In this discussion of consonantal endings Tolkëppiyar first takes the words standing in case relationship, probably because the rule of no change does not apply to them. In the uyirmayaṅkiyal the non occurrence of the no change has been generalised and the words of non-case relationship have been taken as the basis whilst words standing in case relationship have been said to follow the rules applicable to such non-case relationship. But here, in many cases the rule for non-case relationship differs by the no change rule or by prescribing changes which are other than the doubling of the following plosive. Whatever it may be, the change of principle of arrangement of sutras, is significant.

II.

There is only one verbal noun which is of the form of verbal root ending in n i.e. uriñ. It gets an augment u except when followed by y or vowels. If the next word begins in a plosive there is also doubling of that plosive. This rule applies both to non-case relationship and case relationship.
The ending in \( \text{n} \text{J} \) behaves in the same way. But in case relationship the \( \text{n} \text{J} \) ending loses its \( \text{u} \text{J} \) and gets an \( \text{a} \text{J} \). But the \( \text{n} \text{J} \) in \text{verin} becomes a homorganic nasal corresponding to the plosive following it. Of course, the sutram explains this in a different way; it speaks of the loss of the final \( \text{n} \text{J} \) and coming in of the homorganic nasal. This way of stating the rule helps Tolkappiyar to speak easily of the plosive itself, coming in, in some places instead of the nasal.

IV.

The rules, with reference to non-case relationship forms, had already been stated for \( \text{n} \text{J} \) in ff. 147. In case relationship \( \text{n} \text{J} \) becomes \( \text{t} \text{J} \). But the words \text{an} and \text{pan} though belonging to the category of common nouns behave like inferior nouns. Venkatarajulu Reddiar points out that \text{an} or \text{pan}, if separately used, without any addition, denote the superior class of nouns; because at least with reference to \text{pan}, marapiyal specifically states that it refers to human being.

\text{an} is also the name of the tree; Tolkappiyar
whenever there are homonyms, takes care to specify the meaning of the word to which the particular rule he lays down applies. The word vin 'sky' gets the augment {attu}. This as already stated belongs to morphology. But Naccinarkkiniyar speaks of a glide coming in after the consonantal ending of this word. It is an abuse of language to call $\l v$ as a glide in this context i.e. in vinvatukkoykum. This kind of $\l v$ comes in the word nälvar. If the form svar is compared with nälvar $\l m$ and $\l v$ seem to be related. Therefore this $\l m$ or $\l v$ must be part of the word vin (vin ma maudiovinma).

The behaviour of the verbal noun has already been discussed. The commentators try to imply a statement applying this rule to nouns other than verbal nouns. But such cases belong probably post Tolkâppiyam usages, in which one must include the Pattuppattu usages also. There are certain names which denote a class of people such as unag 'the salt merchants'. The $\l n$ here undergoes no change; under this rule the commentators try to explain the rule of the change of ãṅkaṭ $\l n$ kopaṭ (n) kopaṭ etc. It is surprisingly absurd that a rule of no change should, according to these commentators, imply a rule of change. These must therefore be post Tolkâppiyam usages. mappuppattam.
kavankāl and parankāl should be either dialectal words or later usages.

The word an denotes the sesame seeds; and then it undergoes change even when occurring in non-case relationship. muraŋ is also a verbal noun. It follows both the non-case relationship rule and also the case relationship rule as already stated. For the purpose of making the rule of optional change applicable to this word, it it is not proper to bring other words like araŋ and they are probably post Tolkāppiyam usages.

V.

[...]

... ending in the case of case relationship disappears completely and the following plosive doubles. When the word ends in [m J] the loss of the final [m J] makes that word appear as though ending in [a J].

If it is followed by a word beginning in [a J] or [ā J] the final [ā J] is lengthened in [ā J].

mara + ati > maraati. kula + āmpal must become kulāmpal. The commentators show the latter example as kulāmpal. But there is no rule to shorten the initial long vowel of the coming word into short vowel. So they read a rule of implica-
tion to have the form as *kulaṇḍapal*. If this is the correct form Tolkāppiyar should have said a sutram for the change of the initial long vowel. So one has to consider it as a later day usage. *kulaṇḍapal* as shown by the commentators is surely a later day usage. Venkataramulu Reddiar generalises that when the initial of the coming word is long it is not written as long. But the sutram, as already stated does not give any such liberty to interpret that way. We are not to argue on the basis of later day usage which do not contemplate the clustering of two long vowels, which therefore looked upon such vowel clusters as alapetai and for this reason wrote them as a long vowel followed by a short vowel.

