VII. PUNARIYAL.

I.

The first sutram is according to Ilampurapar virintatu tokuttal that is summarising what has been elaborated. In the previous chapter the number of initial sounds and the number of final sounds have been mentioned. If these numbers are added up, one will get a large number; but in this sutram according to Ilampurapar from another point of view, the number is summarised. This is not correct, because by stating that certain number of sounds occur initially and that certain number of sounds, occur finally, one cannot add up the numbers, especially when these sounds overlap. Therefore there is no elaboration to be summarised. At the most what one can say is that the sutram clears the doubt whether such an assumption of addition may be made. Therefore Nacci-parkinnyar states that it is aiyam akarrutal, i.e. clearing the doubt. A few further preliminaries have to be explained. Here, he speaks of formation of words as being either natural or artificial. These refer respectively to the words continuing as they are without change and to words which change. maram 'tree' without any change represents the word having a natural ending in $\overline{\text{m}}$. In sandhi, this word may lose
this \( \text{a} \) ending and stand as \( \text{mara} \); the ending \( \text{a} \) which is not its natural ending is only an artificial ending. These natural and artificial endings are according to Paśaṅ-
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\( iya\text{lpu } \text{Iru} \) and \( \text{viti Iru} \), respectively. Elsewhere, the insistence on the correct order in stating the categories has been given as a characteristic feature of the commentators. \( u\text{yir} \) 'vowel' and \( \text{mey} \) 'consonant' should be stated in this order but since this sutram states them as \( \text{mey} \) and \( u\text{yir} \) a reason has to be suggested and that reason is the consonant undergoes the \( \phi \) four varieties of sandhi whilst the vowel does not.

Ilampūraṇār never saw in his age the shorter \( \text{a} \) written with a dot. That is his difficulty in understanding the third sutram of this chapter. The consonant is stated in the second sutram as having dot. The next sutram states that the shorter \( \text{a} \) is also like that.

Since Ilampūraṇār had not seen a dot on the shorter \( \text{a} \), he has to interpret the sutram regarding the consonant also, so as to bring about a characteristic feature which will be common to both the consonant and the shorter \( \text{a} \). Therefore he interprets ff. 104, to mean that when the consonant stands with a dot, it will give room for a vowel and stand as its vehicle. Paśaṅanti also does not specifically refer to the dot with reference to the shorter \( \text{a} \) though.
Mayilainātar states that a few write the dot. Naccinārkkinīyar probably has not also seen the dot on the shorter ṣ u ṣ and therefore denies the existence of the dot in that place.

One wonders whether the phrase pulli perāmaiya 'because the shorter ṣ u ṣ is not dotted' might not have been in Ilampūranar's commentary as well. So one has to conclude that Tolkāppiyar's tradition must have changed by the time of Ilampūranar. Though a few like Pērāciriyar probably knew that the old usage was brought into currency once again by a few writers after Ilampūranar this was not so very widespread as to be known to Naccinārkkinīyar. This is the reason for the peculiar interpretation of the ff. 104 which is said to imply that the consonants will carry on their shoulders the vowels.

Naccinārkkinīyar has his own doubt about this inference or implication because of ff. 15, 17 and also of ff. 138 which seem to state the inferred rule explicitly. They have therefore to be distinguished from this. ff. 138 is with reference to puṇarocci of consonants and vowels. Therefore Naccinārkkinīyar has to say that the second sutram in puṇariyal is intended to clear the doubt whether the initial consonants also have to carry their dot. He points out that
the sutram says that only the final consonants carry the dot and that therefore impliedly the initial consonants, do not.

