Tokai marapu is the noun of the fifth chapter in Tolkāppiyam. The term tokai marapu according to the commentators means the grouping together of morphophonemic rules in relation to the twenty four final sounds whenever such groupings are possible. Ilampūraṇar explains this in the second sutram that the author has here grouped together the forty eight sutras which may be necessary at the rate of one sutra per one ending that is twenty four for case relationship and another twenty four for non-case relationship. Further he says in his commentary that one should find out for oneself all the other groupings.\(^1\) Naccinārkkiniyar explains this term here under the commentary on ff. 156 also. Venkaṭārājalu Keddiar explains this term as the grouping together of the various endings whenever they follow the same sandhi rules; for instance, the second sutram of this chapter speaks of twenty four final sounds and the fourth sutram speaks of the two final sounds. But, it will be seen that the author has grouped together in various ways under various general principles, not restricted to those mentioned by these writers.
According to Dr. P.S. Cupprenanamya Sāstri

the changes in the coming sound that is regressive assimilation and the coming in of the augment have been grouped together in this chapter. Further, he thinks that the author is also grouping together the principles of ancient authors. K. Vellai vāranar is also of the same opinion. But, one cannot agree with this view that Telkāppiyar refers to the traditional rules as distinguished from his own contribution. With reference to the former class, he always uses words like empa, emmpār and varaiyar melipa etc. it cannot be said that in all the sutrams of tokai marapu, he is using these words. marapu further need not mean tradition; it may mean the grammatical rules.

Tokai marapu is the fifth chapter; In the seventh chapter uyirmayankiyal he takes the vowel endings one after another and enumerates the changes which each vowel endings undergoes, when followed by another word. In pullimayañkiyal, the eighth chapter the consonantal endings one after another are similarly treated. kurriyal ukara-p-punariyal, the ninth chapter deals with the words ending in shorter when followed by an another word. Here tokai marapu, however, the method is different. It is not dealing with the endings seriātim one after another.
There are certain rules of sandhi which are of general application to groups of endings. These groups are made either because they follow the same rules of sandhi or because their functions in syntax are alike.

Instead of referring to the syntactical function, one may speak of these groups as morphological or syntactical classes. The syntactical relationships were explained according to old grammarians in terms of two categories viz (1) non-case relationship and (2) case-relationship.

The classes of words were also distinguished on the basis of their occurrence as subject or predicate of a sentence or phrase. The former is called noun class and the latter verb class. Amongst the noun classes, there is the class of inferior and superior nouns and the class which is common to both. There are again the three persons and two numbers singular and plural. In third person, all the distinctions of the inferior class etc. hold good. The first person belongs to the superior class of noun according to Tolkappiyar. The second person belongs to the common class of noun; and in these there is the distinction only of number.

Amongst the case relationship there is the
case of relationship of the case sign cją 19 ai 18. There is also a case relationship usually called instrumental but which is defined functionally as occurring in the phrase which ends with the passive verb. 19 So also there are case-relationships of dative, ablative, genitive and locative.

Certain class of words are classified according to their interrogative / demonstrative bases, coming with one or another of the two endings ści 1 or ści al 1. These certainly refer to a morphological classification.

Words are also classified according to their syllabic structure as closed long monosyllables, closed long syllables, 21 and those which are more than disyllables. 22

Words are further classified as words of measurement, weight and number, since these occur, more or less as attributives. 23 Tolkāppiyar speaks of another group of words which take the augment ści u ści as described in the subsequent chapters. There is another grouping on the basis of their behaving alike in sandhi. 25

II.

The first sutram states that whenever a nasal is said to be coming in (as for instance in ff. 217)
the nasal should be interpreted as being homorganic with the plosive following i.e. $\mathcal{L} \mathcal{h} \mathcal{m} \mathcal{H} \mathcal{n}$ and $\mathcal{m} \mathcal{H}$ respectively before $[k][c][z]$ and $[p]$. Naccinarkkiniyar refers to ff. 314 where the change of nasal is pointed out. But even there, to what nasal the sound changes is not given in detail because of this sutram. There is no necessity to bring vilak-kuraittan etc under this sutram because such cases are contemplated by ff. 157. These are cases of regressive assimilation. That is why the commentators say that they depend upon the coming words.

Most of the rules in uyirneyankiyl for instance belong to cases where the first word ends in a vowel and where the second word begins in a plosive. However there are some exceptions. Therefore in this chapter mostly the non-plosive initials of the second word in sandhi are considered; there are the vowels which begin a word; amongst the nasals $[\mathcal{m} \mathcal{H}]$ and $[\mathcal{m} \mathcal{H}]$ occur initially; among semi vowels $[\mathcal{y} \mathcal{H}]$ and $[\mathcal{v} \mathcal{H}]$ alone occur initially. In the subsequent chapters changes are mostly in the form of the doubling of the initial consonant of the following word. In this chapter therefore only the cases of no change are given.

