguistic universals of the languages, and Tolkāppiyar has grasped them. Therefore, in following the Pan-Indian school, he does not do violence to the native genius of the Tamil language.

After Intimate Contact With the North

All these go to prove that Tolkāppiyam came into existence after an intimate contact with the Sanskrit grammatical system. Even as the discovery, in the 19th century by the Westerners, of Sanskrit grammatical description led later to the development of linguistics in the West, in the East, the contact with Sanskrit and other non-Dravidian languages might have been directly responsible for the attempt at describing the phonological and grammatical structure of the Tamil language. This is like the cross-fertilization which nature herself uses. It is how cultures and civilizations have grown all round the world. This attempt is also original.

Kātyāyana of the IV century B. C.

The Dravidians might have come into contact with the Āryans during the Rig Vedic Age. But the Sanskrit contact with

Tamil culture and civilization is something definite and could have taken place only in a later age. The Vedas are said to have been codified for ritualistic and other purposes roughly about 1000 B. C. For facilitating the preservation of the phonological and grammatical features of the Vedic mantras, various studies were undertaken with the result, grammar and phonology, etymology and syntax developed. It must have taken many generations for the perfection of the Pāṇiniyan grammatical system. Pāṇini's age is fixed as the 6th century B. C. or a little earlier. Pāṇini's language does not show any trace of contact with Tamilians and their culture. Vararuci or Kātyāyana whose age is fixed in the fourth century B. C. wrote his Vārtikas or amendment to Pāṇini's sūtras for filling up the lacunae therein. He is familiar with the Tamils and their culture. One of his vārtikas refers to Chōḷa-Pāṇḍia which, like the term Kurupāncālā, means both the kings and the country. Therefore, by the 4th century or perhaps by the 5th century the distant northerners and the southern Tamils had developed cultural contacts. But Tolkāppiyam contemplates a greater amount of intimate contact. In any case, one cannot date Tolkāppiyam before the 4th Century B. C.

Asoka and Tamil land

By the time of Chandragupta, and especially during the time of Asoka, the contact was intimate, and Asoka's edicts are found as far South as in Brammagiri and his messages are addressed to all including the Tamil Kings. The contact must have become intimate. Asoka speaks about the four kings of the Tamil land, viz. Cēras, Cōlas, Pāndiyās, and the Satya Putras or the Atiyamāns. Tamil tradition speaks only of the three former kings where the Atiyamāns are mere chieftains trying to trace relationship with the Cēras. This is the picture we get in the Caṅkam Age and Tolkāppiyam. There must have been an earlier age when the Atiyamāns were powerful, competing with the other three kings for political hegemony. This must have been the Age when the Asokan edicts were prepared. In another essay, it is argued that Tolkāppiyar refers to the Tamil script, which was but an adaptation of the Pan-Indian script; an adaptation which was inspired or hastened by the Asokan message, appealing to the common man, who therefore developed

a thirst for literacy. If this were so, Tolkāppiyam could have arisen only after the Age of Asoka.

Theory of puḷḷi

References were also made to the theory of puḷḷi. It was pointed out that the puḷḷi appears only in the 2nd Century A.D. and thereafter. It may be granted that it would have taken a century or more for the grammatical theory to show its effects on the writing system of the inscriptions, which are intended for the public at large whose habits die hard. Tolkāppiyar may therefore be placed at the turn of the Christian era or a little earlier. It is however possible that grammatical analysis might have developed as in Sanskrit without any necessity for a writing system. And it is also possible to assume that the references to the writing system are later developments.

Ilakkaṇam

But even then it would not go earlier than Kātyāyana. The use of the term Ilakkaṇam had to be explained by Kātyāyana himself, as referring to grammar based on "lakṣya" or usuage, for the Tamil grammar shows the high antiquity of this study in Tamil land.

Various Strata in Tolkāppiyam

We have already explained the confusions and complications arising because of two great authors, one of the earlier age and the other of the later age, bearing the same name Tolkāppiyar. The possibility of confusion suggests a careful analysis of the present work Tolkāppiyam, from this point of view. It is only such an analysis that will reveal the various strata of the work which have to be dated on other grounds.

We may next review Tolkāppiyar's grammar for defining his contributions to grammatical theory. Analysis Eḷuttatikāram and Collatikāram are relevant.

<div align="center">

Tolkāppiyam – Eḷuttatikāram

I Nūn Marapu

</div>

List of Phonemes, Their Classification

The first part of Tolkāppiyam is called Eḷuttatikāram. The first sub-section is called Nūnmarapu, the conventions of the nūl, the book. I have suggested that to start with,

Tolkāppiyar wrote only Eluttatikāram, and therefore nūl or book refers only to Eluttatikāram. The Nūlmarapu deals with the enumeration of Tamil sounds and their classification, and the clustering of the consonants, all of which refer only to Eluttu. Explanations and definitions found depend upon the order of the sounds probably in the alphabet then in use. The primary letters are thirty, those that begin with "a" and end with "n", naturally referring to the order of the alphabet. Again he speaks of those twelve sounds (in the alphabet) ending with 'au' as vowels, and of those eighteen coming thereafter and ending with 'n' as consonants. Then follows the quantity of various sounds, on which basis the classification of long and short vowels are made as having one and two mātras respectively. The quantity of the consonant is half a mātra.

Puḷḷi

When he proceeds to discuss the written form of certain letters, he introduces the theory of puḷḷi. It is understandable, as explained elsewhere, that he should start with the consonants, having the puḷḷi, the short vowels 'o' and 'e' also have the puḷḷi. This leads to the syllabic letter, uyirmey. In between comes the description of makarakkurukkam, "the shortened m", whose script form is described even before puḷḷi or consonant. There is also another irregularity. Nūlmarapu deals with sounds per se, and Moḷimarapu deals with the combinatorial variants of these sounds. As against this scheme makarakkurukkam, a combinatorial variant is discussed in Nūlmarapu. Evidently this is an interpolation. It is significant that Mailaināṭar, in discussing the authorities for makarakkurukkam, refers to other authors and not to Tolkāppiyar. Can it be that the sūtrams relating to makarakkurukkam are of the later Tolkāppiyam?

The consonants are classified as stops, nasals and semivowels.

Distribution of phonemes

The prātiśākhyas also describe the distribution of the phoneme, and Nannūl speaks about that as mutalīriṭainilai. Tolkāppiyar however deals with the initial and final occurrences

of phonemes in Moḷimarapu and the clustering of consonants in Nūlmarapu. Using folk psychology, unconsciously, Civañanaswāmikaḷ speaks about the clustering consonants as friendly consonants and the non-clustering consonants as unfriendly ones. Perhaps some such thing was in the mind of Tolkāppiyar when he separated clustering from other kinds of distribution. This clustering would be in single word and in phrases and compounds; perhaps that also was in his mind. Naccinārkkiṇiyar however deals with the clustering, only in single words, and therefore proposes the theory of loss of words in which clustering permitted occurred, but for which no examples are now available. There is the description of the demonstrative and interrogative bases, which also do not really belong to Nūlmarapu.

Moḷimarapu

The next chapter is Moḷimarapu. Herein he deals with the combinatorial variants, viz. shorter i, o and āytam. All the three occur in single words and sandhi words. Knowing the pluta in Sanskrit, he had already warned the readers that there is no long vowel of more than two mātras in duration. But why the samething should be repeated here in terms of sūtram six is not clear. Perhaps he states here that aḷapeṭai occurs as a combinatorial variant of the long vowel.

Coming to discuss the phonological word, he classifies it into three: 1) the word of one letter, 2) the word of two letters, and 3) the word of more than two letters. He next describes the initial distribution of phonemes. Makarakkurukkam is once again mentioned, and also Aikārakkurukkam. This seems to be out of place, if he has not recognised more than three combinatorial variants. The later generation, when they realised the difficulties in introducing 'ai' and 'au' as long vowels in Tamil metres, must have introduced this theory of pōli eluttu or Samānākṣara.

The limited occurrence of 'y' has been elsewhere referred to. 'C' also does not occur followed by "a" (and ai and au) because "a" becomes palatalized into "e" after the palatal consonant "c". This refers to the state of the language in the age of Tolkāppiyar

which must have been different from that of the existing Caṅkam work where a number of words beginning with "ca" occur.

PIṟAPPIYAL

Piṟappiyal gives the articulation of the sounds. The last sūtram therein states that he is objective in his approach, and he does not describe what happens before the process of articulation. He refers to Antaṇar maṟai where other things connected with the anterior stages were also found described. Here is clearly a reference to his knowledge of the Sanskrit school.

SIX SANDHI CHAPTERS

Phonological conditioning:

The remaining six chapters deal with sandhi. Therefore the purpose of sandhi, the final sound of a standing word, and the initial sound of a word above are important. So instead of speaking in terms of uyirmey, he has to speak of uyir or mey. We have four kinds of sandhi from this point of view: 1) v and v 2) c and v 3) v and c, and 4) c and c. (Where v is vowel; c is consonant, where the 1st of the pair gives the ending of the standing word, and the second the initial of the coming word). The first and second are dealt in uyir mayaṅkiyal and in kuṟṟiyalukarappuṇariyal as well; if kuṟṟiyalukaram is included as uyir. The third and fourth categories are dealt with in puḷḷi mayaṅkiyal. These are from the phonological point of view, and the results are, either there is no change, i.e. iyalpu or there is a change. The change is of three kinds: 1) coming in of a sound or a syllable, 2) loss of a sound or a syllable and 3) change of one sound into another. There are sounds which could not cluster, and naturally there should be a change.

Syntactical conditioning

The author feels that sandhi is also syntactically conditioned, and therefore he speaks of four other kinds of sandhi from this point of view: 1) noun and noun 2) noun and verb 3) verb and noun, and 4 verb and verb. Owing to this classification of words into noun, and verb, he speaks of these four possible combinations. The others like demonstrative, come in as aṭai or prefix or attributes. After the finite verb there is

always a pause, and therefore the process of sandhi does not take place. This is an example for sandhi being syntactically conditioned. He does not always mention the finite verb, because according to him, probably it always ended with a sentence pause. But other finite verbs like viyaṅkōḷ, ceymmaṇa, occur in the middle of the sentence, and there he prescribes no change (sūtram 210). He does not always give the conditions for the rule. Often he states, for instance in sūtram 198, that there can be no change, that the plosives can be doubled and optionally there can be no change, that the plosives can be doubled and optionally there can be variation when words ending in "e" or "ai" occur in non-declensional construction. Later authors define the environments to a certain extent, but most of them have not understood the significance of the scheme adopted by Tolkāppiyar.

Telescopic changes:

Tolkāppiyam also recognises certain telescopic changes, and he calls them marūu. He feels that they cannot be explained in terms of sandhi. This is significant because on this score he refuses to split paṇputtokai and viṇaittokai, and tammuntām varum eṇṇuttokai. If this is not understood, it will be difficult for anyone to follow the explanation of toṇṇūru and toḷḷāyiram and other such extreme transformations. It may be that such changes including the one which explains that transformation of num into nīr are not from older Tolkāppiyar. But Tolkāppiyar, though refusing to analyse marūu, takes them up as units for further sandhi with other words (sūtram 111).

Semantically conditioned:

Tolkāppiyam also realizes that sandhi is semantically conditioned. When we have homonymous words like ce, puḷi or ekiṉ, the sandhi rules differ according to the meaning. (for puḷi 244 and 245; for ce 278 and 279, for ekiṉ 336 and 339). There are a number of other such instances.

Morphologically conditioned:

Tamil is an agglutinative language, and there will always be marginal cases where it will be difficult to distinguish a morpheme from a word. Therefore he finds that sandhi is also

morphologically conditioned. The first major contribution of Tolkāppiyam to morphological analysis is his analysis of the unit composed of, 1) the word: 2) the inflectional increment or cāriyai, and 3) the case sign. He first identifies the case sign. Though there are at times more than one case signs for a case, he takes only one as the basic morpheme case sign, treating others, perhaps, as allomorphs. His basic case morphemes are "ai" for the second case, or accusative, "oṭu" for the third case or the instrumental and social, "ku" for the fourth case of the dative, "in" for the fifth case or ablative or motion, "atu' for the sixth or genitive case, and "kaṇ" for the seventh or locative case. Our translation is not exact, but since no such specific statement is necessary here, we need not go into the details.

alvaḻi and vēṟṟumai

He divides the syntactic construction: into 1) declensional construction where after the first word there is a case sign or where a case sign is implied. The first is urupiyal and the second is vēṟṟumai proper. All the others come under non-declensional constructions. It will be seen that since the nominative and vocative are not included in the declensional construction they come only under vēṟṟumai alvaḻi or in a shorter form alvaḻi, that is, non-declensional construction. This distinction is important for the empty morphs, called the inflectional increments or cāriyai, come only in the declensional construction, whether there is a case sign or not. The case sign is called "urupu", and where there is the urupu it is called "urupiyalnilai". Where there is no urupu, it is vēṟṟumai-t-tokai or declensional compound, and for the purposes of sandhi, it is the vēṟṟumai-p-puṇarcci as contrasted with urupu puṇarcci, which later grammarians called vēṟṟumai viri–expansion of the vēṟṟumai compound.

cāriyai in vēṟṟumai

Though Tolkāppiyar does not specifically state so, most of the places where the cāriyai comes belong to the declensional construction. Therefore Dr. Caldwell is right in concluding that these sandhi increments were originally case signs; but the force of these older case signs was lost by constant usage, and the speakers of a later generation referred to, have a further

new case sign with the old case signs, to clarify the meaning. Thus the old case signs came to be called cāriyai and, the forms without the case signs but with this cāriyais alone, were considered now cases of compounding. I have explained in my "History of Tamil Language" the various cāriyais as old case signs; but Tolkāppiyar was not writing a historical grammar, but only the description of the language as intuitively understood by the speaker of his age. This necessitates the possibility of cāriyai, but his grammatical acumen realised the importance of cāriyai coming mostly in declensional constructions.

Tolkāppiyar's analysis.

As already stated, the new case signs were identified by Tolkāppiyar. They were separated as the outermost peel or layer, and when they are peeled off the next layer or peel appears, namely the cāriyais. The nouns are identified in comparison with their forms elsewhere. What remains there after the removal of the case sign is the cāriyai. In this way he has identified the following cāriyais: in, varru, attu, am, on, aṉ, akku, ikku, āṉ etc. We must remember that Tolkāppiyar lived in the age when glide was not compulsory. In "yāvarrilum", yā is the basic word; when the cāriyai beginning with a vowel comes there is no necessity for any glide. Tolkāppiyar lays down that v is lost elsewhere. Since single short vowels do not form a word, he gives the form of the cāriyai as varru instead of arru His canonical form for a word has to be more than that of a short syllable. That is another explanation for the longer forms of cāriyais. He lays down that the case sign comes after the noun. But the nouns according to him are of two major kinds: 1) human, 2) non-human. Human has its suffix of person, gender and number, and behaves in a particular way. He summarizes this in sūtrams 153 to 156. He, in explaining sandhi in puṇariyal, describes the changes which cāriyais undergo. He also speaks of cāriyai for the letters when used in the meta-language.

General remarks :

At the end of Puṇariyal, he makes certain general statements. When there is a consonantal ending followed by an

initial vowel, the writing system combines both into a syllabic letter, though there is really no change from the point of view of the sounds. He mentions that glides are not prohibited. That is to show that by the age of Tolkāppiyam, glides have come into greater usage though not compulsory. He also mentions the homonymous phrases, whose meanings become clearer not at the phonological level but at the morphological level, thanks to junctures and different intonation patterns.

Interpolations ?

It is difficult to get an idea of the general plan. In Puṇariyal the author must have confined himself to the general statements about puṇarcci, which we had previously mentioned as the great contribution of Tolkāppiyar. But unfortunately, there are also other kinds of statements like those mentioned above which, though general, do not fit into the pattern of the general description of sandhi. These were probably taken from other parts of the book, or from later works. The same thing has to be said about "tokai Marapu" where he lays down rules for not particular endings as in the last three iyals of Eḻuttatikāram, but for a greater number of endings and a greater number of beginnings before going to treat each endings. For instance, he deals with the nasals generally stated to be coming as the homorganic nasal of the following plosive. Again it is stated that all the initial sounds undergo no change generally, though the nasals may double optionally. Some general statements are also made about group of nasals and group of other sounds about second person verbs, uyartiṇai verbs, etc. There are some general statements about the change occurring in declensional constructions. He also mentions about the changes which personal pronouns undergo whilst coming in declensional constructions. Perhaps the general statements about glide, etc. should find a place in tokai marapu.

Metrical equilibrium:

There is one important point which has to be specifically mentioned. In sandhi, so to say, the metrical equilibrium even in prose should also be maintained. A closed syllable may consist of a single short vowel and may be proceeded or not

by a consonant. This will be a nēracai in Tamil meter. If the root in a closed syllable like "maṇ" is followed by a suffix "a", and if the consonant "ṇ" and the vowel "a" form into the syllabic letter "ṇa", instead of having "maṇ" a nēracai, we will be having only maṇa a nirai-yacai. Sandhi would thus have reduced the metrical syllable. This has to be avoided. Therefore, whenever there is a word consisting of a closed syllable that contains a short vowel, the consonantal ending doubles, and thereafter, the coming vowel forms into a syllabic letter. "Maṇ" when followed by "a" becomes "maṇṇ" whereafter "a" comes. "Maṇṇa" where we have the original nēracai + nēracai. When there is a closed syllable with more than one short vowel or only of one long vowel, there is no necessity for such doubling (sūtram 160). But there was a time when each sound was pronounced fully as separate syllables and when the consonant did not lose its māttirai as in later times. That was the time when in verse, certain fixed numbers of letters formed distinct lines. That was the age of "kaṭṭaḷai-c-ceyyuḷ". The primary pronouns, especially when taking older case sings, still preserve to us the earlier stage. Num, nin, em tam etc. while taking the old case sign "a", which has become an empty morpheme so that it required another case sign "ku" as in "numakku", "tamakku" etc. The consonant of the closed syllable with a short vowel did not double. In "taṇṇai", etc. there is doubling which suggests that such case signs as "ai" are not of the earlier age but of the later age. (See sūtrams 161, 162.)

More suspicions :

General rules about sandhi in relation to measures, numbers and weights are also given. In iṭaiyiyal "ē" (sūtram 742) has the meaning of an additive conjunction. In a construction like "pattēkāl", "ē" is really an additive conjunction though sūtram 164 will call it a cāriyai, a fact which makes us suspect that sūtram 164 may not be from the earlier Tolkāppiyar. There is the sūtram which enumerates the initial sounds of words denoting a measure and weight in the age of Tolkāppiyar (sūtram 170). This information is interesting, but its relevance in a grammar is not clear. There is again a sūtram 172, which describes the marūu form "yā" and "yāvatu", after the "puraṇaṭai" for the "iyal" had been given, suggesting clearly that it is a later addition.

urupiyal

urupiyal deals with the cāriyais coming after the nouns and before the case endings, and points out the respective cāriyais coming after their corresponding noun endings. In the last sūtram of this iyal it is stated that other words not mentioned here are not bound to take cāriyais. But the commentators Iḷampūraṇar and Naccinārkkiniyar have pointed out instances of: 1) words not taking the cāriyai described as obligatory, 2) words taking other cāriyais, and 3) words for which no cāriyai was prescribed, however obligatorily taking a cāriyai. These must be considered to have been later developments. They are really important for the history of Tamil language.

Scheme of uyir mayaṅkiyal

Having made general statements about puṇarcci and general rules applicable to certain groups of words, and having laid down the cāriyais for the nouns ending in vowels and consonants, the author proceeds to take up each ending separately to point out the changes that occur in those different places, under every ending. He first considers nouns before which the plosive doubles, in non-declensional constructions. Thereafter he gives exceptions to that rule of doubling. Thirdly, he considers the non-nouns or verbs in non-declensional constructions following the doubling rule which is followed by exceptions. Next, he takes up the declensional constructions where the urupu is absent but where also the plosive doubles. Exceptions here also follow. Under exceptions in all these cases, he mentions not only cases of no change but also other kinds of changes including the coming in of the cāriyais.

Puḷḷimayaṅkiyal

In the puḷḷimayaṅkiyal, dealing with the consonantal endings, the verbal nouns standing with the roots alone take an enunciative "u". The consonants ṉ and ṇ become their corresponding plosives when followed by plosives. Exceptions to these rules also are mentioned. He deals with endings one after another. Cāriyais also are laid down in such sandhis. There is a sūtram which explains forms like korrantai, āntai, etc. (sūtrams 347, 348). There is also mention of the proper names tāṉ, pēṉ and kōṉ which had gone out of current usage even in the caṅkam age (sūtram 351).

kurṛiyalukara-p-puṇariyal :

kurṛiyalukarappuṇariyal deals with kurṛiyalukaram endings. He first classifies kurṛiyalukarams into six categories. Sūtram 408 speaks of kurṛiyalukaram ending, in all cases becoming full. The idea is that when kurṛiyalukaram occurs not as utterance final, but utterance medial, it behaves like kurṛiyalukaram discussed in this chapter. But even when kurṛiyalukaram occurs as the utterance medial if it is followed by a plosive, it continues to be a kurṛiyalukaram (sūtram 409). This is the reading which Iḷampūraṇar and Pērāciriyar have accepted. But in course of time even in the utterance medial position kurṛiyalukaram continues to be kurṛiyalukaram as an unrounded "u" but not as having only half a mātra. When the plosive follows a "vaṉroṭar kurṛiyalukaram" the vaṉroṭarkkurṛiyalukaram almost sounds like a consonant and this latter generation called kurṛiyalukarakkurukkam. Even by the time of Iḷampūraṇar and Pērāciriyar, this must have happened. But they are true to Tolkāppiyam. Naccinārkkiniyar suggests a different reading for Tolkāppiya sūtram to suit the conditions of his age.

Numbers

The behaviour of kurṛiyalukaram when taking case signs has already been discussed. Tolkāppiyar points out their behaviour in the absence of the case signs. The most important thesis in this chapter relates to the behaviour of numbers and words of directions which all end in kurṛiyalukaram. Here we have another morphological analysis of numbers and the allomorphs of bound or other forms. The following list will show this analysis.

English meaning	Free form	bound or other allomorphic forms.	
one	oṉru	oru, ōr, or	
two	iraṇtu	iru, īr, ir	
three	mūṉru	mu, mū, mu	(with the doubling of the coming consonant)
		mūv, muv	
four	nāṉku	nāl, nāṛ	

five	aintu	ai aiv (with the doubling of the coming nasal or coming in of a homorganic nasal)
six	āṟu	(āṟu) aṟu āṟ aṟ
seven	ēḷ	eḷu eḷ (ēḷ)
eight	eṭṭu	eṇ
nine	oṉpatu	oṉpatiṉ toḷḷ toṉṉ
ten	pattu	paktu pāṉ paṉ patu patiṟṟu 1 nūṟu
hundred	nūṟu	nūṟṟu 2 āyiram

(1 and 2 come by paradigmatic assimilation for pattu and nūṟu.)

Since he does not frame general rules which are applicable to these bound forms like nāl > nāṟ, he mentions both forms. Since he does not contemplate compulsory glides, he has provided them as allomorphs. (See forms like mū, mūv.) We have expressed our doubts about the sūtram explaining toṉṉūṟu and toḷḷāyiram. On account of paradigmatic or distant assimilation, nūṟu comes for ten in toṉṉūṟu, and āyiram for nūṟu in toḷḷāyiram; toḷḷ and toṉṉ are allomorphs of oṉpatu. "Toṇḍu" is the word which means nine, and from that these bound forms have come. It is significant that Tolkāppiyar does not give the allomorph "patu" as pointed out by Ilampūraṇar. Certain forms like arāyiram and eḷāyiram are older forms.

DOUBLING OF THE INITIAL PLOSIVE

Modern student

Before passing on, one has to mention the most important problem that baffles the modern students. It is the doubling of the plosives and other consonants, because the environments under which they occur have not been clearly stated. In the 19th century Jegarow Mudaliyār and others in their grammatical guides intended for students have attempted to specify the environments. The difficulty is that these rules are not always uniform, because there are a number of exceptions apart from contrary usages in literature, and because of the differences in pronunciation from time to time and from region to region. In Modern Tamil the colloquial language is not taken into consideration when writing the literary language. Hence the

difficulty for the student. In Modern Tamil except in the initial position where the plosive is voiceless, in other places the geminated plosives alone denote the voiceless plosive while the single plosive denotes a voiced plosive. Having this in mind, the student writes accordingly and there is bound to be variations from social group to social group and from region to region. The social and regional dialects have to be carefully studied for this purpose, for making a general statement about the overall pattern for the voiced and voiceless plosives. Thereafter it may be compared with the literary usage and differences he pointed out to the students.

Voiced and voiceless plosives.

In the age of Tolkāppiyar, the so-called rule of the convertibility of surds into sonants did not operate; at least as fully as it does today. There was no question of a voiced plosive in that age. The contrast was not between the voiced and voiceless plosives, even as allophones, but between geminated plosives and single plosivies not only in the medial position but also in the initial position. In modern Tamil since except in borrowed words, all initial plosives are voiceless as against their voiced alternants in the medial position, there is virtually no contrast initially between the single and double plosives. That is how the modern student finds it difficult to follow the old rules of Tolkāppiyam, where there was a real contrast between the double plosive and the single plosive even in the initial position wherever there was sandhi.

Initial contrast.

The contrast between the double plosives and the single plosive has to be traced to the proto-Dravidian. The contrast there developed into a contrast between the voiced and the unvoiced plosives in the languages including colloquial Tamil. In the initial position there was no contrast in the proto language. However, this contrast in the proto-language is not due to sandhi. Therefore, the question arises how this contrast due to sandhi arose.

GLOTTAL STOP

Tolkāppiyam belongs to the age when glide has not become obligatory because of the usage in writing of forms

without glides, Uyir aḷapeṭais are vowel clusters where one can easily move from the long vowel to the short vowel; but in other places either the glide was not noticed or there was the hiatus. This hiatus, called viṭṭicai in initial rhyming or resonance as pointed out in Yāpperuṅkalavirutti and other books, rhymes with plosives or valleḷuttu. I have suggested in my "Tamil Sounds" that viṭṭicai is therefore the glottal stop; and so in my later writings I have used glottal stop and viṭṭicai as synonyms. Therefore, the glottal stop may be said to have characterised the pronunciation of the Age of Tolkāppiyam though it is not a phoneme. In modern Tamil, as pointed out in my "History of Tamil Language", the glottal stop occurs in certain areas when initial vowels are pronounced. I noticed glottal stop occurring in the end of words in pronunciation, for instance, of every number in Kolāmi language. It is therefore possible that wherever there was no pause but only a juncture there occurred a glottal stop at the end of words, and this when followed by a plosive, and in the course of time, led to the doubling of the latter. This may be an explanation why, as generalised by Naṉṉūl, Tolkāppiyam mentions the doubling of plosives as a general rule.

SOCIETY PORTRAYED IN EḶUTTATIKĀRAM

The picture of the society which we get from Tolkāppiyam Eḷuttatikaram is rather simple. We have a few trees mentioned probably because of their daily use. The birds mentioned are too few and the beasts are not many. We have a fairly good list of pronouns, demonstratives and interogatives. The names of measurements and numbers also are not many and not complicated. There are words for cocks and the pot of burial īmakkuṭam. There is the word for the child "maka", and the words for the night, the crescent moon, the rain, darkness, sun's light, loudness, lightning, and thunder. We have an idea of the days named after the "nakṣatram" and the names of the months occurring more or less in the same form in which they occur today; manure "eru" played an important part. There were wars "ceru". Flesh had its own name ūṉ. Āṭūu and makaṭūu were old terms even in Tolkāppiyam. There was a palace

referred to as Kōil. The word for the back "verin" was undergoing change. The sky was named viṉ. The word for the palm was aṅkai. Industrial occupation was there, which was however of an elementary kind. There were a few words referring to clans. They had known the fish, sour preparations, and honey. Cotton and scale probably represent another form of their industrial and commercial activity. They knew gold. There used to be quarrels between the son and the mother, perhaps after his marriage even in these old times. Paddy was known and also the work on metals and wood. They had their games, one of which is mentioned as nāy and palakai, where people played with pieces called dogs on a board. Bolts for the doors and gates were known. They had become philosophical enough to speak in terms of uṇṭu and illai. In their family, the terms like āntai, pōntai, etc. suggest the meaning of pēraṉ, that is, the grandson who was named after the grandfather. The three generations for example, living at a time will be named as koṟṟantai, koṟṟaṉ and koṟṟantai, and similarly a long practice is strengthened by the use of Rajakesari and Parakesari among the Cholas, Māṟaṉ and Caṭayaṉ among the Pāndyās. The simplicity of the society itself will suggest an earlier date for Tolkāppiyam. Of course, it has to be remembered that it takes a long time for aspects of civilization and culture to leave their marks on language. First, there is the influence only on the vocabulary; but if the morphological structure is to be influenced, it must take a longer time for being specifically mentioned in a book of grammar.

CHAPTER III

SANSKRIT APPROACH TO TAMIL GRAMMAR

INTRODUCTION

A. General

The project undertaken for the first year by the Dravidian Linguistic Association relates to the commonness of the four major Dravidian languages-their grammatical theories. As already stated elsewhere, except Tamil the other major Dravidian languages followed the Sanskrit grammatical theories and technical terms. Therefore it is difficult for the students of those languages to follow the analysis of the Dravidian language, Tamil made by the Tamil grammarians. Fortunately, a few authors have attempted to analyse Tamil from the point of view of Sanskrit. Therefore it was thought necessary to explain this approach in Tamil in an elaborate manner, almost following the words of the original works.

There are three works of this kind: (1) Vīracōḷiyam by Puttamittiraṉār of the eleventh century, 2) Pirayōka Vivēkam by Cuppiramaṇiya Tīkṣitar of the seventeenth century, 3) Ilakkaṇakkottu by Icāna Tēcikar of the seventeenth century.

Vīracōḷiyam for the first time probably attempted to explain Tamil in terms of Sanskrit grammatical theories. It uses Sanskrit technical grammatical terms. It has taken into consideration the language of the common man without however recognising what it calls the corrupt speech of the lower classes. Probably the inscriptions of those times are explained by this grammar. Perhaps there were many attempts of this kind, but we do not know anything of them. In giving examples for its Sanskrit technical terms in Tamil often it gives Sanskrit examples showing the difficulty in finding out purely Tamil examples. Perhaps this attempt is due to the number of Sanskrit terms borrowed into even the colloquial language.

This work had some influence. Peruntēvaṉār, considered to be the student of the author, wrote a commentary on this book. Nēminātam, which came later in the age of Kulōttuṅga Cōḷa the Third, is evidently following Vīracōḷiyam. Naṉṉūl also takes into consideration the changes noted in Vīracōḷiyam, though it is more concerned with literary language. But Vīracōḷiyam methodology had not taken roots in Tamil studies.

Pirayōka Vivēkam however is not concerned with colloquial language. The author was erudite in both Sanskrit and Tamil. Therefore he gives Tamil literary examples profusely, quoting from the commentators on ancient grammatical works. It also serves as a dictionary giving the meaning of Tamil technical terms in Sanskrit, and of Sanskrit technical terms in Tamil, with examples in both the languages. Thus this work will be of great interest; first, to the non-Tamil grammarians in understanding the grammar of Tamil, and secondly, to the students of Tamil in understanding the Sanskrit approach to Tamil language. It was thus thought necessary to take up the explanation of this work along with the related works, as the first part of the project was from the point of view of Tamil. But as the Commentary on Pirayōka Vivēkam, as written by the author himself, points out first there are two schools of Sanskrit grammar:

1) the school of Kāśikā vrtti, etc., and

2) the school of Siddhānta Kaumudi following Kaiyaṭa, Bhartṛhari, etc., and secondly, Pirayōka Vivēkam follows the latter. As the latter is also more or less the current Sanskrit grammatical tradition, a study of Pirayōka Vivēkam is really useful from our point of view.

Ilakkaṇak Kottu follows Pirayōka Vivēkam, and explains further grammatical intricacies. But its interest lies in the fact that it uses Tamil examples and Tamil technical terms, even when explaining Sanskrit theories. In that way the book is important.

All the three proceed on the basis that Sanskrit grammar applies to all the languages of the world though differing from them in minor details. This may be taken as

tantamount to saying that Sanskrit grammar can be looked upon as the universal grammar and that all the languages agree in having more or less the same linguistic universals. From this point of view also a study of these works is important and interesting.

One way of approach will be to write separately about these works. This will lead to repetition. A general statement about their approach may not give the individual contribution of each one of these three works. Therefore a general statement is given first under various heads and then the contribution of each author also is pointed out under each head. An attempt has been made for showing the line of thought pursued by each author. In the end, under the head "miscellaneous" what remains has been elaborated, though here also there are common points, especially in the two, namely Pirayōka Vivēkam and Ilakkaṇak Koṭtu. This chapter is important in showing how a Tamilian would proceed to explain Sanskrit theory.

First, as done by these authors, the declensions are discussed. Secondly the compounds are explained. Third comes the topic of Taddhitam or derived nouns. The fourth topic is the verb. Finally comes the miscellaneous chapter. What is of general interest in Pirayōka Vivēkam and Ilakkaṇak Koṭtu is given in this introductory chapter.

B. General Remarks From Pirayōka Vivēkam

In Pirayōka Vivēkam what we called an introduction has some thing to say which is summarised here.

Pirayōka Vivēkam makes certain general observations about the relationship between Tamil and Sanskrit, some of which remind us of Ilakkaṇak Koṭtu. It equates certain Sanskrit grammatical terms with Tamil grammatical terms.

Miscellaneous

The author refers to Maheśvara, the master of Paṇini. The latter wrote the classical Sanskrit grammar aṣṭādhyāyi. Kātyāyana or Vararuci wrote amendments to aṣṭādhyāyi. Patañjali wrote the great commentary on Pāṇini and on its amendments, called Mahābhāṣya. Pirayōka Vivēkam deals

only with words. So does its counterpart in Sanskrit. (Sūtram : 1)

The author posits the proposition that the source-books for Tolkāppiyam by Tolkāppiyar and Akattiyam by Akattiyar are Pāṇinīyam, the work of Pāṇini, and Aindiram, or the grammatical school of Indra. He quotes from Akattiyam to show that Agastya refers to Pāṇini and Indra He also quotes from the verse introduction to Tolkāppiyam where it is said Tolkāppiyam is full of Aindiram. The author says that it is significant that it is not mentioned therein, "Akattiyam niṟainta tolkāppiyam". It is also very revealing that Tolkāppiyar nowhere mentions Agastya by name. Even in the place where he refers in singular he uses the general term 'teacher'. This makes it clear that the sources even for Tolkāppiyam are Pāṇinīyam and Aindram.

In the next kārikā (No. 2) the author states that other authors had given the technical terms mostly in Tamil and to a lesser extent in the forms of "tatsamas" and "tadbhavas" from Sanskrit, whilst he, to prove that the grammatical structure for Tamil and Sanskrit is the same, uses the technical grammatical terms in the form of Sanskrit "tatsama" and "tadbhava" forms.

The tatsama or tadbhava forms used by Tolkāppiyam and Naṉṉūl are the following: cūttiram, utāraṇam, takāram, nakāram, vakāram, antam(tamakkila), (avvē) māttirai, (kāyap peyar vayin) (ākāśam), karumam (allāccarpu), (innān)ētu, ampōtaraṅkam, kuñcaram, vaiciyaṉ (perumē) vāṇika (vāḷkkai), Under the sūtra "tiṅkaḷum nāḷum" again all the names of months except āṉi, āṭi and tai, and also the names of twenty-seven Nakṣatrās for which sandhi rules are laid down, are Sanskrit tadbhavas. Naṉṉūl adds some more tadbhavas, viz. pakuti, vikuti, accu, aivarukkam, karuvi, karutta, pāntam, etc. Other grammarians mention pulutam.

Naṉṉūl in Collatikāram states that vaṭacol or Sanskrit words occurring in Tamil are made up of: (1) sounds common to Tamil and Sanskrit, (2) ciṟappeḻuttu – sounds special to Sanskrit, (3) or a combination of both. Later in Eḻutta-tikāram under the sūtram "iṭaiyil nāṉkum", etc. omitting

tatsamas which consist of common sounds, he takes up the other two kinds of Sanskrit words, and points out the peculiar Sanskrit sounds changing into sounds common to both. In a few cases -a ending becomes am and ā becomes ai. He lays down rules for even common sounds coming from Sanskrit to Tamil being changed into other common sounds, so as to become tadbhavas.

He concludes that from this it is clear both Tolkāppiyar and Nannūl agree that Sanskrit sounds do not change into the peculiar sounds of Tamil. (But he had himself shown later such changes occurring in literature, and he himself had coined words with such changes). He points out that Nannūl's statement in Eluttatikāram is not redundant when interpreted as above.

Tolkāppiyar, under the sūtram "vatacor kilavi", refers to tatsama alone, e. g., kīrtti, maṇi, vāri, mēru, vāyu, uru, vēṇu and under the sūtram "citaintaṉa variṉum" he refers to two kinds of tadbhavas: (1) words with peculiar Sanskrit sounds only, and e.g., citti, putti, canti, taca, (2) words with common and peculiar sounds, e.g., āṇai, vattam, nattam, viṇṇāṇam. (In all the above instances the word, letter refers to sounds).

Others speak of vattam, nattam, viṇṇāṇam, āgñapayati, āṇavēti, viñāpayati, viṇṇāvēti, etc., as Prakrit.

According to sūtram "katicollillai" in Tolkāppiyam that new words coming into literary usage in course of time should not be rejected; for instance, words in which common sounds and peculiar sounds are changed into special Tamil sounds like:

(1) tarpavam, etc., tarcamam, tarpuruṭan, urpalam (where dental r becomes alveolar plosive;

(2) entira ūrti – where 'ya' ecomes 'e'.

(3) teyya mālvarai and teyvam cuṭṭiya (where ai has become e or ey)

(4) kōṅkaṇak kūttar > koṅkaṇak kūttar (where ō > o)

(5) amiltiṉum (where r has become l);

(6) cōla valanāṭu (where l has become l);

(7) arputan (where t has become r)

(8) karpakam (where l has become r);

(9) īcan, ācāṉ, āciriyaṉ, civaṉ, tirunārāyaṇaṉ (where a ending has become aṉ ending).

Against the rule that in tadbhavas the Sanskrit sounds will not change into special Tamil sounds, the above changes occurred even in the poetry of ancients.

One may have in Tamil also the three varieties; (1) tatsama, e.g., nilam, nīr, tī, vali, viṇ; (2) tadbhava – consisting of purely special sounds in Tamil, eg., eṉru, ēri, oṉru, oru, koṉri, kori, veṉri, veri; (3) words consisting of common sounds and special Tamil sounds, e. g., vālai, malai, cōru, kūrai.

These words do not enter into Sanskrit with or without change. Therefore, they are called neither tatsamas nor tadbhavas. (All these are treated in Ilakkaṇak Kottu; see the chapter "Miscellaneous" and not in the introduction). It is true that the pure Tamil place – name Maṇalūrpuram occurs in Vyāsā's Mahābhārata. It is dēsikam or regional word, but neither tatsama nor tadbhava.

To show that he is converting Sanskrit words into tadbhavas he follows Sanskrit practice of writing prātīkam or ṭīka or commentary. Like Daṇḍin he also gives original examples (Sū: 3).

In the fourth kārika he gives technical terms for primary sounds. Vowels are 'ac' or 'svara.' Consonants are 'hal' or 'vyañjana;' 'ac' and 'hal' result by pratyāhāra. If the semi-vowels are enumerated in the sūtra as y, r, l, v, l, l, and if one takes the first and last letters there and combines them as 'yala' as a technical term for semi-vowel that is pratyāhāra. Similarly, consonants which begin with 'ka' and end with 'na,' are given the name 'kaṉa' that will illustrate the process called pratyāhāra. Sanskrit grammar calls some of the consonants as mahāprāṇa, others ardhaprāṇa and a few others alpaprāṇa.

The following synonyms, being suggestive are given: (Sū: 5)

kuril	=	hrasva	=	short vowel.
netil	=	dīrgha	=	long vowel.
alapetai	=	pluta	=	extra-long vowel.

vanmai, } = sparsākṣara = { the stops – the plosives
menmai }   { and nasals.

y, r, l, v   ≈ antasthākṣara = the medial kind of sounds (like a vowel and a consonant).

ai, au, ē, ō = sandhyakṣara – diphthongs

mayakkam   = { saiyukta or saiyōga – the clustering of sounds, esp. consonants.

menmai   = anunāsika = the nasal.

The Sanskrit grammarians will take clustering not only in single words but also in phrases and compounds. Iḷampūraṇar and the author of Naṉṉūl are of the same opinion. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar, however, holds that the rules about the clusters apply only to single words. In this way he does not find examples for all clusters occurring in single words, and therefore he states that the examples are now lost. If the clusters are held to occur even in compounds and phrases, this difficulty will not arise.

According to Sanskritists that which is born with one mātra duration is a short vowel; that which is born with two mātra duration is a long vowel. In Vēdas where there is a metrical deficiency, pluta, ie. extra long vowel, will occur as an alternant of the long vowel. But it does not create any contrastive meaning like the short and long vowels. In colloquial usage pluta will occur in the vocative case. In verse the short and the long vowels will remain natural as they are. In addressing a person who is distant the pluta will occur as anukaraṇa dhvaṉi.

Tolkāppiyar holds that pluta will come as an alternant to short vowel as well. See the sūtra "akara ukaram nīṭiṭaṉ uṭaitte", e. g., palūup pal. Taking that as upalakṣana, Nālaṭiyār has the following usages:

    virāayc ceyyāmai naṉru

    neruppalar cērntakkā neypōl vatūum.

In Tiruvaḷḷuvar the short vowel is replaced by pluta so as to form a metrical syllable on rare occasions:

    tuppārkkut tuppāyatūum maḷai.

In the final position pluta occurs in kuḷīi, uṭīi. In music, in the vocative case and in selling aloud the articles, the natural pluta occurs:

e. g., nūrōooo nūru (nūru is lime powder). Natural is sahaja; that characteristic feature which is coeval with a thing, and not a later addition in sahaja.

As against the natural pluta there is the artificial or āgantuka pluta where additional metrical syllable is created by introducing pluta if metrical exigencies required it.

Cerāaay-ā in cerāy is one syllable; āaa in cerāaay are three syllables. The sūtra in Tolkāppiyam "kuṉricai - moḷivayiṉ" applies to artificial pluta and not to natural pluta. But in some places even without the requirement of metrical exigencies pluta sandhi occurs as in the following cases:

    uvāappatiṉāṉku
    irāappakal.

He gives the following Sanskrit examples as well: –agnīiityāga.

Sandhyakṣarās or diphthongs.

Sandhyakṣarās or diphthongs or two sounds one sound is called monothongs or ekākṣaram.

    a + i = ē
    a + u = ōx

(The author fails to point out that in Tamil ē and ō are not diphthongs.)

    a + i   = ai
    a + u   = au.

Following this Tolkāppiyar has said as follows :

(1) a + i   = ai
(2) a + u   = au
(3) a + y   = ai

The author of Naṉṉūl uses the phrases aiyotticaikkum; avvoraṉṉa, i. e., a+i will sound like ai, or, a+u will sound like au.

Following Naṉṉūl, Tolkāppiyam also was similarly interpreted. Instead of saying a+i = ai, etc., they state that a+i,

etc. will sound like ai, etc. In this way, what is called pōliyel-uttu was introduced. But pōliyeluttu or samānākṣara or equal sound is accepted as one of the topics to be discussed under phonology by Naṉṉūl. Ilampūraṇar also does not reject this. It is only Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar who rejects it. If it is rejected the following verses will go wrong as being without any etukai initial rhyming or assonance:

ai and a, au and a occur as alterations. The ai has ass-onance with ay or any short vowel followed by y. Similarly au has assonance or initial rhyme with any short vowel followed by v.

Alliteration.

ai and a, etc.

vaikil	...	vāliya
kaiyil	...	kaṇ
aitu	.	aḷi
kaiyaru	...	kaḷiyal

av and a/ā, etc.,

kavvai	...	kaṭumpuṉal
kavviya	...	kayakam
avviyam	...	akaṉru
avviyam	...	ākkam

Assonance or initial rhyme.

ai with a short vowel followed by Y.

aitu	...	meyyaṇi
aiyam	...	meynnaṭu
kai	...	moy
kai	...	poy

au having initial rhyme followed by v.

kauvam ⎫
pavvam ⎭ cevvaṉ and evvelā

kauviyam ⎫
avviyam ⎭ with vevviṉai and ivviyal

auviyam with cevviyāṉ

If ai and au are not taken as two sounds each, there will be no alliteration or assonance in the above examples. That is why in the chapter on prosody or ceyyuḷiyal commentators take ai and au as kiḷaiyeluttu i. e., branching sounds. ai branching into a and y; au branching into a and v.

Tolkāppiyar has accepted two kinds of "thousands" (1) natural āyiram (2) the altered form of āyiram (In toḷḷāy-iram; āyiram is the altered form of nūru).

The word tāmarai is one unit word (meaning 'lotus') It is also an analysable compound, pirimoḷi i. e., tā + marai 'the jumping deer.' Similarly it may be stated that grammarians have accepted natural single letters ai and au and also ay and av as forming two sounds and occurring as ai and au. The gramma-rians from an integral point of view have accepted uyirmey i.e. the syllabic letter consisting of the consonant and a vowel, and from differential point of view they have taken the syllabic letters as consisting of a consonant and a vowel. Similarly ai and au will be one letter each from an integral point of view and two letters each from a differential point of view.

Those who accept eluttuppōli along with ilakkaṇap pōli and oppilpōli can explain the alliteration and assonance. Like miyā and nuntai which were of use in ancient times but which serve no purpose in modern times we may hold that ai and au which must have been in significant use in an early age serve no purpose in modern times.

(Ilakkaṇak kottu also states these points in the chapter oḷipiyal 'miscellaneous').

C. General Remarks From Ilakkaṇak Kottu

In pāyiram or introduction Ilakkaṇak Kottu makes certain preliminary observations though not always relevant for any grammatical theory. They give an idea about the author.

He refers to the tradition that Agastya had twelve disciples of whom Tolkāppiyar, the author as Tolkāppiyam, the earliest Tamil grammar was one. This must be a very late tradition because Tolkāppiyar himself does not refer to Akattiyar. The name of Akattiyar does not occur in caṅkam literature except in Paripāṭal as the name for southern constellation. The quotations

from Akattiyam seems to be later than Tolkāppiyam from a linguistic point of view. The story goes that Tolkāppiyar was a colleague of Avinayanār. Avinaiyam belongs to an age latter than that of Tolkāppiyam. Ilampūraṇar and others who are commentators of Tolkāppiyam do not accept the tradition that Tolkāppiyar wrote the first chapter in Panṇirupaṭalam. Perhaps there was a Tolkāppiyar of a later age who was a disciple of one Akattiyar the teacher of Avinayanār. Perhaps some of the sūtras of later Tolkāppiyar got mixed with the earlier work. For instance, the sūtram on ārruppaṭai as it exists today in Tolkāppiyam must have been composed only after the ārruppaṭais in Pattuppāṭṭu had been composed. There are interpolations which I have referred to elsewhere which probably came from a pen of later Tolkāppiyar.

The author of Ilakkaṇak Kottu refers to the commentators of Tolkāppiyam with great respect and veneration namely Ilampūraṇar, Cēnāvaraiyar and Naccinārkkiniyar. He also refers to the later grammatical works smaller dimensions like Ciṉṉūl i. e. Nēminātam and Nannūl. He gives his conclusion that all the rules are not exhaustively given in Tamil as in Sanskrit. He therefore refers often to Sanskrit grammar.

The author gives a few particulars about himself. His spiritual Guru is Ampalavaṇar, the head of the Mutt of Tiruvāvaṭuturai. His Sanskrit teacher is one saivaite Kanakasabhāpathi. He learnt Tamil under Mayilērum Perumāḷ Pillai.

Sanskrit according to him is a divine language and is universal. Others are regional languages and they are nineteen in number including Tamil.

He points out conflicts or variations between languages (sūtram : 6). Example: Sanskrit has fifty three letters and Tamil thirty only. Even in one language one book may conflict with another. For instance, Tolkāppiyam speaks of three kinds of cārpeluttu dependent sounds or combinatorial variants while Nannūl mentions ten kinds. Even in one book one chapter may be in conflict with what is said in another chapter. In eluttatikāram neṭirtoṭar kuṟṟiyalukaram (c v p ɯ) where c– is consonant; v– vowel, p–plosive and ɯ –unrounded u) consists of two syllables, while in ceyyuḷiyal it is taken to have only one

metrical syllable. One subdivision of a chapter may be in conflict with another sub-division. In colliyal pālpōlmoli is a viri or expanded phrase as against pāl moli the compound, whereas in aṇiyiyal it is tokai uvamai. Finally one sūtram may contradict another. For instance, it is stated ṇaṇa will become tara. But against this the word paraṇ is stated to undergo no change.

The commentators differ from each other. In the chapter on eluttu the syllabic letter called uyirmey is explained as ummaittokai, conjunctival compound or co-ordinate construction meaning uyir of mey by a few as aṇmolit tokai by others, a syllabic sound consisting of a vowel and a consonant and as verrumait tokai by a third group (consonant which has a vowel) In collatikāram the compound makkaṭ cuṭṭu occurring in the very first sūtram is explained in different ways by different authors. 1) As aṇmolit tokai 2) as irupeyaroṭṭu 3) ākupeyar 4) piṇmoliyākupeyar 5) as paṇputtokai. One commentator differs from another commentator. The same rule is given for many names. Three changes or alternations namely 1) the coming in of a letter or an augment 2) the change of one sound into another 3) the loss of one sound are all called tiripu by some and vikāram by others. The names common to uyartiṇai and akriṇai are called akriṇai iyarpeyar by Tolkāppiyar and pālpakā akriṇaip peyar by Nannūl. Again there are many rules for one name given by different people. For taṇimoli the following examples are given. ā, aru, ārriṇan.

For toṭarmoli the following two groups are given as examples.

    I. ā, aru, ārriṇan

    II. ā, aru, ārriṇan, āriraṇṭu, āriraṇṭu tōlāṇ, vālai

For potumoli the examples are given as, eṭṭu, kavi, cāttaṇ, vālka. [The teachers are of three kinds. 1. Teacher 2. The author of a book and 3. The commentator. Any one of the three may forget what he had himself stated earlier.] Nannūl has stated in eluttu that the vinaiyeccam aṇri, iṇri will change into aṇru, iṇru. Forgetting this he states in collatikāram that it is vinaimuṟṟu which got changed into vinaiyeccam. It is fate and the influence of varying guṇās that are responsible for this kind of forgetfulness

The world could be thought of as the world of sounds and the world of matter or content: śabdap prapañca and arthapprapañca.

Amongst the five parts of grammar eḷuttu, col, poruḷ, yāppu and aṇi, the latter three are not of great importance. eḷuttu is not as important as col. Amongst the three, iyaṟṟamiḷ literature, icait tamil music and nāṭakat tamil drama, iyaṟṟamiḷ is of greater importance than the other two. Amongst books of literature in Tamil vaḷḷuvar, kōvai and Tirumurukā ṟṟuppaṭai are of greater importance than cintāmaṇi and Cilappatikāram. Amongst the books dealing with dharmam, ārtha, kāma and mōkṣa the books dealing with mōkṣa are more important than others. Even amongst these, those which deal with ñāṉa are of greater importance than those dealing with carya, kriya and yōga

The author proceeds to point out that what are not clear even in Tolkāppiyam and other old literature are clarified by Sanskrit grammatical rules. Even Tolkāppiyam and Tiruvaḷḷuvar follow Sanskrit tradition. Having Sanskrit number system in mind i.e. singular, dual and the plural Tolkāppiyar speaks of ōreḷuttorumoḷi, word of one letter, īreḷuttorumoḷi word of two letters and iraṇṭiṟanticaikkum toṭarmoḷi word of more than two letters (śūtram:7). When he speaks of mūnṟu talaiyiṭṭa muppatu 'three and thirty' he follows the Sanskrit method of mentioning the compound number thirty-three. Vaḷḷuvar follows Sanskrit construction when he speaks of, ātipakavaṉ (ādibhagavān) mutaṟṟē ulaku. When he speaks of nāṇeṉum nallāḷ always he has in mind the word lajja which is in feminine gender in Sanskrit. But they have in many instances followed the Tamil tradition alone. For example, when Tolkāppiyar sp aks of "eḷuttu muppatu", "cārntuvaraṉ marapiṉ mūnṟalaṅ kaṭaiyē;" and when Vaḷḷuvar speaks of "kaṟṟataṉāl āaya payaṉeṉ kol".

Tamil cannot proceed without following Sanskrit books.

Here are a few examples: Even as Sanskrit, guṇi is that has guṇa, in Tamil paṇpi (guṇi) is that which has paṇpu (guṇa)

The following Sanskrit technical terms are used in Tamil.

ilakkaṇam	lakṣaṇa
ilakkiyam	lakṣya
ētu	hētu
nimittam	nimitta
cāttiram	sāstra
cūttiram	sūtra
tantiravutti	tantrayukti
pakuti	prakṛti
vikuti	vikṛti
patam	pada
patārttam	padārtha
āti	ādi
antam	anta
akāram	akāra
makāram	makāra
utāraṇam	udāharaṇa
māttirai	mātrā
uvamai	upamā
uruvakam	rūpaka
vikaṟpam	vikalpa
canti	sandhi
viti	vidhi
alaṅkāram	alaṅkāra
kālam	kāla
ilēcam	lēśa
kārakam	kāraka
ñāpakam	ñyāpaka
vicēṭaṇam	visēṣaṇa
vicēṭiyam	visēṣya
vikāram	vikāra
atikāram	adhikāra
kuṇam	guṇa
kuṇi	guṇi

There are translations of Sanskrit words in Tamil works The term piṟitiṉ iyaipiṉmai nīkkutal is the translation of a Sanskrit term anya yōga vyavacchēda whilst iyaipiṉmai nīkkutal is the translation of the Sanskrit term "ayōga vyavacchēda".

The rules for the following are common to both Sanskrit and Tamil except in a few cases:-

The posession svam, the posessor svāmin; pakuti, vikuti, pakupatam, urupu, poruḷ, tiṇai (the category of high caste or human low caste or non-human), pāl (gender and number), iṭam (person)

The following are not found in Sanskrit:-

The distinction between human and non-human, the worldly gender of masculine and feminine, as against merely grammatical gender, the suffix of verbs.

In Tamil we do not have trilingās or three genders nor have we case signs for nominative and vocative as in Sanskrit.

Rules

He speaks of simple rules, e.g. vowels are twelve and consonants are eighteen etc. The difficult rules are like that of the movement or pronunciation of the consonant. This is possible only with the accompanying vowel a etc., In interpreting these one may take eḻuttu as uruveḻuttu, uṇarveḻuttu, oliyeḻuttu and taṉmaiyeḻuttu. Eḻuttu is interpreted as one of these. The difficult rules cannot be consistently explained.

Tolkāppiyar has given the articulation of sounds and others explain it in a manner inconsistant therewith. Tolkāppiyar to emphasise the fact that ēl, number seven, is not ending in a vowel has mentioned it in Puḷḷimayaṅkiyal treating of consonantal endings. Having known this, others (Naṉṉūl) included it in uyirīrrup puṇariyal dealing with vowel endings so as to denote that ēl is not ending in a consonant. In this way authors and commentators differ. When they contradict, weighing the pros and cons and after deep consideration, one must find out the truth, reject one view and accept the other, or state that from one point of view one may be correct and from another point of view, the other may be correct, or state that for various reasons one view may be rejected and for other view also may be rejected leaving us, on other grounds, to accept a third view.

In this book if such inconsistencies are seen they must be taken as the view of different authors. In this work what is

stated at first is sometimes repeated. Such repetitions are not redundant but are anuvādas. Such anuvādas are to suggest an additional fact.

The author has stated that certain words are not easily translatable and therefore such words are used as in the original language itself i.e. Sanskrit. e g. civaṉ, pārvati, kārttikēyaṉ etc.

For understanding the books on dharma, artha, kāma and mōkṣa the instruments or guides are eḻuttu, col, poruḷ, yāppu, and aṇi. Of these five, for understanding eḻuttu, poruḷ, yāppu and aṇi, the instrument is col. For understanding col also the instrument is col itself. Therefore col is all important. On account of this, in this work consisting of three chapters a few points relating to col alone are discussed.

The Sanskritists also call all the five divisions by the name, col because of this importance. For understanding any work consider thrice; move intimately with many great and good men for the purpose of understanding. If still there are things not clear, read carefully Tolkāppiyar's work, Tiruvaḷḷuvar's work and Tirukkōvaiyār. If things are not clear even after that it may be crystal clear in Sanskrit. Tirukkōvaiyār is by Māṇikkavācakar which is the true pure form of knowledge of Siva himself. Without considering this people rank his tirukkōvaiyar along with cintāmaṇi, cilappatikāram, maṇimēkalai, caṅkam poetry and koṅku vēl mākkatai

Grammar in Tamil is Tolkāppiyam alone. Poetry similarly is that of Vaḷḷuvar alone. Others without considering the greatness of grammars like iṟaiyaṉār akapporuḷ and of the divine literatures like tēvāram, tiruvicaippā, tiruppallāṇṭu, periya purāṇam, civañāṉapōtam, civañāṉa cittiyār, tiruvācakam and the songs of Paṭṭiṉattup Pillaiyār, will value highly. Naṉṉūl ciṉṉūl, akapporuḷ, kārikai, and Daṇḍiyalaṅkāram as grammars and held in great estimation, paṭṭup pāṭṭu, eṭṭut tokai, patiṉeṇ kīḻk kaṇakku, irāmaṉ katai, naḷaṉkatai, and ariccantiraṉ katai as great literature.

Is it in order for the author himself to write the commentary? This question is raised since he has himself written the

commentary to his work. He replies: Vaittiyanātar of Tiruvārūr had written the book Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam and also its commentary. Cuppiramania Tīkṣitar has written the book Pirayōka Vivēkam in Tamil. He has also written the commentary thereon. These are before me whilst many have done so in earlier times (sūtram 8)

"If certain sūtra rules are not understandable look at the former and later portions of the book and once again come back to the point. The rules will be crystal clear then or when you have studied different books"

Naṉṉūl

He explains upalakṣaṇa and answers some of the objections raised to Naṉṉūl sūtra "aium mutal taṉivariṟ cuṭṭē" (Probably by Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam). He states that conviction should arise in our minds that if older books are left out of account, amongst the latter works, there is nothing equal to Naṉṉūl.

SUGGESTIONS OF LEARNING

He also points out how different statements could be reconciled by interpretation. "If certain statement is conflicting with what one had learnt, then consider this as one way of stating the same & by another author. If one moves only for two days with the learned it may not be of much use. But if one moves with them for many days then it will be useful for clearing doubts. If one rushes through the book nothing will be clear. If one reads without haste, everything will be clear. Restrain the desire to know more and concentrate on what had been already learnt. One need not read a book many times. One should decide to refer to a sūtra as many times as possible.
    "Leave those who are not intelligent and mix with those with a quick intelligence. If mind goes astray during a particular point of time leave the reading then. Follow the teacher and behave like him in the world of knowledge".

(sūtram 9-10) There are many more points like this. There is no end. Therefore it is not necessary to add all of them here.

Other books have said many other things. Therefore let us be satisfied with things stated here.

(sūtram : 11) "In olden days, the teacher would not hide anything. But in modern times the teachers do not explain without hiding anything. Therefore, thinking that valuable rules will die away, I have collected them. I have written this not because there is no other book. Therefore, those who have carefully read many books alone, should read this book.

(sūtram : 12) "We have shown only a few examples from ancient literature. From colloquial or worldly usage we have given many examples. This is for the purpose of clear understanding. Both types of usages are not uniform in clarity. Therefore we have avoided many examples from ancient works and also a few examples from colloquial usage"

CHAPTER IV

SANSKRIT APPROACH TO TAMIL GRAMMAR

KĀRAKĀS OR CASAL CONSTRUCTION

A few general remarks about declension should be noted. Vīracōḷiyam gives the following case signs.

For the first or the nominative case the case signs are: (this conception will be explained latter).

cu, ar, ār, ārkaḷ, ārkaḷ, kaḷ and mār. (sū: 3ə)
For the second case the sign is ai (sū: 34)
He calls the case sign Vērrumaippratyayam.

The second case sign occurs in Karma kāraka

(What is stated in the commentary is also included in these notes. The tradition is that the commentator of this work was himself a student of the author and therefore to a certain extent the commentator's views may be taken as those of the author).

It is pointed out by the author that this case sign sometimes is lost. Even if it is lost, it gives the significance of the case sign.

The case signs for the third case are oṭu. ōṭu and āl. They occur In kartr kāraka and karaṇa kāraka. (sū: 34).

For the fourth case the signs are ku and poruṭṭu. They occur in kōḷi kāraka or the dative (sū: 34).

The fifth case sign is ninru. It occurs also among the case signs of seventh or locative. in is another case sign for the fifth case and it occurs in avadhi kāraka. It occurs in the meaning of boundary. (sū: 35)

The sixth case sign is uṭai (sū: 35). The meaning of this case is 'being attached to another.' uṭai with the suffixes āṉ, āḷ, ār, ārkaḷ, atu, and ina form into six pratyayās or case signs, viz., uṭaiyāṉ, uṭaiyāḷ, uṭaiyār, uṭaiyārkaḷ, uṭaiyatu and uṭaiyaṉa. These six pratyayās will occur after eight prakrtis (which will be later explained under the first case sign) without going against the established convention. This case sign occurs also as uṭaiya i. e., uṭai + a. When the sixth case forms a kāraka or takes a predicate, only one case sign occurs and that is ku. (sū: 35).

The seventh case signs are kē, uḷai, vayiṉ, pakkal, uḷi, il, kaṇ, cār, iṭam, iṭai, muṉ, piṉ, kīl, mēˡ, uḷ, puram and vāy. The seventh case is called ātāram, ādhara the locative (sū:35).

The case signs for the vocative are the following: āy, āḷ, ī, ē, a, ā, āṉ, ōl, ōy, īr and kāḷ and their alternative forms with further elongation of the vowel (sū:36).

Turning to Pirayōka Vivēkam its author calls the case signs vibhakti or vērrumai. The meaning of the case signs are called vibhaktyartha or vērrumaipporuḷ. This vibhaktyartha is denoted by periphrastic case signs not in the form of mere particles but in the form of words. These periphrastic forms (collurupu) are called vibhaktyartha (P. V. sū:6)

In Sanskrit the case signs are numbered for instance as the first case, the second case, the third case etc. Pirayōka Vivēkam is of the opinion that Tolkāppiyar, when he uses the terms iraṇṭākuvatē, mūṉrākuvatē, is translating the corresponding Sanskrit terms.

ai is the second case sign. Ex: nilattaik kaṭantāṉ.

The third case signs are āṉ and oṭu; examples are taccaṉāl; koṭiyoṭu. oṭu has two meanings though usually occurring as the sign of the social case as in koṭiyoṭu. In ancient times it functioned as the sign of the instrumental as well. Ex. ūciyoṭu-kuyiṉra, "stiched with the needle," and this responsbile for clubbing the social and instrumental cases as one as in Sanskrit. There are periphrastic case signs.

(1) uḷi : iyalpuḷik kōlōccum
iyalpuḷi – iyalpāl

(2) māru : cirantōṉ pērāṉ pirantamāru
piranta māru = pirantataṉāl

(3) koṇṭu : vēlkoṇṭeriya

    vēl koṇṭu = vēlāl

These are the vibhaktyarthās of the third case.
Tolkāppiyar refers to them in vēṟṟumaip poruḷ vayiṉ urupākuṉa as pointed out by cēṉāvaraiyar.

For the fourth case the sign is ku. Example: irappāṉukkuc-cōriṭṭāṉ vibhaktyarthā of the fourth case is the periphrastic poruṭṭu. Ex: nakutar poruttaṉru naṭṭal

The fifth case sign is iṉ Ex: kaḷḷariṉ añcum. The vibhakt-yartha or periphrastic sign is niṉru, and mēniṉru. Ex: pōtār amaḷiyiṉ mēniṉru yām avaṉiṉrum varutum.

The sixth case sign for singular is atu. Ex: cāttaṉatu kai. The sixth case sign for plural is a. Ex: campataṉa tamiḷ.

The vibhaktyarthā for the sixth case is (1) ku. Ex: nam-pikku makaṉ and (2) uṭaiya Ex: tammuṭaiya taṇṇaḷi.

il is the sign of the seventh case. Ex: ūrile iruntāṉ. kaṇ is the seventh case sign and also seventh case vibhaktyarthā. kāl, puram, akam etc. mean in some places are the seventh case vibhaktyarthā and in other places the part of the word which has received the seventh case sign, i. e. one part of the location.

In Sanskrit parimouli, anukari, adhikaram are saptamiyar-thas which have come by the transposition of the word and the sign of the locative. Similarly saptamiyarthā occurs in Tamil by a similar transposition : uḷḷūr for ūruḷ, kīḻnīr for nīrkkīḻ, mīkaṇ for kaṇmī. uḷ, kīḻ and mī are saptamyarthās which have come before the respective nouns.

The cases are also called after their semantic implication. Ilakkaṇak Kottu gives the case sign and the semantic name of the case as in Sanskrit and also their corresponding Tamil names. The Sanskritists speak of eight cases and Tamil grammarians sometime omit viḷi or vocative and give only seven. Others taking vēṟṟumai to mean the case sign, omit also the nominative which has no case sign and give only the remaining six case relations or constructions.

English name	Name as in V. C. and P. V., and Sanskrit kārakas	Tamil names for kārakas as in P. V., I.K. and V. C.	case sign
Nominative :	mutal vēṟṟumai (Ist case) kartṛ kārakam	viṉaimutal	—
Objective :	irantām vēṟṟumai (2nd case) karma kārakam	ceyappaṭu poruḷ	ai
Instrumental :	mūnrām vēṟṟumai (3rd case) karaṇakārakam	karuvi	-āl
Dative :	nāṅkām vēṟṟumai (4th case) sampradānam	kolvōṉ (I.K.) koḷi (V.C.)	
Ablative of motion or separation :	aintām vēṟṟumai (5th case) apādānam; avadhi (V. C.)	nīkkam	-in
Genitive :	āṟām vēṟṟumai sāṣṭhi (6th case)	kuṟai	-atu
Locative :	eḷām vēṟṟumai (7th case) adhikaraṇam; ādhāram (V. C.)	iṭam	-kaṇ

For the occurrence of all kārakas (case signs taking their predicates) the following examples are given :

Vīracōliyam

"varaiṉiṉ riḷintaṅ kor vētiyaṉ vāviyiṉ kaṇmalinta viraiṉiṉra pūvaik karattār parittu vimalaṉukkut turaiṉiṉra tīviṉai nīṅkaviṭ ṭāṉ eṉru collutalum uraiṉiṉra kāraka māṟumpiṟakkum oḷiyiḷaiyē" (V.C. 39)

In the commentary another example is given which is almost like the one given in Pirayōka Vivēkam.

"intiraṉ tāmarai yaikkarat tārkoy tiṟaivaṉukkut
tantiruṅ kuṟṟatti nīṅkiviṉ mēlirun tāṉeṉṉalum
vantaṉa kāraka mellām vakutta valimuṟaiyē

Pirayōka Vivēkam

"intiraṉ ṟāmarai yaikkarat tārkoy tiṟaivaṉukkut
tantiruṅ kuṟṟatti nīṅkiviṉ mēlirun tāṉ"eṉalum
vantaruṅ kāraka mellām pirakkumōr vākkiyattut
cintura vāṉutaṟ cevvāyk kuṟunakait tēmoḻiyē

<div align="right">(P. V. 10)</div>

Ilakkaṇak Kottu :

"nārā yaṇaṉpū vōrā yirattaik
karattāṟ koytō raraṟke koṭuttee
pakkarac ciṟumaiyi nīṅki naṟcuvaip
nāṟkaṭar kaṇṇē paḷḷikoṇ ṭāṉ"eṉak
kāraka muḷutum vantaṉa kāṅka   (I.K. 15)

vēṟṟumai or case is used in three senses in Tamil. (1) the
case sign which differentiates; (2) the noun which takes the case
sign as that which is differentiated; and (3) the predicate or the
word completing the meaning of the case that which comes after
the case singn as their immediate constituent, (I. K. 20 and as
finalising the differentiation).

Tolkāppiyar as pointed by Pirayōka Vivēkam (sū : 8) denotes
by veṟṟumaik kiḷavi (urupu toṭarntaṭukkiya vēṟṟumaik kiḷavi,
and aiyeṉap peyariya vēṟṟumaik kiḷavi, (1) the case sign and
(2) the noun which takes the case sign. Naṉṉūl, however,
applies the name vēṟṟumai only to the case sign.

Ilakkaṇak kottu further points out that the noun which
takes the case sign thereby denotes various meanings. (1) The
locative denotes space, time or place where the action occurs
viṉaiceyiṭattiṉ nilattiṉ kālattiṉ; (2) when the word follows as
immediate constituent, the case sign also may be of various
meanings. The predicate of the nominative may affirm an
existence or be in the optative mood etc. poruṇmai cuṭṭal viyaṅ-
koḷa varutal etc. (sū : 21).

