II. UYIRMAYAńKlYAL.

I.

uyrūniyál, the sixth chapter deals with the augments. As already stated, they belong to morphology rather than to phonology here examined.

II.

uyirmayańkiyal and pulšimayańkiyal though treated as two chapters form one unit because the general exception to these two chapters occurs at the end of pulšimayańkiyal.

III.

In the first chapter vowels are taken seriatim. First, rules are given for non-case relationship in the presence of plosives, then of nasals, semi-vowels and lastly of vowels, wherein, in all these cases, the change occurring in the initial of the following word is dealt with. Next are given cases of no changes and a few special cases. The case relationship is then lastly taken up.

This is the general pattern. Tolkāppiyar also tries to point out that the general rule in all these
cases is only one, that is, the doubling of the coming plosives. Instead of generalising that way in the beginning itself, he leaves it to the student to do generalise. But he forcibly brings this conclusion to the mind of the student by the method he follows usually called māttēru 'linkage' with reference to the grammatical sutras. It means defining a rule with reference to a particular ending and if the same rule applies to other endings, instead of repeating it with reference to each ending, it is asserted that the rule there also is identical or similar to the one already explained with reference to the previous endings.

For instance, the rule for $\zeta a$ $\mathfrak{I}$ ending is first stated for non-case relationship\(^1\) and then coming to discuss the $\zeta a$ $\mathfrak{I}$ ending the sutra states $\zeta a$ $\mathfrak{I}$ behaves like $\zeta a$ $\mathfrak{J}$.\(^2\) The words used are atancarra\(^3\) or iyārnu 'is similar'.\(^4\) The $\zeta u \mathfrak{I}$ ending in non-case relationship is of the same nature as that of $\zeta a \mathfrak{J}$.\(^5\) The $\zeta i \mathfrak{I}$ ending in non-case relationship had already been treated and therefore, case relationship is alone discussed under this ending. The next is $\zeta i \mathfrak{I}$ ending; in non-case relationship he states, that it is similar to $\zeta a \mathfrak{J}$.\(^6\) The long endings are based on previous long endings. So also $\zeta u \mathfrak{I}$ is similar to $\zeta a \mathfrak{J}$ and $\zeta ð \mathfrak{I}$ is like $\zeta u \mathfrak{J}$ and $\zeta ð \mathfrak{J}$ is like $\zeta ð \mathfrak{J}$.\(^9\)
This series suggest that the sutram ūkāra iyūti śkāra iyārē should have been śkāra iyārē because the general pattern of Tolkāppiyar's sutram is to suggest the similarity with the last of the sutras related and not with the first of the group.

It has also been pointed out that generally non-case relationship and case relationship follow the same rule. Tolkāppiyar gives first the rule relating to the non-case relationship and then he says 'case relationship is similar' to that e.g. ṭ a ṭ ending of words standing in non-case relationship with the following word behave in a particular way; then ṭ a ṭ is said to behave in a similar way even when standing in case relationship. Under ṭ ā ṭ occurs the sutra in the same form but naturally ātu 'it' refers to non-case relationship of ṭ a ṭ. Under ṭ ū ā ṭ, ś ū ṭ, ś ē ṭ and ś ō ṭ we get the same sutra repeated.

For ṭ ai ṭ and ṭ au ṭ we do not get such a sutra. The ṭ au ṭ ending follows the same rule both in non-case relationship and case relationship, that is, the doubling of the plosive and the coming in of the augment ś u ṭ. Therefore there are no two sutras for this ṭ au ṭ ending. The ṭ ai ṭ ending had already been treated with
reference to the non-case relationship in tokai marapu.

IV.

The pullimayunkiyal also takes the consonantal endings in the following order \( \text{त्र-} J, \text{न-} J, \text{प-} J, \text{म-} J, \text{न-} J, \text{म-} J, \text{द-} J, \text{र-} J, \text{आ-} J, \text{अ-} J, \text{द-} J \) and \( \text{त्र-} J \) i.e. the nasals and semi vowels are arranged in the order in which they first and semi vowels second occur in the alphabet. But there is an exception with reference to \( \text{न-} J \) which instead of following \( \text{न-} J \) precedes it. This is because the \( \text{न-} J \) ending follows the rules of \( \text{त्र-} J \) ending and also because \( \text{न-} J \) ending appears only in two words whilst \( \text{त्र-} J \) ending appears only in one word. Therefore both the endings could be exhaustively treated as yet as summarily as possible. Therefore they are taken together. This is pointed out by Naccinarkkiniyar.