The general rule is stated in ff. 144 that
all the initial plosives of the second word undergo no change when preceded by a word whatever be its ending in Tamil, when that word is a noun and a subject. Therefore according to the commentators the first word is said to be a noun, ending in any one of the twenty-four sounds already described. The specific sutras coming hereafter will be exceptions to this general rule. 29 Naccinārkkitinīyar is careful to show that the combination of words are meaningful. Therefore, he gives the list of proper predicates, interpreting specifically certain words wherever necessary. He also gives instruction where in the groups consisting of subjects and predicates, one must take the proper and meaningful words only.

Naccinārkkitinīyar makes clear that the sutra refers only to the no change of the initial of the second word and does not deal with the change occurring in the ending of the first word. 31 Therefore there is no meaning in his referring to sutras defining the change occurring to the final letters; perhaps he means to say that the changes are governed by rules other than this sutra.

In the usages of even the age of the Sangām Naccinārkkitinīyar found that when the final ऽ y ण was followed by an initial ऽ y ण one of them disappears, which according
to Raccinärkkiñiyar is the final $\sqrt{y}$. Since Tolkäppiyar does not refer to this in his age it is clear there was no such loss. It must also be noted that in Tolkäppiyar's age the final $\sqrt{y}$ had the value of $\sqrt{i}$.  

There are a few changes not contemplated in sutras. They are changes which are of universal applications viz. the coming in of the glide of the consonants and the vowels becoming syllabic letter and (iii) the doubling of the final consonants in a closed short monosyllable when followed by a vowel. These are not the kinds of changes referred in the sutram according to the commentators. These changes are called karuvi-t-tiripu which has already been explained.

There are twenty four endings and the relationship for each is of two kinds vis. case relationship and non case relationship; therefore there should be forty eight sutras for this one sutram, if Tolkäppiyar were to follow the method of taking each ending and assigning one sutram for its case relationship and another for its non case relationship. He grouped together all these forty eight possible sutras in this one sutram. This is the tokai that is referred to in the title of the chapter, according to the commentators.

There is an exception to this rule.
is with reference to words of three letters which are called
*totarmoli*. In these cases the initial nasal of the second
word either uniformly doubles or optionally doubles or suffers
no change. *Naccinārkkuniyar* who in the previous chapter
spoke of *katir* as consisting of two letters refusing there
to count the consonants here gives it as an example of *totar*
moli where there should be necessarily more than two letters.
That is because of his explanation of ff. 53, as already
explained. This is another reason that *Naccinārkkuniyar*
thought of the importance of syllablic structure later than
he completed his commentary and then revised only his commen-
tary on a few sutras.

Under this sutra which is restricted to
*totar moli* the commentators try to bring in the optional rule
even after words of one letter and two letters, and also to
justify the usage they found in *Sangam* and later literature
viz. cases of compulsory doubling of nasals after some
monosyllables. This attempt is not proper because these
usages are to be explained as developments in the language
occurring after *Tolkāppiyam*. Even with reference to these
usages there seems to be doubts in the minds of some authors.
The doubling after consonants is considered to be a case of
forced pronunciation by some. This is pointed out by Nacci-
gärkkinīyar. He points out, for instance, that instead of
following the optional rule explained as an implication under
the sūtraṃ pūñapārīṇāṃ the rule of no change. There,
the doubted cases are exceptions and clearly prove that the
implied rule could have come only after the age of Tolkāppiyam.

III.

The cerebral (ṅ) and alveolar nasals (ŋ) are
then taken up, first of all in the particular environment on
which they occur as endings before verbs beginning with ya.
It is because of this that the commentators assume that whenever
Tolkāppiyar lays the rules for non-nouns, he specifically
referred to them and that therefore when there is a reference
only to words in general, such reference should be interpreted
as being limited to nouns only. To proceed with the rules,
this ya there alternates with ṅ. There is an old
instance of this usage that is given by the commentators from
post Tolkāppiyar work. This is a case of progressive assim-
ilation. The palatal nasal was nearest to the nasalised
semi-vowel. The commentators, therefore, refer only to the
root, ya na. is not looked upon as original,
because the sūtraṃ refers to a case of nasalisation. It is
the change of nasals that are discussed in these few sutras.

With reference to these two consonantal endings, Tolkāppiyar makes the statement of a wider scope that they do not suffer any change whatever when standing in non-case relationship, whatever may be the coming word, that is even when followed by plosives. Cāṭ-kōl is mentioned as an exception by commentators; it is however really a case of later usage.