Next he points out that 1) for one case one case sign alone
may come (ai for the second case and ku for the fourth) and
that (2) many case signs may come for one case (e. g. al, āl,
oṭu, ōṭu for instrumental). (sū : 22)

Again one case sign may have many meanings and for one
meaning many case signs may come (all these will be explained
under respective cases). (Sū : 23)

The eighth case signs may occur after (1) pakupatam; word
which can be further analysed (2) pakāppatam, word which
cannot be so analysed (3) alvaḷit toṭar, non-casal noun phrase or
noun compound (4) vēṟṟumait toṭar, casal phrase or declensional
compound. (5) participial noun stem, teriṉilai viṉai muṟṟup
peyar (6) the appellate nouns – kurippu muṟṟu-p peyar and
(7) verbal nouns, toḷir peyar etc. (sū : 24)

He refers to instances where one may mistake for the case
sign what is really not the case sign. (sū : 19)
ai in the following instances :

peṇṇai valarttāṉ; tāḷai vaṉaṅkiṉāṉ. Here ai is part of
word itself and not the case sign.

3rd case : talaiyōṭu takarntatu, ōṭu is not the case sign but
means the 'skull'.

4th case : uṇarku vantāṉ. uṇarku here is not the dative
but has the force of infinitive of purpose, a viṉai-y-eccam

5th case : cāriyai iṉ nīṅkiṟṟu iṉ here refers to cariyai-iṉ.

6th case : avaṉatu ceytaṉ Here atu is not the genitive but
demonstrative neuter pronoun singular.

7th case : avaṉkaṇ patiṉaintu. Here kaṇ is not locative but
means the eye.

Of the eight cases, omitting the vocative and the genitive
the other six, if they take a verb, are called kārakas.

Case signs are of three varieties : (Sū : 16)

(1) the sign of the case itself–urupu
Ex. vāḷāl veṭṭiṉāṉ–āl is the case sign for the instrumental
(2) vēṟurupu–the sign of some other case which is also appli-
cable here for bringing out the same semantic meaning.
Ex. vāḷiṉ veṭṭiṉāṉ. (Here iṉ is the ablative but is applicable
in this instance as well for the same meaning vāḷāl veṭṭiṉāṉ
(3) collurupu or periphrastic case sign. Ex. vāḷkoṇṭu veṭṭiṉāṉ
(Sū: 17) [There are other distinctions. (1) The sign may be
unique for a particular case coming by its own right. It is
called urupu urimaiyāy niṟṟal. Ex. vāḷāl veṭṭiṉāṉ.]

It may not come by its right but it may be equal to the case sign and as such it may come there   Ex: ālattiṉāl amirtā-kkiya kōṉ.   Here āl, the instrumental occurs and has the same force as of the case sign i. e. ai usually occurring there. Ex : ālattai amirtākkiya kōṉ. The object and the instrumental construction mean here the same thing. The object construction is taken as its base and instrumental is taken as its trans-formation (Sū : 1ᴜ)

(3) The case sign occurring is different from that required and has not also the force of the latter. He gives the example from kuṛaḷ, kālattiṉārceyta naṉṛi which must be kālattil ceyta naṉṛi kālattiṉāl is instrumental; kālattil is the locative. (Sū : 19) One cannot be the transformation of the other (These are called urupu mayakkam). But really these are archaic examples where the so called instrumental āṉ had once upon a time the locative significance. When the archaic usage was forgotten the old case sign is either explained as an inflexional increment (or urupu mayakkam).

Ilakkaṇak Kottu proceeds to show how authors differ in their explanations of the nominative case. (Sū: 25)

(1) Nominative has no case sign. (2) It is the noun itself. (3) Nominative has the potentiality of taking the predicate. (4) Nominative has the characteristic feature of taking the predicate. (5) Nominative consists in being or becoming the agent. (6) Nominative is the altered name. (taṉ, tam, nam, eṉ, em, niṉ, num are considered to be unaltered forms. It is these forms which take the case signs and their immediate con-stituents (with their case signs explicit or implicit) or not. When these become the nominative they have always the altered forms respectively tāṉ, tām, nām, yāṉ, yām, nī, nīyir respectively. (This change itself is the nominative case sign). (7) the noun takes the suffixes as in the following :

irai + aṉ = iraivaṉ

taiyal + āḷ = taiyalāḷ

kō + ṉ = kōṉ

each one of which can go with their respective predicate vantāṉ or vantāḷ.

kō + kaḷ = kōkkaḷ goes with the predicate vantār; maram + atu = maramatu goes with the predicate vaḷarntatu; maram = kaḷ = maraṅkaḷ goes with the predicate vaḷarntaṉa. These suffixes themselves are the nominative case signs (As we see later, this is the view of Vīracōḷiyam).

(8) The aimpāṛ col words denoting the five fold division i.e., 1) masculine singular, 2) feminine singular, 3) human plural or epicene, 4ᴵ non-human singular and 5) non-human plural such as āyavaṉ āṉavaṉ etc. come after the verb as nominative case sign. If it is objected that they are words rather than case signs, they may be taken as periphrastic case signs like koṇṭu.

The case sign for nominative are thus of three kinds :

(1) the alternation of the word itself, as taṉ becoming tāṉ etc. (2) suffixes as in iraivaṉ etc. (3) āyavaṉ, āṉavaṉ, āvāṉ, ākiṉṛavaṉ etc.,

In the meaning of āyavaṉ etc. eṉpāṉ etc. also occur. Ex. ilvālvāṉ eṉpāṉ.

Ilakkaṇak Kottu explains under each case the general statements made above about, (1) case signs coming by way of right (urimaiyāy niṛṛal); (2) the word taking case signs having different meanings; (3) the case signs coming to denote various other meanings.

In the following i.e. iṉṉā tāmē varum; keṇmai tāṉē nantum; toṭarpu tāṉē tēyum, the objects come as the agents in the nominative case followed by the particle of certainty tāmē but the predicate or verb is an instransitive one.

(2) The other kind of occurrence where also the object comes as the agent in the nominative case is as in tiṇṇai meḷu-kiṛṛu. Here also the objective case is transformed into the agent. But the predicate is a transitive verb. There is no particle of certainty. These two are found in Sanskrit (Pirayōka vivēkam explains that further)

(3) hētu "cause" becomes the kartā or the agent. Instead of kāṛṛiṉāl paḷam utirntatu 'because of the wind the fruit fell' it can be also said kāṛṛu paḷam utirttatu 'the wind made the fruits fall'.

(4) taṉ vacak karuttā is voluntary agent. Example: cāttaṉ uṇṭāṉ 'cāttaṉ ate' i. e., he ate on his own accord.

(5) teriyā nilaik karuttā is the implicit agent (in a passive sentence, the agent does not occur in the nominative case but the subject of the sentence is really the object.) Ex: māṭam ceyyappaṭṭatu. Though the subject is not the agent it occurs in the nominative case (since this is implicit. In the active voice the subject is explicit)

(6) taṭumāṟṟam The subject and predicate mutually alternate in a sentence. We call this mutual alternation.

e. g. otta kiḷavaṉum kiḷattiyuṅ kāṇpa 'the lady love and the lover see (each other)." The Lady love sees the lover and lover sees the lady love.

(7) toḻir peyark karuttā; the verbal noun becoming the subject i. e., the act appears as agent;

Ex: kollāmai aravinai ellām tarum

'non-violonce gives or lead to all other charitable acts'.

There are three other places where something other then the agent occurs as the subject, but they are considered to be quite idiomatic

(1) karuvi karuttā = instrument as subject

Ex: kaṇ kāṇum 'the eye sees'

(2) iṭam karuttā the location becomes the subject. Ex: tūṇ pōtikaiyait toṭṭatu, pillar touched the pōtikai.

(3) koḷvōṉ karuttā; the dative as the receiver occurs as the subject. Ex: irappavar eṉ periṉuṅ koḷvar

'Beggars will receive anything they get.' (Sū 26)

Ilakkaṇak kottu points out that one action may result from two agents Ex: tāy makavukku ūṭṭiṉāḷ The mother fed the child.

This means mother is feeding and the child is drinking.
e.g. āciriyaṉ māṇakkaṉukkup paṭippittāṉ

'the teacher teaches the student'-the act of teaching requires two agents: (1) one to teach and the other (2), to

be taught. e. g. talaivaṉ talaiviyaip pulliṉāṉ "the hero embraced the heroine".

Here embracing requires two agents (Sū: 27)

Ilakkaṇak Kottu divides the agent into three kinds.

(1) ēvutal viṉai mutal i.e. commanding agent: Ex. aracaṉ tēr ceytāṉ 'king made the car.'

(2) iyaṟṟutal viṉaimutal i.e. executing agent Ex: taccaṉ tēr ceytāṉ "carpenter made the car."

(3) ivaṟṟiṉ vēṟām viṉai mutal i.e. the agent which is neither commanding nor executing. Ex: cāttaṉ uṟaṅkiṉāṉ 'cāttaṉ slept.' (Sū: 28)

Vīracōḷiyam speaks of the following case sings for the nominative.

(1) cu (2) ar (3) ār (4) ārkaḷ (5) arkaḷ. (6) kaḷ and mār (Sū: 30) These case signs occur in all other cases except the vocative where also they occur in a few places.

Every word ends either in tiṅ-verbal suffix or sup or nominative suffix Therefore Pāṇini assumes a word marker without which there cannot be a word but only a word-stem called prātipadika.

When the nominal word marker sup i. e. su is added the word becomes a noun in the nominative case. In all cases when sup is added, it is lost. Then the question arises why then it is added? The answer is, it is added to differentiate a word from a word stem.

In Sanskrit, the word vāri for denoting the nominative singular, takes the sup and loses it. Similarly in every Tamil word su is added which is then lost. Unless it is added it will not become a word. Vīracōḷiam calls the prātipadika, prakṛti or the stem.

There are eight kinds of prakṛtīs or stems when the nouns are taken into consideration. Vīracōḷiyam enumerates the five fold division- 1) masculine singular, 2) feminine singular, 3) human plural or epicene, 4) non-human singular and 5) non human plural. (Sū: 31). To these it adds three kinds

of honorific plurals - (1) Masculine honorific plural oruvanai-c-cirappitta col e. g., cāttanār, korranār; (2) Feminine honorific plural oruttiyai-c-cirappitta col Ex: cāttiyār korriyār. Sometimes instead of ār, kaḷ also comes e. g., ammaikaḷ (3) The honorific plural of the non-human singular, onrai-c-cirappitta col. e. g., nariyanār, nāraiyār

For the old five-fold division, examples are :

cāttan, korran	: Masculine singular
cātti, korri	: Feminine singular
nāttār, ūrār	: human plural or epicene
yānai, maram	: non-human singular
yānaikaḷ, marankaḷ	: non-human plural

When each of these eight prakrtīs occur with the case signs of the eight cases then we have 8 x 8 : 64 kāraka padas. In Sanskrit there are only 63.

There are three genders masculine, feminine and neuter and there are three numbers-singular, dual and plural and there are seven cases (the vocative is only nominative case of address and not a separate case there). Hence we have 3 x 3 x 7 : 63 kāraka padas in Sanskrit. If we divide words into vowel endings and consonant endings, the above 63 Sanskrit kāraka padas will become 126. (sū : 32) But Pirayōka vivēkam does not accept the necessity for following Sanskrit methodology for explaining the nominative case.

The formal distinction in form, for denoting the nominative case sign does not occur in Tamil as does in Sanskrit. There-fore Pirayōka Vivēkam asserts eḷuvāy vērrumai tiripil peyarē i.e. the noun without any change in its form is the nominative case (Sū : 8). However, Pirayōka Vivēkam explains the views of Vīracōlkyam as the views of others. The Tamil grammarians, as Pirayōka Vivēkam points out, consider an, ān, aḷ, āḷ, ar, ār, kaḷ etc. as suffixes and not as case signs.

Sanskrit changes a word into singular, dual or plural. The case signs of the nominative, accusative, instrumental, dative, ablative, genitive, and locative have each of them three case signs, for singular, dual and plural respectively. Thus

there are twenty one case signs. For understanding this dis-tinction, one goes to genitive case in Tamil, where we have the case sign atu for singular and a the case sign for plural. Such distinctions are not made in other cases. On the basis of this Tamil example, the existence of 21 case signs in Sanskrit may be understood the number distinction in Tamil is only in genitive; so also in Sanskrit certain words like ēkam have the case sign for the singular alone and not for the seven dual case signs; nor for seven plural case signs; in all for fourteen they do not have case signs.

Pirayōka Vivēkam refers to prātipadikam as being labelled by Pāṇiṇi. Prātipadika is that which has meaning and that which however does not come under the category of dhātu or roots; pratyaya or suffix. But he states prātipādikam is dhātu niṣpannam. This is to show that it will not suffer transposition or metathesis of sounds.

The position in Sanskrit has been explained by Vīracōḷiyam. Pirayōka Vivēkam thinks that the Tolkāppiyar has distinguished between the altered nominative form and the non-nominative form of the pronoun for plural 'you'. To show how things happen in Sanskrit, he has made num the prātipadika or the stem and added the case signs ai etc to become nummai etc. The nominative form also is distinguished by a separate subanta, sup ending; niyir which is the altered subanta form of the prātipadika num. See sūtra "allatan marunkin collunkālai" Tais has been done just to give an idea of what happens to all the nominative forms in Sanskrit.

But he has not thus referred nin, tan, tam, en, em, nam and their respective altered nominative forms namely nī, tān, tām, yān, yām, making the latter subantam nominative forms. See the sūtras ellā nīyir nī and niyir nīyena varun kiḷavi

It may be objected that there is no sup or su coming at the end of niyir. To this it may be answered even as the vocative is the altered form of the nominative, nīyir which is the altered form of the standing word num, is the case sign of the nominative.

Compounds – samastapada, words derived from nominal bases taddhita, the participial noun– kṛdanta, verbal noun & bhāva pada: these four also are prātipadikas, and they take case signs and become subantās.

I. First case: The nominative

Iḷampūraṇar and Naccinārkkiṇiyar state that when the noun stands by itself, it is not the nominative case. It is nominative only when the meaning of the nominative is in the context, i. e. when the noun is capable of taking one of the six kinds of predicates. But Cēṉāvaraiyar rejects this view. Nouns standing by itself, according to him, is its nominative case. It is true that a noun should denote a thing or take a case sign. Similarly a nominative case should end with a verb or predicate. But even when it does not take a predicate it is in the nominative case. The nominative is distinguished from other cases like objective, i. e. accusative, etc , by its meaning alone. The other case signs change their form by addition of case signs. The nominative does not thus change its form. On the basis of majority rule the name vērṛumai is applied to nominative also even when it does not change in form but only its meaning, since the majority of cases have changed forms, thus justifying the name for whole group.

Pirayōka Vivēkam proceeds to distinguish various kinds of the agent case or kartṛ kārakam (sū : 12). kartṛ kāraka is either abhihita kartā, explicit agent, or anabhihita kartā, implicit agent.

The explicit agent is of three kinds :

(1) karma kāraka : where the karma or object behaves as a subject as.

  e g. kūrai vēyntatu

   tiṇṇai meḷukiṟṟu.

This has been referred to already by Ilakkaṇak Kottu.

Patañjali speaks of karma kartā in only those instances where karma or object comes after intransitive verbs, or object comes after intransitive verbs or akarmaka parasmaipada,

  e.g. iṉṉā tāmē varum 'the evil will follow itself';

tāṉē or tāmē equals swayam ēva. But the example kūrai vēyntatu, etc. is not karma kartā according to Patañjali, because the predicates there are transitive verbs or sakarmaka parasmaipada.

(2) svatantra kartā : This is translated by Ilakkaṇak Kottu as taṉvacak karuttā eg: dēvatattaṉ cōṟṟai aṭṭāṉ' Dēvatattaṉ cooked his food'. (He cooks of his own accord without anybody commanding him.)

(3) ēvutaṟ karuttā–'commanding agent.' prayōjaka is the name given to it in Sanskrit. The 'executing agent' iyaṟṟutaṟ karuttā is prayōjyaka kartā,

  e.g. ācāryaṉ māṇakkaṉai aṟivittāṉ–

'The teacher made the student understand'. The agent of the verb 'understand' is the student; the teacher is the commanding agent who made him understand.

The second variety anabhihita kartā is of only one kind,

  e.g. taccaṉāl eṭukkap paṭṭatu māṭam–

'The house was constructed by the sculptor.'

The agent is not explicit since it is not in the nominative case. The following explanation given by Pirayōka Vivēkam may be noted:

  abhihitam = teriṉilai = collappaṭu nilai
  anabhihitam = teriyāṉilai = collappaṭā nilai.

He adds two more kinds of agents :

(1) bhāva kartā–Ilakkaṇak Kottu has explained it as the instance where verbal noun comes as agent,

  e.g. kōṟal piraviṉai ellām tarum (Murder will lead to all other evil deeds.)

(2) It however adds also the alternating subject-object type, i.e. taṭumāṟal as explained by Ilakkaṇak kottu,

  e.g. kiḷavaṉum kiḷattiyum kāṇpa–

'Hero and the heroine see each other'. Vīracōḷiyam speaks of five kinds of kartṛ kāraka (sū: 40, 41):

(1) kāraṇak karuttā–This is the same as Pirayōka Vivēkam's ēvutaṟ karuttā, e.g. Cāttaṉ koṟṟaṉai añcuvittāṉ.

(2) tāṉ teri karuttā– This is abhihita kartā in Pirayōka Vivēkam e.g. cāttaṉāl eriyappaṭṭa kal.

(3) tāṉ teriyāk karuttā–This is anabhihita kartā in Pirayōka Vivēkam,

e.g. tēvatattaṉ cōṟṟai aṭukiṉrāṉ– Dāvatatta cooks food.

(4) karumak karuttā – This is what has been explained by Pirayōka Vivēkam and Ilakkaṇak Kottu,

e. g. naṉmai tāṉē veḷippaṭum.

(5) talaimaik karutta – Probably this is the svatantra kartā or tan vacak-karuttā, but example given is: viḷumiyōr naṉmai ceyyār – 'The great will do good'. Here the action is not left to others, but the great have assumed the agency; there-fore the kartā is talaimai.

II Second case : The objective case

This is called karumak kārakam. Vīracōḷiyam gives here seven kinds; (V. C., sū : 40; P. V., sū : 12; I. K. sū : 26–31):

(1) paṟṟuk karumam – The Karmam or object of attach-ment, e. g. poṉṉai ācaippaṭṭār variyōr – 'Beggars aspired for gold'.

(2) vīṭṭuk karumam – object of release, e. g. oḷukkattai ikaḷvār tīyōr – 'Bad people decry good conduct'. Here the agent leaves the object, i. e., good conduct.

(3) irupuṟak karumam – is two-sided karma where the action is done partly consciously and partly unconsciously. He gives the example : The young boy who eats the flour food, ate also the dust which fell into it.

(4) tāṉ teri karumam,

e. g. vīṭṭai eṭuttāṉ taccaṉ – House, which is the object here, appears as object by its own form and not by the help of any other word. This example is given for abhihita karumam in Pirayōka Vivēkam and as terinilaic ceyappaṭupporuḷ in Ilakkaṇak Kottu. There seems to be a difference everywhere in the use of the verb terinilai by Vīracōḷiyam.

(5) tāṉ teriyāk karumam – karmam which is not explicit,

e. g. vīṭu taccaṉ kāṭṭiṉāṉ.

(6) karuttāk karumam – e. g. koṟṟaṉai ūrkkup pōkkiṉāṉ cāttaṉ : 'Cāttaṉ made koṟṟaṉ go to a village'.
Here koṟṟaṉ is karma or object which is also the agent of the verb (to go).

(7) tīpakak karumam – (This is an instance where there are two objects),

e.g., pacuviṉaip pālaik karantāṉ. 'He milked milk (from) the cow.' There are two objects pacu-the cow, and pāl-the milk. Similarly in māṉākkaṉai nūlai aṟivittāṉ-"He taught the book to the student".

Pirayōka Vivēkam divides karma kāraka into two (Sū. 12): (1) abhihita karma explicit object; (2) anabhihita karma-implicit object. Explicit object is of one variety only,

e.g. māṭam taccaṉāl kaṭṭappaṭṭatu-'House was built by carpenter'.

The implicit object is of five varieties :

(1) īccita karumam (īpsita karma) is that object which is done voluntarily. Kallāṭar translates it as karuttuḷ valic ceyappaṭuporuḷ, i.e. the object consciously done,

e.g. pāyai neytāṉ–
"He wove the mat".

Ilakkaṇak kottu calls this karuttuṇṭātal,

e.g. cōṟṟai uṇṭāṉ.

(2) anīccita karumam (anīpsita karma)–Kallāṭar calls this karuttil valic ceyappaṭuporuḷ, i.e. object done unconsciously,

e.g. tīk kaṉāvaik kaṇṭāṉ "He dreamt a bad dream", Ilakkaṇak Kottu calls this karuttiṉṟātal, and the example is cōṟṟaik kuḷaittāṉ

(3) īccita-anīccita karumam (īpsitanīpsita karma) is that where the object is done partly consciously and partly uncon-sciously This is same as irupuṟak karumam of Vīracōḷiyam. Ilakkaṇak Kottu calls this irumiayum ātal, and the example is tūḷoṭu kūḷai uṇṭāṉ, 'He drank the gruel with the dust'. [Compare this with Vīracōḷiyam.]

If this is so, paṟṟuk karumam of Vīracōḷiyam must be īccita karumam and vīṭṭuk karumam must be anīccita

karumam. The example given by Pirayōka Vivēkam is: ūrai celvān pacum pullai mitittān, 'Man going to the village walks on the grass'.

(4) kartru karumam-this is the same as karttā karumam of Vīracōliyam, e.g. makal pōkkiya tāy.

This is parallel to the 8th category of Ilakkaṇak Kottu. The example given there is makalai ūrukkup pōkkiṇāl. The karma is the agent of the action going on and is also the object of pōkku.

Pirayōka Vivēkam gives another kind of kartr karma, which he calls karmavatbhāvamāṇa kartru karma, where the agent occurs as the object also. This is reflexivisation,

e.g. tannaik kuttiṇāṇ – 'One stabbed himself: agadita or auxiliary accusative or dvikamaka or two objects,

e.g. pacuviṇaip pālaik karantāṇ. Here one of the accusative case signs can be replaced by the genitive case,

e.g. pacuviṇatu pālaik karantāṇ. In the other instance the ai cannot be so replaced,

e.g. ācariyaṇai aiyurra porulai viṇāviṇāṇ– 'He asked the teacher his doubts'. Pirayōka Vivēkam also speaks of antar bhāvita karmam. Ilakkaṇak Kottu gives a Tamil form for this as akanilaic ceyappaṭuporul, i.e. the object which is inside the word itself. vantāṇ '(he) came', is equated with varutalaic ceytāṇ-'He did the act of coming'-varutal is the interior object.

Vākyapadīyam and Kaiyaṭam divide the object into three kinds:

(1) nirvartyam, which is translated by Cēṇāvaraiyar as iyarrappaṭutal, i.e. making something which did not exist,

e.g. eyilai ilaittāṇ-'He built the fortress'.

(2) vikāryam-This is translated by Cēṇāvaraiyar as vērupaṭukkap paṭutal i. e. changing or deforming what is already in existence,

e. g. marattaik kuraittāṇ-
"He cut the tree".

(3) prāpyam –Cēṇāvaraiyar translates this as eytappaṭutal, which is neither of the two foregoing but which consists in receiving the effects of an action, e.g. porulaip perum- "He will receive the wealth".

Pirayōka Vivēkam points out that the author of Naṉṉūl, following the school of Jinēndra, divides the karma into many kinds such as creating: ākkal, destroying: alittal, achieving: aṭaital, etc.

Ilakkaṇak Kottu translates Iccita karumam as karuttuṇṭātal, e. g. cōrrai uṇṭāṇ.

anīccita karumam is translated as karuttinrātal,

e. g. cōrraik kulaittāṇ
iccitānīccita karumam is translated as irumaiyumātal,

e. g. tūloṭu kūlai uṇṭāṇ. irumai refers to (2) mentioned above.

agadita or dvikarmaka is translated as iraṇṭurupu iṇaital, i. e., where two accusative case signs occur.

Ilakkaṇak Kottu makes the distinction already made in Pirayōka Vivēkam between the cases where one of the accusative case sign is replaced and where it cannot be so replaced.

The examples are those given in Pirayōka Vivēkam under kartr karma. It has mentioned karmavat bhāva kartr karma where the subject itself is also the object with the reflexive pronoun. Ilakkaṇak Kottu labels this ceyappaṭuporul karuttāvātal where the object becomes the subject.

The real kartr karma mentioned by Pirayōka Vivēkam and the example makaṭ pōkkiya tāy is mentioned in the commentary on Ilakkaṇak Kottu where the object is the agent of the verb going and the object of pōkku, and where there is also a commanding agent.

The antarbhāvita karma or akanilaic ceyappaṭu porul of Pirayōka vivēkam is translated in identical terms and the same example is given.

The abhihita karma of Pirayōka Vivēkam is called terinilaic ceyappaṭuporul, and the example given is: māṭam ceyyappaṭṭatu. The explanation is that though the object appears

in the form of a nominative case, it is clear in the sentence that it is the object. Ilakkaṇak Kottu adds that this is terinilaic ceyappaṭu poruḷ and all the others are teriyānilai-c-ceyappaṭu poruḷ.

taṭumāri niṟṟal has been mentioned by P. V. under kartā, because it is an alternation of object for subject. Ilakkaṇak Kottu mentions it under karma also and the example is what is given earlier : kiḷavaṇum kiḷattiyuṅ kāṇpa.

I. K. also mentions three divisions referred to in Vākyapadīyam and translated by Cēnāvaraiyar as iyaṟṟappaṭutal (e.g. eyilai iḷaittāṇ), vēṟupaṭukkap paṭutal (e.g. marattaik-k-uṟaittāṇ), and eytappaṭutal (e.g. poruḷaip peṟṟāṇ).

III. Third Case : Instrumental

(V. C Sū 40; P. V Sū 12; I. K. Sū 33-34).

Vīracōḻiyam speaks of karaṇa or the instrumental being of two kinds: 1) puṟak karaṇam-external instrument, e.g. kōṭaliyāl marattai veṭṭināṇ.

'(The maṇ) cut the tree with an axe'. The axe is the exterior instrument because it is not an organ of the man who cuts the tree.

(2) akak karaṇam-the interior instrument.

e.g. kaṇṇiṇāṟ kaṇṭāṇ – "He saw with his eyes".

This is interior because the eye as an instrument of seeing is an organ of the agent.

But Pirayōka Vivēkam differs from V. C., and so does Ilakkaṇak Kottu.

According to P. V. instruments are of two kinds · (Sū : 12):

(1) bāhya or puṟak karaṇam,
e. g. kaṇṇāṟ kaṇṭāṇ, kālāl naṭantāṇ

kaṇ (eye) and kāl (leg) being organs were called akakkaraṇam by V. C. For P. V. it is mind alone which is an interior organ.

(2) abhyantaram or akak karaṇam. Pirayōka Vivēkam gives the example uḷḷattāl uḷḷal – 'thinking with the mind'.

P. V. adds that the third case comes with the meaning of hētu, and gives the example nāṇāl uyir tuṟappār– "They will renounce their life because of the sense of shame".

Pirayōka Vivēkam says that hētu is of two kinds :

(1) kāraka hētu –the cause,

e. g. vaṇikattāṇ āyiṇāṇ ·
became great because of trade.

(2) Jñāpaka hētu is the middle term (the co existent component reminding of the other component),

e. g. muyaṟciyāṟ pirattaliṇ oli nilaiyātu–

"Because the speech sound is born of effort it is not permanent".

Ilakkaṇak Kottu divides karuvi or instrument into three kinds (Sū 33, 34). The first two are what we have already noted in Pirayōka Vivēkam and Vīracōḻiyam. They are akak karuvi and puṟak karuvi, and the examples are respectively : (1) maṇattāl niṇaittāṇ – 'He thought with the mind'; and (2) vāḷāl veṭṭināṇ. – 'He cut with the sword'.

The third category is something new which is identity or unity, that is, where the instrument is identical with the agent, ·

e.g. aṟivāṇariṇtāṇ – "He understood it through his knowledge". Knowledge is the form of the self itself. The material cause, the instrumental cause, Jñāpaka hētu, kāraka hētu, (action or vinai), nimitta kāraṇam or the personal cause and other environments, vēṟṟumai, agent or viṇaimutal, time or kālam-all these should be brought under the above-mentioned three according to Ilakkaṇak Kottu.

IV. Fourth Case : The dative

(I. K. Sū 33-37; P. V. 13; V. C. 40.) Pirayōka Vivēkam (Sū : 13) states that the dative or sampradāna is of three kinds:

(1) anirākartṛ sampradāna which is translated as kēḷātu ēṟṟal, i.e., receiving without, however, asking for it. The example is: mukkaṇṇaṇukkup pūvittāṇ –"He offered flowers to the lord of three eyes."

Ilakkaṇak Kottu gives the same Tamil name but the example is : āviṟku nīrviṭṭān-. 'He gave water to the cow' (Sū : 36).

Vīracōḷiyam calls this kiṭappuk kōḷi,

e.g. tēvarkkup pūviṭṭān - 'He offered flowers to dēvas'.

The commentary adds that the dēvas did not ask for flowers, but it is the natural routine of life of the gṛhasta to offer fresh flowers to gods. The traditional routine is called kiṭappu.

(2) prēraka sampradāna - The Tamil name is : kēṭṭē ērral, i. e. receiving after having asked for it,

e. g. variyārkku oṉṟu ītal - 'giving one thing or something to the poor.'

irappārkku oṉṟital - 'giving something to beggars'. Vīra-cōḷiyam calls this irappuk kōḷi,

e. g. antaṇarkkup poṉ koṭuttāṉ - 'King gave gold to Brahmins'. Here the Brahmins ask for gold and got it. iravalarkkup piccai iṭṭāṉ - 'He gave alms to beggars'.

Ilakkaṇak Kottu calls this by the same Tamil name and the example is : variyārkku īntāṉ - 'He gave to the poor'.

(3) anumantṛ sampradāna is viruppāy ērral-'receiving with pleasure.'

e. g. ācaryaṉ māṇākkaṉukkuk kacaiyaṭi koṭuttāṉ-

'The teacher gave the student a thrashing'. Ilakkaṇak Kottu gives the same name and also the same example.

Vīracōḷiyam labels this ārvak kōḷi-"reciving with enthusiasm and also giving with enthusiasm" as explained by the commentary.

e. g. aruntavarkku ūṇ koṭuttāṉ - 'He gave food to tapas-vins'; viruntiṉarkku iṭam koṭuttāṉ-'He gave accommodation to guests'.

P. V. points out that there is another kind of dative - abhēda sampradāna-where the recipient is himself the giver,

e. g. aṟivilāṉ ceyyum perumiṟai tāṉē taṉakku-

'The ignorant will do harm unto himself.' (In this case the reflexive pronoun is used.)

I. K. calls this īvōṉ ērral and gives the example, taṉakkē cōṟiṭṭāṉ-'He gave food unto himself'.

I. K. also makes further distinctions.

In a society with a number of hierarchies the author distinguishes amongst :

(1) Receipt by a superior, i. e., uyarntōṉ ērral and the example given by Saivite bigotry is araṉukku ari kaṇmalar koṭuttāṉ-

'Hari gave the flower of an eye to Hara'.

(2) Receipt by an inferior, i. e. iḷintōṉ ērral. Again an example of Saivite bigotry comes in.

araṉ arikkuc cakkaraṅ koṭuttāṉ-

'Hara gave Hari the cakra or disc'.

(3) Receipt by an equal, i. e. oppōṉ ērral,

e. g cēraṉ cōḷaṉukku viruntu koṭuttāṉ-

'Cēra gave a feast to Cōḷa'.

Ilakkaṇak kottu distinguishes between ēlātu ērral-'receiving without any receiving', and uṇarviṉṟi ērral-'receiving without being conscious of it.'

The example for the former is:

māṇākkaṉukku-aṟivaik koṭuttāṉ-

'He gave his student knowledge'.

The example for the latter is :

cōṟṟirku ney viṭṭāṉ-

'He poured ghee into the food'.

I. K. further distinguishes four kinds of gifts:

(1) a gift according to convention - vaḻakkuk koṭai,

e. g. marukaṉukku makaḷ koṭuttāṉ-

'he gave his daughter to his sister's son';

(2) a gift by inherited right - urimaik koṭai,

e. g. makaṉukku aracu koṭuttāṉ

'he gave kingship to his son', i. e. crowned him;

(3) a gift out of fear - accak koṭai,

e. g. aracaṉukkut tiṟai koṭuttāṉ-

'He paid taxes to king';

(4) a gift by imagination – bhāvanaik koṭai,

    e. g. perrōrkkut titi koṭuttāṉ–

    'he gave offerings to the (deceased) parents'.

V. Fifth Case: The Ablative

This is called avadhi or apādānam or nīkkam. It is of two kinds:

(1) A thing from which one moves out is an immovable, i.e. acala or nilaittiṉai, or

(2) the thing from which one moves out may be movable, i e. cala or iyaṅku tiṉai.

ūriṉ niṉrum pōṉāṉ tēvatattaṉ–'Dēvadatta went out of the village'–is an example for acala.

malaiyiṉ iḷintāṉ–'he descended from the mountain'–is an example for calam.

Vīracōḷiyam gives the example: kutiraiyiniṉrum viḷuntāṉ cāttaṉ–.

'cāttaṉ fell from the horse'.

P. V. and I. K. give the example kutiraiyiṉ iḷintāṉ '(He) descended from the horse'.

Pirayōka Vivēkam adds one more variety where the thing is neither movable nor immovable:

kuṭip pirantu kuṟrattiṉ nīṅki–

'Going outside the exterior borders of defects'.

Pirayōka Vivēkam calls this purappāṭṭu ellai or bahissīma. Ilakkaṇak Kottu calls this paṇpu or quality, :

    e. g. kuṟrattiṉ nīṅki

        aiyattiṉ nīṅki

        cirumaiyiṉ nīṅki.

VI. Sixth case: The Genitive (P. V. Sū: 13; I. K. Sū: 40)

Pirayōka Vivēkam points out that the kriyā ṣaṣṭhi coming with the case sign ku is the only genitive kārakam.

sambandha ṣaṣṭhi does not take any verb. It is of two kinds: (1) abhēda (2) bhēda.

The abhēda saṣṭhi is one of the kind where there is identity between the owner and the owned, e. g:

(1) irākuttalai Raghu's head Raghu consists in nothing more than the head.

(2) eṉṉuyir – my life – where the life is not different from one's self.

The bhēda ṣaṣṭhi or non-identity is of three kinds. The first is called samavāya sambandha, where there is organic relationship–.

1. between the whole and the part;
2. between a thing and its guṇa or quality;
3. between the action and the actor;
4. between the genus and the species, i. e. cāti; and
5. between the altered form and its original. These are respectively ciṉai (organ), kuṇam (quality), toḷil (action), cāti (caste), and vikāram (the altered form). The examples for the first five respectively are as given below:

(1) cāttaṉatu kaṇ (Catta's eye);

(2) nilattatu akalam (land's width);

(3) campantaṉatu varavu (sambandha's coming);

(4) eḷḷatu kuppai (sesame's heap or a heap of sesame);

(5) eḷḷatu cāntu (sesame's paste or a paste of sesame).

The bhēda ṣaṣṭhi is always an attachment or a coming together; and it is not the relationship of identity. It is called samyōga sambandha and is of three kinds :

(1) relation between the thing and its owner :
    murukaṉatu vēl–'Lord Muruga's spear or lance';

(2) the place and its owner : murukaṉatu kuṟiñci–
    'Lord Murugan's hill';

(3) the time and its ruler :
    Veḷḷiyatu āṭci–
  "Venus' rulership (of time)".

The third variety of bhēda is called svarūpa sambandha which is a relationship based on any condition other than samyōga or samavāya,

e. g. cāttanatu cey–"catta's land".

Patañjali divides these three main varieties into hundred and one sub-divisions. The author of the commentary Kāśikā vṛtti gives thirty–six sub-divisions. Cēnāvaraiyar has given twenty-two varieties.

sambandha ṣaṣthi stands as a noun preceded by an attribute. It does not take a verb. Sanskrit example 'puruṣō rājñah' may come as rajña puruṣah; so also in Tamil we can have āṭai cāttanatu or cāttanatu āṭai. (In the former, cāttanatu will be non-human singular implied verb.)

Ilakkaṇak Kottu translates ṣaṣṭi, as kurai which is equated with kiḷamai or relationship. (See the note attached on Sēṣa given by Dr. K.N. Eḷuttaccan) For the abhēda ṣaṣthi he gives the Tamil name orrumaik kurai, and the examples given are: ennuyir–'my life', and irākut talai–'head of Raghu.'

The bhēda ṣaṣthi is called vērrumaik kurai. As stated in Pirayōka Vivēkam this is said to be of three kinds.

samavāya sambandha is called onrāyt tōnral. He gives the same examples for cinai (organ) kuṇam (quality) and toḷil (action) as given in Pirayōka Vivēkam. cāti he calls onran kūṭṭam–'the heap of the same thing.' For this the example is: eḷḷatu kuppai. The same is given in Pirayōka Vivēkam. Here, as in Nannūl and Cēnāvaraiyam, he adds palaviṇ iṭṭam – 'the crowding of many things.' The example is: paṭaiyatu kuḷām 'the group of the army.' Because of this new addition to Pirayōka Vivēkam's five kinds of samavāya sambandha we have six kinds. For vikāram he gives the Tamil name piriviṇ ākkam and the example is: kōṭṭatu nūru–"the powder of lime".

---

samyōga sambandha is translated as urimaiyāyt tōnral–'appearing as of inherited right.' Three divisions are given Sēṣa means svasvāmi sambandha (relation between the possessor and possessed) etc., which do not come under the meaning of kārakas (hence they are sēṣa). There ṣaṣthi occurs When kāraka meaning is not intended weget ṣaṣthi. Here only the general relation is kept in mind, e.g. mātuh smarati 'He remembers his mother.' (This is more idiomatic though mātaram smarati is the usual form).

Jamyōga under this in Pirayōka Vivēkam: poruḷ (object), iṭam (place) and kālam (time). To these three which Ilakkaṇak Kottu mentions and illustrates the same examples as given in Pirayōka Vivēkam, I. K. adds two more kinds: (1) the relation ship between the author and his book. e.g. campantanatu tamiḷ, 'sambandha's Tamil'–and (2) the relationship between the patron and the book, e.g. campantanatu piḷḷait tamiḷ. "sambandhā'spiḷḷai-t-tamiḷ"–i.e. piḷḷai-t-tamiḷ on sambandha.

The third variety is called svarūpa sambandham by Pirayōka Vivēkam. It is given in Tamil as vērāy-t-tōnral. He calls this nilaimaiyil uṭaimai–impermanent relationship, i.e. where one thing is owned at one time by one and later by another. The examples are cātta's cow, cātta's land, and cātta's gold.

Vīracōḷiyam does not give anything further in his kārakap paṭalam, because among the twenty– three kārakas enumerated therein genitive does not figure.

VII. Seventh case: Locative

(V. C. Sū : 41; P. V. Sū : 13, I. K. Sū : 42). This is called ādhāram in Vīracōḷiyam. The Tamil name iṭam is given by Ilakkaṇak Kottu. According to Pirayōka Vivēkam adhikaraṇa is of three kinds:

(1) viṣayādhāra, which is translated as urimai natural or appropriate. The example is : Kāṭṭil nari 'Fox in the forest.'

(2) upaślēṣa – what is being located in a part. This location may be of an organic kind or samavāya sambandha or mere junction or coming together or samyōga. The example for the former is matikkaṇ maru–'blot in the moon'. For the latter the example is : pāyiṇkaṇ iruntān–'he was on the mat.'

(3) vyāpaka – all pervasive in a thing. From the point of difference, the two may be considered as distinct. From the view point of identity the two will be one, e. g. eḷḷiṇkaṇ ney–'oil in the sesame seed'. Similarly maṇikkaṇ oḷi –'light in the precious stone' – i. e. the light shines all through the precious stone.

Vīracōḷiyam calls urimai viṭayātāram or pulaṉātāram, e g., kāṭṭiṇkaṇ puli-'tiger stands in forest'; kaṭaluḷ mīṉ tirikiṇratu-'fish roams in the sea'. This is the viṣayādhāra of Pirayōka Vivēkam. The upaśleṣa of Pirayōka Vivēkam is called cērvādāram, e.g. taṭukkiṉ kaṇ iruntāṉ korraṉ.-'korraṉ was on the mat',-tēriṇkaṇ niṉrāṉ; 'He stood on the chariot.'

The vyāpaka adhikaraṇa of P. V. is called by V. C. kalappādāram, e.g. eḷḷil eṇṇey niṉratu-"oil was in the sesame seed";-tayiril veṇṇey niṉratu-"Butter was in curd".

Vīracōḷiyam mentions in addition āliṇkaṇ pacu kiṭantatu-'cow laid itself under the banian tree'-i.e. it lies under the shade; yāḷiṇkaṇ ōcai niṉratu-'sound stands in the lute.'

Ilakkanak Kottu divides location into four kinds. urimai or viṣaya is as mentioned by Pirayōka Vivēkam and the example is nilattiṇkaṇ tērōṭukiṉrata-'chariot runs on the land.'

upaśleṣa is translated as ōriṭam, e.g. ūrkkaṇ iruntāṉ-'He was in the village';-tērkkaṇiruntāṉ-'He was on the chariot'.

Two kinds of relationship are either samavāya or samyōga. samavāya is the relationship of identity; samyōga is the relationship of coming together. These should be taken along with ōriṭam and eṅkumiṭam.

P. V.'s vyāpaka is translated as eṅkumiṭam, e.g. maṇiyiṇkaṇ oḷi-'shining in the precious stone';-tīyiṇkaṇ cūṭu- 'heat in the fire.'

P. V. points out that the location and the located may be without a form, i. e 'aru or with a form, i.e. uru. The examples are: vaṭakkaṇ Vēṅkaṭam-Vēṅkaṭam in the north'; akāyattiṇkaṭ paruntu-'kite in the sky;' makattir piṟantāṉ,-'he was born on the maka day'; nallārk kaṇ paṭṭa varumai-'poverty among good people'.

The location according to Ilakkaṇak Kottu can be time, 'dik' or direction, place or ākāyam, sunshine, darkness, land, the form, or the formless.

uḷ occurs as saptamyartha or meaning of the locative. It has two meanings: (1) yōga vibhāga:- Where a thing added to one group and thereafter separated from that, e.g. uṭaiyāṉ

aracaruḷ ēru-'One who owns these things is the lion among kings.' He is first joined to the group of kings and thereafter separated as a unique lion amongst them

(2) vibhāga yōga :- Where a thing is separated from one group and added to another, e.g vāṉuraiyum teyvattuḷ vaikkappaṭum - 'He will be placed among the heavenly one'. He is separated from other human beings and added on to the group of the heavenly ones.

Pirayōka Vivēkam speaks of nirdhāraṇa saptami where there is no real location. muṟai ceyyum maṉṉavan makkaṭku iṟai yeṉru vaikkapaṭum-'The king who rules according to law will be placed or deemed as the ruler of human beings'.

Ilakkaṇak Kottu also speaks of location without there being a location and, he divides such instances into three. First two are kūṭṭip pirittal or pirittuk kūṭṭal and the examples are as given above. The third is iruvariṉ muṭiyum oruviṉait toḻirpeyar verbal noun consists of one act but which requires two people, e.g. pulliviṭāp pulaviyuṭ tōṉrum Here pulavi is the verbal noun which requires two parties, the man and the woman. taṭṭup puṭaikkaṇ vantāṉ -'He came when people were fighting'. There is a slight difference between Pirayōka Vivēkam and Ilakkaṇak Kottu.

I. Case Suffixes

Case	Vīracōḷiyam	Pirayōka Vivēkam	Ilakkaṇak Kottu
Nominative	cu, ar, ār, arkaḷ, ārkaḷ, kaḷ, mār	...	...
Accusative	ai	ai	ai
Instrumental	oṭu, ōṭu, āl	āṉ, oṭu	āl
Dative	ku, poruttu	ku (poruttu is arthā)	ku
Ablative of motion or separation	niṉru	iṉ (mēniṉru, niṉru arthā)	iṉ
Locative	kē, uḷai, vayiṉ, pakkal, uḷi, il, kaṇ, cār, iṭam iṭai, muṉ, piṉ, kīḷ, mēl, uḷ, puṟam, vāy	il, kaṇ	kaṇ

II. (1) Nominative case: Karta or Vinai Mutal

Ilakkaṇk Kottu	Pirayōk Vivēkam	Vīracōḷiyam
terinilaik kartā	abhihita kartā (terinilai tānteri karuttā is of three kinds)	
iruvakai ceyappaṭu poruḷ- karutta vāka varutal	karma kartā kartṛvad bhāvam	karuma kāruttā
	(1) coming with sakarmaka parasmaipadas (2) coming with akarmaka parasmaipadas.	
tanvacak karuttā	svatantra kartā	talaimaik karuttā
ētu karuttā	hētu kartā (author refers to this, but the example is for ēvutar karutta. A line must have been omitted.)	...
ēvutal viṉaimutal	ēvutar karuttā (no mention is made about this. But there is example. A line must have been omitted.)	...
iyarrutal viṉaimutal	...	...
iraṇṭumallā viṉaimutal	...	...
teriyāṉilaik karuttā	anabhihita kartā or teriyāṉilai	tān teriyāṉilaik karuttā.
toḷirpeyar viṉaimutal	bhāva kartā	...
taṭumāri nirral	karumamum karuttāvum taṭumāral	
iruviṉaimutalāl oruviṉai	...	...

ilakkaṇamallātaṉa:
1. karuvi karuttā
2. iṭam karuttā
3. koḷvōṉ karuttā.

II (2) Accusative case: Karumam or Ceyappaṭuporuḷ

Vīracōḷiyam	Pirayōka Vivēkam	Ilakkaṇak Kottu Kallāṭar.
parrukkarumam	īccita karmam	karuttuṇṭatal karuttuḷvaḷic-ceyappaṭu poruḷ

vīṭṭuk karumam	aṉīccita karmam	karuttiṉrātal karuttilvaḷic-ceyappaṭu poruḷ
irupurak karumam	īccitāṉīccita karmam	irumaiyumātal ...
tānteri karumam	abhihita karmam ((5) kinds)	
karuttāk karumam	kartṛ karmam	ceyappaṭuporuḷ viṉaimutal āyum, ceyappaṭu poruḷāyum taṉit taṉi varal
	karmabhāvamāṉa ceyappaṭu poruḷ	karuttā-kartṛu karmam vātal
tīpakak karumam	agaditam or tuṇainilai dvikarmaka	iraṇṭurupu varutal

antar bhāvita karma akanilai
or akanilaic ceyappaṭu ceyappaṭuporuḷ
poruḷ
The following is
according to
vākya-padīyam and
kaiyaṭam:

iyarrap paṭutal or	iyarrap paṭutal
1 nirvartyam	
vērupaṭukkap paṭutal	vērupaṭukkap paṭutal
2. vikāryam or	
3. prāpyam	
eytappaṭutal	eytap paṭutal

(3) Instrumental case: Karaṇam or Karuvi

Vīracōḷiyam	Pirayōka Vivēkam	Ilakkaṇak kottu
purak karaṇam	purak karaṇam	purak karuvi
akak karaṇam	akak karaṇam	akak karuvi
		orrumaik karuvi
	hētu (2 kinds):	
	1. kārakam	mutal
	2. jñāpakam	tuṇai jñāpakam
		kārakam ētu
		viṉai nimittam
		vērrumai viṉaimutal
		kālam

(4) Dative case, Kōḷi: Sampradānam or Kolvōn

Vīracōḷiyam	Pirayōka Vivēkam	Ilakkaṇak Kottu
āṛvak kōḷi	anumantṛ sampradānam	viruppāy ēṟṟal
kiṭappuk kōḷi	anirākartṛ sampradānam	kēḷātu ēṟṟal
irappuk kōḷi	prēraka sampradānam	kēṭṭē ēṟṟal
	abhēda sampradānam	īvōn ēṟṟal
		ēlātu ēṟṟal
		uyarntōn ēṟṟal
		iḷintōn ēṟṟal
		oppōn ēṟṟal
		uṇarviṉṛi ēṟṟal
		vaḷakkuk koṭai
		urimaik koṭai
		accak koṭai
		bhāvanaik koṭai

(5) Ablative; Avadhi, Apādānam or Nīkkam

Vīracōḷiyam	Pirayōka Vivēkam	Ilakkaṇak Kottu
acalam (nilaittiṇai)	acalam	nilait tiṇai
calam (iyaṅku tiṇai)	calam	iyaṅku tiṇai
	puṛappāṭṭellai or bahis śimā	paṇpu

(6) Genitive: Kriya Ṣaṣṭhi Kuṛai - Kiḷamai

Pirayōka Vivēkam	Ilakkaṇak Kottu
sambandha ṣaṣṭhi: 2 kinds-	
i. abhēdam : (e. g. rākut talai, eṉṉuyir)	i. oṛṛumaik kuṛai, e. g. rākuttalai
ii. bhēda ṣaṣṭhi: 3 kinds-	ii. vēṛṛumaik kuṛai
(i) samavāya sambandham	(i) oṉṛāyt tōṉṛal
(i) organic relationship	(a) ciṉai (b) kuṇam
(a) ciṉai (b) kuṇam	(c) toḷil (d) oṉṛaṉ- kūṭṭam (=cāti)
(c) toḷil (d) cāti and	
(e) vikāram	(e) palaviṉ īṭṭam
	(f) piriviṉ ākkam (= vikāram)

(ii) samyōga sambandham
(a) poruḷ (b) iṭam
(c) kālam

(iii) svarūpa sambandham

(ii) urimaiyāytt tōṉṛal
(a) poruḷ (b) iṭam
(c) kalam
(d) iruvakainūḷ

(iii) vēṛāyt tōṉṛal.

(7) Locative: Adharam or Adhikaraṇam or Iṭam

Vīracōḷiyam	Pirayōka Vivēkam	Ilakkaṇak Kottu
pulaṉātāram	visayādharam or urimai upaślēṣam	urimai iruvakai
cērvātāram	(1) samavāyam	(1) samavāyam i.e. oṛṛumai
ayalatāram kalappātāram	(2) samyōgam vyāpakam abhivyāpakam = eṅkum vyāpakam yōga vibhāgam vibhāga yōgam	(2) saiyōgam, i.e. kūṭṭam eṅkumiṭam iṭamallā itam: 1. kūṭṭippirittal 2. piruttuk kūṭṭal 3. iruvariṉ muṭium- oruviṉai

nirdhāraṇa saptami =
ātāramiṉṛi varutal
(This is different from
I. K's iruvarin muṭiyum-
oruviṉai.)

MISCELLANEOUS

Other Important Facts Relating to cases:

Mayakkam

  Rules have been laid down :

  (1) For the particular case sign ,

  (2) for the meaning as agent, etc. (3) for the words which follow as predicates the noun taking the case sign. But in some places the same meaning of a particular construction may be given by another construction i.e., there may be constructions which are synonymous or paraphrases of each other. It will be coming together of case signs urupu mayakkam–where a case sign which has no privilege of occurrence at the spot occurs with in the meaning of some other case sign.

Tolkāppiyar refers to this in the sūtra, yātan urupir kūrirrāyinum. Cēnāvaraiyār and others explained this as follows: nānal manarkkinra mulai-"nānal the reed which sprouts in the sand." Instead of using the locative manalil, the author used manarkku the dative which has not the privilege of occurrence there the locative alone has. Here the noun having the case sign and the predicate coming thereafter do not semantically combine and make any sense. The ku has to be taken in the sense of the locative. Similarly, kālattil ceytananri "a good turn done at the proper time"-occurs in Tirukkural as Kālattināl ceytananri-"a good turn done by the time." The noun and predicate do not make any sense as they stand. The instrumental case sign āl has to interpreted as the locative il. Similarly kokkinukkilinta tīmpalam: kokku is the mango tree. The sweet fruit thereof descends from the tree and not to the tree. The dative used after the mango tree does not make any sense as it stands. It has to be interpreted as the ablative of motion.

The shoulders which laugh at the young bamboo shoots :- This is one way of contrasting the shoulders with the shoulder like bamboo shoots. The case sign should be the accusative after the bamboo. In nāku vēyoțu-the case sign used is oțu which is meaningless as it stands and which therefore should be interpretted as the accusative ai.

There is also the coming together or overlapping of the meaning of case signs. Tolkāppiyar has laid down certain rules for words ending in consonants or vowels taking the vocative case. He mentions vowel endings in i, u and states that other vowel endings amongst the human category will not occur in the vocative case, But against this rule āțūu takes the ordinary vocative ē, e. g. aṭūuvē. This is given as an example for poruḷ mayakkam, āțūu has taken the case sign ē which has not been laid down for it but which has been laid down, for words like tiru etc. and therefore occurs with the meaning of the vocative prescribed for - tiru - etc. The word taking the case sign and the word following it become connected semantically. When such a thing happens we have poruḷ mayakkam.

The third is that coming together or overlapping of not only case signs but also of their meanings. The example is paliyai

añcinān ·He fears the scandal' - paliyin añcinān, 'he fears because of the scandal' - is also idiomatic. Here the accusative ai in paliyai, and the in the ablative of motion in paliyin have the same privilege of occurrence. For Tolkāppiyar has said for the meaning of fear both the second and fifth case have equal privilege of occurrence

Here since both have the privilege of occurrence pali can be the object and equally the hētu. There is no mixing together of meaning. This is true. But the hētu itself is the object in this construction; and therefore in such place both hētu and object occur in the same sense. In this way there is coming together or overlapping of two senses. pulikol yānai etc. may either mean that 'the elephant killed the tiger' or 'tiger killed the elephant'. Here there is an alternation between the agent and the object. This is an alternation between the agent and the object. This is also a case of urupum poruḷum uṭan mayakkam. i. e. The overlapping of case signs and overlapping of their meaning.

Tolkāppiyar also gives the examples viz, nālaikku varum he will come tomorrow and mālaikku varum – 'he will come in the evening', where ku the dative case sign occurs with the meaning of locative. In all these, more than one case signs come with the meaning of one kāraka. (P. V. Sū : 15)

Ilakkaṇak Kottu also refers to (1) many case signs coming with the meaning of a particular case or kāraka (2) case signs which have of equal privilege of occurrence (3) to case signs which occur in a place though they do not have the privilege of occurrence there. He also refers to many case signs coming for one case.

Vīracōliyam, Pirayōka Vivēkam and Ilakkaṇak Kottu menttion the case signs coming for the various other case signs. The following tables give them with examples. Since the translations of the examples had already been given when mentioning and illustrating the various kārakams, the examples are not again translated.

III. Comparative Tables Kartā Kārakam or Viṇaimutal.

Viracōliyam	occurs with the case sign for	Pirayōka Vivēkam	occurs with the case sign for	Ilakkaṇak Kottu	occurs with the case sign for
tāṉ teriyāk kartā e.g. tēvatattaṉ cōṟṟai -aṭukiṟaṉ	I case	abhihita kartā or terinilai ex. tēvatattaṉ cōṟṟai aṭṭaṉ; tiṉṉai meḻukiṟṟu anabhihita kartā or	I case	vinaimutal e.g. avar ceytār	I case
Other kartas					
1. tāṉ teri kartā e.g. tēva tattaṉāl cōṟu peṟappaṭṭatu ...	III case	teriyāṉilai e.g. avarāl ceyyat takum-akkāriyam	III case	teriyāṉilaik karuttā viṇai mutal e.g. avarāl ceyya-ttakumak kāriyam	III case
2. tāṉ teri kartā tēva tattaṉuṭaiyacol	IV case	anabhihita kartā or teriyāṉilai e.g. avarkkuc ceyyat takumakkāriyam	IV case	teriyāṉilaik karuttā viṇai mutal e.g. avarkkucceyyat takum- akkāriyam	IV case
		anabhihita kartā or teriyāṉilai e.g. avarkkuc ceyyat takumakkāriyam	VI case	teriyāṉilaik karuttā viṇaimutal e.g. avaratu varavu	VI case
3. kāraṇak kartā : cāttaṉ koṟṟaṉai añcu vittaṉ	I case	...	...	...	...
4. karumak kartā naṉmai tāṉā veḻippaṭum	I case	...	...	...	...
5. talaimaik kartā viḻumiyōr naṉmai ceyyār	I case	...	...	...	...

(add to these 3 and 6th cases) (See II. I) Comparative table "Nominative case" for the comparative list of the names of kārakās)

III. (2) Kārumak Kārakam or Ceyappatuporuḷ

Viracōliyam occurs with the case sign	Pirayōka Vivēkam	occurs with the case sign.	Ilakkaṇak Kottu Occurs with the case sign	
tāṉ teriyāk karumam e. g. cōṟu tēvatattaṉāl aṭappaṭṭatu	I	abhihita karma e. g. cōṟu tēvatattaṉāl aṭappaṭṭatu	I ceyappatuporuḷ e. g. cōra– ṭappaṭṭatu	I
other karumam: tāṉ teri karumam E. g. nūlai arivittaṉ	II	anabhihita karma e. g. nūlaiyariṉtāṉ; marattaik kuraittaṉ	II terinilai ceyappatuporuḷ e. g. cōṟṟaiyaṭṭaṉ	II

karumam III anabhihita karma
e.g. cattaṉōṭu etiriṭṭāṉ

karumam IV anabhihita karma
e.g. ceykku nīr pāycciṉāṉ

...

karumam VI anabhihita karma
e.g. cāttaṉukkurimai
coṉṉāṉ

...

III anabhihita karma
e.g. pālai ōmam ceytāṉ;
palāl ōmam ceytāṉ

IV anabhihita karma
e.g. 1. avaḷaik koḷḷum ivvaṇikalam
2. avaṭkuk koḷḷum ivvaṇikalam

VI anabhihita karma
e.g. nūlaikkuṟṟam kūṟiṉāṉ
nūlatu kuṟṟam kūṟiṉāṉ

VII anabhihita karma
e.g. tūṇiṅkaṭ cārntāṉ; tūṇaic cārntāṉ

III ceyappaṭuporuḷ
e.g. aṟiciyāṟ cōrākkiṉāṉ

IV ceyappaṭuporuḷ
e.g. avaṭkuk koḷḷum ivvaṇikalam

V
ceyappaṭuporuḷ
e.g. puliyiṉ añcum

VI ceyappaṭuporuḷ
e.g. nūlatu kuṟṟam kūṟiṉāṉ

VII ceyappaṭuporuḷ
e.g. tūṇiṅkaṭ cārntāṉ

(See comparative II. 2) Accusative case for the comparative list of the name of kārakās)

III (3) Kāraṇak Kārakam or Karuvi

Viracōliyam	occurs with the case sign	Pirayōka vivēkam	occurs with the case sign	Ilakkaṇak kottu	occurs with the case sign
karaṇam	III	karaṇam	III	karuvi	I
e.g. koṭāliyal marattai veṭṭiṉāṉ		e.g. ceviyāṟ kēṭkalām, kaṇṇāṟ kāṇalām		e.g. kaṇ kāṇum karuvi	

...

e.g. karaṇam
cevikkuk kēṭkalām;
kaṇṇirkuk kāṇalām IV

e.g. kaṇṇirkuk
kaṇalām IV

karaṇam V
e.g. yām kaṇṇir
kāṇaṇākupa

karuvi V
e.g. kaṇṇiṟ kāṇalām

karaṇam VI
e.g. kōṭāliyatu veṭṭu;
koṭaliyāl veṭṭum
veṭṭu

karuvi VI
e.g. kaṇṇatu kāṭci

paṭalollā pētaikkeṉ kaṇ;
pētaiyāl eṅkaṇpaṭalollā
Here Karaṇam occurs
with 6th case sign as
karaṇa of hētu; ku– is
the sixth case sign.
pētai is not karta but
karaṇam

(See comparative table II–3) for the comparative list of the names of the kārakās)

III (4) Kōjik Kārakam or Koḷvōṉ or Sampradānam

Viracōḷiyam	occurs with the case sign	Pirayoka Vivekam	Ilakkaṇak Kottu	Occurs with the case sign
Kōjikkārakam e.g. poṉṉoṭu veḷiyiṭṭatu	III	sampradānam e.g. varaiviṉ makaḷināṉ mālai vaḷaṅkiyōṉ	III koḷvōṉ e.g. nākarāl pali	III
Kōjikkārakam e.g. cāttaṉukkuk koṭuttāṉ	IV	sampradānam e.g. nākarkkup pali	IV koḷvōṉ e.g. nākārkkup pali koḷvōṉ	IV
...		Sampradānam e.g. nākaratupali (nākarkkup pali)	VI koḷvōṉ e.g. nākaratu pali	VI
...		Sampradānam e.g. tavvaiyaik kāṭṭiviṭum (Sanskrit grammarian did not speak about this)	II koḷvōṉ e.g. tavvaiyaik kāṭṭiviṭum	II
...		...	I koḷvōṉ e.g. irappavar eṉperiṉuṅ koḷvar	I
...		...	V koḷvōṉ e.g. nākariṉ anpu ceytāṉ	V
...		...	VII koḷvōṉ e.g. nākarkkaṉ anpu ceytāṉ	VII

(See comparative table II–4 for the comparative list of the kārakās)

III. (5) Avadhik Kārakam or Apādānam or Nikkam

Viracōḷiyam	Occurs with the case sign	Pirayōka Vivēkam	Ilakkaṇak Kottu	Occurs with the case sign
avadhik kārakam e.g. marattiṉiṉrum viḷuntāṉ	V	apadana e.g. eirumaiyiṉ niṅki	V nikkam e.g. maturaiyiṉ vaṭakku citambaram	V
		apādāna (occurs against the rule) e.g. niṉaippāṉai niṅkum (niṉaippāṉiṉ niṅkum)	II nikkam e.g. maturaiyai niṅkiṉāṉ	II
		apādāna e.g. ūrkkut tīrntāṉ; ūriṉ tīrntāṉ	IV nikkam e.g. maturaikku vaṭakku citambaram	IV

(nikkam occurs only with 5th case. This is the contention of the author. In expansion, the 5th case sign should be expanded with the addition of the niṉru (iṉ — niṉru) e.g. kuṟṟattiṉ niṅki-kuṟṟattiṉiṉrum niṅki But in occurring in the sense of hētu cannot be expanded like this :
e.g. vaṇikattiṉ āyiṉāṉ-vaṇikattiṉkaṇ niṉru āyiṉāṉ.

(See comparative table II-5) Ablative-for the comparative list of kārakās)

III (6) Adhārak Kārakam or Adhikaraṇam or iṭam

	Viracōliyam	Pirayōka vivēkam	Ilakkaṇak Kottu
	occurs with the case sign	occurs with the case sign	Occurs with the case sign
	VII	VII	VII
			iṭam e.g. tuṇiṅkaṭ cārntāṉ
		II	II
			iṭam e.g. tūṇaic cārntāṉ
			IV iṭam e.g. iṉṟaikku varuvāṉ
			I iṭam e.g. tūṇ pōtikai toṭṭatu
			IV kuṟai e.g. cāttanukku makaṉ
			V kuṟai e.g. marattiṉ niṅkiṉa kompu kuṟai
			kuṟai e.g. cāttaṉatu kai kuṟai
			VII e.g. uyiriṅkaṇ uṇarvu
	ādhārak kārakam e.g. eḷil eṇṇey niṉṟatu	Adhikaraṇa e.g. tērilē iruntāṉ tērkkaṇ iruntāṉ; Adhikaraṇa (This is against the convension) e.g. neṟiyai ceṉṟāṉ (neṟiyir ceṉṟāṉ)	

(See comparative table II–6 Locative for the comparative list of kārakās)

Karma Ṣaṣṭhi

Under karma kāraka P. V. has stated that it can occur in the sixth case sign; but as he points out it can occur thus only in Sanskrit. The Tamil works according to it simply translated the Sanskrit sentences and shown them as examples for karmaṇi ṣaṣṭhi. ūrai ceṉrāṉ -graman agaccat. Here the second case sign has come. ūrkkuc ceṉrāṉ-gramāya agaccat. Here the ṣaṣṭhi has come P.V. considers here the ku as 6th case (sū : 14) (In the age of Tolkāppiyar the root cel-'to go' was a transitive verb because he lists the root cel under the transitive roots sūtram 72: Collatikāram; Cēṉavaraiyar's commentary. P. V. does not understand this, because the root cel has ceased to be transitive in later times.)

upapada vibhakti

P. V. points out the difference between kāraka and vibhakti. When the noun taking the case sign directly takes the predicate as in pālaik kuṭittāṉ 'he drank the milk'—it is called kāraka vibhakti. But where it takes the predicate not directly but with a word attached to the predicate it is called upapada vibhakti e.g. pālait tayirākkiṉāṉ.- 'he made the milk into curd? The predicate is not merely ākkiṉāṉ, but tayirākkiṉāṉ.

P. V. continues to add a note about the Tamil usage as explained in Tolkāppiyam, the usage which differs from Sanskrit. The third case has in addition to karaṇa a social case meaning also, though the case signs are the same viz. oṭu and āṉ which have also the meaning "along with". This it calls sahārtha tṛtīya (sū: 16). In Tamil it is uṭaṉikaḷvu or oruviṉai. Tolkāppiyar calls it oruviṉai oṭuccol. Tolkāppiyar calls it oruviṉai oṭuccol. There is only one verb agreeing in number with the subject in the nominative case e.g., āciriyaṉoṭu māṉākkaṉ vantāṉ 'student came along with the teacher"; tāyoṭu makaḷ vantāḷ 'daughter came along with the mother.'

According to Tolkāppiyar, the noun taking the case sign oṭu is of greater importance than the noun in the nominative case. Tolkāppiyar states "oruviṉai oṭuccol uyarpiṉ valittē". But according to Pāṇini the noun taking the case sign saha which is equal to oṭu is apradhāna or unimportant. The nominative taking the predicate according to Pāṇini is of greater importance.

maṇattōṭu vāymai moḻiyiṇ tavattoṭu tāṇam ceyvārir ṟalai;

Pirayōka Vivēkam feels that here and in the example for Tolkāppiyam sūtra makaṇ viṇai kiḻappiṇ viz. makaṇ tāyoṭu kalāytta kalām, words taking the case sign oṭu are unimportant.

Social case is not considered as a separate case. Even in Sanskrit there is only one third case. But in Tamil there are two case signs āṇ and oṭu. Since they do not differ in meaning they may be taken as one case sign. Pirayōk Vivēkam accepts this view of Cēṇāvaraiyār.

Note on the third case:

urāṇoru tēva kulam 'a temple in each village'. "In each" s the meaning of the case sign aṇ. It is interpreted as toṟum or vīppicai in Tamil.

P. V. talks of the explanations given in Tolkāppiyam along with their examples and explains them in terms of Sanskrit.

malaiyoṭu poruta mālyāṇai – Figuratively here an elephant which is as big as a hillock is said to be battling or competing with the hill. Here there is no real action. This figurative usage is called viṇaiyiṇmai by Tolkāppiyar. P. V. translates it as kriyā abhāva. These are all cases where sahārtha tṛtīya comes.

kāvoṭu arakkuḷam toṭṭāṇ – 'he dug tanks along with gardens'. Here the tank alone could be dug and not the garden. Garden comes here with a verb which is not its own or comes with a verb belonging to another noun – vēṟuviṇai.

Pirayōka Vivēkam translates this as bhiṇṇak kriya. eṇṇoṭu virāya arici 'rice mixed with the sesame seed.' This is a mixture with something different. The mixture is mutual. Therefore Pirayōka Vivēkam translates it as itarētara.

There is a figure of speech where two things are contrasted in terms of a simile viz. poṇṇoṭu irumpaṇaiyar niṇṇoṭu piṟarē 'others in comparison to you are like iron in comparison to gold.' This is phrased as follows: "You along with them are like gold along with iron." This is called in Tamil ataṇoṭu oppaḷ oppurai, that is, the instance where oṭu comes in the form of simile where there is no real comparison.

mati okkum mukam 'your face is like the moon'. In Tamil this can come with oṭu as matiyoṭu okkum niṇmukam. This oṭu occurs in comparison or oppu : eḻuttoṭu puṇarnta col 'words mixed along with letters' but really it (letter's) is not different from the other i. e. col or word. This is called abhēdat the identity of the word taking oṭu and the noun in the nominative case.

In vēloṭu niṇṟāṇ 'he stood with spear' oṭu has the meaning of conjunctive participle koṇṭu. (In transformational grammar 'he cut the bread with a knife' is said to have some from 'he used the knife to cut the bread with').

Note on the Dative

Pirayōka Vivēkam refers to tādarthya caturthi in which case ku, the dative, comes not after the noun denoting the receiver but either after the material cause and effect or after the efficient cause and effect. (Sū : 16) Material cause and effect are described as atuvāku kiḷavi by Tolkāppiyar. The examples are

kuṇṭalattukkup poṇ	...	"gold for the earring"
āṭaikku ṇūl	...	"yarn for the cloth"
cōrruk karici	...	"rice for food"
eṇṇeykku eḷḷu	...	"sesame for oil"

The efficient cause and effect or nimitta is referred to in Tolkāppiyam as atar poruttatal.

e. g. kūḻirkuk kuṟṟēval 'meanial service for gruel'. cōrrirkup paṇam – 'money for food.'

