II. CHANGE IN THE MEANING OF SOME TECHNICAL TERMS.

One may now proceed to consider the technical terms like eluttu etc.

The question is whether the term eluttu refers to spoken sound or written script. eluttu to-day means script and indirectly spoken sound denoted by the written script. The latter commentators quote the sutram 'elutappatutalin eluttē.' ¹ But Tolkāppiyar seems to use this term in the meaning of sound, and pirappiyal seems to suggest that Tolkāppiyar is speaking of the sound rather than the script. The root seems to be elu which he himself uses in the phrase kūṭi elūtal.² It is true that he also refers to the script forms.³ But one has already expressed one doubt whether these come from the pen of Tolkāppiyar. They often refer to consonants as pulli.⁴ Except when the script forms are referred to pulli simply means consonants or sounds which occurs in a shortened form in particular environments. In the later case it is the sounds which are referred and not the script, though as a name it may be applicable also to scripts even as may and orru which refer at the first instance to the sound become applicable to script forms. Naccinārkkinīyar's conception of eluttu ⁵ is discussed elsewhere.
The conception of mutal eluttu and carpu eluttu may be taken for consideration at a later stage. kurreluttu and nettu eluttu refer to short vowels and long vowels. eluttu here cannot mean the written script.

II

The term uvir refers to the vowel, the term mey to the consonants. Dr. Caldwell praises them as beautiful metaphors. "Vowel is compared to life or soul, making the consonants move or articulate and the consonants are compared to body, the consonants which receive the movement as it were from the vowel" as Naccinärkkäniyar explains them. Civanä-nacavamiikal explains that the consonants cannot be pronounced without the help of the vowel.

The consonants when they are not voiced have no existence of their own; but from the effect produced by the consonants on the succeeding vowel, one infers the consonants which are after all mere silence. The photographs of the sound waves reveal this fact. Therefore Civanä-nacavamiikal's explanation which is also the explanation given by the later day writers may be correct with reference to the voiceless plosives. But the nasals are voiced and so also are the semi vowels. To this extent, it may be said this applies to twelve out of eighteen consonants; the explanation of
Civañamunivar and others is otherwise wrong.

The syllabic writing itself throws light on the conception of sounds held by the ancient. The conception of metre still further strengthens their conception of a sound. The consonants in verses are not counted as separate from the vowels coming with them. The syllables are formed by vowels either independently as in the initial position, or in combination with the consonants. If Civañamunivar's explanation can be understood as referring to syllabic sound it may be acceptable. Perhaps on this basis it has been considered that in the syllable, the consonants have no quantity of their own and that it is vowel that has any quantity.

III

Now on this topic of quantity the definition of one unit of quantity is given in ff. 7. "The duration of a twinkling of an eye or a snapping of the fingers are fixed as one unit of quantity." This is the interpretation according to Ilampuranar and Naccinärkkiniyar. This kind of measurement is different from weighing or linear measurement or counting or cubic measurement. These are said to be of two kinds even as they measure liquids or solids. terittu alattal is measuring the tune or pitch of a sound in relation to a
standard string or suruti. There is another variety of measure-
ment called cārṭṭiālattal. In measurement of time this
occurs. This is a sort of comparison between two different
things. One is the passage of time and the other is a motion
which uniformly takes place during the passage of time e.g.
duration between two sun rises etc. or to take a modern example
the motion made by the minute hand completing a circle within
an hour. The time is stated in relation to this movement
through a space. The quantity of sound is also connected with
duration and this is measured in terms of or in relation to the
duration of another action either a twinkling of an eye or
in relation to the duration of sound produced by the snapping
of the fingers.

This sutram according to Ilampuranar is a
definition of māṭṭārai where as Naccinarkkiniyar takes it as
giving the duration for māṭṭirai.

Naccinarkkiniyar starts with saying that the
sutram gives the duration for the māṭṭirai but when he closes
the commentary the penultimate sentence is "Tolkāppiyar has
given only the quantity for letters and he does not give the
quantity for māṭṭirai." This seems to be a contradiction of
the first sentence. The word māṭṭirai occurs in the sutram
and he interprets it as "eluttin mättiraikku alavu" that is, the quantity of the sound. He further adds that all the authors have stated these only as the quantity of sounds, and therefore Tolkäppiyar also gives the same. Hence, it looks as though the first sentence should be eluttin mättirikku alavu and not merely mättiraikku alavu, because the short vowel has been taken as the unit he seems to feel that the unit is the duration taken in the natural pronunciation of a sound. He feels that the unit has not been defined as something different from these short vowels or as a common measure for all these. The short vowel is the unit; the long vowels quantity is double this unit, while half of it is the quantity of consonants. It is not clear what is the advantage gained by this kind of explanation. Ilampūraṇar explains that the unit is called mättirai and that this has been defined as a common measurement in relation to which the short vowel, the long vowel and the consonants are measured out. But perhaps the clue to Naccinärkkiñiyar's interpretation lies in Ilampūraṇar's commentary itself. "It is not possible to have a measurement for this measure of mättirai in the sound in the same way in which one can speak of nāli being the four times the measure called ulakku. From this, Naccinärkkiñiyar infers that mättirai itself is not defined in terms of some other measurement. In the sutram occurs the
phrase muntin urarntor kantavare. It is for explaining the significance of this statement, Ilampuranar has stated, "There cannot be a measurement for measuring out this mitirai."

Naccinarkkiniyar, however states the implication in a different way. If one were to look for measurement for a kanni 'the twinkling of eye' or noti 'a snapping of the finger' then another measurement for these measurement ought to have also been described. And in this way there will be infinite regressions. Therefore, Naccinarkkiniyar conclude that Tolkappiyar has not given the measurement for mitirai but only a unit for measuring the sound.