The verbal nouns which are not different from root forms takes the augment \( \text{ern-} J \). This is stated with reference to \( \text{त्र-} J \) in the first sutram on pullimayunkiyal, for \( \text{न-} J \) there is linkage; \text{nakara irutiyum atapúrki} i.e. \( \text{न-} J \) is similar (i.e. to \( \text{न-} J \)). But with reference to \( \text{त्र-} J, \text{म-} J, \text{ल-} J \) and \( \text{द-} J \) they are said to follow the same rule when their verb forms occur as forms verbal
nouns and therefore this form of the sutram tolír payar eḻlām
tolír payar iyala is repeated with reference to each one of
these endings. There are words under the various endings
which follow the same rule, for instance, the taking of the
augment saṭṭu with reference to which ff. 241, 242, 287, 377
and 402 are linked. The last refers to its previous word
and that to its previous word and so on; the linkage goes
to pani to irul. There is a kind of implicit oxymoron in
the sutras when they say pani 'cold season' behaves like
vali 'the season of wind'; malai 'rainy season' behaves like
vali; veyil 'summer or sunshine' behaves like malai and
irul 'darkness' behaves like veyil. So also the ff. 242,
262, 278, 282 and 313 are linked because they get the same
sandhi rule. Tolkāppiyar also groups certain words which
get the same sandhi rule, like ya, pitā, talā in a sutram.14
There is another kind of linkage where the rules of the
various endings are linked to the various rules already
enumerated in urupiyyal which refers to their occurrence with
case signs. In all these the phrase urupiyyal nilaiyum 'same
as that when it is followed by a case suffix' is repeated.15
In the same way if the non-verbal nouns behave like the
verbal nouns the phrase 'tolipuyar ivarre' 'similar to the verbal nouns' is repeated.\textsuperscript{16}

V.

Therefore it remains for us to note only exceptions to the rule of the doubling of the initial plosive of in the following word. The first rule for the $\underline{\ldots} a \overline{\ldots}$ ending deals with nouns in non-case relationship and the second sutram with non-nouns following the same rule. ff. 205, 206 and 207 have been dealt with already.\textsuperscript{17} We had already referred to the fact that words like tam which becomes tam ought to be treated as two forms and that the rule which applies to the one need not apply to the other. $\underline{\ldots} a \overline{\ldots}$ etc. become lengthened into $\underline{\ldots} a \overline{\ldots}$ etc. and these $\underline{\ldots} a \overline{\ldots}$ etc. need not follow the rule laid down with reference to $\underline{\ldots} a \overline{\ldots}$ etc. In this view it is not necessary to read any implied rule in ff. 207, about these changed forms. What happens when these $\underline{\ldots} a \overline{\ldots}$ etc. are lengthened is not stated here, for such lengthening is noticed in ff. 208. That is, $\underline{\ldots} y \overline{\ldots}$ which usually occurs after the lengthened bases is a \textit{g} regressive glide; the non statement of the glide with reference to these bases shows what was specifically stated i.e. the coming in of $\underline{\ldots} v \overline{\ldots}$ after the short demonstrative
bases should not be looked upon as a glide. This lengthening of the demonstrative base does not take place, when the following word begins with a consonant. Even this lengthening is said to be occurring only in poetry. The commentators give only cases of $\sim \tilde{a} \sim$ followed by a word beginning with a vowel. They state that this lengthening will take place even when they are followed by a nasal or semi-vowel; but no examples have been given. It has to be stated in passing that in Malayalam this is true.

In the word cāva the final syllable is lost in a few cases, when followed by plosives and non plosives; when that happens the general rule of the doubling of the plosives shall apply. This general application need not be taken as an implied meaning of the sutram.

The next sutram (ff. 210) is really important as giving us the exception. In the vocative case there is naturally a pause after the noun; so also there is, after a finite verb. The viyāṇköl also is a finite verb, and which is more or less like the word 'hallo' in English and which according to ff. 212 may become lengthened has also a pause following it. The neuter noun ends in $\sim \tilde{a} \sim$ and this is capable of being used as a predicate; therefore there
is also a pause following it. It will be therefore impossible
to expect any intimate contact being developed between these
words and those which follow them. As a result there is
really no sandhi and the rule of doubling of the plosive does
not apply. The verbal participle on the pattern ceyiya and
the relative participle on the pattern ceyta also behave like
the other words mentioned here. It is not clear whether it
was due to the analogy of the other form mentioned above or
for any other reason that a pause is developed after these.
Anna is really on the pattern of the relative participle.

vinaî ecu kilavi 'verbal participle' men-
tioned in ff. 204 should be in view of this sūtram limited
only to the verbal participle on the pattern ceyta. It is
pointed out by Naccinārkkiniyar that the form ceyyana is an
ancient form. The form ceyta includes the negative form
ceyyata. The forms of relative pronoun derived from the
noun pala cilla palla cilla and uilla are mentioned in collati-
karam amongst the neuter plurals ending in ç a ç a . Naccin-
ārkkiniyar points out palla and cilla do not occur in modern
times, that is, in his own times. The vivānkoî is said to
imply the command. Therefore it is pointed out that there
are viyankol which do not imply any command. This is according to Ilampūranar. But Naccinārkkiniyar holds that the command is always implied in viyankōl and that therefore the phrase óvakannya is an explanatory rather than a determining or restrictive qualification. It is not clear why the finite verbs ending in a ā are not included here; perhaps we are not having here all that Tolkāppiyar wrote.

The next sutram speaks the loss of the final syllable in vāliya. This word is referred to as to ceyaven kilavi, according to Naccinārkkiniyar’s reading. Ilampūranar takes it as ceyen kilavi. The meaning according to Ilampūranar is that the prayer or blessing is for a life, reaching a very distant time. Naccinārkkiniyar also interprets it likethat; but has the reading ceyan kilavi which he interprets it as ceyaven cecakkilavi. There seems to be something wrong; if atleast it has been stated ceyyiya ene kilavi it may be a little more understandable.

But there is one important point here that the optative form is really in the form of the infinitive of the pattern ceyā according to some theory. Since no mention is made of the initial sound of the word that follows, it may
be taken as a general rule applicable to all environments. The last three statements about *cayya*, *ama* and *pila* in ff. 210 seems to be the subject matter respectively ff. 211, 212, and 213.