When expanding these into phrases one must introduce poruttu as in kūḻiṇ poruttuk kuṟṟēval. See the following also.

nāṇāl uyir tuṟappar, uyir poruttāl nāṇ tuṟavār

ku coming in the following really belongs to the sixth case. It is called tumartha – "for the purpose of"; pūvirkuc ceṇṟāṇ "he went for the flower" – really means – "he went to pluck flower."

tuṇpattuk ku-t-tuṇai – 'a help to misery' – which really means 'a help to relieve misery'.

marattirkut tuṇai – marattai nīkkutarkut tuṇai.
piṇikkut tuṇai – piṇiyai nīkkutarkkut tuṇai

Because the words – to pluck or to remove – etc., are introduced while expanding these phrases, it is called tumartha "for the purpose".

Sati saptami

In the seventh case, there is an idiom sati saptami. Tolkāppiyar calls this viṉaiceyiṭam where an action is the location i. e. something happens when an action is taking place. Parimēlaḻakar calls this viṉai nikaḻcci. (Sū : 16)

e. g. taṭṭup puṭaiyuḷ vantāṉ. Here somebody else was fighting and at that time one comes. Here there is the action of coming i. e., taṉviṉai – action of the man who is coming. piṟaviṉai is the action of the other i. e., the action of these fighting. This idiom is called sati saptami.

kāraka & kurippu viṉai :

When the nouns taking the case sign, without ending with a noun, end with a verb we have a kāraka. But the question is raised when a sentence ends with uṇṭu 'is', illai 'is not', vēṟu is 'different', yār- 'who', how there can be a kārakam, kartṛ karakam. Pirayōka Vivēkam explains that these predicates are kurippu viṉai or taddhita which, though from a nominal base are on a par with verbs. kurippu viṉai is implicit verb i.e. gamyamāṉa kriyā; terinilai is srūyamāṉakriyā.

kāraka-predicate : Ordinarily the nominative takes the predicate which is appropriate. In some cases, it takes the predicate of the more important one than others enumerated. In the following, it ends along with the predicate of the non-important thing.

tammuṭaiya taṇṇaḷiyum tāmum tam māṉṟērum

emmai niṉaiyātu viṭṭārēl

Cēṉāvaraiyār has explained this in a similar way under the sūtra palavayiṉāṉum eṇṇut tiṇai.

kāraka and ākka-c-col :-

tēvatattaṉ neṭiyáṉ-here the subject takes the taddhita neṭiyaṉ. tēvatattaṉ oruvaṉ here subject takes the numeral noun oruvaṉ The word ākkam from the root ā is called in Sanskrit san. In

Sanskrit, they introduce san in such places for showing the predicate. Therefore the same should be done in the following places. tēvatattaṉ neṭiyaṉ āyiṉāṉ-'tēvatattaṉ has become tall' and tēvattattaṉ oruvaṉ āyiṉāṉ-'tēvatattaṉ has become one ? Here these also take the verb āyiṉāṉ corresponding to san as predicate.

kāraka and negative verb :

The next question is if a kāraka could arise only when the predicate is an action word, how there can be a kāraka when the verb is a negative or negation of an action.

But it is answered that the negative verb will also be a predicate like a positive verb and therefore a kāraka may result (see under verbs).

kāraka and Naṉṉūl :-

Pirayōka Vivēkam refers to Naṉṉūl to examine its own position that kāraka consists of case sign and a verb. According to Naṉṉūl the fifth case sign iṉ, when occurring with the meaning of a boundary, and the sixth case sign atu take nouns as predicates. The fourth case and the seventh case in a majority of cases take a noun or verb as their predicate. The rest namely, the second and the third case take verb only as their predicates. Thus even according to Naṉṉūl the second and third cases form kārakās.

The sixth case and kāraka

The following are the alternations of sixth case.

avarkkuc ceyyat takum is anabhihita kartā.

nūlaik kuṟṟam kūriṉāṉ i. e. nūliṉ kuṟṟam kūriṉāṉ is anabhihita karma.

kōṭaliyāl veṭṭu i. e. kōṭaliyatu veṭṭu is karaṇa.

nākaratu pali i. e. nākarkkup pali is sampradhāna.

The ku which is said to be the case sign of the sixth case takes the verb as a predicate as shown above. It also forms a kāraka. It is then called kriyā Saṣṭhi. (Sū : 17)

CHAPTER V

SANSKRIT APPROACH TO TAMIL GRAMMAR

Samaśas or compounds General remarks

Compounds

In compounds, individual words occurring with mutual expectancy, appropriateness and temporal immediacy, come together as one unit without being pronounced as separate words, in denoting a declensional or non-declensional meaning. (P. V. Sū: 19). Non-compounds or phrases or individual words are not thus united but they sound as different individual words. Even when case signs etc. are not explicit they give their meaning as though they are explicit in such compounds even according to the authors of Naṉṉūl and Nēmiṉātam. Therefore, it is not correct to say that compounds result from an ellipsis of case signs etc. Pāṇini in his sixth chapter explains sandhi where words combine with words without any case sign what-so-ever. In the second chapter, however, he lays down case signs in compounds and also their loss. kātyāyana is definite that there is no case sign in compounds Cēnāvaraiyar follows Kātyāyana. In the sūtra, "vēṟṟumai-t-tokaiyē uvamat-tokaiyē" he speaks of two conflicting views.

Two theories :

According to one view compounds are those where there is an ellipsis of either case sign, the particle of similarity, the conjunctive particle or the particle ending a verb (i. e. relative verbal participle) or the ending of a noun denoting quality. According to the other view, compounds are coming together of two or more words to be compounded together as one unit without being realised as separate individual words.

Naciṉārkkiṉiyar follows the views of the former where compounds result due to ellipsis of case signs etc. Tolkāppiyar speaks of the case signs not being explicit, of the absence of

particle of similarity or conjunctive particle of similarity or conjunctive particle etc. The negation is not pradhyamsa abhāva but only prāg abhāva. That is to say, the absence of these particles is not as a result of being lost but as being due to their non-existence before they are brought in for interpretation.

Three theories :

As against these two views mentioned in Vīracōḷiyam and Pirayōka Vivēkam, Ilakkaṇak Kottu making a subtle distinction enumerates three conflicting views. (I. K. sū: 96)

The first view interprets tokai as ellipsis where in a compound a case sign or other particle is not explicit though implicit. viri refers to non-compound or phrase. Example: nūl kaṟṟāṉ is a compound where the case sign ai has suffered an ellipsis, after nūl. Non-compound corresponding to it is nūlai-k-karrāṉ.

The second view will emphasise the coming together of two words whilst in the corresponding non-compound or viri words will stand apart. In this meaning of the compound, the las sound of the first word and the first sound of the second word are harmonized and commingled without any hiatus. Then both these words, as one word proceed to combine with the coming word. E g. cūraṉaiveṉrāṉ vantāṉ becomes one standing word without any hiatus to proceed to take the predicate vantāṉ.

According to the third view the compounding is perfect where compounded words become one word inseparable and indivisible, where one cannot speak of the ending of the first word or the beginning of the second word. Examples are: orukōṭṭuirucevi mukkaṇṇālvāyaṉ or maṇṇakumāraṉ or in Sonskrit caṅkapaṭakam.

Ilakkaṇak Kottu raises the question often raised by others: why should we have case signs etc. explicitly mentioned in the non-compounded form when even without their actual presence the meaning is clear in the compounds ? If the case signs etc. are not explicit, either the meaning is doubtful as leading to the possibility of many meanings or one is let to interpret it wrongly. It is the presence of case signs etc. that helps us to

correctly define the meaning. For this reason case signs etc. should be explicit.

Acceptability of compounds:

As in other instances the compounding also may be (i) unacceptable or grammatically wrong; (2) though not prima face coming under a general rule, it is idiomatic as no other possibility exists; (3) it is prima-facie acceptable and grammatical. The non-compounded form marattai veṭṭiṉāṉ 'he cut the trees'- can be compounded into maram veṭṭiṉāṉ, The meaning is clear and the usage is grammatical. But if cāttaṉai veṭṭiṉāṉ-'(he) cut cāttaṉ.' is compounded as cāttaṉ veṭṭiṉāṉ-'cāttaṉ cut' and if cattaṉoṭu vantāṉ-'he came with cāttaṉ' is compounded as cattaṉ vantāṉ-'cāttaṉ came' the compounds will mean something different from the uncompounded form. If karumpukku vēli is compounded as karuppu vēli it means 1) fence made out of sugarcane or 2) sugar cane which itself is the fence or many other meanings; and one is doubtful about the meaning in such cases.

Similar difficulties arise with reference to other five compounds as well. virinilam, kuḷir nīr are acceptable compounds. But pārtta nīr cannot be compounded as pārnīr nor ākum vākaṉam as āku vākaṉam for obvious reasons that they mean something different. This is under viṉaittokai.

Under paṉputtokai, āruyir, āramirtam are acceptable. āriruḷ, āraṭicil, ārvayiṟu which suggest different meanings are unacceptable.

Under uvamaittokai, pavaḷavāy, matimukam are acceptable. But it is clear kaṭalpōl muḷaṅkiṟṟu cannot be compounded as kaṭai muḷaṅkiṟṟu nor malaipōl poḷintatu as malaipoḷintatu.

Under ummaittokai, kapilaparaṇar and uvāppatiṉāṉku are acceptable. But eṭṭum nūrum cannot be compounded as eṭṭu nūru nor cāttaṉum vantāṉ as cāttaṉ vantāṉ nor poṉṉum maṇiyum as poṉmaṇi.

Under aṉmoḷittokai, poṟṟoṭi is acceptable but not poṟkuṭam.

Therefore for deciding the correct meaning the case signs etc. should be explicit. It is true that unacceptable forms are

used in poetry as ceyyuḷ vikāram in a few exceptional cases, on the basis of the rule that mistakes like that of letters etc. could be tolerated but not defective chandas or prosody. But in all those places, they take care to place the unacceptable form followed or preceded by words which by their context will force us to interpret the form correctly. This shows that even for those authors, those forms are otherwise unacceptable.

Ellipsis :

tokai may mean also an ellipsis. (I. K. sū: 97) If so the ellipses are of various kinds : .

(1) One alone may suffer an ellipsis e.g. maram veṭṭiṉāṉ· Here the 2nd case suffix ai suffers and ellipsis :

(2) Many suffer an ellipsis :

(a) The case sign and the conjunctive um may suffer together an ellipsis. kuṉṟi kōpam pavaḷam ceṅkāntaḷ okkum niṉṉiram. After each one of the first four nouns the case sign ai and the conjunctive um have suffered an ellipsis.

tuṭiyiṭai neṭuṅkaṉ tuṇaimulai poṟṟoṭi. Here in between tuṭi and iṭai the particle of similarity pōl has suffered an ellipsis. In between neṭum and kaṉ the particle of equation ākiya has suffered an ellipsis. In between tuṇai and mulai the ending of the relative participle has suffered an ellipsis. In between poṉ and toṭi the case sign āl and its predicate ākiya have suffered an ellipsis. In addition, after each one of the predicates the conjunctive ums also have suffered an ellipsis. At the end of poṟṟoṭi which is aṉmoḷittokai the suffix al, has suffered an ellipsis.

(3) The particle alone suffers an ellipsis. In matimukam, in between, pōl the particle of similarity has suffered an ellipsis;

(4) Both the particle and the predicative word suffer an ellipsis. In paṭaikkai case sign ai and its predicate uṭaiya have suffered an ellipsis.

(5) Not the particle but the tense of predicate itself suffers an ellipsis. In porupaṭai the substance of a tense i.e. the tense sign suffers an ellipsis:

(6) The particle and the connected word not once but many times suffer an ellipsis. pāṇtikkarai which means pāṇti nāttil kaṭaliṉ karaiyil uḷḷa oru ūr. This shows that the particles and words have suffered ellipsis many a time. Similarly in poṉṉaracaṉ which means poṉṉil viruppam uṭaiya aracaṉ and in kuḻal vāy which means kuḻaliṉimai pōṉṟu inimaitarum colliṉai uṭaiyāḷ. etc.,

(7) connected word may twice suffer an ellipsis.

vaṭukak kaṇṇaṉ means vaṭuka nāṭṭil piṟanta have suffered ellipsis.

Similarly in centāmarai which when expanded will be civanta pūviṉai uṭaiya tāmarai.

(8) Ellipsis occurring at the beginning, at the middle and at the end.

At the beginning: as in malar mukam which when expanded will be tāmarai malar mukam.

In the middle: as in tāmarai mukam, which becomes when expanded tāmarai malar mukam.

At the end : as in poṟṟāli which becomes when expanded poṉṉālākiya tāliyai uṭaiyāḷ

(9) Ellipsis occurring both at the end and at the middle.
In ceytāṉ māṭam which when expanded will give ceytāṉ māṭattai, ai suffers ellipsis at the end. Secondly in aṉparuḷḷirukkum which when expanded will become aṉparuḷḷiṉkaṇ irukkum, the seventh case suffix kaṇ suffers an ellipsie in the middle of the sentence.

(Note all these discussions are useful in working out transformational grammar for Tamil, where the ellipsis may be considered as transformations by deletion)

Vīracōliyam and Pirayōka Vivēkam

Compounds :

Compounds are called Samāsas in Sanskrit. Vīracōliyam also refers to two different views about compounds, one emphasising the ellipsis and the other compounding together of words as one unit.

Both Vīracōliyam and Pirayōka Vivēkam emphasise the theory of compounding rather than ellipsis Vīracōliyam explains further that two or more nouns forms into one unit that is as it were as one word to denote a meaning and thus compound together. When thus being compounded, according to V. C. in a few places the case signs are also lost. In a few other places not only case signs but other dependent words are also lost. What is the reason for this? These words suffering an ellipsis are pronounced for making the meaning of the compound clearer. Even when they suffer a loss, the meaning remains clarified (V. C. sū : 44)

Views of Vīracōliyam on vēṟṟumai-t-tokai:

Of the eight possible declensional compounds the eighth case is not involved in forming a compound. As for the nominative case is concerned Pirayōka Vivēkam gives us examples. Where there is a transposition of two nouns. nānuṉi 'the blade of the tongue'–comes as nuṉinā; nāmutal–'tongue's root', becomes mutal nā. Similarly nāyiṭai becomes iṭainā. (P. V. sū: 21).

Pirayōka Vivēkam does not believe in the applicability of the theory of sup being added to every nominative noun, only to be lost, as far as Tamil words are concerned. This is one of the important places in which Pirayōka Vivēkam differs from Vīracōliyam. That is why he does not give the example mārkaḻittiṅkaḷ–'mārkaḻi month'–where Vīracōliyam presupposes a loss of sup; but instead gives examples which we have noted above.

Vīracōliyam on ellipsis:-

kuṭiyait tāṅki–'one who supports citizens' becomes kuṭi tāṅki whère the case sign ai is lost.

tāyōṭu nālvar 'the four along with the mother' is tāy nālvar where oṭu 3rd case sign is lost. (This is not correct because the latter will mean "four mothers".)

The tiles for māṭam or 'upper floor'–māṭattiṉ poruṭṭu, ōṭu becomes māṭavōṭu poruṭṭu the fourth case sign suffers a loss.

āṭṭininru karanta pāl–'milk milked out of the goat'–becomes āṭṭup pāl. ninru, the fifth case sign and the predicate karanta suffer a loss.

korranuṭaiya makan–'son of korran' losing the sixth case sign uṭaiya becomes korran makan.

'The tiny bird in the village,' ūrkkuruvi. Losing the seventh case sign kaṇ as in urinkaṇ kuruvi–becomes ūrkkuruvi.

The commentator on Vīracōliyam points out that not only case signs but also some words depending thereon sometimes suffer a loss (sū : 44). For this he gives the example tayirinai kuḷaitta cōru – 'rice mixed up with curd' – becomes tayirccōru where not only the third case sign but also kuḷaitta depending on the third case sign is lost. Similary, caṅkaranukku makanāyuḷḷa cāttan where the fourth case sign ku and the words depending thereon makanāyuḷḷa are lost when compounded as caṅkarañ cāttan.

Apart from these, there is also madhyapada lōpa, translated into Tamil as iṭaiccol aḷi tokai. iṭaiccol does not mean here the non-root morpheme iṭaiccol but the words which come in between two words.

pāṇṭināṭṭuk kaṭalin karai becomes pāṇṭikkarai, where the words between the first word pāṇṭi and the last word karai, the words namely nāṭṭu and kaṭalin are lost.

In this connection one may note in passing the expansion of pāṇṭikkarai as given in Ilakkaṇak Kottu. Pāṇṭiyanāṭṭu kaṭalinatu karaikkaṇ irukkum ūr – Pāṇṭikkarai is the village which stands on the shore of the sea belonging to the land of Pāndya, in which case as Ilakkaṇakkottu points out more than one case sign and more than one dependant predicate are lost. (sū : 97).

Six kinds of compounds :

In Sanskrit there are six kinds of samāsas.

(1) tatpuruṣa samāsa;

(2) dvigu samāsa;

(3) bahuvrīhi samāsa;

(4) karmadhāraya samāsa

(5) avyayībhāva samāsa;

(6) dvandva samāsa

tatpurṣa samāsa is verrumaittokai in Tamil or the declensional compound where the first word of a compound is a noun in any one of the first seven cases.

dvigu samāsas are those compounds which may be called numerical compounds where there is a number word and also a noun. Pirayōka Vivēkam explains this in Tamil as eṇṇoṭu poruḷ puṇarnta eṇtokai.

bahuvrīhi is called aṇmoḷittokai in Tamil. This is an exocentric compound. bahu means 'much'; vrīhi means 'rice'; both together denote "a person with much rice." An example itself has become the name of the compound.

karma dhāraya is a compound where the first word is a qualitative or attributive word. It is called paṇputtokai in Tamil.

avyayībhāva samāsa is a compound where a noun is either preceded or followed by indeclinable particle. Pirayōka Vivēkam explains that in Tamil as follows : muṇṇum piṇṇum moḷiyaṭuttu varum iṭaiccol tokai.

dvandva samāsa is a compound of two or more words in coordinate construction but where the conjunctive particles um "and" is absent. It is called ummaittokai in Tamil (P.V. sū:20).

I. tatpuruṣa samāsa

I. There are eight declensional compound. The names given in Pirayōka Vivēkam and Vīracōliyam are arranged side by side, along with examples already given :

Pirayōka Vivēkam	*Vīracōliyam*
Ist case : prathamā tatpuruṣa	eluvāy verrumaittatpuruṣan
Ex. nuninā	Ex. mārkaḷīt tiṅkaḷ
2nd case : dvitīya tatpuruṣa	iraṇṭām verrumait tatpuruṣan
Ex niḷaṅkaṭantān	Ex. kuṭi tāṅki
3rd case : tritīyā tatpuruṣa	mūnām verrumait tatpuruṣan
Ex. nāykkōṭpaṭṭān	Ex. tāy nālvar

4th case :   caturthī tatpuruṣa   nānkām vēṟṟumait tatpuruṣaṉ

           Ex. maṉaippali   Ex. tay nālvar

5th case :   pañcamī tatpuruṣa   aintām vēṟṟumait tatpuruṣaṉ

           Ex. karuvūrk-kiḻtticai Ex. āṭṭuppāl.

6th case :   saṣṭhi tatpuruṣa   āṟām vēṟṟumait tatpuruṣaṉ

           Ex. nāviḷimpu   Ex. koṟṟaṉ makaṉ.

7th case :   saptamī tatpuruṣa   ēḻām vēṟṟumait tatpuruṣaṉ

           Ex. eṉṉey, kaiviṟal Ex. ūrk kuruvi

Eighth variety :

The eighth variety of tatpuruṣa is called naññu tatpuruṣa. As stated in Vīracōliyam (su: 46) it occurs only in Sanskrit where a negative particle na occurs as a, before consonant and as an before vowels.

   na + kaḻaṅkaṉ = a + kaḻaṅkaṉ = akaḻaṅkaṉ

   na + aṅkaṉ   = an + aṅgaṉ   = anaṅgaṉ

Here na is tad abhāva: i. e. the absence of the thing. It may also mean the other – what is called in Tamil anmai or piṟa i. e. tad anya. (P. V. 21)

e. g. na + brāhmaṇa = a + brahmaṇa – 'one who is other than the brahmin'.

na + aśvam = an + aśvam = anaśva i. e. 'one which is other than the horse'.

na may also mean the contrary. tadviruddha what is etirmaṟai in Tamil or puṟatta.

e. g. na + dharma – a + dharma – adharma i. e. what is opposed to dharma.

Pirayōka Vivēkam tries to bring out some purely Tamil examples for tad abhāva naññu. He gives the example, maṉṉāp porul. For tadanya naññu he gives the example maṉṉāp piṟavāḻi. For tadviruddha naññu he gives the example puṟatta pukaḻumila. These may serve as explanations rather than true examples of naññu appearing in Tamil.

To bring these examples also under the category of naññu, he has to point out that apart from na other particles like nir as in nirguṇam also occur in Sanskrit. Having said that much

he proceeds to give the above examples for naññu in Tamil, he has to point out that apart from na like nir as in nirguṇa also occur in Sanskrit. Having that much he proceeds to give the above examples for naññu in Tamil. Vīracōliyam which explicity states that naññu does not appear except in Sanskrit is to be preferred though the profuse borrowings like akaḻaṅkaṉ in Tamil make these words themselves as perfect examples of naññu in Tamil.

II dvigu samāsa

II. dvigu samāsa : In this compound a word denoting a number comes as the first word; and the second word may be a taddhidārthā word or other words. It is of two kinds.

(1) ēkavadbhāvi dvigu:- Here the compound acts as a noun in singular number, ex: pañcavaṭi–'the place where there are five trees', is in singular number.

ēkavad bhāvi is translated into Tamil as orumai opputtuvikut tokai. The example given in Pirayōka Vivēkam is paṉṉiru paṭalam– 'twelve chapters.' It denotes a book of twelve chapters and acts as a neuter singular.

(2) anēkavad bhāvi dvigu: acts as a plural noun. Pirayōka Vivēkam translates it into Tamil as paṉmaiyopput tokai. The example given there is muk kōkkaḷ denoting mūvar kōkkaḷ or three kings.

For the second word of the tuvikuttokai being a taddhitārtha word, under ēkavad bhāvi the e.g. is pañcakapālam 'the sacred offering fried in five vessels.'

Under anēkavad bhāvi the example pañcapāṇṭavar with a taddhitārtha word as the second member of the compound is given.

ēkavadbhāvi dvigu occurs with words denoting a thing, a measurement, weight etc. The examples where the second word of dvigu compound is a thing are irukaṇ–'two eyes,' muccuṭar 'three fires.' Examples where the second word is a word denoting measure are orupalam, muṉṉāḻi. Examples for the second word denoting a weight are irupalam, muttoṭi.

bahuvrīhi may occur on the basis of dvigu : arukāl-ṣaṭpada 'a bee'. Examples for the taddhita on the basis of dvigu are: mukkāli, nārkāli, aṣṭapadi etc. For compounds where one number word comes with another number word the e. g. is pati-nonru. "eleven" (10+1)

For the compound where one of measurement comes with another word of measurement examples are tūṇippatakku; toṭiyēkakcu.

All these three kinds of compounds, it should be noted are considered as dvandvan or ummaittokai by Patañjali and Tolkāppiyar. (P V. 21)

III. karmadhāraya Samāsa:

Vīracōḷiyam gives six kinds of karmadhāraya. (sū: 48) karmadhāraya is paṇputtokai in Tamil These are given below with Sanskrit names as given in Prayōka Vivēkam (sū: 22) The examples as given in both are given in brackets.

KARMADHARAYA (paṇputtokai)

Vīracōḷiyam	Pirayōka Vivēkam
(1) muṉ moḷip paṇpu (nīlak kuvaḷai) :	(1) muṉmoḷip paṇpu viśēṣaṇa pūrvapada Ex. karuṅ kuvaḷai and ceṅkuvaḷai
(2) irumoḷip paṇpu (kuru-mai) (This is artificial)	(2) irumoḷip paṇpu = viśēṣaṇa ubhayāpada (perū veḷḷai; ciru veḷḷai)
(3) piṉmoḷiyoppu (peṇṇaṇaṅku) There is nothing correspon- ding to muṉmoḷi viśēṭiya	muṉ moḷi viśēṭiya = viśēṣya pūrva (tēyvap pulavar tiruvaḷḷuvar)
(4) muṉmoḷiyopput tokai (pavaḷa vāy)	(4) munmoḷiyoppu = upamāpūrva (caṅku veḷḷai)
(5) munmolik karuttut tokai (aṭaiyā neṭuṅkaṭai)	(5) piṉmoḷiyoppu = upamōttara- pada (peṇṇaṇaṅku)

(6) muṉmoḷit tuṇivu (maruntu maram) munmoḷit tēṟṟam = avadharaṇa pūrva (araccuṟṟam; aruṭcelvam)

(This is the 5th in this list muṉmoḷi-k-karuttāt tokai: muṉmoḷi eṇṇam = sambhāvanā pūrva: araccuṟṟam; aruṭcelvam).

(1) karmadhārayaṉ where the first word denoting quality or attribute. This is viśēṣaṇa pūrvapada.
Ex. nīlak kuvaḷai. (Vīracōḷiyam)

(2) karmadhāraya where both the words of the compound are words of quality. This is viśēṣaṇa ubayapada. Vīracōḷiyam gives a doubtful example kuru-mai. Pirayōka Vivēkam gives peruveḷḷai, ciruveḷḷai-names of paddy-and also iṉpa tuṉpam. Pirayōka Vivēkam adds as the seventh variety of karmadhāraya where the first word denotes a title or such other thing called in Tamil cirappu. This he calls muṉmoḷi vicēṭiyam or in Sanskrit viśēṣya pūrvapada The example is teyvap pulavar tiruvaḷḷuvar. According to rule given by Tolkāppiyar, cirappu- should precede the ordinary name.

cirappiṉākiya peyarnilaik kiḷavikkum-iyarpeyarkkiḷavi muṟpaṭak kiḷavār.

Sometimes the proper name precedes the tittle. For example, caṅkarācāryaṉ, akattiya muṉivar. These latter are called viśēṣya uttarapada; Here alone is mentioned compounds of two or more names which mean the same thing. Examples are: puṭṭakap puṭavai both mean 'cloth'; perumalaic cilampu both mean 'mountain'; arāppāmpu both mean 'a snake' Tolkāppiyar in view of this kind of usage has framed the sūtra: oruporuḷ irucol pirivila varaiyār-'the learned will not prohibit the use of two words with he same meaning and which are inseparable.'

Compounds like this where two nouns come together are called irupeyar oṭṭup paṇput tokai by Kallāṭar. Examples are makkaṭ cuṭṭu; peṇṭakai. In these the second word is an ākupeyar – a word with an extended meaning. Kallāṭar calls piṉmoḷi ākupeyar.

Naccinārkkiṉiyar calls them ākupeyar. Cēṉāvaraiyar however names them as aṉmoḷit takai or bahuvrīhi.

uvamaittokai:

Going back to Vīracōḷiyam the next variety of karmadhā- raya is where the second word is an upamā or comparison.

He also notes the following characteristic features with reference to some of the paṇput tokai.

(1) The first member of the compound is a word of quality e. g. karuṅ kutirai

(2) Both the members are words of quality ex. veṇṇiram

(3) Where after two words of quality the qualified occurs e. g. cirupaintūvi

(4) Where two abstract qualities denote by themselves the qualified things Ex. peru veḷḷai, ciṟu veḷḷai which are names of paddy;

(5) (a) The proper name coming first and the title coming next e. g. tiruvaḷḷuvar teyvap pulavar; akattiya munivar

(b) This may occur transposed as teyvap pulavar tiruvaḷḷuvar, munivar akattiyar.

(6) The species and genus becoming important in this order e. g. palāmaram; paraṇi mīṉ, mēṭarāci

(7) The genus and species becoming important in this order mentioned e. g. pārppāṉ irāmaṉ

(8) Where the second member becomes important as ākupeyar e.g. makkaṭ cuṭṭu, paḷampuḷi.

(9) Where the first member becomes ākupeyar e.g. kuḻaṟpaṇ.

(10) Where both members are ākupeyar e.g. puḷiccuvai kaṟiccuvai.

(11) Where for one and the same thing two names come together e.g. arāappāmpu; kaṇṇiyā kumari.

(12) Where the first member is Tamil and the second word Sanskrit-maṉṉaṉ kumāraṉ.

(13) Where the first member is a Sanskrit word and the second word is Tamil. e.g. atinuṭpam.

(14) Where both the members are Tamil words. e.g. aḷakappirāṉ.

(15) Where both the members are Sanskrit e.g. ātipakavāṉ, ādibhagava.

He proceeds to point out certain karmadhārayas in Sanskrit which however are not paṇputtokai in Tamil.

(1) The relative participle construction eṉṉum poruḷ. If interpreted as karmadhārayaṉ it will mean eṉṉap paṭuvatākiya poruḷ.

(2) Similarly, viṉaittokai if so interpreted will be karmadhārayan e.g. uraikaḷ, uraikkap paṭuvatākiya kaḷ.

(3) uvamaittokai as already noted is considered to be karmadhārayaṉ. There are two varieties: (1) Where the particle of similarity is deleted in the middle: e.g. matipōṉṟa mukam which becomes matimukam (2) where that particle is deleted at the end. e.g. mukam matipōlum which becomes mukamati.

(4) vaṇṇac ciṉaiccol where the first word denotes colour, second the organ of that colour and third the possessor of the organ. Ex. ceṅkāl nārai veṇpūntāmarai. In Tamil "ceṅkāl will be paṇputtokai but "kālnārai" will be tatpuruṣa or vēṟṟumaittokai. In Sanskrit these are considered to be karmadhārayas. He points out that these four should not be taken as karmadhārayaṉ in Tamil. He has started his book with a bold statement that the grammar for both Tamil and Sanskrit are one and the same. But in view of these statements he explains that the original statement as being true in a majority of cases.

IV avyayibhāva samasa

Here either the first word or the second word is an avyaya or an indeclinable particle. (sū: 23). Vīracōḷiyam suggests that avyaya can be equated with iṭaiccol. (su: 49). But he does not give any Tamil example.

There are two kinds here:

(1) Where the first word is an avyaya i.e. muṉmoḷi avviyayat tokai according to Vīracōḷiyam; and munmoli iṭaiccol tokai according to Pirayōka Vivēkam, these being called in Sanskrit avyaya pūrvapada. Vīracōḷiyam gives the example upakumbham meaning "something "something happenthing near the kumbha or pot." "upa" the first word of the compound is an avyaya.

(2) The second variety has the avyaya as the second member and a noun as its first member. Vīracōliyam calls this peyar munmolittokai i.e. in Sanskrit nāmapūrvapada. (The usual example is sākaprati " a little vegetable where prati is an avyaya)

Pirayōka Vivēkam gives Tamil examples for both the varieties. For nāma pūrvapada the examples are vālman. For the avyaya pūrva pada the examples are marraiyātai; konnūr;

Pirayōka Vivēkam goes to the extent of stating that because of this feature, Tolkāppiyar speaks of itaiccol as preceding or following an ordinary word.

(If these are avyayībhāva samāsa one has to take as compounds where other similar itaiccol e, um etc. occur. This is not being done even by Pirayōka Vivēkam.

Pirayōka Vivēkam is helpful only to the extent of making us understand what is happening in the avyayībhāva Samāsa in Sanskrit.

V. dvandva samasa

dvandva is of two kinds (1) samāhāra dvandva and (2) itarētarayōga dvandva. dvandva is ummaittokai in Tamil. (P. V. sū : 23)

(1) samāhāra dvandva is in Tamil orumai īrāy vanta akkrinai ummaittokai i. e. the dvandva which acts as neuter singular. This may consist of two or more words. For two words the example is aram porul, caṅka-patakam is a Sanskrit example.

Vīracōliyam gives the examples for two words uvāppatinānku, neyyennai and nātpakkam.

(2) The second variety is itarētarayōga dvanda. It is the dvandva which ends in human plural. The example for two words is kapila paranar, cēra cōla pāntiyar is the example for more than two words and for Sanskrit rāma lakṣmana. (P.V: 23)

Vīracōliyam

Vīracōliyam after giving the example kapila paranar states that both of them competed in a debate. Vīracōliyam at the

end adds six more varieties of ummait-tokai (1) irupeyart tokai-where there are two nouns; (2) palapeyart tokai – where there are more than two nouns; (3) alavup peyart tokai where the measure is denoted; (4) niraippeyart-tokai – where weight is denoted; (5) ennintokai where number is denoted and (6) enniyarp peyart tokai where nouns bearing number are included. (sū : 50) Pirayōka Vivēkam has mentioned them under dvigu. A distinction must be made between patinonru and pattuppattu.

Pirayōka Vivēkam

Pirayōka Vivēkam makes an important statement about karmadhārayan consisting of two or more words. dvandvan represents a coordinate construction : therein no one word is an attribute to any other. In other kinds of compounds one will ba an attribute to the other. Having this in mind Tolkāppiyar in speaking of dvandvan as two words or three words framed the sūtra as irumoli panmoli (standing independantly in co-ordinate construction without one becoming attribute to the other). (Sū : 23).

Pirayōka Vivēkam mentions one more variety–ēkaśēṣa pada dvandva. This is understood through the example given.

antañālanai nakukam yāmē "you and I let us laugh at the Brahmin." yām here means nī (you) and yān (I). We should expect the form nī, yān; but here the first word nī has suffered an ellipsis. The second word yān has become plural yām. This kind is called ēkasēṣam and this yām takes the inclusive plural verb nakukam. Therefore this dvandvan is called ēkaśēṣa pada dvandvan. (This is an artificial explanation for Tamil)

Corresponding to the dvandvan or ummaittokai we have two kinds of non-compounds or tokānilai in which case two nouns take one verb. When the statement is made "nampiyum vantān "nampi also came", it means naṅkaiyum vantāl "naṅkai too came". This is called eccauvamai in Tamil where two nouns take one verb. In Sanskrit it is called samuccaya. Here one noun takes two verbs. This is called ummai with a nagative implication etirmarai ummai.

Nampi ulutum varuvān implies nampi ulātum varuvān "nampi may come without ploughing." Similarly, pacu

mēyttum varuvāṉ means meyātum varuvāṉ. This is called in Sanskrit anvācaya.

VI bahuvrīhi samāsa

Names given in Vīracōḷiyam   *Names given in Pirayōka Vivēkam*
with examples :   *with examples :*

(1) irumoḻit tokai : Compound   dvipada bahuvrīhi
with two words e.g. karralai   e g. uṇṇāmulai "a woman"
"A fish said to have a stone   e.g. murrāmulai "a
in its head"   woman"
e.g kaḷuttāṭai
"One who wears a cloth
around his neck."

(2) paṉmoḻit tokai :   bahupada bahuvrīhi
Compound having more   e. g. maṭṭuvār
than two words   "a woman"
e. g. kuraṅkāṭu turai
"a place name"

(3) piṇmoḻi eṇtokai :   śaṅkhyōttarapada bahuvrīhi
A compound where the second   e. g. kār nārpatu
word is a number   "name of a book"
e. g. iṉṉā nārpatu
meaning "a book"

(4) irumoḻi eṇtokai : both the   śaṅkhyā ubhayapada
words denote number   bahuvrīhi e. g. añcāru
e. g. aintāru

(5) vitiyārilakkaṇat tokai :   vyatihāra lakṣaṇa bahuvrīhi
this does not occur except   = anyōnya = itarētaram
in Sanskrit e. g. (1) when a   = taṭumārram.
fight spreads from country
to country it is called
dēśādēśi (2) when a fight
starts with striking with
clubs it is called daṇḍādaṇḍi

(6) cakamuṉ moḻittokai   saha pūrvapada bahuvrīhi
e. g. saniti were saha becomes   e. g. (1) keḷutakaimai
sa (ca)   keḷu means "saha"

(7) tikantarāḷat tokai   (2) kūṭiya kāmam
e. g. teṉkiḻakku, teṉmērku   kūṭiya means "saha"
vaṭamērku. All denoting   He gives examples in
angular directions in between   Sanskrit. cakaniti,
two directions given by the   sahanidhi samūlam
two members of compounds.   digantarāḷa lakṣaṇa
   bahuvrīhi.

Pirayōka Vivēkam adds that bahuvrīhi will not occur on the basis of dvandva samāsa: samāsa (su : 24). This is according to the Sanskritists. There is an example āṉakadundubi in Sanskrit. Some take it as madhyaādalōpa while others consider it as bahuvrīhi born of a dvandva samāsa.

In Tamil according to P. V. except the one example takara ñāḷal there is no other example for bahuvrīhi occurring on the basis of dvandva. takara ñāḷal means "a kind of hair ointment made of takaram and ñāḷal" and then it means a lady who has used that ointment like dvirēpha; it is a bahuvrīhi on the basis of a bahuvrīhi.

ākupeyar :

Tolkāppiyar speaks of ākupeyar of two kinds (1) where the extended meaning is directly connected with the original meaning (2) where the extended meaning is not so connected. What is thus applied to ākupeyar is applied by Pāṇini to bahuvrīhi. The first variety is called tadguṇa samñāṉa bahuvrīhi. The second is called atadguṇa samjñāṉa bahuvrīhi.

Vīracōḷiyam and Tamil

Vīracōḷiyam after having enumerated the variety of Sanskrit samāsas concludes that one school of Tamil scholars hold that, in Tamil there are only six varieties of compounds namely (1) vērrumaittokai (2) ummaittokai; (3) viṉaittokai; (4) paṇput tokai (5) uvamattokai and (6) aṉmoḻittokai. (su : 50).

VII Emphasis in compounds

Lastly comes the discussion about the place where the meaning or emphasis is important in a compound.

Vīracōḷiyam gives four varieties (su : 51) (1) where emphasis is on the second member of the compound. Examples:

maṅkāy, maḷaikkuṭai, maruntennai, palāppaḷam. Pirayōka Vivēkam calls it (sū: 25) uttarapada prādhāna or piṉmoḷic ciṟappu as in

(1) tatpuruṣan: e.g. vāṇaikkōṭu, palākkōṭu;

(2) dvigu samāsam: e.g. irutēvar, irupārppār.

(3) karmadhārayaṉ or paṇputtokai e.g. nīlakkuvaḷai

cāraippāmpu.

(2) muṉ moḷiyil poruḷ ciṟattal – where the emphasis or significance lies in the first part of a compound. Vīracōḷiyam gives the following examples araippalam, eḷḷūr, puraṅkaiᵢ Pirayōka Vivēkam calls this pūrvapada pradhāna or muṉmoḷic ciṟappu and refers to prathamā tatpuruṣaṉ giving the examples nuṉi nā, iṭai nā, mutal nā.

(3) Of the third variety Vīracōḷiyam speaks of vēṟṟu moḷiyil poruḷ ciṟattal or aṉmoḷip poruṭ ciṟapput tokai ex. karraḷai, kaḷuttāṭai – where the significance lies outside the compound. Hence this is an exocentric compound.

Pirayōka Vivēkam mentions this as the fifth of its variety namely anyapada pradhāna. It mentions bahuvrīhi compound under this. The examples given are maṭṭuvār kuḷalᵢ ponnēru.

The fourth and last variety given by Vīracōḷiyam is muṉmoḷi piṉmoḷi ākiya irumoḷiyilum poruḷ ciṟattal i. e. where the significance lies in both the first and the second members. Pirayōka Vivēkam gives this as its fourth variety labelled ubhayapada pradhāna and metions dvandva as having this characteristic features e. g. irappakal, uvāppatiṉāṉku, kapila-paraṇar.

Pirayōka Vivēkam adds another variety which according to his numbering will be the third variety. In ordinary reckoning, this will be the fifth variety – one more than the four listed by Vīracōḷiyam

The emphasis is sometimes on the first and sometimes on the second member of the compound – muṉmoḷiyuḷ orukālum piṉ-moḷiyuḷ orukālum poruḷ ciṟantu niṟṟal. This occurs in avyayī-bhava samāsam e. g. upakumbham; sāka prati and in upamita samāsa e. g. matimukam, peṇṇaṉaṅku.

upamita samāsa has not been mentioned separately except under the two varieties of karmadhāraya – upamāpūrva and upamōttarapada.

Vararuci

Dr. P. S. Subramania Sastri ("History of grammatical Theories in Tamil", Madras, 1934, p. p. 209) has proved that Vīracōḷiyam and Pirayōka Vivēkam with some differences here and there, in tokai and samāsap paṭalams respectively are translating the kārikās on samāsas assigned to Vararuci in Sanskrit.

VIII. Changes as mentioned in Pirayōka Vivēkam madhya pada lōpa :

(P. V. sū : 26) vaḷaikkai means 'the hand which wears a bangle.' Here the case sign ai and its predicate uṭaiya have suffered an ellipsis. Similarly in porroṭi which must be ponnālākiya tōṭi "bangle made up of gold" the case sign āl and its predicate ākiya have been deleted. In all these cases of declensional compounds or tatpuruṣa the medial words viz. the case sign and the predicate have suffered an ellipsis. This is called an ellipsis of medial words or madhya pada lōpa.

The author gives the following Sanskrit examples.

paraśu rāma

kōdaṇḍa rāma

daśaratha rāma

Kātyāyaṇa is of the opinion that śākapriya pārthiva suffers madhya pada lōpa and becomes śāka pārthiva. But Patañjali calls this merely lakṣaṇā. When these expand like the umbrella and shadow expanding together, or like the fire and the smoke expanding together, the case sign and predicate expand together.

Under Tolkāppiya sūtra, makkaḷ muṟai tokūum maruṅkiṉ the examples are cāttaṉ korraṉ etc. which means korraṉ who is the son of cāttaṉ, cāttaṉ makaṉāṉa korraṉ and these are also madhyapada lōpa. Similarly cempūt tāmarai "white flowered lotus" "veṇpūvalari"–the white flowered alari which consists of words in the following order (1) colour word;

(2) the organ words (3) the name of the whole suffer here also madhyapada lōpa. centāmarai and veḷḷalari contrast with ceṅkarumpu and ceṅkirai where the quality cem or "redness" belongs to the whole whilst, it is not so in centāmarai and veḷḷalari. But he points out ceṅkamalattalarpōluṅkaṇ and ceṅkāntaṭ pōtu where the attribute cem has been given to the whole and not merely to the flower. But really cem is only an attribute of the organ flower–but in the above instance that attribute comes attached to the whole. In the intention of the speaker, it is only to be applied to the flower. Thus in all these cases, everything depends upon the intention of the speaker is vaktṛvivakṣa. Naṉṉūl speaks of it as uraippōr kuṟippu. The Sanskrit term is vivakṣādhīnam.

In malar mukam and tāmarai mukam, should we not take them as tāmarai malar mukum where the first word tāmarai is lost whilst in the second the next word "malar" is lost ? Kātyāyana holds that the suffix of the organ word would suffer ellipsis. But Patañjali holds that tāmarai is the name of both the whole and the organ. Tolkāppiyam speaks of ākupeyar or lakṣaṇā in such cases. Since Tolkāppiyar follows Indra, Indra should have accepted lakṣaṇā.

The three changes :

After having explained madhya pada lōpa in compounds, the author proceeds to mention other changes in the Tamil words (1) tōṉṟal i. e. coming in of sounds and syllables. e. g yāṉai kōṭu = yāṉaikkōṭu is called āgamam. (the coming here of k in the middle). (2) The kēṭu the loss of a sound or a syllable is called lōpa e. g. maram + vēr = maravēr (lose of m). (3) The tiṟtal or change is called ādēśa e. g. maram + pāvai = marappāvai where the final m of maram changes into p.

Unconditional changes :

In the individual words and in combination of more than one word certain changes in sounds take place without any reason whatsoever. These unconditioned changes of sounds are of four kinds. (See I. K.)

(1) varṇa vikāra – the change of one sound into another. māki > māci, where k > c.

(2) varṇa viparyaya : metathesis of sounds
tacai > catai
t and c change places.

(3) varṇa nāśa or loss of a letter
yāvar > yār
the medial v is lost.

(4) varṇa āgama
yātu > yāvatu (va – has come in) See "palarari colmuṉ yāvareṉṉum peyariṭai vakaraṅ keṭutalum ēṉai – oṉṟari coṉmuṉ yāteṉ viṉayiṭai – yoṉṟiya vakaram varutalum"

muṉṟil and niṉme; here alveolar ṟ and nasal ṉ are varṇāgamas.

He gives Sanskrit examples of which not all them are clear. (See the note below as given by Dr. K. N. Eḻuttaccan.

BHAVĒD VARṆĀGAMĀD HAMSAḤ :

SIMHŌ VARṆA VIPARYAYĀT :

GŪḌHŌTMĀ VARNA VIKṚTĒḤ :

VARṆANĀS'ĀT PṚṢŌDARAḤ.

(hamsa is formed by varṇāgamā i. e., by the addition of a new letter. simha is by varṇa viparyaya i.e., metathesis. gūḍhōtmā is by varṇa vikṛti (change of letter). Pṛṣōdara is formed by varṇanāśa (i.e., elision of letter).

(1) hamsa : There is a root ham meaning himsa ('killing') and gati (walk). The letter sa is added to the root in its second sense. The meaning of the word is that which walks' or 'that which is noted for its slow walk.'

(2) Simha : metathesis of himsaḥ, 'that which kills animals' like elephants etc.,

(3) gūḍhōtmā : gūḍhātmā, 'ātmā who his hidden inside' a > o. The word is not found in ordinary literature.

(4) pṛṣōdara. The word is pṛṣad udara 'd' is elided. Pṛṣōdara means 'wind.' pṛṣat means 'drop of water' also. Wind may have drops of water in it. We can make it a tatpuruṣa

compound also meaning, the udara of pṛṣat, 'the inside of a water drop.'

A number of words and compounds which cannot be grammatically formed but which are current in the language get sanction under "pṛṣōdarāditvāt sādhuḥ."

Pṛṣōdarādīni Yathōpadiṣṭam (Pan. 6. 3. 109)

i. e., pṛṣōdara etc., are correct as they are taught. The words coming under this group are :

pṛṣōdara : Smāśāna (cremation ground)
pṛṣosthāna : ulūkhala (mortar)
balāhaka (cloud) piśaca (devil)
jīmūlā (cloud) bṛsi
mayūra (peacock).

(This is called an ākṛtigaṇa. Any new word of which the origin is doubtful can be brought under this head.)

The etymology of mayūra is this : mahyām ranti i.e., 'the bird which cries standing on the ground' (fanciful etymology :).

(1) Varṇa vikāra e.g. mayūra
                              gūḍhōtmā

(2) varṇa viparyaya : nārikēḷi ∞ nāḷikēra simha ∞ himsa.

(3) varṇa nāśa
      prasad udara ⚮ pṛṣōdara

(4) varṇāgamā hamsa
      añcam (Tamil form given)

These have no conditions of contexts for the occurrence of these changes.

ceyyuḷ vikāram :

The author raises the question whether the ceyyuḷ vikāram so called in Tamil as occurring in metre for instance.

                    taṭṭai   >   taṇṭai

should not be brought under these changes. He holds they should not be. For, ceyyuḷ vikāram occurs because of the presodic tradition, rhythm and metrical exigencies. In Sanskrit also the same is the case see.

māṣam   >   maṣam. But these never cause any metrical deficiency.

adēśa is alteration i. e. tirital in Tamil.
e. g. poṟkuṭam (n becomes ṟ)

He gives Sanskrit examples

ṣaṭmuka	=	ṣaṇmuka (ṭ > ṇ)
vākmūlam	=	vāṅmūlam (k > ṅ)
vākīśa	—	vāgīśa (k > g)

varṇa vikāra, ādi vṛddhi and vikaraṇi are also considered as vikāras.

Author gives further similarities and explanations. āgama etc.

(1) Where there is āgama in the first word or standing word and in the second or coming word.

e. g. arāappāmpu (a in the first word and p in the second word)

(2) vikāra -a) where there is alteration in the first and the second word.

poṉtāli   >   poṟṟāli
(ṉ > ṟ and t > ṟ)

(b) where there is complete alteration of both the words.
                oṉpatu pattu > toṇṇūṟu

(3) loss or lōpa – (a) where there is loss in both the words.
                ātaṉ tantai > āntai
                pūtaṉ tantai > pūntai

vikāra – b) where the first word loses a part
                maram + aṭi   marāaṭi

Where the m of first word is lost and the final a of mara is lengthened.

                –c) alteration of the first word.
                        paṇai + aṭṭu = paṇāaṭṭu

the final ai of the first word changes into ā

at + anru = atāaṉṟu

the final u of the first word changes into a.

prakrtibhāva

In all these three cases just mentioned, the initial vowels of the second words neither get a glids nor change in any way. They are as they were. This is called prakrti bhāva.

vikalpam

There are also optional alternations. This is called vikalpa or vaiśeṣika or uṟalcci in Tamil.

1. kiḷi + kaṭintār   kiḷi kaṭintār or
                                kiḷik kaṭintār

2. kuḷam + karai   kuḷaṅkaṟai or
                                  kuḷakkarai

3. il + poruḷ   ilporuḷ or
                                  illaiporuḷ or
                                  illaipporuḷ or
                                  illāpporuḷ

4. There is vikāra of vikāra

     kal + tītu   >   karrītu (l > r)
     karrītu   >   kakrītu (r > k)

5. Change in the coming word

     mēl + ticai   >   mērricai
     poṉ + nāṭu   >   poṉṉāṭu

All these vikāras can be brought under the above mentioned three: (1) āgama (2) ādēśa and (3) lōpa. Where a sandhi rule is laid down but the words stand as they are in sandhi in a particular case that is called prakṛti bhāva. It is called in Tamil peṟuvaḷip peṟāmai.

nāṭu kiḷavōṉ should become nāṭṭukkiḷavōṉ; but stands as nāṭu kiḷavōṉ.

kāṭu + akam must become kāṭṭakam; but remains as kāṭakam in kāṭakam iṟantōrē.

He gives Sanskrit examples.
bhrahmaṟṣi; hari ētan.

Can there be sandhi?

The author speaks, in the kārikā, of harmonised words. What does he mean? There are people who hold that there can be no sandhi or puṇarcci because no two sounds coexist to commingle in sandhi. The last sound of the standing word is first born and it died away. Then the initial sound of the coming word is only then born and it also dies away. Therefore the two sounds which are born and which die one after the other have no opportunity of coming together. But the true explanation is that those who pronounce these words, and those who listen to these words, perceive in their mind the sounds without any break. Therefore these sounds without any loss reside in memory or mind where occurs sandhi or puṇarcci as a natural fact. The final sound of the first word and the intial sound of the coming word are linked like two ends of a string. They are not linked like two fingers. Its ending and beginning alone come into sandhi process, Therefore Tolkāppiyar speaks of the final sound of the standing word and the initial sound of the coming word harmonising themselves in sandhi.

The logicians – tārkikas state that the sounds are born and are lost. The śabda śāstra holds that sound never dies and that it is eternal.

karikara etc :

In (1) phaṇi phaṇam, (2) kari kara, (4) vamśa karīram and (4) kari kaḷabham, the first word and the second word have the same meaning according to some. Here one of them does not have the full force of its word. Such a thing happens in Tamil also. (See I. K.)

     veruvanta ceytoḷukum veṅkōlaṉ
     vem means same as veruvanta ceytoḷukum

In aṭiyaḷantāṉ tāyatu, tāyatu is redundant after aḷantāṉ.

In kōṭāta ceṅkōl, kōṭāta and ceṅkōl mean one and the same thing. In these cases, one word should be taken as not having the full force.

Change in the form and hence in the meaning :

There are such things (1) akṣara cyutaka where sounds or syllables are taken away one after another and where at every stage there is difference in meaning e.g. pālāṟu = "a river" pālā = "a milk cow" pāl = "milk" pā "song"

and (2) akṣara vardhana which is a reverse case i.e. where sounds or syllables are added on one after another to give different meanings.

e.g. kā "garden"
kāvi "a flower"
kāviri "a river"

Here in both the cases the meaning changes because of the addition or loss of letters.

Sandhi change with no change in meaning.

But when two words coming together undergo changes in sandhi they do not undergo any change in meaning as a result of the change in letters.

e.g. arāappāmpu (addition of a sound ā)
yānaik kōṭu (addition of a sound k)
mara vēr (loss of a sound m)
āntai (ātan tantai)
pūntai (pūtan tantai)

The mental process in Sandhi :

When letters cluster one with another and when standing words come to join the coming word, one speaks them out. With the help of the ear these are retained in memory or mind; these are sound forms.

Written forms :

Later on for understanding them and for reminding us we have written forms for each one of the sounds. There is the sūtram in Tolkāppiyam.

puḷḷi yillā ellā meyyum where the author states that all consonants are sounded with the vowel a, but the consonant changes its form when pronounced with other vowels; and there is the sūtram, meyyīrellām puḷḷiyoṭu nilaiyal that all consonantal endings stand with a dot. These do not apply to the sound form of letters as well. Therefore these rules are not necessary (in phonology). They have nothing to do with the intrinsic sound. Even without these, Tamil written forms, Sanskrit and other seventeen languages recognise their sounds. But as for the sūtram meyyin iyakkam akaramoṭu civaṇum-a

consonant can be pronounced only with an intrinsic a and the sūtram, meyyin valiyatu uyir tōṉṟunilaiyē i.e. in pronouncing a syllabic letter the consonant comes first and then the vowel these apply to the sound form of letters. Therefore these rules are necessary. The author of Naṉṉūl in the sūtram, puḷḷi viṭṭu gives rules for the sound form and also the written form. Is it absolutely unnecessary to lay down any rule for the written form? Since Tamil e, o and Tamil consonants get a dot as their special features, these written forms should be explained.

(P. V. Sū : 27) sandhi variations and compounds :

The six kinds of compounds get different technical names on account of sandhi variations.

(1) nitya compound–

In dvigu compound, oru always comes as the first member. e.g. orukalam; oruporuḷ etc.

(2) But when oṉṟu instead of coming preceding its head word as in "orukalam" follows the noun as in "tēr oṉṟu" the latter also is nitya compound.

oṉṟu naṉṟuḷḷappaṭum–should be taken as naṉṟu oṉṟu uḷḷappaṭum as pointed out by Parimēlaḻakar.

oṉṟu tēriṉāṉ–in Cintāmaṇi should be taken as tēr oṉṟiṉāṉ. In dvandva compound, kiḻakku mēṟku is the nitya form.

It does not become kīḻ mēṟku. The following are the nitya (bound forms) and anitya forms for number 2 to 8 respectively occurring as first member of the dvigu compound.

nitya form	anitya form
irumā	iraṇṭu mā
mūvuṟuppu	mūṉṟu uṟuppu
nārkaṭal	nāṉku kaṭal
aiyaṟivu	aintaṟivu
arumukam	ārumukam
eḻukaṭal	ēḻkaṭal
eṇṭicai	eṭṭut ticai

(3) The compound may come with any case sign suffering an ellipsis. This is called aluk samāsa.

According to sūtram, uyārtiṇai maruṅkiṉ oḻiyātu varutalum in uyartiṇai or human nouns the accusative case sign is not deleted.

e. g. putalvaraip perutal
mannaraic cērntoḻukal
nūrruvaraik kolli
cērntāraik kolli
nampiyaik koṇarntavaṉ etc.,

(4) luk samāsa :

Even in human nouns thanks to an alteration, the case sign can be deleted.

ikaḻvārp poruttal;
kēḻirp pirippar

(Note : that a p has come in between two words to avoid any ambiguity in the meaning, even in the absence of any case sign).

(5) pāntam – (where the words of compounds occur probably without any transposition)

e. g. palākkāy, māṅkāy, nānuṇi

(6) viparyaya – where the words in compounds suffer transposition. He calls such false compound - poyttokai. These occur in (1) prathamā tarpuruṣa (2) in upamita samāsa (3) in taddhita.

prathama tarpuruṣa
nuṇik kompar (for kompar nuṇi)
kaṭaik kaṇ (for kaṇ kaṭai)
araik kācu for (kācarai)
munril (for ilmuṉ)
mīkaṇ (for kaṇ mī)
upamita samāsa

peṇṇaṇaṅku (aṇaṅku pōlum peṇ or aṇaṅku peṇ)
mukamati (matipōlum mukam or mati mukam)
vāyp pavaḻam (pavaḻam pōlum vay or pavaḷa vāy)
taddhita :

ceyta vēḷviyar (vēḷvi ceytavar)
vīḻnta pācattar (pācam vīḻntavar)
kaḻinta uṇṭiyar (uṇṭiyar kaḻintavar)

vēṇṭā uyirār (uyir vēṇṭār)
aruṅ kēṭaṉ (kēṭariyāṉ)
koṇṭa kūḻttāki (kūḻ koṇṭatāki)
ucci kūppiya kaiyiṉar (kai kūppiya ucciyiṉar)
vīta rāgi (This must be vīta rāga a transposition of rāga vīta).

upapada samāsa is that where first occurs the concrete noun and then the taddhita word kāraṉ as in cūttira kāraṉ; kumpa kāraṉ; uraikāraṉ, icaikāraṉ, kaṭṭiyaṅkāraṉ.

More sandhi rules :

The next kārikai gives few sandhi rules applicable to samāsas and taddhitas.

Those sounds which have the same place of articulation effort of articulation are called iṉaveḻuttu or savarna.

savarna dhīrga sandhi occurs in the following :

$-a + a > a$ e.g. pada + ambuja > padāmbuja
$-i + i > ī$ e.g. suci + indra > sucīndra
$-u + u > ū$ e.g. bahu + upamā > bahūpamā

Instead of the short vowel, a long vowel may come and result in the respective long vowel.

$-i + ī > ī$

ardhanāri + īśvara   = ardhanārīśvara.

If instead of the same vowels (savarna) coming together in the above instances, if different vowels come one gets guṇa sandhi.

$-ā + u = ō$ e.g. gangā + udakam = gaṅgōdakam
$-a + u = ō$ e.g. kula + uttuṅga = kulōttuṅga
$-a + ī = ē$ e.g. nara + indra = narēndra
$-a + ē = ai$ e.g. brahma + ēvasatyam = brahmaiva
satyam ēka + ekam = ēkaikam
$-a + ō = ō$ e.g. kuḻa + ōdana + kuḻōdana bimbha + ōṣṭa = bimbhōṣṭa

The ō may not change.

When the taddhita pratyaya is affixed, –ādi vṛddhi occurs for the first vowel.

Vṛddhi is as follows:-

a > ā
ṛ > ār
i > ai
e > ai
o > au

daśarathā's son is dāśarathi
janaka's daughter is jānaki
ṛsis work is ārṣa.
Indrā's work is aindra
What is related to vēda is vaidīka.

IX. Changes as Mentioned in Vīracōliyam

Loss of words (sū 51)

Vīracōliyam speaks of certain citaivu or loss or alteration in the compounds. In anmolittokai and other compounds the second word and the words in the middle are lost. Even if they are lost, the meaning of the compound has the meaning of those words lost.

(1) Loss of the second word :

katuk kāy > katu
tānrikkāy > tānri
nellikkāy > nelli

(2) The loss of medial word :

kavilap pūkkun tumpai · > kavil tumpai
velukkap pūkkum tāmarai > ventāmarai
civakkap pūkkum tāmarai > centamarai
kommattip pōla kāykkum mātalai > kommatti mātalai
vērir palukkum pala > vērppalā

(3) Loss of both the last word and the medial word.
civakkat tōynta vilimpinai utaiya kūrai > cevvilimpan

(4) The loss of the ending of the first word
cōlan kōn > cōla kōn
Sometimes the ending of the first word signifies plural.
pattarkal teruvu
nāttār vāykkāl
ayirattaliyar vācal.

No transposition :

Other peculiarities : Vīracōliyam mentions certain other peculiarities about compounds.

(1) The first and second word of the compound come as they stand, without suffering any transposition. This he calls kitapput tokai.

Transpositions :

(2) The words suffer transposition in compounding where the first word becomes last and this last word becomes the first.

ilmun > munril
ilvāy > vāyil

nitya compound :

(3) nitya eompounds or nittat tokai, or permanent compounds.

The attribute and the head form one name and occur with the common name of a particular thing.

e. g. cempōttu.

alitokai :

(4) alitokai or compounds suffering loss namely the loss of the case sign.

cāttanukku makan > cāttan makan
ellinul enney > enney
erumaiyatu pāl > erumaippāl

aliyāt tokai :

(5) aliyāt tokai are compounds without a loss i.e. the case sign is not lost.

kaluttil ātai
potumpil tēn

The commentator raises the question why should the loss be mentioned here since the author had already mentioned the loss of words in the middle. But he points out that there the loss was of kārakapada vibhakti and their related words. Here the loss is of all kinds of words.

CHAPTER VI

SANSKRIT APPROACH TO TAMIL GRAMMAR

TADDHITAN (Derived nouns)

I. General

Taddhita in Tamil :

Taddhitas or taddhitānta words do not exist separately in Tamil as in Sanskrit with distinct suffixes. Pirayōka Vivēkam and Vīracōḷiyam however call all those finite words which are derived from noun base as taddhita. It can be a noun or a nominal predicate or a participial noun but their base should be a noun. These are all nouns to start with in Tamil, but are differentiated in accordance with the function they play in syntax. They are not primary words but derived words. But to show somehow the relationship between Tamil and Sanskrit, these two works picked upon the derived nouns to illustrate the characteristics of the Sanskrit taddhita. The word valaiyaṉ means literally "net man" i.e. a fisher man. It is derived from the noun valai meaning "net". It means a person who has some relationship with valai or "net." These relationships are attempted to be defined in these two works following the explanation given in Sanskrit works to taddhitānta nāmapadas. Vīracōḷiyam explains the Tamil words in terms of Sanskirt grammatical taddhita practice. The base is taken and the question is asked "who has the particular relationship with the thing denoted by the base noun." The answer is the taddhitānta nāma pada. Pirayōka Vivēkam takes the phrase valaiyāl muyaṉṟu uṇpavaṉ–"He who lives by working with the net" and states that becomes valaiyaṉ by omitting all the words except the base of the first word and then getting the suffix aṉ added; words formed thus are taddhitānta words according to Pirayōka Vivēkam. (sū : 29).

A table :

Vīracōḷiyam enumerates the places where taddhita will occur; the various relationships are illustratively listed (sū : 53, 54). The corresponding explanation from Pirayōka Vivēkam is also given in a tabular form.

Vīracōḷiyam	Pirayōka Vivēkam
(1) One who lives by this i. e. the noun denoted by the base	See the corresponding note in the first column under Vīracōḷiyam
valai > valaiyaṉ	valai > valaiyaṉ
(2) One who recited this e. g. vēda > vēdiyaṉ	vēda > vaidikaṉ purāṇa > paurāṇikaṉ kavi (poetry) > kaviñaṉ.
(3) One who possesses this e. g. kundam – kundavaṉ See also verpaṉ, cilampaṉ	kaccinaṉ kaḷalinaṉ, Sanskrit daṇdi, kuṇḍali.
(4) One who does this e. g. maruntu > maruttuvaṉ	maruttuvaṉ
(5) One who practices this e. g. kūttu > kūttaṉ	...
(6) One who gets the benefit out of this : e. g. vil > villi	...
(7) One who thinks of this. e. g. cōtiṭam > cōtiṭavaṉ	One who thinks of it e. g. cōtiṭam > cōtiṭaṉ
(8) One who is the lord of this e. g. malai > malaiyaṉ	Sanskrit examples : vaidarbha. naiṣādha, saudhala : Tamil examples vaikaiṭ turai > vaikaiṭ turaivaṉ kumaric cērppu > kumaric cērppaṉ also puṉal nāṭaṉ; puliyūrāṉ; tamiḻnāṭaṉ; malaiyamāṉ.
(9) One who lives here e. g. paṭṭiṉam > paṭṭiṉavaṉ	paṭṭiṉavaṉ; cōḷanāṭu > cōḷanāṭaṉ, pāṇṭināṭu > pāṇṭināṭaṉ Sanskrit, nagara nāgarika.

(10) One who resides here.
e. g. pāṇṭināṭu > pāṇṭināṭan;   -do-
Similarly cōlanāṭan;
vaṭukanāṭan
Vīracōliyam differentiates
between one who is there
iṅkirukkum from iṅkuḷan.
Pirayōka Vivēkam does
not. Commentary on
Vīracōliyam tries to
distinguish paṭṭiṇavan
which is also the name of
a caste. as yōga rūḍhi.
When there is no such
yōgarūḍhi form then it
should come under
iṅkuḷan.

(11) One who resembles this   Who is like this; poṉ >
e.g. ciṅkam > ciṅkam.   ponnannaṉ mayil > mayil-
Here the suffix su has   annāḷ Sanskrit example:
been affixed and lost;   kanaka sādṛśa; ṛṣi tulya
also nūl > nūl; pāvai >
pāvai. Pirayōka Vivēkam
does not accept su as the
suffix These according to
P. V. are ākupeyar.
Pirayōka Vivēkam gives
other examples.

(12) Who has achieved this;   ...
e.g. siddhi > cittaṉ

(13) Who is the son of this   kāṅkēyaṉ, kārttikēyaṉ,
(person) man   vainatēyaṉ, vaicciravaṇaṉ
e.g. pāṇṭu > pāṇṭavar

(14) Who is the son of this   Who is the daughter of this
woman?   man? pārppati, pākīrati,
Vinadā- vainadēvaṉ   cātti, korri; porupparaci
gaṅgā - kāṅkēyaṉ

(15) Who belongs to this   kākuttaṉ, irākavaṉ,
varga : e.g. kuru > kaurava   kauravaṉ

(16) Who has the following as   caiva; Pākavataṉ.
his God.
e.g. buddha > pauttaṉ

Suffixes (abstract noun) :

Vīracōliyam gives the following taddhita suffixes which
come to clarify the meaning of the abstract base itself denoting
a quality. It may be noted that these are verbal noun suffixes
etc. and not taddhitas or even suffixes of derived nouns. It is
clear how forced, the explanations are :

mai   — valimai, neṭumai
am   — nīlam
Note the author takes nīl as the alternant of neṭu
pu   — melipu
tu   — valitu melitu
vu   — valivu, (note that the vu is an alternant of the
original pu)
kam   — kurukkam. (Note : kuruku becomes kurukkam
in the verbal noun form, where there is no kam).
val   — iḷaval
aḷavu   — taṉṉaḷavu

Suffixes (concrete noun) :

Suffixes which come for denoting the concrete things or
persons (V. C. sū : 55)

maṉ   — kuruman "the short one" karuman–"the black
one".
kaṉ   — cirukkaṉ "the young one" (But ciruvar >
cirukku + aṉ);
aṉ   — eḷiyaṉ "the poor one"
ai   — veḷḷai "the white"
am   — puram "outside"
avaṉ   — kariyavaṉ "he who is black" (kariya-v-aṉ)
avaḷ   — kariyavaḷ – "she who is black". (kariya-v-aḷ)

Suffixes : (feminine) :

The following are the suffixes which are said to occur in
feminine nouns (sū : 56)

1. acci   from parai-paraicci
āṭṭi   ex. veḷḷāṭṭi

ani	pārppani
ātti	vaṇṇātti
atti	naṭṭuvatti
ti	orutti, kuṟatti
āḷ	nallāḷ
aḷ	nallaḷ
i	cātti
icci	kaḷḷicci (acci > icci)
ci	pēycci

(Note that some of these analyses are doubtful)

Pirayōka Vivēkam

Pirayōka Vivēkam points out that Cēnāvaraiyar has given the following explanation. aruvānilattaṉ > aruvāḷaṉ. It is not only single word like valai etc. but also compounds become the base for the taddhitānta word (P. V: 29). When compounds become the base, the second word may be lost as in cōlanilattaṉ-cōliyaṉ. In some cases the second word of the compound may not be lost and the whole compound is taken as the base as in pāṇṭināṭaṉ.

II. Three kinds of taddhita

1. sāmānya

taddhita according to Pirayōka Vivēkam is of three kinds. sāmānya taddhita is the ordinary taddhita. He gives the following suffixes for that. (sū : 30)

aṉ	kuḷaiyaṉ
aḷ	kuḷaiyaḷ
ar	kuḷaiyar
ṭu	kuṇṭukaṭṭu (This is –tu>ṭu in sandhi)
ṟu	kātaṟṟu, mutaṟṟu
tu	kuḷaiyaṭu
m	tolkāppiyam, avinayam, paṇiṉīyam tiramiṭam, kāpilam
na	kuḷaiyana (kuḷai-aṉ-a)
i	villi, vāḷi, namdi, vāḷi
u	vaṭuku, teluṅku
ai	naṅkai, kaucalai

It may be noted that Pirayōka Vivēkam does not give the Sanskrit suffixes. The question is raised whether Tolkāppiyam is not an ākupeyar i.e. a word with an extended meaning. If it were ākupeyar the ending must be Tolkāppiyaṉ. There is no provision for the changing of m into n under ākupeyar. Pirayōka Vivēkam points out that all the nouns referred to in peyariyal by Tolkāppiyar with a few exceptions are taddhitas.

Compounds as base :

As already stated the compound may come as the first word of the taddhitan Parastrī makaṉ becomes Pārastriṇēya. The Tamil examples are kaṉaṅkuḷaiyāḷ, poṟṟoṭiyāḷ where the compounds kaṉaṅkuḷai, poṟṟoṭi have become bases. teluṅkaccol becomes teluṅku; vaṭukaccol becomes vaṭuku. In the case of these two compounds the first part of the compound teluṅku, or vaṭuku is retained; the second part col is lost. The a ending of the first member of the compound is also lost and in its place u comes in. In this way, we get the forms teluṅku, vaṭuku.

The taddhitan can come in single words.

ex. valaiyaṉ peṇṭāṭṭi > valaicci.