IV

With reference to the quantity of sound Naccinarkkiniyar discusses the propriety of certain terms.

kurruluttu means short vowel as already stated and nettmeeluttu a long vowel. The shortness and length can be spoken of only with reference to sounds belonging to the same class, that is, here with reference to vowels. Therefore consonants, though shorter than short vowels, do not belong to the class called vowels. Hence, they are not called shorter sound as such. The diphthong ai and au have no respective short sounds to justify being called long; but
since they are one with the other long vowels in having two māttirai units for their length they are also called long vowels.

Both the commentators raise the question with reference to shorter \( \overline{i} \) and shorter \( \overline{u} \). The latter continue to be vowels even as a sandal stick when shortened does not become a cane stick but continues to be only a sandal stick. Because of the difference in meaning and of their behaviour in sandhi, the \( \overline{u} \) and the shorter \( \overline{u} \) are treated as distinct sound, and so also \( \overline{i} \) and shorter \( \overline{i} \).

This shall be discussed later on.

The consonants have only half a māttirai and dependent sounds have also half māttirai each. The shortened \( \overline{m} \) has only one-fourth of a māttirai.

The uyirmey is said to have only the māttirai of the vowel. But this is the commentators' interpretation. The sutram simply states that when the vowel is combined with a consonant the nature of the former is not altered. "The nature of the vowel ", mentioned in the sutram according to Ilampūraṇar, "refers to its māttirai to a greater
extent, and to its name and number to a lesser extent. What is meant by number is not clear. But Naccinārkkīṇiśa explains it as the characteristic feature of each one of the twelve vowels being one only, that is, none of them, because of this combination with consonant is classified into more than one sound.

Why māttirai is implied in this sutram is explained by Ilāmpūraṇaśa. "This syllabic sound is really a combination of a vowel and a consonant; But in the sutram the vowel is given the prominent position because it is stated that it combines with the consonants, though it may be equally true to say that the consonant combines with the vowel. This is to suggest that the unit of the syllable is that of the vowel." This is not found in Naccinārkkīṇiśa's commentary. But the latter raises the question "how is it possible to understand, half plus one māttirai becoming only one māttirai; and half plus two māttirai becoming two māttirai? When the salt is added in water up to the saturation point the whole solution, when its cubical content is measured is nothing more than the cubical content of the water. That is, the cubical content of the salt added is not found separate in addition to that of the water. One measure of water plus half measure of
salt do not become one and half measure but remain only one measure. Some such thing occurs with the syllabic sound. It is the characteristic feature of this kind of sound. One cannot give reason for it. It is nature. That is how according to Naccinarkkiniyar, Iḷampūraṇar also explained this quoting from Nālaṭiyār, the verse which says that none has painted the Kālankāṇi black or shaped wood apple into a round form.

It is surprising that this portion expressing this statement is not found in the present day edition of Iḷampūraṇar. Here is one more reason to show that these commentaries have not reached us in their original forms.

VI.

With reference to the syllabic letters the pronunciation is explained in the ff. 18. It is stated that the vowel is pronounced after the consonants.

The syllabic sounds have to be treated in two different ways. It forms one unit and then it is one sound. But it can be treated as a combination of two different sounds namely vowels and consonants. Therefore the term uyirmey according to Iḷampūraṇar as a unity means a sound born of the conjunction of the vowel and consonant. Then it is babu vṛihi samāsa or anmoli compound. When treated as two different
units it is only a conjunction compound meaning a vowel plus a consonant. This combination is not like the joining together of the tips of the two fingers which remain separated, but is like the harmonised compound or combination of milk and water. Naccinärkkiniyar gives the same simile for the harmonised combination, but that is when he is explaining the ff. 138. But in ff. 18 he states that when the quantity is considered the syllabic sound is one harmonised combination like that of salt and water. The syllabic sound has also the characteristic feature of standing as two separate sounds like the joining together of two fingers. And this is a simile which Ilampūraṇar rejects.

According to Naccinärkkiniyar uyirmey is never an an melittokai but always umpaittokai. It is never a unified sound though it may stand as a mixture. Even as the water mixed in salt takes the nature of the salt, the vowel combined with the consonant takes the characteristic feature of the consonant, that is, its hardness /explosive nature/ /softness (nasality) or middling nature (being as a semi vowel).

It is thus clear that Naccinärkkiniyar considers the syllabic sounds as conjoint letters. He does not admit that the syllabic sound becomes united into one sound. This
is probably more correct and shows that he is trying to get
rid of the implication of syllabic writing.

VII.

Tolkāppiyar specifically states that there is no sound in Tamil which is of three māttirai duration. This kind of statement is made according to some because of the existence of such a unit sound in Sanskrit which is called pluta. In that case the discussion of grammar must have been carried on an all India basis. But Tolkāppiyar adds, if lengthening is required, it is effected by combining the long vowel with the required number of short vowels so as to attain the required length. Iḻampūranar adds that the long vowel and the short vowel are pronounced without a break or hiatus. Naccinārkkiniyar points out that in music the vowel sound and other sounds exceed this limit prescribed for them in this chapter. But that has nothing to do with language. Music is dealt within treatises on music.

Naccinārkkiniyar speaks of natural alapeṭai and artificial alapeṭai. The artificial alapeṭais are those which the poets use because of metrical exigencies. In the chapter on molimaraṇu, Tolkāppiyar speaks of alapeṭai in ff. 41.
One may not accept its necessity there and one may therefore doubt the genuineness of the sutram. The meaning of that sutram is this: "wherever there is deficiency of sound in the words occurring in poetic metre, the short vowels related to the long vowel will come and stand there and fill up the deficiency in the sound."

The word otta found in the sutram is interpreted as referring to the similarity in shape, in sound and in their behaviour in sandhi.