If the plosives are omitted with reference to other consonants the no change rule of these two consonants hold good even in case relationship. What will happen if the plosives follow, as Naccinārkkiniyvar points out is explained under the respective consonantal endings in pulli mayankiyal.

Tolkāppiyar discusses the changes which these consonants bring about. Here the ķ l J behaves like ķ n J and ķ l J behaves like ķ n J in the presence of dental sounds. And ķ t J or ķ n J following [1] or [n] becomes alveolar plosive or nasal respectively. So also ķ t J or ķ n J becomes the cerebral plosive or nasal respectively when they occur after an [1] or [n] ending environments. The change is that of the initial consonant of the second word
and not of the final consonants of the first word. But the [l] or [l] ending become [r] or [t] respectively when occurring at the end of closed mono short syllables. These are cases of reciprocal assimilation or it may also be taken as regressive assimilation of the final consonants followed by the progressive assimilation of the initial consonants.

IV.

Tolkappiyar takes up the specific classes of words. Amongst them, the class of second person words are first taken up. Since Tolkappiyar always refers to pronouns specifically, these and much other references are taken as referring to verbs. Tolkappiyar does not differentiate between the imperative and the indicative mood in the second person though he uses the word ā-val with reference to viyāṅ kōl. That is a distinction referred to in the post Tolkāppiyam age. Such second personal verbs whether ending in a vowel or a consonant, before a plosive following them suffers no compulsory change in some cases; in some cases the following plosive is optionally doubled. These rules relate to the initial plosives of the second word which are the main concern of the subsequent chapters. But all the words of the second person could not be brought together under this group only one group out of many is taken up and dealt
within this chapter and in this sutram.

Tolkāppiyar does not define and distinguish the environment where the compulsory rule will occur and where the optional rule will occur. Maccinārkkīnīyar speaks of compulsory doubling after tu and no and this must be a post Tolkāppiyam usage. So must be the optional change of \( \text{ŋ} \) into alveolar plosive. It is for consideration whether the no change rule may be assigned to the second personal verbs of the indicative mood and the optional rule to the imperative mood. The examples of optional rule occur in words of the imperative mood also. In that case there must be a few imperative verbs which have this free variation, probably because the two different forms coming into the standard language from two different dialects. All cases of such \text{uralcci} 'variation' have to be explained in terms of dialectal variations.

\( \text{ŋ} \) does not occur as a final sound in such verbs. The shorter \( \text{ŋ} \) when followed by another word ceases to be a shorter \( \text{ŋ} \) and therefore it cannot occur in the present context. Venkāṭarājalu Reddiar thinks since in the imperative mood the shorter \( \text{ŋ} \) becomes a fully rounded \( \text{ŋ} \) as stated by Iḷampūranar the shorter \( \text{ŋ} \) cannot occur in the imperative mood. But Maccinārkkīnīyar
kiṉiyār himself does not say so under this sutram. There is no verbal root ending in \( \text{ṣ-} \), for the form given in Tolkāppiyam is teṟṟu. \( \text{ṭ-} \) and \( \text{ṭ-} \) according to Venkatarājalu Reddiar occur only in verbal nouns. But that is because these endings are shown as examples of verbal nouns. This is the only place where their occurrence in the imperative mood can be referred to. Therefore the commentators are right in interpreting that these endings come with short \( \text{ṣ-} \) and not in their natural form. And in the altered form they may follow the rules stated above.

V.

Tolkāppiyar takes up the bigger group of the superior class of nouns which suffer no change, whatever their endings whatever be the sound, following them and whatever be their relationship viz., case relationship or non-case relationship. One may raise the question why Tolkāppiyar repeats the endings and the initial sounds contemplated in ff. 144. Naccinārkkkiṉiyar explains the Tolkāppiyar's scheme according to which whenever not specifically mentioned otherwise, the general reference to words will mean only the words of the inferior class. Hence the sutram does not repeat to any extent. The various instances of the loss of final sounds,
the compulsory or optional duplication of the following plosives when Sanskrit words precede belong to the post Tolkāppiyam’s age. According to collatikāram, superior class includes the first person. But the verbs are not contemplated here, possibly because Tolkāppiyar thought that they may not occur as the first word in a sandhi except in poetical inversions. To include a verb under the specific term noun seems to be an abuse of language. Therefore it is better to take any such example under specific sutras or under general exception.

Of these words, those ending in \( \sqrt{a} \) do not follow the rule of no change, i.e. the plosives following them double. Since no restriction is placed, one must take both the relationships of case and non case. The commentators give only words beginning with the plosives as the second word. The words given by them as the first words are ēṭṭi, kāviti and nāmpi which are titles conferred to persons of distinction. Iḷampūṟṟar does not give examples for non-case relationship but Naccinārkkiniyar gives them.