It may come in compounds as well. e.g. Porupparacaṉ makaḷ "the daughter of the king of mountain" becomes porupparaci.

No specific suffixes :

Pirayōka Vivēkam is conscious that there are in Tamil no specific suffixes for taddhitan. He points out that the same suffixes occur in tiṅ or verb. Ex. vantāṉ, vantāḷ, vantār, vantatu, pōyiṟṟu. Thus it is clear that there is no separate suffix exclusively for taddhita or tiṅ or kṛt in Tamil. To speak of tiṅanta, kṛdanta or taddhitānta in Tamil is meaningless and opposed to its structure.

Pirayōka Vivēkam points out like Vīracōliyam a few suffixes for toḻiṟpeyar or verbal noun or kṛd bhāva padās. The examples for kṛd bhāva padās taking suffixes are as follows :

tīṉ	"food"
pāyttuḷ	"jumping"
puṇar	"coming together"

cākkāṭu	"death"
pēṟu	"receipt, profit"
aṟivatu	"knowing"
ākkam	"increment"
puṇarcci	"embracing"
puṇarppu	"coming together"
uṭukkai	"dressing"

It also points out some of the above suffixes occur with medial suffixes or iṭainilai and also with empty morphs or cāriyai which he calls padapūrti. cāriyai, he explains it as the welding material which welds together the suffixes and other particles of the word.

Kinds of sāmānya :

Pirayōka Vivēkam then proceeds to give the various kinds of Sāmānya taddhita. (sū : 31). He has given the seven forms corresponding to many given by Vīracōḷiyam. It denotes the possessor. It further adds that it will come with various other things as well namely, 1) things, 2) quality, 3) numerals, 4) caste, 5) organ, 6) to me 7) and the actions connected with these.

Things: Sanskrit examples are daṇḍi, kuṇḍali. Tamil examples are villi – "one who has a bow", vāḷi "one who has a word", kaccinaṉ "one who wears the kaccu", kaḷaliṉaṉ "one who wears the heroic anklet"

2) Quality :- kariyaṉ "one who is black"
ceyyaṉ — "one who is red or fair"
The Sanskrit examples are also given.
dīrgha, rakta, śukla, syāmaḷa, pīta,

3) Numeral : pañcavar "the five"

aṣṭa śahaśram	"the eight thousand"
pañcakam	"the five"
aṣṭamam	"the eighth"
daśamam	"the tenth"
catuṣṭayam	"a set of four
ēkādaśi	"eleventh day"
dvādaśi	"the twelfth day"

Tamil examples are oruvar, iruvar, eḷuvar etc.

4) Caste : pārppār "brahmins"
aracar "kings"
vaṇikar "merchants"
vēḷāḷar "vellālās"

The Sanskrit Ex. brāhmaṇa, kṣatriya, vaisiya, śūdra.

5) Time : viśākan-"one who was born on the viśīka day".
paraṇiyāṉ – "one who was born on the bharaṇi day."

6) Organ : kaṇṇaṉ "one who has eyes."
ceviyaṉ : "one who has ears"

Sanskrit examples : daṇṭi, kumbhi, kari, phaṇi

"that which has the tusk, front globe, trunk or the serpent's hood respectively".

7. Verbs connected with these : All the above can come as predicate and therefore as verbs kaccinaṉ or kaḷaliṉaṉ denotes the person who has the attribute of having the thing-dravya viśiṣṭa. Here the things possessed is more important than the possessor. It denotes the possessor but not as separate from the possession.

The following translations are given.

utaiyaṉ — the possessor = dravya viśiṣṭa
i. e. viśēṣyam.

uṭaipporuḷ — the thing possessed. viśiṣṭa dravya or viśēṣa.

uṭaimai or ownership is viśiṣṭam.

uṭaipporuḷ :

In the following instances, the things possessed viśiṣṭa dravya is emphasised. (sū: 32) (here he gives those cases which he left out from the consolidated list of Vīracōḷiyam above mentioned)

(1) Son of this man : kāṅkēyaṉ etc.

(2) The daughter of this woman-pārvati etc.

(3) One who belongs to a particular race or varkkam-irākavaṉ etc.

(4) Member belonging to a group or relations-taman-
"their man," tamaḷ: "their woman", tamar-"their
persons" naman-namaḷ, namar, "our man etc.,"
numan, numaḷ, numar "your man etc." Sanskrit
examples : madīya, asmadīya, yuṣmadīya, tadīya.

(5) Membership of a group of relatives other than those
mentioned above :

tantai	"their father"
entai	"my father"
nuntai	"your father"
taṅkai	"their sister"
eṅkai	"my or our sisters"
tampi	"their younger brother"
empi	"our younger brother"
umpi	"your younger brother"

The Sanskrit examples are pitāmaha, pautra, pitṛvya, mātula.

Pirayōka Vivēkam further notes that nampi, naṅkai
according to the intention of the speaker(vaktṛ vivakṣa) without
denoting any relationship may denote over lordship, coming
under what has been already described "itanukku nāyakan"-
"the lord of this".

(6) The devotee of this person Caivan etc.

In all these cases, the possessor is emphasised as against
the thing possessed. This is called Viśiṣṭa dravya or uṭaip
poruḷ the thing possessed; that is the meaning of the taddhita
suffix.

In this way all other suffixes above mentioned will occur.

tu	pariyatu, "that which is big" kūrṅkōṭṭatu- "that which has sharp tusk" nallāḷuṭaiyatu- "that which has excellent soldiers"
m	tolkāppiyam-"work written by Tolkāppiyan" pāṇinīyam-"work written by Pāṇini"
a	tama-"what are theirs"
tu	tamatu-"What is theirs". tanatu-"what is ones own" ninatu-"what is yours" uṭaiyatu-"what they possess"

taṅkaittu-"what is in one's own hand."
piṭittu-"what is of the size which one can
hold with his hand."

tam and not taṉ :

In all these cases taṉatu and tama, taṉatu is genitive
singular, tama is the genitive plural. In taṉatu the base is
taṉ-the non-human 3rd person singular and in tama, the base
is tam which is non-human 3rd person plural. This happens
with non-human words. But in the human category we always
get the plural base tam so as to form taman, tamaḷ etc., we
never get singular base tāṉ or taṉ. Thus we have no forms
like tanaṉ tanar and tanaḷ.

The word tamar may be preceded by a genitive in the
singular – civaṉ tamar, maṇivaṇṇaṉ tamar, namaṉ tamar. Or
may be preceded by a plural genitive.

kallāmā aṉṉār tamar

Thus both in the plural and in the singular preceding this
word tamar, we have only words with the plural base tām >
tam and not taṉ.

Tolkāppiya has a sutram beginning in, ta na nu e eṉum avaị
(Tol : 893) referring to the words we are discussing. Cēṉāvar-
aiyar there points out that these are common to singular and
plural and the words like tamar could not be analysed into base
and suffix. Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar however does not understand the
implication of this statement and proceeds to state that in these
words also tām, nām etc. have become shortened as tam and
nam to take the suffix aṉ, ar etc.

Viśiṣṭam :

It was stated above that in the relationships mentioned,
there is such a thing as viśiṭṭam koḷvatu – bearing a relation-
ship or ownership. This is of two kinds. (1) this man
possesses this as his own and (2) the second is exemplified by
the sentence "this thing is that of this person."

II (2) avyaya taddhita

The second kind of taddhita mentioned by Pirayōka
Vivēkam is avyaya taddhita, a taddhita which comes with a

base which is indeclinable (sū: 33). It should be noted that according to Pirayōka Vivēkam both the iṭaiccol like maṟṟai and uriccol like kuḷa and maḷa are indeclinables, He gives the following examples :

1. kuḷavi;
2. maḷavan
3. maṟṟaiyān

Pirayōka Vivēkam proceeds to discuss this kind of taddhitan occurring in Tamil.

(a) Amongst the demonstratives there are unanalysable locatives. ex : āṅkuk koṇṭān–"he got it or captured it there." This word āṅku is what is referred to in Tolkāppiyam as cuṭṭuc ciṉai nīṭiya meṉ toṭar moḷi. He gives also the examples ārkoṇṭāṉ, īrk koṇṭāṉ meaning "he got it there, he got it here" (the aṉ and iṉ are referred to in the sūtra, maṉṉum ciṉṉum āṉum īṉum.) āṅku, āṉ, and īṉ are the locative particle or avyaya taddhitan.

There are unanalysable interrogatives like vāṇṭu, yāṅku, eṅku etc. and they would also come under this head.

(b) The second kind is illustrated by the following examples :

oruvayiṉ, iruvayiṉ, palavayiṉ

vayiṉ is an indeclinable particle giving the meaning of the locative case and this locative is preceded by number words oru, iru and pala.

(c) The third kind is illustrated by the examples :

avvayiṉ, ivvayiṉ, uvvayiṉ
aṅkaṇ, iṅkaṇ
avvāy
āyiṭai

These begin with demonstrative particles a, i or u and end with indeclinable particles denoṭing the locatives–

vayiṉ, kaṇ, vāy, iṭai

(Tolkāppiyam refers to some of these in the sūtra, "cuṭṭu mutal vayiṉum ekāra mutal vayiṉum.")

The forms contemplated in Naṉṉūl such as aṉṉaṉam iṉṉaṉam and uṉṉaṉam are also avyaya taddhitan in Tamil.

The following words are also viṉaikkuṟippu or taddhitan coming with the meaning of the locative as explained by Cēṉāvaraiyar in the sūtra in Tolkāppiyam, iṉṟila.

kuṭātu is kuṭakkuḷḷatu i.e. "what is in the west" tēṉātu = terkuḷḷatu–"what is in the south" vaṭātu = vaṭakkuḷḷatu "what is in the north"; kuṇātu = kuṇattuḷḷatu "what is in the east". cēyttu = cēymmaik kaṇṇatu-'what is at a distance'; aṇittu = aṇimaik kaṇṇatu–'what is nearby'

The demonstrative particles and demonstrative nouns denote what the speaker intends (vivakṣitārtha.)

Pirayōka Vivēkam gives the following dictionary entries.

yatra	=	evvayiṉ;
tatra	=	avvayiṉ;
atra	=	ivvayiṉ;
yatah	=	eṅku;
tatah	=	aṅku;
atah	=	iṅku;

avyaya taddhitan and compounds :

In the above instances the demonstrative and interrogative particles can be combined with indeclinable locatives. Therefore they were called avyayat taddhitan. But if these demonstrative particles come with a noun like apporuḷ, ipporuḷ, akkoṟṟaṉ, ikkoṟṟaṉ, avviral, etc. they will be compounds or samastapadas OR TOKAICCOL and they will not be avyayat taddhitan. Tolkāppiyar explaining the sandhi in uyirmayaṅkiyal takes the demonstrative particle as one word or iṭaiccol. Then it is considered as the standing word ready to be combined with the coming word. This is another reason why apporuḷ etc. should not be considered as avyaya taddhitan. But Tolkāppiyar takes avvayiṉ, uvvayiṉ etc. as the standing word (see cuṭṭu mutal vayiṉ) and lays down further sandhi. Since they are taken as one unit they may be called avyayat taddhitan. Similarly Tolkāppiyar does not take the demonstrative and interrogative letters as standing words to be combined

in sandhi with kaṇ or vayiṉ. Therefore aṅkaṇ, avvayiṉ etc. are avyaya taddhitaṉ.

āṉ in the sūtra, atuccol vēṟṟumai uṭaimaiyāṉum combines with the noun uṭaimai and denotes the locative. So also in viṉai mutalāṉum. In the phrase āṉ vantiyaiyum, āṉ has the meaning āṅku, "there" Therefore āṉ is also avyaya taddhitaṉ.

II 3) bhāva taddhita

The third variety of taddhitaṉ is bhāva taddhitaṉ-a verbal noun or abstract noun. (sū : 34)

mai in many places and u in a few places occur as the final suffix to abstract bases or nouns like āṉ, peṇ;

veḷ	+ mai	=	veṇmai "witeness"
ce	+ mai	=	cemmai "redness"
karu	+ mai	=	karumai "blackness"
peru	+ mai	=	perumai "bigness"
neṭu	+ mai	=	neṭumai "length"

The abstract bases occur with u: e.g.

veḷ	+ u	=	veḷuppu
karu	+ u	=	karuppu

(it is not clear why he has not analysed the suffixes as "pu").

Pirayōka Vivēkam compares Veṇmai etc. with the Sanskrit usage dhavaḷa bhāva, dhavaḷyam, dhavaḷimā, nīlimā; mai occurs as suffix after nouns like āṉ and peṇ. e.g.

āṉ – mai;
peṇ-mai;
tāḷāṇmai;
kuṭi-mai;
ceṅkōṇ-mai
vaḷḷaṇ-mai;
kātaṇ-mai;
oru-mai;
iru-mai;

eḻu-mai;
pakai-mai;
kēṇ-mai;
pukaḷ-mai;
camaḷ-mai
u occur with nouns. e. g.
vēntu – "the king's nature"
aracu – "the king's nature"
These are also bhāva taddhitas.

Pirayōka Vivēkam compares āṇmai etc. with Sanskrit puṃstvam. strītvam etc.

In the following instances mai does not denote nature; it denotes the things with the nature. Thus it has no meaning other than that of the base itself. This is called in Tamil – pakutip poruḷ vikuti

This is called bhāva taddhita pratyaya having svārtha conmai for col (in conmai tiṟital)
poruṇmai for poruḷ (in poruṇmai tiṟital)
iḷamai for iḷam.
muppattu mummai for muppattumūṉṟu (in muppattu mummait tēvar)
irumai for iraṇṭu (in iruvakai)
immai for inta (in immaip piṟappu)
kuṟumai for kuṟu (in kuṟumai eḻuttu)
irupēr āṇmai for irupēr āṇmaiyar
kuṭimaikkaṇ for kuṭimaiyāṇkaṇ
āṇmai aṭutta makaṉ for āṇaṭutta makaṉ = āṇmakaṉ
aracu for aracaṉ
amaiccu for amaiccaṉ
vēntu for vēntaṉ

He gives similar examples for Sanskrit as trailōkyam = trilōki; cāturvarṇyam for cātur varṇam.

The words kuṭimai and āṇmai occur in Tolkāppiyam and in Kuṟaḷ. Iḷampūraṇar, Cēṉāvaraiyar and Parimēlaḷakar call them ākupeyar i. e. the word with an extended meaning.

ākupeyar is lakṣaṇā.

Naccinārkkiniyar however states that these words denote the abstract quality and also the person having the quality. The word peṇ (peṇṇir peruntakkatil) is taken as ākupeyar by Parimēlaḻakar. aruḷuṭaimai means 'being possessed of grace or mercy'. Similarly poṟaiyuṭaimai means 'being possessed of forbearance.' Therefore these are taddhitaṉ based on bhāva taddhitaṉ.

cāttaṉ uṭaimai means literally 'cāttaṉ's ownership;' it means the thing which is possessed by cāttaṉ. This is also bhāva taddhitaṉ. In Sanskrit also we have such usages. kṛpā viśiṣṭatvam which refers to the owner's active quality and dēvadatta viśiṣṭatvam where the thing possessed is emphasiscd.

taccanatu toḻil "carpenter's occupation"–taccu.

kollanatu toḻil–black smith's occupation–kollu.

These are bhāva taddhitaṉ. But it is open to interpret it in the following way.

taccaṉ = taccut toḻilai uṭaiyāṉ "One has the occupation of carpentry."

kollaṉ – kollutt toḻilai uṭaiyāṉ– 'one who has the occupation of blacksmithy.' If these are interpretted this way these will be samānya taddhitas. Here the meaning depends on the intention of the speaker-vivakṣādhinam.

CHAPTER VII

SANSKRIT APPROACH TO TAMIL GRAMMAR

Tiṅ or Kriyā or verbs
A. VĪRACŌLIYAM
1. TĀTUP PATALAM

tiṅ or kriyā taddhitaṉ :

Vīracōliyam deals with the verbs under two chapters Tātuppaṭalam consisting of eleven kārikās and Kiriyāp patap paṭalam consisting of thirteen kārikās. The explicit verbs are terinilai viṉai and implicit verbs are kuṟippu viṉai. Both can become participial nouns, which shows that the distinction between noun and verb often gets blurred in the Dravidian languages. The implicit verbs as verbs and participial nouns have been dealt with in the Taddhitap paṭalam. The distinction in Tamil between tiṅ and taddhitaṉ is unnatural because taddhitaṉ and tiṅ take the same suffixes and behave alike except for the fact that the implicit verb has noun as its base whilst explicit verb has verbal root as base.

Roots and imperatives :

Vīracōliyam proceeds on the conviction that Sanskrit is the mother of all Tamil words and that therefore all the uses in Sanskrit will befit Tamil. He states that the roots naṭa "to walk" aṭu "to cook" etc. should be formed in Tamil as Sanskrit cara and paca, by making these Tamil forms equal to the second person imperative singular. (Note that he does not identify imperative singular with the verbal root). They are merely similar in form but not in meaning because unless these roots take the word marker cu or sup they cannot give any meaning like "walking" "cooking" etc. That is why a similarity of form alone is referred to. (sū : 60).

Roots : Tamil and Sanskrit and other languages :

The commentator divides dhātus into three kinds. They are (1) Tamil roots e. g. naṭa, aṭu, cey, paṇṇu etc. (2) Sanskrit dhātus either as tatsamas or tadbhavas most of the latter ending in i- while occurring in Tamil (3) dhātus from other languages.

List of dhātus :

Vīracōḷiyam lists a few dhātus and suggests others being formed on those lines. The dhātus listed are naṭa, aṭu, cey, paṇṇu. naṇṇu, pō, cinti, navil, uṇ, iru, kiṭa, viṭu, kūṟu, peṟu, maṟu, koḷ, aḷai, vāl, kiḷai, vel, kaṭa, naṭu, taṅku, kaci, poci, pūcu, miku, puku, cel, iṭu, muṭi, ēntu and koḷ. (sū : 61).

The commentary adds that dhātus can be sakarmaka transitive i. e. coming with an object and (2) akarmaka or intransitive i. e. coming without the potentiality of taking an object.

List of suffixes :

Vīracōḷiyam next lists the suffixes which occur after these roots for making them taddhitās or viṉaik kuṟippu or kārakam.

The following are the suffixes mentioned along with the words formed, as given by the commentator. (The latter morphologist has still further reduced the number by splitting the suffixes). The author splits a word into a root and the final suffix as in Sanskrit. But in Tamil we get a medial suffix which denotes tense etc. He combines the medial suffix with final suffix and takes them as one form. P. V. calls this iṟutitōy iṭainilai (P. V. sū : 41) Perhaps this way of stating the final suffix establishes the seeming similarity between the final suffixes in Sanskrit and Tamil (V. C. sū : 62). See pō + v + āṉ given as pō + vāṉ; kaṭā + n + t + āṉ given as kaṭan + tāṉ).

vāṉ	pōvāṉ, ceyyāṉ, karutuvāṉ
u	pūccu, nāṟṟu;
mai	meṉmai, vaṉmai;
am	āttam, nāttam
pu	kaṟpu, cirippu
kai	aṟikkai, naṭakkai
val	iḷaval, karuval;
i	kāṇi;

vu	aṟivu, karavu;
tal	pōtal;
al	cellal;
aṇ	ūṇaṉ
pāṉ	kāppāṉ;
alai	cuṭalai:
ku	pōkku;
tāṉ	kaṭantāṉ;
vi	kēḷvi;
ṭi	uṇṭi
vai	pōrvai;
ci	kāṭci, māṭci, mītci

The commentator adds that ai etc. also occur as suffix giving the examples kolai, talai.

toḷiṟ peyar :

The verbal nouns which are having the forms of roots themselves according to him, had suffix cu added anly to be lost e. g. vitai, avil. pār, maṭi, cari etc. According to him, the original forms kaṇṇu, eṇṇu, lose the final nu and stand as kaṇ, eṇ. The roots undergo other vikāras or changes. taṟi is that 'which was cut'. Therefore it is karma kāraka according to the commentator. So are muṟi, poti, tuḷai, viti, uri. 'What illuminates or lights up' is called viḷakku or 'light' coming in the meaning of karaṇa kāraka. Where people pass out is kaḷi which is avadhi kāraka.

'The place where the dead bodies are burnt' is cuṭalai i.e. ādhara kāraka or adhikaraṇa kāraka. The commentator interprets viṉaik kuṟippu occurring in the text as bhāva. From his explanation it is clear that he is interpreting viṉaik kuṟippu as toḷiṟ peyar or verbal noun for which he gives the following examples.

> kēttal, aṟital, cātal, pōtal, vīṭu, kūṭu, kūttu,
> nūkku, kāṭci, cari, kāval, āttam, ōttu.

Combination: The text adds that preceding the kind of combinations explained above, another noun may come and form a unit along with it. The examples are :

aṇintāṉ	nīraṇintāṉ
kātti	āṟukātti;

kaṭṭu	kaṉ kaṭṭu;
añci	paḷiyañci
ēnti	pukaḷēnti
āṭi	ampaḷattāṭi
colli	muṟcolli
uṇṇi	pāmpaḷivuṇṇi
pōki	ūṭupōki
kāṇi	nāṭukāṇi

Sanskrit pratyayas :

The text next lists the Sanskrit pratyayas occurring in bhāva and kāraka. (V. C. sū : 63) The purpose is not clear but the list is as follows :

tam, am, ti, kaṉ, vam, aṉam, aṇam, taṉ, akaṉ, akku, i, u, cam, maṉ. ai, akam, car, tiṟam, ā, āyu, al, il, mi, āṉ, kam, aṉ, tavam, kal.

Changes :

Commentator adds that any formation of a word can be explained. The case for the person who explains thus is stronger. He emphasises that any amount of change occurs in word. The text then lists the changes which certain dhātus undergo whenever a pratyaya beginning with a vowel follows, ī ending and becomes ai or ay; u ending becomes av or āv; the dhātus may take a guṇa or vṛddhi; otherwise one must note other changes occurring (V. C. sū 64). The examples for the two rules are :

ī : ending : (Tamil forms are given)

nī + anam	=	nayanam;
nī + akam	=	nāyakam
cī + anam	=	cayanam;
cī + akam	=	cēyakam

ū ending :

pū + anam	=	pavana;
pū + akam	=	pāvaka

Suggested formation of words :

The following are the examples given for explaining the formation of words (which are not always satisfactory).

Sanskrit words also are found in the list. It is difficult to give explanations.

pū	+ tam	—	pūtam;
tā	+ mam	—	tāmam
nī	+ ti	—	nīti
pā	+ kaṉ	—	pākaṉ;
i	+ vam	—	ēvam;
puca	+ aṉam	—	pōcaṉam
cā	+ aṇam	—	cāṇam;
viti	+ taṉ	—	vēntaṉ;
kiru	+ an	—	karutaṉ
tuṭa	+ akku	—	tuṭakku;
car	+ i	—	cari
mata	+ u	—	mātu
vā	+ cam	—	vācam;
vā	+ maṉ	—	vāmaṉ
cā	+ mam	—	cāmam
naṭa	+ ai	—	naṭai
naṭa	+ akam	—	nāṭakam
ni	+ car	—	nēcar
pā	+ tiram	—	pāttiram
kaṭa	+ ā	—	kāṭā
vā	+ āyu	—	vāyu
paṭa	+ al	—	paṭal;
puṭa	+ il	—	puṭṭil;
pū	+ mi	—	pūmi;
vali	+ āṉ	—	vallāṉ;
kaṭa	+ kam	—	kaṭakam;
mata	+ aṉ	—	mataṉ;
kata	+ tavam	—	katavam;
pā	+ kal	—	pākal

kārita and kēvala dhātus : (In the following often Tamil forms are used except when the word occurs first)

These authors explain the piṟaviṉai as kāritam, but they do not distinguish between piṟaviṉai and causal (V. C. (sū 65). One dances : here "dance" is done without any body ordering it. The root here is kēvalat tātu 'simple root' If one makes another dance the root becomes āṭṭu; āṭu is taṉviṉai; āṭṭu is

piravinai. This latter is called kāritat tātu; when another degree is added-make one make another dance- we have to āttuvi-

(1) āṭu;
(2) āṭṭu;
(3) āṭṭuvi

kāritak kāritam :

The third is called kārita kārita. This is the kāritam of kāritam This is explained in terms of causal roots which usually take the suffix vi or pi. One may have another degree also kārita kārita kārita (āṭu, āṭṭu, āṭṭuvi āṭṭuvippi)

Similarly for kartā and karma :

The commentator points out that kartā also can be kēvala karta e. g. uṇṭanaṉ "only he ate", ūṭṭiṉaṉ i. e. "one who made another eat" this is kāritakārita-kārita kartā. Correspondingly we have kēvala-karmam e. g. uṇṭatu cōru; kārita-karma-ūṭṭiṉatu cōru, kārita-kārita-karma-ūṭṭuvittatu - cōru.

Peyareccam :

The text next proceeds to enumerate tense suffixes (V. C. sū: 66). As already stated tense in addition to number and person is denoted by these final suffixes; for instance, in peyar eccam, for the past tense after the dhātu or root the following three come.

ta : e. g.   piranta piḷḷai, kaṇṭa erutu, niṉra pacu ;

na :   ūṭṭiṉa, tīrriṉa, pōṉa (the i or iṉ which
            denotes the past tense is not explained)

ya :   colliya, āya : (y is i denoting the past tense; this
is not stated)

For the present tense, he gives the following : kira, cu (which later on is always lost)

kira : e.g. ceykira cāttaṉ;

cu :   cey cāttaṉ (this is viṉait tokai where the base
         of peyareccam alone remains)
āniṉra : ceyyā niṉra cāttaṉ

For the future the following three are given : kum, um, and m.

kum : e.g. nirkum cāttaṉ;
um   ariyuñ cāttaṉ

m   cām kiḷavi (this is an alternation of cākum
           kiḷavi)

The commentator states that pratyaya given for the future will be also for all the three tenses. But he does not give examples.

tumanta :

The text next speaks of tumanta pratyaya (V. C : sū : 67)

tumartham was mentioned in connection with the dative (ref : Pirayōka Vivēkam) uṇṇutarku, uṇṇutarporuttu, uṇṇa, uṇpāṉ, nirka are some of the forms. The suffixes mentioned are poruttu, ka, pāṉ, tarku, vāṉ and a. These six all called tumarttam because in Sanskrit the translated forms end in tum; example yātum "to go" etc. which are called tumartta.

tvānta :

Vīracōliyam next proceeds to explain tvāntan (tuvānta) pratyayas (sū : 68). The tuvānta pratyayas are (1) ā- (uṇṇāppoṉāṉ) (2) ittu (uṇṭittup pōṉāṉ) (3) tu (4) u (The example is pukkup pōṉāṉ; probably the commentator thinks pu + u = pukku) (5) i (colli). When two finite verbs come the first is a conjunctive participle (avaṉ vantāṉ pōṉāṉ > avaṉ vantu pōṉāṉ). When these conjunctive participles are translated into Sanskrit, the Sanskrit words end with the suffix tvā e. g. nītvā 'having led' and those words are called illai etc.

illai etc.

Vīracōliyam next talks of iṭaiccol forming into words. (sū : 69). By iṭaiccol he means avyayās - the indeclinables. illai, uṇṭu, āl, il are mentioned. illai is negation; uṇṭu is asser- tion of existence; these two are common to all persons, number and gender; that is why they are said to be avyayās. āl and il come in the conditional participles: e. g. vantāl, ariyil, We have to explain them in accordance with the usage. The other in- declinable particles mentioned by the commentator are a, āṉ, iṉri, iṉṉam, pōlum, ām, ākkum, ē, ōṭu, vāli, cārri, naṉi, ōṅku.

Negative suffixes :

The final kārikā (70) in Tātup paṭalam relates to the negative suffixes. He calls them taṭaip pirattiyam. He has

already stated the six categories : (1) Masculine singular (2) Feminine singular (3) honorific singular (4) human plural or epicene (5) the non-human singular and (6) the non-human plural. The suffixes and the examples are for the future as follows :-

āṉ	=	naṭavāṉ;
āḷ	=	naṭavāḷ;
ār	=	naṭavār;
ārkaḷ	=	naṭavārkaḷ;
ātu	=	naṭavātu;
ā	=	naṭavā

(it is difficult to see how the first three differ from the suffixes for the positive verbs for the present tense and the past) Vīracōḻiyam gives the following for which the commentator gives the corresponding examples.

In all the instances, in between the root and the final suffix given, the consonant t will come in the past; for the present, the consonant k will come :

	suffixes	past	present
Masculine singular	ilaṉ	naṭantilaṉ	naṭakkilaṉ
Feminine singular	ilaḷ	naṭantilaḷ	naṭakkilaḷ
Honorific plural	ilar	naṭantilar	naṭakkilar
Human plural	ilarkaḷ	naṭantilarkaḷ	naṭakkilarkaḷ
Non-human singular	ilatu	natantilatu	naṭakkilatu
Non-human plural	ila	naṭantila	naṭakkila

When two verbs vārāṉ, iruntāṉ come they are coordinated into vārātiruntāṉ. vārātu here is a conjunctive participle. The commentary gives examples for other negative suffixes :

naṭavātoḷi, nillāvaḷi, māyāp pukaḷ, itu naṭakkutilai, (colloquial form) avai naṭappaṉavaṉru

2. kiriyā paṭap paṭalam

III person finite verbs : 18

Vīracōḻiyam in its kiriyāppaṭap paṭalam (71) in the first kārikā states that the third person verbs are of eighteen kinds occurring as the predicates of the nominative. The six already

---

stated (1) masculine singular (2) feminine singular (3) human plural (4) honorific plural; (5) non-human singular (6) non-human plural multiplied by three tenses give the eighteen kinds.

I Person : 9

II Person : 9

In the next kārika (sū : 72) the verbs of the second person and first person are said to be nine each in all making eighteen for I and II person and thirty six for I, II and III person. Since there is no gender distinction, we multiply the three tenses by (1) singular (2) honorific plural (3) plural, we get only nine each for the I and II.

III Person :

Tense :

In the next kārikā (73) he gives the suffixes for the verb but as usual, with the tense signs preceding them, for instance tāṉ etc. where one has t showing the past tense. He does not mention i or iṉ; for instance when he mentions āṉ as the suffix in uraṅkiṉāṉ and atu has the suffix in urankuvatu. He according to his plan of giving what Pirayōka Vivēkam calls iṭainilai tōy iruti (P. V. 41) must have given iṉāṉ in the former case, iyatu in the latter case. Realising this, the commentator adds that preceding aṉa etc. (the past tense sign) i will occur. The following list shows the suffixes along with examples given by commentator.

tāṉ, āṉ	uṇṭāṉ, uraṅkiṉāṉ
tāḷ, āḷ	uṇṭāḷ, uraṅkiṉāḷ;
tār, ār	uṇṭār, uraṅkiṉār,
tārkaḷ, ārkaḷ	uṇṭārkaḷ, uraṅkiṉārkaḷ;
tatu, atu	uṇṭatu, uraṅkiyatu;
taṉa, aṉa	uṇṭaṉa, uraṅkiyaṉa

Present :

For the third person singular, he mentions niṉṟāṉ and kiṟ⁻ṉ (sū : 74). In giving the suffixes for peyareccam he had mentioned the form āniṉra. On that basis he must have given here the forms āniṉṟāṉ etc. The commentator therefore says that before niṉṟu, ā always comes in. The commentator adds

not only ni<u>n</u>rā<u>n</u> etc. but also ki<u>t</u>antā<u>n</u> and iruntā<u>n</u> which also come when preceded by ā to show the present tense. He further warns us against taking u<u>ṇ</u>ṇāni<u>n</u>rā<u>n</u> etc. as consisting of the conjunctive participle u<u>ṇ</u>ṇā and the finite verb ni<u>n</u>rā<u>n</u> "he stood" since in the usages given ni<u>n</u>rā<u>n</u> etc. are not independent predicates but only suffixes.

The following are the examples :

	Suffixes		Forms	
Human masculine	1. ni<u>n</u>rā<u>n</u>	2. ki<u>r</u>ā<u>n</u>	1. u<u>ṇ</u>ṇā	
		ni<u>n</u>rā<u>n</u>	2. u<u>ṇ</u>ki<u>r</u>ā<u>n</u>	
Human-Feminine	1. ni<u>n</u>rā<u>ḷ</u>	2. ki<u>r</u>ā<u>ḷ</u>	1. u<u>ṇ</u>ṇā	
		ni<u>n</u>rāl	2. u<u>ṇ</u>ki<u>r</u>ā<u>ḷ</u>	
Honorific plural	1. ni<u>n</u>rār	2. ki<u>r</u>ār	1. u<u>ṇ</u>ṇā	
		ni<u>n</u>rār	2. unki<u>r</u>ār	
Human plural	1. ni<u>n</u>rā<u>r</u>kaḷ	2 ki<u>r</u>ārkaḷ	1. u<u>ṇ</u>ṇā	
		ni<u>n</u>rārk<u>ḷ</u>	2. u<u>ṇ</u>ki<u>n</u>rārkaḷ	
non-human singular	1. ni<u>n</u>ratu	2. ki<u>n</u>ratu	1. u<u>ṇ</u>ṇā	
		ni<u>n</u>ratu,	2. u<u>ṇ</u>ki<u>n</u>ratu	
non-human plural	1. ni<u>n</u>ra<u>n</u>a	2. ki<u>n</u>ra<u>n</u>a	1. u<u>ṇ</u>ṇā	
		ni<u>n</u>ra<u>n</u>a	2. u<u>ṇ</u>ki<u>n</u>ra<u>n</u>a	

Future :

The next kārikā (75) enumerates the suffixes of future finite verb. (The future tense sign is p which becomes –v– after vowels or semi-vowels. Thus we get two forms one with –p– and the other with –v–.) The following is the list with the corresponding examples given by the commentator.

	Suffix		Forms	
1. vā<u>n</u>		2. pā<u>n</u>	1. u<u>r</u>aṅkuvā<u>n</u>	2. u<u>ṇ</u>pā<u>n</u>
1. vā<u>ḷ</u>		2. pā<u>ḷ</u>	1. u<u>r</u>aṅkuvā<u>ḷ</u>	2. u<u>ṇ</u>pā<u>ḷ</u>
1. vār		2. pār	1. u<u>r</u>aṅkuvār	2. u<u>ṇ</u>pār
1. vārkaḷ		2. pārkaḷ	1. u<u>r</u>ankuvārkaḷ	2. u<u>ṇ</u>pārkaḷ;
1. vatu		2. patu	1. u<u>r</u>aṅkuvatu	2. u<u>ṇ</u>patu
1. va<u>n</u>a		2. pa<u>n</u>a	1. u<u>r</u>aṅkuva<u>n</u>a	2. u<u>ṇ</u>pana

I and II person
tense suffixes :

In the following kārikās he gives respectively (1) the past tense finite suffixes for the second person and first person (sū:76) (2) finite present tense suffixes for them (sū 77) (3) the finite future tense suffixes for them (sū : 78). What we have mentioned about the finite suffixes showing the tenses are applicable here also. The following are the list of suffixes along with the examples given by the commentator.

	Suffixes			Forms	
Past : II person					
	ṭāy	āy	:	nī u<u>ṇ</u>ṭāy,	u<u>r</u>aṅki<u>n</u>āy ;
	ṭīr	īr	:	nīr u<u>ṇ</u>ṭīr,	u<u>r</u>aṅki<u>n</u>īr
	ṭīrkaḷ	īr	:	nīṅkal u<u>ṇ</u>ṭīrkaḷ,	u<u>r</u>aṅki<u>n</u>īrkaḷ
Past : I person					
	ṭē<u>n</u>	ē<u>n</u>	:	nā<u>n</u> u<u>ṇ</u>ṭē<u>n</u>	u<u>r</u>aṅki<u>n</u>ē<u>n</u>
	ṭēm	ēm	:	nām u<u>ṇ</u>ṭēm	u<u>r</u>aṅki<u>n</u>ēm
	ṭōm	ōm	:	nāṅkaḷ u<u>ṇ</u>ṭōm	u<u>r</u>aṅki<u>n</u>ōm
Present : II person					
	ki<u>r</u>āy	ni<u>n</u>rāy	:	u<u>ṇ</u>ki<u>r</u>āy	u<u>ṇ</u>ṇā ni<u>n</u>rāy
	ki<u>r</u>īr	ni<u>n</u>rīr	:	u<u>ṇ</u>ki<u>r</u>īr	u<u>ṇ</u>ṇā ni<u>n</u>rīr
	ki<u>r</u>īrkaḷ	ni<u>n</u>rīrkaḷ		u<u>ṇ</u>ki<u>r</u>īrkaḷ	u<u>ṇ</u>ṇā ni<u>n</u>rīrkaḷ
Present : I person					
	ki<u>r</u>en	ni<u>n</u>rē<u>n</u>	:	u<u>ṇ</u>ki<u>r</u>ē<u>n</u>	u<u>ṇ</u>ṇāni<u>n</u>rē<u>n</u>
	ki<u>r</u>ēm	ni<u>n</u>rēm	:	u<u>ṇ</u>ki<u>r</u>ēm	u<u>ṇ</u>ṇāni<u>n</u>rēm
	ki<u>r</u>ōm	ni<u>n</u>rōm	:	u<u>ṇ</u>ki<u>r</u>ōm	u<u>ṇ</u>ṇā ni<u>n</u>rōm
Future : II Person					
	vāy	pāy	:	u<u>r</u>aṅkuvāy	u<u>ṇ</u>pāy
	vīr	pīr	:	u<u>r</u>aṅkuvīr	u<u>ṇ</u>pīr
	īrkaḷ	pīrkaḷ	:	u<u>r</u>aṅkuvīrkaḷ	u<u>ṇ</u>pīrkaḷ
Future I person					
	vē<u>n</u>	pē<u>n</u>	:	u<u>r</u>aṅkuvē<u>n</u>	u<u>ṇ</u>pen
	vēm	pēm	:	u<u>r</u>aṅkuvēm	u<u>ṇ</u>pēm
	vōm	pōm	:	u<u>r</u>aṅkuvōm	u<u>ṇ</u>pōm

Imperative :

The next kārikā (79) enumerates finite imperative suffixes : In the singular cu is the suffix which is always lost. e. g. uṇ, uṟaṅku, kiṭa.

Honorific imperative :

In the honorific plural the suffixes are : āmē (pōkāmē) um (nillum), miṉ and ka (niṟka). The honorific plural of the second person is nām. (This is evidently a mistake for nīm. On speaking to great men "Is this your house" is put in the form "Is this our house" "nam vīṭo ?" etc.) The form pōkāmē in modern times appears as pōkalāmē. For the plural miṉkaḷ and um and kaḷ are the suffixes. The examples are :

Suffixes		Forms
miṉkaḷ	—	nīṅkaḷ pōmiṉkaḷ
um–nīṅkaḷ nillum		
kaḷ–nīṅkaḷ pōṅkaḷ		

(Note this is a colloquial form. The commentator adds that in some places miṉ also occurs as the plural suffix)

Acceptance :

The text mentions acceptance of the command being denoted by –ka. (sū : 79). The example is : avan eṉ ceyka. The context and meaning are as follows : One is ordered to do a thing. The order is accepted impliedly and the person who commands is further asked what the one should do ? In, ceyyātta nī uṇka– the implied interrogative is "you eat". The person ordered accepts it and requests the other to eat.

parōkṣa

The next mentions parōkṣa verbs where the speaker does not take any responsibility for the statement. The author mentions two suffixes : (1) pōlum e. g. uṇṭāṉ pōlum "perhaps he ate" and (2) ām e. g. uṇṭāṉām "It is said he ate". (These are indeed important usages).

Decision :

The next kārika (80) mentions another important usage probably then current where certain suffixes show decision. Note the shortened forms of some of these suffixes.

I person singular :

vaṉ	—	aṟivaṉ,	kūṟuvaṉ
paṉ	—	niṟpaṉ,	uṇpaṉ

Here the final –ṉ sometimes becomes l
e. g. aṟival, kūṟuval

I Personal plural :

Suffixes :

ṭam	—	nām kaṇṭam	nāṅkaḷ kaṇṭam
cam	—	nāmaṟicam	nāṅkaḷaṟicam (Is it the altered form of aṟitum ?)
pōm	—	nām niṟpōm	nāṅkaḷ niṟpōm
vōm	—	nām aṟivōm	nāṅkaḷ aṟivōm

II Person singular

ci	— nī	aṟici (The altered form of aṟiti)
vai	— nī	aṟivai
ti	— nī	aṟiti

II person plural

kir ∽ kīr	aṟikir
vir ∽ vīr	aṟivir
cir ∽ cīr	aṟicir
tir ∽ tīr	aṟitir
pir ∽ pīr	naṭappir

III person singular

um — avaṉaṟiyum, avaḷaṟiyum

III person plural

var, varkaḷ	avar aṟivar, avarkaḷ aṟivarkaḷ
par, parkaḷ —	avar niṟpar, avarkaḷ niṟparkaḷ

III person :

Non human singular :

The subsequent kārikā (81) is important as showing certain significant usages–The III person non-haman sigular form is equal to the form of a verbal noun though tenses are denoted.

Past :

> uṉṭatu, uraṅkiyatu, uṇkiṟatu,

Present :

> uraṅkukiṉṟatu, uṉṉāniṉṟatu, uraṅkāniṉṟatu

Future :

> uṇpatu, uraṅkuvatu

The commentator adds that a becomes i as follows :

> uṉṭiyatu, uraṅkiyatu, uṇkiṟiyatu
> uraṅkukiṟiyatu, uṇkiṟitu,
> uraṅkukiṟitu, uṇpitu, uraṅkuvitu

(These are important colloquial forms of those times)

Passive : (Vīacōḷiyam is the first work to deal with the passive voice in detail)

The root takes a + paṭu

All these forms above mentioned come also as showing the object taking the passive form.

> uṇṇappaṭṭatu, uraṅkappaṭṭatu, etc.

In converting the active form into passive form the natural root is taken and -a is suffixed and thereafter paṭu is added.

Ex. The root ari "to know" gets the -a added to become ariya to which paṭu is added to become karmadhātu or passive verbal root. These can be conjugated in all numbers, genders and persons.

There are other dhātus or roots like these karmadhtātu paṭu. Instead of paṭu, uṇ comes in. e.g. pāṭuṇpāṉ. colluṇpāṉ.

There are few roots like ari etc. which even when not passive take a and another root,

> ariyattakuvāṉ, kāṇattakuvāṉ.

Verb forms as nouns :

All the finite verbs mentioned can in the proper context behave like nouns coming in the various cases.

B. ILAKKAṆAK KOTTU

Ilakkaṇak kottu is more comprehensive and explains with the help of Tamil terms. The study of Pirayōka Vivēkam after the study of Ilakkaṇak kottu will be easier.

I. K. divides verbs into two kinds : (sū: 65)

(1) Verbs with the root alone – taṉiviṉai;

(2) Verbs with the suffixes – toṭar viṉai

taṉiviṉai :

The first kind of verb taṉi viṉai which stands with the root alone– has certain peculiar behaviours as described below according to some. (sū: 66)

(1) The root alone becomes the verbal noun e. g. arikoṉṟariyāṉ. Here root ari is equal to the verbal noun aṟital.
In keṭuvāka vaiyātu, kēṭu the root is equal to the verbal noun kēṭu or keṭutal etc.

(2) It occurs as second person imperative singular finite verb. see urai

> e. g. vāḷvārkkurai.

(3) The root occurs as other finite verbs.

e. g. koḷvārum kaḷvarum nēr. Here nēr is equal to the non-imperative finite verb nērvar.

(4) Root occurs as peyareccam or relative participle and as viṉaiyeccam or conjunctive participle or other verbal participles.

(i) Relative participle e. g. poru paṭai.
poru is equal to porukiṉṟa or poruta.

(ii) verbal participle

varippuṉai pantu. Here vari is equal to varintu a conjunctive participle.

(iii) pālari vanta; ari is equal to the infinitive form ariya.

(5) The verbal root appearing in finite and non-finite verbs impliedly separates itself away and acts as a verbal noun which then occurs as subject etc.

Non-finite verb: (1) relative participle :
kāṇkiṉṟa pōtu akkāṭci – the root kāṇ
implies kāṭci which is then referred to, with the remote demonstrative -a and that kāṭci becomes subject.
Here the non-finite verb is a relative participle.
kāṇkiṉ turattum akkāṭci – here kāṇkiṉ is a non-finite verb

i. e. a conditional verbal participle. Here also kāṇ becomes kāṭci; thereafter it is referred to as akkāṭci.

kāṇkiṉrār tamakku vīṭaḷikkumak kāṭci – kāṇkiṉrār is a finite verb. Here also the root kāṇ from the context implies the verbal noun kāṭci which is subsequently referred to as akkāṭci. In all these cases the verbal noun occurred in the nominative case. In akkāṭciyāṟ payaṉuṇṭu, it takes the instrumental.

In akkāṭcikku iṇai illai –it occurs in the dative. Sometimes there is no finite or non-finite verb where from, one could say the root covertly separated itself and denoted the verbal noun to act as a subject.

iruḷnīṅki iṉpam payakkum

maruḷ nīṅki mācaṟu kāṭciyavarkku.

There is no finite or non finite verb here with the root kaṇ; still the sentence requires the subject kāṭci.

Pirayōka.Vivēkam also points out that what is equal to the root form occurs not only as second person singular imperative finite verb but also as other finite verbs viz. verbal participles, relative participle, verbal noun. It also points out that the root from a finite or non-finite verb can impliedly separate itself to act as subject.

e. g. In, tēṟāṉ piṟaṉait teḷintāṉ vaḷimuṟai

tīrā iṭumpai tarum.

The subject of tarum is teḷital which is to be implied from the root teḷi and the finite verb teḷintāṉ. (This is a better example than given in Ilakkaṇkkottu.)

The participial noun is called sāmānya taddhitaṉ. kāṭciyavar is one such participial noun.

In, iruḷnīṅki iṉpam payakkum maruḷnīṅki mācaṟu kāṭciyavarkku, the verbal noun kāṭci from the participial noun kāṭciyavarku separates itself to act as a subject. This occurs only in literary or poetic usage which Pirayōka Vivēkam translates as vaidiika prakriya.

Ilakkaṇakkottu while enumerating some of these views mentioned above, has stated them to be the views of others.

We can identify some of them as the views of Pirayōka Vivēkam.

(We have enumerated, before we passed on to consider the views of Pirayōka, five aspects of the verbal root which are described by others according to Ilakkaṇakkottu. He gives in all twelve views of others, the remaining seven may now be considered).

(6) The form equal to the root (when by extension or ākupeyar has become a common noun e. g. urai or col 'to say' > 'saying' > 'a word') occurs in eight cases with case sign. (maṭi: 'to be lazy' > laziness > lazy person; kaḷi, "to be joyful" as one drunk > one who has drunk)

I case :	urai perukiṟṟu
II case :	collaic cērttāṉ
III case :	uraiyālaṟivittāṉ
IV case :	iccoṟkup poruḷ itu, ivvuraikkuc collitu
V case :	maṭiyiṉ nīṅki; iccolliṉ aṟiyalām ipporuḷ
VI case :	uraiyatu perumai;
VII case :	iccoṟkaṇ ipporuḷ irukkum
VIII case :	kaḷi vārāy, maṭi pōvāy

(7) These roots separately come as (1) intransitives or ceyappaṭuporuḷ kuṉṟiyavai, which Pirayōka calls akarmakadhātu; e. g. naṭa, vā etc. (2) transitives – ceyappaṭuporuḷ kuṉṟātaṉa which P. V. calls sakarmakadhātu. e. g. aṭi, viṭu, cī etc. (sū: 35) (3) or as common to both muṭi, maṭi, keṭu etc. (see keṭṭāṉ intransitive and keṭuvāṉ– transitive).

(That certain verbs are deficient in showing certain things like object etc. is stated by Cēṉāvaraiyar under the sūtram vaḷaṅkiyal maruṅkiṉ kuṉṟuva kuṉṟum as pointed out by P. V. sū. 35)

(8) Even as there are verbs which do not suffer diminuition of an object there are other roots which do not suffer diminuition of a place or location. (I. K. page 36: sū: 66)

uriñ "to rub against"

cel "to go"

(9) The roots may be synonyms or homonyms

e. g. (a) homonyms vai "to abuse" in vaitā<u>n</u>.

vai in vaittā<u>n</u> "he placed"

(b) synonyms :

col, u<u>r</u>ai, a<u>r</u>ai, kū<u>r</u>u, vi<u>l</u>ampu, pakar "to say"

(10) The root occurs as indivisible word – pakāp patam. Any root can be an example, because it cannot be analysed further.

(11) The roots may appear

(a) in their natural form : e. g. nata; poru

natantā<u>n</u>, porutā<u>n</u>

(b) in their altered form :

va > va<u>n</u>, or varu : see vantā<u>n</u>, varuki<u>nr</u>ā<u>n</u>.

(12) There may be certain root forms which are common to the verbs and nouns.

e. g. <u>n</u>atu as the verb root has the meaning "to plant"

e. g. nā<u>rr</u>ai natu.

natu as meaning "an arbitrator" is a noun;

natu as meaning "a midway" is a noun.

The root form of some verbs and forms of other finite or non–finite verbs may be identical.

nata "walk"

nata vantā<u>n</u> "he came to plant"

Ilakkanakkottu after listing these, states that these are not its views, that they are the views of others and that amongst them one another will oppose the other. As a sample of this controversy he takes up one view and explains.

Is the root the imperative ?

"Some state that the roots are second person imperative future singular finite verbs '. This view is disputed for the following reasons.

(1) "If the root alone, standing by itself, occurs in the second person, it must also occur in other two persons. Since it does not occur, it cannot be taken by itself as second person imperative.

(2) "Any root by taking suffixes like vi or pi gets it meaning altered thereby. Similarly if the root is imperative, the addition of second person imperative ai, āy should also result in a different meaning. Again if the roots themselves are imperative, the addition of ai, ay becomes unnecessary, useless and redundant. Therefore the roots themselves are not imperative finite verbs.

(3) "nata- in natantār – is plural and not singular. In natantā<u>n</u> nata is a past tense verb In natattal–nata- is a noun and not a verb. As already stated the root can come as peya-reccam (ceyku<u>nr</u>u) as vi<u>n</u>aiyeccam (ceytakka<u>n</u>a-ceyyat takka<u>n</u>a) as verbal noun (a<u>r</u>i ko<u>nr</u>ā<u>n</u>) as verbal noun, and as concrete (iccol na<u>nr</u>u). Therefore these are common to all these verb forms. Therefore it cannot be stated that root is an imperative finite verb.

(4) "If nata is second person, it should not occur with any other person. But it does occur in correct grammatical usage in other persons (natantē<u>n</u>, natantā<u>n</u>)

(5) "Verb is a word which can be both positive and negative. If the root is taken as imperative, it will not be having these common characteristic feature".

PIRAYŌKA VIVĒKAM

This discussion may be compared with what Pirayōka says in arriving at the same conclusion (sū : 35).

"nata, vā, mati etc. referred to in Nan<u>n</u>ūl are verbal nouns. These are called dhātus or prak<u>r</u>tis. These are equal in form to the imperative verb. Cē<u>n</u>āvaraiyar in the sūtram vi<u>n</u>aiyi<u>n</u> tokuti – identifies these as dhātus. These roots are different from the second person imperative. The roots nata etc. have the same meaning as natattal etc. They are common to the five fold number-genders and to the three persons. They get later, the tense signs and the final suffixes attached to them so that they become natantē<u>n</u>. Ist person; natantā<u>n</u> – 3rd person; natantāy – 2nd person. But the second person imper-atives are really natavāy, vārāy etc. which lose their final suffix āy and occur as nata, vā etc. Therefore nata, vā etc. are not by themselves second person imperatives; for if all roots are

second person imperatives there will be a confusion of persons if they were to occur with 3rd person and first person suffixes. If the imperatives and the roots occur in the same form, the imperative should be pronounced with an accent and the ordinary root pronounced without an accent".

toṭar viṉai :-

I. K. discusses thereafter the characteristic features of roots occurring with suffixes i. e. with toṭar viṉai (sū : 67) They occur as follows :-

(1) They occur with suffix.
āṭu – tal; āṭ. – al; aruḷu, cey–tu

(2) They occur with tense sign and suffix uṇ–ṭ· āṉ, tiṉ– r–āṉ

(3) The occur with tense sign, cāriyai and suffix (cāriyai is an empty morpheme coming between the noun and the case sign or between tense sign and final suffix) uṇ–kiṉr–aṉ aṉ

(4) They may occur with tense sign, cāriyai, suffix and a sandhi change occurring in between, naṭa–k–kiṉr–aṉ–aṉ (–k–is sandhi)

(5) They may come with vikāra or other changes.
naṭa–n–taṉ–aṉ (t–comes by sandhi then t becoming –n–)

(6) They may occur not in the above order. naṭa–n–tu (here –n– occurs as vikāram i. e. t– occurring as sandhi changed into a nasal; tu–is a conjunctive particle suffix)

pō–n–āṉ (the past tense in had lost its initial i by vikāram; āṉ is the suffix).

(7) Without occurring with any of the following five viz. (1) suffix (2) tense sign (3) cāriyai (4) sandhi (5) vikāram, a root, by mere change of its form can occur as a verb.

keṭu > kēṭu

viṭu > vīṭu (These are verbal nouns)

(8) The verbs can occur showing any one of the two categories of human and non-human, referring to anyone of the three persons and to any one of the five fold division viz., masculine singular, feminine singular, human plural, non-human singular and non-human plural

(This requires no explanation)

(9) (a) The verbs occur as verbal noun, (b) finite verb

(c) non-finite verb (d) verb, special to any one of the five fold division or three persons or as verbs common to all or to a few of the sub-divisions above mentioned.

They may occur as taṉviṉai, (intransitive) piṛaviṉai (transitive) or common to both.

pirivar "they will separate" taṉviṉai;
pirippar–"they will separate them"–piṛaviṉai;
tērru is common to both.

tērrāṭal = taṉviṉai
avaṉait = piṛaviṉai

This tērru is common to taṉviṉai and piṛaviṉai.

Verbs may occur (1) as positive verb e.g. uṇpāṉ "he will eat" (b) as negative verbs e.g. uṇṇāṉ "he will not eat". or (c) as common to the positve and negative e.g. ceyyāy which means either the imperative "do" or a negative "you will not do".

Verbs may occur in the (a) active voice or cey viṉai e. g. uṇṭa cāttaṉ "cattan who ate".

(b) or in the passive voice :
e.g. uṇṭa cōṛu "the rice which was eaten".

(c) or as common to both active and passive voice
e.g. puli kol yāṉai.

This may mean either "the elephant which killed the tiger" (in the active voice) or "the elephant that was killed by the tiger" (in the passive voice).

Vesbs may occur as the verb of the whole or as a verb of the part or as a verb common to both:-

second person imperatives there will be a confusion of persons if they were to occur with 3rd person and first person suffixes. If the imperatives and the roots occur in the same form, the imperative should be pronounced with an accent and the ordinary root pronounced without an accent".

toṭar viṉai :–

I. K. discusses thereafter the characteristic features of roots occurring with suffixes i. e. with toṭar viṉai (sū : 67) They occur as follows :–

(1) They occur with suffix.
āṭu – tal; āṭ. – al; aruḷu, cey-tu

(2) They occur with tense sign and suffix uṇ–ṭ- āṉ, tiṉ–r-āṉ

(3) The occur with tense sign, cāriyai and suffix (cāriyai is an empty morpheme coming between the noun and the case sign or between tense sign and final suffix)
uṇ-kiṉr-aṉ aṉ

(4) They may occur with tense sign, cāriyai, suffix and a sandhi change occurring in between, naṭa-k-kiṉṉr-aṉ-aṉ (–k–is sandhi)

(5) They may come with vikāra or other changes.
naṭa-n-taṉ-aṉ (t–comes by sandhi then t becoming –n–)

(6) They may occur not in the above order. naṭa-n-tu (here –n– occurs as vikāram i. e. t– occurring as sandhi changed into a nasal; tu–is a conjunctive participle suffix)

pō–n-āṉ (the past tense in had lost its initial i by vikāram; āṉ is the suffix).

(7) Without occurring with any of the following five viz.
(1) suffix (2) tense sign (3) cāriyai (4) sandhi (5) vikāram, a root, by mere change of its form can occur as a verb.

keṭu > kēṭu
viṭu > vīṭu (These are verbal nouns)

(8) The verbs can occur showing any one of the two categories of human and non-human, referring to any-one of the three persons and to any one of the five fold division viz., masculine singular, feminine singular, human plural, non-human singular and non-human plural

(This requires no explanation)

(9) (a) The verbs occur as verbal noun, (b) finite verb

(c) non-finite verb (d) verb, special to any one of the five fold division or three persons or as verbs common to all or to a few of the sub-divisions above mentioned.

They may occur as taṉviṉai, (intransitive) piṟaviṉai (transitive) or common to both.

pirivar "they will separate" taṉviṉai;
pirippar–"they will separate them"–piṟaviṉai;
tērru is common to both.

tērrāṭal = taṉviṉai
avaṉait = piṟaviṉai

This tērru is common to taṉviṉai and piṟaviṉai.

Verbs may occur (1) as positive verb e.g. uṇpāṉ "he will eat" (b) as negative verbs e.g. uṇṇāṉ "he will not eat". or (c) as common to the positve and negative e.g. ceyyāy which means either the imperative "do" or a negative "you will not do".

Verbs may occur in the (a) active voice or cey viṉai e.g. uṇṭa cāttaṉ "cattan who ate".

(b) or in the passive voice :
e.g. uṇṭa cōṟu "the rice which was eaten".

(c) or as common to both active and passive voice
e.g. puli kol yāṉai.

This may mean either "the elephant which killed the tiger" (in the active voice) or "the elephant that was killed by the tiger" (in the passive voice).

Vesbs may occur as the verb of the whole or as a verb of the part or as a verb common to both:–

(a) The verb of the whole : cāttan naṭantān

(b) verb of the part : kāl naṭantatu

(c) verb common to the whole and the part :-

e.g. vānam poḷintatu; paṭaiporutiṟṟu

"The rain fell"   "The army faught"

Verbs may occur as (a) peyareccam – relative participle:-

e. g. tēṭinaporuḷ "wealth sought for"

(b) as verbal participle e.g. tēṭa vantān "he came to search"

(c) or as common to both.

tēṭiya poruḷ – relative participles "the wealth sought"

tēṭiya vantān – verbal participle "he came to search"

Verbs can be (a) explicit or terinilai (b) inexpressible- or teriyānilai (c) kuṟippu or implied verb.

terinilai   =   vantān etc.

teriyānilai   =   vēṟu, illai, uḷ, al etc.

kuṟippu viṉai =   kuḷaiyaṉ, aṉṟu, iṉṟu

(4) kuṟippup peyareccam: nalla cāttān

(5) kuṟippu viṉaiyeccam: aṉṟi vārān.

This division is according to Sanskrit usage. According to Tamil usage, there will be only two divisions – terinilai and kuṟippu where the teriyānilai will be included along with the kuṟippu viṉai.

vār, evaṉ, eṉ, eṉṉai: If they are interrogative nouns they are special to uyartiṇai; If they are interrogative implied verbs they are common to akriṇai and uyartiṇai. Thus yār and evaṉ occur as common to both special and common verbs:

The form may be one which will be common to a noun or a verb.

In, antaṉaṉaik koṉrāṉai aracaṉ koṉṟāṉ. koṉrāṉai is noun. koṉṟāṉ is verb. Therefore the form koṉṟāṉ is common to both the noun and the verb.

One word may be common to a finite verb form and a participial noun form.

ōtuvāṉ   vantāṉ

ōtuvāṉ may be future finite verb and also verbal future participial form may have the same form.

In piṟanta iṟantaṉa, piṟanta "what were born", is the verb form (participial noun)

In, piṟanta cāttan "cattan who was born" piṟanta is a relative participle.

ceyyā may be a negative finite verb. It can also be a negative relative participle e.g. ceyyāc cāttaṉ for ceyyāta cāttaṉ. ceyyā cāttaṉ be also a negative conjunctive participle e g. ceyyā vantāṉ for ceyyātu vantāṉ.

ceyyā with the meaning ceytu will be a positive verb.

In ceyyāvākiya kutiraikaḷ–ceyyā is a non-human negative plural participial noun.

cey is a homonym; cey "to do"; cey "a field"

The verb ceyyum is a common finite verb. The same form may be taken as a relative participle; it may occur in present tense or future tense; it may be the special finite verb of human second person plural.

In the ceyyum form the vowel u and the preceding consonant may be lost. In the "ceyyum" form the final um becomes untu.

In the first three sūtras the author of I. K. says it has laid down general rules and what follows are special rules.

Base of the verb :

Ilakkaṇakkottu proceeds to state that the verb can have for its base (1) noun; (2) verb; (3) iṭai or (4) uri (sū: 68). Others speak of other bases like quality or paṇpu; but all these will come under these four.

The verb further can be brought under any one of the five divisions (1) root (2) verbal noun (3) finite verb; (4) relative participle and (5) verbal participle.

Ilakkaṇak kottu gives the following list.

Root Verbal noun Finite verb Relative parti- Verbal
                                            ciple   participle

noun as the base :

mutal	mutalutal	mutalum	mutaliya	mutali;
īru	irutal	irum	īrra	īrru
orru	orrutal	orrum	orriya	orri
alukkāru	alukkaruttal	alukkaruppān	alukkarra	alukkarru.

Verb as the base :

nata	natattal	natantān	natanta	natantu

itai as the base

pōl	pōlutal	pōnrān	pōnra	pōnru

(other uvama urupus will combine like these)

uri as the base :

civa	civattal	civantatu	civanta	civantu

(all quality noun bases will combine like these)

Verbs without roots :

I. K. next mentions the verbal nouns which are without any root (The idea is the whole word is un-analysable and therefore to be taken as one unit). (sū : 69–70)

pūcal, vēttai, cantai, kūttu, tolil, vinai, ācai, vētkai, avā, cūtu, vātu. taccu, kollu, netti

Piravinai

Piravinai or what Dr. Caldwell terms as transitive verb is of eight kinds (sū : 71).

8 kinds of formation :

(1) Where the root is changed into piravinai

ātu > āttu

(2) A tanvinai can become piravinai without any alteration of the root.

e. g. 1. kōli kūvip polutu pularntatu. kūvi is kūvuvittu;

2. yānai otittuntu eñciya

Note what Pirayōka Vivēkam states about the two examples under kārikai 39 in tiññup patalam; kūvi is the conjunctive participle of the ceytu pattern. So also untu in otittunt eñciya is a conjunctive participle. Tamil scholars interpret this conjunctive participle here as the verbal participle of the ceya

pattern. In both the cases according to them the ceya form has become ceytu form. Cēnāvaraiyar and Naccinārkkiniyar explain these usages under the two sutras in Tolkāppiyam (1) Vinaiyen kilavi (2) ammuk kilavi by stating that ceytu pattern will go along with the predicate which is not only the predicate of its own subject. (i. e. Sanskrit: samāna kartrkam-) but also with the predicate of another subject other than its own – (bhinna kartrka) The Sanskritists however will explain that in kūvi and eñciya the casual suffix vi is to be understood. Therefore kūvuvittu stands as kūvi and eñcuvitta stands as eñcuva. Time is the cause for making the cock crow; the elephant is the cause of reducing the tree. This is what can happen i. e. sambhāvita. Therefore Sanskritists call this antarbhāvita ani, that is, the usage where the causal has to be understood.

In the example, ñayiru pattu vantān cāttan pattu cannot be taken as patuvittu or 'making the sun set' for cāttan cannot be the cause for the sun set. Therefore it would be asambhāvita i.e. what cannot occur. In such cases pattu must be read as patu. The ceya form occurs in the ceytu form.

To continue the formation of piravinai, it has been already mentioned (1) that the tanvinai root changes into piravinai (2) tan vinai root without changing gives the meaning of piravinai piravinai is formed out of tanvinai in the following ways as well. (3) where vi or pi, pi ppi together are attached to tanvinai e.g. natappippi (4) where vi pi is added to piravinai e.g. natattuvippi (5) where vi is added separately with tanvinai e.g. vituvittān (6) vi is added separately to piravinai (7) pi is added separately with tanvinai e.g. unpittān.

In this connection this may be compared with kāritam and kāritak kāritam mentioned in Pirayōka Vivēkam (sū : 35) and Vīracōliyam (sū : 65 and 66).

Ilakkanakkottu points out that there are some ceyvinai amongst those which are found in the form of ceyvi vinai. Ilakkanak kottu uses ceyvi in the meaning of piravinai (sū : 72) e.g. āmāc cērkkum nāta for āmā cērum nāta, tērrā for tērā.

Ilakkanakkottu points out that the verbal noun pōkku is piravinai confusing the verbal noun pōkku with the piravinai root pōkku.

Iiakkaṇakkottu points out (in sū: 73) that taṉ viṉai may be recognised as such a) by the form of the word itself e.g. tīrtal, āṭiṉa or b) by its meaning e. g. viṇṭa tāmarai. Similarly piṟaviṉai may be recognised as piṟaviṉai because of the meaning of the word e. g. viṇṭa paṉai.

They can be recognised as common to both either by their form e. g. naṭattal, uraikal or by their meaning e. g. viṇṭaṉilam

Negation:

Ilakkaṇakkottu takes up negation and contraries. (su: 74). Negation of a finite positive verb e. g. vālvāṉ is expressed in Tamil in three ways as may be seen from the following table. It may be noted that the roots which have been already explained as verbal nouns are not negative since they are common both to positive and negative verbs.

(1) Finite verbs

Positive	Negative with ā	with ilan or allaṉ	contrary word
vālvāṉ	vālāā	vālvāṉallaṉ	keṭuvāṉ
koṭuppāṉ	koṭāṉ	koṭuppāṉallaṉ	vāṅkuvāṉ
pukalvāṉ	pukalvāṉ	pukalvāṉallaṉ	ikalvāṉ

(2) Relative participle:

uṇṭa	uṇṇāta	uṇalaṟṟa	pacitta

(3) Verbal participle:

naṭantu	naṭavātu	naṭaiyiṉṟi	vākaṉamēṟi

(4) Verbal noun

uṇṭal	uṇṇāmai	uṇalaṟal	paṭṭiṉi

Negative words are formed: This is the first time that a negative formation is analysed.

(1) By using negative ā : to a finite verb; e. g. vālāṉ

(2) By using the positive form and adding a negative finite verb derived from the negative base -al

e. g. vālāṉallaṉ

(3) By using the contrary word. e.g. keṭuvāṉ.

Note: Here one must note, as Ilakkaṇakkottu later on points out that there are opposite words or contrary words like the following. (sū : 75)

pō	"go"	vā	"come"
toṭu	"touch"	viṭu	"give up"
vāl	"prosper"	keṭu	"to dwindle"
ulavu	"to plough"	nil	"to stop"
uṟaṅku	"to sleep"	vili	"to wake up"
virumpu	"to love"	veṟu	"to hate"
koṭu	"to give"	vāṅku	"to receive"
cā	"to die"	piḻai	"to escape death"

Finite verbs etc., could be formed on the above roots. In implicit verb also one gets such contraries. e.g. Celvaṉ "rich man" variyaṉ "poor man". In nouns also such contraries exist as follows :

kiḻakku	"east"	mēṟku	"west"
teṟku	"south"	vaṭakku	"north"
uṟavu	"friendship"	pakai	"enmity"
iṉpam	"happiness"	tuṉpam	"misery"
āṇ	"masculine"	peṇ	"feminine"
oḷi	"light"	iruḷ	"darkness"
mey	"truth"	poy	"falsehood"
uṇmai	"existence"	iṉmai	"non-existence"

If taken singly no one word from the point of view of contraries is positive or negative. If taken in pairs one is mutually negative to the other. Therefore Ilakkaṇakkottu states that it is not possible in such cases to say which is positive and which is the negative.

negative phrases:

Ilakkaṇakkottu next proceeds to discuss the negative phrases consisting of at least two words (sū: 76). Such negative phrases may express negation,

(1) by having the first word in negative form.
e. g. uṇṇātu vantāṉ "he came without eating"

(2) by having the second word in the negative form :
e. g. uṇṭu vārāṉ "he will not come after eating".

(3) by having both the words in negative form e. g.

uṇṇātu vārāṉ. "he will not come without eating".

Peculiarities of the negative word :

Ilakkaṇakkottu explains further the peculiarities about the negative word. (sū : 77)

(1) The word which is in the positive form however may have a negative meaning :

aḻukkāṟu (positive form) – poṟāmai (negative meaning)

(2) The word which is negative in form may have a positive meaning.

aḻukkāṟāmai (negative form) – poṟuttal (positive meaning)

(3) The root of a positive form may have a negative meaning.

uṭaṉpaṭal (positive form)–maṟāmai (negative meaning).

(4) The root of the negative verb may have the positive meaning.

maṟuttal (negative root)–uṭaṉpaṭāmai (positive meaning), kollāmai though negative in form is positive in meaning and is described as aṟaviṉai "dharma."

There are sentences in which impossible conditions are mentioned for emphasising really the negative aspect of the impossible condition; and the positive verb which follows the condition are therefore negative.

e. g. uḷḷaṅkaiyil urōmam muḷaittatāyiṉ aṟivilāṉ aṭaṅkum

"If hair grows on the palm then the ignorant will be humble" Here the root of muḷaittatu really means muḷaiyāmai "not growing" and the root of aṭaṅku means aṭaṅkāmai "will not be humble".

Is there a negative word ?

Ilakkaṇakkottu raises the questions how a positive verb can end with a negative verb as pointed in the examples given for negative phrases.