The rule of the coming in of the plosive after the loss of \( \text{m} \_ \) is not followed by some words which have the option of bringing in a plosive or a nasal. But Tolkāppiyar wants us ourselves to know them by studying the usage. With reference to usages, like *kalam peru kappular* they come under the second case 26 or under general exception and should not be explained under this rule as unfortunately attempted by Naccipārkkiniyar.

The words standing in non-case relationship when followed by a plosive get their final \( \text{m} \_ \) changed
into their respective homorganic nasal. \textit{vattattatukku etc} which are not as required by this sutram, instead of the form \textit{vattantatukku etc}, cannot be brought under this rule; therefore they can be included under exception rather than under this sutram.

\textit{akam + kai > ankai}. İlampüranar rightly takes it as \textit{marūu} and such cases could not have been written by Tolkāppiyar because of his ff. 462. \textit{ilan + patu > ilampatu}.

It is stated that this is a poetical usage. This is a case of $\text{I} \text{ai} \overset{\text{I}}{\text{j}}$ varying, with an i.e. illai varies with ilam.

The number \textit{āyiram} 'thousand' is then taken up for discussion. Naccinārkārṇiyanar asserts that Tolkāppiyar gives only rules for pure Tamil words. Is one to take this \textit{āyiram} as a pure Tamil word and not as one derived from Sanskrit \textit{sahasram}? Perhaps \textit{sahasram} was not recognized in this tadbhava form. Here is a case of the initial loss of consonant in Tamil. Dr. Burrow is of opinion that this tendency to lose the initial consonant $\text{I} \text{s} \overset{\text{J}}{\text{j}}$ probably began after the Asokan inscriptions; because they have the forms with initial $\text{s}$ - e.g. Satiyaputra for atiyāman. This
suggestion if valid becomes important in fixing the age of Tolkappiyam.

āyiram sets an augment[attu] and it does so, even when it occurs with an attribute.\textsuperscript{34} Though the occurrence with an attribute has already been referred to in ff. 110 this specific mention here is probably because as a numeral when followed by words of weights and measures, it behaves like a word of case relationship. \textsuperscript{35} Naccinärkkinijar points out that because the statement itself about weight etc., following it shows that in reality it is not an instance of case relationship.

Because according to Tolkappiyar's scheme, superior class nouns and common class nouns should be specifically stated, the third personal and second personal endings and those pronouns which get their long initial syllable shortened, like yām and nām becoming em and nam, are specifically mentioned and they are said to follow the rule which have been assigned to them when they are followed by their case sign. These refer to ellārum (third person) and ellīrum (second person). That rule for case signs speaks of the coming in of the augment. \textsuperscript{36} In addition to that rule
ff. 310 also applies; but the last line here states that instead of the plosive of the following word the homorganic nasal will come in. In non-case relationship there is no augment. 39 ellām as a common class noun, looses its final \( \underline{\text{m}} \) in non-case relationship and gets the augment\( \{\text{varru}\} \) in case relationship. 40 ellām instead of getting a plosive can get the homorganic nasal. 41 In superior class of nouns it gets the augment\( \{\text{nam}\} \).

Tolkāppiyar begins to discuss the form \underline{num} when followed by a word in case relationship. This also, instead of getting a plosive after the loss of the final \( \underline{\text{m}} \) as contemplated in ff. 310, gets a nasal. 43 It is not, therefore, necessary to explain the loss of the final \( \underline{\text{m}} \) by reading an implied rule, therefore, in any sutram. unkai is certainly a later day usage and the commentators are wrong in discussing it under this sutram.