Both the commentators refer to the \( \sqrt{a} \) ending also, but that must be a post-Tolkāppiyam usage unless otherwise established. Naccinārkkiniyar gives naikaiccaṇi. Ėṭṭi is probably nāṇi. Iḷampūṟṟar gives
tipai-p-pu and tipai-p-puravu. Probably tipai is a mistake for tipai and tipai must refer not to the conduct but to the people following the conduct such as undertaking to lift cattle, invade, besiege, accept challenge and win. The tipai-p-pu will be then the symbolic flower worn by the people according to the kind of operation they indulge in. tipai-p-puravu is the patronage of such people. It is curious that Dr. P.-S. Upamaniya Sastri should refer to the wrong reading tipai as though it were right and should state that it belongs to the superior class of nouns without understanding its meaning. The wording of the sutram siripitan utitā ‘it has also places of change’ is explained by Venkaṭarājalu Reddiar as not being universal. He refers to ff. 232, 261 and 300 where also exceptions are referred to. That being so, he points out that these rules cannot be extended to ķ ai ķ ending.

As already stated, the class of nouns which are common to inferior and superior classes are always specially mentioned by Tolkāppiyar. Therefore there is a specific sutram about this class of common nouns of whatever ending they may be, and followed by whatever initial consonants, and standing in whatever relationship.
It is said that the ending of such first words do not undergo any change. It is said that this implies there are words of this class which undergo change and which are described under each one of their respective endings in the next chapters. Whilst Ilampurana gives three examples, Naccinärkkiniyar gives for all the initial consonants of the second word, both for non case relationship and case relationship. In this way, with reference to superior class of nouns and the nouns common to both class (virāvuttipai) each of which has to be described under forty eight sutras as already explained, they have been grouped together in two sutras; one sutram for superior class of nouns and other sutram for akripai viravuppuyar.

VI.

One would have expected that the rules about the $\overset{\wedge}{i}\overset{\wedge}{j}$ ending would continue to be stated for non case relationship also. But there are two sutras which deal with the so called third case relationship and second case relationship in between the sutras relating to the rules of $\overset{\wedge}{i}\overset{\wedge}{j}$ and $\overset{\wedge}{ai}\overset{\wedge}{j}$ ending for non case relationship. The discussion of these two case relations is justified because the first sutram referring to what may be now called passive
construction, deals with all the possible endings of the first word, when followed by initial plosives which are said to be doubled, in the subsequent chapters. The question of the doubling of the plosives after a consonant occurs only with reference to the semi vowels, \( \underline{\text{y}} \) or \( \underline{\text{J}} \).

\( \underline{\text{J}} \) is given by the commentators. But one, can give

\[ \text{pulkkötpattatu pul (a bird was caught).} \]

The phrase used in this sutra is

\text{taminakiyatolip col.} \text{ tolip col} is the verb and \text{taminakiya}

means that the verb or the action there, should have been caused by them, namely by any being. The plural is used so as to include all agents. The word \text{tamin} shows the agent as distinguished from the subject suffering the action. It is in the third case relationship. The form \text{tamin} with in shows that originally the instrumental called the third case and the ablative or the fifth case were the same. But here then the subject of the final predicate will be in the nominative case. The agent in the example given is also without a case sign the case sign being implied therein. One also gets a phrase or a compound where the last word is any finite verb of the root \text{patu} though in the example the past tense and masculine gender forms are alone given. The final verb need
not be restricted to that gender and that tense. No such restriction is implied by the commentators; nor the verb need be a finite verb. In the compound form the patu is preceded by a verbal noun kōl 'being captured' or 'being killed.' This is a compound of a noun and a verb. This compound is preceded by the agent which can be compounded with kōl. In that case of any verbal noun if it is a phrase the last word will be kolla an infinitive form instead of the verbal noun form kōl etc. In that case the subject of the verb in the infinitive will be the agent whilst the subject of the second verb will be any one suffering the result of the first verb. Perhaps in the first case of the compounding there occurs the usual doubling and in the second case the rule of no change operates.

The question is not about the compound kōtpatān if that is looked upon as one word. But the question is whether the phrase kolla pattān can be taken as one word. It is looked upon as one word in modern times. Was it so looked upon in the age of Tolkāppiyam. Venkaṭarājalu keddıar suggest that it was; but that is not so clear. In sandhi it has been shown that a compound or a phrase is treated as one word; in any case, the whole thing whether
a phrase or compound, is taken as one unit.