The viṉai or the verb is movement or motion of anything This has been accepted by all. viṉaiyeccam, the verbal participle which requires a verb to complete it, is called so because it gets completed by a verb. It can therefore take only a verb or action word and not take a non–action or negation word. Therefore the phrase uṇṭu naṭantāṉ "having eaten he walked" is acceptable. But uṇṭu naṭavāṉ where the verbal participle, takes a negative word, is unacceptable, because it is ungrammatical. Therefore the root of a negative word is taken up here for instance naṭa which means naṭattal and therefore denotes a movement of a thing. The positive word uṇṭu "having eaten" ends with a verbal root which is a verbal noun. Thereafter the negative verb ceyyāṉ, "he will not do" is brought in for completing the sentence. uṇṭu naṭattalai is thus really uṇṭu naṭattalaic ceyyāṉ. This conclusion is uniformly followed by Parimēlaḻakar and Uraiyāciriyar.

Iiakkaṇakkottu concludes that the root of negative word naṭavāṉ has the positive meaning naṭāttal.

Pirayōka Vivēkam

In this connection the discussion in Pirayōka Vivēkam on the same point may be brought in for identifying the source for Ilakkaṇakkottu's remarks. P. V. takes up the phrases uṇṇātu vantāṉ and uṇṭu vārāṉ where in each phrase one word negatives the other. viṉai or verb has the characteristic feature of movement or motion of a thing. The negative word has no such characteristic feature. "How can the negative verb be called a verb at all ?" (P. V. sū: 39).

maruṅkōṭit-tīviṉai ceyyāṉeṉiṉ is a phrase which occurs in Tirukkuṟaḷ. Here ceyyāṉ is split into (1) the root cey which is a verbal noun i.e. ceyal and (2) the negative word ilaṉ "he is not". tīviṉai takes as predicate viz. the root cey which is a verb or action word. Thereafter ceytal takes the predicate ilaṉ. P. V. points out that this is how Parimēlaḻakar is explaining the phrase.

karṟila kaṇṭu is similarly interpreted by Pērāciriyar karṟal ila. Taken this way the negative verb is similar to the positive verb. Sanskrit works call this āhāryārōpa.

aravinai yātenin kollāmai : "If one asks what is dharmic action (positive act) it is non-killing or kollāmai." Dharmic action is something positive--to be done. How then could it be equated with a negation kollāmai. Consciously withdrawing from doing something prohibited is also a positive action. That is how what appears a negation kollāmai is really a positive dharmic act.

paḷḷiyuḷ īram pularāmai ērarka "do not get into bed without getting the wetness being dried up" pularāmai is a verbal participle and ērarka is a finite verb. The word form alone seems to be negative. But the net result is to say "get into the bed after the wetness is dried up." Therefore there are no two negatives contradicting each other. The non-existence is existence. Alaṅkāra śāstras call this abhāvābhāva.

Passive Verb :

Ilakkaṇakkottu next takes up for discussion the passive verb and enumerates its various characteristic behaviours. (sū : 78)

I. (a) The passive verb occurs as the predicate of the subject. aran aruccikkap paṭṭān.

(b) as the predicate of the object :
āṭai tarappaṭṭatu ;

(c) as the predicate of a verbal noun :
oḻukkam ceyyappaṭum.

(2) (a) The passive verb can occur as the subject.
cūtennum mukaṭiyāl mūṭappaṭṭār.

(b) as object itself :
ikaḻap paṭuvāraik kāṇinum

(c) and as verbal noun
innātu irakkappaṭutal.

3. The root, the verbal noun, the finite verb, the relative participle the subject and the object, instrument etc. without having the passive auxiliary paṭu can signify in some places the meaning of paṭu. They can occur with the auxiliary paṭu also.

Kinds of roots	Where paṭu does not appear	Where paṭu appears the meaning is the same as the corresponding word in the previous column.
Root:	ceykunru	ceyyappaṭṭa kunru
Verbal noun:	āntavan enral ararkē takum	
Finite verb; relative participle.	maram veṭṭirru aram poruta pon	veṭṭap paṭṭatu porappaṭṭa pon
verbal participle.	eḻutivanta vōlai	eḻutappaṭṭu vantavōlai
subject:	ilvāḻvānenpān	enru collap-paṭuvān
object:	ūruṇi	ūrāl uṇṇappaṭṭatākiya nīr
instrument:	eḻuttāṇi eḻutirru	eḻuttāṇiyāl eḻutappaṭṭatu

In some cases paṭu occurs where the meaning of paṭu is not there.

	word	Its meaning has no paṭu
(1) Finite :	uṭkappaṭār	= uṭkār
(2) verbal noun :	ērkappaṭutal	= ērral
(3) Relative participle :	uṇṇappaṭṭa cāttan	= uṇṭa cāttan
	karpikkappaṭum ācān	= karpikkum ācān
	karpikkappaṭā ācān	= karpiya ācān
	karkappaṭumāṇākkan	= karkum māṇākkan
	karkappaṭā māṇākkan	= karkā māṇākkan
(4) verbal participle	uṇṇappaṭṭu vanta cāttan	= uṇṭu vanta cāttan

(as Dr. Caldwell points out uṇṇappaṭṭa means "one who is accustomed to eat well").

(5) This paṭu occurs after noun, verbal participle but with a different meaning, namely "to become" or "to be desirable" or "to be proper".

(1) Noun   cōrvupaṭum
    Verbal participle   ceṉrupaṭum

(2) Noun :   iṉmaipaṭum
    Verbal participle   oḷukappaṭum

(Later on in sūtra 85 he discusses vēṇṭum, takum, paṭum like vēru, illai being words common to all genders, numbers and persons.)

(6) The word in which paṭu occurs is also common to word with paṭu and to the word without paṭu

    utaviceyyap paṭṭār means

    (1) "those who had been helped" where paṭu has its full force;

    (2) and "those who had received the help" where paṭu denotes other meaning.

    (7) paṭu will never occur in certain constructions for instance maram veṭṭiṉāṉ or corrai uṇṭāṉ. But through the implied meaning, it comes in as maram veṭṭappaṭṭatu, cōru uṇṇappaṭṭatu

    (8) paṭu comes in even when one tries to avoid it, as in the following construction:

        nāykkōṭapaṭṭāṉ

        puli kavvappaṭṭāṉ

    (9) paṭu has other characteristic features.

        (a) paṭu in certain places can be deleted when no ambiguity arises.

    In emmāl vīlappaṭṭa tirunutal one can without ambiguity delete paṭu and it may occur as yām vīlum tirunutal. When however there is ambiguity it cannot be deleted. In kēḷviyyāl tōṭkappaṭātaccevi, paṭu cannot be deleted to become kēḷvi tōḷāta cevi. So also mukaṭiyāl mūṭappaṭṭār cannot be contracted to:

        mukaṭi mūṭiṉār

Pirayōka Vivēkam also refers to this deletion of paṭu (sū: 37).

    (1) in an explicit participial noun which occurs as an object, e. g. tām vīlvár meṉtōḷ (Vīlappaṭṭār)

    (2) in a root: e. g. ceykuṉru (ceyappaṭṭa kuṉru)

    (3) in a relative participle: e. g. aram poruta poṉ (arattāl porappaṭṭa poṉ)

    (4) in a verbal participle: e. g. eḷuti (eḷutappaṭṭu)

    In all these cases the form of the word is without paṭu i. e. is not passive but active i. e. nayakku, but when interpreted it means a passive verb i. e. as agent yakku. Pirayōka Vivēkam adds however that on some rare occasions kēḷviyāl tōṭkappaṭāta cevi, and mukaṭiyāl mūṭappaṭṭār can be contracted into kēḷvi tōḷāta cevi and mukaṭi mūṭiṉār.

paṭutokai :

    Having discussed the deletion of "paṭu", Ilakkaṇakkottu points out that some will call the form resulting from the elision of paṭu as paṭu compound (sū : 79)

    (Note in the commentary, the word viṉaiyiṉ tokai appears. The correct reading must be paṭutokai or viṉaiyiṉ paṭutokai). He has stated that the verbs can be divided into five kinds (1) root (2) verbal noun (3) finite verb (4) relative participle and (5) verbal relative participle. Ilakkaṇakkottu gives examples under paṭu tokai for each of these :

root :   cey kuṉru (ceyyappaṭu kuṉru)
verbal noun :   collutalāl col - (collappaṭutalāi col)
Finite verb :   pāl karakkap paṭṭatu
Relative
participle :   uṇta cōru - (uṇṇappaṭṭa cōru)
Verbal
        participle : vaṇikam arintu vanta poṉ (vaṇikaṉāl ariyap-
                                        paṭṭu vanta poṉ)

    Tamil grammarians speak only of six compounds namely (1) viṉai; (2) paṇpu; (3) uvamai; (4) ummai; (5) vērrumai; and (6) aṉmoḷi. Therefore paṭu compound should be the

seventh. But Ilakkaṇakkottu adds that this is not as important as the other six.

Categories of actions :

Ilakkaṇakkottu discusses a classification of action or viṇai in two sūtras. It points out that this is according to Sanskrit usage and not Tamil usage. (sū: 80 - 81)

It divides people into two classes and therefore the verb of their action into two major categories (1) action of the people of great wisdom-pērarivōr viṇai and (2) the action of the people of a little knowledge ciṟṟarivōr viṇai. Each one of these is divided into four kinds. (the people of great wisdom who will be hereafter called class I, whilst people of a little knowledge will be called class II).

1. That which is useful to one's self alone
   Re. class I.

   (a) avāvai viṭṭān   "He left off desires"
       vīṭṭai aṭaintān   "He reached salvation"
   (b) Re: class II : uṇṭān   "He ate"
                      uṟaṅkiṇān   "He slept"

2. That which is of use only to others :
   Re. Class I.

   nūlaip paṇintān   "He composed the work"
   uraiyai eḻutiṇān "He wrote the commentary"
   Re. Class II
   pāṅkaṇ tūtu naṭantān
   "Hero's companion went as an envoy"

3. That which is useful to both-one's self and others :
   Re. Class I

   irakkattoṭu pali irakkat toṭuttān
   "With mercy he began begging"
   civaṇatu pūcaiyai mikac ciṟappittān
   "he made the Sivapūja unique"
   Re. Class II

   talaivi talaivaṇukkuc cōraṭṭāḷ
   "Lady love cooked food for her lover"

4. That which is useful neither to one's self nor to others.
   Rs.   Class I
   aṭṭamā cittiyai arumaiyāttēṭiṇān
   "he with rare effort achieved eight great Siddhis".
   Re.   Class II
   kaiyai vīciṇān   "He moved his hand"
   kaṇṇai imaittān   "He winked his eyes"

Ilakkaṇakkottu adds that even if you inform the people who are learned in worldly books about the action of the men of great wisdom they could not be understood. Similarly, the people of great wisdom cannot understand the action of the people with a little knowledge. Those alone who ar well versed in both will understand both these. For instance, worldly books condemn begging. The book of wisdom praises it as the greatest act. In this way all the actions are explained in a contradictory way. Therefore it is difficult to say for those who are not learned in both kinds of works to what subdivision a particular act belongs.

(It is not clear, of what relevance this discussion is in any grammatical theory.)

Ilakkaṇakkottu next divides these action in various ways as follows: (sū : 81)

Action involving movement of (1) mind, (2) word; (3) body and (4) knowledge and (5) action involving no movement

Examples :
1. mind :   niṇaittān   "He thought"
2. word :   uraittān   "He said"
3. body :   naṭantān   ·   "He walked"
4. knowledge :   aṟintān   "He learnt"

(The Tamilians call all these four as movement of a thing).

5. Action involving no movement. These are called

paravaśam in Sanskrit.

e.g. aṟivirantāṅku aṟintilīr

"You have not gone beyond knowledge and they do not," know
There are various schools of thought about the existence of five kinds of actions.

Some hold that there is no such thing as action without and that therefore omitting the fifth there are only the other four. Others hold that even amongst these four, there is no such thing as movement of knowledge and therefore there are only three kinds. There is the third school which denies that there is any definite number like these three and that action or vinai is only movement of many things in our world and that therefore there is only one vinai. There is the fourth school which states that there is no such thing as vinai, that like heat in the fire, it is the characteristic feature of any thing. To discuss these in detail will consume more space.

Ilakkaṇakkottu proceeds to divide vinai into three kinds:

1. nalvinai : "Good actions."
2. tīvinai : "Bad actions"
3. veṟu vinai : "Action which is neither good nor bad."

veṟu vinai :

e.g. kaiyai noṭittān "He snapped his finger"

mūccu viṭṭān "He breathed"

uṟuppaḷukkai uruṭṭi utirttān

"He rolled the dirt of the body and broke them into bits."

Such of the examples given for acētanam–cey vinai i.e. the action done by inanimate things, will fit in here.

It may be stated that all actions would come under the two, good and bad, and that, therefore, there is no usage from authoritative books for including veṟuvinai as a third kind of vinai. The answer is (1) Paṭṭaṇattup Piḷḷaiyār divides verbs into three kinds (2) Parimēlaḷakar divides action into two : (1) payaṉ vinai "useful action" and (2) veṟu vinai "useless one mere action" and he further sub divides payaṉ vinai into many kinds whilst under veṟu vinai he includes those which come under "fate" in the Kuṟaḷ vakuttāṉ vakaiyallāl kōṭi tokuttār-kkum tuyttal aritu. If we do not have these three kinds of vinai, there is no scope for giving examples of veṟu vinai as given above.

Amongst these three vinais, nalvinai are a few, tīvinai are also a few, but veṟuvinai are many. See Parimēlaḷakar.

Paṭṭinattār speaks of nalvinai as naṉṟu and tīvinai as tītu in the singular, whilst he speaks of the third kind in the plural.

Ilakkaṇakkottu makes another distinction : (1) aṟintu cey vinai 'action done with knowledge'; (2) aṟiyātu cey vinai 'action done unconsciously' and (3) acētanam cey vinai–'action done by inanimate things', for which the examples are :

viḷakkuk kāṭṭiṟṟu "The light showed"
iruṭṭu maraittatu "The darkness hides"
viṭam koṉṟatu "Poison kills"
kaḷḷu mayakkiṟṟu "Toddy intoxicates" etc.

Ilakkaṇakkottu next points out that nalvinai and tīvinai may become topsy-turvy. eṇṇāyiravarai-k-kaḷuvēṟṟiṉār. 'He (Campantar) impaled eight thousand people.'

kaṭavuḷai nāḷtoṟum kallāl erintaṉar.

"He (Saint Cākkiya) hit God every day with a stone"

(Here tīvinai had become nal vinai in both instances according to saivites)

anaṅkaṉ alarai araṇitat tiṭṭāṉ.
"Manmatha aimed flowers at Siva"

pāmpukkup pāl vārttāṉ

"He fed the serpent with milk" – Here nālvinai has become tīvinai.

Ilakkaṇakkottu points out that the two kinds of vinai which are not done become vinai that is done.

The non-action becomes an action actually done, as already explained with reference to aṟavinai yātenin kollāmai.

"Consciously restraining from doing any prohibited thing is itself doing a good thing".

Similarly consciously restraining from doing the prescribed acts is tīvinai as for example :

periyāraik kāṇin irukkai eḷāmai

"Not getting up when seeing great men".

Ilakkaṇakkottu similarly points out that nalvinai and tīvinai actually performed, amount to ceyyāvinai "action not performed".

Vēdās and Āgamās proclaim that people who have attained real knowledge, whatever act they may do, nalviṉai or tīviṉai it is as good as not doing them.

Ilakkaṇakkottu concludes that viṉais are still further of many kinds (1) In certain acts the agent is consciously involved as in

e. g. naṭakkiṉrāṉ, paṭikkiṉrāṉ "He walks, He reads"

(2) In others he is not so involved.

uṇkiṉrāṉ, uraṅkukiṉrāṉ;

"He eats", "He sleeps"

(3) In certain actions like viḷakkuk kāṭṭirru, kaṇ kaṇtatu meaning respectively "Light shows" and "eye sees", both light and eye are indispensable and one cannot act without the other.

(4) In certain cases as in the following three fourth of the act turns to be useful.

e.g. cōrrai mukkāṟ kūṟu uṇtaṟku muṉṉē ōr nimittattāl
   uṇavoḷintāṉ

"He ate three fourths of the food but before he could eat the remaining fourth, because of a circumstance he left off eating."

(5) In some other instances the whole of the three fourth of action becomes absolutely useless.

neṟpayir mukkāṟ kūṟu muṟaiyē vaḷarntu kārkūṟu viḷaivataṟku muṉpē maḷaiyiṉri viḷaivu oḷintatu.

"Paddy crop gradually grew up to a three fourth extent and that before the rest one fourth could grow, because of the failure of rains, growth stopped".

Ilakkaṇakkottu points out that this sūtra also explains only Sanskrit usage. But it is not clear in what way this is relevant in a grammatical discussion.

Verbs:

Ilakkaṇakkottu proceeds to discuss certain characteristic features of verbs as propounded by various schools of thought. (sū : 82).

Verbal nouns:

He first points out that verbal noun means the following:

1. **Agent:**

   paravai parantatu "The bird (paravai) flew"

2. **Object:**

   uṭukkai kiḷintatu
   "What is worn (uṭukkai) is torn"

3. **Instrument:**

   viḷakkuk kāṭṭirru
   "that which lights (viḷakku) shows"

4. **Location:**

   kiṭakkai uyarntatu
   "the place which lay (kiṭakkai) has been raised"

5. **Relative participle:**

   poruḷ ceyal vakai means poruḷ ceyyum vakai

Note that P. V. also notes this. He points out janmabhūmi, and janma nakṣatram in Sanskrit are similar to this usage (P. V. 38)

6. **Finite verb:**

   āytam keṭutal (āviyiṉāṉa)
   keṭutal means "keṭuka"

Finite verbs becoming participles:

Next he points out that the explicit and implicit finite verbs become relative participles and conjunctive participle respectively (sū : 82)

e. g. uṇṭāṉ cāttaṉ ūrkkup pōṉāṉ

Here uṇṭāṉ cāttaṉ means uṇṭa cāttaṉ i. e. finite explicit verb becomes relative participle.

For the other three, namely 1) explicit finite verbal participle becoming verbal participle 2) the implicit finite verb becoming the relative participle and (3) becoming the verbal participle, Ilakkaṇakkottu refers us to the examples given in Naṉṉūl under the sūtram, "viṉai muṟṟē viṉai eccamākalum."

Participles become finite verbs :

Ilakkaṇakkottu refers to the other view that relative participle and verbal participle become finite verbs. In the example : veṟutta ñāni vīṭṭai aṭaintāṉ. veṟutta ñāni means veṟuttāṉ ñāṉi where the relative participle has become finite verb. In, cāttaṉ uḷutu vantāṉ. the verbal participle uḷutu has the force of uḷutāṉ. Therefore the verbal participle has become finite verb.

(Note that some of the examples remind us of the approach of transformation grammar).

Participial noun :

Ilakkaṇakkottu next states certain behaviours of participial nouns (sū : 83)

I.   It means the following five :

(1)   It occurs as subject.

e.g. tārtaṅkic celvatu tāṉai

    ulakattār uṇṭeṉpatu illeṉpāṉ

(2)   It means the object
utuppatu-meaning uṭukkap paṭuvatu.

(3)   It means the instrument :

velvatu aṟaṉ-velvatu means velluṅ karuvi what conquers is Dharma i.e., "the means used for conquest."

(4)   It means location :

viḷaivatu nāṭu

viḷaivatu means viḷaiyum iṭam. "the place where it grows".

(5)   It means the verbal noun.
uṟaṅkuvatu means uṟaṅkutal.

Note : that in all these cases the participial noun without taking the case sign denotes various kārakas mentioned above.

II.   The participial noun takes the eight case signs denoting their respective meanings. Examples are given for each case :

I case :	māṉati cērntār vālvār;
II case :	oruttārai oṉṟāka vaiyārē;
III case :	koṇṭāṉāl vālntāḷ kulamakaḷ;
IV case :	oruttārku orunālai iṉpam;
V case :	īṉṟāḷin nīṅkiṉāḷ ivaṉimittam;
VI case :	koṇṭāṉatu māṭu;
VII case :	koṇṭāṅkaṇ iruntāḷ kulamakaḷ;
VIII case :	irappāṉ ! iccoṟṟai ēl.

III.   He notes certain alterations in the participial nouns.

(1)   The change of penultimate letter :
e. g.   tiṉpāi > tiṉpavar

where the penultimate pā > pava; similarly in other words.

(2)   Alternant forms of certain participial nouns have the same form as that of relative participle and occur with the meaning of the relative participle. e. g. naṭantana has the alternant form naṭanta. The latter is also the form of the relative participle naṭanta. Therefore in naṭanta kutiraikaḷ the finite participial nouns have become the relative participles naṭanta.

uṅpāṉ is a participial noun.

uṇpāṉ is also the form of the future verbal participle. Therefore uṇpāṉ vantāṉ can be taken as a case where the finite participial noun uṇpāṉ has become the verbal participle uṇpāṉ.

(3)   The final suffixes get changed into i;
ēntiṉāṉ > ēnti   (see māṉēnti "one who bears the deer" etc.)

(4)   Those which have thus altered their ending to i occur as agent, object, instrument, location and verbal participle and also in many other ways.   The examples are as follows :

(a)   viṉai mutal or agent.

maṇṇuṇṇi (maṇ uṇṭavaṉ i.e. (Viṣṇu); veṇṇai uṇṭāṉ.

(b)   Object.
ūruṇi (ūrāl uṇṇappaṭuvatu)

(c)   Instrument :

ittakaṭu pēyōṭṭi (pēyōṭṭuvatu or pēyōṭṭum karuvi)
iccakaṭu tērōṭṭi (tērai ōṭṭuvatu or tērōṭṭuṅ karuvi)

(d) Location :

ippānai nāli ponki

(ponki=ponku tarku itam)

(e) Participial noun with its ending changed into i, comes with the meaning of a verbal participle.

ampalattāṭi vantān

(āṭi means "One who dances")

The conjunctive participle meaning "having danced" also has the same form āṭi. Therefore in ampalattāṭi vantān the participial noun has become verbal participle meaning the "dancer came" which is equal to "he came dancing"

The participial noun deleting the case sign and also the auxiliary paṭu occurs as agent and object.

(1) Agent : ilvālvān enpān (enappaṭuvān)–This is in the nominative case and paṭu has been deleted.

(2) Object : uṇpatu nāli

uṇpatu means uṇṇappaṭuvatu which is the object and the paṭu has been deleted.

Pirayōka Vivēkam

Pirayōka Vivēkam in kārikai 37 gives the same facts and the same examples. In the akriṇai the participial nouns or kṛdantas come as (1) kartā "subject".

e.g. tārtānkic celvatu tānai

(2) karmam "object'

e. g. uṭuppatūum uṇpatūum inrik keṭum

(3) bhāvam: "verbal noun"

e. g. urankuvatu pōlum cākkāṭu

(4) karaṇam: "instrument"

e. g. vēlanru venri taruvatu. taruvatu as tarum karuvi

(5) adhikaraṇam or location:

e. g. viḷaivatu nāṭu. viḷaivatu as viḷaiyum iṭam

In uyartiṇai participial noun occurs as:

(1) karta: illenpān

(2) karmam or object: ilvālvān enpān (enappaṭuvān)

(P. V. points out that Tolkāppiyar refers to these)

(6) There are participial nouns ending in i.

In akriṇai the example is ūruṇi

In uyartiṇai the examples are mānēnti etc.

Sanskrit examples are: vēṣadhāri; jaṭadhāri, sōmayāji

Here compounds also occur as ending in–i e. g. cērntāraik kolli

These are upapada samāsas-where two words come together to form a compound without losing or deleting any particle or case sign.

e. g. pankajam, pankajātam, vanaruham are Sanskrit kṛdantās based on upapada samāsa.

The participal noun gets "sū" ending and loses it i. e. it occurs in the nominative case.

Participial nouns take the case signs

e. g. oruttārai onrāka vaiyārē etc.

The penultimate letter of participial noun undergoes change:

Penultimate = upadhā = irraval

nayavātān   nayavatavan

(Note: It will be thus seen that for all the statements made by Ilakkaṇakkottu the source is P. V. Many examples are given which are omitted here)·

Views on non-finite verbs:

Ilakkaṇakkottu proceeds to discuss various views about the non-finite verbs namely the relative participle and the verbal participle (sū: 84).

(1) One view is that there is no such thing as non-finite verb. They come with the word which forms its immediate constituent the constitute consisting of an attribute and head. Therefore they may be taken as adjuncts or attributes. They serve no other purpose.

e. g. aṭṭa cōru: aṭṭa is the attribute and cōru is the head.

In, uranki viḷittān, viḷittān is head word and uranki is attribute or adjunct.

(2) The second view is that the non-finite verb is not something distinct but only the altered form (or can we say transformation) of finite verb or mu<u>rr</u>u.

(3) The third view is that since the non-fin<u>i</u>te verbs are incomplete, there is only one non-finite verb on the basis of incompleteness.

(4) The fourth view is that since the word following to become its immediate constituent (i. e. noun in the case of non-finite verbal participle, and verb in the case of non-finite verbal participle) they must be distinguished as two categories on the basis of the different characteristic features of the coming word, as noun or verb.

(5) The fifth view suggests that the relative participle or verbal participle is divided further into ta<u>n</u>vi<u>n</u>ai and pi<u>r</u>avi<u>n</u>ai i.e. there should be four classes :

(a) ta<u>n</u>vi<u>n</u>ai relative participle :

(b) pi<u>r</u>avi<u>n</u>ai relative participle ;

(c) ta<u>n</u>vi<u>n</u>ai verbal participle and

(d) pi<u>r</u>avi<u>n</u>ai verbal participle

(6) The sixth view is that since the non-finite verbs denote the three tenses the non-finite verbs should be classified as three.

(7) The seventh view states that since the subject of the non-finite verb, may be (a) the superior as in araca<u>n</u> ceyta tē̄r "Chariot built by the king" and vē̄nta<u>n</u> u<u>l</u>utu paya<u>n</u> ko<u>ṇṭ</u>ā<u>n</u> "King cultivated and got the yield" or (b) the non-superior or his inferior as in tacca<u>n</u> ceyta tē̄r "The chariot built by the carpenter" (relative participle) and va<u>r</u>iyā<u>n</u> u<u>l</u>utu paya<u>n</u> ko<u>ṇṭ</u>ā<u>n</u> "The poor cultivated and got the yield" (verbal participle) there can be only two categories of finite verbs, the superior and the non-superior.

(8) The eighth view is that the non-finite verb denotes either (1) "cause" or kā̄ra<u>ṇ</u> as in ma<u>l</u>ai peyta nī̄r "the water that was poured by the rain" (relative participle) u<u>l</u>utu vi<u>l</u>ainta nel "paddy which grew after cultivation" (verbal participle) peyta means peytalā̄l "That was poured" means "because of the pouring".

(2) the effect – camainta arici "cooked rice" where camainta implies a cause (relative participle camainta means camaintata<u>n</u> payanā̄ka "Rice food resulting from cooking".)

pi<u>n</u>itī̄rak ku<u>t</u>ittā<u>n</u> maruntu (tira means tirvata<u>r</u>kā̄ka). "he drank the medicine so as to be relieved of the disease"; so the non-finite verb should be divided into two categories (1) that which denotes cause and (2) that which denotes the effect.

(9) The ninth view states that the non-finite verbs are either the verbs of the whole (mutal) or the verbs of the part or organ (ci<u>n</u>ai) and that therefore they have to be divided into two categories as (1) the action of the whole and (2) the action of the organ or that part.

(10) The tenth view is that the non-finite verbs first as relative participles appear either (1) in the natural unaltered form (iyalpu) as in maruvi<u>n</u>a nā̄<u>l</u> (relative participle) or (2) in the changed or altered form (tiripu) e. g. marīẏa nā̄<u>l</u>. Similarly verbal participles appear either in the natural form e. g. ta<u>l</u>uvik ko<u>ṇṭ</u>ā<u>n</u> and in the altered form ta<u>l</u>īik ko<u>ṇṭ</u>ā<u>n</u>. Thus there can only be two categories (1) non-finite verbs of the natural form and (2) the non-finite verbs of the altered form.

(11) The eleventh view is that the non-finite verbs appear in (1) their contracted or bound form i. e. in their root form

e. g. relative participle: e. g. poru takar
verbal participle: e. g. varip pu<u>n</u>aipantu

or

(2) in their expanded form

(a) relative participle: e. g. poruta takar

(b) verbal participle: e. g. varintu pu<u>n</u>ai pantu

and therefore they should be divided into two categories
(1) compound non-finite verb (tokai) and (2) expanded non-finite verb (viri).

(12) The twelfth view is that since non-finite verbal participles have various canonical forms like ceẏtu, ceypu etc. it is not proper to club them all together and give them one name. The form is important; for, if we without caring for their intrinsic form take the succeeding predicate of the verb as the

only basis for clubbing them all together as viṉaiyeccam, on the same basis we must call all the eight case signs, particles of similarity and other words which take a verb to complete them, as viṉaiyeccam. Nobody does so. Therefore viṉaiyeccam should be taken to be as many as there are formal patterns. The same argument applies to peyareccam or relative participle.

(13) The thirteenth view is that viṉaiyeccam or non-finite verbal participle is of two categories (1) all those which are referred to in terms of their suffix as ceytu, ceypu etc. or (2) those which are referred to by their final words such as vāṉ, pāṉ, pākku, piṉ, muṉ, kāl, kaṭai, vaḻi, iṭattu.

Ilakkaṇakkottu is not satisfied with this enumeration adds that many more are suggested.

For example (1) the non-finite verbal participle ceyaṟku is taken by some as viṉaiyeccam and by others as a verbal noun taking the dative case sign ku.

2. nīr poy kūṟiyapiṉ mey kūṟuvār yār.

kūṟiyapiṉ is taken as one word meaning kūṟiṉāl "if you utter" and that is labelled viṉaiyeccam. Whilst others take kūṟiyapiṉ as two words kūṟiya and piṉ where kūṟiya is labelled as peyareccam.

The commentary gives the warning that amongst these views one should not accept one and reject any other. It holds the eclective view that all the views should be accepted.

Common verbs :

Ilakkaṇakkottu next refers to verbs which are common to all genders, numbers and persons (sū : 85). These are ten in number (1) vēṟu (2) illai, (3) uṇṭu (4) yār (5) vēṇṭum (6) takum (7) paṭum (8) any verbal participle (9) any relative participle (10) any viyaṅkōl–implied imperative.

yār :

yār occurred once upon a time only in human third person. In Tolkāppiyam–age it was common to the three sub divisions of the human category. But we have occurrence of this yār in the first person e. g. nāṉ ār; in the second person as in ikkāryam ceytaṟku nī yār; in the third person non-human

singular as in vaṇṭu yār maṉ and in plural ñāṉaṅkḷ ār. Therefore it has to be taken to be common to all persons genders and numbers.

vēṇṭum, takum and paṭum :

vēṇṭum, takum, paṭum, appear to be of the ceyyum pattern, both in its finite and non-finite form with the finite pattern. But these occur (1) in human plural e. g. ōotal vēṇṭum oḷimāḻkuñ ceyviṉai yāatum eṉṉumavar (2) in I person e.g. yāṉ pōkal vēṇṭum (3) in II person e. g. nī uraittal vēṇṭum. Therefore these cannot be of the ceyyum pattern; which does not occur in these other three instances. These three (1) convey the same meaning; (2) they are verbal nouns; (3) they denote certainity. The meaning of certainty is that (1) the doing of the particular act is proper (2) appropriate (3) clear, (4) decisive (5) good and (6) desirable and that its non-performance will be bad, mean and a crime. He gives illustrations.

uṇṭu has been elaborately explained in Naṉṉūl. uṇṭu going beyond old rules and usages occurs as (1) first person finite verb (2) as non-finite verb (3) as the base uḷ (4) as a word which can be analysed into roots and suffix (5) as a verbal noun meaning uṇmai and (6) as an unanalysable word.

Pirayōka Vivēkam

Pirayōka Vivēkam in kārikai 41 speaks of kṛtyam "that which has to be done". The Sanskritists consider lōṭ as having the meaning of command like kṛtyam. In kartavyam "what is to be done", vaktavyam "what is to be said" we get the suffix tavyam "what is to be done". He gives the following examples for kṛtya.

ōotal vēṇṭum oḷimāḻkuñ ceyviṉai – yāatu meṉṉu mavar
nirantaram niṉaippatāka nīniṉaikka vēṇṭumē
nīyeṉkuṟai collavēṇṭumārvala
yāṉ porutal vēṇṭum
veyyōrkaṉēka nāḷ vēṇṭumē
iṉaitteṉa varinta ciṉaimutaṟ kiḷavikku – viṉaippaṭu
ummai vēṇṭum

vēṇṭum :

(1) iṇaitteṉa variṇta ciṉaimutar kiḻavikku-
vinaippaṭu tokutiyiṉ ummai vēṉṭum;

(2) inneṉa varūum vērrumai yurupir
innen cāriyai iṉmai vēṉṭum;

(3) nalam vēṇṭiṉ nāṉuṭaimai vēṇṭum

(4) iruviṉaikkut takka uṭal (here relative participle takum
occurs as takka)

paṭum : oḷiyō ṭoḷukap paṭum
karrarintōrait talainilattu vaikkap paṭum
kīḻkaḷaic ceytoḷilār kāṇappaṭum
vañcarai añcap paṭum
koḷḷapaṭātu marappa tarivaleṉ kūrrukkaḷē
(here the negative voice of paṭum occurs).

These literary usages are interpreted variously by Naccinārk-
kiniyar, Cēṉāvaraiyar, and Parimēlaḷakar.

Uraiyāciyar and others without grasping the full force of
the word, feel however the ungrammaticality in taking them as
finite or non-finite verbs and therefore they variously interpret
them as having the meaning of implied command, or of a rule
or of propriety."

kiḻavikku-viṉaippaṭu tokutiyiṉ ummai vēṇṭum

inneṉa varūum vērrumai urupir kinneṉ cāriyai iṉmai
vēṇṭum. These are not finite verbs of the pattern ceyyum.
vēṇṭum is a suffix comparable to Sanskrit suffix tavyam; vēṇṭum
has the meaning of "laying down a rule." In nalam vēṇṭiṉ
nāṉuṭaimai vēṇṭum, Parimēlaḷakar says that vēṇṭum implies
a 'rule.'

Next P.V. gives examples of takum and paṭum where they
occur with human plural which the verb ceyyum should not
take takum.

ivarāl ikkāriyam ceyyat takum.

paṭum :

eytiya celvattarāyiṉum kīḻkaḷaic ceytoḷilār kāṇap paṭum
kaṭainilattōrāyiṉum karruṇarntōrait talai nilattu vaikkappaṭum.

P. V. points out therefore that paṭum, and takum are not
of the pattern of ceyyum but anavyaya kṛt having the meaning
of a vidhi or rule.

Pērāciriyar interprets vañcaraiyañcappaṭum as añcattakum.
Parimēlaḷakar interprets it as añcavēṇṭum. Therefore P. V.
concludes that vēṇṭum, paṭum and takum are synonymous and
that they are anavyaya kṛts common to all persons numbers
and genders (P. V. sū : 41), but not indeclinable.

(It will be thus seen that Ilakkaṇakkottu actually follows
Pirayōka Vivēkam which however does not criticise Parimēlaḷa-
kar and others as Ilakkaṇakkottu does)

Essentials :

Ilakkaṇakkottu concludes by saying that there is no limit
to the grammatical peculiarities of verbs (sū : 86). But he
adds that we should include everything under the five mentioned
by him namely (1) the root, (2) the verbal noun (3) the finite
verb (4) relative participle and (5) the conjunctive participle.

Verbs in a majority of cases occur in the three forms
(1) finite verb (2) relative participle and (3) verbal participle.

It gives certain examples where without the grasp of this
essential knowledge, words are interpreted in various ways.

Variations in formation of words :

Next he points out that Naccinārkkiniyar and Naṉṉūl take
ā and pō as natural forms of the root. Tiruvaḷḷuvar and
Parimēlaḷakar however take āku and pōku as their natural root
forms. The roots kal, vil, nil on the one hand and ol, kol, cel,
col, pul, vel on the other hand are of the same pattern (i. e.
(c) VC.) Yet when they take implied imperative suffix -ka
they behave variously. The first group endings are karka, virka
and nirka, while the second group ends as olka, kolka, celka,
colka etc. This is not the only variation. If these roots take up
the ceya forms, the viyaṅkōḷ form karka itself occurs as the
ceya form, whereas in the other groups it is different. There
the forms are olla etc. when occurring in the ceya form. These
roots occur as nouns.

kallai uruṭṭiṉāṉ;   kal "stone"

villai valaittā<u>n</u>   vil "bow"

kol = "the black smith." cel "the white ant";

                                  col   "the word".

Further when they become verbal nouns they assume various forms. The first group comes as ka<u>rr</u>al, ka<u>r</u>kutal, ka<u>r</u>pu, kalvi, etc., whilst the second group comes as kō<u>r</u>al, kollutal, kollal and kolai etc.

Further when they assume pi<u>r</u>avi<u>n</u>ai or transitive forms one group ends in the following way: ka<u>r</u>pi, ni<u>r</u>pi, ni<u>r</u>uttu, ni<u>r</u>uvi, ni<u>r</u>u, nilaippi, etc., whilst the other group ends with celvi, celuttu etc.

The question is raised whether ni<u>r</u>u is not a primary root; Ilakka<u>n</u>akkottu points out that the root nil meaning "to stand" becomes ni<u>r</u>u when it assumes the pi<u>r</u>avi<u>n</u>ai or transitive form. In this way the grammatical peculiarities of the roots are said to be very many.

ākupeyar:

Ilakka<u>n</u>akkottu then points out how ākupeyar the extended meaning goes on continually extending.

e. g. e<u>l</u>uttu, first it is a verbal noun meaning e<u>l</u>ututal; leaving that meaning it comes to denote anything written or drawn, as a concrete common noun of the non-human variety; leaving of that meaning also, it comes to denote not the forms like pictures but the forms of written letters like those of a and <u>n</u>a as a special (not common) noun; leaving that meaning also it comes to denote not the written form but the special sound. Here it is an ākupeyar. It does not stop there. It leaves that meaning also and comes to denote a grammar dealing with sound i.e. phonology. It is here ākupeyar of the second degree-iruma<u>t</u>i ākupeyar. Leaving that meaning also, it comes to denote the grammatical work on phonology. This is mumma<u>t</u>i ākupeyar or ākupeyar of the third degree. kū<u>rirr</u>u e<u>l</u>uttu is karma kartā; i<u>ññan</u>am a<u>r</u>ivittatu e<u>l</u>uttu is karma kartā referring to the statements therein. Here it is ākupeyar of the fourth degree or nā<u>n</u>ma<u>t</u>i ākupeyar. Thus if one elaborates the grammatical peculiarities of verbal noun, it is limitless.

Similarly finite verbs and non-finite verbs if elaborated will become endless. A few of their aspects are given in Tolkāppiyam and other grammars and in Tiruva<u>l</u>luvar and other books of literature.

C. PIRAYŌKA VIVĒKAM

Roots and the imperative:

In Pirayōka Vivēkam verb is treated in Ti<u>nn</u>up pa<u>t</u>alam as in Vīracō<u>l</u>iyam. dhātu is discussed first. dhātus are not imperative singulars but their form is equal to that of the latter. Root e. g. na<u>t</u>a etc. having the meaning of their respective verbal nouns, na<u>t</u>attal etc. are common to all tenses, persons, genders and numbers, since, these roots, by combining with the tense signs and suffixes, as for instance na<u>t</u>antē<u>n</u> etc. will occur in all tenses, persons, numbers and genders. If they are second person imperative singular they cannot occur elsewhere. It had already been noted that as the imperative singular it would be pronounced with an accent and as the dhātu without an accent.

PIRAYŌKA VIVĒKAM

Sakarmaka and akarmaka dhātus:

Like Vīracō<u>l</u>iyam, Pirayōka Vivēkam divides the dhātus into two kinds (1) Sakarmaka dhātu: transitive-cey<u>a</u>ppa<u>t</u>u poru<u>l</u> ku<u>nr</u>ā vi<u>n</u>ai e. g. ma<u>t</u>i, cī, vi<u>t</u>u and (2) akarmaka dhātu: intransitive ceyappa<u>t</u>u poru<u>l</u> ku<u>nr</u>iya vi<u>n</u>ai e. g na<u>t</u>a, vā. etc. (sū : 35)

For ku<u>nr</u>utal or being deficient it has been already pointed out by Cē<u>n</u>āvaraiyar under the sūtram "va<u>l</u>aṅkiyal maruṅki<u>n</u> ku<u>nr</u>uva ku<u>nr</u>um" as explained there.

    kēvala and kārita

    dhātus or <u>n</u>ijantas.

sakarmaka dhātu and akarmaka dhātu form one category namely kēvala dhātu i.e. dhātu standing alone without <u>n</u>ic. When the suffixes vi and pi called causal by Dr. Caldwell are added to kēvala dhātu, as already noted previously one gets the kārita dhātu. Pirayōka Vivēkam calls this <u>n</u>ic antam or <u>n</u>ic ending. In <u>n</u>ijantam there is the action of the commanding

agent and the action of the executing agent found at the same time. The sculptor constructs a temple–he is the executing agent (iyarruvān)-kaṭṭutal is his action. But the king commands him to construct the temple; king is the commander (ēvuvān). kaṭṭuvittal is his action. In the example aracan taccanāl kōyilaik kaṭṭuvittān.

"king had the temple built by the sculptor" we have in kaṭṭuvittal (1) kaṭṭutal which is the verb of the iyarruvān, namely taccan, and also (2) kaṭṭuvittal which is the verb or action of the commander, the king.

sahaja ṇijantam :

The ṇic can occur without vi or pi.–Then it is called sahaja (natural) ṇijantam.

Intransitive	Transitive
tōnri	tōrri
uṇ	ūṭṭu
tin	tīrru

(In the following the plosive doubles to become ṇijantam.

āṭu	āṭṭu
kūṭu	kūṭṭu
tēru	tērru

svārtha kāritas :

Where the form is that of the kārita but where the meaning is not kāritam, the kārita suffix has no meaning except that of the non-kārita root. These are called kārita coming in the meaning of svārtha. These are merely kēvala dhātus.

In arrin oḷukki, oḷukki means oḷuki
In kēḷirp pirippar
    pirippar means only pirivar
In tōrri has the meaning of tōnri.
In tērrā oḷukkam, tērrā means tērā.

kārita as kēvala :

There are other instances where the word appears to have the form only of kēvala dhātu but which are to be interpretted as ṇic, denoting the meaning the action of the commanding agent.

teḷitta col means teḷivitta col
In aracan eṭutta ālayam, eṭutta means eṭuppitta.
In antaṇan vayalai uḷutān, uḷutān means uḷuvittān.

In kāṭukonru nāṭakkik kuḷam toṭṭu" the words konru, ākki, tōṭṭu mean respectively kolvittu, ākkuvittu and toṭuvittu.

According to sūtram "uppakāram" in Tolkāppiyam tapu is both transitive and intransitive. It is an example to be given here.

Roots :

Pirayōka Vivēkam next discusses the form of root occurring as the form of the imperative singular, verbal participle, relative participle, verbal noun etc. which we discussed when explaining Ilakkaṇakkottu.

tiṅ and taṅ :

He next (sū : 36) discusses parasmai padam as that word which has received la which is the technical term for any verbal suffix showing tense in parasmai pada finite verb. This is called tiṅanta. It will come only as a predicate of kartā, agent or subject. The ātmanē pada which is called taṅ or la ādēśa which will come with the subject or agent and also with the karmam or object combined with the passive verb called yak and also in bhāva karma. In pōtuppaṭum, manru paṭum etc. the paṭu which comes after a noun is called yak whereas paṭu coming after a verb as in iyarrap paṭutal is called nayak.

Pirayōka Vivēkam thinks it has done a great service in having introduced the words tiṅ and taṅ in that when they combine with the words beginning with vowels, ṅ which now occurs only with a (ṅi, ṅī etc. have no use in Tamil. But now he says he has found use for the whole series) can hereafter occur with all other vowels. He also points out that ārpanēpadam for atmanēpadam is a form introduced by him. arpanēpadam is that which shows the effect of the action of the agent. The other is parasmaipadam.

parasmai pada and ātmanē pada :

In Tamil phraseology parasmai pada is anya karmaṇi kriyā palattaip payappatu. ātmanē pada is kartu karmaṇi

agent and the action of the executing agent found at the same time. The sculptor constructs a temple-he is the executing agent (iyarruvān)-kaṭṭutal is his action. But the king commands him to construct the temple; king is the commander (ēvuvān). kaṭṭuvittal is his action. In the example aracan taccanāl kōyilaik kaṭṭuvittān.

"king had the temple built by the sculptor" we have in kaṭṭuvittal (1) kaṭṭutal which is the verb of the iyarruvān, namely taccan, and also (2) kaṭṭuvittal which is the verb or action of the commander, the king.

sahaja ṇijantam:

The ṇic can occur without vi or pi.–Then it is called sahaja (natural) ṇijantam.

Intransitive	Transitive
tōnri	tōrri
uṇ	ūṭṭu
tin	tīrru

(In the following the plosive doubles to become ṇijantam.

āṭu	āṭṭu
kūṭu	kūṭṭu
tēru	tērru

svārtha kāritas:

Where the form is that of the kārita but where the meaning is not kāritam, the kārita suffix has no meaning except that of the non-kārita root. These are called kārita coming in the meaning of svārtha. These are merely kēvala dhātus.

In arrin oḷukki, oḷukki means oḷuki
In kēḷirp pirippar
    pirippar means only pirivar
In tōrri has the meaning of tōnri.
In tērrā oḷukkam, tērrā means tērā.

kārita as kēvala:

There are other instances where the word appears to have the form only of kēvala dhātu but which are to be interpretted as ṇic, denoting the meaning the action of the commanding agent.

teḷitta col means teḷivitta col
In aracan eṭutta ālayam, eṭutta means eṭuppitta.
In antaṇan vayalai uḷutān, uḷutān means uḷuvittān.

In kāṭukonru nāṭakkik kuḷam toṭṭu" the words konru, ākki, tōṭṭu mean respectively kolvittu, ākkuvittu and toṭuvittu.

According to sūtram "uppakāram" in Tolkāppiyam tapu is both transitive and intransitive. It is an example to be given here.

Roots:

Pirayōka Vivēkam next discusses the form of root occurring as the form of the imperative singular, verbal participle, relative participle, verbal noun etc. which we discussed when explaining Ilakkaṇakkottu.

tiṅ and taṅ:

He next (sū : 36) discusses parasmai padam as that word which has received la which is the technical term for any verbal suffix showing tense in parasmai pada finite verb. This is called tiṅanta. It will come only as a predicate of kartā, agent or subject. The ātmanē pada which is called taṅ or la ādēśa which will come with the subject or agent and also with the karmam or object combined with the passive verb called yak and also in bhāva karma. In potuppaṭum, manru paṭum etc. the paṭu which comes after a noun is called yak whereas paṭu coming after a verb as in iyarrap paṭutal is called nayak.

Pirayōka Vivēkam thinks it has done a great service in having introduced the words tiṅ and taṅ in that when they combine with the words beginning with vowels, ṅ which now occurs only with a (ṅi, ṅī etc. have no use in Tamil. But now he says he has found use for the whole series) can hereafter occur with all other vowels. He also points out that ārpanēpadam for atmanēpadam is a form introduced by him. arpanēpadam is that which shows the effect of the action of the agent. The other is parasmaipadam.

parasmai pada and ātmanē pada:

In Tamil phraseology parasmai pada is anya karmaṇi kriyā palattaip payappatu. ātmanē pada is kartu karmaṇi

kriyā palattaip payappatu. But really these words are not strictly used in this sense. They are names for differentiating the verbs by their endings. parasmai pada is that which has a short vowel as its ending or its penultimate. ātmanēpadam is what has a long vowel at its end or as its penultimate.

In passive voice every word is an ātmanēpada. A root[t] may come only in ātmanēpada or come only in Parasmaipada. Such roots are called ēkapada's. Other roots which come as both ātmanēpada and parasmaipada are called ubhayapadi's.

camaikkinṟaṉaṉ.

(Note, the penultimate ending which is short a, therefore this is a parasmai pada which literally must mean "he cooks for others" though it has no such different meaning)

In camaikkiṉṟāṉ – the penultimate ending is long ā; it is an ātmanēpada which must mean "he cooks for himself,'.

As pointed out, this distinction in meaning is not usually followed. The distinction is merely based on the final ending or penultimate ending.

> yāriṉum kātalam (am)
> immaippirappir piriyalem (em)
> añcutum vēpākkaṟintu (tum)

Here there is only differentiation in suffixes but no differentiation in meaning. So also:

> cūṭiṉir; eṉ maṟantir; tummiṉir;

These are honorific second person plurals. They are not the inclusive plurals of second person. It includes second and third persons. Such inclusive second persons are called ēkaśēṣam. (already explained)

One has to take the distinction in relation to the form of suffixes and not the difference in relation to meaning when one speaks of ātmanēpada and parasmaipada. Tolkāppiyar first describes suffixes for masculine etc. as nakkāṉ oṟṟē. Then later when the suffixes are to be definitely stated he gives the form aṉ, āṉ, aḷ, āḷ, etc. for their respective genders. Tolkāppiyar gives two suffixes for masculine, two suffixes for feminine etc. even as Sanskritists give two forms, one for ātmanēpada and one for parasmaipada.

Examples for ubhayapada or roots which take (1) ātmanēpada suffixes i. e suffixes having the long vowel as its final or penultimate ending and also (2) the parasmaipada suffix i. e. suffixes having the short vowel as its final or penultimate ending.

	parasmaipada	ātmanēpada
Positive :	camaikkiṉ raṉaṉ	camaikkiṉṟāṉ
	camaippaṉ	camaippāṉ
Negative :	camaikkiṉrilaṉ	camaiyāṉ

ēkapadi roots coming with ātmanēpada alone :

> e. g. uṇmār, uṇṭaṉai, uṇṭāy

(Note : It is doubtful whether ai at the end is long.)

ēkapadi coming in parasmaipada alone :

e. g. uṇku, uṇṭu, varutu, cēru, uṇkum, uṇṭum, varutum, cērum, uṇpal, uṇpa, varuti, vammiṉ, vantatu, pōyiṟṟu etc. (The author need not have wasted his precious pages for pointing out the correspondence between ātmanēpada and parasmaipada which are not basic in Tamil).

kartari-p-prayōgam :

kartari prayōgam or the usage where the finite verb comes with a predicate, can be formed with the help of the above verbs with suitable subjects added on, as for example avaṉ camaikkiṉṟaṉaṉ.

If the verb is transitive then it is sakarmaka kartari prayōga e. g. cāttaṉ āṭaiyaittarum.

If the verb is intransitive or akarmaka then we have akarmaka kartari prayōka e. g. cāttaṉ varum.

karmaṇi prayōga.

karmaṇi prayōga is that usage where the active transitive verb takes the form of the passive verb and where the agent is the third case sign.

> e. g. cāttaṉāl āṭai tarappaṭum.

(Here cāttaṉ the word for the agent takes the third case sign āl. The root tā, a transitive verb has taken the passive finite form tarappaṭum.

bhāva prayōgas

bhāva prayōga is that usage where the intransitive verb takes the form of a passive voice verb and where the agent takes the third case sign.

e. g. cāttanāl varappaṭum. (This cannot occur in Tamil)

Even these two kinds namely karmaṇi pirayōga and bhāva prayōga are kartari prayōgas since there also the subject takes the predicate.

Literary examples.

(1) karmaṇi prayōgam.
akam tūymai vāymaiyār kāṇappaṭum
iṉattāl ikaḻap paṭuvar.

(2) bhāva prayōgam :
oḷiyōṭu oḷukappaṭum.

ōṭu does not occur here in social case; but in the instrumental as in ūciyoṭu kuyiṉṟa tūcu. In oḷukap paṭum the root oḷuku which has the tiṉ bhāvam becomes the verbal noun or krit bhāvam and means oḷukutal. That verbal noun is the subject when ceyya is introduced in between aḷukutal and paṭum; thus it means oḷiyāl oḷukutal ceyyap paṭum. paṭum then is intransitive passive singular finite verb. This is how Parimēlaḻakar explains it. The root is separately taken out to become a verbal noun and to serve as subject. See Parimēlaḻakar writing on vañcarai añcappaṭum. See Pēraciriyar commenting on "koḷḷap-paṭāṭu marappaṭu arivileṉ kūṟṟukkaḷe" in Tirukkōvaiyār. These have been referred to elsewhere under I. K. where reference was made to P. V. discussing the behaviour of root or root forms.

tēvatattaṉ uṇṭavaṉ – here the subject takes a kṛt or a verbal participial noun for completing the sentence. Completing the sentence is called viśrānti. This is also karttarip pirayōkam.

In tēvatattaṉ kacciṉaṉ the predicate is a taddhitaṉ, nominal participial noun.

In tēvatattaṉ yāvaṉ the predicate is yāvaṉ an interrogative word or praśnapada.

In tēvatattaṉ avaṉ, the predicate is avaṉ, the cuṭṭup peyar or demonstrative noun or tatśabda. All these are kartari prayōga.

Verbal participial nouns : (sū : 37)

Next Pirayōka Vivēkam turns to describe the nine characteristic features of kṛd-anta or verbal participial noun which we had already discussed while explaining Ilakkaṇakkoṭṭu.

Non-finite verbs :

Pirayōka Vivēkam in the next kārikā (38) takes up for consideration the non-finite verbs. He explains Tāmil terms in terms of Sanskrit grammatical terminology. Finite verbs are sārvadhātukaḷ Those which have not viśrānti i. e. verbs which are non-finite are ārdha dhātukaḷ. These are (1) relative participle or peyareccam and (2) verbal participle or viṉaiyeccam. He gives the Sanskrit translations for some of the Tamil technical terms.

VINAIYECCAM

In Sanskrit, forms like kṛtvā (ceytu,) kartum – (ceyya) are not named as in Tamil by giving the full pattern ceytu, ceyya, but are named after the ending only, namely tvā, tumun. Tolkāppiyar also names certain viṉaiyeccams after their endings. See Tolkāppiyar speaking of viṉaiyeccams ending in piṉ, muṉ, etc. Herein below are given the Tamil names, Sanskrit names and the examples.

1. ceytu   ..   tvā – conjunctive participle.
   (Tamil)   (Sanskrit)

e. g. uṇṭu vantāṉ – where uṇṭu comes with the finite verb vantāṉ; uṇṭu varutal – where it comes with verbal noun.

viḷuṅkiyaṟṟu – where viḷuṅki comes with the implied verb aṟṟu.

kaṟṟu vallavaṉ – where (kaṟṟu) comes with the taddhitaṉ, The other examples are as follows :

Tamil	Sanskrit	Remarks
2. ceya	tumun	Infinitive of purpose
e. g. pāṭa vantāṉ etc.		

3. ceyyā   khamuñ   conjunctive participle
 Tamil e. g. uṇṇā vantā<u>n</u>

4. ceyyū   ṇamul i. e. am (duplicated often in
              Sanskrit conjunctive
                participle.)
 e. g. gāyam gāyam "having sung continuously".
 Tamil e. g. uṇṇū vantā<u>n</u>

5. ceypu   lēyap i. e. lēyap; where the suffix
          ya is conjunctive participle

 e. g. pratipālya "after waiting for"
 Tamil e. g. uṇṭu vantā<u>n</u>

6. e<u>n</u>aven eccam   iti
 Tamil e. g. peyye<u>n</u>ap peyyum maḷai.

7. The conditional verbal paticipals of the pattern ceyi<u>n</u> or ceytāl are called yadi cēt.

8. ceyyiya   nvul

NOTE: Dr. K. N. Eluttaccan informs me as follows :
tumun etc., which are used for our viṇaiyeccams.

(1) tumun ṇvulau kriyāyām kriyarthāyām (Pāṇ. 3.3.10)
(tumun and ṇvul suffixes are used with verbs which are subservient to other verbs Ex : tumun :- kriṣṇam draṣṭum yāti (He goes to see Krishṇā)

nuul :- Kriṣṇam darsako yati (Meaning is the same).
(NB : In tumun tum remains In ṇvul, all except v get elided v > aka (darśaka).

(2) Samāna kartṛkēṣu tumun (Pāṇ 3.3.158)
(tumun is used where the subjects are the same icchati bhōktum (he desires to eat).

(3) Samāna kartṛkayōḥ pūrvakālē (Pāṇ. 3.4.21)
(ktvā: (= tvā) is added to the root showing previous action, when both the actions pertain to the same person.)
Ex : bhuktvā vrajati (He goes after eating).

(4) Samāsē anaṅpūrvē ktvō lyap (Pāṇ 7.2.37.)

(in compounds other than nañ samāsas, ktvā changes into lyap).
ktvā – tvā e. g., āgatya (having come)
lyap = ya   adhītya (having studied).
In nañ compound no change, e. g. akṛtvā-
              'without doing'.

(5) ābhīkṣṇyē ṇamul ca (Pan. 3.4.22)
(In frequentatives ṇamul is used also as ktvā),

e.. g. Smāram smāram namati śivam
(or Smṛtvā smṛtvā namati Śivam).

(He adores Śiva, having remembered and having remembered, i. e. remembering him).
ṇamul = the suffix is am

e. g. Śrāvam (having heard)
bhōjam (having eaten)
pāyam (having drunk).
ṇamul is used in other places also :

e. g. kanyādarśam varayati (he wants to marry every lady he sees). Kēśagrāham yudhayantē
(They fight catching hold of each others hair).

(6) Karmaṇyākrōśē kṛñah khamuñ (Pāṇ. 3.4.25)
(karmaṇi + ākrōśē)

(The root kṛñ (to do) will have the suffix khamuñ when it is used along with the object).

e. g. cauram kāram ākrōśati (He cries aloud saying 'Thief, Thief');

caura = cōra (thief, karōti is here in the sense of crying aloud).

peyar eccam in the present tense

(1) śatṛpratyaya

Turning to relative participles he distinguishes between relative participles of the present tense which take their kartā as the head word,

e. g. ka<u>r</u>ki<u>r</u>a mā<u>n</u>ākka<u>n</u>
  ka<u>r</u>ki<u>nr</u>a mā<u>n</u>ākka<u>n</u>
  kallāni<u>nr</u>a mā<u>n</u>ākka<u>n</u>.

This kind of present tense relative participle taking their agent as head is called śatṛpratyaya.

(2) śānac and kānac

The relative participle of the present tense of the ceyyum pattern taking its subject or object as its head word is called śānac, e. g. karkappaṭumnūl, karkappaṭumāciriyan. When there is difference in pitch accent, it is called kānac.

Past tense :

In the Tamil of Nannūl age when ceykinṟa form had come into use, ceyyum denoted the future. The distinction which he makes does not hold good. We do not have different suffixes as in Sanskrit.

tapratyaya

The relative participles which denote past tense are called tapratyaya in Sanskrit. The examples in Sanskrit are :

brahmadatta vara	'boon given by Brahma'
mukta kēśa	"one whose hairs had been removed"
datta kāñcanam	"gold which was given"
dagdha paṭam	"cloth which was burnt"
niṣkrānta bhūmi	one who has crossed the land
śuddha jalam	water which was purified

Interchange of relative participle and finite verb :

In some places the relative participle appears in the form of a finite verb, though with the meaning of a relative participle,

e. g.   tērān piranil pukal
      where tērān piranil means tērāta piranil –
      tērāta is relative participle.

He points out that in Sanskrit, kurvan dēvadattaḥ means kurvat dēvadattaḥ.

In the negative relative participle also the finite verb and the relative participle interchange:
      uyiroṭum pōkoṭātatirumakaḷ
where the relative participle means also pōkoṭāḷ (finite verb).

The relative participle sometimes appears in the form of a verbal noun:

porul ceyal vakai – which must be porul ceyyum vakai
vinai ceyal vakai means vinai ceyyum vakai

tōnral means tōnrum in tōnralārē
uyirttal means uyirkkum in uyirttalārē

He gives Sanskrit examples jenma bhūmi, jenma nakṣatram; yaṣtum yāti "he goes for performing yāga" which stands as yāgāya yāti – "He goes to the yāga". kurvan dēvadattaḥ means "dēvatatta who does".

pacyamāna ōdanam has taken the object ōdanam as head word. sat-brāhmaṇah means "good brahmin" -nalla pirāmaṇan. nalla is peyareccak kurippu.

He gives a kind of Tamil Sanskrit dictionary.

cey	=	kṛ
ceytu	=	kṛtvā
ceyya	=	kartum
ceyal	=	karmam or kriyā
ceytavan	=	kartā
ceykirēn	=	karōmi
ceyvēn	=	kariṣyē
ceyyāy, cey	=	kuru
ceyvittal	=	kāritam

Characteristics of the ceytu pattern :

Pirayōka Vivēkam mentions seven characteristic features of conjunctive participle of the pattern ceytu. (sū : 36)

tuṇai vinai: (1) It occurs as the first part of the compound root. (Compound roots consist of two roots like culal taru, etc.) But in some cases the first member of this compound root is in the pattern of ceytu, the conjunctive participle. Ordinarily, when a conjunctive participle and another verb come together, it means that the action of the conjunctive participle occurs first and then the action of the verb, etc. In vantu pōnān "coming" occurs first, then follows "going". Against this general rule, a new development has taken place very early in the history of Tamil language where the action of the verb in the so-called form of conjunctive participle and the action of the following verb occur together as in the following case:

kan mūṭic cirittān, here the closing of the eyes and laughter occur together. Similarly in the following cases:

varitu nīntic cellum nīḷiṭai
koṭiyāṭit tōṉrum, viraintu pōyiṉāṉ
nakupu vantāṉ, kutirai ērikkoṇṭē ceṉrāṉ
ōṭi vantāṉ

(The ceytu coming as the first part of the compound root is called here tuṇai viṉai. Perhaps iṇai viṉai might have been better. In modern times the term tuṇai viṉai is used for auxiliary verb.)

Negatives

(2) The conjunctive participle and the predicate which complete it may negative each other, i. e. if there is a conjunctive participle and the predicate (a) the first may be negative and the second positive, e. g. uṇṇātu vantāṉ; (b) the first may be positive and the second negative. (This has been explained while discussing such phrases under Ilakkaṇakottu.

aṭukku

(3) The conjunctive participle of the pattern ceytu may be piled up. (a) This piling up and (b) the participle and its immediate constituent negativing each other apply also to peyar eccam or relative participle.

Example for negating each other and for piling up of relative participle :

iṭippārai illāta ēmarā maṉṉaṉ
puraitīra maṉṉā iḷamai
mūvā mutalā ulakam

Negative relative participles have been piled up and in each instance, the negatives take the positive head word.

It is also pointed out that not only non-finite verbs but also finite verbs and nouns pile up.

(i) Conjunctive participles consisting of the same words are repeated,

e. g. kaḷintatu vantu vantē; arintarintum pākaṉaiyē kollum. Conjunctive participles consisting of different words may also be piled up.

kaṇṭu kēṭṭu uṇṭu uyirttu urrariyum.

The following are the examples for the finite verb being repeated:

ceṉratu ceṉratu vāḻnāl

For nouns being repeated examples are :

paṭai paṭai; tītti

The Sanskrit examples are: dinēdinē; rakṣa rakṣa; śiva śiva; rāma rāma; punah punah.;

The repetition is like that of human twins. This is called aṭukkut toṭar as against iraṭṭaik kiḷavi, which will be explained below and which are like doublets of flowers or fruits where each one does not remain isolated but is attached to each other.

iraṭṭaikkiḷavi

The examples for iraṭṭaikkiḷavi :
tuṭituṭittut tuḷḷi varum
kalakala kūuntuṇai
cōlai kalakalakkum
calacala matam
kuru kuru kai
vayiru moṭumoṭuttatu
cirram ciru kālē, cekkac civanta

The Sanskrit example is: dēdīpyamāṉa, where y of the first is lost, i. e. yaṅ luk. (see I. K. also.) (In dēdīpyamāṉa, yathe yaṅ is there; it is not lost i. e. yaṅlak. For, if luk, it must be dēīdpītior dēdīpti.)

ceytu followed by verbs of three tenses :

(4) The conjunctive participle of the "ceytu" pattern comes with verbs of three tenses.

nērru uṇṭu vantāṉ—"He took his food yesterday and came;"
iktō uṇṭu varukirāṉ—"There he is coming having taken his food".
nāḷai uṇṭu varuvāṉ—"Tomorrow he will come after taking his food".

One may omit the words nērru, iktō and nāḷai which have been introduced to explain the meaning without any doubt whatsoever. Thus, it is concluded that uṇṭu can occur in three tenses.

It is pointed out that Tolkāppiya sūtram "ceyten eccatt iranta kālam eytitan utaitte vārāk kālam" refers to this fact.

(The most important point is that the past tense of ceytu is not absolute but only relative to the tense of the predicate. In all cases-above mentioned the "eating" precedes "coming". This has to be noted).

Inversion

(5) The conjunctive participles sometimes get inverted e. g. vērttu vekuḷār. (In all the instances given, it may be taken as occurring as a compound verb, so that inversion may not be necessary.)

According to the author there is inversion. vekuḷtal is "getting angry". vērttal is sweating. The author feels that anger occurs first, and perspiration, the result, occurs next. (But according to James – Lange's theory, emotion is not different from the symptoms exhibited. Therefore, anger and sweating are simultaneous.)

He takes toluteḷuvār as an inversion of eḷutu toḷuvār. eḷutal is "to wake up", toḷutal is "to worship", because, as he feels; one cannot offer physical worship before waking up from sleep. But Parimēlaḷakar and Pērāciriyar think of mental worship which goes on continuously. Therefore, they take "toḷutu eḷu" as a compound verb where mental worship and waking up go together. The author points out that even in Sanskrit there are such instances. He gives the translations,

e. g. vāy piḷanturaṅkinān;

    kurattai vittu uraṅkinān and

    kotuttu irantanan.

He criticizes Parimēlaḷakar and Pērāciriyar, and quotes from the work Nāṉmaṉik katikai, where "waking up" – tuyileḷutal – is mentioned first and toḷuteḷal next. (See I. K.)

samāna kartā as against bhinna kartā

(6) Conjunctive participles of the patterns ceytu, ceyyā, ceyyū, and ceypu take samāna kartā, i.e. the predicate of their own subject,

e. g. uṇtu vantān,

while other participles ceya (tumuṅ), ceyiṉ, ceytāl, etc. (which are called avyaya kṛt) may take samāna kartā or bhinna kartā, i.e predicate of their own subject or the predicate of any other subject,

e. g. cāttaṉ uṇṇa vantāṉ

      cāttaṉ uṇṇak korraṉ cōru kotuttāṉ

      kōḷi kūvip pōtu pularntatu

      urarkāl yāṉai otittu uṇteñciya yā.

The latter two examples were discussed explained and under Ilakkaṇakkottu which may be referred to here.

ceytu in the form of a finite verb

(7) The conjunctive participle ceytu changes its form to that of finite verb, but that finite verb has to be interpreted as a conjunctive participle:

    mōyiṉaḷ uyirtta kālai

(mōyiṉaḷ which is in the finite form has to be interpreted as the conjunctive participle mōntu.)

    pātiṉāṉ kaṉint ilaippōḷil kuraṅkiṉamīṉra nuṇtaḷir.

(Here pātiṉāṉ has to be interpreted as the verbal participle pāta of the ceya pattern. Similarly in other examples.)

If the finite verb above is not interpreted as participles one will not get the unity of the sentence (ēkavākyatva).

Verbal participles in the form of finite verbs

In the verse of Tiruvāymoḷi, karunāy kavarnta kāliṉar etc. the implied finite verbs kāliṉar, pāṉaiyarāy should be interpreted as participles, i. e. as kāliṉarāy, pāṉaiyarāy. The word āy is added after kāliṉar, etc. This āy is called san in Sanskrit. It is only in that case all these participles will end with one subject. All these participles become the attributes, i. e. kriyā-viśēṣaṇa modifying the predicate. In the verse arivāṉai antaṇartam cintaiyāṉai each one of the participial nouns is the attribute of the object which takes the case sign ai (See I. K.).

Piling up varieties

In arivāṉai antaṇartam cintai yāṉai the object phrases (ending in ai) refer to the same person. Therefore, they are

connected with each other. In kūṟṟuvaṉai maṉṉavaṉai arakkar kōṉai different persons are intended by each one of the words taking the case sign ai Therefore, they are not connected with each other though they are connected with the predicate. The first is like akal vicumpuḷār kōmāṉ intiraṉ - where two phrases refer to the same person and where these different phrases take one predicate. These are called the attribute of the subject – kartṛ viśēṣaṇa where the peyareccam comes in between. This is also kartṛ viśēṣaṇa. Akattiyar and the author of Naṉṉūl contemplate (1) such piling up of nouns taking up a predicate and also (2) piling up of verbs taking one noun. See "eṉaittu muṟṟaṭukkiṉum" in Akattiyam and "urupupala aṭukkiṉum viṉai vēṟaṭukkiṉum orutam eccam īruṟa muṭiyum" in Naṉṉul.

Relative participle as noun

In peṇṇēval ceytoḷukum āṉmai, oḷukum means oḷukuvāṉ, i.e. the relative participle is interpreted as a noun. In tērāṉ piṟaṉil pukal the finite verb tērāṉ has the meaning of relative participle tērāta. These are called artha vikāra. In Sanskrit they do not say that one form changes into another, but state that one form has acquired the meaning of another form. In khalu pītvā, pītvā means "having drunk"; it comes in the sense of "drinking". They say tvā comes in the meaning of tumun.