A sutram follows which takes \underline{num} occurring only in the nominative as the basic form and explains \underline{nīyir} as its alternant. 44 There is nothing objectionable in referring to this variant. But the sutram says \underline{num} ~ \underline{nīlm} ~ \underline{nīi} ~ \underline{nīir} ~ \underline{nīyir}. These alternations are very artificial.
This is something more than saying niyir and num are alternants. In Collatikāram, num is considered to be the infexional form of niyir. Čēnāvaraiyar explains the contradiction between that sutram and this by stating that Tolkāppiyar has no bias for any one of these explanations. Tolkāppiyar there does not explain the changes of niyir into num in any way similar to the sutram. It is for consideration whether one may reject this sutram as suspicious.

ff. 327 deals with verbal nouns. Im, kam and urum behave like the verbal nouns getting an augment ے u ਯ 47 though the im and kam may get an augment ³. 48

It is said in ff. 330 that ے m ے is shortened when followed by ے v ے. It is not clear why this sutram should come in here. In molimarapu one has been told of the shortening of the ے m ے. 49 The general scheme of Tolkāppiyar is to explain such allophones, first, as occurring within individual words and then as occurring in combination of words. ff. 52 refers to a single word, and Tolkāppiyar gives this sutram here for shortened ے m ے occurring in combination of words. He should have stated this after ff. 52. Therefore a cloud of doubt casts its shadow on this sutram. It arises probably as a marginal note by a diligent student.
The names of stars have already been referred to. But the sutram is important for explaining the scheme of māṭēru. Whenever māṭēru occurs, as pointed out by Venkatakrējulu Reddiar, previous rules other than the specific māṭēru are not usually contemplated to be operative; therefore Tolkāppiyar is, according to Venkatakrējulu Reddiar, constrained to repeat the older rule when not fully covered by māṭēru. Before attu 'according to' the previous consonant usually disappears. But because Tolkāppiyar has introduced the phrase mērkilantane he has specifically to refer to the loss of the final consonant also, though that loss is covered by a previous sutram.

VI.

The final ə n ə in words of case relationship becomes the alveolar plosive. This is a case of regressive assimilation. man, cīn, ān, īn, pin, mun and verbal participles ending in ə n ə also behave in a similar way. cīn is a participle found in finite verbs even by the time of Tolkāppiyar. This was looked upon as an acaic or empty morph. The modern studies of other Dravidian languages show that the real form is icin which probably has become the past tense suffix [in] man is also icicco; so
also in 'in this place' and an 'in that place'.

The conditional verbal participle ending in 4n7 is that of the pattern seyin. It looks that the examples of no change like an kontan and in kontan given by commentators belong to post Tolkāppiyam age.

The word vayin when preceded by the demonstrative and interrogative bases also follows the above rule. The commentators speak of that word following the rule of no change in some places. But that must be with reference to post Tolkāppiyam usage.

kuyin means 'the cloud'; as explained by the commentators it follows the rule of no change. Naccinarkkiniyar states that kuyin may occur as a verb.

skip is another word, which may mean either the tamarind tree or the bird 'swan'. The tree skip had already been dealt with. The other skip 'swan' gets an augment[a] and the natural doubling of the following plosive thereafter. As already stated, the original form might have been skipam. The words which denote a class of people such as eyin undergoes no change.
The word mīn optionally changes its $\sim n$ $\sim$ 
into the alveolar plosive. $\text{ten + kutam} \rightarrow \text{teñkutam}$ according to the above rules, or becomes tēkkutam when there is the coming in of the plosive where its original nasal is lost.

It will be noticed that $\sim n$ $\sim$ and $\sim m$ $\sim$ endings behave in a similar way in many cases. But in the time of Tolkāppiyar a new usage has gained currency and he says that it is not a mistake to say that tēn + kutam becomes tēnkutam where alveolar nasal when followed by a plosive becomes a velar or other homorganic nasal. When tēn is followed by a nasal, $\sim n$ $\sim$ may optionally disappear. tēn + īnari may become either tēnīneri or teñeri. If the word tēn is followed by irāal one gets the form without any change tēnīrāal. The other form is where tēn appears tētt. This gives the form tēttirāl.

Perhaps this is a case of an augment $\{\text{attu}\}$ or was then an alternant form with the formative tu, as tētu. (This will be one way of explaining the $\{\text{attu}\}$ cāriyai generally; $\{\text{arru}\}$ or $\{\text{varru}\}$ will give then forms like palavaru. Of course this has to be examined further). This sūtram also does not follow the ordinary way in which Tolkāppiyar explains the sandhi rule. The various forms represent the various stages of assimilation or various dialectal forms which have entered
into the literary usage.