VI.

*pila* and *cila* are said to be getting their ending lengthened in the verse. The verse here may be taken as referring to the literary usage which conserves older usages. *pilaam* and *cilaam* are given as examples. This supports the suggestion that the \( \text{l} \text{ m} \text{j} \) ending was an amending originally before plosives and that in course of time the final ending was lost leaving only *pila*, *cila* etc. How the final \( \text{l} \text{ m} \text{j} \) developed into a conjunctive um seems a problem to be dealt with under morphology and hence it is not discussed further.

The sutram that follows speaks of these *pila* and *cila* standing as *pad* and *cil* and getting their final \( \text{l} \text{ l} \text{j} \) changed into an alveolar plosive \( \text{l} \text{ r} \text{j} \). The loss of the final \( \text{l} \text{ a} \text{j} \) has necessarily to be implied. That can be only when these words come before themselves. Venkataraju Reddiar states that the implications of the
loss of the final $\sim a$ need not be read into this sutram. According to him the $\sim 1$ which changes into the $\sim r$ is the syllabic letter la and he quotes ff. 356 where $\sim 1$ means only the syllable la. Before semi vowels, there cannot be any such alternation. But one may raise the question "Is ff. 356 genuine?"

The next sutram speaks of pala and cila getting the ordinary rule of doubling of the plosive, both in non-case relationship and case relationship. These words certainly behave when changed into pal according to the rule ff. 379 though as usual the commentators deny the operation of the general rule here and therefore are forced to read an implication. The case relationship is then taken up and said to behave like non-case relationship. Ḩruvila is said to be a name of a village in vēnātu or hamlet in Karuvūr. Ḩolai is blade or leaf. Both the commentators refer to the genetive case as kūna vērrumai.

VII.

There are specific words which end in $\sim a$. ff. 217 states that in sandhi a nasal comes in after the
names of the trees. This nasal according to ff. 143 will change into the corresponding homorganic nasal of the following plosive. There is another way of looking at it. The original ending may be nasal probably \( \sqrt{m} \) or \( \sqrt{n} \) according to the ff. 82. There is a tendency for the nasal ending to disappear. It is because in a number of words such \( \sqrt{n} \) or \( \sqrt{m} \) has disappeared that the vowel endings seems to have grown in number.

VIII.

It will be seen that most of the names of the trees whatever be their endings, either get a nasal at the end, either \( \sqrt{am} \) or \( \sqrt{m} \) in the sandhi. The sandhi may be taken to represent the ancient form of these words ending in \( \sqrt{m} \) or \( \sqrt{am} \). For otherwise it is not clear why these should come in after \( \sqrt{va} \), \( \sqrt{pita} \), \( \sqrt{tala} \), \( \sqrt{ma} \), \( \sqrt{uti} \), \( \sqrt{puli} \), when it means sourness of the tamarind and \( \sqrt{otu} \), \( \sqrt{c\breve{a}} \), and also \( \sqrt{an} \), \( \sqrt{illam} \) and \( \sqrt{skin} \). These get the nasal or \( \sqrt{am} \) at their end and therefore they may be looked upon as originally having a nasal ending. Why ff. 313 is given is thus clear because if it is ending in \( \sqrt{m} \) that \( \sqrt{m} \) will change into the homorganic nasal of the coming plosive,
unless Tolkāppiyar contemplates the complete loss of the final $<s>m$ according to ff. 310, in which case, according to the order of the sutras, for getting the form illam, Tolkāppiyar must bring a nasal after the form of illa. This seems to be the scheme of Tolkāppiyar.

There are names of trees and plants which end in $<s>ai$ \textsuperscript{38}. The $<s>ai$ ending is what is found when any of these words stand by itself. These may be taken to lose -am the original ending, which is unfortunately retained in sandhi. The ending is am in sandhi instead of $<s>ai$; $<s>ai$ becomes -am. This is what happens with reference to panai and ávirai. The word arai gets $<s>am$ without the loss of the $<s>ai$ even as it happens in the case of am \textsuperscript{39}.

Now pir \textsuperscript{40} and kumil \textsuperscript{41} will get only the nasal in some cases and get only the $<s>am$ in other cases. This reveals the history of these forms. One may assume that the more ancient form is $<s>am$ and that at a later stage this $<s>am$ becomes reduced to $<s>m$ and that finally even this nasal disappears leaving the word ending in a vowel or a consonant or a shorter $<s>u$.\textsuperscript{42}
In this thesis the reference to augments or empty morphs are not discussed because they belong to the study of morphology and not phonology, and hence ff. 218, 219, 220, 228, 241, 242, 244, 247, 248, 260, 262, 270, 271, 278, 279, 281, 282, 283, 286 and 287 are not discussed here.