CHAPTER VIII

MISCELLANEOUS

(Piṟayōka Vivēkam)

Pirayōka Vivēkam comments on a number of miscellaneous topics at the end.

Pirayōka Vivēkam tries to establish that the grammatical structure of Sanskrit is applicable to Tamil also. There are certain special features of Sanskrit such as vikaraṇi, lakārās, liṅ, lōṭ, etc. (Sū: 41). The author attempts to show that there are vikaraṇis, etc. in Tamil also. vikaraṇis are augments which are added to Sanskrit roots according to the conjugation to which the root belongs. There is no such conjugational difference in Tamil, and, therefore, there are really no vikaraṇis (augments). But optionally, sometimes, some sounds or syllables are added to the roots like "ku", for instance.

Example peṟuvaṉ = peṟukuvāṉ

In other cases he splits the medial suffix into two parts and shows the first part as vikaraṇi. In uṇṇā niṉṟāṉ the medial tense sign is āniṉṟu. Following Vīracōḷiyam and going against Naṉṉūl, niṉṟu alone is taken as the case sign whilst ā is taken as vikaraṇi. Therefore, according to Pirayōka Vivēkam, vikaraṇi is that which occurs in between the root and the tense sign. He speaks of ten kinds of vikaraṇis of which four are vowels, viz. a, ā, u and ī; and three are syllabic letters, viz. ta, tai, and ku. Thus he is in a position to show only seven. He states that the rest three can be found out wherever they occur. The examples are given below :

Vikaraṇi	Examples
a	uṇṇappaṭum
ā	uṇṇā niṉṟāṉ
u	colluka

ī	viṉaikalantu veṉṟīka
ta	tēmalaraṅkaṭ tiruvē pukuṭaka
tai	iṉpattiṉ pakkam iriṉṭaikka
ku	aṟaikuvaṉ collē; kūṭippeṟukuvam

He points out that the vikaraṇi may occur; (1) without suffering ellipsis, i. e., aluk, e. g. aṟaikuvaṉ, peṟukuvam-where this (ku) does not suffer any ellipsis, and (2) as suffering an ellipsis,

e. g. aṟaivaṉ, peṟuvam.

(He shows aṉādi which must be an-ad-ādi in Sanskrit for aluk and ādi which must be ad-ādi for luk. The group of roots ad etc. suffer an ellipsis of the vikaraṇi, i. e. the group which is not that does not suffer an ellipsis.)

Next, certain vikaraṇis do not suffer any ellipsis.

ā	uṇṇāniṉṟīṉ
u	uṇṇuvōm

Thirdly, there are verbs where vikaraṇi always suffers an ellipsis as the Sanskrit asti·

Tamil example is uṇṭāṉ.

In Sanskrit the suffix shows not only person and number but also the tense. But in Tamil the structure is different. The tense sign showing the tense is the medial suffix and person gender and number are shown by the final suffix, Vīracōḷiyam, as already pointed out splits the finite verb into two parts, viz. (1) the root, and (2) the rest which consists of the tense sign and the suffix. For emphazising the similarity between Sanskrit and Tamil the method of combining the tense and final sffix as one un-analysable unit is followed.

Pirayōka Vivēkam is conscious of the existence of tense signs apart from the final suffixes. But for establishing the similarity of structure, he takes the tense sign and the final suffix as one unit and calls it in an explanatory way, "iṭainilai tōy iṟuti", i. e· the final suffix commingled with medial suffix. In Sanskrit the final suffixes showing the tense, are of ten varieties. They are called ten lakāras. Pirayōka Vivēkam calls the amalgam of tense sign and suffix (e. g. tāṉ in vantāṉ) as lakāram.

In peṟukuvam, peṟu is the root; ku is the vikaraṇi; vam is lakāram showing tense.

In uṇṇākiṭantāṉ, uṇṇāviruntāṉ-uṇ is the root; ā is the vikaraṇi; kiṭantāṉ and iruntāṉ are lakāras.

In pukutaka, puku is the root; t is vikaraṇi; ka is lakāram.

In collu and aruḷu; u is the vikaraṇi; Like the Sanskrit roots paca, etc. there are second person imperative verbs which have a vikaraṇi and whose lakāras have suffered an ellipsis.

The viyaṅkōḷ or honorific command is of two varieties in Sanskrit; those which end in vowel and consonant are called liṅ, and lōṭ.

In Tamil the example for liṅ and lōṭ will be vāḻka- "Long live" and kiḻattal- "Let it be said".

The Viyaṅkōḷ occurs in the following meanings:

(1) blessing or vāḻttal, e. g. vaḻiyar, vāḻiya, vāḻi, vāḻka;

(2) curse or śapa; e. g. "parantu keṭuka ulakiyaṟṟiyāṉ-"Let the creator be destroyed";

(3) prayer or prārthanā or vēṇṭikkōṭal, e. g.
tiruvē pukutaka
"please do come";

(4) Command prēraṇai or ēval,
(The above example under (3) can mean a command as well).

(5) laying down a rule,
iyaṟkaip poruḷai iṟṟeṉak kiḻattal.

bhāvapadas

Verbs are tiṅanta, verbal roots occurring as verbal nouns without suffixes,

e. g. kēṭu, uṟai; and as roots of verbal nouns with suffixes.

e. g.	paṟavai	– 'that which flies'	– karta
	uṭukkai	– 'that which is worn'	– object
	tuṭaippam	– 'that with which something is brushed' –	
			karaṇa
	kiṭakkai	– 'that on which one may lie down'–	
			adhikaraṇa-

These verbal nouns with suffixes are tiṅbhāvapadas.

bhāvapadas like compounds, taddhitas and kārakas are subantas, i. e. nouns.

The author of Naṉṉūl also speaks of "viṉaiyiṉ peyarē".

The above-mentioned verbal noun in the form of roots alone, though not having the formal suffix, have the meaning of a verbal noun with a suffix.

avyaya or indeclinables or particles

iṭaiccol, eccam (non-finite verbs), and words yār, uṇṭu, illai, vēṟu are avyayas. The words yār, etc. are viṉaik kuṟippu (implied verbs). They imply an action-gamyamānakriyā. All these six are common to all persons, genders and numbers. Therefore, they are called avyaya. yār is praśnapada or interrogative word. It occurs in human masculine singular, human feminine singular and human plural. But now it occurs also in non-human: yār vaṇṭu- "what is this bee?". It occurs also in first and second persons: nāṉār-"who am I", and nīyār "who are you?". Therefore, it is called avyaya.

Amarasimha gives under avyaya vargas only what are called in Tamil iṭaiccol and uriccol. uriccol also is, therefore, included under iṭaiccol. (This is the position of Caṅkaranama-ccivāyar, the disciple of the author Iśāna Dēśika of Ilakkaṇak kottu.)

avyayas can be (1) implicit – sūcaka avyaya,

e. g. iṭarppaṭṭatu or (2) explicit – vācaka avyaya,

e. g. cerāay vāḷiya neñcu,

P. V. gives the following synonyms:

kim	=	yār
asti	=	uṇṭu
nāsti	=	illai
pṛdak	=	vēṟu

Sanskrit and Tamil :

In kārikās 43 and 44 P. V. points out further similarities between Sanskrit and Tamil.

1. Tenses

kālatraya or three tenses – they are: (1) bhūtakāla-irappu in Tamil; i. e. past tense; (2) vartamāna kāla-nikāḻvu in Tamil; i. e. present tense; (3) bhaviṣyat kāla-etirvu in Tamil, i. e. future tense.

There are four different theories about tenses

1. Such usages as "mountain stands", "the river flows" and "fire burns" show that there is only one tense – the present tense. There is nothing but the present tense.

2. When an action is happening, one moment passes away and the other follows it, and, therefore, there is room for two tenses only, namely the past and the future.

3. All these tenses are nothing but the qualities and the actions of a thing; and thus there is no such thing as tense at all. Nothing can be shown as tense.

4. There are the present tense, the past and future, and thus there are three tenses.

Akattiyar says that, according to the Vēdic path, the worldly usage understands firmly the three tenses. Thus, according to him, tenses are laid down by the Vēdas.

There are others who point out the following examples to assert that there are three tenses.

muṉ piṟantāṉ – "one who was born prior"

piṉ piṟantāṉ – "one who was born later"

mūttāṉ "elder"; iḷaiyāṉ "younger"

2. Person

puruṣa traya-three persons: namely, (a) prathamā puruṣa-in Tamil paṭarkkai, i. e., third person;

(b) madhyama puruṣa-in Tamil muṉṉilai, i. e. second person;

(c) uttama puruṣa – in Tamil taṉmai, i. e. first person.

3. Genders

liṅgatraya or three genders:

(a) pulliṅga – āṇpāl in Tamil, i. e. masculine gender;

(b) strīliṅga – peṇpāl in Tamil, i. e. feminine gender;

(c) napumsaka liṅga - alippāl in Tamil, i. e. neuter gender.

He states that liṅga is kuṛi in Tamil. Where there is satvaguṇa in a thing that thing is called pulliṅga. Where there is rajōguṇa that is called strīliṅgam. Where there is tamōguṇa that is napumsaka liṅga. There is nothing in this world which is not a mixture of these guṇas. By a figure of speech or upacāra, the word denoting a thing with the guṇa is itself named after the guṇa. These three guṇas (1) may be: "predominant"- upacaya, (2) deficient-adacayam, (3) or sama or equal. On account of this, a word denoting the same thing may belong to three different liṅgas. Note bhāryā, meaning a "wife", is in feminine; gender; kaḷatram, with the same meaning, is in neuter gender; and dārāh, meaning also wife, in masculine gender. Pāṇini and Jaimini have explained the gender in this way, and they point out that this gender has nothing to do with the actual gender of persons and things in the world. We are warned against taking them in that way. These genders are śastra liṅgaś or grammatical genders.

4. Numbers

vacana traya or three numbers, namely; (1) ēka vacana- orumai in Tamil, i. e. singular; (2) dvi vacana-irumai in Tamil, i. e. dual number; (3) bahu vacana-paṉmai in Tamil, i. e. plural number.

5. Pakutip poruḷ vikuti or svārtha pratyaya

Certain other equations are given. pakutip poruḷ vikuti = svārtha pratyaya, i. e. the suffix which has no meaning except that of the root itself.

In mātar the root is "mātu"; suffix, ar has no independent meaning. Other instances of svārtha pratyaya are the following:-

(Ilakkaṇakkottu mentions these as cases where pakupatam behaves like pakāppatam)

ai: kuṛiyetirppai (means only kuṛi etirppu)

pōl: nattampōṛ kēṭu (nattampōl means only nattam)

a: vāyavum (means only vāyum) }
kaṇṇavum (means only kaṇṇum) } ('v' after 'a' is a glide)

In Sanskrit ka comes as svārtha, e. g. nīlakam (i. e. nīlam) mauṭikam, paṭakam.

In all the above instances, the svārtha pratyaya came in sāmānya taddhitaṉ.

It also occurs in avyaya taddhitaṉ.

"tiripilavē" comes with svārtha as "tiripiṭaṉ iṉṛē" (note iṭaṉ).

Similarly, "vayiṉ" comes as svārtha,

e. g. "irupeyaroṭum" comes as "iruvayiṛ peyaroṭum". Svārtha occurs also in bhavā taddhitaṉ.

mai: kuṛṛeluttu comes with svārtha as kuṛumai eḷuttu. āṇaṭutta makaṉeṉkiḷavi comes as āṉmai aṭutta makaṉeṉ kiḷavi.

colterital comes as coṉmai terital, etc.

6. valukkāttal

Literally, guarding against mistakes; corresponds to dōṣa abhāva, which is literally absence of dōṣa. It is of two kinds:

(1) valuvarka eṉal: Laying down a rule that a thing should be denoted by the word rquired for it.

(2) valuvamaittal - idiomatic usage. Though it is not the most proper word, since it denotes the thing in one way or the other, it is acceptable. For, the poets are like the elephant uncontrollable by the aṅkuśa or goad.

7. Convention of a commentary

Pirayōka Vivēkam points out certain conventions of writing a commentary. Certain words may be consciously omitted from, or added to, so as to remind the reader that he has to add certain rules, guided by the deficiency or redundancy.

(1) Deficiency is cēṭam (śeṣam) or nūnam nyūnam (as used in Tamil is equal to kuṛai in Tamil).

The examples are :

What should have been stated The forms with the deficiency (the words omitted in the next column are underlined)

ākāra viṛuti yakara   ākāra viṛuti yakara iyaṛṛē.
viṛuti iyaṛṛē
ātiyatenpa apikita karttā,   ātiyatenpa anapikitam
anapikita karttā.
ceyta ceykiṇṛa ceyyumeṉ , ceyta ceykiṉṛa ceyyumeṉ
vāypāṭṭil   pāṭṭil
eṭuttukkāṭṭu   kāṭṭu
ilvāḻkkai vaḻiyeñcal   vāḻkkai vaḻi-yeñcal
cīrtūkkic ceyal   tūkkic ceyal

(Dr. K. N. Eḻuttaccaṉ informs me as follows:

bahu   { abundant, numerous
          { often, mostly
bahulam or bahulakam

They are variously applicable, diversity from giving wide applicability (to a rule).

If a rule is bahula it means:-

It will apply in some places; in others it will not apply. It will be optional in some cases. Complete change may occur in others.

(Skt., Kārikā
kvacit pravṛthiḥ, kvacid apravṛttiḥ
kvacid vibhāṣa, kvacid anyad ēva)
'bahulam chandasi (in Vedas the rules are bahulam).
grahaṇam – catching, taking, mentioning, understanding.
bahula grahaṇam means mentioning or understanding a rule as bahulam.

(2) The redundant or extra word is called mikai in Tamil and lēśam or lavam or bahulagrahaṇam in Sanskrit. No example is given, as this is the major occurrence found almost everywhere. (bahulagrahaṇam is not generally used in that sense in Sanskrit, it is learat; see the note above.)

8. upasarga's

In kārikā 45 a few more technical terms are introduced and Tamil examples are given. The indeclinables or avyayas like kai occur with participial nouns and verbs. These are called upasargas or prefixes. Examples are given for the following upasargas:-

(1) kai coming with the noun: kaimmikaḷ
     kai-coming with the verb: kaiviṭutal, kaitūvēṉ,
     kaikūṭum
(2) kāl – nūlkāl yātta mālai veṇkuṭai
(3) talai– uyiriṛṛalai pirinta ūṉ
(4) mēl – kallāta mēṛkoṇṭu oḷukal, mēṛkōḷ
(5) mī – mīkkūṛu maṉṉaṉ nilam
(6) ollai–ollai yuṇarappaṭum
(7) vallai – vallaik keṭum
(8) puṛam – puṛantarutal, puṛappaṭal
(9) akam – akappaṭal
(10) ilam – ilampaṭu pulavar

The Sanskrit upasarga pari comes in Tamil,
e. g. parimāṛutal.

The Sanskritists state that there are twenty upasargas in Sanskrit.

Sanskrit examples are: atilōpa, aticayam.
Cintāmaṇi uses atilōpa māntar.

Valḷuvar uses ati nuṭpam. But since this ati here does not come either with the participial noun or with the verb, it is called only avyayībhāva.

9. Relative construction

P. V. next refers to relative construction (It is like the following: he, who said, so that one is here).
"Who" is yat in Sanskrit; –"he" is tat

This rule is followed in Sanskrit.

Remote demonstrative words beginning with a are called tat śabda. The interrogative nouns beginning with yā are called yāt śabda.

It is a rule in Sanskrit that tat must come after the occurrence of yat.

Tiruvaḷḷuvar follows this:
epporuḷ yāryārvāyk kēṭpiṉum apporuḷ
meypporuḷ kāṇpa tarivu
yātaṉiṉ yātaṉiṉ nīnkiyā nōtal ataṉiṉ ataṉiṉ ilaṉ.

10. yak and ya: ref. paṭu

Pirayōka Vivēkam further points out that the passive-voice verb occurring in bhāva and karmaṇi prayōgas is called yak. (ya is added to the verb).

The auxiliary paṭu comes immediately after a noun, as for example:

pottup paṭum; manru paṭum; cōrvu paṭum – That paṭu is called yak.

Whilst the "paṭu" immediately following a verbal noun or infinitive as in iyarrap paṭutal and verupaṭukkap paṭutal is merely called ya.

kārikā 46 gives further equations between Tamil technical terms and Sanskrit terms.

11. Endings, etc.

meyyīru	– halanta	– consonantal ending.
uyirīru	– ajanta	– vowel ending
meymmutal	– halādi	– consonantal beginning
uyirmutal	– ajādi	– vowel beginning

Example : āl – hal ending and ac beginning;
maṇi – hal beginning ac ending.

12. Componnds

Tokaippatam in Tamil Samastapada — compound – tokāppatam or viri in Tamil vyastapada—non-compound or expanded forms.

The following are vyastapadas (first column) with their samasta padas, compounds, shown opposite (second column) and their full meaning (in the third column) :-

Non-compound form	Compound form	Meaning of the compound
cakkaram celvam	cakkarac celvam	cakkaranatu celvam "wealth of Indra"
mannan kumāran	manna kumāran	mannanukkuk kumāran "son of the king"

cankam paṭakam	canka paṭakam	cankamum paṭakamum "the conch and the drum"
vaṭṭam palakai	vaṭṭap palakai	vaṭṭamākiya palakai "the round plank"
kamalam tāḷ	kamalat tāḷ	kamalamotta tāḷ. "lotus-like foot"

This is how words are compounded to give the meaning shown above. It is not true to say that the case signs, for instance, atu and ku, or the conjunction um, or particle of similarity pōl, suffer an ellipsis so as to form compounds.

13. ceyyāy > cey

The third point made out in this kārikai is that the imperative of the canonical form "ceyyāy" suffers diminution and stands as cey.

In cellāmai uṇṭēl enakkurai, uraiyāy stands as urai.

In Sanskrit also pacahi stands diminished as paca; but giving the same meaning, bhaja, tyaja and disa are also similar. ı olkāppiyar has stated this in his sūtram, "ceyyāy ennum munnilai vinaiccol ceyyen kiḷavi ākiṭanuṭaittē".

"The second-person verb "ceyyāy" at times becomes cey."

Cēnāvaraiyar interprets it as shown above, following the Sanskrit tradition.

Naccinārkkiniyar, however, interprets this sūtram in a different way – "the negative verb ceyyāy gives the meaning of the positive verb cey". According to him, the word does not get shortened. If that change in meaning were the intention of Tolkāppiyar he must have laid down rules for similar usages. For instance, the negative verb ceyyā gives the meaning of the positive verb ceyyum. For that, a sūtram must have been framed. The form enal (which means (1) "do not say" and also (2) "do say") has thus positive and negative meanings. Tolkāppiyar should have written a third sūtram for this purpose. If like Naccinārkkiniyar, Tolkāppiyar had the negative and positive meanings in his mind he would have unambiguously stated as follows:

"ceyyāy eṉṉum etirmaṟai viṉaiccol–
–ceyyāy eṉṉum uṭampāṭakum"

i. e. the negative verb of the form ceyyāy will give the meaning of the positive verb of the form cey.

Further, when the word is the same as its root, Tolkāppiyar always refers to them as toḻiṟpeyar. For example, oṟṟiru toḻiṟpeyar, uyiriru toḻiṟpeyar. He never calls them second – person imperative verbs. These roots will not by themselves become verbs. These roots are verbal nouns and become verbs by getting the tense signs and final suffixes. If by standing alone the roots can become second-person verbs, it should be possible for them to stand alone and become first – person verbs as well. That never happens. Naccinārkiniyar's view is in conflict with Sanskrit usage.

14. cāva > cā, etc.

Tolkāppiyam lays down that the final letter of the non-finite verb cāva is lost in some cases. Taking it as upalakṣaṇa, other usages can be similarly explained : (ceya form occurring as cey):

pālaṟiya vanta	=	pālaṟivanta
ceyyat takka	=	ceytakka
puṉainta pâvai	=	puṉaipāvai

Similarly, ceytu form comes as cey,

e. g. varintu puṉai pantu = varippuṉaipantu.

The relative participles also lose their suffixes and stand as cey. This is called viṉaittokai,

e. g. nuṉmāṉ nuḷaipulam

In all these cases it is the intention of the speaker that controls the meaning – vivakṣādhinam.

15. lakṣaṇā

The 47th kārikā deals with lakṣaṇā. This has nothing to do with śabda śāstra or grammar. But what has been accepted by other śāstras also is accepted here. Tolkāppiyar refers to this in poruḷiyal under the sūtram "nōyum tuṇpamum", when the things without consciousness or without the power of refusal are

poetically spoken of as having organs or as having consciousness or as stating a refusal. Kālidāsa also in his Mēghasandēsa speaks in those terms, taking these as models. Later poets have spoken of : (1) the evening coming, waving its shoulders, (2) the bangle mourning with its mouth and (3) the eyes speaking out by opening their mouths.

Every word has got the power or śakti to denote a meaning. In some places, a noun or a verb does not denote the direct meaning. It denotes the meaning indirectly connected with the direct meaning; and the general idea is conveyed by the context. śakti is direct meaning. What is connected with direct meaning or what is indirect meaning is śakya sambandha, and that indirect meaning is called lakṣaṇā. A word may not denote the direct meaning. There is such a thing as coming together of words for denoting a meaning, i. e. anvaya. The general idea conveyed by the context is tātparya. The direct meaning has relationship with other meanings, i. e. sambandha. The direct meaning sometimes has no propriety with each one of their words (upapatti is appropriateness, anupapatti is inappropriateness). Under those circumstances, the direct meaning will be inappropriate. Then the word is taken to give indirect meaning. This indirect meaning is called lakṣaṇā.

"Would my mind have gone by this time, or is it placing its hand on its hip and waiting for the opportunity to see the Pāṇḍya".

(ceṉṟatu kol pōntatukol cevvi perun tuṇaiyu
niṉṟatukol nērmaruṅkiṟ kaiyūṉṟi-muṉṟiṉ
muḷaṅkuṅ kaṭāyēṉai moymmalarttār māṟaṉ
kuḷaintupiṉ ceṉṟaveṉ neñcē.)

Its relation to mind, hip, etc., cannot denote direct meaning, nor do they denote any other meaning or relationship. The hip and mind are intended to have a kind of poetic relationship. Similarly, when the poet requests the birds to narrate the grievance of the lady by bringing their palms together in obeisance, the palms have no meaning as referring to birds. Some kind of poetic relationship or personification or anvaya alone is intended.

vaikal pūṅkaḷi vāyvantu mēyum kurukiṉaṅkaḷ
kaikaḷ kūppic collīr.

kaṅkaiyuḷ iṭaicceṟi

"The hamlet of the shepherds in the Ganga"- here Ganga cannot have the direct meaning of "the flood". It refers to the bank nearby which is connected with the direct meaning "flood–Ganga".

Similarly, one is spoken to have eaten sourness – puḷit tiṇrān. Sourness or puḷi cannot denote the direct meaning. It connotes the indirect meaning connected with the direct meaning; in this case, the tamarind fruit which is connected with the sourness. Here inappropriateness of the direct meaning is clear.

He gives further examples from literature.

He raises the question whether it is proper to combine together (1) usages like the mind and hip where the poetic anvaya alone is emphasized and (2) the usages like the Ganga etc. where an indirect meaning is connoted. He answers that after suitable discussions the stand should be refuted.

upacārās

The 48th kārikai also refers to other figurative usages or upacāras :

1. Sometimes cause is spoken of as effect and at other times effect is spoken of as cause.

Ignorance is the cause and birth the effect. But in Tirukkuraḷ the effect is spoken of as the cause. See piṟappennum pētaimai:

Bad fate causes pride: bad fate is the cause and pride, the effect. But Tirukkuraḷ speaks of tīviṇai eṇṇum cerukku- where cause is spoken of as effect.

(2) The attribute is spoken of as the thing having the attribute.

In illavaḷ māṇpāṇāl, māṇpu means brilliance, but becomes the predicate of illavaḷ. The attribute word denotes the person having the attribute, i. e. one who is having brilliance.

The action of the attribute has to be interpreted as the action of the person having the attribute,

e. g. ciṟṟiṇam añcum perumai.

(As this does not belong to grammar further discussions are avoided.)

3. An action of one thing (person) is transferred to another (his words),

e. g. munṇiṇṟu piṇṇōkkāc col.

4. Action of the thing is attributed to the place located i.e. pulaṇ or viṣaya attributed to the place or location itself,

e. g. intappāṇai nāṇāḷi arici poṅkum, etc.

5. The attribute and the viṣaya or place may change places,

e. g. iṇcol, vaṇcol.

The sweetness is not one of taste but of sweetness to the ear.

17. Difference between Sanskrit and Tamil

kārikā 49 discusses the difference between Sanskrit and Tamil. The difference may not be $\frac{1}{1,00,00,000}$.

1. The verbal suffix denoting tiṇai (tiṇai is the distinction between the human and non-human. Human consists of masculine singular, feminine singular, human plural; the non-human consists of non-human singular and non-human plural.)

2. The verbal suffixes denoting masculine gender and the feminine gender are not found in Sanskrit, whilst the case sign for the nominative and the three genders are not found in Tamil.

He gives the following equations:

uyartiṇai   =   cētana
akriṇai   =   acētana

Even in Tamil there is no separate suffix for showing the masculine and feminine genders amongst the non-humans.

It has already been stated that noun itself functions as the nominative. Why then separate and state that the nominative has no case sign in Tamil ?

This is to show that liṅgatraya, or three genders, is to be accepted to a limited extent only.

The liṅgas occur to a limited extent according to Sanskrit tradition when a thing becomes an attribute to itself or when things get attributes.

jayati means "he wins", "she wins", and "it wins": one suffix -ti denotes all these.

nāṉeṉum nallāḷ

nāṉ –"the good woman". nāṉ is withholding oneself from doing any ignoble act. It is spoken of as nallāḷ –"good woman." lajjā is the Sanskrit name for nāṉ. lajjā is feminine in Sanskrit. (See I.K.) Therefore, Parimēlaḻakar explains that Tiruvaḷḷuvar has used the word nallāḷ–

"tiṅkaḷañ (moon) celvaṉ yāṇṭuḷaṉ;

teṉṟalañ (southern breeze) celvaṉ yāṇṭuḷaṉ.

Here both the noun (celvaṉ) and the verb (uḷaṉ) are in the masculine gender.

inniḷavēṉil (spring) vantaṉaṉ.

Here the verb alone is in masculine gender. Other examples are also given.

Cēṉāvaraiyar, under the sūtram, "pallōr kuṟitta tiṇainilaik kiḷavi", states that the caste names ending in plural, e. g. antaṇar and aracar, are uyartiṇai or human nouns and the caste names ending in singular, e. g. antaṇaṉ, aracaṉ, are common nouns, common to the humans and non-humans. But "nāṉ eṉṉum nallāḷ" or "teṉṟalañ celvaṉ" is not a caste name, nor does Parimēlaḻakar speak of personification when referring to "nāṉ eṉum nallāḷ". We cannot take them as common nouns. They are human nouns denoting feminine and masculine respectively.

tāṉ is the third-person pronoun common to human and non-human. nī and nīr are second person-nouns common to human and non-human. yāṉ, yām are first-person nouns common to both human and non-human.

nī, nīr are yuṣmat śabda's; yāṉ, yār are aṣmat śabda's.

The Sanskritists call all these common nouns or pronouns as having sāmānya liṅga, and state that liṅga is not patent in them.

Similarly, iṭaiccol or avyayas have no liṅga.

18. liṅga and compound

Some more conventions about the liṅgas are given.

In karmadhārayaṉ or paṇput tokai the paṇpu or attribute word may be of any liṅga. But it is converted to the liṅga of the head word and then compounded. Because of this, the liṅga of the attribute is considered as anitya liṅga or unimportant as changing with the liṅga of the head word, e. g. In the compound dakṣiṇā mūrti, both dakṣiṇa and mūrti are feminine. Therefore, dakṣiṇa ends in a long vowel á to be in the feminine gender. In dakṣiṇa dēśam, dēśam is in masculine gender. Therefore, dakṣiṇā becomes shortened into dakṣiṇa to become masculine gender, to agree with dēśa.

In karuñ cāttaṉ, karuñ cātti, karuñ cāttar, karuñ kutirai, karuñ kutiraikaḷ - when meaning is expanded, the root form of the attribute "karu" must be expanded respectively as kariyaṉ, kariyaḷ, kariyar, kariyatu and kariyaṉa, thus changing the ending in accordance with the gender of the head word. Tolkāppiyar also is of the same view.

See "aimpālaṟiyum paṇpu tokum moḻi".

In karmadhārayaṉ the attribute denotes the thing which has the attribute. Therefore, one is viśēṣaṇa of the other; but both come to denote a single meaning. This is the intention of Tolkāppiyar when he speaks of 1) "iṉṉatu, 2) ituveṉa varūum" in referring to paṇput tokai.

But karuñ cāttaṉ, etc. have expanded as kariya cattaṉ, etc. where kariya is a sāmānya liṅga.

In all these cases the guṇas come as viśēṣaṇa or attributes of guṇi "the thing having the attribute". This is Cēṉāvaraiyar's view (See I. K.).

If karuñ kutirai is expanded as karitu kutirai, karitu will be the subject, kutirai will be the predicate, and, therefore, there is no compound according to Naṉṉūl. Therefore, the author of Naṉṉūl has taken karumai, cemmai, etc. as attribute words which are compounded with the nouns kutirai, etc. But Naṉṉūl follows śabda śāstra composed by Vāmana or Jinēndra. Following the school of Jinēndra, the crow and the koel are spoken of as human feminines. But without understanding this, the commentators of Naṉṉūl speak of these as rūpakas.

19. vinayam – (sū : 50)

vinayam or avaiyaṭakkam is an appeal to the learned. It may be taken as an appendix to the book. "What is stated here in P. V. should be understood without difficulty what-so-ever if one deeply considers pratipadas, nirvacanas, and udāharaṇas. It is the duty of the learned to teach this book and explain things not stated here in terms of those which are stated so as to see that no mistake is committed", so says P. V.

. Pratipadam is another word denoting the same meaning. Amongst the many synonyms or paryāyapadas, a few may be praśiddhapadas or well-known word; or all of them may be well-known words. The following are all well-known synonyms:

aṭi, kāl	=	foot
nāsi, mūkku	=	nose
kātu, cevi	=	ear
neruppu, tī	=	fire
puṭaivai, cēlai	=	saree.

Amongst the synonyms the well-known one is as follows:

ūl, pāl, muṟai, teyvam, niyati, uṇmai, pākkiyam, poṟi, viti. (These words occur in the chapter on ūḷ 'fate' in Tirukkuraḷ).

nirvacanam or nirutti is giving the meaning in the form of a sentence or in the form of a sūtra. See in Daṇdi and meyyppā-ṭṭiyal. [udāharaṇas or examples which reveal the original rule as a mould to reveal its original.]

Examples for things not stated:

1) vēṟu vēṟu stand always like a compound vevvēṟu

pattup pattu   as pappattu
paiya paiya   as paipaya
Sanskritists also show that ēka ēka come as ēkaikam.
(See I. K.)

2) (a) Restrictive attribute in Tamil is called "piṟitin iyaipu nīkkutal". In Sanskrit it is anyayōga vyavaccheda.

   (b) Non-restrictive attribute – "iyaipiṉmai nīkkutal" in Tamil; in Sanskrit ayōga vyavaccheda. (See I. K.)

3) jātyēka vacanam: cātiyorumai in Tamil, i.e. a word being in singular because of being taken as one group. A word may or may not have a singular suffix but goes to denote the plural even in the absence of a verb denoting singular or plural. (See I. K.)

civikai poṟuttāṉ – "one who bears the palanquin". Here jātyēka vacanam occurs in the human noun. It denotes all the planquin bearers as a class. Naccinārkkniyar brings this under "meynnilai mayakkiṉāakuṉa". Even Sanskritists accept this jātyēka vacana in human nouns. (The author translates from Naiṣadha to illustrate this).

In akṟiṇai or non-humans, the class noun denoting a group or class which we may call class name can occur with a suffix:

añcuvatu añcāmai pētaimai;
nūleṉap paṭuvatu.
In non-humans the class names may occur without a suffix:
kuṇamennum kuṉaru (kuṇam).

Sometimes in non-humans the class names (e. g. kaḷiṟu end in plural vēlāṉ mukatta (the a of mukatta).

But these are not called jatyēka vacana. Sanskritists also speak of jātibahu vacana, e. g. in Tamil kaṟpavai kaṟka.

4. When statement is made for the first time it is called pūrōvāda (pūrvāvāda) and when it is repeated with a purpose it is called anuvāda (See I. K.).

Sometimes without the first statement, from the form of a sūtram it can be taken as anuvāda implying a prior statement. In Tolkāppiyam in the earlier parts Tolkāppiyar does not speak of orṟaḷapeṭai, i. e. a consonant becoming a metrical syllable. But in ceyyuḷiyal he says that "if consonants, nasals and semi-vowels occur as a metrical syllable it would behave similarly." This form of the sūtram suggests a previous statement or a pūrōvāda (pūrvavāda), that the consonant will become a metrial syllable. This is called māṭṭēṟu which is equated with Sanskrit atideśa or vyapadeśa. (It is learnt vyapadeśa is generally used in the sense of naming or concealment and not in this sense). p. 68.

5. A word e. g. viṇṭa or viṇṭu, can occur as a sakarmaka or transitive verb,

e. g. vilaṅkalaik kālviṇṭu-"breaking the mountain"
and also as akarmaka or
intransitive: viṇṭa tāmarai - "lotus which bloomed"
kim karōti in Sanskrit is vātu ceyvaṉ in Tamil.

Here it occurs both as sakarmaka and akarmaka.

6. kāku is equated with icaiyeccam, e. g.

"numaruḷḷal emmai maṟaittīrō" - "you hide your remembering your people".

There will be facial distortions or distortion in the pronunciation:

nucuppiṟku nalla paṭāparai-

"The auspicious drum will not be sounded for the waist".

The idea is that because of the heaviness of the breast, the waist will break down as an inauspicious event. The implication arises on the bais of lakṣaṇā. This is called lakṣaṇā mūla dhvani.

In kuṭampai tanittoḷiyap puṭ paṟantaṟṟē-uṭampoṭu
uyiriṭai naṭpu-

"the friendship between body and soul is like a bird flying away for good from the cage or egg shell". Here the implication of the noun naṭpu, "friendship", is exactly its opposite. Since it is based on noun it is called abhidhā mūla dhvani It is called vriuddha lakṣaṇa. It is like speaking of the rākṣasas as virtuous people.

7. nipāta is equated with "uṭampoṭu puṇarttal" in Tamil, where though no rule is directly stated it is assumed from a casual statement

Valluvar speaks of the person who understands the classification of twenty-four prakṛti tatvas. From this statement, by implication, we get the knower as the twenty-fifth tatva. This is called nipāta.

8. Mention has been made of āhāryārōpa. One is aware that the immage is a stone or bronze. Still one consciously imagines that it is God, and worships it. This is āhāayārōpa. In the srāddha ritual, a man who performs knows that the person, worshipped and imagined as one's father, is not so in reality,

though imagined and worshipped as such. This is also āhāryārōpa.

9. Words are introduced in interpreting a sūtra in various ways. What is introduced in discussing a topic, because of the topic, is called anuṣaṅga. What is brought in because of the expectancy in a word avāynilai is called adhyāhāra.

Example : kaṭu moḷiyum kaiyikanta taṇṭamum vēntaṉ
aṭu muraṉ tēykkum aram-

is interpretted as two sentences :

(1) kaṭu moḷiyum vēntaṉ aṭumuraṉ tēykkum aram-

"Harsh words are a file, filing away the strength of a king";

(2) kaiyikanta taṇṭamum vēntaṉ aṭumuraṉ tēykkum aram-

"The punishment beyond a limit is a file, filing away the strength of a king".

The noun in the singular aram or file is separately taken with each one of the two sentences, like the different strings drawing the temple car. This is called pratyēka bandha anvāya. This also comes under dūrānvaya (but not as a defect, as is usually meant but as a poetic inversion).

The books on figures of speech speak of three kinds of words: (1) abhidhā, (2) lakṣaṇā, (3) vyanjanā vṛtti. Following them, Parimēlaḷakar divides words similarly: (1) ceñcol – words with direct meaning, (2) ilakkaṇac col – words with indirect meaning, and (3) kuṟippuc col – words with implied meaning, respectively.

Usages such as maṅkaḷam eṉpatōr ūruṇṭu pōlum– "Perhaps there is a village called maṅkalam" (Vīracōliyam calls such statements as parōkṣa) are called anytāhpratipatti (knowing from some one). Here pōlum is called oppil pōli; iva in Sanskrit is equal to pōlum. In Sanskrit also we get iva in the same sense.

ayam khalu rāja āsīt–here khalu comes in that meaning and is called vākyālaṅkāra.

11. What is specifically stated is called in Tamil eṭuttōttu and in Sanskrit pratipadōkta. The general rule is called utsarga.

12. The special rule which negatives the general rule obtained and which prescribes a different rule is called apavāda. utsarga is in Tamil "potuvāy eytiya viti", and apavāda or niṣēdha vidhi is in Tamil "eytiyatu vilakkippiṟitu varuñ ciṟappu viti".

There is also the special rule which does not negative, but is an addition to a general rule. It is called viśēṣa vidhi. In Tamil it is called eytiyataṉ mēṟ ciṟappu. When two rules optionally alternate we have the vikalpa rule. The Tamil for that is uṟalcci.

All these must be distinguished. Pāṇiṇi has a sūtram "rād iphah", according to which the consonant r gets the enunciative augment ipha. Patañjali has explained the sūtram not as negativing (niṣēdha or apavāda) the ordinary rule of the enunciative augment kāra coming. (varṇāt kārah is a vārakyas in naming words kāra is added to them.) This is a vikalpa rule or a viśēṣa rule which states that ipha will come in addition to kāra, alternatively. Patañjali quotes Vālmīki's usage of kāra coming with r, e. g, rakāra. (It is not Pāṇini who said rādiphaḥ. It is a vākya of kātyāyana. Nor does Patañjali explain it as he mentioned. That interpretation is, however, according to a tradition of making Valmiki's use grammatical and not merely ārṣa.)

Without understanding this position, people have assumed that rādiphaḥ is an apavāda. They assumed that rakāra of Vālmīki is unpāṇinīyan which has however to be accepted as ārṣa or the usage of a ṛṣi.

13. Naṉnul states palaiyaṉa kaḷitalum putiyaṉa pukutalum vaḷuvala kāla vakaiyiṉāṉē- "usages becoming obsolete or newly coming in are not mistakes if understood in terms of the passage of time".

This is in accordance with Pāṇini's statement.

Sanskritists give one enunciative augment or kārap pratyaya for two letters,

e. g. taḷakāram.

Similarly, Tolkāppiyar gives one cāriyai or augment for two letters,

e. g. ṇaṉakkāṉ, laḷakkāṉ.

14. Usages differ from place, to place, e. g. the learned residing on the west of Sarāvati river call the bird vartika, whilst those who reside east of the river call it vartaka.

15. When doubts arise in this book one should consult people who have studied the following :

Mahābhāṣyam, kaiyaṭam, Siddhānta kaumudī, Sabda kaumudī, Vākya padīyam, Haripīṭhika, Dhātuvṛit, Pada mañjari, Sabda kaustubham.

Different conclusions and procedures are followed by Kāśikā vṛtti and Prakriyā kaumudi. Therefore, those who are learned in those two books should not be consulted. Cēṉāvaraiyar, etc. wrote their commentaries on Tolkāppiyam when the following books were in current usage : (1) Vākya Padīyam, (2) Haripīṭhika and Hēlārajīya.

CHAPTER IX

MISCELLANEOUS II

Ilakkaṇakkottu

Ilakkaṇakkottu has a separate chapter called oḷipiyal or miscellaneous. It is the last chapter in that work. The sūtras relating to compounds occurring in this chapter have been discussed in our chapter on "compound". The rest of that chapter is discussed herein below.

1. Tamilization of Sanskrit words   Ilakkaṇakkottu (sū : 87)

The Sanskrit words occur in Tamil consisting of the following :

1) Sounds common to Sanskrit and Tamil; e. g., maṇi.

2) Sounds which are specific to Sanskrit, e. g. dadhi.

3) Sounds of both kinds, e. g. ādi.

4) Even when consisting of common sounds one common sound is altered to another common sound,
   e. g. mālā > mālai; nārī > nāri.

5) The sounds are altered into five sounds specific to Tamil,

e.g.   r: vikalpam   vikarpam
       ṉ: śivah   civam
       ḻ: drāviḍa   tamiḻ
            amṛtam   amiḻtam
       e: daivam   teyvam
            entra (ūrti) entira (ūrti)
       ō: kōṅkaṇam   koṅkaṇam

6) Words coming into Tamil undergo changes at the final medial and initial positions :

i) coming in of sounds, etc.–

(a) Initial: lōkam   ulakam   – It is a prothetic   u

(b) Medial: tatva   tattuvam – It is an epenthetic u

(c) Final: vāk   vākku   – The enunciative vowel u comes at the end.

ii) changing of one sound into another
Initial: ṛṣabam   iṭapam
Medial: viṣam   viṭam
Final: rāmaḥ   rāmaṉ

iii) loss of a sound

sparśa	paricam
mukti	mutti
dhanus	taṉu
ājñā	āṇai
vijñāpanam	viṇṇāṇam
vṛttam	vaṭṭam
dṛdham	tiṭṭam
vibhu	vimmu

All the rest of the extensive usage may be brought under the above categories,

7) i. Tamil words consist of (a) sounds common to both the languages.

   e. g. nilam, nīr;

(b) sounds specific to Tamil,
    e. g. oṉru, eṟi;

(c) both kinds of sounds;
    e. g. paḻam, vāḻai (sū: 88)

   ii. Bringing in of words which are not there. (sū: 89)

For various reasons such as the following, words which are not in the sūtra are brought in to complete the sentence in order to understand the sūtra.

1. atikāram : If a particular topic is taken up, certain words are repeated in interpretation though not there. In the sūtra, "avaṟṟuḷ, a i u e o kkuṟil aintē", the word avaṟṟuḷ is repeated in the subsequent sūtras classifying sounds. aṉṉāṉ

iṟumoḻiyāṉpāṟ paṭarkkai. This comes under the topic of the ending of the finite verbs both explicit and implicit, positive and negative. Though these words are not there in the subsequent sūtras, they have to be repeated there and in the subsequent sūtras.

2. **avāynilai or expectation**: In the sūtra, "iyampuvaṉ eluttē," the verb iyampuvaṉ expects or contemplates the subject yāṉ which is introduced though not there, in interpreting the sūtra,

3. **takuti** – introducing words for the purpose of emphasis. When the word ūḷ occurs, it is easily intelligible even if any of the synonyms viti, poṟi, viṉai, etc. were not given. For the purpose of emphasis and clarification the explanation is given in the form of a sentence,

e. g.   ūḷ aktāvatu iruviṉaippayaṉ ceytavaṉaiyē ceṉṟu
aṭaitaṟku ētuvākiya niyati

(Pirayōka Vivēkam gives this sentence as an example of nirukti).

4. **ceyyuḷ vikāram**: When a word undergoes lengthening, shortening, etc. it is called ceyyuḷ vikāram, and thus gets distorted. Taking that as a clue necessary words are introduced in the commentary. (P. V. describes this as śeṣa or kuṟai and gives the same examples. Therefore, they are not repeated here.) The author suggests taking this as two : (1) ceyyuḷ vikāram, (2) distortion or citaivu. In that case, what is stated above will come under ceyyuḷ vikāram, and citaivu will be illustrated by iṭakkaraṭakkal or euphemism, where the true meaning is expanded by necessary words, e. g. kaḻākkāl. One treads on faeces, and his leg is described thus as uncleaned or unmarked leg.)

5. In the six kinds of compounds necessary words are brought in for the purpose of greater clarification.

muṟimēṉi – "sprout (like) appearance of the body."

It is expanded as muṟipōlum mēṉi. Not satisfied with the clarification, the implications are made more explicit,

e. g. "the outward form, which gives pleasure to the eyes and the touch alike, being of the colour of the mango sprout and being cool to the touch". The author suggests taking this also as two: (a) in six different kinds of phrases which are expansions as the above occur; (b) in compounds where such expansions are made. The example given above is for the second kind.

(6) When all the words that come between two words suffer an ellipsis, they are brought in when interpreting the sūtras. In "a au uyirē", a, au are interpreted as a (ā, iī, uū, eē, ai, oō and) au. Words in paranthesis have suffered an ellipsis and are brought out in the commentary. Words are brought in for various reasons as may be seen as profusely illustrated in the commentary on Tolkāppiyam poruḷatikāram.

Implication or kuṟippu is illustrated by the statements, piṟitumākūpa kāmaṉ kāḷkkoḷiṉē in Kalittokai; naḷḷār puṉaivarē in Civañāṉapōtam, where the implication is "I will also do so". karuṇāy kavarnta kāḷiṉar, citaikiya pāṉaiyar– kāḷiṉar means kāḷiṉarāy, and pāṉaiyar means pāṉaiyarāy. This is because the conjunctive participles kāḷiṉarāy, etc. have become the implicit finite verb kāḷiṉar etc. Is it not a case of a finite verb becoming the conjunctive participle as contemplated in Naṉṉūl sūtram, "kuṟippu muṟṟu iṟeccam ākalum uḷavē? It is not so. Because the author of Naṉṉūl has made this sūtra forgetting his own earlier statement - aṉṟi iṉṟi eṉ viṉaiyeñci karam toṭarpiṉuḷ ukaramāy varum. This kind of foregetting is common to all except God. (P. V. had also mentioned inconsistency in Naṉṉūl.) With reference to this change of viṉaiyeccam into viṉaik kuṟippu, there are people who consider that āy had suffered an ellipsis, and insist, therefore that, āy must be brought in when interpreting. But such cases are not really cases of bringing in words or moḻi varuvittal. What is the difference between such cases and moḻi varuvittal? In the former the word or the meaning or both will be incomplete without the words brought in, and in the letter, i.e. moḻi varuvittal, words and meaning will be complete even before words are introduced for clarification.

II. aḷapeṭai (sū: 90)

1) Natural or iyaṟkai aḷapeṭai, e. g. where, even when the word is stated in the vocative case in complaint, in weeping

and in selling goods, the aḷapeṭai is born with the pronunciation of the word. It is not a letter alteration.

2) Non-natural aḷapeṭai – The poet introduces the aḷapeṭai to fill up the metrical deficiency.

3) eḷuttup pēṟu aḷapeṭai is coming in of an extra vowel after a similar long vowel in sandhi.

ārā + pāmpu   arāappāmpu.

4) icainūḷ aḷapeṭai, i. e. aḷapeṭai which comes in music.

5) Oṟṟup pēṟaḷapeṭai is the coming in of consonants which come for filling in metrical deficiencies (evaṉ >evvaṉ > evvvaṉ). This oṟṟup pēṟaḷapeṭai is of rare occurrence. [All these five may be brought under three heads: 1) kuṟṟeḷuttaḷapeṭai where a short vowel is made a long vowel and then into aḷapeṭai. (The short vowel takes aḷapeṭai often in the vocative case.]

(pōlvatum > pōlvatūm > pōlvatūum),

2) neṭṭēḷuttaḷapeṭai, and 3) oṟṟeḷuttaḷapeṭai.]

III. samānākṣara or pōliyeḷuttu (sū: 91) (Pirayōka Vivēkam has spoken about the necessity for recognizing samānākṣara or pōliyeḷuttu and the arguments and examples are repeated in Ilakkaṇakkottu).

The coming in of two sounds as one sound, i. e. pōliyeḷuttu should be accepted. Otherwise, various verses will go without alliteration and initial rhyming. Without rejecting such cases Sanskritists have accepted them as samānākṣaras. Following that, Tamilians forgot to translate samānākṣara as iṉaiyeḷuttu and translated it as pōliyeḷuttu. pōli means in some places pseudo as in pōliccarakku, pōliyilakkaṇam and pōliyurai. Considering that pōliyeḷuttu means a pseudo sound, others have rejected pōliyeḷuttu without considering what comes before and what comes after the sūtra mentioning pōliyeḷuttu in grammatical studies.

IV. The negative prefixes (su: 100)

1. a– arūpam (negation - that which has no form)
   appirāmaṇaṉ (piṟitu-those other than brahmins)
   ataṉmam (the contrary or maṟai, i.e. what is contrary) to dharma)

2. an – ananyam (that which is not the other but the same)

3. na – nāsti (non-existence, that which is not)

4. ni – nirmalan (he who has no defects or malas)

5. ku– kutarkkam (that which is not right argument)

6. vi – tikku and vitikku (vidik) (the place between two directions like tikku and vitikku)

1) This negative prefix denotes the non-existence of things which is denoted by the word to which it is prefixed;

2) or it denotes something other than that word;

3) maṟai – that which is contrary to that denoted by the word

(P. V. also has mentioned these three kinds of negations.)

(sū: 101) These three iṉmai or abhāva are of five kinds as stated in Civañāna cittiyār and Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram. What is the use of elaborating the grammatical points applicable to Sanskrit? This is necessary because the ancients have translated those three kinds of negation, and made them lakṣaṇa and lakṣya as applicable to Tamil.

1. iṉmai,
   e. g. illeṉ kiḷavi iṉmai ceppiṉ

2. piṟitu: alvaḷi, akṟiṇai, etc.

3. maṟai or contrary
   kōḷil poṟi; payaṉil col, etc.

The later scholars without translating them have used the same words in Tamil grammar and literature. Apart from these six kinds of negative particles, there are others, as in apakīrti, atikramam, apavātam, tunnimittam.

V. The force of letters etc. (sū: 102)

1) Eḷuttāṟṟal, the force of the sound or letter;

2) collāṟṟal–force of the word;

3) poruḷāṟṟal–force of the meaning;

4) moḷip poruṭ kāraṇam–the reason for the word denoting a meaning.

Force is power or potentiality. These four powers are difficult to understand. Whatever can be easily understood may alone be here concentrated upon.

Eḷuttāṟṟal: In ayaṉ, ari, araṉ, the vowel a shows that it is not a consonant or a syllabic letter but only a vowel, and its fixed quantity is one mātra. This is the potentiality, power or the force of the vowel a.

Syllabic letter ku in the imperative perukku ("increase") has one mātrā duration. The same word perukku as a verbal noun has a final u which is kuṟṟiyalukaram having only half a mātra, and when followed by a word beginning with a plosive like perukkuk kaṭal pōṉṟatu ku becomes kuṟṟiyalukarakkuṟuk-kam-ultra short u with only quarter of a mātra duration. These, for purposes of metre, are counted as a syllable in the first case; in the second case it is counted or not counted, according to the exigencies of metre; and in the third case it is not counted. By varying in these ways, it makes it impossible for us to say what is the force of this letter, because it has lost its force.

collāṟṟal-viral ("finger") does not denote a hand which is the whole, of which the viral is a part. It does not denote nakam or nail which is a part of the viral. It denotes an "inch" decidedly. Such a definite denotation is called collāṟṟal or the force of a word. But the word nakam has not always such definite denotation since it is a homonym. In some places it means a "nail" or "finger". In other places it means a "mountain". Therefore, it has lost its power or force, (Linguists call this linguistic pathology.)

poruḷāṟṟal

(See cilai vaḷaittu veṉṟāṉ and cilaiyāl ālayam ceytāṉ.)

In the first the word cilai does not denote a stone but a bow definitely. Similarly in the second, cilai does not denote a bow but means definitely a stone. This definite meaning is called poruḷāṟṟal.

The sentence "paṇam muḷutum koṭātē" may in one place mean "do not give any part of the amount", and, in another place "keep back a little and give the rest", and, in the third place, "keeping back a small portion give away the major portion". Thus it has lost its definiteness and therefore its poruḷāṟṟal.

For moḷip poruḷ kāraṇam, refer to Tolkāppiya sūtram beginning with that phrase.

VI. Similarity of letters (sū: 103)

The thirty letters of the alphabet have many kinds of similarity :

1) Including the relationship between two like a, ā, etc. in ancient and modern usage a and ā,

e. g. arumukam – ārumukam, and r and ṉ,

e. g. mīrkaṇ – mīṉkaṇ,

similarity between k and c;
e. g. pikkai – piccai;
between c and y;
e. g. paṅkacam and paṇkayam;
of v and y;
e. g. kōvil – kōyil;
of m and n;
e. g. kalam and kalaṉ;
of l and ḷ:
e. g. alamaru and aḷamaru;
and of v and l;
e. g. vilvam and villam;

2) The second kind of similarity is being based on similarity of word forms.

The other kinds of similarities are many, including a few given below:

1. The similarity in meaning of the root,
   e. g. iyampiṉār – viḷampiṉār.
2. The similarity of final suffix or vikuti,
   e, g. uṇtaṉaṉ – uṇtāṉ.
3. Similarity of medial suffix, i. e. iṭainilai,
   e. g uṇṇā niṉṟāṉ – uṇkiṉṟāṉ..
4. Similarity of cāriyai,
   e. g. oṉṟaṉai – oṉṟiṉai.
5. Similarity of sandhi,
   e. g. muṭṭītu – mukṭītu.
6. Similarity of noun forms,
   e. g. poṟpaṇi – āṭakappaṇi.

7. Similarity of verb roots,
   e. g. tottān – tīntinān.

8. Similarity of itaiccol,
   e. g. atuvō – atukol.

9. Similarity of uriccol,
   e. g. "karuppum civappum vekulip porula".

10. Similarity of more than one word – the standing and the coming word,
    e. g. civan nañcu tinrān; aran vitamuntān.

VII. cāriyai letters (sū: 104)

1. One cāriyai for one letter.

   In the enumeration of eighteen consonants ka ca ta ta pa ra. One cāriyai a is given to each one of them.

2. Many cāriyais for one letter (karam, kāram and
                                              kān for a),
   e. g. akaram, akāram, akkān.

3. One or the same cāriyai for many letters–
   akāram, ākāram, aikāram.

4. One cāriyai for a combination of letters–
   aākāram, īīkāram.

5. No cāriyai of letters occurring separately and in
                                              combination–

   a. ammin ikaram
   a i ummutal tanivarin.

6. One cāriyai for one letter; combination of two cāriyais for one letter–
   makkān   :   (a and kān)–
   One cāriyai for two letters combined–
   nanakkān, lalakkān. (P.V. also mentions this).

VIII. sandhi – a) meaning

(sū: 105) sandhi or punarppu :
   sandhi is coming together of two words having the following:

1) takuti– "property",
   e. g. cōrraiyuntān.

Here the word cōru, before combining with case signs and coming words, though standing alone and isolated, is not, meaningless word like iriñi, mīriñi, etc.; nor has it any grammatical meaning like subject instrument, etc.

There are also other characteristic features of a word.

2) avāynilai – "expectancy" (that isolated word not only expects the case sign ai but also expects or requires a predicate).

3) anmainilai - "immediacy"

   cōrrai untān is different from cōru katal mulankirru untān, where the words katal mulankirru have intervened. Cōrrai untān does not give room for any such parenthetic words. The two words follow immediately each other.

Without understanding this grammatical feature of immediacy others argue as follows:

If words intervene, the great men resolve to speak of no defects, and therefore state that the intervening words have come because of either metrical exigency or various methods of interpretation, which require that words are displaced from their proper prose order, or because the words have parenthetically come in, or because of other reasons for which they will give separate labels. They divide such sentences into two units– cōrrai untān and katal mulankirru. These will be refuted by a few. When the heroes of four different castes and the heroines of four different castes lie separately in two's thay can embrace. But when the four heroes are in a line all the eight thus falling in one group in an established order, then embracing cannot occur. Through such similies and others they argue that there can only be coming together or juxtaposition of words and not coming together of connected meanings even to a little extent. This rule about immediacy will require to explain, than propriety and expectancy.

Tolkāppiyar had these three in mind when he spoke of "nirutta collum kurittu varu kilaviyum".

IX. sandhi– b) words

(sū: 106 to 108) sandhi or punarcci are of three kinds.

1. sandhi or punarcci which is not appropriate.

a) The seven kinds of poruḷkōḷ or framing prose orders. Here, however: 1) ,ārroḷukku (where no reordering for prose is necessary), and. 2) aṭimari mārru (where transposition of each line is allowed to come under the appropriate sandhi).

b) marūu moḷi – where changes in the colloquial language of established usage (like the following transpositions) occur:

nuṉikkompar for kompar nuṉi,
kaṭaikkaṉ for kaṇkaṭai.

(In passing it may be stated that these are ilakkaṇappoḷi according to others, and tarpuruṣa samāsam according to P. V.)

c. False statements,

e. g. "son of a barren woman climbed up on the horn of a hare and plucked the sky flowers".

d. Coming in of the other words paranthetically.

Instead of saying vallamerinta mallal yāṉaip peruvaḷuti, introducing the words "nalliḷaṅkōcar taṇtai" after the words vallam erinta and before mallal.

e. Attribute words brought from another place in the sentence.

e. g. iniya uḷavāka iṉṉāta kūral, kaṇiyirupak kāy kavarntarru, where iniya is taken to go with kaṇi, and iṉṉāta with kāy,

atikāram – this has been explained under sūtram number 89, thus far have been stated for the inappropriate sandhis in relation to words.

There are inappropriate sandhis in relation to words and suffixes, etc:-

i) suffixes,

e. g. koṭic cēvalāṉ which ought to be cēvar koṭiyāṉ.

(In passing it may be stated that P. V. also had referred to such transpositions.)

ii) case signs,

e. g. celvattuḷ ellāam talai which must be
celvam ellāvarruḷḷum talai.

iii) ummai,

e. g. cāttaṉ varutar kuriyaṉum āvaṉ. It must be cāttaṉ varutarkum uriyaṉāvaṉ.

iv) cāriyai,

e. g. oṉriṉai uṇarntāṉ which ought to be oṉraṉai.

(sū: 109) 3) sandhi or puṇarcci which is appropriate and inappropriate, i. e. approriate in some places and inappropriate in other places.

"nīlamayil ēṛivarum īcaṉaruḷ ñāṉamatalai".

When there is appropriate sandhi why should one speak of the other two. Though the beauty of sandhi, may not be there in those cases, there is metrical beauty and therefore they are adopted. In some places there will be economy of words. In some places there will also be elaboration of words. All these three are faultless sandhis. The first of these is important; the second is unimportant; and the third is of the middle variety.

(sū: 110) 4. The faulty sandhi, provided it is not ruled out for the purpose of enumeration. Many have described this in the faults prohibited in eḷuttatikāram.

Example has already been stated, viz. cōru kaṭaṉ mulaṅkirru uṇṭāṉ.

IX c) eḷuttu vikāram or change occurring because of letters (sū : 111)

They are of two kinds :

1) sandhi vikāram, i. e. vikāram or change occurring because of sandhi,

2) Non-sandhi vikāram.

(sū: 112) Again each of them are of two kinds:

1. vikāram described in eḷuttatikāram,

2. vikāram described under prosody.

(These are described by others).

(sū: 113) 2) Non-sandhi vikārams are of 4 kinds:

1) coming in of new letters,

e. g. cel > ceṉri
yātu > yāvatu

2) tirital – changing of one letter into another;

uyartiṇai mēṉa for mēla;

kaṇṇakaṉ parappu for kaṇṇakal;

vāḷāṉ veṭṭiṉāṉ for vāḷāḷ

In all these cases l has been changed into ṉ. (Historically it is ṉ which has become l.)

malaiyil vīḷaruvi for malaiyiṉ;

maḷai peyyil vāḷalām for peyyiṉ;

ṉ has been changed into l.

cuḷiyōṭu eṟipuṉal for cuḷiyoṭu eṟipuṉal.

The short o has changed inty ō.

māci for māki – here k has changed into c.

3. keṭutal or loss of a letter :

yāvar > yār : loss of v

yāṉai > āṉai loss of initial y

4. Metathesis or transposition:

tacai   catai

vaicāki   vaikāci

nāḷikēram   nārikēḷam

(P. V. also speaks of these four kinds of unconditional changes or non–sandhi changes.)

What is the difference between sandhi vikāram and non-sandhi vikāram ?

Sandhi vikāram is due to other causes or conditions – the initial letter of the coming word being a vowel, a plosive, a nasal or a semi vowel – the syntactical construction being dec-lensional or non-declensional, the metrical line or toṭai or ōcai requiring the change. The non-sandhi change is not so condi-tioned.

IX-d. Unconditional change of words (sū; 114)

1) tōṉṟal: e. g. cāttaṉ pacittuṇṭāṉ-

pacittu has come in.

2) tirital or change of a word form: kuruvi > kuṟīi.

3) keṭutal or loss of a word : peyarccol > peyar where col is lost. Similarly viṉai, iṭai and uri.

4) Transposition - nuṉik kompar for kompar nuṉi;

vantāṉ uḷutu for uḷutu vantāṉ, etc.

Similary ceytāṉ māṭam; iruntāṉ kuṉṟam.

These are transpositions, according to Tamil rule. There are transpositions according to Sanskrit rules but occurring in Tamil as well,

e, g. ceyta vēḷviyar for vēḷvi ceytavar, etc.

(This has been given as examples for inappropriate sandhi for words with suffixes.)

What is the difference between these two kinds of trans-positions ? In the Tamil rule, the standing word and the coming word get transposed without any change whatsoever. In the transposition according to Sanskrit rules, words are transposed after undergoing change.

vaikkum tannāḷai eṭuttu is the example for Tamil rule.
vāy piḷantuṟaṅkiṉāṉ is the example for the kind of Sanskrit transposition.

The conditional changes have been described by many others.

The following and other changes which are unconditional may be brought under the two sūtras 112 and 113.

peyar   >   pēr

nīyir   >   nīvir or nīr

evaṉ   >   eṉṉai or eṉ

poḷutu > pōḷtu or pōtu .

ñeṇṭar > ñeṇṭu, ñaṇṭar, ñaṇṭu, naṇṭu, neṇṭu; [teṅkinkāy > teṅkāy]

IX-e. Meaning and vikāram or change (sū : 115).

I. Because of the vikāram the meaning may be. changed,

e. g. 1) tōṉṟal: kā > kāvi > kāviri (already explained);

2) tirital: āram "necklace" > aram "a file".

(change of long vowel into short vowel).

aṉpaṉ "the lover" > aṟpaṉ. "the mean"

(change of the nasal into plosive).

3) keṭutal or loss:

e. g.   pālāṟu > pālā > pāl > pā (already explained);
mālai perṟāḷ "received a garland" > māl perṟāḷ
"received confusion" (loss of ai).

II.   Because of the changes or vikāram there will be no change in the meaning:

1) tōnṟal:

e. g.   puḷiyaṅkāy

2) tiṟital:

naṉṟeṉṟēṉ tiyēṉ (for tīyēṉ)
(shortening of the vowel)
poṉkuṭam or poṟkuṭam,

3) keṭutal or loss;

e. g.   pālai virumpiṉāṉ >. pāl virumpiṉāṉ;
ātaṉ tantai > āntai
koṟṟaṉukku makaṉākiya koṟṟaṉ   >   koṟṟaṉ koṟṟaṉ·

X.   Motivated (yōga) and unmotivated (rūḍhi) words   (sū: 116)

1.   The learned in some places interpret kāraṇap peyar (i. e. motivated words) as iṭukuṟip peyar (i. e. unmotivated words), e. g. karikaram.   Here in view of the word karam coming later, kari is not interpreted as that which has a hand or trunk, but merely as an elephant.

Similarly, phaṇi in phaṇi phaṇam is simply interpreted
as a snake.

Similarly, in vēlaṉ, because of the word vēl, vēlaṉ is interpreted as Murukaṉ and not as one who has a vēl.   Even otherwise, names like piṟai cūṭi, cakrapāṇi, etc. occur as proper names of men or bulls.   The names civakāmi, etc. occur as proper names of women folks or cows.

2.   The learned in some places interpret iṭukuṟi as kāraṇam.
(See sūtram "moḻip poruṭ kārṇaṉam" in Tolkāppiyam.)

3.   The learned in some places takes many
words as one word: ·

kōṭāta ceṅkōl-kōṭāta and cem mean only the same thing and behave like one word.   (This has been referred to in P. V. also.)

Apart from this, kumpakāraṉ, icaikāraṉ are taken as single words.

4.   The learned in some places consider one single word as though consisting of many words,

e. g. poruppaṉ means 'one who has as his, by right, the mountain', i. e. murukaṉ.

In this way the one word poruppaṉ is made equal to a number of words.   In all the examples given if the words which occur are taken according to their occurrence it will be ungrammatical or redundant.   Hence, the sūtram has been framed as though these four are contradictory cases.

XI.   pakupatam-analysable words   (Sū: 117)

In this sūtram the author enumerates some of the grammatical features of pakupatam or words analysable into roots and suffixes.   (pakupatam is neither pakāppatam or words unanalysable like kutirai, nor is it a toṭarmoḻi or a combination of words like "karuṅkutiraikaḷ".   All those which do not come under these categories are pakupatam.)

1.   (a)   The suffix will occur at the end of single words,
e. g. 'an' in vēlaṉ.

(b)   It can occur at the end of a combination of words,
e. g. cēvaṟ koṭiyaṉ, and
ceṉṉirak kuṭumi veṇcēvaṟ patākaiyaṉ.

(c)   The suffix will occur at the end of the first word when the next word is lost.

The language which is spoken by a Telugu person– teluṅkaṉ collutal toḻilai uṭaiya pāṭai-teluṅkaṉ collu.   It should occur as teluṅkaṉ collu.   Second word collu is lost and the suffix aṉ is attached to the first word.

(d)   The suffix is attached to the second word where the first word is lost.

In pañca ilakkaṇattāṉ the first word pañca is lost and the suffix is added to the second word.

The suffixes are limitless, and amongst them the pakupatam gets the appropriate suffix.

Note: While Naṉṉūl has limited and listed the suffixes in sūtram "aṉ āṉ", how can they be said to be limitless? The author explains his statement. The suffixes are either: (1) vowels like u in teluṅku, aruḷu, etc.; (2) or consonants as -m in Akattiyam; ṉ in makaṉ; ḷ in makaḷ; ār - in makār; v - in av, etc.; or (3) a syllabic letter consisting of a combination of a consonant and a vowel as mai in āṇmai, etc.; kai in uṭukkai, etc.; pu in kāppu, etc.; ci as in puṇarcci, etc.; vi in kuḷavi, etc.; -vu as in makavu, etc; or (4) words like maṉ in vaṭamaṉ, etc.; tal -in eḷututal, etc.; kāṭu in cākkāṭu, etc.; pāṭu in uṇappāṭu, etc; am in āṭṭam, etc.; uḷ in pāyttuḷ etc.; āṉai in vārāṉai, etc. These four come extensively without any limit. Omitting all the general suffixes which are useful only in a few instances, the author of Naṉṉūl has set limits only to the finite verbs which are of greater usage, and has given us the most important of them. Naṉṉūl should be understood in this sense. Its author should not be taken as having exhausted all kinds of suffixes.

He has not given us in the sūtram "aṉ āṉ" even the suffixes which he had mentioned in "Peyariyal", nor the twelve suffixes which he describes for viṉaiyeccam, nor the suffixes like piṉ, muṉ, kāl, kaṭai, vaḻi, iṭattu, etc. given for viṉaiyeccam by Tolkāppiyar; nor has he mentioned there the suffixes like ēl (uṇṭēl), āl (arrāl) i - y, (pāṭi, pōy), etc., mentioned in neither Tolkāppiyam nor Naṉṉūl; nor does he mention the suffixes like makaṉeṉal which occur in viyaṅkōḷ etc. and which do not come under the three categories mentioned, namely finite verb, noun, and viṉaiyeccam; nor has he mentioned the case of ṉakku etc., where a consonant like -k- comes like iṭainilai and acts as a suffix. In view of all these the author states that the suffixes stated by Naṉṉūl are not limitless.

The question next arises, how does he get that Naṉṉūl has given the list of important suffixes?

He gives the following reasons for that conclusion. The suffix aṉ is repeated twice. In other places, for instance, when he mentions cāriyai he specifies that he mentions only the general cāriyai. But when listing the suffixes in "viṉaiyiyal", he specifies that he is listing only the suffixes of verbs and even there of finite verbs only. Here also he mentions aṉ twice. He

contemplates that some of these suffixes will occur as suffixes of nouns. If these are general suffixes, there is no necessity for stating that some of these will occur in nouns as well. Even with reference to finite verbs, the suffix is stated only with reference to the finite verb and not with reference to the roots or medial suffixes. He has stated the other kinds of suffixes in "Peyariyal" and "Viṉaiyiyal" separately. If we study the sūtrams which go before and come after the sūtram, "aṉ āṉ", the context will make the position clear. Also he has not stated the four kinds of suffixes which we have mentioned earlier. There are also other reasons for our conclusion. He has not stated the suffixes for the two kinds of eccam; for peyarppakupatam; for iṭaippakupatam like marraiyatu, marraiyāṉ; for urip pakupatam like maḷavaṉ. People who do not understand this, get confused in many ways, by stating that that sūtram, "aṉ āṉ"; is: (1) general; (2) or general only to verbs and nouns; (3) such that aṉ is repeated unnecessarily twice; (4) such that in one case it is aṉ and in another, ilaṉ: that the sūtram consists of a mistake; and that they have corrected it. (This refers to the auther of Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam.) It has been stated that amongst the limitless suffixes, those which befit the case, or those which are appropriate, alone will occur. What is this appropriateness? In reply, the following cases are referred to:

i) The word kuḷaiyaṉ will get the aṉ suffix and not the i suffix. ceṭṭi gets the i and not the aṉ suffix. kātaṟai does not get either. viḷ in villaṉ and villi gets both the suffixes.

ii) The pakupatams will be attached or prefixed to:

1) case signs
   e. g. aruḷai;

2) particles of similarity
   e. g. atupōl - atupōla;

3) medial suffixes or iṭainilai
   e. g. aruḷāṉiṉṟu; or

4) cāriyai
   e. g. kōṉ, kāmattu.