The first word in sandhi must be the word denoting the agent because the second word or unit is said to be the verb denoting the action effected by the former. For emphasising the rule of no change, it is said that the phrase meyapityaka has been used in the sutram: the first word remains as it is in its own nature, as against uralko 'optional alteration' of doubling. It is said that there are cases where any one of the two rules apply in the respective places. This limitation should be taken care of when the case relationship is discussed. This is the meaning of last line of the sutram according to Ilampuramar.

But Naccinärkkiniyar in his usual way makes all sorts of distortions. The essence of the interpretation is not different. He states that the meaning is as follows:— "That since these rules of no change or optional alteration operate, we must not bring in, the rule of compulsory doubling which is asserted generally in the subsequent chapters, with reference to the words having case relationship.

The following texts with the numbers showing the order in which Naccinärkkiniyar takes them will
show the absurdity,

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
3 & 5 & 6 & 8 \\
\text{pulli yirutiyam uyiriru kilaviyan-} & \\
17 & 15 \\
\text{valleluttu mikuti colliya muraiyal} & \\
1 & 2 & 4,7 & 9 \\
\text{taminäkiya tolircol munvarin} & \\
10 & 11 \\
\text{meymai yïkalum urala-t-tönralum} & \\
12 & 13 \\
\text{ammural iranïtum uriyavai ulavê} & \\
14 & 16 \\
\text{verrumai marunkir pórral ventum} & \\
\end{array}
\]

Again the final word is usually a predicate in a sentence. Even, when the poetic inversion occurs, the peyar eccam 'the relative participle' never occurs after its peyar 'noun'. It as a rule always precedes it. But he will make the final word venštum not as the usual predicate but as an attribute or transfer its to go before the noun valleluttu in the second line.

It was suggested that no change rule may come in a phrase where there is a pause between the agent word, and that the optional rule may come in, with reference to compounds. But in both the cases, the agent will have no case sign and therefore will be treated as forming, with the
subsequent word, a compound implying the third case relationship. The commentators, however, suggest that pāy 'dog' and pull 'tiger' follow the rule of optional change. But this does not sufficiently define the environments or explain the complimentary distribution of these two words. The examples pāmpu kōtpattān and pāppukōtpattān given by the commentators seem to justify the suggestion thrown out in the two rules. This sutram also states in one place what under the scheme of subsequent chapters would require forty eight sutramas.

VII.

The next sutram deals with the exceptional changes which occur in the juxtaposition of two words where the first word stands in the relation of the object i.e. in the second case relationship. These changes are (1) coming in of the plosive instead of the nasal which should occur according to rule; (2) similarly coming in of the nasal instead of the plosive (3) occurrence of doubling in the place of no change (4) the loss of a vowel where it ought to come in (5) the loss of an augment where it ought to come in (6) the occurrence of doubling in the place of augment (7) the case of superior class and common class of nouns, the
case sign $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ai}}$ itself coming in, always without suffering any ellipsis (8) the change of the coming word (9) the occurrence of no change where the change should occur. The list is not exhaustive and the sutram states that further changes like enumerated will also occur.

On the basis of the examples of the Sangam age such as māḷavar oṭṭiya, the commentators try to get an implied rule for the omission of the case sign after māḷavar, the second case sign which is here said to occur always with superior and common class of nouns. These uses should be taken as post-Tolkāppiyam. So should be the cases where the plosive doubles to imply an ellipsis of the case sign $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ai}}$. Because the sutram follows the previous one where the second word is said to be a verb, the commentator Nāccinārkkiniyar is certain that this sutram also applies only when the second word is a verb. Ilampūrar is not so sure; therefore he says "probably this rule applies only when the second case is a verb." Dr. P. S. Cupiramaṇiya Sastrī will bring the phrase tolīr col munvarin from the previous sutram into this sutram.

The commentators try to read an implication that this sutram itself provides for the changes occurring in relation to the seventh case. But all such cases should be dealt with under
general exception rather than as complications.

The sutram continues according to Ilampūraṇar in the following way. 81 "The first word of a combination with the significance of the case sign अ i अ, whilst moving in its natural way, that is, in the way according to the explicit rules for such combination, depending on the meaning, so that the said first word may have the full force of its meaning (for function), will undergo the changes herein defined, so as to delimit such general rules." This is the meaning of the last three lines. This interpretation seems to suggest the reading kilanta instead of kilantu. If Naccinārkkiniyar's commentary is referred to, he almost copies Ilampūraṇar and there the phrase is found as ēṭuttu  ēṭappatā as found in the edition of Ilampūraṇar’s commentary. This will be the meaning of the word kilantu.

On this basis one has to correct the wordings in Ilampūraṇar. ēṭuttu  ēṭappatā must be ēṭuttu  ēṭappatū. Naccinārkkiniyar interprets the word tanniyalmarūkin in the following way. "Whilst the changes hare mentioned occur in relation to the first word" as against Ilampūraṇar who takes it to mean the following "whilst the first word operates in its natural way."