Coming to the $\mathcal{L}\tilde{a}\mathcal{J}$ ending, after stating the general rule for neuter noun in ff. 221 through linking that ending with $\mathcal{L}\tilde{a}\mathcal{J}$, Tolkāppiyār extends the rule to the verbal participles of the pattern ceyyā. The exceptions are then given. The words $\tilde{a}$ and $\tilde{mā}$ in non-case relationship do not get the doubling rule, because they occur as subject and therefore with a pause in the binary division of any sentence in which they occur, into subject or predicate. The vocative case, the plural of the inferior noun, the imperative ending with the morpheme miyā, the word $\tilde{vā}$ occurring as a singular or plural and the first person finite verb occurring with $\mathcal{L}\tilde{a}\mathcal{J}$ as an interrogative all of them because of the pause after them do not get the doubling of the plosives following them.
The case relationship follows the general rule. Here also there is a sutram, about \( \text{mā} \) and \( \text{ā} \), which first states that they behave like \( \text{yā} \), \( \text{pītā} \), that is, get a nasal at their end or get the following plosive doubled.\(^{46}\) But it is curious that this plosive and the augment \( \text{[a]} \) which will come in according to ff. 226, are stated to be not permanent. Then it concludes by saying that \( \text{ā} \) and \( \text{mā} \) will get an \( \text{n} \). This curious way of stating the rule is not on the pattern of the other sutrams. It may be that because ff. 229 lays down only the coming in of a nasal in general terms without any specification, this sutram also lays down the general rule. But Tolkāppiyar takes care to prevent the operation of ff. 230 i.e. coming in of the plosive and also ff. 226 i.e. coming if of the augment \( \text{[a]} \) especially for \( \text{ā} \) and \( \text{mā} \) which are said to get the specific nasal \( \text{n} \). \( \text{ān} \) gets \( \text{a} \) as in \( \text{ānaney} \). ff. 259 connects \( \text{ū} \) also with this \( \text{ā} \). That also gets an \( \text{n} \) where the final form is \( \text{ūn} \). ff. 233 refers to \( \text{ān} \) and gives the following rule. \( \text{ān + pi} \) becomes in some cases \( \text{āmpi} \). But it is not clear how the form \( \text{āmpi} \) which is found in post-Tolkāppiyam usage is arrived at through this sutram. The word \( \text{tōnri} \) in the sutram is interpreted by
Naccinarkkiniyar as referring to the loss of final \( \sqrt{a} \) and
the word \( \text{ni} \) is interpreted as meaning the doubling of the
\( \sqrt{a} \). Venkataraju Reddiar says that it is tirintatan
tiripu atu enral like ff. 457. But there (ff. 457) m\( \text{u} \)ru
which was already stated to become \( \text{mu} \) is in the new environ-
ment said to become lengthened into \( \text{mu} \) but here the \( \sqrt{a} \) cannot
be interpreted as standing for the original \( \sqrt{a} \).
Therefore one must admit only \( \text{am} \) as Tolkappiyam form and
reject \( \text{appi} \) as belonging to the post Tolkappiyam period.

In discussing the alapatai, reference was
made to the clusters in internal sandhi. Here also it will
be making the things clearer, if it is assumed certain words
like \( \text{ma, ka, pal\( \text{a} \) am uv\( \text{a} \) are taken as ending in \( \sqrt{a} \).}
In these cases \( \sqrt{a} \) disappears completely and the plosive
comes in even as in \( \text{mar\( \text{a} \) + kilai} \) where one gets the form
\( \text{mar\( \text{a} \)-k-kilai} \). If this is assumed, \( \text{pala + am} \) according to the
rule \( \wp^1 + \wp^2 = \wp^2 \wp^2 \) will be \( \text{pal\( \text{a} \)am} \). So also \( \text{ka + am} \) \( \text{k\( \text{a} \)am} \).
Since this final \( \sqrt{a} \) was not recognised as an ending,
it disappeared completely except in sandhi which refers to
an older state of affairs. The \( \sqrt{a} \) of the \( \sqrt{a} \)
stands as a cluster by the side of the longer vowel. This
occurs after an open monosyllabic word and also after an open disyllabic word consisting of an open short syllable and an open long syllable. Without going to the original form, Tolkāppiyar explains the sandhi form as consisting of an augment \( \mathcal{S} \) in addition to the plosives already mentioned in ff. 225. \( \text{palāam} + \text{kōtu} \) \( \text{palāakkōtu} \), \( \text{kāam} + \text{kōtu} \) \( \text{kāakkōtu} \).

It looks that in the post sangam literature the \( \mathcal{S} \) a \( \mathcal{I} \) after a long monosyllable become rarer.

The next sutram (ff. 227) mentions the exception to the rule. Naccimarkkiṇiṇiyar differentiates here \( \text{irā} \) which means night and \( \text{irā} \) which is a negative relative participles and states that \( \mathcal{S} \) a \( \mathcal{I} \) will not come, when the meaning is night. Where he gets this clarification is not made clear by him nor is he justified by bringing in \( \text{annāattu} \) and \( \text{uvāattu} \) where \( \text{attu} \) comes in and where the word is not of the kind stated in ff. 226 though his examples are important as showing that some vowel clusters were found preserved even in the post-Tolkāppiyam usage.

XI.

There are certain words which consists of an open short syllable followed by an open long syllable. Here
the long vowel is taken as consisting of two short vowel parts and he speaks of the last part disappearing when an augment \( \sqrt{\{u\}} \) comes in.\(^47\) This is the explanation of the commentator; but the meaning is not clear. Can it be one has here such forms as kanavu where the final \( \sqrt{\{a\}} \) augment is lost.