The fourth sutram is interpreted as an exception by Ilampūranaṟar because it contemplates an uyir-mey ending, whilst the first sutram speaks only of a vowel ending or a consonantal ending and not of any uyir-mey endings. But Naccinārkkkiniyar interprets it as a clarification that an uyir-mey ending is really an uyir vowel ending. This applies also to the uyir-mey in the medial position according to the commentators. When interpreted like this, there is a lacuna about the status of the initial uyir-mey and therefore Ilampūranaṟar and Naccinārkkkiniyar include an implied statement about it viz. that the initial uyir-mey should be treated as an initial consonant. The medial position also has to be referred to here by implication because words like varaku are spoken of as uyirrttañar kuvriyalukaram; that is ñra is looked upon as a vowel ending. And this can be done only when the medial uyir-mey is taken as a vowel ending. Naccinārkkkiniyar has his own doubts about this interpretation because ff. 18 of nūnumarapu seems to convey all these ideas. Therefore he is forced to differentiate ff. 18 and ff. 60 from the fourth sutram. ff. 18 of nūnumarapu refers to the initial letters by themselves individually, and this sutram
to letters occurring in words. ff. 60 is in relation to the occurrence of the initial sound; but this sutram is dealing with the difficulty created in analysing all the endings in all the words, into categories (1) vowel endings and (2) consonantal endings.

All these show that Tolkāppiyar does not care for brevity and often repeats himself for the sake of clarification of ideas to the students.

Both the commentators agree that the first four sutras are molimarapin qilipu 'the remnant relating to the previous chapter called molimarapu'. This is because of the fact that these sutras like molimarapu speak only of single words and not about the coming together of two words which is the theme of the puṇariyal. The sutras come by way of an introduction which is necessary in view of the statements in molimarapu.

II.

The fifth sutram according to Iḻampūraṉar denies that there can be any triple joint, that is any coming together of three words. The first two words are to be taken first and there is a joint; the whole combination is considered as one unit in relation to the third word. Really,
there is no sandhi between the first word and the third word for justifying the term triple joint. The first word and the second word and the second word have a joint; the second word then becomes the first word in relation to third and similarly the third word will be the first word in relation to the fourth and so on. In this linear treatment there can be only the coming together of two words at a time. Naccinārkkiniyar does not see why the denial should be only with reference to three words. There cannot be on this explanation only joint of four or more words also. The term given for the first word here in the joint will be niruttacol and the second word will be called kurittu varu kilavi. When the third word comes in, the second will become niruttacol and the third will become kurittu varu kilavi and so on. The later day usage is to call the niruttacol as nilai moli; the word that stands '(first) and the kurittu varu kilavi as varu moli 'that which comes,'(second).  

kurittu varu kilavi is interpreted by Ilam-pūrṇaṉar as meaning that which comes as connected in meaning (kurittu) with the first word. Naccinārkkiniyar will interpret it to mean as that which comes in a way to complete the sense of the first word. But it is doubtful whether every
two words juxtaposed are always coming in for the completion of the meaning of the preceding word. That is why Naccinārk-kiniyar has to provide for such cases elsewhere and he does it by his strained interpretation of ff. 111.

III.

The conception of meaning and its complete expression have to be brought in, because he raises the philosophical question whether there can be any puṇārccī at all. Naccinārkākiniyar is fully conscious that the language, referred to here, is the spoken language and that therefore there is no meaning in appealing to the writing system. In speech, the sounds occur in succession one after another and in one dimension of mere length in time. There cannot be a multi dimension here. Sounds, here referred to, are not supra segments. If sounds are in linear succession the words by that very fact should be also in linear succession. One sound dies and there after another sound is articulated. In that case, the question naturally arises where there can be any juncture at all of two sounds one dead and not existing and the other just then born; there can be only succession and not simultaneity; for, if there is simultaneity only there can be any sandhi where one sound affects the other.
Naccinārkkiṇiyar's answer is that those who articulate the sounds and those who hear the sounds have to receive them in their mind where these sounds exist juxtaposed at one and the same time, as ideas in the mind. Thus arises simultaneity and hence sandhi.

Naccinārkkiṇiyar does not refer to the question of assimilation and dissimilation, that is, to the question of one position of the tongue etc. in the articulation of one sound passing on to the other position of articulation of another sound; nor to the question of the psychological effect of anticipating, the succeeding and preceding articulations. In the absence of this kind of approach, he has naturally to appeal to the purarcci of words in our mind, that is to the coming together of two words with the connected meanings one completing the sense of the other. In this the introduction of meaning is objected to, he may answer that Tolkāppiyar himself is engaged in the consideration of meaning when he speaks of case relationship and non case relationship. But that distinction is not made however by Tolkāppiyar for the purpose of explaining the meaning of the words thrown together, but to show that the meaning also plays an important role in differentiating the behaviour of the sounds in their process of assimilation and dissimilation etc.
Naccinārkkiniyar in his own view of things illustrates his position. \textit{mu}yār kōṭu uṇṭu 'the horn of the hare exists' cannot occur in puṇapaccī because the statement has no meaning in relation to the facts of the world; but the sentence \textit{mu}yār kōṭu illai, 'the horn of the hare does not exist' can occur. The question however is whether the compound \textit{mu}yār kōṭu 'the horn of the hare' can occur.