There are cases as pointed out by Venkaṭarājulu
Reddiar in Tolkāppiyam itself, where the second case sign is not explicitly found even with reference to superior class nouns as e.g. āthu ari col1; tappum avanum avalum cutti and pāllērk kuritē murai nilai-p-pøyārē.²⁶ it differentiates these cases where the context and the general pattern of the construction of the phrases of the doubling of the plosive may make clear the sense; whereas malavar ottiya is not such a case. In all these cases it is better to take the alternate suggestion of Čēnarvaraiyar that these are cases of metrical exigency.²⁷

VIII.

The next sutram deals with non-case relationship.²⁸ This is the special concern of the next two chapters. The previous sutram was concerned with the endings of ā i  and ā ai  and now he takes up here the two endings with reference to non-case relationship, because they can be grouped together as following the same rule. These endings have three different rules viz. (i) the rule of no change (ii) the rule of compulsory doubling of the following plosives and (iii) the rule of their optional geminations. The operations of these rules are not defined. The reading of an implication
of a rule of about verb, itaicool and uricool are attempted to be read into the sutram but as already stated they should be brought under the miscellaneous exception mentioned at the end. 89 Ilampuranar has taken into consideration only the subject occurring with predicate (for the no change rule and the optional rule). This is because as already in ff. 113 he has stated that no case relationship (in a majority of cases) refers to instances of sandhi where the first word is standing as a subject. 90 In the example given it will be seen that the optional rule occurs when one had two short open syllables as already mentioned. Elsewhere the no change rule will occur; but this latter rule seems to be negatived by the example karai given by Ilampuranar for the no change rule. Naccinarkkiniyar gives as marai instead of karai and in view this Ilampuranar's commentary also must be taken to have given marai; if this were done the rule will not be negatived. For compulsory doubling of the coming plosive he gives as examples compounds called panputtokai; here also the second example is found as pulikkorrpan which will be a case of similar compound 'korpan being like tiger'. Probably Ilampuranar gives only pulaiikkkorrpan which will be panputtokai (the mean korrpa). The uvamatttokai is not taken as a word, occurring
with any key word and therefore not forming one unit. It is
only indirectly so taken. Therefore he does not give examples
of simile compounds. In view of this, pulikkorran should be
only pulaikkorran.

He distinguishes these two sets of compounds
(vinaittokai and panputtokai) on the basis of ff. 482 which
refers to vinaittokai and panputtokai as being indivisible.
Naccimārkkāniyar does not make any such distinction because
ff. 482 has nothing to do with the characteristic feature of
a compound perse. Therefore he shows all these examples
here itself. The other exceptions given by Ilampūranar
should come under the general exceptions viz. ff. 406, rather
than here because they contemplate cases other than those
contemplated here.

Tolkāppiyar refers to some words of \( \text{\textit{i}} \) and \( \text{\textit{ai}} \) endings which have locative significance though
they are not words implying or manifesting the locative case
sign. They are referred to by their initial and by their
final endings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. demonstrative</td>
<td>( \text{\textit{i}} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. interrogative</td>
<td>( \text{\textit{i}} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. lengthened demonstrative \[ ai \]
4. interrogative \[ ai \]

It is said that when any one of them occur as the first word in combination of words there are places where there is compulsory or optional doubling of the plosive following them. These are cases of non case relationship. \textit{atōli, itōli, utōli} and \textit{etōli} are examples for the first two groups, where the plosives compulsorily doubles. \textit{atōli} is explained by Naccinārkkiniyar as meaning "that place."\textsuperscript{92} for the optional rule they give for the first word \textit{avvali} etc. As for the \[ ai \] ending, \textit{āntal} etc. gets the plosive doubled. For the next two groups there are not clear examples. Ilampūraṇar gives \textit{ānkaval} etc. But he himself states that they are not uniform but varying.\textsuperscript{93} Therefore he leaves it to the reader to find the proper examples when occurring in the course of his readings. Naccinārkkiniyar naturally takes exception to these examples because as stated by Ilampūraṇar they follow varying rules. He therefore suggests that words \textit{āvali} etc. might have occurred in ancient times to illustrate the optional rule.\textsuperscript{94} Here is therefore a case where certain usages contemplated by Tolkāppiyam had ceased to be current
even by the time of Sangam literature from which the commentators would have easily quoted if there were any.