Though min, pin and kan are not verbal nouns, yet follow the rule of augment. kan in combinations of case relationship gets an augment ṣ a orbit. 67

Here follow five sutras which relate to proper names. (Masculine) proper names ending in alveolar nasal when followed by the word of paternal relationship tantai undergo some changes. The final an of the first word is lost; the initial consonant in the second word is lost e.g. cāttan becomes cāttu and tantai becomes antai and one gets therefore the form cāttantai. One wonders whether it is not a case of marūu. If the first words are ātan and pūtan not only the final an of the first word is lost, but also the medial consonant there, namely ṣ t ṣ is lost; so also in the second word not only ṣ t ṣ but also the vowel ṣ a ṣ is lost. 69

These give the resulting forms āntai and pūntai. These are also marūu forms. The next sutra states that if the proper name is preceded by a title, then all the changes do not take place e.g. peruṅ cāttan tantai. 70

All these three cases mean that the person denoted is the father of one denoted by the first word. But
if the meaning is that the person denoted by the second word
is the son of the person denoted by the first word there is
a different, though small, change i.e. when the final $\underline{\text{m}} \underline{\text{f}}$
of the first word is lost an augment $\underline{\text{m}} \underline{\text{f}}$ comes in e.g.
koppaikkoppa.

There are three words which are exceptions
to ff. 347, 348 and 350. These also follow the rule of no
change. These proper names are tān, pēn and kōn. pēn means
God in some Dravidian languages; perhaps it is connected with
the word pēsy. It is for consideration whether the sutram
explaining the maruũ are really from Tolkāppiyam. It must
be admitted however, these explain a very ancient usage of
Tamil land.

The pronoun tān and yān are taken up next for
consideration. Their first syllable is shortened in words
of case relationship as they do when they take case signs.
In non-case relationship these words neither shorten their
initial syllable nor change their final $\underline{\text{m}} \underline{\text{f}}$

The word alaũ 'corpse' according to commenta-
tors (like the word tān) loses its final nasal and gets a
plosive similar to the one following it. alaũ + kutam > alakkut
\textit{mun} \textit{+ il} gets an alveolar plosive in the middle, giving the form \textit{munril}. The sutram specifically states that it is a marūu form and therefore is against the Tolkāppiyar's scheme contemplated in ff. 482. \textit{munril} is in modern dialect \textit{munmatu + il}; it will be in the older dialect \textit{munru + il} and naturally it becomes \textit{munril} without this sutram. It is the later age which looked upon it as a marūu.

VII.

Of the six semi vowels, \textit{ḷ ṝ ḍ ḍh ḍh h} and \textit{ḷḷ ḍ} follow more or less the rules prescribed for the vowel endings. This is made clear by the nāṭṭēru in ff. 357, 362, 383. \textit{ḷḷ ḍ} and \textit{ḷḷ ḍh} do not follow identical rules or similar rules. \textit{ḷ ṝ} ending remains; and this has already been referred under āytam. (sw.) p. 225.  

VIII.

... aw... iv... and... av... get the augment\textit{vāṇru} in case relationship as they do when occurring with case sign (ff. 183). In non-case relationship as already stated \textit{ḷ ṝ} becomes āytam. Venkaṭarājulu Keddiar points out, in probably explaining the Nacciñārkkīniyar's statement that this sandhi is of rare occurrence even in the latter's time and that people of a later age wrote this as
akkatiya etc. rather than as akkatiya.

The above two rules of \[ \text{V} \text{J} \] ff. 36, 378, refer to instances where the second word begins with a plosive, as is made clear by the subsequent sutras. ff. 380 refers to instances where the following word begins in a nasal and where the \[ \text{V} \text{J} \] becomes the corresponding nasal an instances of regressive assimilation and of nasalisation of \[ \text{V} \text{J} \]. ff. 381 refers to instances where the second word begins in vowels and semi vowels and where the ending follows the rule of no change.