It is not also clear why this ff. 234 had not been stated after ff. 226. In any case the commentator’s interpretation gives two variant forms for a number of words e.g. irā-iravu; curā-curavu; purā-puravu. But if the juxtaposition of two words form a conjunctival compound or co-ordinate compound the augment \( \sqrt{\{a\}} \) will come in the middle as in irāappakal.\(^48\)

Naccinārkkiniyar gives examples of vērumattokai, paṇuṭtokai, eluvāy-t-totar combination of subject and predicate and etirmarai peyarecca-t-totar combination of negative relative participle and noun.\(^49\) Of these irupayarottu, eluvāy and relative participle are given by Ilampūrānar.\(^50\) Tolkāppiyar does not speak here of the glide which may nor may not come in. There is also the form without \( \sqrt{\{u\}} \) but that is a later usage or a dialectic variation as it is not mentioned here.

XII.

Next the \( \sqrt{\{i\}} \) ending is taken up and
demonstrative as described in ff. 205, 206, 207 and 208. Naccinärkkkuṇiyar gives examples for the long form \( \overline{\text{i}}\overline{\text{j}} \) followed by a word beginning with a plosive e.g. \( \overline{\text{k}}\text{an} \). Both the commentators give examples for the form followed by a semi vowel viz. \( \overline{\text{iyavip}} \). Naccinärkkkuṇiyar gives here the form \( \text{itu} \) though there is no corresponding form \( \text{atu} \) in ff. 238.

ff. 239 speaks of \( \overline{\text{tuni}} + \text{patakku} \), instead of becoming \( \overline{\text{tuni}}\overline{\text{y}}\overline{\text{patakku}} \) according to the rule ff. 164, follows the ordinary rule of doubling i.e. \( \overline{\text{tuni}}\overline{\text{patakku}} \). The extension of this sutram to words other than \( \text{patakku} \) and other alternations pointed out by the commentators should be taken as post-Tolkāppiyam usages and should not be taken as being covered by the implied meanings of this sutram.

ff. 240 especially refers to \( \overline{\text{nali}} + \text{uri} \) \( \overline{\text{naturi}} \). This shows the \( \text{\( \overline{\text{i}}\overline{\text{j}} \) and}\overline{[\text{r}]} \) which are alveolar have some phonetic relationship with \( \text{\( \overline{\text{t}}\overline{\text{j}} \). The only difference between them one notes is that the first two are the retroflex whilst \( \text{\( \overline{\text{t}}\overline{\text{j}} \) is not. This sutram speaks of the disappearance of \( \overline{\text{li}} \) and coming in of \( \text{\( \overline{\text{t}}\overline{\text{j}} \). This is rather a curious way of stating the rule. It is really a case of the disappearance of the final \( \text{\( \overline{\text{i}}\overline{\text{j}} \), and then the} \)
change of \( \text{I} \) \( \text{I} \) into \( \text{I} \) \( \text{I} \). This looks like a case of marūu which, Tolkāppiyar states, cannot be described in sandhi. Therefore the sutram is rather suspicious.

ff. 241 and 242 deal with augments. ff. 243 and 244 had already been referred to. When there are two forms pulim and puliyam the first probably came to be specialised for referring to the tree while puliyam came to be specialised for referring to the sour taste. In the later case the nasal is replaced by plosive in appropriate places. 56 The commentator brings in a number of cases like kūtālāṅkōtu, kanavirāṅkōtu, kappintai, cannintai, kattakal under this sutram but these should be taken as post Tolkāppiyam usages. 57 Of course it is assumed that Tolkāppiyar is exhaustive.

XIII.

There are words denoting the days; but the days then were not named after planets as in modern times but after the twenty seven stars or constellations. nāl means a star and therefore mean a day named after the star. To-day in modern times, these names of stars end either in \( \text{I} \) \( \text{I} \), \( \text{I} \) \( \text{I} \) or \( \text{I} \) \( \text{I} \). It is curious that in Tolkāppiyar's age also they seem to have ended in these sounds. 58
It is not clear what could have been the full forms of the twenty-seven names. Ilampūranaṉ gives only the example parani, Naccinārkkiniyir adds to it the example cōti. But one cannot be very dogmatic about the existence of these very forms in the age of Tolkāppiyar though there is nothing to prevent such an assumption. an is said to come in after these names of stars and it is said to be an augment. But an seems to be really an old locative sign. Naccinārkkiniyir and others explain this augment, when occurring in Tolkāppiyam, as having the force of a locative. The word an means also 'that place.' The locative case signs always have the meaning of place. Even in modern colloquial usage terūval pōnān, al, a variant form of an has in rare cases the locative significance for e.g. well preserved. By the time of Tolkāppiyar this usage was slowly disappearing, giving room for the usage of an as the sign of third case, though even this had not been so well established as to be given by him as a third case sign.

The next sutram refers to the names of months ending in i. These names also ended in ai. Only these two endings are referred to with reference to the names of the months. And it is curious that the names of
the months even to-day end in these two vowels. Tolkäppiyar mentions \( i \) coming after these words. The \( i \) in this disappears in accordance with the rule in urupiyal,\(^{62}\) and one gets only \( k\) left, which is considered to be the sign of the fourth case, \( k\), formerly, as found in vatakk̑u, kilakku, terku, mērku had the significance of direction and therefore it was an ancient locative case sign. Even to-day \( k\) appears as such in words denoting time nālaikk̑u etc. It is because of its new development that it has established itself as the fourth case sign; and therefore Tolkäppiyar has to speak of \( k\) as an augment, when appearing in the meaning of a locative case sign. This seems to justify Dr. Caldwell's conclusion that the augments were originally case signs.\(^{63}\) These are not however necessary for a discussion on phonology.

\[ \text{AIV.} \]

\( i \) behaves like \( a \) ending in non-case relationship.\(^{64}\) The next sutram deals with exceptions to this rule. The exceptions refer to are \( ni, pi \) and \( mi \) (denoting place).\(^{65}\) But the word \( mi \) will sometime get the following plosive doubled. The commentators imply, the rule of coming in of the nasal in some places.\(^{66}\) Then \( i \) is said to behave
in a similar manner even when standing in case relationship. Lastly Tolkæppiyar asserts that ni 'you - singular' (when it stands as the first word and when it is followed by plosives is changed to nin) behaves as it does when preceding case suffixes and that in that case the following plosive will not be doubled.68

IV.