Any one of these four coming alone may occur combined with others
   e. g. cāriyai and case sign aruḷiṉai:

a)   am + particle of comparison;
     vānampōla

b)   iṭainilai and cāriyai
     e. g. uṇṇā niṉṟaṉaṉ;

c)   cāriyai and suffix
     e. g. kōṉma.

The five kinds of iṭaiccol or particles which come at the end of words are: (1) case sign, (2) particle of comparison, (3) iṭanilai, (4) cāriyai, (5) vikuti or suffix. But the sūtram speaks only of four, omitting vikuti or suffix.   In a majority of cases pakupatam is formed with the suffix.   Therefore, the addition of the vikuti is separately stated as the first characteristic feature and the addition of the other four as the second characteristic feature (next in importance).

The question is raised if the five kinds of particles are added to the words one should get a combination of words, rather than pakupatam.   (Dr Caldwell has stated that pakupatams are old compounds.)   Why should one call the combination of words, a pakupatam?

If we study the commentaries and learn from great men, it will be clear that the following are not combinations of words, but only pakupatams:

e g. kuḷaiyaṉ (suffix – aṉ)

     cāttaṉatu (āṭai) (case sign-atu)
     pavaḷam pōl (vāy) – (particle of similarity)
     uṇṇāniṉṟu (medial suffix-āniṉṟu)
     kōṉ (cāriyai- ṉ).

The author of Naṉṉūl, when he considers the pakupatams, states that the combination of a word with an iṭaiccol is a single word.   He calls it a combination of words when he considers the fourteen kinds of alvaḷi.   Therefore, he calls them alvaḷic canti.   But in "urupiyal" he calls them vērrumaic canti.   He speaks in many places in very many ways. See "a-i-ummutal taṉivarum", "kurippeṉ eṉ pakutiyirraṉittiyaliṉri".   So does Tolkāppiyar; and so do Sanskrit authors.   Therefore, the learned have to be consulted.

iii)   The pakupatams may imply the meaning of case signs, (It may be noted that what is here explained corresponds to what is given in Taddhitaṉ in Vīracōḷiyam and Pirayōka Vivēkam.)

a)   second case:

   kuḷaiyaṉ   – "one who wears kuḷai or ear ring".
   tamiḷaṉ   – "one who speaks Tamil".
   poṉṉaṉ   – "one who has poṉ – 'gold' ".
   maruttuvaṉ – "one who compounds medicine".
   kūttaṉ   – "one who practises dances".
   mūvar   – "those who are three in number".

b)   Third case:

   tolkāppiyam   – "the work composed by Tolkāppiyar".
   kaṇakkaṉ   – "one who lives by working
                                              on accounts".
   ārralāṉ   – "one who has won by power".
   māṉi   – "one who is defective from the point
                                       of view of honour".
   kāmi   – "one who is deluded by lust".
   piṇiyaṉ   – "one who suffers from disease".

c)   Fourth case :

araci – " the daughter of aracaṉ 'king' "
arūraṉ – "the load of ārūr".
caivaṉ – "one who is a devotee of lord Śiva".
pākavataṉ – "one who sings and dances to pakavaṉ" or "who is the follower of pakavāṉ or Viṣṇu".

d)   Fifth case :

   vaṭamaṉ – "He who has come from the north".
   vāṇikaṉ – "One who has prospered by trade".

e)   Sixth case :

caivam – "the religion of Śiva".
marattatu – "what is on the branch of a tree".
kōṭṭatu – "the sharp point or edge of the tusk".
eḻuttatu – "the ilakkaṇam of eḻuttu"
cūttirattatu – the meaning of sūtra"

kuḷalatu – "the sound of the flute".   The twelve kinds of kiḷaippeyar or names of relationship like tamaṉ etc., come here.

f)   Seventh case :

maturaiyāṉ   -   "One who lives in Mudurai".

vicākaṉ   -   "One who was born on the day of vicākam".

aracaṉ   -   "One who was born in the caste of aracar".

ampalavaṉ   -   "One who dances in ampalam".

iv)   The pakupatams denote the meaning of case signs-meanings separately   (the examples under iii) show how pakupatams denote separately the meaning of each vērrumai (second case to seventh case).

v)   The pakupatams denote, in some places, "this has this, or this is in possession of this".   (The statement is made with reference to neuter singular.   Such statements should be repeated in each of the five genders and three persons.)   The examples may be selected from those given before or after the statement here.

vi)   The pakupatams in some places denote that "this is the possession of this".   The statement should be repeated for every gender and person.

vii)   The interrogative and demonstrative words and uriccol with number attributes, denoting the locative meaning, stand as iṭaiccol only.

Interrogatives:

yāṇṭu; yāṅku, eṅku, eṅkaṉ, evaṉ, yāvaṉ, eṅṅaṉam, and yāṅkaṉam.

Demonstratives:

āṉa, īṉa, aṅku, iṅku, uṅku, āṅku, īṅku, ūṅku, avaṉ ivaṉ, uvaṉ, ampar, impar, umpar, aṅṅaṉam, iṅṅaṉam, uṅṅaṉam.

iṭaiccol denoting the locative meaning and taking an attribute of number:

oruvayiṉ
iruvayiṉ
mūvayiṉ
eṇvayiṉ.

viii)   Pakupatams stand as denoting the quality or the abstraction alone:

veṇmai,   veḷuppu,   veḷḷai,   karumai,   karuppu;   āṇmai, peṇmai, kōṉmai; āṭutal, āṭal, āṭṭam.

ix)   pakupatams come: a) from a noun base like kuḷaiyaṉ; b) from a verb base like uṇṭāṉ;   c) from an iṭaiccol base like marratu, marraiyāṉ; and   d) from an uriccol base like kuḷavi, maḷavaṉ, and makavu.

x)   The peyarp pakupatam is divided into six kinds. i. e. poruḷ, iṭam, kālam, ciṉai, kuṇam, toḷil, as elaborated in Naṉṉūl.

xi)   The pakupatam, because of its various characteristic features, is called : a) pakupatam (no example is required); b) pakāppatam,   e. g., in, nīratuṭaittu, nīratu is taken as nīr;

in, mātar maṉaiy aṭāiyāḷ, – mātar is taken as mātu;

paṇṇai is taken as paṇ
kompar as kompu
nattam as nattu
vāya   as vāy
kaṇṇa   as kaṇ
vāṉam   as vāṉ
iruvayiṉ as iraṇṭu
coṉmai as col
poruṇmai as poruḷ.

(These were already explained.)

Thus the pakupatam is taken as pakāppatam.   The suffix or vikuti is called pakutip poruḷ vikuti by Tamilians (P. V. calls this svārthan pratyayas).

c)   viṉaik kurippu murru – implicit finite verb.

d)   viṉaik kurippup peyar – deverbalised, implicit verbs occurring as participle nouns.

e)   peyareccam – relative participle.

f)   viṉaiyeccam – verbal participle – for all these, examples are not required.

xii)   Though appearing in meaning as pakāppatam, they are interpreted as pakupatam.   Examples are given under xi-b.

xiii) Though appearing in form as pakāppatam, they are interpreted as pakupatams:

māṇpu interpreted as pakupatam, as māṇpiṉāḷ

pāymā	as pāymāvuṭaiyâr
kaḷi	as kaḷiyaṉ
maṭi	as maṭiyaṉ
kuṇam	as kuṇavāṉ
iṟai	as iṟaivaṉ
taccu	as taccar
kollu	as kollar
vēntu	as vēntar
aracu	as aracar
naṭu	as naṭuvan
amaiccu	as amaiccar,
pētai	as pētaiyāḷ

The author points out that the Tamil grammarians include these under ākupeyar or extended meaning.

xiv) pakupatam becomes divisible (already illustrated like kuḷaiyaṉ, ūraṉ).

xv) pakupatam becomes unanalysable (already illustrated like āṉa, īṉa).

xvi) pakupatams are analysable from one point of view and unanalysable from another point of view,

e. g. aṅṅaṉam, iṅṅaṉam, (ṅaṉam does not appear except in this bound form. Hence the two points of view).

xvii) Many pakupatams occur with one meaning only (no example required).

xviii) pakupatams with many meaning occur as one word.

a) Noun: e. g. aracan means–

(1) one who was born in the royal caste;

(2) one who belongs to a different caste, but was born to a king;

(3) a man of another caste who has assumed rulership;

(4) one who was born in the royal caste but relegated to become a member of another caste.

b) verb:

e. g. mān̄tāṉ- 1) (one) "died";

mān̄tāṉ- 2) "one who was great".

xix. pakupatam has some more characteristics. The words vayiṟaṉ, pallaṉ, poyyaṉ, etc. are not interpreted as these words stand, but as referring to one whose belly or vayiṟu, etc. is bigger or greater than all the other organs.

In kan̄taṉaiyatu, mayilaṉṉāḷ, etc., the uvama urupu 'aṉṉa' etc. come as the first part of the second word.

In caivaṉ, pārvati, kārttikēyaṉ, kāṅkēyaṉ, vaiṉatēyaṉ, the suffixes (pointed out in Vīracōḷiyam are the taddhita suffixes) come at the beginning.

Note: In the sūtram, pakupatam is divided into various kinds. The word pakupatam is of greater occurrence. pakāppatam is of lesser occurrence. The rest are common to both.

XII. Constructions

(sū : 118). vēṟṟumai and alvaḻi

When words come together, their construction and sandhi belong to one of the following:-

1) vēṟṟumai - declensional constructions (examples are not required).

2) alvaḻi or non-declensional construction or sandhi (illustrations are not required),

3) constructions or sandhi are common to both the above,

e. g. aṅcevi: for vēṟṟumai it means "inner ear"; for alvaḻi- "beautiful ear";

aṅkai is similarly interpreted;

[karuppu vēli:

for vēṟṟumai it means "karumpukku vēli";

for alvaḻi "karumpākiya vēli";]

puli koṉratu:

for alvaḻi it means   "pulikoṉratu"

for vēṟṟumai it means   "puliyaik koṉratu", as subject and object.

4) Construction or sandhi which does not come under the above three.

   a) viṉaittokai and paṉputtokai:

   where in the absence of necessary suffixes, there cannot be any construction (Tolkāppiyar brings them under marūu),

   e. g. porupaṭai, karuṅkutirai;

   b) words piled up–

   i) as aṭukkut toṭar where there is no connection between two words,

   e. g. paṭaipaṭai,

pappattu (pattu-p-pattu) – "ten each", where also there is no direct connection between the two words, pattu+pattu.

   ii) Onomatopoeia, –

   e. g. moṭumoṭu.

   c) i.   Where there is transposition of words,

   e. g. muṉṟil for ilmuṉ;

   ii.   Where non-existing things are mentioned by bringing together two words,

   e. g. muyarkōṭu–"the horn of the hare";

   iii.   Parenthetical words or phrases which intervene in the construction,

   e. g. cāttaṉ cōṟṟaip pakarkaṭ pacittu viruntōṭuṉṭāṉ

The author raises the question why a common construction has been accepted.   The answer is that this has been done for the purpose of accepting the following:

   1) potut tiṉai ⎫
   2) potup pāl   ⎪
   3) potup peyar ⎬   (examples are not required);
   4) potu viṉai ⎪
   5) potukkālam ⎭

   6) potu eccam, e. g. ōṭiya – which is peyareccam in ōṭiya cāttaṉ "cāttaṉ who ran", and viṉaiyeccam in ōṭiya vantāṉ "He came to run";

   7. potu muṟṟu,

   e. g. ceyyum – which is a finite verb and also a relative participle,

   8. potuviṭam – word common to three persons,

   e. g. ivaṉ coṉṉa col.

potuviṭam may also be illustrated by inclusive first person and inclusive second person.

The construction which does not come under the three categories are too elaborate to discuss here.

Construction – vēṟṟumai   (sū : 119):

In the vēṟṟumai construction the word may come in the following ways: 1) without the case sign being explicit, 2) with the case sign being explicit.   Each one of the eight cases coming in this way will give us eighteen kinds,

   e. g. I case : tokai viri

   cāttaṉ vantāṉ – cāttaṉ āṉavaṉ vantāṉ;

   8th case :

   kuyil vārāy ! – kuyilē vārāy.

If we take the word coming with the case sign as a separate construction of noun and case sign, we have the third construction under each case, which may then give us 3 × 8 = 24 constructions in all,

   e. g. cāttaṉai etc.

But a few do not accept this as vēṟṟumaic canti.   They will include it (word and case sign) under pakupatam.   In Sanskrit also this usage can be found.

XIII.   aṭukku – or piling up of words   (sū: 120)

Nouns, finite verbs, case signs, relative and conjunctive participle-these five pile up.   If we include iraṭṭaikkiḷavi also there will be six kinds:-

   1.   In each one of them,   one kind of word or particle may pile up–   case signs,

   e. g. ai: ariyāṉai antaṉartam cintaiyāṉai

   conjunctive participle (ceytu pattern)

   kaṇṭu kēṭṭu uṇṭu uyirtturru.

2. Various kinds pile up—
   various case signs,
   vāḻāṉ maruvārai vaḻikkaṉ veṭṭiṉāṉ
   (case signs āṉ, ai and kaṉ are piled up).

3. Piling up of positive forms—
   (See above).

4. Piling up of negative forms—
   e. g. "puraitīrā maṉṉā viḻamai;

   ēvavuñ ceykalāṉ tāṉtērāṉ;

   iṭippārai yillāta vēmarā maṉṉaṉ.

5. Positive and negative forms piling up together—
   cāttaṉaik kaṇṭu korraṉaik kāṇātu vantāṉ.

6. Many words piling up to give one meaning—
   e. g. paṭai paṭai
   vayiṟu moṭumoṭeṉratu.

7. Piling up of one word (ovvoru, etc.) for denoting different things—

   ovvoruvarkkē ivviru paṇam koṭu
   "Give two paṇams to each one"
   ippala carakkai veērākku – "Separate them into
   different heads".

8. Piling up so as to be common to both 6 and 7—
   vēruvēru in one place denotes many things as in "avaṉum vēru ivaṉum vēru", and in other place denotes the same person as in "aṭukkut toṭar" implying quickness,
   e. g. avaṉ vēruvēru "he is different different".

In the sūtram, iraṭṭaikkiḻavi or double imitatable words and words of onomatopoeia, words are separate as a class by themselves because whilst the other five are like twins among human beings or animals or eggs Iraṭṭaikkiḻavi is united as one unit like the double flower, double leave, double fingers, etc.

9. Piling up without any change. (Examples already given.)

10. Piling up with change—
    kaṇṇaṅkarēl, ciṉṉañciṟu, etc.

11. Piling up is of many other kinds as well. All the six mentioned in the beginning may pile up together in one sentence, or all of them with a few exceptions may pile up in one sentence,
   e. g. pacittu vanta cāttaṉ cōrrirkup paṭapaṭattāṉ.

(Here : 1 conjunctive participle, 2 relative participle, 3) noun, 4 case sign, 5) verb, and 6) iraṭṭaikkiḻavi have piled up.)

(sū: 121) Even those which are not aṭukku pile up and come like aṭukku in aṇi or rhetoric in a limited way,
   e. g. poyyāmai poyyāmai āṟṟiṉ;
   iṟantār iṟantār aṉaiyar.

XIV. Decisiveness or Definiteness (sū : 122)

The decision is of three kinds:

1) Deciding what a thing in reality is,
   e. g. deciding earth as earth; water as water; fire as fire.

2) Deciding as true what is not true,
   e. g. taking the brass for gold;
   taking rope for snake;
   mother of pearl for silver, etc.

3) Knowing that a thing is not what one assumes it to be, and yet the thing behaving as though it were a true thing,
   e. g. in śraddha a man is imagined to be the father or mother of the agent for the purpose offering food, in spite of the person knowing that the other is not the father or the mother.

Similarly, knowing fully well that the idol is made up of only mud, wood, stone or bronze, one imagines it to be God and worships it.

Similarly, the guru is worshipped as God.
(Pirayōka vivēkam calls this āhāryārōpa.)

Words also in an extended sense are things in the world. Therefore these decisions apply to words. The examples for correct decision are:

considering peyarccol, vinaiccol, itaiccol and uriccol as peyar, vinai, itai and uri respectively. This is correct decision. Examples for incorrect decision are:-

That consonant c and the long vowel ē come as the initial syllable in cēkkaliṅkam, meaning it is kaliṅkam in every part of it. Similarly, it is wrong decision to interpret attuvitam to mean that there are not two entities. For āhāryārōpam the following are the examples:

In māṇaṭi cērntār – cērntār is a verb. Knowing that, it is decided that it is a participial noun in that construction.

In vēloṭu ninrān – oṭu is a case sign and an itaiccol. Knowing that, it is interpreted as the verb koṇṭu.

In uḷutum vārān – vārān is a negative verb. Knowing that, it is interpreted (as varutalaic ceyyān,) i. e. as a positive verb.

In araviṇai yāteniṇ kollāmai the negative form kollāmai means the active and positive (dharma of love, etc.).

All the things and all the words denoting these things will come under these three catigories. Of these three the first and the third are not mistakes. The second alone is a mistake. See the kuṛaḷ :

"poruḷallavarṛaip poruḷeṇ ṛuṇaru
maruḷāṇā māṇāp piṛappu";
"nillā tavarṛai nilaiyiṇa venṛuṇarum
pullaṛi vāṇmai kaṭai".
The chapter on kūṭā oḷukkam refers to this.
The decision may arise out of five causes,

(sū: 123): 1) love or aṇpu, 2) mercey or aruḷ, 3) desire or ācai, 4) knowledge or aṛivu, and 5) ignorance or aṛiyāmai. But all these decisions will come under the three categories mentioned above.

XV. ēka vākya (sū : 124)

A group of words may be either one sentence or many sentences, ēka vākya or bhinna vākya as the Sanskritists say:

e. g. cāttaṇ brought rice, paddy, green dhal, etc.
koṛṛaṇ brought flowers, leaves, fruits, etc.

tēvaṇ brought pepper, tamarind, etc.,
pūtaṇ brought saree, tāli, ornaments, etc.,
The king came with his ministers,
The hero married the heroine.

These many groups of words come with the meaning of one subject-matter, namely marriage. If we convert the first finite verb into ceyaveṇ eccam this will be clear. This idea will be seen in the verse "kāṇavar iriya," quoted under the sūtram "vinaimuṛṛēvinai yecca mākalum".

Example for bhinna vākya:

He sent cāttaṇ northward for marriage.
He sent koṛṛaṇ eastward for the funeral.
He sent tēvaṇ southward for purchase.
He sent pūtaṇ westward to sell honey.

All these are the actions of one person. But one sentence seems to be contrary to the other. There is no connection with one another. Therefore they are different sentences. This idea will be clear in the verse "pēcariya varākam". (In the sūtram there should be one central idea and, therefore, only one sentence. Even if there are many sentences they should be interpretable as one sentence.)

XVI. Change of meaning, form, etc. (sū : 125)

Change of letters, change of words – these two have already been mentioned. Change of meaning also occurs if appropriate everywhere, i. e. in all kinds of words.

a) Change of letters:

ṇ	>	ṛ	poṇkuṭam	> porkuṭam
k	>	c	māki	> māci
ī	>	i	tīyēṇ	> tiyēṇ
ā	>	a	ārumukam	> arumukam

b) Change of words forms:

uṭuttu	>	uṭīi
velka	>	venṛīka
ellāpporuḷum	>	epporuḷum
kaḷuvāta kāl	>	kaḷākkāl

pariyavarai	>	pararai
maravattu	>	marattu
terivān	>	terikirpān
kāṇpāṇ	>	kāṅkirpāṇ

c) Change of meaning:

peṇṇēval ceytoḻukum āṇmai– Here the finite verb should be oḻukuvāṇ, and its meaning is given here by the relative participle oḻukum.

"neñcattār kātal avarāka

veytuṇṭal añcutum" – Here the finite verb should be in singular number añcuvaṇ. That meaning itself is given, in a changed condition, by the plural finite verb añcutum.

tāṇum tērum pākaṇum–
vanteṇ nalaṇuṇtāṇ

Here the meaning of the finite verb uṇṭār, in changed conditions, is given by the singular number uṇṭāṇ.

"ñāyiṟu paṭṭu vantāṇ" – Here verbal participle should be of the ceya pattern. The meaning of that, under the changed condition, is denoted by the verbal participle of the ceytu pattern.

eḻuttut tiripu and col tiripu have already been stated.

With reference to these tiripu, there are a number of schools of thought. One school holds that there is only col tiripu and not poruḷ tiripu. Second school holds that there is only poruḷ tiripu and not col tiripu. Others who have accepted both the kinds of tiripus have stated in conclusion: "col tiriyiṇum poruḷ tiriyā viṇaikkuṟai", thus contradicting themselves. A few others hold eḻuttuttiripu is only cārpeḻuttu (i. e. dependent letters or combinational variants).

Some others hold that col tiripu is like "kiḷi" becoming "kiḷḷai", mayil becoming maññai. There are also people who hold that the following are poruttiripu

"The white flowers of the mango have become unripe green fruit". "Green unripe fruit of kaḷā has become a black fruit".

"The blackness of the hair has become white".
"The sweetness of the milk has turned sour".

XVII. Homonymy and accents (sū: 126)

There are words with many meanings but of one form. The learned pronounce these with different intonation patterns. This homonymy occurs in individual words and in combination of words. In single words the homonymy occurs often in verbs, e. g. naṭa, vā, etc., are single verbs or words consisting merely of their roots If they are to be understood as finite verbs they have to be uttered with an accent – eṭuttal. If they are verbal nouns they have to be pronounced without accent. If kaṭṭu is a finite verb (imperative) ending in a rounded u, it has to be pronounced with an accent. If it is a verbal noun ending in a unrounded u, it has to be pronounced without an accent.

In neṟi niṇṟār nīṭu vālvār.

Either of the verbs can be taken as a participial noun when the other will be a finite verb. The participial noun should be pronounced with an accent. The finite verb has to be pronounced without an accent.

If ceyyum is a relative participle, it has to be pronounced with an accent. If it is a finite verb it has to be pronounced without an accent.

If "ampalattāṭi" is a noun it receives an accent. If "āṭi" is a conjunctive participle it receives no accent. All these are homonymous single words.

Combination of words:

Homonymous combination of words are of three kinds.

1) Where the form of the word does not change whilst meanings do change:

"kuḻal vaḷar mullaiyiṟ kōvalar tammoṭu
malalait tumpi vāyvaittūta

With reference to kōvalar, the phrase kuḻal vaḷarmullai "mullai fluit".

With reference to the bee it refers to "mullai" the flower.

2) aktaḷakitu; ataṉai; avarrai;
niṟuveṉṟāṉ; kūveṉṟāṉ ēveṉṟāṉ
colleṉṟāṉ; viḷḷeṉṟāṉ

Here the words alone have changed but not the meaning.

3) In the third category both meanings and word forms are changed.

cempoṉ patiṉ toṭi – which is either:

1) cempu onpatiṉ toṭi,   or

2) cempoṉ patiṉ toṭi.

Here, for clarification, words should be pronounced with accent and without accent.

XVIII. Accent (sū : 127)

The ōcai are of two kinds: eṭuttal – accented; paṭuttal – unaccented (pronounced with or without emphasis).

A few say that there are four kinds, and add nalital and vilaṅkal. Many decide that there are only three.

P. V. has referred to these accents in connection with the homonyms as follows.

There are three pitch accents or svara in Sanskrit. They are: udātta, anudātta and svarita. These are equated with Tamil accents eṭuttal, paṭuttal, nalital respectively. The participial noun receives the accent, whilst the verb having the same form does not. Thus it is the accent that differentiates them. The author points out that, according to some, it is the verb or predicate which receives the accent whilst participial noun receives none.

In neṟiniṉṟār nīṭu vālvār, neṟiniṉṟār is a participial noun and hence is accented. vālvār is the verb; therefore it is not accented.

Homonyms have different meanings. They are called nānārthapada's. They have the same phonetic form – vaṇṇavatbhāva. These are called sarūpaśliṣṭa padas. They are of three kinds. The first variety is where the words are the same but the meanings are different.

mullai means "the flute" in one case and "the jasmine" in the other.

The second variety of sarūpaśliṣṭa is where the meaning does not change but the forms of words are changed,

e. g. aktu, iktu, uktu – demonstratives ending in unrounded u.

atu, itu, utu are demonstratives ending in rounded u. These do not change in meaning though they are different in form. All the six when followed by the phrase "aḷakitu" assume only three forms. atu and aktu become aktaḷakitu, itu and iktu become iktaḷakitu;

Of the above six demonstrative pronouns, when they take case sign ai, and the empty morpheme aṉ, atu and aktu stand as ataṉai; itu and iktu become itaṉai; utu and uktu become utaṉai. Here also accent would differentiate them.

The third variety consists in the same phonetic form, but where the word is different and so also the meaning.

cempoṉpatiṉ palam: This is taken in two different ways where the words and meanings also change: (1) cempoṉ + patiṉpalam – "pure gold is ten palas in weight";

2) cempu + oṉpatiṉpalam – "the copper is nine palas in weight".

kuṉṟērāmā – This is taken as kuṉṟu + ērāmā and
kuṉṟu ēru + āmā

"the deer does not get up the hillock" and "the āmā which gets up the hills".

nāṭiyātu :

(1) nāṭiyātu: nāṭi is pulse, (2) nāṭu + yātu – nāṭu is "country". Here also these will be differentiated by accent.

Tolkāppiyar calls them "iraṭṭuṟa moḷital – "having two different meanings".

Parimēlaḷakar therefore calls the phrase "periyāraip piḷai-yāmai" as iraṭṭuṟa moḷital. Without understanding all these, Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar tries to bring these usages in an unnatural way under the sūtram "oruporuḷ iṟucol pirivila varaiyār", which he has to interpret against all canons of interpretation as

"iruporul orucol pirivila", and gives the above mentioned illustrations.

The nānārtha padas have varṇavat bhāva or phonetic similarity. We have been considering them as one word having many meanings. But the Sanskritists hold that they are not one word or phrase. They are really many words. If there are two meanings they have to be repeated twice. Thus does Amarasimha. See his speaking of payakṣīram (paya = "milk") and again payāmbuja (paya = "water") "Cēnāvaraiyar similarly interprets "ulakam" in the sūtram, "kālamulakam", as a word to be repeated. Tolkāppiyar also follows the same procedure, when he speaks of "tevvuk kolar poruṭṭē" in one sūtram and "tevvup pakaiyākum" in another sūtram, whilst interpreting the homonym tevvu. kaṇ is the locative case sign and also the periphrastic locative case sign. Therefore in one sūtram he speaks of "kaṇṇeṇappeyariya vērrumaikkilavi" and repeats it in another sūtram which enumerates the vibhaktiyarthas.

Appaiya Dīkṣitar gives the example of two fruits ripening in one stalk – ēkanāla avalambi phala dvandvam. When a homonym is repeated once, the environment for thinking of many meaning arises along with such repetitions.

"ikku" is an empty morph added to words āṭi and cittirai, where the initial of "ikku" is lost in sandhi in a locative compound. The resulting form is "āṭikkuk koṇṭān" or "cittiraikkukkoṇṭān". Again, āṭi and cittirai may be taking the dative ku; then also the resulting forms will be as above. In the latter case the dative ku must receive an accent, whilst the empty morph ikku does not.

nalital is svarita. That final part of kali verse, which is called cu varitakam, is so named because of svarita, or nalital, occurring at the final or at the penultimate position. Even when an additional ka occurs in rūpaka and dīpaka, svarita gets an additional ka and becomes svaritakam. Without understanding this, Tamil commentators explain cuvaritakam as curintu iṛutal, i. e. ending in a whirling way.

(sū: 128) In some cases there is only one canonical form for one meaning. As these are clear, no example is mentioned here.

The learned speak that there are cases of:

1) many canonical forms having one meaning.

e. g. for the past conjunctive participle meanings there are the following many canonical forms or patterns,

namely – ceytu, ceypu, ceyyā, ceyyū;

for the present tense sign there are the following forms– āninṛu, kinṛu, kiṛu.

2) One form for many meanings,

e. g. "ceyyum". This is applicable to human and non-human to the masculine and feminine to the singular and plural to the finite verb and the non-finite verb;

ceyyā and uṇṭu are forms which have many meanings as already pointed out in "viṇaiyiyal".

XIX. Meanings – Motives (sū: 129)

Meanings are assigned to words for the following fifteen reasons, taking into consideration the proper place where they will apply.

1) poruḷ. First, deciding upon the meaning one requires, one divides the words accordingly. The author gives many examples from the Saiva Siddhānta sāstras. He finally gives the example-

cempu onpatiṇ palam – If one decides that it is about copper he divides the words into "cempu onpatiṇ palam". If it is decided it refers to gold; then words are divided into "cempoṇ patiṇ palam" and interpreted accordingly.

2) atikāram-topic decides the meaning.

"kūṭil iṇpam piriyiṛ ṛuṇpam". If this occurs in akam poetry it is interpreted thus: "if the heroine embraces the hero there is limitless joy. But if, for reasons of further education, embassy, in enemy action, amassing wealth, etc. the hero departs, there is limitless misery".

If the statement occurs in puṛam poetry it will mean the following-

"If one were to learn or practise arts with the learned there is limitless joy. If because of undertakings like vratas, one leaves for learning or practicing, then it is limitless misery".

3) mu<u>nn</u>am:

The author of Na<u>nn</u>ūl explains it in a few words in the sūtram, "mu<u>nn</u>atti<u>n</u> u<u>n</u>arum ki<u></u>aviyum u<u></u>avē". Tolkāppiyar elaborates it in the sūtram, "ivvi<u>t</u>attu immo<u>l</u>i". Reference may be made to these two sūtras.

4) utti or yukti:·

Tolkāppiyar elaborates them under forty-four heads. They may be learnt there.

5) ve<u>l</u>ippa<u>t</u>ai- Explicit statements.

6) ku<u>r</u>ippu or implication.

7) meyppā<u>t</u>u – see in the "meyppā<u>tt</u>iyal".

8) a<u>n</u>moli (bhahuvrīhi) or exocentric compound.

9) o<u>tt</u>u – see in Ta<u>nt</u>iyalaṅkāram.

10) āku<u>r</u>eyar-extended meaning.

11) uvamai – simile.

12) i<u>r</u>aicci – Tolkāppiyar states that "i<u>r</u>aicci tā<u>n</u>ē poru<u>t</u> pu<u>r</u>attatuvē".

13) upacāram – figurative usage.

14) ācai – desire.

15) u<u>n</u>mayakku – forgetting what has been learnt.

These various kinds of interpretations do not come under the nine kinds of poru<u>l</u>kō<u>l</u> or prose order or under the seven kinds described in the next sūtram 130.

These 15 kinds of interpretations occur mainly in Tolkāppiyam poru<u>l</u>atikāram, in Kalittokai, in Paripā<u>t</u>al and Da<u>n</u>di, while in other places they are of rare occurrence.

XX. The learned speak of seven kinds of divisions (sū: 130):

1) uyarti<u>n</u>ai iya<u>r</u>peyar – common nouns of the human category.

i<u>r</u>ai is one such noun. To start with, it is common to both singular and plural. But there is the coming word; then it changes according to the latter, as i<u>r</u>aiva<u>n</u> vantā<u>n</u> or as i<u>r</u>aivar vantār, in the masculine. Similarly, kō becomes kō<u>n</u> or kōkka<u>l</u>.

vē<u>n</u>tu as vēnta<u>n</u>　　　or vēntar
aracu as araca<u>n</u>　　　or aracar

amaiccu as amaicca<u>n</u>　　or amaiccar
kavi as kaviña<u>n</u>　　　or kaviñar

The following come in the feminine:

pe<u>n</u>tu　becomes　pe<u>n</u>tā<u>tt</u>i　or pe<u>n</u>tuka<u>l</u>
vēcai　becomes　vēcaiyā<u>l</u>　or vēcaiyār
umai　becomes　umaiyā<u>l</u>　or umaiyār
taiyal　becomes　taiyalā<u>l</u>　or taiyalār

2) ak<u>r</u>i<u>n</u>ai iya<u>r</u>peyar – common nouns of the non-human category (no example is necessary).

3) uyar ti<u>n</u>aip poru<u>l</u>il cātiyorumai – group singular in the human category-

civikai po<u>r</u>uttā<u>n</u> and cātiyava<u>n</u> irantā<u>n</u>;
tā<u>n</u>um ata<u>n</u>ai- va<u>l</u>aṅkā<u>n</u> paya<u>n</u> <u>r</u>uvvā<u>n</u>-

These statements are made as being true to all and not to any one single individual. Therefore the singular words without reference to the coming word leave off their singular number and denote only plural.

Hence these are examples of uya<u>r</u>ti<u>n</u>aic cātiyorumai. (P. V. refers to this).

Forgetting this, there are people who have corrected this ku<u>r</u>a<u>l</u> as "civikai po<u>r</u>uttār".

In A<u>r</u>attuppāl occur the phrases ilvā<u>l</u>vā<u>n</u> e<u>n</u>pā<u>n</u> and avvittu a<u>l</u>ukkā<u>r</u>u u<u>t</u>aiyā<u>n</u>ai. In Poru<u>t</u>pāl occurs the phrase "u<u>t</u>aiyā<u>n</u> aracaru<u>l</u> ē<u>r</u>u. In Kāmattup pāl occurs the ku<u>r</u>a<u>l</u>, "cellāmai u<u>n</u>tē<u>l</u> e<u>n</u>akkurai ma<u>rr</u>uni<u>n</u>

valvaravu vā<u>l</u>vārk kurai".

They have not considered this very extensive usage in "muppāl"; perhaps they must have forgotten to correct all these.

4 ak<u>r</u>i<u>n</u>aic cātiyorumai- group singular of the non-human category-

nūle<u>n</u>ap pa<u>t</u>uvatu; añcuvatu añcāmai pētaimai;
ulakattār u<u>n</u>te<u>n</u>patille<u>n</u>pā<u>n</u>

nērvatu nā<u>t</u>u. [These are general statements not restricted to any one book or country. Therefore without reference to

the coming word, the singular non-human words have left their singular number and denote only the plural. Hence these are ak<u>r</u>iṇaic cātiyorumai.]

5) uyartiṇaip poruḷil cātip paṇmai.

6) ak<u>r</u>iṇai poruḷil cātippaṇmai–

(Group plural in the human and non-human categories):
"eṇṇeṇpa ēṇai eḻutteṇpa ivviraṇtum
kaṇṇeṇpa vāḻum uyirkku".

Here we have both the kinds of group plurals.

7) One word alone goes separately to many places–
"kaṭumoḷiyum kaiyikanta taṇṭamum vēntaṇ
aṭumu<u>r</u>aṇ tēykkum aram".

Here "aram" or file goes separately with kaṭumoḷi and taṇṭam. (P. V. refers to this.)

In "poruḷkaruvi kālam viṇaiyiṭaṇō ṭaintum
iruḷ tīra veṇṇic ceyal",

The word oṭu goes separately with the following five words:

1) poruḷ, 2) karuvi, 3) kālam, 4) viṇai, and 5) iṭaṇ though standing with iṭaṇ.

The initial dīpakam, medial dīpakam, final dīpakam etc. also come under this head. All these seven escape from the position in which they are, and get separated.

There are those who state that ak<u>r</u>iṇai iya<u>r</u>peyar and cātiyorumai have the same grammatical feature. There are those who state that uyarṭiṇaic cātiyorumai and ak<u>r</u>iṇaiccāti yorumai have the same grammatical features. There are others who deny the existence of cātip paṇmai. There are those who will include the last category under orucol nin<u>r</u>u taṇittaṇi utavutal under poruḷkōḷ or under pirippeccam. They have not developed the intricate grammatical acumen.

XXI. Literary composition (sū : 131)

Composition or ceyyuḷ may be either ilakkaṇam or grammar, ilakkiyam or literature, and urai or prose. The

question is raised: can ilakkaṇam urai be ceyyuḷ ? In reply he quotes the following sūtrams:

"cūttiram ku<u>r</u>itta yāppi<u>r</u> <u>r</u>ākum"

"palvakaittātuvi<u>n</u>"

"n ū<u>r</u>pā vakaval".

Nacci<u>n</u>arkkiṇiyar also states–

"cūttiramuñ ceyyuḷ".

The grammatical works exhibit parts of metrical beauty as follows :–

"vitittaṉa ceytalum
vilakkiyaṉa voḷitalum (alliteration)
"poruppu villipāl viruppam ilarē" (assonance).

Even when writing examples they write with alliteration and assonance as in the following :

"uṇṭāṉ tin<u>r</u>āṉ ōṭiṉāṉ pāṭiṉāṉ".

Many, moreover, use the following expressions :

"ilakkaṇac ceyyuḷ"

"ilakkiyac ceyyuḷ"

"uraic ceyyuḷ".

The Sanskritists also are of this view. Note carefully the meaning of the word ceyyuḷ.

EPILOGUE I

SOME PECULIARITIES OF THE TAMIL OF THE VĪRACŌḺIYAM AGE

By the time of Vīracōḻiyam more foreign words have come to be introduced into Tamil. The initial occurrences of sounds have become enlarged. Tolkāppiyar ruled out the occurrence of 'c' with short 'a'. But this rule no longer was valid even in the caṅkam age as we get there a number of words beginning with 'ca'.

Tolkāppiyar ruled out the initial occurrence of ñ + a. But words like ñamali occurred even in the caṅkam age. Similarly, according to Tolkāppiyar, 'y' can occur initially only with the long vowel ā. But in Perunkatai, Taṇṭi and other works, words like yakkaṉ, yavaṉaṉ, yantiram, yukti, yūki, yūpam, yōkam and yawkantarāyaṇaṉ occurred. Therefore Vīracōḻiyam writes that initially (1) all the twelve vowels, (2) k c t n p m along with all vowels, (3) v except with u, ū, o, ō, (4) y with the vowel a, ā, u, ū, o and au, (5) ñ with the vowel ā, e and o occur.

Referring to the final occurrence of sounds, we find a change from the position explained in Tolkāppiyam where 'e' and 'o' occurred at the end of aḷapeṭai as separate syllables. But by the time of Yāpparuṅkalam uyiraḷapeṭai came to be pronounced as one sound like pluta in Sanskrit. Therefore 'e' and 'o' occurred no longer finally. There was only one word uriñ which ended in the palatal nasal ñ But this word went out of existence giving rise to the forms urāy or uracu or uriñcu. Therefore there was no ñ ending. There was in the age of Tolkāppiyam only one word ending in dental 'n' - veriṉ; but it came to be written with an alveolar nasal ending. Thus amongst the nasals ñ-dental nasal 'n' ceased to occur at the end. Tolkāppiyar mentioned four words ending in v, viz. av, iv, uv and tev. But these

words assumed altered forms as a, i, u and tem. Therefore 'v' also never occurred finally; and Vīracōḻiyam gives the following final sounds- alveolar ṉ, m; retroflex ṇ, y, r, l, ḷ, ḻ; all the vowels except short e and o. (Amongst vowels: a, ā, i, ī, u, ū, ē, ai, ō, au; among consonants: ṉ, m, n, y, r, l, ḷ, ḻ.)

More of Sanskrit words flowed in, and as a result combinations, which were avoided in Tolkāppiyar's age, like tr., etc. came to be popular in the century subsequent to that of Vīracōḻiyam, especially in the works of Oṭṭakkūttar. But in the age of Vīracōḻiyam the old clusters alone were recognized; and after Oṭṭakkūttar there was a feeling that new clusters were spoiling the genius of the language. Therefore Pavaṇanti came to reconsider the position at the end of Oṭṭakkuttar's age (end of twelfth century). He laid down only the old rules about the clusters. To avoid clusters, svarabhakti was introduced. We have discussed this under "Orthography and its Influence" wherefrom the following is taken.

Vīracōḻiyam describes for the first time the method of Tamilizing foreign words as summarily as possible. This fashion of Tamilizing Sanskrit words is described at the end of Tātup paṭalam so that the roots may explain the Tamilized forms of dhatus.

There are in Sanskrit five vargas or groups, namely velar, palatal, retroflex, dental and labial, each consisting of: (1) the voiceless; (2) the aspirated voiceless plosive; (3) the voiced; (4) the aspirated voiced plosive; and (5) a corresponding nasal. Since the aspirated voiceless plosives, the voiced plosives, and the voiced aspirates are not found in Tamil they have to become perforce the corresponding voiceless plosive.

Further, k ṣ in Sanskrit > kk in Tamil

e. g., pakṣam > pakkam

(i. e. k doubles, and since there is no ṣ it is lost).

ṣ k > kk; i. e. k doubles and ṣ is lost,

e. g. pariṣkaram > parikkaram;

ṣ (intervocally) = ṭ

e. g. puruṣa > puruṭaṉ;

s > c (e. g.) Sabda > cattam;

s > c (initially) Sakala > cakalam;

s > t (elsewhere) vatsa > vattan

dāsa > tātan;

h > zero (initially) hara > araṇ;

h > y/k (elsewhere), e. g. mahitalam > mayitalam or makitalam.

Clusters, except those of (1) geminated consonants; (2) of nasals and their homorganic plosives; (3) of y, r, or l combining with both the two kinds of clusters above, are not permitted in Tamil. Therefore Sanskrit clusters have to undergo some change or other. In the clusters of consonants, of which the second member is y, r or l, the epenthetic vowel 'i' comes between them to break the cluster.

vākya > vākkiyam

putra > puttiran

sukla > cukkilam

If 'v' is the second member of the cluster the epenthetic vowel is u.

pakva > pakkuvam.

The commentary adds that if 'm' or 'n' is the second member u comes in as the epenthetic vowel.

padma > patumam

ratna > aratanam

Certain sounds do not occur initially in Tamil, and if these occur in foreign words a prothetic vowel is added. If the initial is 'y', the prothetic vowel is 'i'.

yakṣa > iyakkaṇ

If the initial is 'l' the prothetic vowel is either 'i' or 'u' depending on the next vowel. If it is a back vowel the prothetic vowel is 'u', otherwise i.

lakṣmaṇa > ilakkumaṇan

lōka > ulakam

If the initial is 'r', depending on the next vowel as above the prothetic vowel is i, a, or u.

rāma > irāmaṇ

raṅgam > araṅkam

rōmam > urōmam

This represents a state of affairs where the colloquial language also was taken into consideration in framing the rule. [See mahitalam > mayitalam.]

Naṉṉūl points out the common letters and the special letters for Sanskrit. ṛ, ṛ:, ḷ, ḷ: and the anusvāra, and the visarga amongst the vowels, are all special to Sanskrit, whilst the rest ten are common to both Sanskrit and Tamil. Sanskrit has no short 'e' and short 'o'. Amongst the consosnants in the five vargas the middle three in each are special to Sanskrit. But the first, the voiceless plosive, and the last, the nasals, are common. So are y, r, l and ḷ. The aspirated voiceless plosive, the voiced plosive and the voiced aspirated plosive– these three in each varga – in all 15– are special to Sanskrit. s, ṣ, ś, h, k, these five are also special to Sanskrit. jīhvamūlya and upadmānīya also are special to Sanskrit. Thus 25 are common letters and 28 are special letters to Sanskrit. These 28 naturally undergo change when Tamilized.

ṛ	∞	i	ṛsabam	=	iṭapam
ṛ	∞	ir	ṛṣi	=	iruṭi
ā		ai	sītā	=	cītai
ī		i	kumārī	=	kumāri

Naṉṉūl gives all the rules given in Vīracōḷiyam. But it makes certain omissions and additions. It omits the following because it is colloquial:

h ∞ y.

It adds the following:

ṣ initially ∞ c,

e. g. ṣaṣti ∞ caṭṭi;

j medially ∞ y,

e. g. ajaṇ ∞ ayaṇ;

s (medially) ∞ y,

smāsāṇam ∞ mayāṇam.

I have elsewhere explained this fashion of Tamilizing foreign words from a historical point of view (pp 173–179, "History of Tamil language". Deccan College Publication) and this may be read as part of this essay. The respective scholars for the other Dravidian languages can similarly explain the changes at least as they occur amongst the ordinary people.

Naṉṉūl differs from Vīracōḻiyam in that, though it provides for new developments it does not give up older usages which still persist in literary works. Therefore, in addition to rules laid down by Vīracōḻiyam, Naṉṉūl gives rules for the ending which have gone out of use, namely ñ, n, v, e and o.

At the end of the portion on col or Morphology, Vīracōḻiyam warns against following corrupt usages. Vīracōḻiyam recognizes colloquial usages but still protests against what it calls corrupt usages. By carefully noting the usages of the great, the correct usage might be found out. He gives as illustrations of certain dialectic variations which he considers should not be followed. But these usages are of special importance, by their having been current among the un-sophisticated.

ḷ and ḻ alternate, e. g.

(a) ḻ for ḷ

nāḷi, kōḷi, mūḷai, uḷakku, vāḷai, vaḷi (respectively for nāḻi, kōḻi, mūḻai, uḻakku, vāḻai, vaḻi);

(b) ḷ for ḻ, e. g.

paḷiṅku, taḷikai, iḷamai, (respectively for paḻiṅku, taḻikai and iḻamai).

It will be thus seen that ḷ and ḻ have come to fall together at least amongst some people.

In the Sandhi rules ḻ behaves like ḷ,

e. g. vāḷ + nāḷ > vāṇāḷ.

This alteration or the merger of ḷ and ḻ has become a well-established fact in the southern dialect of Tamil land today. The commentator writes that in his age the alternation took place in the region around the land of black soil.

The second alternation which he condemns is that of geminated alveolar plosive becoming geminated palatal plosive:

veṟṟilai   >   veccilai
muṟṟam   >   muccam
kaṟṟai   >   kaccai

By hyper-urbanization the following occur:

mattiyam   >   maṟṟiyam
piccai   >   piṟṟai
vāṅkiviṭṭāṉ > vāṅkiviṟṟāṉ

By this time the geminated alveolar must have become geminated dental plosive, and the geminated dental plosive, geminated palatal plosive in certain environments, namely after 'y' or 'i', which environment was not observed in certain hyper-urbanizations as in the above instances.

The commentator says that this alternation took place in the kāvēri, and river Pālāṟu area,

e. g., nellukkā niṉṟatu– "It stood by the side of paddy"; vīṭṭukkāniṉṟatu – "It stood by the side of house".

The commentator points out the corrupt usages which he condemns.

itaṉaippākka for itaṉaippārkka
aṅkākka for aṅkāka– "for that side"
iṅkākka for iṅkāka– "for this side"
ippaṭik koṟṟa for ippaṭikotta
appaṭik koṟṟa for appaṭik kotta
cēttunilam for cēṟṟunilam
āttuk kāl for āṟṟukkāl

Here the geminated alveolar plosives have become geminated dental plosive, which is a characteristic feature of modern Tamil. The last but one alternation which the commentator condemns is the replacement of 'l' by 'y'.

kōḻimuṭṭai   >   kōyimuṭṭai
vāḻaippaḻam   >   vāyaippayam

This is an alternation which is a characteristic feature of one social dialect of Madras District and its surrounding places.

The last alternation condemned is that of replacement of 'y' by 'c'.

uyir   >   ucir
mayir   >   macir

(The original Dravidian form had only 'c' in these places as shown by Kannada, etc. which became y only in the Tamil classical dialect.)

EPILOGUE II

THE TAMIL ALPHABET SYSTEM
IS IT AN ADAPTATION ?

The earliest known script used for Tamil, as far as our present knowledge goes, seems to be related to the so-called Brahmi script, which was utilized by Asoka to write down the Prakrit languages, naturally, so modified as to suit the sound system of Tamil language, as is proved by the old Tamil cave inscriptions and the Arikamedu graffiti ('Ancient India,' 1946, pp. 109-14; Sivaramamurthy, 1952, pp. 57-158; Mahadevan, 1968, p. 83). The later Tamil inscriptions in all their varieties are traced to this script, by the Epigraphists and others mentioned above.

The earliest work now known, on Tamil grammar dealing partly with orthography is Tolkāppiyam, whatever the age one may assign to it. The question is whether from the descriptions of a few graphemes in that old grammar, one can conclude that the author knows of the script mentioned above. Fortunately, there is a clue, though he describes the form of only a few graphemes. Tolkāppiyam describes certain graphemes which were written with puḷḷi (புள்ளி), a dot or a small stroke, namely the pure consonants, the letters e (எ), o (ஒ) and the makarakkurukkam respectively in sūtrams 14, 15, and 16 (Tolkāppiyam Eḷuttatikāram). When we study the form of other vowels in Tamil, except in the case of 'e' and 'o' in ancient times, it is the long vowels which get additional marks to differentiate them from the short vowels, making the form of the short vowel primary or basic. This ought to have been the case with the middle vowels. One would therefore expect the short 'e' and 'o' to have the basic forms as in the current writing system of Tamil and the long vowel to be differentiated by additional marks. But this is not so. The basic forms denote the longer vowels 'ē' and 'ō' and a dot is added to each one of them to denote their shorter variety, namely 'e' and 'o'. This is the significance of sūtram 16.

What is the significance of this statement? The script should have been adapted from a language where the 'ē' and 'ō' were basic because there were no short 'e' and 'o' available in that language. When that script is adapted to Tamil one has to find a way of denoting 'e' and 'o' which are phonemes in Tamil. Therefore, a distinguishing mark, namely a puḷḷi, was put on short 'e' and 'o'.

The arrangement of the letters in the Tamil alphabet system also shows that the scripts were adapted from some other system. The letters common to that system and Tamil are first enumerated and, thereafter, the additional letters for the pure Tamil sounds are added. The only exception seems to be that of 'e' and 'o' where the short vowels though unique to Tamil, preceded the corresponding long vowels.

Is there any clue to find out Tolkāppiyar's alphabetic system ? Fortunately, there are. The first sūtram definitely states that the system begins with 'a' (அ) and ends with the alveolar nasal ṉ (ன). But what about the intervening sounds? The vowels do not create much trouble, if we assume the short vowels preceded their corresponding long vowels as at present (sūtram 3 and 4). One can assume, even here, the plosives preceded their homorganic nasals. The fact that the alveolar nasal ended the list is an additional clue, though in itself may not be conclusive. The additional consonantal sounds in Tamil are the alveolar plosive (ற), which is now pronounced as a trill intervocally, as 'ḍr' after the nasal, as 'ṭr' when geminated, the alveolar nasal (ன), the retroflex voiced groove spirant, (ழ) and doubtfully the retroflex lateral (ள). The arrangement of the plosives and nasals shows that alveolars (sūtrams 19 and 20) were given the last place though in any order based on the place of articulation it should be as follows :– velars (க, ங), palatals (ச, ஞ), retroflexes (ட, ண), alveolars (ற, ன), dentals (த, ந), and labials (ப, ம). The only explanation can be that in adapting another system the additional sounds were made to come at the end.

Describing the articulation of sounds, Tolkāppiyar first describes velar, palatal, retroflex and the dental stops. But before describing the labials he describes the consonant, in articulating which the tip of the tongue makes certain movements upward; namely, in sūtram 94 the alveolar plosive and nasal (ற, ன); in sūtram 95 r (ர), l (ழ); in sūtram 96, l (ல), l (ள);

before describing in sūtram 97 the labials; in sūtram 98 labio-dentals; and in sūtram 99, y (ய). This order cannot be taken to be the order of sounds in his alphabetic system since he has definitely stated in the first sūtram and also in sūtram 9 that the alveolar nasal comes at the very end. The retroflex voiced groove spirant (ழ), the retroflex lateral (ள) which is not a phoneme, in the other system and the alveolar stops being sounds not found in the other system may come at the very end. That is why the alveolar stops do not follow other stops but follow the semi–vowels which come after the stops in the other system and which are common to Tamil as well. The order ya, ra, la, va, ḷa, ḻa (ய, ர, ல, வ, ழ, ள) has a kind of feminine rhyme even as the enumerations of the plosives and nasals have in Tamil.

This analysis of Tolkāppiyam seems to show that his alphabetic system was one adapted from a system used for some other language to which were added the unique Tamil sounds at the end. This will suggest probably Tolkāppiyar is speaking of the system found in the Tamil caves and at Arikamedu.

Naccinārkkiniyar in explaining the order of sounds in the Tamil alphabetic system states that the alveolar stops are placed at the end because they are unique Tamil sounds (Naccinār-kkiniyar: Commentary on Tolkāppiyam Eluttu, p. 27). Sivagnāna Swamigal states, in addition, that ழ is also a unique Tamil sound and therefore it comes at the end followed by ள, which is a free variant of 'l' in Sanskrit (Tolkāppiyac-c- cūttira Virutti p. 22). Therefore, our ancient commentors had known this peculiarity of the Tamil alphabetic system which we have tried to explain.

REFERENCES

1. *Ancient India, No. 2; 1946.*
2. *Iravatham Mahadevan,*
   Tamil Brahmi Inscriptions of the Sangam Age, Proceedings of the Second International Conference Seminar of Tamil Studies, Madras, India, Volume–I; January 1968.
3. *Naccinarkkiniyar*
   Tolkappiyam Eluttatikaram, Pub: SISSWP Society, Tinneveli; 1923.
4. *Sivagnana Swamikal*
   Tolkappiyac cuttira Virutti, Ed. Arumuga Navalar Rattaksi Year.
5. *Sivaramamurthy, C.*
   Indian Epigraphy and South Indian Scripts, Madras 1942.

EPILOGUE III

ORTHOGRAPHY AND ITS COMMON INFLUENCE

(CULTURAL DIFFUSION AND LANGUAGE)

A Tension

Culture spreads by diffusion and this has made possible the one-world idea. But the resultant unity must be a rich one and not a dull dead mechanical uniformity. There is thus always a tension between the two poles of convergence and divergence, individuality and universality, independence and inter–dependence.

Language – the cultural medium

Language was evolved when man was evolved and in that sense they are co-eval. When human beings were evolved evolution began to be social, developing from generation to generation through the preservation and further progress of social heritage. In this process language plays an important part as the vehicle of the inherited and developing ideas, relating to all cultural aspects and activities.

Global Diffusion

It cannot be conceived that every human group or nation invented separately every one of the culture and other aspects of human progress. It is too much of a luxury and therefore a waste of precious human labour which nature can ill afford, when it has reached the human level. It is said that knowledge doubles itself every decade in the latter half of the twentieth century. This may not be true of earlier ages. But any student of history will be familiar with the diffusion of culture almost becoming global. When the Roman civilization was destroyed the very destroyers inherited and developed that grand civiliz-ation. The conquerors every where thus become the conquered.

Absorbtion

Therefore every nation is both creative and receptive—creative of new influences and receptive to other influences. Everything living absorbs what is necessary for it, from its surroundings. This kind of absorbtion is a sign of life. It is only the dead and the non-living that do not develop by diffusion.

Influence – Mutual

Language is a living institution and one must naturally expect its development through diffusion and absorbtion as a matter of course. Unfornately the term borrowing earlier used created in the minds of men a pejorative meaning implying that the so-called borrowers were non-creative parasites living and growing at the expense of others. But diffusion is mutual and there is no nation however insignificant that has not influenced the other groups around it. The developing nations are allergic to the conception of parasitic borrowing. Perhaps if a list of their contributions is also drawn up then the balance may be restored. What is to be remembered is that diffusion is the more widely known mode of the spread of culture and that such a diffusion is generally mutul. There is nothing infradit about borrowing

Divergence

Language starts from one point as it were, and when it develops the original convergence is slowly replaced by divergence due to social and reigional differences, slowly growing and splitting the language-speaking community into various groups. Dialects in time develop into languages and when the community spreads the languages further split up, and this process goes along everywhere. Thus the Indo-European family of languages has spread throughout the five continents of the world.

DRAVIDIAN LANGUAGES

Genetic Relationship

The Dravidian languages form an independent family. Attempts have been made to affiliate it to old Mediterranean languages, like Basque to the Finno-ugrian family, to the

Sumarian language, etc. But nothing has yet been conclusively proved. The languages of this family are found within the Indian subcontinent, in Baluchistan in Pakistan, in Nepal and all over India. By comparing more than twenty of these languages till now studied and analysed there emerge three groups, namely: (1) The Northern Dravidian, the Brahui and the Kuḍux; (2) The Southern Dravidian, consisting mainly of Tamil and Malayalam on the one hand and Kannaḍa on the other, with more dialects related to these like Toḍa, Kūrg, Kōṭa, etc.; (3) The Central Dravidian consisting mainly of Gōnḍi, Kolāmi, Parji, Nāiki, Kui, Kuvi, Koṇḍa, Peṅgu, etc. Telugu, one of the cultivated languages of the Āndhras, is mainly a member of the central group. Here is the story of the divergence. A comparative study leads us to a common proto-language and to its gradual divergence through the ages. The point of convergence lies at their origin. The studies of Dr. Caldwell in the last century, and in recent years of Emeneau and Burrow and Indian scholars, have roughly traced this development. The commonness lies here at their origin. A more intensive contrastive, study of the four major Dravidian languages should be made for finding out the shared features due to the ordinary course of development, especially those due to contact with other cultures and languages. This will be a study of their genetic relationship.

Areal Relationship

Languages often develop relationships which in course of time become much more important than the genetic one. Certain linguistic areas have a language-bund or group of languages, which, on account of the mutual contact as a result of occupying a common area, develop convergence. India is one such linguistic area. The languages spoken here genetically belong to different families of languages — the Munda, the Dravidian, the Indo-European, etc. But in the course of history they have converged, and developed common features such as the retroflex. The existence of retroflex sounds in all these languages even when they cannot be genetically traced, is one such point of convergence which can be explained only as an areal feature due to cultural diffusion. In this way also commonness of the languages is developed. But here the commonness is not at

their origin but is slowly developed through their contact with other languages.

Major Dravidian Languages

The Dravidian languages have thus two kinds of commonness: (1) one due to their common genetic origin; (2) the other due to their occupying a linguistic area. The languages taken up for study are the four cultivated languages, namely Tamil, Kannada, Telugu and Malayāḷam. These have rich literature preserved in writing.

COMMON WRITING SYSTEM

Pan-Indian

Their writing systems seem to differ from each other. The study, however, of the inscriptions, century after century, has revealed that not only the written systems of these four languages but those even of languages outside India like those of Tibet, Ceylon, Burma, and even distant Annam, can all be traced to the one Pan-Indian source from which the Asokan or the Brahmi script was developed. Taylor in his book, 'Alphabet', claims that even these scripts can be traced further back to the script, which the sailing Phoenicians brought to Greece. But inside India there is the older script of the Indus – Valley Civilization. Unless that is deciphered and the result finally proved in one way or the other, one may not be justified in tracing the pan–Indian source.

Telugu and Kannada

Today, Telugu and Kannada have scripts which are almost similar with only certain variations. Really, as explained earlier, Kannada belonging to the South Dravidian group is nearer to Tamil rather than to Telugu, which, belonging as it does to the central Dravidian family, is far removed from Kannada. But historical connections made the scripts of these two languages to become more and more similar. The genealogical tree showing the development brings out this fact very clearly.

Tamil and Malayāḷam

The scripts of the languages Malayāḷam and Tamil are to a certain extent similar. There were two different scripts,

(1) kōleḻuttu, with more straight lines, and (2) vaṭṭeḻuttu; with more of curves. [This is due to the fact that the latter was used in cursory writing]. It is the latter that continued in the Malayāḷam country. After its disappearance from the Pāṇḍya and the Tamil country it continued in Kerala for a long time till the recent centuries. This vaṭṭeḻuttu consisted only of written forms of the Tamil sounds. It was used in writing. The Pāṇḍya inscriptions are found in vaṭṭeḻuttu, but recent explorations in and around Cengam has brought to light a number of vaṭṭeḻuttu inscriptions of early Pallavas. Tamils used 'grantha' script, developed during the Pallava period, for writing down Sanskrit and Prakrit. The Malayāḷam scripts bear similarity to the grantha script with exceptions here and there.

Genealogical Tree

On account of this variety it may be difficult for anyone, at first sight, to believe that all of them have developed from a common source. The development of each one of the vowels and consonants in Tamil along with their counterparts in Telugu, Kannada, grantha and vaṭṭeḻuttu had been traced in the form of a genealogical tree from the Asokan Brahmi, on the one hand, and the southern variety, represented by the cave inscriptions of the southern districts of Tamilnadu of the pre–Christian era, on the other. When one sees these charts there cannot be any two opinions about all of them coming from one pan–Indian source. That is the point of convergence from which they had diverged in the course of their history in the various ways, thanks to the historical trends.

Asokan Edict

The basis is the Brahmi of the Asokan incriptions. The Asokan inscriptions, which Asoka engraved in many places all throughout India north of Tamil land, for delivering his spiritual message to the people at large, in their dialects or Prakrit, produced almost an intellectual revolution. It was democratic in its procedure and approach. It was not merely a registration of any royal gift or of any similar event. Here were documents which, so to say, were speaking to the people as though Asoka himself was addressing them. At first, it must have excited the curiosity of the people and then a wonder and finally a

desire for literacy. These monuments with their mighty influence, in spite of the difference in language, on even the non–Prakrit speakers, forced them to adopt and adapt the script for their own mothertongue. This is certainly the result on Tamils.

1, 2 and 3 in the Tree

The development of the scripts is marked by various steps, and these steps are represented by various numbers which gives the development in the form of a genealogical tree. No. I represents the form of the letter as found in the Asokan edicts of the third century B. C. No. 3 is the form found in the Tamil cave inscriptions of the third or second century B. C. The language of these inscriptions is Tamil and the script is Brahmi or Asokan, however, modified to suit the genius of the Tamil language. No. 2 is the form found in the Bhattiprolu caskets. The language is Prakrit but, the scribe must be one coming from the South; for, he has introduced some of the southern variations, though they are not required for the Prakrit, for which the Asokan script was suitable enough without any variation.

ADAPTATION FOR TAMIL SOUNDS

Tamil Sounds

The Dravidian languages, especially Tamil, have: (1) short 'e'; (2) a short 'o'; (3) an alveolar voiceless plesive (r as transliterated in the Tamil Lexicon; the sound has undergone various changes); (4) a corresponding alveolar nasal (n as transliterated in the Tamil Lexicon: this has merged with dental n in many cases); (5) a retroflex (once an alveolar) groove spirant (l, as transliterated in the Tamil Lexicon; this has also changed its pronunciation, or is lost in various languages). There is also the retroflex lateral which is a phoneme in Tamil, but which in some languages has merged with ordinary l or l. At first the short e and o were not differentiated for instance in the cave inscriptions. The alveolar nasal was similar in sound to the dental nasal though distinct. In many Dravidian languages the dental and alveolar nasal merged as the dental but Tamil of the early times

had them as two distinct phonemes. See the contrast in the following analogical pairs:

verin — 'back',
varin — 'if one comes'.

Alveolars, etc.

Whoever invented the letter form for the alveolar nasal, he knew the similarity and also the significant difference. There was the script for the dental n–a perpendicular line standing on a horizontal line. The inventor realizing the similarity had chosen this for alteration: he made the perpendicular line bend down to the right and made it the sign for alveolar nasal. The alveolars are in between the dentals and retroflexes, from the point of view of the place of articulation. Toe symbol for the alveolar plosive in the adopted script consists in the retroflex plosive standing as it were on the form for the dental plosive. The retroflex lateral was differentiated from the ordinary lateral by drawing a curve near the ending of the right side line and making that bend downwards. For the retroflex groove spirant a form like the English capital "G" in the cursory writing is found with its variations.

It is thus seen that the Brahmi was adopted with necessary modifications to suit the needs of the Dravidian languages, especially Tamil.

e and o

The use of the long e's and o's for the short e's and o's is certainly a violence to the genius of the language. But as the context suggests the correct length to a native speaker, they become accustomed to this. Even as late as the nineteenth century, after centuries of differentiating these in writing, the scribes never differentiated them whilst writing on the cadjan leaves. Non – Tamil sounds were not used in cave inscriptions except dh, and s in loan words. The Samyuktākṣaras were not introduced into Tamil which avoid clusters.

No Inherent 'a'

As against the original Brahmi system, the 'a' is not considered inherent in a consonant in the cave inscriptions. The

consonantal symbol, for instance, k represents not 'ka' as in the Asokan but only the basic consonant k. The medial sign for the vowel a was used to denote an addition to the consonant of a or ā. The medial vowel signs for a or ā are identical in the cave inscriptions and it was only the context which helped a native Tamil speaker to distinguish the length.

Bhattiprōlu

In the Bhattiprōlu inscriptions the consonant sign, for instance, k was basic and the medial sign, for ā was adopted for showing a consonant occurring with a. It must therefore be a southern scribe who knew the writing system of the cave inscriptions that thus engarved the Bhattiprōlu inscriptions. Bhattiprōlu has medial signs for a and ā whilst in the cave inscriptions there is only a single sign for both

Geminates

A development, according to Iravatam Mahadevan ("Tamil Brahmi Inscriptions of Sankam Age", Proceedings of the II International Conference-Seminar of Tamil Studies, IATR MᴬDRAS; 1958), has taken place. In the early stage the scribes who were probably not native-born Tamil speakers could not differentiate between the single plosive and geminated plosive and wrote for both a single plosive. At the next stage the consonantal symbol comes under the old Asokan tradition above mentioned as against the early tradition of the cave inscriptions. But there was a wavering between the two. consonantal symbol is either basic or is with the inherent a. The context alone will make the native speaker read it correctly. 'meyyin iyakkam akaramoṭu civaṇum' of Tolkāppiyam probably refers to the inherent 'a" in the consonantal form. As a result, the medial 'a' sign is no longer necessary. The old medial sign which did duty for both 'a' and 'ā' does duty for the latter only. The single plosive and the geminated plosives come to be distinguished. This is a change which can be dated, because they characterize the potsherds found at Arikamedu as belonging to the first two centuries of the Christian Era. No mention is made of Arikamedu in the genealogical tree. But it must be mentioned in the line tracing the Tamil script from the cave inscriptions as probably 3 (a).

Any older script ?

It is often claimed by certain scholars that Tamils had a script of their own. If it was different from all the known scripts now available for a study, it is naturally difficult for any one to argue purely from imagination against such a theory; till something more definite is known about it or about its existence. An ancient commentary on a book on prosody quotes a sūtram which speaks of various kinds of letter forms and from this reference it is argued that the Tamils like others started with pictogram and reached the alphabetic system at the end. But this is all the work of a fertile imagination; for, it is not clear what these various kinds of letters are. However, in the following passage Thiru G. Vijaya Venugopal has tried to explain this ("A Modern Evaluation of Naṉṉūl", Annamalai University, Annamalainagr, 1968; p. 67).

"There are distinctions metnioned in Y. V. on the basis of some old sutra 188, viz.: (1) uru-v-eḻuttu, i. e. the script written with a form; (2) uṇar-v-eḻuttu, i. e. the sound or what is symbolized by a symbol and what is understood by our mind, (3) oli-y-eḻuttu or the sound heard or perceived by the ear even as one perceives the song of the bird; (4) taṉmai-y-eḻuttu the sound as pronounced and heard, intended and perceived as a speech sound. In this case, oli-y-eḻuttu as distinguished from taṉmai-y-eḻuttu must be the speech sound recognized, for instance, by a linguist as a speech sound, perhaps of language unknown to him and whose value in the word system of the language he does not know. uṇar-v-eḻuttu will then be the mental recognition of a script as a symbol of a sound in the absence of any pronunciation. taṉmai-y-eḻuttu alone will be the unit sound of a known language pronounced or recognized as such. It is possible if we strain the meaning to read into these four, the pictogram, the ideogram, the phonogram, and the alphabetic sounds, respectively. Naṉṉūl, however, distinguishes only oli-y-eḻuttu and vaṭivam or vaṭi-v-eḻuttu. Oli-y-eḻuttu in Naṉṉūl is the speech sound and vaṭi-v-eḻuttu is the script form. It must be stated that in following Tolkāppiyar in the description of syllabic letters, it uses the word 'uru' used in Tolkappiyar's sūtra (TE sūtra 17)."

Vaṭṭeluttu and Brahmi

Some others have argued that the vaṭṭeluttu was the old Tamil script. But the charts of the evolution of the scripts clearly prove that the present Tamil script and the old vaṭṭeluttu both developed from the cave inscriptions. Vaṭṭeluttu is only a cursory way of writing the same script. It is only when one compares and follows the gradual development of vaṭṭeluttu one will be convinced of its origin lying in the script of the cave inscriptions.

STUDY OF SCRIPT FORM IN GRAMMAR

Phonology and Orthography

Tolkāppiyar and other grammarians discuss orthography as a part of their grammatical theories. Therefore one cannot raise any objection to our discussing the script forms in our study of the commonness of the grammatical theories in the Dravidian languages. One of the twelve topics discussed under phonology by Naṉṉūl which rules the world of Tamil grammar ever since it was written at the end of twelfth century or the beginning of the thirteenth century is the script form or 'uruvam'. Naṉṉūl is not the first to do so; for, herein as elsewhere it is following the ancient tradition of the grammatical studies in Tamil land. (See G. Vijaya Venugopal: "A Modern Evaluation of Naṉṉūl, and Dr. S. V. Shunmugam: "Naccinārkkiniyar's conception of phonology".)