Naccinārkkiniyar is not discussing this difficulty but he himself agrees in ff. 111 that there are cases of puṇapaccī ilvalippuṇapaccī i.e. 'joint of words which are not joined in meaning.' All these elaborate discussions become, from one point of view meaningless. Any two adjacent words do not form immediate constituents, though because of the physical nature of the sounds, they undergo assimilation etc.

IV.

Though the alternation takes place at the end or beginning of words as already stated there cannot be any juxtaposition except in a sentence. Therefore the syntactical relations are emphasised. Though the words are classified into four categories \textit{puṣyaṇ} (noun), \textit{vipai} 'verb', \textit{ita} (suffix) \textit{uri} 'roots', \textit{ita}iccol and \textit{uriccol} occur only as the suffix and root respectively and therefore there are really two
categories of words i.e. peyar and vīnai. This interpretation is suggested on the basis of Teyvaccilaiyar and modern writers like Prof. T.P. Meenakshisundaram. Tamil has got substantive sentences and verbal sentences. As a result, we have combinations of (1) nouns and nouns; (2) nouns and verbs; (3) verbs and verbs; and (4) verbs and nouns coming juxtaposed in sentences. This gives four varieties based on meaning. Naccinārkkiniyiar states that the verbs are either actual verbs or kurippu vīnai denominalised nouns (in substantive sentences) e.g. avan nallan 'He good man'; 'He' is subject; 'good man' is predicate; the copula never occurs in Tamil; 'good man' is itself the predicate though a noun; since it is a predicate and it is generally assumed that verb alone can be predicate, nallan is called denominalised verb. This will at once become clear when we translate the sentence into English where 'He' will be subject 'is good man' is the predicate. In Logic also 'he' will be subject and 'good man' predicate whilst 'is' is considered merely a copula. The real distinction is between the subject word and the predicate word. As the same word occurs in both places, though in different systems, the distinction is not morphological but syntactical. According to Naccinārkkiniyiar the nouns can be noun words or compounds.
When juxtaposition takes place either there is no change or there is change in the sounds. Absence of change is asserted as a positive condition i.e. as natural. The change is said to be of three kinds. These three are described in the next sutram. First (change) is the case, for instance, of a consonant changing into another consonant. The next is where in between words, a new consonant or vowel comes in, that is, the case of coming in of sound where it is not already in existence. The third is the disappearance of an existing sound. The word here used is mey and it cannot be interpreted as elsewhere as merely consonant. It should be taken as referring to the form or nature of any sound. The question is raised whether all these changes could occur in one and the same juxtaposition of words. Since no such restriction has been placed, the question need not have been raised; but the commentators rely upon the extra word itan occurring in the last sutram, only to arrive at the same conclusion.

V

The next sutram raises another question. Sentences do not consist only of two words taken in their order. Every juncture will be considered as sandhi. But
the idea of two words coming together without any connected meaning is not contemplated. The sentence is divided into subject spot and predicate spot. The question arises what happens for all those words which go with the subject or with the predicate. It is not clear how far the theory of immediate constituents could be read into this question raised. Since it is, however, a question of syntax, it need not be discussed in this thesis on phonology. The sutram answers that a word whether it is a subject or a predicate word, with all its qualifications or attributes, can become only one unit and in that way two units allo i.e. subject and predicate come together in sandhi.

atai is an attribute; a noun preceding another noun by such an occurrence in that order connotes an attribute in a subordinate construction. Therefore, subject or predicate will include ordinarily all the compounds and the phrases which can be looked upon as subject or predicate. Peyareccam and peyar; or vinaiyecam and vinai can be taken as one construction and they behave like one word when coming into juxtaposition with another such construction so as to bring about the sandhi. The compounds ordinarily can occur as attributes. But there are certain compounds which cannot
be called subordinate constructions. There are the unnaittokai (irā-p-pakai = night-day where 'and' is understood. Since this is enumeration no one word is more important than the other to be considered as a subordinate) which denotes a co-ordinate construction, the other is irupeyarotttu (nāga-p-pāmpu the cobra-serpent is like the Queen Elizabeth) which may denote the appositive construction. The commentators state that ajai includes these constructions also.