£ u i is said to follow £ a i in non-case relationship.69 The demonstrative base as a non-noun behaves like the noun when followed by the plosives.70 This is stated in a separate sutram. But there is no such separate sutram for the other demonstrative bases because they, as non-nouns have been treated in the sutram relating to the latter. When non plosives follow the demonstrative base £ u i the rules already stated in ff. 205 to 208 is said to apply here.71

The demonstrative nouns ending in £ u i form an exception to the doubling rule.72 This atu in poetry undergoes a special change before anru. atu + anru > ataanru. Before £ ai i the £ u i disappears e.g. atu + ai > atai.73 In all these cases the £ u i is the fully rounded £ u i.
Venkataramul Reddiar suggests that atu etc. was pronounced as an ending in a, that is ata etc. even as it is pronounced to-day in certain dialects in modern Malayalam. He also points out that the $\mathcal{L} u \mathcal{J}$ in these cases is only enunciative, the original proto-Dravidian form ending only in the consonant $\mathcal{L} t \mathcal{J}$. The enunciative vowel in Telugu is $\mathcal{L} i \mathcal{J}$ whereas it is $\mathcal{L} u \mathcal{J}$ in Tamil and Kannada. If atu is ata according to him ata + anru $\Rightarrow$ atanru and $\mathcal{L} a \mathcal{J}$ of the anru is written as in the middle to form a vowel cluster thus atanru (see our discussion uyiraḻapetai). But it was suggested there that $\mathcal{v}^1 + \mathcal{v}^2 = \mathcal{v}^2 \mathcal{v}^2$. In such cases the original form may stand as atu and yet this change might occur. The writing down of the short $\mathcal{L} a \mathcal{J}$ is simply to show emphatically the real form of the second word. It will be seen that Tolkāppiyar speaks only of the final $\mathcal{L} u \mathcal{J}$ becoming $\mathcal{L} a \mathcal{J}$ but never refers to the change of the initial of the second word. This has been already explained. It is not made clear what the nature of this anru is. The commentators take it as a verb. It is for consideration whether it includes the anru which is the variant form of anri. In the Sangam usage it is so.

74 ff. 259 applies the doubling rule to case
relationship. ff. 260 deals with the coming in of the augment, ff. 262 deals with the name of tree. ff. 263 assert that atu etc., in case-relationship get an augment even as they do when case signs follow them as in ff. 176. The second line here that "the consonant will not double" seems to be unnecessary; and it is suggested that this line is probably the concluding part of another sutram which probably the concluding part of another sutram which probably explained the usages like utukkan etc. or that the second line was mistakenly written here. But the commentators rely upon the second line for giving out a rule of interpretation. They assume that even where the original rule is made impossible by the subsequent form suggested, the old rule should be specifically negativd. Except in this sutram, it is not correct to say that Tolkappiyar makes any such assumption and this line therefore, should be omitted as having nothing to do with the sutram.

XVI.

Passing on to [ū] ending the doubling rule is applied when it occurs in non-case relationship.  

Here Naccinarkkiniyar adds the example kaluu-k-katumai but
he seems to take the ālapetāi as a short vowel ending. If so it need not be mentioned here, in this place which deals with a long \( \text{ē u ī} \) endings and not with the short \( \text{ē u ī} \) endings. As Tēvanēyappāvanār states in his foot note an example under ff. 261 by mistake has come in here. The non nouns are dealt under ff. 265. These are verbal participles and second person verbs, probably imperatives. The sutram states that the doubling is not here objected to. Therefore the rule seems to be here permissive, showing that a new usage is creeping into the language. As already stated in ff. 151 munnīlai follows either the no change rule or the optional change rule. Here \( \text{ē u ī} \) ending amongst them, is said to follow the compulsory change rule. This shows that the new usage is recognised with reference to this ending, though according to Tolkāppiyar the old usage remains true to what is prescribed in ff. 151. If this is true, one has to admit the same with reference to īn the verbal participles ending in \( \text{ē ā ī} \). If there is any truth in the suggestion that verbal participles were originally finite predicates and that therefore there must have been a pause after them requiring the operation of the rule of no change, the optional change and then the compulsory change must only have gradually developed.
There is no rule stated for any doubling after \( \text{atū} \) etc., words which Tolkāppiyar himself states. In that sutram it is said that it will get an augment \( \text{ṣ} \) in \( \text{ṭ} \). The \( \text{ṣ} \) um \( \text{ṭ} \) in the sutram may refer only to the doubling rule in case relationship and not in non-case relationship. Naccimarkkiniyar states that since Tolkāppiyar always makes specific reference to superior class nouns, one has to read a rule of implication in ff. 265 as applying to these words which should not be brought under the final exceptional sutram. It is not easy to understand why the implication cannot be read in the final exceptional sutram, when in any case, it is admitted there is no specific mention of \( \text{atū} \) etc. Venkatarajulu Reddiar points out that \( \text{atū} \) etc. are looked upon more or less as inferior class nouns; and that is why the augment \( \text{ṣ} \) in \( \text{ṭ} \) which is not prescribed for superior class nouns can occur with these words without creating any impropriety in ff. 271.