As pointed out in the previous sutram, rules about other words (for instance here the word pantai gets the plosive doubled) of the same ending are tried to be read by implication. They are clearly post Tolkāppiyam usages. Venkatarajulu Reddiar feels that atoli etc. are really ending in a consonant ꝍ Ꞇ ꞇ with an augment ꝍ Ꞇ ꞇ ꝍ Ꞇ. Ilampūranar and Naccinärkkiniyar show these words are ending in ꝍ Ꞇ ꞇ. Therefore one gets two alternate forms, one with ꝍ Ꞇ ꞇ ending and the other without ꝍ Ꞇ ꞇ. Naccinärkkiniyar, as pointed out by Venkatarajulu Reddiar refers to itā as a dialect word. In modern usage one gets the form atē etc. when the final ꝍ Ꞇ ꞇ and ꝍ Ꞇ ꞇ have disappeared. itā is therefore a dialectic variation of itō. It is difficult to say which is the original, the ꝍ Ꞇ ꞇ ending or the ꝍ Ꞇ ꞇ ending. Ordinarily it is easy to understand the final loss. But it may come in by way of analogy to avvali etc.

The phrase cuttu-c-cinai occurs in this sutram. cinai means an organ or a part. Therefore the commentators explain the phrase as referring to the letter or sound which
is a part and which is the demonstrative base. They do not explain of which whole, this demonstrative is a part. Venika-ṭarājulu Reddiar explains that Tolkāppiyar looks upon the long vowel as a whole and the short vowel as its part and he refers to ff. 427; where the same phrase is used. Tolkāppiyar seems to think that the demonstrative base is the short letter, its longer allomorph is explained as the lengthening of this short sound. If the short vowel is only a part or particle of the long vowel it is not clear why Tolkāppiyar should speak of the lengthening. As already pointed out, these demonstrative and interrogative bases do not by themselves constitute words. They always appear as parts of words, that is, they always appear as bound forms either as an external part in cases like a-k-kutirai etc. or as an internal part in words like avan etc.

It is this characteristic feature of these bases appearing in bound forms as parts of words, that is, probably referred by the term cutṭu-c-cinai. Tolkāppiyar in other places, for instance with reference to pronoun, takes the word with longer syllable as the original form, deriving the words with shorter syllable therefrom. On this basis, here also the longer form may be said to be the basic form and the shorter form may be derived from it.
According to Dr. M.B. Ameneau the longer forms suffer diminution because of the addition of suffixes. But in Tamil there are cases where the longer form is found even when suffixes are added āyitīsai and āṅku etc. Even in other places we get both the longer and shorter form occurring in the same environment e.g. pōltu and polulu.

IX.

Next are discussed certain rules which do not depend on any meaningful relation but seem to be the characteristic feature of syllabic structure - the syllabic structure that results when two words are combined. The sutram differentiates from long syllabic words the short syllabic words, as already interpreted by Tolkāppiyar himself. The long syllabic words include not only long monosyllable but also words of more than one syllable which naturally will have more than two units of length or māttirai or quantities in all. It is unfortunate that Naccinārkkinniyar instead of explaining it in this way should have been trying to read an implication here. It is said in this sutram that "the consonant following the long mono syllabic word will disappear the consonant following the short syllabic word will double, and
this is said to be a rule which is so clearly patent according to the ancients." This doubling occurs mostly when the second word begins in a vowel. It is made clear by the next sutram.

This way of interpretation is not followed by the commentators, but they rely upon the disorder found in enumerating the case signs. Because firstly the sixth case; and then the fourth case are read into this sutram. It has been pointed out that Naccinarkkiniyar is copying Ilampūraṇar. The present commentary of Ilampūraṇar might have been as in Naccinarkkiniyar mēlaiccūttirattu nānkan urupu pirkūriyatapan. The commentators feel that the sutram always applied to natural forms and not to the altered forms. Therefore they feel the sutram cannot apply to nam, tam etc. whose natural forms are nām, tām etc. But this restriction is unnecessary.

The sutram does not define the environment in which the consonant is lost after a long syllable. Ilampūraṇar states that it happens only when the following CLUD or CLUD is changed according to the rules in ff. and 150. Naccinarkkiniyar states that this disappearance of the consonants relate to CLUD, CLUD, CLUD and
This sutram has to be read in relation to other sutrams. The doubling of the consonants relate to those other than S n J, S n J and S l J. But when these double it is not possible generally to have a consonant beginning the next word. Therefore as Dr. P.S. Cupiramaniya Sastri points out it is clear this doubling can apply only to cases where vowels follow. This makes it unnecessary to refer to the next sutram. 106

ff. 161 and 162 refer to the exceptions to the rule according to which words which get their initial syllable shortened, when these are followed by the fourth or the sixth case sign. nam + ku > nam + a + k + ku > namakkku instead of namakkku according to the above sutram. namatu according to the ff. 160: so should become namatu but it remains as namatu. So also num also does not get its final nasal doubled. 107