Irupeyaroṭṭutttotar in modern times denotes only constructions like cāraippāmpu where both the words mean the same thing. The word irupeyaroṭṭutputpanputtokai as used in the commentaries need not refer to such cases alone. If such restriction was meant, the example given by the commentators as pointed out by . Tēvanesyappāvāner 32 and Dr.P.S.Cupirmāṇiya Sastri is not correct. But irupeyarotttu as used by the old commentators is differentiated from panputtokai. Panputtokai cannot be split into two different words of free forms. karuḥkutirai 'black horse' has to be interpreted as kariyatukutirai; Tolkāppiyar is of opinion that one should not split the panputtokai in this way; hence the noun root karu (which occurs only in the bound form) and the noun kutirai are compounded. But irupeyaroṭṭutputpanputtokai is a
compound of two nouns in their free forms, one occurring as an attribute of the other.

That both together may mean only one thing is however not necessary in such cases. **pattāyiram** or **patināyiram** 'ten thousand' consist of two nouns not of a noun root and a noun. In this sense, this is an instance of **irupeyarōttuppanputtokai**. **āyirattōnru** is an instance of **ummaittokai** which means thousand and one. The other instances of subordinate constructions do not create any difficulty, because everything there is subordinated to the head. It is only this co-ordinate and appositive constructions that raise any difficulty. Therefore the commentators say that what comes before as a qualification may also be of these types.

VI.

There is yet another difficulty. Tolkāppiyar is of opinion that there are cases where two words become so transformed beyond recognition that they cannot be ordinarily explained in terms of the sandhi changes. Such transformations are called maruu. But after the transformation of this type (marūu) had occurred the whole group can be taken as one unit and juxtaposed with other words or units. And such
juxtaposition is capable of being explained in terms of the ordinary rules of sandhi. This is what is referred in the next sutram.

This gives us an important principle about the sandhi rules explained by Tolkāppiyam. In ff. 462 marūu is referred to; and it refers also to those terms which can be brought under the head marūu, because they are not clearly recognised as two different words, as undergoing any or all the three kinds of changes already mentioned. Therefore it is clear that Tolkāppiyar cannot be offering any explanation of these marūus in terms of puṇarcci. But unfortunately there are a number of sutras which seem to refer to such explanations in relation to marūu terms. The very sutram under discussion seems to justify the conclusion that Tolkāppiyar is not taking into consideration the marūu terms so as to split them into two words though he has referred to take marūu words as a unit for further combination. In view of this, it is difficult to understand a few sutras which deal with the explanation of marūu terms in terms of puṇarcci; such as the sutras explaining the form tonnūru, tellāyiram etc. Though the commentators refer to other term like munρil as marūu, Tolkāppiyar probably does not look upon them
as marūu because he is explaining these in terms of sandhi in pullimayāñkīyal.

Naccinārkkāñkiyār however, interprets this sutram ff. 111 so as to find a place for clearing his own doubt. The insistence of meaning in relation to juxtaposed words raises the difficulty about the juxtaposed words which are themselves immediate constituents, though the constitutes in which they occur are themselves the immediate constituents of larger constructions. In poetry sometimes words are torn away from their natural place and found used in a distant place because of poetic or rhetorical inversion. Naccinārkkāñkiyār even when it is not necessary indulges in creating such unnatural prose order. This has been seen with reference to the sutras themselves. Naturally the question arises in his mind whether there is any rule for such juxtaposed words undergoing sandhi changes. maruvintokuti mayāñkīyam moli is the term used for referring to those combinations of words which have been so telescoped so as to be beyond recognition as two different words. Instead of giving this ordinary meaning he splits that into two different phrases as marumoliyam and (2) intokuti mayāñkīyal moliyam. marumoli according to him will be the telescoped words that we are
here discussing. intokuti mayaṅkiyilmōli are words according to him which come juxtaposed as thrown into confusion without any meaningful connection between them, just for the purpose of creating a sweet sounding expression. The second kind of combination is expected to give the necessary prescription for such disposition of words which he is indulging in. Both these sets according to his interpretation of the uttram, are fit for sandhi changes in their proper places. He illustrates his position with suitable examples.