But the form given in modern edition of Naccimarkkiniyar's commentary occurs with a short \( \text{ṣ} \) um \( \text{ṭ} \) at its end. If there were the short \( \text{ṣ} \) um \( \text{ṭ} \) the sutram must come in the part dealing with ending in \( \text{ṣ} \) um \( \text{ṭ} \). Perhaps the sutram occurred after ff. 263. Even as pālā, kā etc.
get a short $\text{v} \text{a} \text{i}$, similarly the open monosyllabic words ending in $\text{v} \text{u} \text{i}$ and disyllabic words ending in $\text{v} \text{u} \text{i}$ which in the later case must be preceded by a short syllable, get the augment of a short $\text{v} \text{u} \text{i}$.

It looks as though this kind of further lengthening of words through their addition of a short vowel seems to play a part of grammatical importance. That is, this $\text{v} \text{u} \text{i}$ makes the words of $\text{v} \text{u} \text{i}$ ending into a verbal noun. It may be that generally long vowel endings develop this kind of diphthongal pronunciation.

But $\text{v}_\text{u}$ follows the rule of getting a nasal after it, sometimes getting also the plosive following it doubled. Naccinārkkiniyar states that this word is a noun as specifically stated and as differentiated from $\text{v}_\text{u}$ which may occur as a verb meaning 'to shine' or 'beauty'. It is for consideration whether $\text{v}_\text{u}$ might not have a nasal ending, that is, whether it was not $\text{v}_\text{u}$ originally. $\text{u}$ 'flesh' takes the nasal ending $\text{m} \text{h} \text{n} \text{i}$. Naccinārkkiniyar states since it does not occur without an $\text{m} \text{h} \text{n} \text{i}$ in the sangam or other usages, it must have occurred only in the age of Tolkāppiyar. He admits it might be occurring without an $\text{m} \text{h} \text{n} \text{i}$ in dialects.
That ūm gets{akku}augment; but that is not germane to our topic of phonology.

XVII.

Coming to the \( \text{ṣ} \ e \ \text{ṣ} \) ending, Tolkāppiyar couples it with \( \text{ṣ} \ e \ \text{ṣ} \) because both follow the same rule. They appear only at the end of ṣaḷapetāi or vowel clusters. Tolkāppiyar states that no noun ends in \( \text{ṣ} \ e \ \text{ṣ} \) or \( \text{ṣ} \ c \ \text{ṣ} \). This is with reference to the natural form of words and not to the forms which remain after getting an \( \text{ṣ} \ e \ \text{ṣ} \) or \( \text{ṣ} \ c \ \text{ṣ} \) for emphasis etc. These particles of emphasis are treated as separate words and are classified as itaiccōl. Therefore \( \text{ṣ} \ e \ \text{ṣ} \) and \( \text{ṣ} \ c \ \text{ṣ} \) occurring only at the end of verbs in the imperative mood are really cases of ṣaḷapetāi of \( \text{ṣ} \ e \ \text{ṣ} \) or \( \text{ṣ} \ c \ \text{ṣ} \).

\( \text{ṣ} \ e \ \text{ṣ} \) and \( \text{ṣ} \ c \ \text{ṣ} \) are really verbs. The later day will have these as \( \text{ṣu} \) and \( \text{ṣu} \); but in Tolkāppiyar's age 66 and 66 occurred as vowel clusters. The next sutraṃ speaks of these endings occurring after the nouns to which the \( \text{ṣ} \ e \ \text{ṣ} \) or \( \text{ṣ} \ c \ \text{ṣ} \) were added for emphasis. In such cases there is necessarily a pause and therefore doubling does not apply. In this way one gets the rule
implied in the very usage itself here explained: that is, with reference to both the \( \text{ē} \text{u} \) and \( \text{ē} \text{u} \) one finds their corresponding short vowels after them, when these long vowels are either the imperative verb or the particles of emphasis etc.

Passing on to \( \text{ē} \text{u} \) ending, Tolkāppiyar applies the rule of doubling to nouns standing in a non-case relationship. \( \text{ē} \text{u} \) occurring as a particle of interrogation or of negation or enumeration, which naturally has a pause after it, forms an exception to the rule of doubling.

The particle \( \text{ē} \text{u} \) as a particle of emphasis or of certainty gets a short \( \text{ē} \text{u} \) after it and this natural form itself is taken as a vowel cluster as made clear in ff. 277. Therefore it is not mentioned here. To-day and generally in post Tolkāppiyar age, the alapetai form has not been in use except in poetry.

Passing on to the consideration of case relationship, the doubling rule is given. It is also said, as it was said with reference to monosyllabic ending in \( \text{ē} \text{u} \) and \( \text{ē} \text{u} \), that monosyllabic words ending in \( \text{ē} \text{u} \) also get a short \( \text{ē} \text{u} \) after them. \( \text{ē} \text{u} \) is an exception. It has two meanings. If it refers to the tree, it follows the
rule of getting a naal after it as already explained; if it means a bull it gets the augment त in तक्किन्यार. Naccirarkkiniyar refers to an exception to this later rule and quotes the form ēmanī. This should be taken as occurring because of metrical exigencies or as a post Tolkāppiyam usage.