This internal sandhi reveals an earlier state of syllabic structure where there was no such doubling. That the rule applies to other case signs perhaps shows that these case signs as such were later developments though certainly before the age of Tolkāppiyar.
Next are given the exception to the rules which deal with certain endings and which get an augment $\text{u} \text{v}$ at their end. \footnote{108} ff. 163 states that the augment does not come in when the following word begins in $\text{y} \text{v}$ or any vowel. Veṅkaṭarājulu beddīar objects to the examples of \text{uriṇa}pantā and \text{uriṇ} atā given by Naccinarkkiniyar and Ilampūrana. \footnote{109} In \text{uriṇ} + panta and \text{uriṇ} + ata the word \text{uriṇ} is in the imperative mood. but $\text{n} \text{y} \text{e}$ and $\text{y} \text{v}$ states beddīar do not occur as the endings of verb in the imperative mood. \footnote{110}

The remaining sutras deal with words denoting numbers weights and measurements, since all these follow the same pattern.

The words denoting the weights and measurements begin only in either one or other of the nine sounds $\text{r} \text{k} \text{v}$, $\text{r} \text{c} \text{v}$, $\text{r} \text{t} \text{v}$, $\text{r} \text{p} \text{v}$, $\text{r} \text{n} \text{v}$, $\text{r} \text{m} \text{v}$, $\text{r} \text{v} \text{v}$, $\text{i}$ and $\text{r} \text{u} \text{v}$.

It is significant $\text{r} \text{ā} \text{v}$ is not mentioned. \text{ālākku 'one eight of a measure'} is now in current usage but
in the inscriptions one has the form .GetString(112)  which might have been the form even in the age of Tolkāppiyam. Naccinārkki-ṇiyar gives other dialectical words, all of which may be taken as belonging to post-Tolkāppiyam usage. ff. 164 prescribes the augment between these words when combining together. This does not apply to the word GetString(113)  The word GetString(114)  follows the natural rule of doubling of the following the plosive. Sutram ff. 167 to ff. 69 prescribe the augment. As these belong to morphology they are not here discussed.

XII.

ff. 171 is the general exception to this chapter. It has been stated that "particular endings behave in sandhi in specific ways according to the nature here discussed. These words behave in various ways. All these should be compared with traditional and current usages". The exceptions illustrated in the commentaries may be post Tolkāppiyam usages. GetString(115)  are really marūn or the so-called corruptions, or telescoped forms.

There are other exceptions given by Ilampūranar. The ff. 144 refers to the no-change of the
second word. Ḫaṁpūraṇar mentions here the verb or noun occurring as the first word also undergoing no change in that environment. ff. 147 speaks of no change of the ending of the word \( \text{ශන} \) and \( \text{ශන} \). Ḫaṁpūraṇar points out that there are cases of change of some plosives. ff. 151 gives the rules about the endings in the imperative mood following the three various rules. Ḫaṁpūraṇar points out the no change of the coming plosives occurs in some cases and compulsory doubling of the coming consonants in others and the optional change of the ending of the first word in still others. And just like these he has mentioned many more exceptional cases. Naccinārkkiniyar has taken some of them and explained under the respective sutram instead of here.

III.

It is curious that after the completion of the chapter closing with the general exception, there should occur another sutram trying to explain how the word \( \text{yāvār} \) loses the medial syllabic letter \( \text{va} \) and how the word \( \text{yātu} \) gets the syllabic letter \( \text{va} \) in the middle. 116 This is considered to be a marūv change. It is impossible to have a sutram after the statement of the general exception to this chapter. Therefore one has to assume either that the
sutra was wrongly copied here from somewhere else or that is a later interpolation, first written perhaps as a marginal note and then wrongly copied by the later writers as part of the work. This yar which belongs to the epicene is different from interrogative yar which is common to singular and plural of superior class of nouns. This is according to Netcinarkbinniyar. This change in yavar is because of the analogy of interrogative form yar, yatu gets the va on the analogy of yavan, yaval etc. Venkataramulu Reddiar states that the yavar mentioned here is a relative pronoun but this could not have been the case in Tolkappiyar’s age. This kind of relative construction is of later usage due to the Sanskrit influence of yat and tat. Venkataramulu Reddiar also raises the question whether in both the cases the original form should not be taken as possessing the syllabic letter a va which in both the words uniformly disappeared. Again it is not clear whether Tolkappiyar uses the maruu form yar. He does certainly use the interrogative yar and epicene plural yavar. It has already been pointed out ff.482 states that maruu forms could not be explained in sandhi. For all these reasons it is safer to conclude that this sutra I did not form part of Tolkappiyam; but one must admit they
had become part of it, at the latest during the age of İləmpürcər.
TOKAI MARAPU.
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