It is surprising that in many cases Tolkāppiyar does not refer to the demonstrative e, though that e occurs in Tolkāppiyam itself. Venkatarajulu Reddiar points out the view of Aracan Čapmukanār that e is only the shortened form \[ \text{Ya} \] even as \[ \text{En} \] is the shortened form of \[ \text{Yen} \]. But this shortening is nowhere mentioned in Tolkāppiyam with reference to the interrogative e. He suggests that e is not mentioned because it occurs as a relative participle in \[ \text{EpporuL}, \text{ApporuL}, \text{Annilam}, \text{Annilam} \] but it is difficult to prove that e was a relative participle wherever it occurs. In these two sutram it is sheer accident that e can be interpreted as a relative particle.
This seems to be more or less correct because the laterals, have no attraction towards nasals that is, they do not form clusters with the nasals. Therefore they have to change before nasals. All the instances here mentioned are types of regressive assimilation. In non-case relationship the change of the laterals into plosive is optional.
When these laterals are followed by words beginning with dental plosives, these laterals become āytam. As āytam occurs only after the initial short syllable, it must be taken that these rules apply only to such an environment. This is made also clear by the next sutram.

If the lateral occurs after an initial long syllable, the rule of no change applies.

It is to be noted that the pattern of arranging the rules of ि ि ि on the basis of the rule of ि ि is a little disturbed in ff. 400 which though on a par with ff. 370 has two more lines in addition. There are five sutrams however under ि ि ि and specific words such as neि, ceि, koि and coि are pointed out as following the rules applicable to the case relationship even when they stand non-case relationship. The word il takes the form illai, il and illā. The vowel endings here get the plosive doubled. ff. 373 which describes the rule for val is on all force with ff. 403, in which case ff. 373 and 374 should come after ff. 377, that is, if the general pattern is to be followed. ff. 374 is an exception to the above rule where ि ि comes instead of ि ि in the two phrases valla máy and vallappalakai.
This is only a permissive rule not completely ousting the operation of ff. 373. The tree names ending in $\sim$ $l$ $\underline{\iota}$ have already been noticed. The verbal nouns ending in of the laterals will behave like other verbal nouns. The words $\underline{\text{ve{yil}}}$ and $\underline{\text{irul}}$ get the $\{\text{attul\text{\textquoteright}as}\}$ augment. $\underline{\text{pul}}$ and $\underline{\text{val}}$ though not verbal nouns get the $\sim$ $u$ $\underline{\iota}$ augment. As already stated it corresponds to ff. 373.

The Commentators give various examples under these sutras which are exceptions to the sutras themselves. It is not clear how that when in some of the sutras Tolkâppiyar uses the word $\underline{\text{all\text{\textaccentuml{a}{m}}}^\text{m}}$ to cover all cases there could be any exception implied there. Therefore those examples should be taken as post Tolkâppiyam usages arising on account of analogy.

$makkal$ has its final lateral changed into the plosive but the usage must have its proper place defined. The commentators point out that the change occur when the corpse is referred to. The sutra is not specific about such definite usages. But the phrase $makkalcuttu$ occurs in the first sutra in Collatikāram where this restriction laid down by commentators does not obtain. Therefore Nacciçārkkiṇiyar adds that the restriction is not followed in a few cases. On the other hand, Tolkâppiyam usage should guide as a general
usage rather than as an exception to the rule framed by the
commentators. Then the rule can therefore apply only to
post Tolkāppiyam usage. The sutram probably refers to a
dialectal variation of the ordinary rule which has become well
established in the standard literary language. If one is
to keep the pattern of \( \text{ogh l j} \) rules the sutram also must
precede ff. 401.

\[ \text{I.} \]

Passing on to the semi vowels \( \text{ogh y j} \),
\( \text{ogh r j} \) and \( \text{ogh l j} \) which follow the rule prescribed for
vowel endings, the general rule of doubling had already been
pointed out. There is some doubt about the scope of the
māṭṭēru. Does it apply only to case relationship as is
made clear by the māṭṭēru in uyirmayānkiyal? Naccinārkkīniyār
is of opinion is does not apply here and so he says
that the examples of case relation will be shown under general
exceptions. The interpretation of the Ilampūranaṉar also
shows that he is of the same opinion. But Naccinārkkīniyār
points to certain authors who take these māṭṭēru as applying
both to non-case relationship and case relationship. Perhaps
ff. 361 was repeated after the present ff. 365 and also after
ff. 395. It is impossible to think of Tolkāppiyar failing
to mention those sutras under $\Sigma r \mathcal{I}$ ending and $\Sigma 1 \mathcal{I}$ ending.

Some specific words are taken up by Tolkāppiyar which happen to be the exceptions to the general rule. $\theta$ is also an exception; but when it occurs preceded by $makan$ the ordinary rule of doubling occurs. $makan$ tāy-k-kalām is interpreted as the fight by the son and not by the mother. See the phrase $makan$ yinai in the ff. 359. There are other words which optionally get a plosive or nasal.