Now तो also more or less follows the rules relating to तो ending. ff. 289 corresponds to ff. 274. ff. 290 is a repetition of ff. 275 with slight difference. But in addition तो occurs as a particle of olijica 'suggestion'. Therefore Tolkāppiyar has to say that this also does not follow the rule of doubling. There is no mention of pirinilai, terrinilai and cirappu but if ff. 291 is interpreted as not referring to olijica alone but to all the occurrences of particle तो other than those mentioned in ff. 290, all these varieties of तो would be covered. Otherwise one has to explain why Tolkāppiyar omits them here when he mentions them all in collatikāram. The singular is used because the form of the particle is the same in all these cases; or they can be taken as homonyms. ff. 292 corresponds to ff. 276 and 279. But though the word कर is an exception when it occurs before the word ी, reference is made to ff. 294 which refers to words ending...
in $\sqrt{\text{o}}$ behaving as they do under ff. 180.

**XIX.**

The $\sqrt{\text{ai}}$ ending is treated in between $\sqrt{\text{a}}$ and $\sqrt{\text{o}}$ endings because of the alphabetical order. There also non-case relationship has already been treated in tokaimarapu. Taking therefore the case relationship alone he lays down the doubling rule\(^{101}\) whilst the demonstrative plurals ending in $\sqrt{\text{ai}}$ are said to behave like similar words taking a case sign under ff. 177.\(^{102}\) The names of trees have been already discussed. The commentators add more words following the rule of $\sqrt{\text{ai}}$ varying with $\sqrt{\text{am}}$, tutunai, valutunai tillai and tālai.\(^{103}\) tālai is not found in Ilampūrapar's commentary; probably these words were dialectal words at the time of Tolkāppiyar.

panai has two more sutrams. The sugar candy was something cooked or boiled from the palmyra toddy. Therefore it is called attu from the root attu 'to cook'. panai + attu $\rightarrow$ panāttu. Tolkāppiyar says the final $\sqrt{\text{ai}}$ of the first word disappears; and there comes a long vowel viz. panai + attu $\rightarrow$ pana + attu, i.e. panā attu. It was suggested that in dealing with the names of trees, the original
form was probably pana, and that if ఎ మ జ was lost pana alone would remain. In that case యి + లి was given as already explained. For emphasis and clarity, the second word with the initial vowel is written separately so as to create a vowel cluster with the final జ a జ of the previous word. Instead of taking that panai becomes pana it is also possible to state that panai was written according to the rule of ff. 54 as pana; in that case ఎ జ and ఎ ఇ జ will become[అ] according to the rule యి + లి > లి.

All these rules referring to panai must have been in usage; but certain new phrases have come to be added, during the Tolkāppiyar’s age and a little before it. These retain the ఎ అ జ ending; pana + koti panaikkoti according to the doubling rule. This phrase refers to the flag on which was inscribed the palmira. Some of the chieftains of Tamil land like Atiyagn are said to have had this inscribed on their ensign. Of course, in mythology Bālāraman has that ensign. Before further proofs are forthcoming, it is difficult to assert positively that the age of Tolkāppiyar was aware of this particular aspect of mythology of Balāraman. Usages like panaittiral should be rejected as post Tolkāppiyam. The ērānayam, viçaavati, keṭṭāmulam are also included under
this $ai$ rule. They are Prakrit and Sanskrit compounds. Naccinārkkāṇṭhīyar also states that these can be omitted because they are Sanskrit forms; for which Tolkāppiyar is not giving any grammatical rules. If parāṅkal must be explained either as a dialectal usage or post-Tolkāppiyam usage. With reference to panaikkoṭai the author simply states that the natural doubling rule is not condemned. That means as pointed out by Venkātarajulu Reddiar the form panaṅkotī will also occur. 108 ff. 266 and ff. 287 have already been referred to.

In ff. 288 Tolkāppiyar has said that vētkai + aṉā > vētava and then becomes vēnāṉā. This sutram reminds one of the sutram on tonnūru, toḷayiram, so much opposed to the view of Tolkāppiyar who refuses to explain the marūu terms, as already stated.

There are a few words occurring in Tolkāppiyam with nasal endings, which have in medieval or modern Tamil the semi vowel ending. 109

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tolkāppiyar</th>
<th>Medieval and modern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>il</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ān</td>
<td>āl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
<td>ēl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So also the original form might have been veṉ instead of vēl.
which is the form found in modern and medieval time. The vēn is the form which occurs in the cave inscription of the pre-Christian era of vēn kōcipan. Therefore the sutram not only looks as a strained explanation but also appears to be against Tolkāppiyar's scheme itself.

ff. 295 alone deals with \( \underleftarrow{\text{au}} \underleftarrow{J} \) ending. Only two words are said to end in \( \underleftarrow{\text{au}} \underleftarrow{J} \), that is, kau and vau. In both case relationship and non-case relationship, they get the doubling rule, but Tolkāppiyar states that the great people assert that it will be the proper usage if an augment \( \underleftarrow{\text{u}} \underleftarrow{J} \) comes after these endings.
UYIRMAYANKIYAL.
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