Ilampūraṉar emphasises the word moli in the sutram. He points out that the alapēṭai of the long vowel stand as one sound. If because alapēṭai occurs only in words like the other dependent sounds, can one call it also a dependent sound? In a majority of cases, words, for instance, long monosyllabic words occur as alapēṭai sounds and no more. Again the alapēṭai can be pronounced as a separate sound without reference to the word. Therefore alapēṭai cannot be said to occur only in words. Hence they cannot be called dependent sounds. In a few cases the alapēṭai sound does not occur as one word sound, that is, it occurs as a part of a word, in words of more than one syllable for instance urāṭu.
Naccinärkkiniyar has always his eye on the chapter on prosody. He finds that the alapétëi occurs as a word as stated above as an independent sound and that it is sometimes counted as unit in metre and sometimes not counted as a unit. Therefore he is prepared to admit that these alapétëis can be added on to the thirty three (30 primary + 3 secondary sounds) sounds mentioned in the first sutram, thus making in all forty sounds.

The word moli is interpreted by Naccinärkkiniyar as referring to the eight kinds of disyllabic feet, that is iyarcir. Thus accordingly there arise eight kinds of alapétëi. Those authors of prosodical works who do not accept that the lines should be distinguished according to the occurrence in them of particular number of sounds; speak of this alapétëi as that which occurs all alone as a separate word (i.e. monosyllabic word) or as that which occurs in a word initially, medially or finally. Because of the mention of the term moli, if one has to take only the seven syllabic extra lengthened long vowels occurring by themselves separately as independent words, there will not be any room in Toikāppiyam for the other seven kinds of disyllabic feet, that is, in cases other than open long monosyllabic words.
It will be seen that Naccinārkkiniyar differs here from Ilampuranar. Though Ilampuranar admits that there are cases in which the alapetai can occur without being a separate word by itself, he feels they are of rare occurrence. Again, Ilampuranar admits that those extra lengthened long vowel inspite of its occurrence as a separate word, has also a separate existence as a characteristic sound; yet he does not admit that they can be included along with the dependent sounds to make up a total of forty sounds in all in Tamil. It is not possible to pronounce the so called dependent sounds independently of the words in which they occur as separate sounds. This does not apply to alapetais, because they can be pronounced separately as distinct sounds without reference to their occurrence as separate words. This distinction, unfortunately has not been observed by the successors of Ilampuranar. The influence of sanskrit conception of Pluta was so great that the real nature of alapetai in Tamil had been forgotten.

Naccinārkkiniyar adds because, if the term avvalaputaiya is in plural, "Tolkāppiyar implies that the lengthened long vowel need not be restricted to two plus one
māttirai alone.* The long vowel may combine with more than one short vowel in which case the alapetāi can go up to four māttirai. This is on the authority of Mapuranam which Naccinārkkiniyar asserts is earlier than Tolkāppiyam. A vepa therefore which admits four māttiras for alapetāi is quoted therefrom. Naccinārkkiniyar gives examples of alapetāi's having four māttiras, from Tirukkural; from the last appended vepa at the end of Malaipatukaṭam and from Nalaiṭiyar. In Tolkāppiyam itself in vilimarapu one has reference to words which has got an alapetāi in its natural form and which therefore gets an additional māttirai in the vocative case. Tōlii is an alapetāi which has three māttirai units in Tolkāppiyam itself. In the vocative case it still further gets an increment of one more unit e.g. Tōliii.

In ff. 6 the word kūṭti 'combing' is not sufficiently explained by Naccinārkkiniyar, though he notes the usage carefully. It is all due to the influence of Sanskrit plata which has affected the later day writings on prosody so much that nothing else could be thought of by later day writers like Naccinārkkiniyar. The alapetāi is the combination of the long vowel and the short vowel. But according to them it does not remain there as such. So, Naccinārkkiniyar writes
"It becomes one whole sound without any break; this compounded sound is like the red colour born out of the mixture of saffron and bleached shell powder." Here, therefore, there is not even a diphthong but one unified sound even as pluta is in Sanskrit. He further adds "this peculiar alapetai sound can be experienced only when the long vowel and the short vowel are pronounced together. The alapetai is not realised elsewhere, even as the oil is not realised except when sesame seeds are gr und in the rotary mill."

These are the attempts made by our commentators to bring Tolkāppiyam into line with the later day developments.

VIII.

It will serve to clarify the ideas of the commentators if one could pause here to consider the conception of later day authors. Ilakkāppakkottu divides the alapetai into various categories. It speaks of (1) iyarkai alapetai 'natural alapetai', (2) ceyarkai alapetai 'artificial alapetai', (3) eluttuppēru 'sandhi alapetai', (4) icainūl alapetai 'alapetai in music' and (5) orruppēru alapetai 'consonantal alapetai.' The last may be omitted here.
(1) The natural alapetai is that which occurs in a natural way in speech; for instance, when one calls a man at a distance, or when one cries aloud in sorrow, or when one complains to another of one's own misery, or when one goes about hawking his goods so as to be heard even by people at a distance or by people inside the houses in all these cases, the lengthening is not effected consciously; but it occurs naturally as though the word itself has that lengthening as its natural form.

(2) Artificial alapetai is that where the lengthening is consciously done with a view to meet the metrical exigencies.

(3) Sandhi alapetai is the coming in of a short vowel after a long vowel in sandhi.

(4) icaî nūl alapetai is that which occurs in alāpana in music.

The sutram, further divides alapetai from the point of view long vowel or short vowel getting lengthened into alapetai. The first is kurreluttu alapetai 'alapetai of the short vowel'. Here the original vowel is a short vowel. It is lengthened into a long vowel and it is still
further lengthened into an alapetai. The second is netpelutto
alapetai 'alapetai of the long vowel.' Here the original
vowel is long and it is still further lengthened into an alapetai.

One has to omit the alapetai of the consonants which is the third variety according to Ilakkanakkottu.

It still further divides these alapetais from yet another point of view, that is from the point of the place of occurrence in a word, that is, according to the initial, medial or the final position.