VII.

Tolkāppiyar has simply stated about the nouns and the verbs coming together in various permutations. But the meaningful relationship of these words has not been as yet, explained in detail. Tolkāppiyar divides this relationship into two categories. One is a relationship by implicit or explicit presence of the case signs. This may be called case relationship for convenience. The other is the relationship other than this. This can be termed non-case relationship. Because there is no specific case sign for the nominative and vocative case, these two are not considered as creating case relationship. The six case signs are enumerated and the commentators proceed to explain the
various instances of non case relationship. As these belong to the study of morphology and syntax, we need not consider them in this study of phonology.

It must be stated that Ṛṟṟumar, 'the case relationship' is mentioned in many places. All those cases must be discussed under morphology, as changes describing the allomorphs and the rules of morphophonemic alternations. There are free forms and bound forms even in non case relationship; the same thing appears when the compounds are explained as coming together of two words. Wherever, therefore, the case relationship is mentioned and no question of coming in the case sign is meant, they are all cases which are to be discussed under morphology. Even augments are mentioned; some of these are considered by Dr. Caldwell and others as old case signs. These were not recognised even by the people of Tolkāppiyar's age as case signs; they appeared only in compounds and therefore the first part of the word in the changed form will be only an allomorph, found in the bound form and not in the free form.

All those instances which undergo no change will be free forms and all those which undergo changes of whatever nature will be bound forms. Therefore the whole of
pupariyal really belongs to morphology except for the glides and the changes of sounds which occur as it were because of their repulsion to sounds following them. The last case is a natural case of automatic alternation. The coming of the glide has not become an established usage in the age of Tolkäppiyar as a necessary feature required by the necessary pattern of the language.

One has allomorphs in the internal sandhi and external sandhi. The internal sandhi is not attempted in Tolkäppiyam and the trend of ff. 482 seems to suggest as mentioned by commentators, Tolkäppiyar is against the explanation of internal sandhi except in the case of augments which are taken as independent itaiccolas. The other changes which seem to be depend on the nature of the coming sounds seem to be cases of phonologically conditioned alternations. The other changes depending on case relationship or non case relationship may be taken as morphologically conditioned alternations. There are instances of words specifically taken and changes prescribed in particular environments of these definite words. In some cases a sporadic variation is mentioned and some times we get optional rules. These, when they cannot be brought under any rule has to be explained in terms of dialectal variations which have entered into the
standard language, in a later age.

VIII.

After mentioning these two kinds of relationship, Tolkāppiyar states that the change called coming in of a sound between two words may be either a coming of a sound or an augment. This augment may be taken now as an empty morph. Therefore their occurrence though explained in terms of sandhi rules really belong to the morphology; and therefore this thesis does not take them into consideration for a detailed discussion. In pūnariyāl also the empty morphs are mentioned and the allomorphs are also referred to in terms of alternations of the standard form taken as a morpheme. The empty morphs which occur when sounds as sounds are enumerated are also referred to as augments viz kāra, kāra and kān. For example for denoting [a] we have the words akāram, akāram and akānān where these augments came after [a]. These stand on a different footing. There are certain internal sandhi rules mentioned when the case signs occur after nouns. It will be seen that it may be taken as a general rule, that whenever the plosive begins a word or a morpheme, following a vowel, the coming plosive doubles. The whole of uyirnavaṅkiyāl gives only the exceptions to this general rule. Here in
the ff. 114 this general rule is said to apply to what we may refer to as internal sandhi.