XI.

Under $\Sigma r \mathcal{I}$ also we get certain exceptions to the rules. ff. 363 refers to the name of the trees ending in $\Sigma r \mathcal{I}$. ār is shown by Naccinārkkiniyar to receive the augment[am] and pār to receive the augment[attu] on the basis of Akanānuru and Kuruntakai. These are evidently dialectal usages which have come into the language after Tolkāppiyar’s time. These dialectal usages support the suggestion that possibly some of the nouns were originally ending in am. Of these some follow a different rule e.g. cār when followed by kāl get the plosive doubled. Such minute definition of environment shows the careful analysis which
Telikkappiyar has made and it is therefore not proper to read any implication or exception into his sutras. prī get also the augment [am] instead of a nasal.¹⁰³

Under the ending ṣ l ḷ also there are exceptions. The word tāl has the option of following the ordinary rule or getting the augment [akku].¹⁰⁴ So also the word tamil.¹⁰⁵ kumil follows the rule for prī.¹⁰⁶ pāl has the option of following the general rule of getting the nasal in between the words.¹⁰⁷

The number ēl 'seven' is discussed and finally the word kil has the option of following either the general rule or the rule of no change.¹⁰⁸ The numeral seven is not considered to be a word ending in a vowel. It is considered by Telikkappiyar as ending in consonant ṣ l ḷ. This is said to follow the rule of the augment laid down for this word when it takes the case sign.¹⁰⁹ When this number is followed by other numerals, or measures or weights the shortening of the initial syllable and addition of ṣ u ḷ at the end, it is said, are not condemned.¹¹⁰

Unfortunately the environment is not defined; but it may be generally taken as referring to instances the second word begins with a consonant. ff. 391, 392 seem to
suggest that the shortening etc. is usually before a consonant. When ēlu is followed by ṝṣirām the Ā u ā is lost. It is not a case of no change because the initial syllable remains shortened. ēlnūrāyirām is another exception to the general rule of restrictions, because before the consonant Ā n ā is also, the original form; ēl is retained in the phrase ēlnūrāyirām. When Tolkāppiyar is so specific, it is not proper to bring in other exceptions by implication. Such exceptions are probably to be brought under the general exception. ēl retains its original forms before the three numbers tāṉrai, vallam and ārpal. If words beginning in a vowel occur as a second word, ēl is as it is without suffering any change. This makes it clear that the environment above differentiated by us is justified and the various sutras like ff. 391, 392 and 393 are only exceptions. In ēl + pattu, ēl becomes ēlu and the medial Ā t ā in the second word becomes āyam i.e. it becomes ēlupaktu.
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III.

There is a general exception found at the end of this chapter; and the commentators restrict the exception only to words ending in any consonant. But since there is
no such rule of exceptions at the end of uyirmayaṅkiyāl, this
general exception may be taken as not applicable to both the
chapters. This would also suggest that probably both the
chapters were one. Can it be that the work ended here? But
then can it be suggested that the rules in the next chapter
have no application to Tolkāppiyam or have already been stated?

"In the chapter on sandhi which has been
explained clearly, one must note carefully instances of rules
which are properly to be operated carefully". This is the
meaning of ff. 405. The idea is that if there are exceptions
they should be carefully noted and followed. Naccinārkkīniyār
discusses two sets of instances (1) one which are later usages
and which have been accepted as such viz. the augment ꠨ u ꠭
before word poṇ and maṇ etc., (2) the other, which are probably
taken as having been current in the age of Tolkāppiyar. But
it is very difficult to say that these are Tolkāppiyam usages.
For instance the final ꠨ l ꠭ of vilāl is pointed out as
becoming a nasal instead of becoming a plosive. But in view
of nasals like ꠨ n ꠭ in ḍṇ etc. becoming denasalised into
semi vowels, namely[1]etc. So it may be taken that the
original forms of vilāl etc ended in a nasal as vilāṇ and that
\( \eta J \) became later denasalised, as \textit{vilal}. In \textit{molimarpu}
the commentators show the form \textit{vilan}. \textit{eliyank\={a}y}, \textit{put\={a}lank\={a}y}
estc. given by the commentator must be later day forms not contemplated by Tolk\={a}ppiyar.
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