The यापरुणकला virutti and यापरुक्ललक्कारिकai speak of the alapetai usually taken as monosyllabic units as being sometimes considered only as one long monosyllable. When it is considered disyllabic, it consists of one long monosyllable and one short syllable; but the latter it must be warned, does not become part of niraiyacai in combination with any following short syllable. That means there is a natural pause after the alapetai. This will explain the position taken by Tolkāppiyar in the sutram under consideration that the short vowel fills up a metrical deficiency.

The other position where the alapetai is looked upon as a monosyllable represents the sanskrit view about the pluta.
Therefore there are two theories, one taking it as disyllabic and the other taking it as monosyllabic. If one is to rely upon the metre of old Tamil, it will appear that the disyllabic view is older, representing the older conditions of the language which continued in poetry even into later times. The monosyllabic view is the later development in the language probably because of the Sanskrit influence and this has invaded the field of prosody where also the alapetai at first as an exception and later on, as a rule came to be looked upon as a monosyllable.

Perhaps the alapetai was first considered to consist of two different sounds. Later on it became a diphthong. For understanding this position, one must consider the vowel clusters possible in the ancient Tamil language. The later day developments left no room for vowel clusters. The rule in the medieval and later Tamil is as Dr. Caldwell points out to avoid hiatus. There is always a glide between two adjacent vowels. But, this was not always the case in ancient Tamil.

The sutram on the glides occurs in the chapter punariyal. The meaning of that sutram is this. 'At the end of all words when followed by a word beginning with a
vowel the occurrence of the glide is not rejected.' The wording itself is significant. It is not stated in the form of a positive rule that glide comes in. The form of the sutram "that glide is not barred" suggests that the occurrence of the glide was once considered to be a mistake and that later on also when the coming in of a glide became more and more frequent, the grammarians allowed, at first no glide, even during this period when the language was changing and that still later because of the force of usage in language, the grammarians had to agree that one need not object to the coming in of the glide. Therefore the sutram is in the form of a permissive rule rather than in the form of an obligatory one.

The commentators themselves point out that the hiatus also occurs in Tamil. "Because of the force of the word varaiyaṁ 'they shall not reject', it will be accepted that the glide is not of universal or compulsory occurrence." This statement by Ilumpūranar is repeated by Naccinārkkinīyiar.

Nammūl gives the theory of the later day usage. If there is a deficiency in metre the long vowel standing in the initial, medial or final position in a word will increase further in length, its respective short vowel
will be (written as) a symbol for this extra long vowel, that is, the symbol for the lengthening of the long vowel.

The statement that the short vowel is only a symbol is significant. In Sanskrit the pruta which corresponds according to the later writers to the uyiralapetai is symbolised by the number three itself, three being the quantity of the pruta. Probably having this in mind, Pavananti looks upon the short vowel occurring after the long vowel as a symbol. By the time of Yapparunkalakkäríkkai and its commentary (Ciraca I Century A.D.) people have began to identify the uyir alapetai with the Sanskrit pruta; for its commentators quotes a sūtram which equates alapetai. Palkayanär, another author quoted in the above commentary has included the alapetai as the third kind amongst the three kinds of vowels viz. the short vowel having one māttirai; the long vowel having two māttirai and the uyir alapetai vowel having three māttirai each. Another author is also quoted. He also admits a vowel of three māttirai. The author of Yapparunkalavirutti writes that "in vocative case etc., the alapetai may be of more than three māttirai; but since study of each extra long alapetai's is not of any great help in poetry, they are not here defined."
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These later day writers further divide the various sounds on the basis of their place of occurrence in a word. It is on this score that Pavananti also states that uyir alapetai is twenty one in number. As there are seven long vowels the initial alapetais will be seven, the medial alapetais seven and the final alapetais seven in all twenty one. These have been referred to as having been noted down by Ilakkanakkottu. But the writers on prosody take note of words of one syllable and add the alapetai occurring there in as a fourth category, that is, taninilai alapetai. These four places of occurrence are referred to by Naccinarkkiniyar. He refers to the people who do not classify the poetical lines on the basis of the number of syllables therein and these are probably the authors of Yapparunkalam and Yapparunkalakkarikai, their commentaries and the other authors quoted therein.

IX.

One may pause here to follow the developments in the meaning of the sutram of Pavananti vis a vis Tolkëppiyar.

Mayalainatar starts the attack on Tolkëppiyam. He is of the view that Pavananti is differing from Tolkëppiyam for the better. The usual two matras of the long vowel are
further lengthened to the quantity of three mātras. This is ălapetăi according to Pavananti. Mayilainātar does not agree that two sounds are combined to form three mātras as stated by Tolkappiyar. Mayilainātar further quotes a sutram that an author should distinguish and fix (1) the sounds, (2) their symbols, (3) their place of occurrence and (4) there quantity, without the possibility of any confusion about these four aspects; He adds that if therefore Tolkappiyam were simply to speak of the lengthening of one sound, there will be nothing to explain what symbol would denote such a lengthening. He thereby suggests that Pavananti by looking upon the short vowel as a symbol does not suffer from this defect.

Caṅkaranamacivāyar, who followed Mayilainātar as a commentator of Nammūl perhaps a century or more later, had necessarily to justify Pavananti. But he has got a soft corner for Tolkappiyar as may be seen from his discussion of the subject. "Is it not because of the difference in their articulation or pronunciation that the sounds have become many? If that were so, and if the ălapetăi, which is pronounced as one sound, as a modification of the long vowel, were to be considered to have become possessed of three mātras by combining the two letters or sounds, these are the difficulties;
(1) actually (probably referring to the pronunciation in the age of these commentaries) there are no such two letter sounds there in (2) the name alapetai does not suit such a situation of two sounds; because of these difficulties the author had not considered such an interpretation of alapetai as a combination of two vowels but had stated that the short vowel should be taken as a mere symbol. That is why Pavananti says that it is a symbol. Tolkappiyar is also of the same view. He states that the long vowel fills up the deficiency in sound, by further lengthening. He further states that the short vowel corresponding to the long vowel comes in 'merely as a symbol.' So had stated Tolkappiyar. If this were not so, that is to say, if this interpretation of Tolkappiyar were not correct, the word kuriye 'that is a symbol' in Nammul is to be taken as deciding in favour of one of these two theories (1) Theory of two sounds mixing together to form alapetai and (2) the theory of the lengthening of the long vowel being symbolised by a short vowel that is, the latter.