An Adaptation

A careful study of Tolkāppiyam will disclose the fact that the script form he is describing must have belonged originally to a language different from that of the Dravidian family. In an article in JOTS which forms an appendix to this essay, this is elaborated.

e : o

Ordinarily the script form of any short vowel is the basic form and its alteration comes to denote its longer variety. Even in Tamil it is true of 'a', 'i' or 'u' but not of 'e' and 'o'. In the latter case the form of the longer vowels is basic and the respective altered forms come to symbolize their shorter

companions. This want of symmetry can be explained only by the fact that in the language or languages for which the script was orginally intended and from which it was adopted into Tamil, there was only one 'e' and one 'o', both of them being of the longer variety as it happens in Sanskrit. In adopting this script to suit the genius of the Tamil language, separate script forms for the Tamil short 'e' and 'o' had to be improvised by the slight alteration of the original forms for the longer 'e' and 'o'.

Order in the Alphabet

It is also further pointed out that in the study of the order of script form in the alphabet, script forms for the sounds which are common to Tamil and the language for which the script was originally intended were first arranged in the same order as found in the original language, but naturally to the limited extend for the common sounds available in Tamil. Thereafter, especially in the list of consonants, those that are peculiar to Tamil are listed at the end of the Tamil alphabet. The alveolar plosive and nasal, which, if arranged according to the place of articulation as other sounds are arranged in the alphabet, must come between the retroflex and the dental; but in the Tamil alphabet these are relegated to the end in the list of consonants. In the enumeration of the plosive and nasals separately, the alveolar comes after the labials instead of coming between the retroflexes and dentals. Similarly, the peculiar Tamil sounds 'ḻ' and 'ḷ' among the semi-vowels occupy the last place in the list whereas, if arranged on the basis of articulation they should come after 'y' and 'r' and not after 'v' as it is the case at present. One may add in passing that the order of sounds in the alphabet is one of the topics studied by Tamil grammarians under phonology.

Puḷḷi

The cave inscriptions and the Arikamedu scripts do not have any 'puḷḷi' or dot in any of their script forms. Tolkāppiyar however mentions the puḷḷis. It was pointed out above that in the course of development of the script just about the time of Arikamedu, the consonant, for instance, 'k' was standing as the basic consonant 'k' in some places and for the 'k' with the medial

short vowel 'a' in other places. It was earlier suggested that the existence of inner 'a' in any consonant form is probably intended by the sūtram "meyyin iyakkam akaramoṭu civaṇum". Tolkāppiyar, to avoid the ambiguity in reading the script form of the consonant, for instance, 'k' as the basic consonant in some places and the syllabic 'ka' in other places, developed the theory of "puḷḷi" or dot.

Minus Sign

In India, by the time of Ārya Bhatta, minus quantities came to be represented by a minus sign. The minus sign was a dot placed on the top of the figure. This has been taken by the scribes. Whenever they wrote one or more script which had to be omitted they put a dot or dots thereon. puḷḷi came to represent in that way, something suffering from a deficiency. Tolkāppiyar made use of this significant minus sign.

Consonants

The consonant with the inherent 'a' has to be differentiated from the basic consonant. Tolkāppiyar assumed that a dot on the consonant will denote the fact that the inherent 'a' should be omitted. When no such puḷḷi appears no such diminution occurs and the form without the puḷḷi will represent the consonant with the inherent 'a'. This must have happened when after the cave inscriptions the scribes went back to the older system of consonants with the inherent 'a' thereby causing an ambiguity which we referred to above.

e, o

Tolkāppiyar also applied the theory of puḷḷi to the original scripts for 'e' and 'o' from their respective shorter companions, by putting the dot on the longer 'ē' and 'ō' so as to make them deficient by one mātra and thus to denote the short 'e' and 'o'. He probably distinguished the ultra short unrounded 'u' by putting a dot on the ordinary 'u'.

m

'm' has a peculiar form in the cave inscriptions. It is like a tube 'U' with horizontal stroke in the middle. There is a sūtram in Tolkāppiyam that a particular letter will be having an

interior dot. Puḷḷi may be interpreted as a dot or small line. Iḷampūraṇar and Naccinārkkiniyar interpret the sūtram as giving the peculiar forms of 'm'. The commentary on Vīracōliyam, however; interprets the sūtram as referring to the form of what is called the extra short 'm', which Tolkāppiyar describes in the sūtram preceding it. His interpretation is that since, at par with other consonants, 'm' also will be having a dot on the top, the extra short 'm' must have to be distinguished further by putting another dot in the interior.

Tolkāppiyar's Predecessors

Perhaps puḷḷi was introduced by the predecessors of Tolkāppiyar; for, by his time the word puḷḷi has become the general name for consonants. See his naming the chapter on consonantal sandhi as 'puḷḷi mayaṅkiyal'.

Date of puḷḷi

In the inscriptions puḷḷi cannot be traced to before the second century A. D. and, again, it was not followed after the tenth century. Putting a dot is an additional complication and when people could read it with the help of the context without the puḷḷi actually being there, the scribes must have avoided it easily. About the time of Arikamedu, we have seen there was a confusion between the basic consonant and the consonant inherent 'a'. That may be taken as the period when puḷḷi came to be introduced to avoid the ambiguity. First it might have been used in ordinary writing, and the first suggestion could have been made in grammatical studies. Then it was extended to inscriptions. But the old habits died hard. Puḷḷi may be ascribed to the period around the begining of the Christian Era.

Forms Only For Tamil Sounds – Grantha

The Tamil script and the vaṭṭeluttu script have only the Tamil sounds to be transcribed. They did not adopt the other Sanskrit sounds into their alphabet. In the Tamil country the grantha system developed out of the Brahmi script and this grantha was used for writing Sanskrit or Prakṛit in the Tamil country. Thus the distinction between Sanskrit or prakṛit on the one hand and Tamil on the other was strictly maintained.

Viraviyal

A work like Vīracōḷiyam, which follows the Sanskrit approach however, states (verse No.144) that good poetry should avoid Sanskrit letters or sounds. But it contemplates as exceptions two kinds of literary compositions, showing thus a slow infiltration of Sanskrit letters and Sanskrit words into Tamil. viraviyal or the mixture or mixed literature is that where sanskrit letters are introduced. In inscriptions sometimes the Sanskrit sounds of names like Rajendra are written in the grantha script. A literary composition where such grantha scripts are introduced for transcribing Sanskrit words is viraviyal. No work of this kind has come to us.

Manippravāḷam

The other kind of literary composition which is mentioned as an exception is what is called maṇippravāḷam (maṇi is the 'ruby', pravāḷam is the 'coral'; like a necklace made of ruby and coral the literary composition is made of Tamil and Sanskrit words). But the Sanskrit words are not written in the grantha script. According to Vīracōḷiyam this is a poetic composition but without etukai, initial rhyme or assonance. In later times maṇippravāḷa was not restricted to verses alone. It was extended to prose writings. The maṇippravāḷa writings of the vaiṣṇavites are highly famous for their beauty and depth; though, because of the difficulty in understanding the language, lesser and lesser number of people come to read them.

Chanda Viruttam

The chanda viruttams which are songs following the tāḷa pattern could easily acclimatize any word of any language with this metre and thus make the foreign words in vogue in such verses. Yāpparuṅkala virutti writes to the same effect— "centa-mılc ceyyuṭ ṭerintu uṇarntu cen-tamiḷkkaṇ vanta vaṭamoḷiyum mārratē-cantam vaḷuvāmal koṇṭiyarrum māṇpiṇārk kuṇṭō taḷuvāmai niṛkun tamiḷ." Ottakkuttar's "Takkayākapparaṇi" of the twelfth century A. D. uses Sanskrit words without any let or hindrance, but not Sanskrit sounds. In his verses we have etukai or initial rhyme and other peculiarities of Tamil verses. In introducing words the author tries to be true to

Sanskrit; for, he does not follow the rules about the obligatory introduction of prothetic and epenthetic vowels for breaking up clusters not sanctioned in Tamil. There was a revulsion, and when Pavaṇanti comes to write his grammar at the end of the twelfth century, he re-emphasizes the old rules for Tamilizing Sanskrit and foreign sounds and words. But on account of chanda viruttam more and more foreign words from Christian and Muslim sources as well flowed into Tamil. One has only to turn to Tiruppukaḷ by Aruṇakiri Nātar of early Vijayanagar period, to the works of Tāyumānavar of the seventeenth century, and to cirappurāṇam by Umurup pulavar of the same century. The last, introduced Muslim names and Arabic religious words. Tēmpāvaṇi by Beschi ar Vīramāmuṇivar of the eighteenth century introduced Christian names and ideas. Gradually a few grantha scripts, especially for j, ṣ; ś, h and kṣ were introduced, and they have become part of the Tamil alphabet now learned by our school-going children. This has facilitated persistence of certain foreign words and the borrowing of more and more of such words into Tamil.

ALPHABETIC SYSTEM AND BORROWINGS

Telugu, Kannada

The importance of the alphabetic system facilitating borrowing has been sufficiently emphasized. At least no hurdles exist in a language which has adopted such a system for acclimatizing foreign words with the written literature of the learned, though they cannot be easily injected into the colloquial language. Telugu and Kannaḍa, very early in their history, adopted all the sounds of the Brahmi script into their alphabets. Our charts do not show them. But the brochure on the inscriptions by Srinivasa Murthy, published by the Madras Museum, from which we have adopted the relevant portions in our charts, proves how each one of the letters in the Kannada and Telugu alphabets developed from the Brahmi script. In these two languages literacy probably began with the Prakrit and Sanskrit scholars and slowly spread amongst others. The first great literary work in Telugu, the Mahābhāratā, was translated by the great poetic

trio directly from Sanskrit, the authors often using the Sanskrit phrases in their Sanskrit forms themselves. This created a cleavage between the scholarly or literary Telugu and the colloquial Telugu. Grammarians could slavishly follow the Sanskrit grammar merely repeating the Sanskrit examples without caring to search for examples from literature except on rare occasions.

Malayāḷam and Manipravāḷa

As for Malayāḷam, for a long time only the vaṭṭeḻuttu was in use. But soon, with the Nambūdri Sanskrit scholars coming to wield an influence among the elite, the āryaveḻuttu or the grantha script was adopted in its entirety for developing literature for the sophisticated Malayalees who could understand both Sanskrit and Malayāḷam. This bilingualism led to the development of a new kind of literary composition, viz. Bhāṣāmiśram, i. e. literary and scientific compositions with a profuse admixture of Sanskrit words naturally developed. But this was not enough for the sophisticated. A peculiar maṇippravāḷam developed where there were not only Sanskrit words and phrases but hybridized Malayalam nouns and verbs with Sanskrit inflections like teṅṅā bhihi – "with coconuts", and kēḻanti – "(she) cries". On the basis of the number of hybridized Malayalam words, without, of course, neglecting the importance of rasa or poetic sentiment, the literary compositions came to be ranked by Līlātilakam as 'uttama' 'madhyama' and 'adhama'. But soon this unnatural style fell into disuse when the language became more and more democratic, in the hands of people and their popular poets. But still, to a limited extend, the borrowing of Sanskrit words was there, because there was no hurdle caused by the writing system.

Purism as a Reaction

It is for the respective scholars in these languages to trace the varying influence of the alphabet on the history of literature and grammar. But here the fact of a tension between convergence and divergence alone may be emphasized. If the borrowing goes on freely for sometime, but at a particular stage differing from language to language, there is a kind of a counter-revolution in favour of purism of the language. We have the

taṇit tamiḻ or pure Tamiḻ movement in Tamil led by Maṟaimala-iyaṭikaḷ, a movement which was very powerful till very recent times. It is similarly learnt that even in very early times there was a Acca Telugu movement or Jāna Telugu movement, and an Acca Kannaḍa movement and a Paccai Malayāḷam movement. A short history of the movements will indeed be very interesting.

SANSKRIT INFLUENCE

Lingua Franca

The course of history led to what is called the fundamental unity of India from a cultural point of view. But as we know even with reference to recent history, there has not been any complete integration owing to the working of antagonistic forces. The process of cultural diffusion may be called Indianization rather than āryanization or Sanskritization, because Tamilization also is a kind of Indianization. Thanks to the influence exercised by the various religions like Buddhism, Jainism and Hinduism, Southern India from very early times exhibited signs of a cultural area. Pāli, Prakṛit and Sanskrit came to be studied by the scholars in addition to their own mother-tongue or regional language. Soon South India itself became the centre of this kind of learning which was preserved in the South whenever the North was not enjoying a peaceful atmosphere required for the development for such a learning. The southern school of dance, culture, painting, music, etc., may be mentioned in this context. Influence of the works in Sanskrit and Prakṛit on the Dravidian languages could be seen in the various religious and purāṇic works produced in the southern languages. Sanskrit became the lingua franca of India and the Far-East, especially among the learned. Ideas spread from one corner, to another as quickly as possible. Society, law, administration, religion, philosophy, technology and science became pan-Indian. Books on these subjects were written and studied in Sanskrit not only by Brahmins but also by non-brahmins like architects, astrologers, etc. Literature, including ethical works and elementary introductions to a few subjects alone, was written in the regional languages. The learned world of India, in spite of varying schools of thought in every subject, appeared as one.

GRAMMARS FOR THE DRAVIDIAN LANGUAGES IN SANSKRIT

Even grammatical works were written in Sanskrit except for the grammars in Tamil, which having been developed as a literary language as early as third or second century B. C., resisted its complete submergence.

Līlātilakam was written in Sanskrit for explaining the theory relating to the Malayāḷam maṇippravāḷā poetry. Andhra Sabda Cintāmaṇi, which is considered to be the first work on Telugu grammar and which is attributed to the great poet Naṉṉaya of the eleventh century, is also in Sanskrit. The amendments to these works, like the vārtikās of kātyāyana making amendments to the sūtras of Pāṇiṉi, were made by Atarvaṇa Paṇḍita in his Vikṛti Vivēka. This also was written in Sanskrit. Like Patañjali commenting on Pāṇini and Kātyāyaṇa, Ahōbala Paṇḍita wrote his commentary, taking both Āndhra Śabda Cintāmaṇi and Vikṛti Vivēka into consideration. This commentary also was in Sanskrit.

For the Kannaḍa language also, grammars came to be written in Sanskrit. One hears of Śabdāvatāra by Durviṇīta who is assigned to 600 A. D. or thereabouts. The name of the work is in Sanskrit and might have been written in Sanskrit language; since it does not exist, it is idle to speculate on it. Nāgavarma mentions the grammarian Nayasēna, but since nothing more is known about the latter's work one cannot be specific about its language.

Nāgavarma's Karnāṭaka Bhāṣa Bhūṣana is written in Sanskrit with Sanskrit sūtras and vṛtti. This Nāgavarma, called the second, is assigned to the 12th century.

The next Kannaḍa grammarian to write in Sanskrit was Bhaṭṭakaḷaṅka, a disciple of Akaḷaṅka Dēva. He was living during the period of the Vijayanagar king Venkaṭapati Raya (1586 1615). His work is called Śabdānuśāśana, for which he himself has written the notes, Bhāṣa Manjari, and also an elaborate commentary, 'Manjari Makaranda', his works being compared by bilingual scholars in Kannaḍa and Sanskrit to Pāṇini's and Patañjali's works.

"INFLUENCE ON TAMIL

Sanskrit Words in Literature

Thus the fact of the grammatical works being written in Sanskrit is another point of commonness. Of course, Tamil resisted this tendency. But the influence of Sanskrit penetrated from the very early times into Tamil grammar. The earliest grammar, Tolkāppiyam, speaks of the literary language consisting of: (1) words of ordinary usage; (2) words of literary usage; (3) dialect words; and (4) Sanskrit words. Therefore, this must have been written only after its intimate contact with Sanskrit and when Tamil literature came to be produced at least with a sprinkling of Sanskrit words though without the introduction of Sanskrit letters. It is told in its verse preface, that it follows the Aindra. This means that it does not follow the difficult and seemingly artificial Pāṇinīyan method of explaining the grammatical principles in terms of a specially invented metalanguage with pratyāharas, its and other modes of simplification and systematization. A study of the methodology followed by the various grammars and commentaries in the Dravidian languages will reveal further commonness established by grammarians following the methodology of interpretation given by various schools of Sanskrit grammar and school of Pūrvamīmāmsā.

A Misleading Influence – Retroflex

The word Aindra in relation to Tolkāppiyar reminds us of another misleading Sanskrit influence. There was a pan-Indian school of phonetics and grammar, with ample scope for differences. In the description of articulation of sounds there must have been differences from area to area and from time to time. The retroflex sounds gradually crept into sanskrit, though through a natural historical development– a process hastened by contact with the Dravidian languages; and naturally their pronunciations had differences in the Sanskrit area itself. No Dravidian, noting his own pronunciation, could have described as Tolkāppiyar does, that the retroflex plosive and nasal are the results merely of the contact of the blade of the tongue with the palate opposite, without mentioning the necessary retroflexion. In describing the alveolars Tolkāppiyar is careful enough to

emphasise the convergence as against the divergence or the spread of the blade of the tongue for the dentals. Unfortunately, Tolkāppiyar, forgetting his own pronunciation, but relying on an Aindra description, went wrong in his description of the retroflex sounds. The pratiśākhyas preserve a pre-Paṇiniyan tradition, which is usually called the Aindra school of grammar. The pratiśākhya of Thaittriya school belongs to this older school of Aindra. Tolkāppiyar probably follows this pratiśākhya in his description of the retroflex sounds.

Influence on Grammar

Dr. Caldwell has pointed out the arrangement of cases in Tamil on the pattern of Sanskrit case system, though he has not understood the difference in its entirety. For instance, Tolkāppiyar's fifth case was one of comparison and contrast rather than of an ablative of motion, though the latter also developed out of it. Though Sanskrit terms were not borrowed, it is asserted that there are loan translations like vērrumai for vibhakti. Dr. P. S. Sastri, in his "History of Grammatical Theories", tried to point out similarities between the wordings of Tolkāppiyam and of other grammatical works on the one hand and those of Sanskrit grammars on the other. He has also identified certain views of the Tamil commentators as those of Sanskrit grammarians knowing, as we do, that the intellectual world of India was one. Tolkāppiyar and others could not be oblivious of the pan-Indian grammatical theories. One may differ on the amount of influence; but that there was the pan-Indian influence, nobody can seriously dispute about. The commentators from the days of Nakkīrar the earliest commentator on "Iraiyanār Akapporuḷ", began to use Tamilized Sanskrit forms like 'ētuk karuttan', 'karuvik karuttan', 'karumak karuttan', and the use of such terms went on increasing from age to age. (Ed. C. R. Govindaraja Mudaliyar, Bhavananadar Kazhakam, 1939, p. 140.)

Vīracōḷiyam

In the eleventh century A. D. a Buddhist author Puttamitiran applied the Sanskrit grammatical technical terms and explained the kāraka cases, the samāsa compounds, and the verbs in Tamil. He omitted such of the Sanskrit rules for which

Tamil examples were not available. Though at times he introduced Sanskrit rules, in a forced way as for instance, when he states that even in Tamil every noun word is only a noun stem-pratipadika that such a stem becomes a noun only when the word marker su is added only to be lost in all cases. The commentators were absorbing more and more Sanskrit grammatical terms.

Pirayōka Vivēkam, Ilakkaṇak kottu, etc.

In the seventeenth century, Subrahmanya Dīkṣitar wrote his Pirayōka Vivēkam which applied Sanskrit grammatical principles and Sanskrit technical terms for explaining the Tamil compounds, Tamil declension, and Tamil verbs. This time, profuse quotations from Tamil literature and Tamil grammars were given. His contemporary, a sanyāsin of Tiruvāvaṭutura Mutt knew Pirayōka Vivēkam, for he refers to that book and its author. He has noted that Sanskrit grammatical principles were applicable to Tamil. Whereas Pirayōka Vivēkam gives Sanskrit terms often with Tamil translations, Īsāna Dēsikar, in his work Ilakkaṇakkottu, gives only Tamil technical terms, some of which were already found in Pirayōka Vivēkam. These two authors are of the view that the grammatical principles enunciated in Sanskrit are of universal application and therefore applicable to Tamil. This school of thought gained influence. In the eighteenth century Rev. Fr. Beschi coming to write his Tonnūl and its commentary refers to some of the principles laid down in those two works, especially with reference to declension. Civañāna cuvāmikaḷ of eighteenth century asserted that Tamil had an independent structure which was different from that of Sanskrit. But he himself is a Sanskrit scholar and refers to Sanskrit grammatical theories for instance, see his explanations of the diphthongs or sandhiyakṣaras – ai and au in terms of Kaiyaṭa and others. Therefore, though there may be, as already stated, differences of opinion about the extent of Sanskrit influence, there can be no two opinions about the influence itself.

The scholars of various Dravidian languages may identify the influences and trace the history of the influences on the history of grammar in their respective languages.

Other studies

More than grammar the sciences and other studies already referred to came under the influence of Sanskrit. This need not be considered a Northern or foreign influence, because native scholars themselves wrote in Sanskrit for reaching a wider audience. Astrologers, the medical men, lawyers, administrators, architects, sculptors, ritualists and others used Sanskrit textbooks; and even those amongst them who were not literate were familiar with many Sanskrit terms relating to their occupations. As a result another commonness later developed, commonness of borrowed Sanskrit words, in the lexicons of the four major Dravidian languages. Though the frequency of the native words will be considerably higher than that of such borrowed words, if the total number of words alone were taken into consideration, the Sanskrit words will be more than the native words in each one of the dictionaries of the four major Dravidian languages.

INFLUENCE ON PHONEMIC STRUCTURE

New Contrasts

Naturally this leads to new phonemic contrasts and into the development of new phonemes in the languages concerned; for instance, b and p in Tamil were only allophones To start with, the natives would have pronounced the foreign sounds by making them more or less equal to the corresponding sound in their phonemic structure. But slowly and almost unconsciously by constant use the foreign pronunciation was also adopted. In modern Tamil pāvam and bhāvam are written as pāvam but pronounced as in Sanskrit. The aspiration is not important in this borrowing. Here in this pronunciation, b and p contrast in the initial position, whilst there was no contrast at the earliest stage, b being a positional variant of p in the inter - vocal position or after nasal. When they initially contrasted they ceased to be allophones and became phonemes. Similarly other plosives have also developed contrasts between their voiced and voiceless counterparts. In Kannada and Telugu the proto-Dravidian geminated voiceless plosive developed generally as a single voiceless plosive, while the proto-Dravidian single

voiceless plosive developed into the voiced plosive. Therefore there was contrast between the voiceless and voiced plosives. But Malayāļam was like Tamil except that it borrowed, as already pointed out, freely from Sanskrit, and as a result developed the contrast earlier than Tamil. The four languages may be studied by the respective scholars from this point of view.

FASHION OF TAMILIZING

Vīracōḷiyam

There is also the process of acclimatizing the foreign word. There is a fashion in each language relating to the process of introducing foreign words. The general rule as stated in Vīracōḷiyam is to drop such foreign sounds for which there is no corresponding — even a distantly corresponding — sound in the phonemic structure of their own language, as for instance Sphōṭa in Tamil. In this word 'ph' is nearer to 'p' but the initial 's' coming combined with 'p' has no corresponding sound in Tamil. Therefore it is dropped and one has to be satisfied with pōṭam.

Vīracōḷiyam decribes for the first time the method of Tamilizing foreign words, as summarily as possible In another essay the peculiarities of the Tamil of the age of Vīracōḷiyam are summarized, and it may be recalled here. This fashion of Tamilizing Sanskrit words is described at the end of Tātup Paṭalam so that the roots may explain the Tamilized forms of dātus.

There are five vargas or groups, namely, the velar, palatal, retroflex, dental, and the labial, each consisting of : (1) the voiceless; (2) the aspirated voiceless plosive; (3) the voiced (4) the aspirated voiced plosive; and (5) a nasal. Since the aspirated voiceless plosive, the voiced plosive and the voiced aspirate are not found in Tamil, they have to become, perforce, the corresponding voiceless plosive. Further, kṣ in Sanskrit becomes kk in Tamil,

e. g., pakṣam   >   pakkam

k doubles and since there is no ṣ : it is lost.

ṣk > kk, i. e. k doubles and ṣ is lost,

e. g. pariṣkāram   >   parikkāram.

ṣ (intervocally)   >   ṭ

e. g. puruṣa = puruṭan.

ś > c, e. g. śabda > cattam.

s > c initially, e. g. sakala > cakalam.

s > ṭ (elsewhere). e. g. vatśa > vattan,

　dāśa > tātan.

h > zero (initially) hara > aran.

h > y/k (elsewhere) – mahitalam = mayitalam or
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　makitalam.

Clusters, except those of (1) geminated consonants; (2) nasals and their homorganic plosives; (3) of y, r, or l combining with both kinds of clusters, are not permitted in Tamil. Therefore Sanskrit clusters have to undergo some change or other. In the clusters of consonants of which the second member is y, r or l, the epenthetic vowel 'i' comes between them to break the cluster:

vākyam   > vakkiyam

putra   > puttiran

sukla   > cukkilam.

If 'v' is the second member of the cluster the epenthetic vowel is 'u':

pakva > pakkuvam.

The commentary adds that if 'm' or 'n' is the second member 'u' or 'a' comes in as the epenthetic vowel:

padma   > patumam

ratnam > aratanam.

Certain sounds do not occur initially in Tamil, and if these occur in foreign words a prothetic vowel is added. If the initial is 'y', the prothetic vowel is 'i':

yakṣa   > iyakkan.

If the initial is 'i' the prothetic vowel is either 'i' or 'u' depending on the next vowel. If it is a back vowel the prothetic vowel is 'u', otherwise 'i',

lakṣmana > ilakkumaṇan

lōka   > ulakam.

If the initial is 'r', depending on the next vowel as above the prothetic vowel is either i, a, u:

rāma   > irāman

rāṅgam > araṅkam

rōmam   > urōmam.

This represents a state of affairs where the colloquial language is also taken into consideration in framing the rule. See mahitalam > mayitalam.

Nannūl

Nannūl points out the common letters and the special letters for Sanskrit. ṛ, ṛ: ḷ, ḹ: and the anusvāra, and the visarga among the vowels are all special to Sanskrit, and the rest ten are common to both Sanskrit and Tamil. Sanskrit has no short 'e' and short 'o' Amongst the consonants in the five vargas the middle three in each are special to Sanskrit. But the first, the voiceless plosive, and the last, the nasals are common. So are y, r, l and ḷ. The aspirated voiceless plosive, the voiced plosive and the voiced aspirated plosive: these three in each varga- in all 15- are special to Sanskrit. ś, ṣ, s, h, kṣ: these five also are special to Sanskrit. Jīhvamūlyam and upadmānīyam are special to Sanskrit. Thus there are also 25 letters common and 28 letters are special to Sanskrit. These 28 naturally undergo change when Tamilized:

ṛ	>	i	ṛṣabam	iṭapam
ṛ	>	ir	ṛṣi	iruṭi
-ā	>	-ai	sītā	sītai
-i	>	-i	kumārī	kumāri

Nannūl gives all the rules given in Vīracōḷiyam. But it makes certain omissions and additions. It omits the following, because they are colloquial : h > y.

It adds the following :

s initially   > c

e. g. saṣṭi   > caṭṭi;

j medially   > y

e. g. ajan   > ayan;

ś medially   > y

e. g. smaśānam > mayānam.

I have elsewhere explained this fashion of Tamilizing foreign words from a historical point of view "History of Tamil

language", Deccan College Publication, pp. 173-179). The respective scholars for the other Dravidian languages can similarly explain the changes, at least as they occur amongst the ordinary people.

tatsamas and tadbhavas

With reference to the loan-words, there is the distinction between tatsamās and tadbhavās, i. e. between the loan-word having only sounds which are common to the borrowing language and the language from which it borrows, and the loan-word containing sounds which do not belong to the borrowed language and which therefore has to be changed necessarily so as to suit the phonemic system or orthography of the borrowing language. But when Telugu, Kannada and Malayāļam have the alphabets based on the Sanskrit alphabet, this distinction may not hold good, especially to the learned words borrowed by the sophisticated scholars. But whatever may be the alphabet, the phonemic structure of Sanskrit differs from that of any individual Dravidian language, and the ordinary native speaker, a man in the street, will introduce necessary changes in the borrowed words. In this way, there is yet room for the tadbhava-tatsama distinction. The respective scholars may study in detail the formations of these two kinds of loan-words at the highly literary level and also at the colloquial level.

Scholarly Tamilization

In Tamil, in addition to these changes taking place in Sanskrit words when Tamilized for ordinary use, there is the scholarly adoption, for instance, atmanepada becomes ārpanēpatam, where the dental plosive makes the following labial nasal to be assimilated to it as an alveolar plosive. Parasmaipada becomes parappai patam. Such learned forms are found for instance in Pirayōka Vivēkam, etc., and such words can be studied in further detail. We have been noting the sounds peculiar to Sanskrit becoming changed into sounds common to both the languages. But in certain instances Tamilization has gone very much farther, where common sounds found in Sanskrit and even special Sanskrit sounds are changed into special Tamil sounds. The special Tamil sounds are the following:

(1) short a

(2) short o

(3) retroflex grove spirant ḷ

(4) alveolar plosive r̠

(5) the alveolar nasal n

(6) āytam

(7) the unrounded u (the ultra short 'i' is not much in use.)

padma > par̠pa, padmanāban > par̠panāpan̠, where the special sounds of Sanskrit 'd' has become the special Tamil alveolar r̠; amṛtam ⹁ amiḷtam changing ṛ into the special Tamil sound ḷ; karma > kanmam, where the common sound r becomes the special Tamil nasal sound n̠; bhāṣā, pāḷai, where ṣ has become a Tamil sound ḷ; saṣkuli (an eatable dish) becomes after the loss of initial palatal akkuli; where the special sound of Sanskrit ṣ has become the special sound (āytam) k in Tamil.

Alveolar

In this connection what Līlātilakam states about the special Malayāļam sounds: (1) the alveolar nasal followed by the alveolar plosive, and (2) the geminated alveolar plosive, may be noted. If these are alveolar sounds, in the former case after the nasal the plosive is voiced, whilst in the case of the geminated plosive it remains voiceless. Why then mention them as two different sounds? It cannot be said that the author is not aware of the positional alternation. Is he referring to the alveolar nasal in the first case and to the alveolar plosive in the second case or is he referring perhaps to what happened in Malayāļam, as it did in Tamil, namely the development of a 'ṭr' value to the geminated alveolar plosive. A Telugu poet writing the Tamil prayer song sung by Tamilian pilgrims to Srisaila, in one place uses the phrase "ār̠r̠ai an̠intavan̠ē", which he transcribes as "āṭrai an̠intavan̠ē". This Telugu Vira Siva poet belongs to the thirteenth century. Therefore, we may not be very much in the wrong if we assume that Tamil pronunciation was found even in the Kerala country about the time of Līlātilakam.

BORROWING AND LANGUAGE STRUCTURE

Indian Heritage

A study of adoptation of Sanskrit words will give a clearer picture of the phonemic structure of both the Sanskrit and the borrowing language whatever it be, at the time of borrowing. Therefore these borrowed words deserve a deep study. The cultural diffusion which we have been discussing has in the course of history left in the four major Dravidian languages a permanent heritage of Sanskrit words as a point of convergence starting originally from various points of divergence. The tabulated list of these borrowed words with their comparative forms and meanings in the four Dravidian languages will be a concrete representation of this convergence.

Lexicon

This may be important from various aspects of culture, but as we are interested only in the grammatical theories it is not easy to exaggerate this influence even from our limited point of view. The structure of any language consists not only of its phonemic, morphophonemic, morphological and syntactic structures but also its lexical structure as consisting of its vocabulary. In a generative transformational approach, the theory of language gives not only phrase structure and the transformational structure but also the lexicon of the language consisting of words and affixes analysed into their semantic features. The importance of lexicon in any theory of language is that lexicon is that part of language which grows from age to age discarding older forms. It is that part of the structure which is more open to cultural influences.

Sanskrit Words Larger in Number

As a result the number of Sanskrit words, from a gross point of view, is larger than the number of native words. It came to be believed that Sanskrit was the parent language of the Dravidian languages and were considered as varieties of Prakrit of Sanskrit. The respective scholars in the various languages can give a brief account of this attempt and prove that the Dravidian languages are so many Prākrits.

Even after Dr. Caldwell this theory did not die out so easily as one would have expected.

Pan-Indian Common Source

If Sanskrit vocabulary is looked upon as a pan-Indian common source from which all the Indian languages can draw and build new words on the basis of Sanskrit roots especially when new words have to be coined for expressing modern conceptions in science and technology. This attempt is resisted from Sanskrit.

Other Common Foreign Words

The commonness is not restricted to the common vocabulary of Sanskrit words. In the course of history foreign rulers, foreign languages and cultures from time to time came to play an important part and the result is that not only Sanskrit and Prakrit words but also (1) Arabic and Persian words, thanks to the Muslim influence (2) English and other western language words, thanks to the Christian and western influence-an influence ever growing from day to day (3) and many other languages have left their words in current use in the various Dravidian languages. In "The History of Tamil Language" in the portion dealing with the 'External history of Tamil' I have referred to the various languages, thus influencing and being influenced by Tamil. Such a study should be made for other languages and a common vocabulary of foreign words now present in all the four Dravidian languages should be compiled

English Now the Common Source

Sanskrit, we found, is a common source. The important source for the current flow of foreign words is the international terms in science and technology which however flow in their English form. Though literary language may not show all the common words, the colloquial language of the various occupations and industries will show a greater bulk of such vocabulary. This is again an emerging convergence – this part of the country.

Orthography and Phonemicisation

The common orthography affecting the structure of the language in the various ways till now described may be expected to affect the phonemic structure in a still another way which my be examined by the respective scholars in the four major Dravidian languages.

Vowels

As orthography of any language supplies a kind of model for any one phonomicising a new language. It is phonemicising that is the scientific basis for inventing or introducing a suitable orthography for a language till then unwritten. But in the course of history often times the existence of an earlier orthography for a foreign language induces the people of another unwritten language to adopt that already existing foreign orthography.

This may be a help to a certain extent as supplying a kind of guide. But it may be a hindrance as well especially when the foreign orthography belongs to a language whose structure is thoroughly different from the structure of the language borrowing it The adoption of Roman script without much change by the Turks created a kind of confusion. One must see therefore how far the adoption of a foreign orthography gave a blurred picture of the Dravidian languages.

āytam

Taking first the phonemic structure of Tamil vowels into consideration, those who adopted the orthography did well to omit the vowels ṟ and ḷ as also the anusvāras and visargas. Though there are people who will hold that the visarga had been adopted as āytam, the pronunciation of āytam is a puzzle. Avinayam will pronounce it like y. In addition it has to be pointed out that āytam was an orṟaḷapeṭai and sung in poetry. Such a thing can happen only to nasals and semi vowels, y and v. Naturally the visarga cannot compete for this claim. That the succeeding plosive came to be converted into a fricative some times voiced some times voiceless is an ancilary development which has misled people into equating āytam with the visarga. My own views earlier expressed in my "History of Language" have therefore to be modified and re–examined.

Nasal Vowels

If the anusvāra is taken as a nasalised vowel – a position not accepted by all, the people adopting the Sanskrit orthography might have recognised in Tamil some nasalised vowels. The m before v sound suffers a diminution in quantity according to Tolkāppiyar. This is what is labelled 'makarak kuṟukkam' and the oft-repeated example is ‘tarum vaḷavaṉ’. What happens however is not clear. It may be a labial m which was assimilated to the labio-dental v and became a labio-dental nasal or it may be that the u preceding m was nasalised and therefore m was not pronounced separately. If this were so, one may say there was nasalisation of vowels. This is not to decide the characteristic feature of Sanskrit anusvāra which is variously explained. This is only to show that there might have been nasalised vowels at least as variants. Since 'makarak kuṟukkam' has been mentioned this suggestion has to be made. The other kind of 'makarak kuṟukkam' where the m coming after n or ṇ has no further separate closure for it to be heard.

ai and au – a violence

The orthography in adopting the diphthongs ai and au certainly does violence to the genius of the Dravidian languages.

a+i has two syllables sometimes it gets its i still further shortened almost to sound as y. This has been identified as the sound corresponding to the Sanskrit diphthong ai. It could have recognised the following diphthongs as well āi, āy, ōi or ōy etc., But it is very doubtful whether Tamil had this diphthong ai. The cave inscriptions do not have any example for this.

Are They Long ?

It is said that both the diphthongs are long. This is probably wrong. In inititial rhyming – etukai or assonance these do not behave like long vowels. They never rhyme with any long vowel when there is assonance of two words: the first syllable in the two words must be of the same quantity i.e , only a matching long vowel or a matching short vowel and then the consonant of the second syllable must be identical. These are two necessary conditions of assonance or initial rhyming. Optionally more

syllables may be identical. 'vanta' and 'tanta' have assonance. Similarly, 'ākam' and 'kākam. 'kaitavan' which is equal to 'kaytavan' rhymes initially with 'ceytavan'. Here the vowel ce of ceytavan is not long ,nor can, therefore, the vowel ay, or ai in kaitavan be long. Kay as a closed syllable is long by position. But this can never justify anybody labelling the vowel ai as being long, in Tamil.

ai = ay

Tolkāppiyar is conscious of these difficulties. He equates in the first place a + i with ai and in another place a + y with ai. He also states that ai in some places behaves like a short vowel, of only one mātra duration except when it is a long syllable by position. By pointing out that in Tamil i and y alternate at the end he has safeguarded in a way the morphological structure. Roots like pō take the past tense sign i and become pōi, etc., the conjunctive participle. This has another form pōy. Here we have the characteristic feature of i which in a final position becomes so shortened that is equated with y. This equation is because of the influence of the orthography adopting y rather than ultra short i as a phoneme or an allophone. The root pira takes the verbal noun suffix vi, and in the days of compulsory glides we get the form pira + vi = piravi; ā + i = āvi, e.g. vēḷāvi; ō + i = ōvi, e. g. ōviyar. Before the days of compulsory glide rule one has the glottal stop between the vowels glided into each other when possible. Accepting y as phoneme and the variant of the final i, the following equations are made: ā + i = āy; pō + i = pōy; pira + i = piray or pirai – 'the new born crescent moon'. By introduction of y as the phoneme the picture gets a little blurred but not completely altered.

pōlieluttu

Further, it is only by taking ai as ay can one justify the assonance and other metrical peculiarities as pointed out in Pirayōka Vivēkam and Ilakkaṇakkottu. They plead for pōliyaluttu which equates ai with ay. There is nothing false about pōliyeluttu; there is nothing spurious about them. They were interpreted as spurious sounds by Naccinārkkiniyar who ruled

out the acceptance of Pōliyeluttu such as nāi=nāy, as Pirayōka Vivēkam states. pōliyeluttu means samānākṣara or similar sounds and these should not be ruled out, though the grammarian writes the final i as y. In certain dialects the final sound is clearly heard as a distinct i. cey is pronounced se-yi and nāy as nā-yi, both being heard as two syllables. It is topsy-turvydom to equate the final i with the second member of the diphthong ai and then justifying it by calling it samānākṣara.

au

Of course, the diphthong au, inspite of the attempts by Tolkāppiyar and other grammarians, did not take root in Tamil as ai did. auai was uniformly written avvai down from the caṅkam age, and this form alone shows its relationship with ammai and other connected words. It is thus seen that the introduction of the diphthongs, misled by the orthography they had before them, has done violence to the genius of the language, in spite of the exceptions which they framed only to confuse us.

Consonants

y and i

Coming to the consonants, we have already mentioned the wrong identification of final i with y. Tolkāppiyar's phonetic acumen has recognized the shorter i which he labelled the 'kurriyal ikaram' ultra short i, which may be suggested to have been equated with y in other places. Before the days of compulsory glide there was no place for y. The glide may be taken as the shortened form of i. The question is whether y is a phoneme in earlier Tamil. Its limited occurrence is significant. In the final position, as Tolkāppiyar himself suggested, y can be taken as really i. Y occurs initially, only with the vowel ā immediately following it. There was clearly an i preceding this y at least in some places even according to Tolkāppiyam. Tolkāppiyam mentions that ultra short i occurs before ya in the word keṇmiyā. It takes keṇmiyā as consisting of the root keṇ/kēḷ and the second personal clitic miyā. This is unnecessarily increasing the clitics. Tolkāppiyar has recognized yā as second personal clitic. Why add one more to the list?

Instead of taking it as kēṇ + miyā it is suggested that it may be taken as kēṇm + ya. kēṇm means only kēḷ, for, by this time the plural significance of m came to be forgotten. The i which he calls the extra short i is really part of ya, which will be then i + ā. There is another place in which this i was recognized by Tolkāppiyar as coming before yā, though he does not explain it in these terms. Tolkāppiyar states that the unrounded u becomes the ultra short i whenever a word beginning with yā follows it. From the way things have been explained, what happens here is a follows :

pakk + ia = pakkiya. Here the unrounded vowel release has no position when another word follows. This, i as pointed out by Tolkāppiyar, is extra short.

Tolkāppiyar, however, has not recognized the i before initial yā in any other place. Burrow in his 'Dravidic studies' has quoted this i coming before yā after a consonantal ending nā, e. g. pēr + yāṟu > periyāṟu. This must be explained as above, namely, pēr + iāṟu > pēriyāṟu Naṉṉūl sūtram 151, following Vīracōḷiyam, states that when any final consonant is followed by initial y, i. e. i comes in between, i. e. c + y > ciy (where c is any consonant, y is the semi-vowel y; and i is the vowel i which must be taken as ultra short i). Therefore, wherever one has an initial y followed by the long vowel ā, the ultra short i will come at the beginning of y. yā coming after a vowel has not been recognized to have i before it. But it has been suggested that if y is omitted from the phonemic list and if y is read as i then there is no difficulty. This will give no room for y in the early Tamil. iā > ā in later Tamil· iār which is now written yār becomes ār. Here ia becomes e. See ianṟa now written as iyanṟa > enṟa. This has occurred in other languages as well. What occurs as medial –y– followed by a vowel was originally c, e. g. ucir (by the loss of medial palatal c) > uir which is written as uyir. In this way one could have omitted, introducing y as a phoneme among Tamil, consonants of the early age. The glide would be the ultra short i. It must however be said in passing that y appears in the cave inscriptions, which also were blindly following the Sanskrit orthography.

velar nasal

The orthography also misled the early phonemecist to recognize the velar nasal as a phoneme, though it was not one in the early or medieval Tamil. Enough has been said for a foreign orthography misleading phonemicizing in Tamil. This question may be examined with reference to other Dravidian languages.

DRAVIDIAN GRAMMAR IN ENGLLISH AND COLLOQUIAL LANGUAGE

Mention was made of the grammar of Dravidian languages being written in Sanskrit when it was the lingua franca. Something similar is happening in modern times. English being an international language, grammars and grammatical studies have come to be written in English by not only foreigners but native scholars. In this connection, the writing of elementary grammars for the use of beginners, foreign and native, thanks to the introduction of universal education, may also be mentioned. These often simplify the grammatical rules and take note of colloquial usages found even in classics. The works of Gidugu Ramamurthy may be mentioned. This is another convergence which has emerged in recent times. A careful study of these works and their unique contributions with a short history of this kind of movement have to be brought together so as to explain this commonness in depth.

EPILOGUE - IV

A PECULIAR COMPREHENSIVE FEATURE OF THE GRAMMATICAL STUDIES IN THE MAIN DRAVIDIAN LANGUAGES

There is some peculiarity about the ancient Tamil grammar Tolkāppiyam and other Tamil grammars which appeared later right upto the nineteenth century, following Tolkāppiyam. Tolkāppiyam though dated variously (from 8000 B. C. to A. D. 600) is the earliest of the Tamil grammars now available. In a grammar one expects a theory of Morphology and Syntax with a theory of Phonology which will give the phonetic representation to the sentences so framed. Phonology roughly corresponds to what the Tamil grammarians call "Eluttu", i. e. the speech sound. The theory of Syntax roughly corresponds to what the Tamil grammarians call "col"- "word and composition of words into sentences". Tamil has only two main parts of speech, viz. noun and verb, which, however, are according to the genius of the Dravidian language not differentiated completely and hence are merely sysntactic categories, a state of affairs which requires morphological analysis and statement, to be made in the chapter on Syntax. Therefore one can easily understand the provision in grammar of the two parts, one for Eluttu and the other for Col; those parts are called Eluttatikāram and Collatikāram in Tolkāppiyam and in later grammars. One, therefore, expects these grammars to end with an exposition of these two parts.

But they do not. Tolkāppiyam has a third part called Porulatikāram or the portion dealing with Porul or contents, i. e. the contents of literature as differentiated from the grammatical form of literature. Tamil literature from ancient times differentiates between akam poetry or the poetry of the interior or of the noumenon and puram poetry or the poetry of the exterior or the poetry of the phonomenon (see my "History of Tamil Literature,) These distinctions need not be gone into in any detail except to state that Tolkāppiyam gives the conventions relating to these in the first four chapters of its third part: first chapter deals with puram; next three chapters with akam and its more important distinction of (1) kalavu or premarital love, and (2) Karpu or post-marital love; the fifth with contents or exceptional conventions relating to these two in general; the sixth with meyppaatu or rasas or poetic sentiments; the seventh with upama, or generally, figures of speech which can be looked upon as varieties or variations of upama; the eighth chapter is ceyyuliyal dealing with prosody and its conventions, and at the end he gives a few varieties of literary genres; the ninth and last chapter mentions certain marapu or conventional usages with reference to the words denoting the masculine and the feminine and the young ones of the non-human beings. (He gives the words for the young ones of human beings as well.)

The various topics dealt with under the third part came to be studied in detail and in time developed into a few independent studies. The study of contents itself assumed an importance as explained in the commentary on Iraiyanār Akapporul. We get a suggestively significant anecdote which is relevant for the purpose in hand. The Pandiya country suffered from a devastating famine for twelve years when scholars dispersed themselves to various parts of the world in search of their livelihood. After the famine was over, the king tried to bring back the scholars; but whilst experts in Phonology and Syntax were available there was no scholar knowing anything of the Porul. The king felt miserable and according to that anecdote, Iraiyanār Akapporul was written by God himself in answer to his prayers. It is said, in the anecdote, by the king that after all "Eluttu" and "Col" were studied only for the sake of "Porul" and that if there was nobody to explain "Porul" what was the use of a knowledge of "Eluttu" and "Col".

Apart from Iraiyanār Akapporul, there are other works probably following its footsteps – Nampiyakapporul Māranakapporul etc.,

All these works, however, refer only to "Akam" which even today is considered to be of universal interest. But "Puram" also has separate treatises. The story goes that each one of the twelve disciples of Agastiya wrote a separate chapter on the twelve aspects of "Puram". On compilation, these twelve chapters together were given the name of "Pannirupatalam". One of the chapters, the very first therein, is attributed to Tolkāppiyar; but since Tolkāppiyam accepts only seven rather than twelve aspects of "Puram", this Tolkāppiyar of the story must be a later person of the same name, a disciple of Agastiya of later times. Following this Pannirupatalam, one Aiyanāritanār wrote his Purapporul Venpāmālai including therein illustrative verses as well.

The next study to be developed in greater detail and importance is prosody or "yāppu". A host of works came to be written as seen from the quotations found in the famous commentary on Yāpparunkalam of the tenth or eleventh century. Various schools of thoughts arose and the Sanskrit prosody also came to be studied and applied to Tamil prosody. At one stage "alankāra" was included as part of "yāppu" or prosody. Yāpparunkalam gives a list of figures of speech.

But "alankāra" also developed into an independent study. Dandin, the author of Kāvyādarṣa, is said to have belonged to the court of Narasimha, the great Pallava of the early seventh century. This made his work the authoritative one in Tamil land even to this day. There is a translation in akaval metre. The Alankārap patalam in Vīracōliyam in kattalaikalitturai metre is another translation. We have quotations from another book called 'Aninūl,' but the work in full is not available. Māranalankāram was a later book. In the nineteenth century 'Candrālōkam' and 'Kuvalayāndam' were translated into Tamil.

There was another study developed which went by the name of Pāttiyal. There was an attempt to introduce Astrology into Prosody. (See poruttams or affinities of letters and words to the patron, etc.) But what is of permanent interest is the classification of the various kinds of literature. By the sixteenth century, people began to speak of 96 kinds of prabhandas, whilst Tolkaapiyar spoke of 8 vanappu or kinds of liter-

ature. There were a number of works from time to time in the middle ages. The earliest compilation out of older works was Pannirupāttiyal.

There is another study which developed out of Tolkāppiyam. Tolkāppiyar in his chapter on "col" divides the fully-formed words into noun and verb; and again, going down to the morphemic level, he divides all morphemes into: (1) root morphemes or uriccol, and (2) non-root morphemes or itaiccol. In explaining uriccol or root morphemes, he has, perforce, to use the fully - formed word of a verbal noun to give the meaning of root-morphemes which are not of independent occurrence. But this mode of giving the meaning was misunderstood and he was taken to have given a kind of Nighantu or dictionary. Nirukta and Nighantu form part of the study of grammar in Vedic Sanskrit and, therefore, the mistaken conception of uriyiyal let to the development of dictionaries of uriccols. We have the oldest amongst the extant dictionaries, i. e. Tivākaram, followed by a host of dictionaries in various poetic metres. But though a knowledge of Nighantu was considered necessary for beginning a study of grammar, it was not included as an item of Tamil grammatical study.

Though various studies thus arose, only five were considered important, into which the rest came to be included, viz. Eluttu, Col, Porul, Yāppu, and Ani or Alankāram. Vīracōliyam of the eleventh century by a Buddhist, who introduced Sanskrit methods as a grammatical approach to Tamil, first emphasized this five-fold approach. His work consists of five parts: Eluttatikāram, Collatikāram, Porulatikāram, Yāppatikāram, and Alankāram. His Eluttu consists in one patalam, Sandhippatalam; Collatikāram consists of six patalams; whilst Yāppu and Alankāram each has only one patalam. Therefore it is not clear whether the division of five atikārams is his. But there can be no doubt that a five - fold division already emerged by the time of that work.

The next great comprehensive work is Ilakkana vilakkam by Vaittiyanātha Nāvalar of the late seventeenth century. It is a compilation of Nannūl, Nampiyakapporul, Purapporul,- Venpāmālai, Yāpparunkalakkārikai, and Tantiyalankāram, with

modifications of his own, along with quotations from Tolkāp-piyam. Though he treats of the five - fold studies, following Tolkāppiyar he divides his work into three parts only, namely, Eḷuttu, Col, and Poruḷ. In passing one may add that Uvamayi-yal of Tolkāppiyam developed later into the alaṅkāra sāstra; ceyyuḷiyal into Yāppatikāram; and eight vaṇappu into the pāṭṭiyal of later times. Tolkāppiyar's chapter on Puṟattiṇai is the origin, in one sense, of books like 'Puṟapporuḷ Veṇpāmālai.' Books like 'Iṟaiyaṉārakapporuḷ' owe their inspiration to Tolkāppiyar's three chapters on Akam. His chapter on rasa or meyppāṭu has not developed into an independent study except for passing reference in Alaṅkārasāstras

What is significant is that Father Beschi, an Italian, writing his grammar, Toṉṉūl in the eighteenth century, follows this five-fold study. He calls his work "Aintilakkaṇat Toṉṉūl", i. e. Toṉṉūl, the five-fold grammar.

In the twentieth century Muttuvīra Upāttiyāyar has Eḷuttu, Col, Poruḷ, Yāppu, and Aṇi atikārams in his 'Muttu-vīriyam'.

Thus the five-fold division has come to be firmly established. This came to be called the conception of pañcalakṣaṇa as it is made clear by some of the publications of the nineteenth century.

Lakṣaṇa in Tamil becomes ilakkaṇam and means grammar. Lakṣaṇa, rather "lakṣiya lakṣaṇa", is vyākaraṇa according to Kātyāyaṇa; and Patañjali interprets lakṣaṇa itself as grammar. Usage of the word lakṣaṇa for Tamil ilakkaṇam is retained only in Tamil. As Kātyāyaṇa himself found it necessary to inter-pret it, it may be taken to be an earlier usage, and it is surpri sing that this usage is retained only in Tamil. But ilakkaṇam has developed new nuances as seen by the gradual development of the five-fold study already referred to.

The tradition of Pañcalakṣaṇa was continued in the nine-teenth and twentieth centuries. John Murdoch in his catalogue of Tamil printed books writes as follows :-

Tamil Grammar, or Belles Letters as Beschi terms it, is arranged under five heads: (1) letters or orthography, (2) words

(this head treats of the four parts of speech, noun, verb, adjective and particles excluded Etymology and Syntax), (3) matter in the opinion of Tamilians it professes to treat of the nature and qualities of things in general; but in all known works extant on this subject it confines itself to Agapporuḷ' in which rules are laid down for the composition of amatory effusions, and Puṟapporuḷ, wherein rules are given for compos-ing treatises on war, fortifications, the maintenance of the public good, etc., and sometimes on morality, (4) Prosody or verisifcation, (5) Rhetoric.

Murdoch mentions the publication, "Pañcalakṣaṇa Surukka Viṉāviḍai" (16 mo, 99 PP. 2 as.), by Irajakopala Mutaliyar, nineteenth century (a catechism on the five parts of grammar).

Among the books published and registered between 1867 and 1900 the following publications are to be noted:-

1451: (i) Pañcalaṭcaṇa mūlam (naṉṉūl mutaliya nūlkaḷ) (ii) A irāma suvāmikaḷ, jeevārakṣīmirta accukkūṭam, Madras; (iii) 1886; (iv) Se-mū-pa 295; (v) 16 x 13 c. m.; (vi) ......; (vii) iṉṉūlil naṉṉūl, Akapporuḷ viḷakkam, Puṟappruḷ Veṇpā-mālai, Yāpparuṅkalak kārikai, Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram, Nēminātam, Vīracōḷiyam ākiya nūlkaḷ tokukkappaṭṭuḷḷaṉa.

(1451: (i) பஞ்சலட்சண மூலம் (நன் னூல் முதலிய நூல்கள்); (ii) அ. இராமசுவாமிகள், ஜீவரக்ஷ்மிர்த அச்சுக்கூடம், சென்னே; (iii) 1886; (iv) செ. மூ. ப. 295; (v) 16 x 13 செ. மு.; (vi)...... ; (vii) இந்நூலில் நன்னூல், அகப்பொருள் விளக்கம், புறப் பொருள் வெண்பாமாலே, யாப்பருங்கலக் காரிகை, தண்டியலங் காரம், நேமிநாதம், வீரசோழியம் ஆகிய நூல்கள் தொகுக்கப் படுடுள்ளன.)

Various editions of these different works along with commentaries were published from time to time. In addition; the books on literary genres, namely, various Pāṭṭiyals have also been published with their respective commentaries.

In the twentieth century when Tamil came to be studied in-tensively both at the post-graduate level of modern times and at the Vidwan level according to old oriental tradition, apart from a complete study of Tolkāppiyam, a detailed study of Naṉṉūl

for eḻuttu and col; Nambiyakapporuḷ for Akam; Puṟapporuḷ Veṇpāmālaifor Puṟam; Yāpparuṅkalak kārikai for Yāppu; and Taṇṭiyalaṅkāram for Aṇi have to be studied with their commentaries, often along with any Pāṭṭiyal or any book on literary genres. Thus it is clear that the five-fold study of grammar is old, though originally beginning only as a three-fold study but including even therein the five-fold study of later times and a study of literary genres. This tradition is as old as the study of Tamil grammar itself and this tradition continues to the modern times.

The motivation for this five-fold study is not clearly stated in Tolkāppiyam. He refers to the literary and colloquial usage and his aim is to explain the principles of these usages as exhaustively as possible leaving the study to fill up the rest through implications of his explicit statements understood in terms of the usages. He also allows for changes due to history.

But in his study of ceyyuḷ or literary composition he mentions nōkku (நோக்கு) as one of the organic elements of the literary composition. nōkku means aim; the aim of poetry or the aim of a poem. According to Tolkāpiyar, it is so called because the quantity of sounds, their various combinations into syllables, feet, lines, etc. all serve but one purpose of subserving the aim and enriching it. From this it can be implied that the other studies carried on under eḻuttu and col ultimately serve but the one purpose of enriching the literary composition, all of them subserving to the one aim of any poem. In this connection one is reminded of Līlātilakam which speaks of the body of poetry as contrasted with the soul of poetry, namely, rasa.

The study of language even under eḻuttu and col was as usual with everything Indian, aimed at the ultimate salvation or release. A sutram states: "aṟam poruḷ iṉpam vīṭu aṭaital nūṟpayaṉ" (அறம் பொருள் இன்பம் வீடு அடைதல் நூற்பயன்). The usefulness of a book consists in the achievement of dharma, artha, kāma and mōkṣa. Civañāṉa muṉivar further points out that grammar is an aid to the understanding of the works on dharma, artha, kāma and mōkṣa. He quotes a verse: By

learning the letters and the sounds, meanness is destroyed, and when one gets rid of this defect he escapes the hurdles coming through words. Such a fortunate one experiences the subject-matter of the first works above mentioned and attains mōkṣa getting rid of the fetters which stand in the way".

"eluttaṟiyat tīrum iḷitakaimai tīrntāṉ
moḻittirattiṉ muttaruppāṉākum moḻittirattiṉ
muttarutta nallōṉ mutaṉūr poruḷ uṇarntu
kaṭṭaruttu vīṭu peṟum"–

"எழுத்தறியத் தீரும் இழிதகைமை தீர்ந்தான்
மொழித்திறத்தின முட்டறுப்பானுகுய – மொழித்திறத்தின்
முட்டறுத்த நல்லோன் முதனூற பொருளுணர்ந்து
கடடறுத்து வீடு பெறும் ''.

We need not go into the question of the philosophy of śabda, especially śabdabbrahma, where the consummation contemplated above becomes, according to those schools, of immediate achievement. But it is curious that Robins concludes his "Short History of Linguistics", (Longmans, 1967, p. 233) with the following significant statement.

"In striving towards the understanding and knowledge of language, man has throughout his intellectual history been seeking more fully to attain self-knowledge, and to obey the injunction that faced the visitor to Apollos temple at Delphi; the centre of the ancient Greek world, where our civilization finds its source" – Gnathiseauton (know thyself).

Even Bloomfield, with his behavioural anti-mentalistic approach, has a similar high conception of Linguistics. For, he writes in his "Introduction to Linguistic Science" (New York, 1914, p. 325): "Linguistic Science is a step in the self-realization of man".

Though the ultimate aim is as described above, each one of the five fold-studies appears to be self-contained: eḻuttu gives us the theory of phonology and Sandhi; col the theory of Syntax. These books state that they give the complete statement of the principles wherein, with the help of statements made, other facts not explicitly stated can also be explained. A complete statement of the principle or theory is thus contemplated, at least in

eḻuttu and col. There the authority is not only literary usage, ceyyuḷ vaḻakku, but also the colloquial usage, ulaka vaḻakku (Tol., Naṉṉūl, P. Vivēkam, Vīracōḻiyam).

The conception of some of the important parts of Dravidian grammar may be compared with what Thrax begins his grammatical work, Techne Grammatike. Thrax was a disciple of Aristarchus of the second century who was the founder of Scientific Homaric Scholarship in the second century B. C. in Alexandria.

Robins writes as follows :

"The Techne begins with an exposition of the concept of grammatical studies as this was seen by the ALEXANDARIANS. He writes "Grammar is the practical knowledge of the general usages of poets and prose-writers. It has six parts: first, accurate reading (aloud) with due regard to the prosodies; second, explanation of the literary expressions in the works; third, the provision of notes on phraseology and subject matter; fourth, the discovery of etymologies; fifth, the working out of analogical regularities; sixth, the appreciation of literary compositions, which is the noblest part of grammar" (R. H. Robins, "A Short History of Linguistics", Longmans: London, 1967, p. 31).

"Thrax belongs to the Greek world. Coming to the Roman world, Quintilian wrote extensively on education, and in his Institutio Oratoria, wherein he expounded his opinions, he dealt briefly with grammar, regarding it as a propaedaentic to the full and proper appreciation of literature in a liberal education, in terms very similar to those used by Thrax at the beginning of the Techne" (*ibid*, p. 53).

The ideal of the study is the understanding and appreciation of literature and literary usages inclusive of temporary literary flashes in colloquial usages.

A comprehensive study like that of Pañcalakṣaṇa is found in other Dravidian languages in a general way. For example, Līlātilakam in Malayāḷam, Kavirājamārga in Kannaḍa. The name Kavirājamārga, the royal path of poet or poetry, beautifully brings out the idea of the pañcalakṣaṇa. "Kāvyālokana" also is a book on poetics; but its first part 'śabda smṛti',

which is really a grammar of Kannada, though forming part of the work in poetics. Its author is Nāgavarma of the twelfth century. Līlātilakam speaks, as already pointed out, of the body and soul of poetry, the grammar being the body.

In Telugu also this trend is found. Peddaṇṇa's "Kavyālaṅkāra Cūḍamaṇi", though an authoritative book on poetics, deals with grammar proper, prosody, poetics and rhetoric, or figures of speeches. Appa Kavi, the other great author, starts by saying that he is going to write on grammar, prosody, and poetics; but he actually writes only on grammar and prosody. The experts in the other three Dravidian languages may give more details about these works and also about other works of similar nature which can justify of our speaking of this comprehensive trends as a common characteristic feature of the four main Dravidian languages.

So much for the common approach. But in fairness one must add that there is something unique in the arrangement followed by Tamil grammarians. There is nothing comparable to the study of Akam and Puram elsewhere. Caṅkam literature proper consists of a series of anthologies of dramatic monologues. Puram, as already explained, deals with phenomenon under seven heads : (1) poetry of the skirmishes preceding a regular war; (2) poetry of invasion; (3) poetry of sieges; (4) poetry of the pitched battle of heroism; (5) poetry of victory which includes not only victory in war but also in other aspects of life; (6) poetry of the impermanence of the world; and (7) the poetry of patronage. This is not strictly followed in later times because that frame-work cannot fit in with the development of world of phenomenon, though a knowledge thereof is necessary for the study of Puram poetry of Caṅkam age.

The Akam poetry or the poetry of noumenon is mainly a poetry of love—love which is the basic noumenon. It has its own conventions, almost worked out, perhaps by the ideas, beliefs, and mythology and geography of the ancient Tamilians in all its concrete richness, into a myth or an art-motif, which was taken up by the poets of Caṅkam age, as the convenient frame-work or background for the poetic exposition of their highly

significant almost philosophical scheme, though never ceasing to be poetic-love. The five aspects of love, viz. (1) coming together of the lovers (kuṟiñci); (2) their separation (pālai); (3) their bouderies (marutam); (4) their living together actually or in thought (mullai), and (5) their despair (neytal). Under this convention each had its own fixed surroundings consisting of men, animals, plants, etc., representing, as it were, the idealized situation for enriching and making alive each aspect of the drama of love. The poets have taken up this convention and used it as an art-motiff for appealing to the audience aware of this kind of myth. This made it possible by mere suggestion to any one of these conventions to create the relevant world in all its concrete richness. The result is seen in the almost unbelievable economy achieved. To understand this poetry these conventions including those pertaining to the participants, the peculiar situations, the restrictions and liberties of the addressees, the conventions about tenses used, suggestions made, figures of speech elaborated peculiar modes of interpretation, etc. have to be thoroughly understood. It is, therefore, clear why, in addition to prosody, rhetoric, study of poetic sentiments and literary generes, the conventions above mentioned relating to Akam and Puṟam poetry have to be specifically mentioned in Tolkāppiyam and other Tamil works. In the absence of any such convention elsewhere no such study can be expected in other regions. As already stated, Puṟam convention has ceased to have universal validity in its entirety. But love īs of universal validity. In Tamil, when the secular poetry of the Caṅkam was succeeded by spiritual and religious poetry of Alwārs and Nāyanmārs, the Akam conventions have been boldly adopted so as to form a framework for the mystic poetry, especially of the variety of bridal love. In this way these traditions are part of the living heritage of Tamil poetry. There are attempts made to explain the Prakrit work, Satta Sayi (Sapta Sati), in terms of these Akam conventions. But this is not material to the present purpose which consists in pointing out the uniqueness of the treatment of Akam and Puṟam in Tolkā-piyam and other Tamil works.

ERRATA

Page/line	change	to
5/4	paṇti	pāṇti
5/38	Mittiraṉṉār	Mittiraṉār
7/4	Phartṛhari	Bhartṛhari
8/1	kuruntokai	kuṟuntokai
13/28	veṅketanāta	veṅkaṭanāta
13/32	minimize	minimizes
14/33	luminary.	luminary,
14/35	translator. He revisad	translator, revised
15/31	Rāmānjācāriyār	Rāmānujācāriyār
15/41	Aṭṭavatanam	Aṭṭavatānam
16/1	Dr. Swami Natha	Dr. Swaminatha
17/1	Tamilised	Tamilized
24/28	uṟupu	urupu
26/17	tokai Marapu	tokaimarapu
26/36	proceeded	preceeded
37/3-	karutta	Karuttā
41/18	diphthongs or	diphthongs are
41/21	a+u = ōx	a + u = ō
44/14	a pen	the pen
44/18	works smaller	works of smaller
48/5	human low	human, low
52/5	(sū : 3ǝ)	(Sū : 30)
54/18	places are	places as
54/24	nīrkkīl	nīrkkīḻ
55/2	kāṟakas	kārakas
55/11	mūnrām	mūṉrām
55/14	naṅkām	nāṉkām
55/17	aiṉtām	aintām
55/29	kor	kōr
57/19	infinitivc	infinitive
57/21	ceytaṉ	ceytāṉ
62/30	vīracōlkyam	vīracōḻiyam
65/7	withouı	without

70/13	(V. C. Sū4o;	(V. C. Sū 40;
73/21	māṉākkanukku	māṉākkaṉukku
73/26	dlstinguishes	distinguishes
74/28	cirumaiyiṉ	ciṟumaiyiṉ
78/27	akāyattiṉkaṭ	ākāyattiṉkaṭ
80/2	Pirayōk	Pirayōka
83/17	piruttuk	pirittuk
84/13	to interpreted	to be interpreted
91/17	niṉrum	niṉṟum
91/18	But in	But its
92/8	convension	convention
94/11	s the	is the
95/10	some	come
95/29	pūvirku	pūviṟku
99/18	las	last
99/29	Sonskrit	Sanskrit
102/25	ellipsie	ellipsis
105/28	eluvāy	eḷuvāy
105/32	mūnām	mūṉṟām
106/1	nāṉkām	nāṉkām
109/34	takai	tokai
113/33	"something "something	"something
115/4	nirai	niṟai
118/15	karraḷai	karrāḷai
118/23	thc	the
119/22	Kātyāyaṇa	Kātyāyana
120/23	ạhe	the
120/27	lose	loss
121/13	all them	all of them
123/31	paṇai	paṇai
123/33	at	atu
123/34	a	ā
124/2	glids	glides
127/33	eṇṭicai	eṇṭicai
129/2	kēṭariyaṉ	kēṭariyaṉ
129/14	savarṇa	savarna
129/15	>a	>ā
129/16	> i	>ī
129/28	ekam	ēkam

131/14	eompounds	compounds
134/13	rūḍhi	rūḍhi
137/15	rūḍhi	rūḍhi
140/27	pariyatu	periyatu
141/18	Tolkāppiya	Tolkāppiyam
142/17	vāṇtu	yāṇtu
142/31	denoiing	denoting
144/11	"witeness"	"whiteness"
146/19	interpretted	interpreted
148/25	kaṭā	kaṭa
149/12	mīṭci	mīṭci
150/4	ampaḷattāṭi	ampalattāṭi
150/20	ending and	ending
150/20	u	ū
156/12	niṉrāl	niṉṟāḷ
156/14	uṇkirār	uṇkiṟār
156/15	niṉṟārkḷ	niṉṟārkaḷ
156/26	uraṅkuvārkaḷ	uṟaṅkuvārkaḷ
158/8	vīto	vīṭō
159/22	sigular	singular
160/9	(Vīacōḷiyam	(Vīracōḷiyam
164/5	uṟai	urai
164/13	vaṉ	van
165/1	it	its
167/19	avaṉait	avaṉaittēṟṟāṭal
168/5	faught	fought
172/15	vāḷāā	vāḷāa
173/27	proeeds	proceeds
178/19	uṇtāṉ	uṇtāṉ
184/24	kārkūṟu	kārkūṟu
186/14	uṇtenpatu	uṇtenpatu
187/19	uṇpāṉ	uṇpāṉ
191/4	tira	tīra
191/4	tirvata	tīrva
208/3	ēri	ēṟi
209/3	vāḷnāl	vāḷnāḷ
211/21	wiil	will
218/9	guṅas	guṇas
230/19	ūḷ	ūḷ

231/7	Neccinārkkniyar	Naccinārkkiniyar
231/14	paṭuvatu	paṭuvatu
231/32	metrial	metrical
255/21	load	lord
256/7	(the examples	The examples (
261/6	poṭuvitam	potuviṭam
273/18	uyar	uyar
274/8	eṉpa	eṉpa
277/22	dhatus	dhātus
286/1	**Absorbtion**	**Absorption**
286/4	absorbtion	absorption
286/8	absorbtion	absorption
291/12	Toe	The
292/30	singie	single
298/7	sanskrit	Sanskrit
299/9	Aruṉakiri	Aruṉakiri
305/18	techinical	technical