As it is, the following passage in the present edition of Cañkaramakavāyar is difficult to understand.
"aciciriyar Tolkäppiyarum kunricai molivayin
ninricai niraikkum nettelutu enrum avarrinpin
arikuriyäy varum otta kurreluttu enrum kuriñär
anrë? kuriyä enratu avvirantu mërkolil orrutusulalan
orutalai tunital enrum utti."

This is the passage. If it asserts, that Tolkappiyar also
agrees with Pavananti, then there cannot be two theories to
pick and choose from. Dr. U.V. CaminäTai aiyyar has given
another reading in his foot-note 58 Tolkäppiyarum ...........
kuriñär anrë kuriyë. This also makes no sense because there
are not punctuation marks. But if one can supply the punctua-
tion mark, then, the passage will thus become clear:-
Tolkäppiyar ............... kurinär anrër, kuriyë enratu .......

The commentator here because of his consideration for Tolkappiyar,
attempts to interpret Tolkäppiyam in terms of Pavanänti, actually
supplying the verb for the second sentence "it is a symbol".
He himself has his own doubts about this forced interpretation.
Therefore he hastens to add anrël 'if this were not so' or
'otherwise' that is if Tolkäppiyar is not agreeing with Pavanänti
then Tolkappiyar's theory stands against Pavanänti's, thus
creating two theories on the subject. Then it is easy to
understand that Pavanänti is choosing one of these two conflicting
theories.
Civaṇānāmuniṉivar who has corrected the commentary of Cāṅkaraṉāmaciṉāyavaṉ writes as follows. He uses the simile of water being mixed with water, for the aḷapetai which according to Tolkāppiyar is a combination of a long vowel and a short vowel. This seems to accord with the view of Naccinārkkīṇīyar. Of course there is this difference that whilst Naccinārkkīṇīyar's simile emphasises the compounding of two different things, Civaṇānāmuniṉivar emphasises a compounding of similar things. Civaṇānāmuniṉivar tries to interpret Tolkāppiyam in consonance with Nāṭkūḷ. He simply expands the commentary by Cāṅkaraṉāmaciṉāyavaṉ. He states "The sounds are many because of their difference in sound; It is because of this, that the aḷapetai is considered as a single sound being differentiated from others as the variation of the long vowel; that is why Pavaṇaṇanti speaks of the long vowel increasing its length and the short vowel being only a symbol; Tolkāppiyar also has said that the aḷapetai is a lengthened sound, where these long and short vowels become one like water with water." He quotes Tolkāppiyar and proceeds "In this way as far as the sound is concerned, the opinions of both are one; where Pavaṇaṇanti speaks of the short vowel as symbol, he differs from Tolkāppiyar and decides in favour of the school which accepts the short vowel only as a symbol. Those who do not understand this, write
according to their whims and fancies that the long vowel and the short vowel are joined together even as two fingers are joined together and thus become increased in their quantity."

The theory that the long vowel and the short vowel thus stand and increase their quantity as one whole unit is not in consonance with the experience of the later day authors. Therefore they all accept that the theory is wrong. For that purpose, they rely on the technical name. The technical term here is alapetai and not eluttetai. Alapetai means increase in quantity; eluttetai will mean the increase in the number of letters. Perhaps they feel eluttetai will be the proper term for this increase in the number of letters (short vowel letter plus long vowel letter). Therefore the authors feel that the technical name alapetai itself is enough to disprove the other theory. But they feel other difficulties.

Civañanamunivar writes "If that is so, i.e. if one may argue in consonance with this theory of alapetai and not of eluttetai (a difficulty arises); one alapetai, taken as one unit and not as a combination of a long vowel and a short vowel, cannot be divided into two māttirai and one māttirai, for the purpose of metrical syllabification (as is always done) to build thereby a material feet and to define the combination of feet." But
this argument is not correct. The metrical quantity or the letters, the syllabification, the conception of feet and their combinations are all based on sound and not on letters. The author, Tolkāppiyar speaks of aḷapēṭai coming in only for preventing the disturbance of the correct rhythm, the correct combination of cīr or the correct versifications. These rhythm, combination of feet and versification generally are all based on the quantity and not on the letters.

It will be clear that Civaṉānamunivar is attempting to give an interpretation to Tolkāppiyam different from that given by Cankaranamacīvāyar otta kurreluttu is interpreted as the short vowel which becomes one with the long vowel so as to fill up the deficiency in quantity occurring in the metre. Taken in this sense there is no question of two different sounds mixing together. It is a case of short vowel of one unit duration, becoming harmonised with the long vowel of two unit duration and thus articulated as one sound of three māttiras by this extra artificial lengthening by one more unit of the original long vowel of two units. Thus he has to correct the commentary of Cankaranamacīvāyar as already explained.

However, unfortunately Civaṉānamunivar is not
clear. What does he mean by \textit{eluttetai}? Is he referring to the increment of the written symbol called \textit{eluttu} 'letter'. This cannot be. But \textit{eluttu} as already stated means not the script symbol but the sound. If that is granted, \textit{eluttetai} can only mean \textit{alapetai} because in the particular context there is nothing to be increased except the sound. If increase in letters is considered, necessarily the short vowel has to be taken as referring to the script or symbol. A vowel cluster cannot be called \textit{eluttetai} because it is not one sound which is increased in quantity. The fact that Tolkâppiyar uses \textit{alapetai} instead of \textit{eluttetai} proves if any, that he is referring to a cluster of vowels filling up the metrical deficiency.

There is also another difficulty in Civaññamunivār's commentary. He feels that the distinction of the speech sounds as separate units as represented by different written symbols have no value whatever in prosody. He forgets that one cannot cut across the individual sounds to form metrical syllable. This is an impossibility according to any theory of Tamil prosody. One can cut across words in metre but never across individual sounds by joining the last part of a word with the first part of the next word to form a metrical foot. It is not possible for instance to cut a long
vowel into two short vowel to make them two different units for keeping one unit in one syllable and taking the other to the succeeding syllable. But a long vowel in quantity is equal to two short vowels and in this way what is called nirai, double short vowel can come in the place of what is called nēr the long vowel. Tolkāppiyar himself states elsewhere that since length and shortness of sound are based on quantity, a word of more than one syllable is more or less like the word of one long syllable. This is the meaning of the emphasis placed on māttirai in the sutram in the chapter on Tolkāppiyar’s prosody because one can group two short vowels as being equal to one long vowel and one can group a long vowel and a short vowel to make up two when the metre requires two syllable and when the natural long vowel will give only one syllable; therefore the addition of a short vowel is necessary to cover the deficiency. But nobody has so far argued or pointed out that a long vowel should be cut into two, so as to form into two metrical syllables. Unfortunately it looks as though the word eluttu has created the confusion; for this term may mean a written symbol as well as a sound. It is therefore clear that Tolkāppiyar is looking upon alapetai as a vowel cluster, and not as an extra long monosyllable.
This historical digression has the value of revealing also the changing conceptions of the people through the ages, with reference to Tolkāppiyar. Tolkāppiyam tradition came to be replaced by, probably the Avinayam tradition. Mayilainātar actually quotes certain stanzas which laugh at some of Tolkāppiyar’s statements. But slowly Tolkāppiyam was regaining its influence, thanks to Iḻampūranar and the evergrowing line of commentators on Tolkāppiyam. Mayilainātar honours both the traditions sometimes choosing one and sometimes the other. Pavaṇantti also follows in some places Avinayam and in many places Tolkāppiyam. But after Mayilainātar, Tolkāppiyam tradition was glorified as may be seen from Naccinārk-kinīyar’s commentary. Caṅkaranamacivāyar’s commentary seems to waver. But as time went on Tolkāppiyar came to be recognised as the only authority and it is this state of mind that is revealed in Civaṇānamunivar’s commentary.

One may wonder where arise all the difficulties about aḷapeṭai. By the time of the commentators aḷapeṭai came to be pronounced on the lines of the Sanskrit pluta. Therefore they could not think of the aḷapeṭai as a kind of vowel cluster; such clusters having gone out of usage after Tolkāppiyam. Pavaṇantti’s statement accords with their
experience of alapetai. That is why they try to understand alapetai in terms of Pavananti or rather their own experience and usage.

I

Once the existence of vowel clusters especially of the long and the short vowel of the same quality is recognised in the language of Tolkappiyar's age, it is easy to understand Tolkappiyar's statement, that alapetai is a vowel cluster of a long and a short vowel. The only difference is that the other vowel clusters are natural while alapetai comes in where there is metrical deficiency. One must emphasise this fact about the metrical deficiency because of the way in which Nammūl has stated that there are twenty one kinds of uvir alapetai.

If the seven long vowels occur initially finally and medially, on the basis of their position one will have twenty one. But though the commentators on yapparunkalam, yapparunkalakkārikai and Mayilainātar, the first commentator on Nammūl, will admit \( \text{au} \) coming in medially and finally as in manavukam and \( \text{anavu} \), Givanānmanunivar, seeing that \( \text{au} \) does not occur medially and finally in Tamil words, refuses to admit those two positions for \( \text{au} \). In that case one can get only nineteen
instead of twenty one. Therefore Civaṉanumunivar has to add two more to make the twenty one mentioned by Pavananti and he does this by speaking of innical alapetai and collical alapetai as the remaining two. The ordinary alapetai is metrical alapetai. ceyyulicaainirai alapetai is the alapetai which comes in when there is deficiency in the metre. innical alapetai is the kurrellutu alapetai already explained in relation to Ilakkanakkottu. collical alapetai occurs as a derivative. The word macai for instance is considered by these people as a noun and when I i I is added it gets the form of an alapetai macai; it becomes thereby a verbal or conjunctive participle. Therefore alapetai has the value of a derivative or conjunctive participle.

Tolkāppiyar, some argue, is not unaware of the Sanskrit pluta and that is why probably he states that there is no such sound (like pluta) in Tamil which has three units of length. If this is not to deny the existence of pluta in Tamil it is very difficult to understand what the sutram aims at. It will be clear as is shown by many other sutrums that Tolkāppiyar has in his mind the Sanskrit grammatical rules and explanations, because grammar was an India study. Tolkāppiyar also knows that in music the vowel sounds have more than
the quantities given in his work. Even there, gamaŋas will
be vowel clusters. Therefore if Tolkãppiyar recognises in
the aḷapaṭai the Sanskrit pluta he would have stated it in the
most simplest terms. He never thought pluta is aḷapaṭai.
It is the change in the language which at a later stage avoided
the vowel clusters, that made it difficult for the later day
writers to understand correctly Tolkãppiyam. It is also
doubtful as suggested elsewhere whether the aḷapaṭai sutrams
are from his pen, since he is treating of vowel clusters as a
matter of course.

II.

One has in Tolkãppiyam itself, a short his-
tory of the vowel clusters. The first stage was when there
were vowel clusters everywhere. Then came the second stage
when two adjacent short vowels become harmonised into a single
long vowel which came to be as it were a portmanteau morpheme.
In the negative verbs for instance nillāṅ, the root is nil and
and the final masculine suffix is an. The problem here is
how the short vowel ə a ə became a long vowel ə a ə so as
to get the form āṅ. It is true grammarians speak of āṅ as
an allomorph of an. But the question arises how the negative
conception is expressed if āṅ is taken as an allomorph. The
later day grammarians have solved even this difficulty by saying that the very absence of the tense sign in its usual place between the root and the gender suffix expresses this negation, an instance perhaps of an athematic morpheme.

It is in the absence of any other possible explanation that this kind of a strained explanation can be considered proper. If the short $\overset{\circ}{a}$ is equal to the negative $\overset{\circ}{a}$ coming in between the root and the gender suffix as for instance in ceyamu (ce + a + anu) in Telugu where the medial $\overset{\circ}{a}$ is a negative particle. In ceyan also we must have (cey + a + an)

One has to introduce here a rule of morpho-phonemic alternation, $v^1 + v^2 = v^2$. This explains also nillem, nillik etc.

nil + a + em, nil + a + ir. With this morphophonemic rule, one can explain all the longer vowels in the gender suffix as vanta + an = vantān etc. At a later stage before the glide $\overset{\circ}{a}$ came into general usage $\overset{\circ}{a}$ + a $\overset{\circ}{a}$ become $\overset{\circ}{a}$ especially in deverbalised nouns or participial nouns and later when the glides became of universal occurrence $\overset{\circ}{a}$ + a $\overset{\circ}{a}$ becomes $\overset{\circ}{a}$ + v + a $\overset{\circ}{a}$ = $\overset{\circ}{a}$ava $\overset{\circ}{a}$. kilavōn represents the third stage.

This is also known to Tolkāppiyar. He has mentioned that $\overset{\circ}{a}$ $\overset{\circ}{a}$ becomes $\overset{\circ}{a}$ 70. The fourth stage will be where we have glides coming in but these glides originally in the age of Tolkāppiyar
are on glides $\tilde{a} + \tilde{i}tai$ becomes "ayitai", $\tilde{m} + \tilde{iru} = \tilde{m}yiru$.

The later day development is represented in the coming in of the off glide. Except in ancient phrases and words preserved in all the four stages, off glides came to be uniformly used in the Tamil of the later day.

In addition to the rules of the morpho phonemic alteration stated above, the grammarians of Tolkāppiyam period thought it necessary to follow a modified rule so as to emphasise and recognise the morpheme within a word. Perhaps it is not correct to say that the grammarians are responsible for this. Probably the consciousness of this age led to this kind of development. In Tamil usage, it is even now found to be operative; for emphasising the division of words the ending of the first part of the word or compound is lengthened.

muttaiya + pillai becomes muttaiyyappillai. See nillaar etc. $\tilde{m}nil + \tilde{a} + \tilde{ar} \tilde{J}$ becomes nilāar but for emphasising the suffix it is written as nilāar.

One may for clarifying this position take up for consideration the rules which usually lay down the coming in of an augment $\tilde{u} \tilde{J}$ at the end of some words. It is really a derivative suffix making a root into a noun. talu + $\tilde{u}$ becomes talūu (equal to the modern form taluvu). Here the
rule is $\overline{v^1} + \overline{v^2} = \overline{v^2} + \overline{v^2}$. This is according to the rule given by Tolkappiyar. The final syllable lu becomes lengthened and in addition a short vowel follows it. Generally these forms occur in modern usage, as hinted, with a root and the syllable $\overline{l}u\overline{u}$. See taluva kuluvu etc.

Now atu + anru becomes according to the above rule atānru. So also itānru etc. Tolkappiyar looks up on the second word anru as the one remaining without any alternation, the final $\overline{l}u\overline{j}$ of the first word atu having become $\overline{a}\overline{j}$. This is helpful in showing that Tolkappiyar and the people of his generation looked upon the second word as distinct and as undergoing no change, the change if any occurring only in the first word.

In other cases one has an augment $\overline{a}\overline{j}$ coming at the end of the words in earlier times instead of $\overline{l}u\overline{j}$ of the later times, including here, the age of Tolkappiyam itself. kannakkatumai and porunakkatumai. (This $\overline{a}\overline{j}$ may be the remnant of an older suffix am or an. See for instance maram + petti becomes marappetti.) There are number of disyllabic words like uvā, irā, arā, palā, nilā, pītā, talā etc. which in modern usage get an $\overline{l}u\overline{j}$ as a final augment uvāru, iravu,
aravu, palavu, nilavu, pitavu, talavu etc. Now according to
the first rule given above ira + a will become as ira etc.
These are the older forms. Tolkāppiyar speaks of ira, iravu
as alternants. But in compounds one finds the second rule
playing an important part where instead of two short vowel
becoming one long vowel one gets a long vowel and also the short
ɪ a ş which is distinguished as a separate ending or suffix
or an augment. This ɪ a ş has been replaced by ɪ u ş in
later days. Tolkāppiyar himself speaks of iravu etc. But
he recognises them as forms of poetic usage. But unfortunately
it is the poetic forms which are current in modern usage.
Perhaps, here also ɪ a ş is an old remnant of am or an. The
word cilāam, palāam are curious. cilā + am will become cilāam.
So also pala + am will become palāam. This/also the word of
poetic usage in Tolkāppiyar's time and therefore one can
conclude that they represent the much more ancient usage
ya + kotu becomes yaankotu. So also maankotu . If one
has to follow the precedent; palāam is pala + am, one has to
split other words similarly i.e. ya + am and ma + am. So
also talā + am, pitā + am. This am looses its final nasal
as is after the case - See maram looses[9] and the following
plosive doubles in such a position; \textit{yaakkotu}. Perhaps \textit{kāakkurai}, should also be explained similarly, though the explanation even at the time of Tolkāppiyar was that the \textit{k}, \textit{yā}, \textit{mā} were open monosyllables getting an augment \textit{a} when the following plosive also was doubled.

\textit{Alapēṭai} as treated in the places of metrical deficiencies further strengthen the view about the vowel clusters. The long and the short vowel have been treated as two different metrical syllables as already stated. Čivanāma-munivar as already stated tries to minimize the force of this conclusive argument.

There is a second variety of this kind of vowel cluster. These are more akin to \textit{alapēṭai}. Here one has a kind of emphasis which is denoted by the short vowel corresponding to the previous long vowel occurring, for instance, in the imperative mood of the verbs \textit{āē} and \textit{ō} 'command' and 'leave of' respectively i.e. as \textit{āē} and \textit{ōō}. There is a difference between pronouncing the root as root and as commands. The command has a different emphatic pattern which is probably represented in this way by adding a short vowel. The emphatic particle \textit{āō} also gets this augument of a
short vowel. The root /'e/ when it becomes a noun gets this augment of corresponding short vowel. This is a curious way of deriving a noun from the verbal root. The root /'o/ also becomes a noun by getting the augment of a corresponding short vowel. In later day these noun forms occur as /e'vu/ and /o'vu/.

In vocative case, one has this kind of augment for nouns. There is probably a change in the pitch or intonation. /tōlīi/ itself ends in a vowel cluster and one gets in this nominative case of address the force. /tōlīi/ with an added vowel in the vocative. Therefore one has two varieties viz (1) where a short vowel comes in for denoting what may perhaps be called a difference in intonational pattern and (2) where a short vowel comes in as a derivative suffix for converting a verb into a noun. The latter may also be a case of intonation which converts the verb into a noun.

There is another category where one gets a suffix; viz koon which can be looked upon as /'e/n. Here the rule /V₁ + V₂ = V₂/ does not apply because in /kō, /'o/ is a long vowel. But this can be explained, also in the
light of the later development of glides. Suffix an has a
tendency to become on where in later times glide \( \underleftarrow{v} \) 
comes in. Probably this occurs with \( \underleftarrow{e} \) also. If \( \text{team} \)
is \( \text{tecam} \) (this is not admitted by many) the medial consonant
may be taken, as usual, to have disappeared. This will give
us \( \text{te} + \text{am} \). In later times it will become \( \text{teyam} \) with any
glide. In such a context in the period when there was no
necessity for a glide \( \underleftarrow{a} \) varies with \( \underleftarrow{e} \). This is
due to the fact that the disappearing palatal \( \underleftarrow{c} \) has
converted the vowel \( \underleftarrow{a} \) into a front vowel \( \underleftarrow{e} \) for
one may state the morphophonemic rule for the long vowel thus
\( \overrightarrow{v} + \overrightarrow{v} = \overrightarrow{v} + \overrightarrow{v} \).

There is a still another variety of vowel
clusters where the short vowel is definitely a derivative.
\( \underleftarrow{e}, \underleftarrow{o} \) etc. will come under this category. \( \text{elum} \)
has already been explained as consisting of the root \( \text{elu} \) with
derivative \( u \). This must come under this category. One has
the relative participle of the pattern \( \text{ceyyum} \) which consists
of the root \( \text{cey} \) plus the suffix \( \text{um} \). When the root ends in
the vowel[\( u \)] that ending becomes the lengthened \( \underleftarrow{u} \) i.e.
\( \underleftarrow{u} \) and \( \text{um} \) is written distinctively there after \( \text{varu} + \text{um} = \text{varu} \).
In vala, tala, pukki, pera etc.,

one has an or al occurring separately as a suffix and what
goes before that can be looked upon as valu or talu etc., plus
the negative al. The whole thing then becomes vala, tala,
under the original rule \( \overline{V}^1 + \overline{V}^2 = \overline{V}^2 \). There is also another
derivative \( \underline{\text{i}} \text{j} \) which comes in as sign of past tense.
pukki, urti, tali etc. Here \( \overline{V}^1 + \overline{V}^2 + \overline{V}^2 \overline{V}^2 \).

There are forms like tokai, ninai, nilai etc. The later day grammarians have taken the \( \underline{\text{i}} \text{j} \) as a
derivative suffix making the noun tokai, ninai, or nilai etc.,
into a verbal or conjunctive participle. Therefore they call
these collicai alapetai 'alapetai occurring as a derivative.'
The only difficulty about this theory is that one does not get
any such instance elsewhere. As we have argued, the \( \underline{\text{i}} \text{j} \)
is only for emphasising the recognition of the suffix as a
separate unit. tokai, ninai etc. must themselves be of the
same pattern like mar etc. Here probably there must have
been roots with alternate forms toka, ila, ina, ala etc. As
far as ala, cina, kata are considered one has these forms still
in use. One does not have however the root form toka. One
has only the form toku etc. If ina, ila etc. are the root
forms and if \( \vec{i} \) is added on to them one will have nina + i, nila + i etc. the rule \( V_1^2 + V_2^2 = V_2^2 \) does not operate here because there is the natural diphthong sound \( \vec{ai} \) compounded of \( \vec{a} + i \). Therefore, in these cases \( \vec{a} + i \) become \( \vec{ai} \) and one gets the forms nina, nila, cinai etc. If this is correct, one may infer there were forms like toka, as roots. The relative participle is formed by adding \( \vec{a} \) to the conjunctive participle. This is explained the forms mariya \( ^{103} \) (mari + y (glide) + a, suffix of the relative participle) and so on. valliyinum, marliyatu \( ^{104} \) \( ^{105} \) are forms with final suffixes added to the roots and the relative participle. These are more or less natural vowel clusters as distinguished from alapetais which are occurrences in verses.
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