In passing, one convention explicitly noted by Maccinarkkiniyar should be noted. The rules of sandhi when not made specific as to apply to other kinds, apply only to inferior class of nouns. The rules about the superior class of nouns (uyartipai-p-peyar) or about the nouns which are common to both the classes called viravuppeyar, according to Maccinarkkiniyar are always specifically stated as applying to them. On this basis whenever there is no such specific reference for forms found in usage, Maccinarkkiniyar will be searching for an extra word in the sutram on the basis of whose occurrence alone, he could explain such usages. It may be an extra word or a break of an ordinary order of words in a sutram. He makes the internal sandhi rules stated above applicable to common class of nouns because Tolkappiyar in ff. 114 speaks of the coming in of a sound without mentioning the change of one sound to another. This reading of an implied meaning on the basis of an extra word occurring in a sutram however need not be accepted as valid.

We have already explained the term 'uyartipai' and 'akripai' and these are enumerated here, for stating in
the next sutram that the empty morphs occur after them. The rest of the sutras in this chapter enumerates the empty morphs, their allomorphs, their occurrence and non-occurrence. There is another rule of internal sandhi. This, is after certain empty morphs viz. [varru] and [attu] which look like shorter l u j, the plosive of the coming word doubles. 46

IX.

From ff. 138 onwards we have got important sandhi rules which have nothing to do with empty morphs. The first rule here refers to the word ending in a consonant when it is followed by a word beginning in a vowel. 47 The consonant and the vowel combine into uyirmey 'syllabic letter'. This is more or less a rule about the written system. pulliyru is taken here as meaning only the consonant ending, by both Ilampuranar and Naccinarkkiniyar.

But Venkatarajalu Reddiar points out that shorter l u j is also a pulliyru because it is also a dotted letter, and in that case the sutram provides not only for consonantal endings but for words ending in the shorter l u j. The shorter l u j also behaves like consonants, giving room for the following vowel. Interpreting that way, there
is an explicit rule for the shorter $\text{\char13} u \text{\char12}$, when followed by vowels.

Failing to understand pulli in this sense because in their age the shorter $\text{\char13} u \text{\char12}$ had not dot, Ilampuranar and Naccinarkkiniyar are trying to find a rule somewhere in Tolkappiyam for the ending in shorter $\text{\char13} u \text{\char12}$. We found this in their interpretations of ff. 104 and 105. So as to provide a rule, Ilampuranar suggests that there must be an um 'and' in ff. 138 which um according to him implies the shorter $\text{\char13} u \text{\char12}$ also is behaving like consonants. Naccinarkkiniyar instead of leaving it to the implication, brings the um from the second line of that sutram itself to the first line and gives the same explanation. In this interpretation of ff. 105 he has stated in the introduction that Tolkappiyar is applying the rule intended for consonants in ff. 138 to the shorter $\text{\char13} u \text{\char12}$ also. The linkage implied by arru 'similar' is according to him to connect ff. 105 and ff. 138 which are thirty three sutrams away from each other, a fact which is enough to condemn his interpretation.

The next sutram gives the corresponding rule that when in a syllabic letter if the vowel ending is removed, the consonant will assume its old nature of remaining with a
dot. This again refers to the writing system only. Naccinärkkäniyar raises the question whilst Tolkäppiyar refers to the form of the consonants here, why he is not referring to the form of the vowels. Since Tolkäppiyar nowhere gives the form of the vowels, Naccinärkkäniyar is of opinion that the question does not arise; but he continues to give another explanation also; since the dot differentiates the long and short \( \underline{\text{I}} \) \( \underline{o} \) \( \underline{\text{I}} \) and \( \underline{\text{I}} \) \( \underline{o} \) \( \underline{\text{I}} \), they may be taken to have the ancient forms. This is one way of explaining the problem. Since in sandhi, however, Tolkäppiyar divides the syllabic letter to vowel ending and consonantal ending, the sutram according to Naccinärkkäniyar is necessary. Otherwise, there will be he states, the defect of not having explained a necessary thing.

1

The next sutram is about glides. This sutram has already been explained in the discussion of alapetlai. pp. 44. 71

The next sutras deal with what in modern linguistics may be called juncture as for instance in the English words in nitrate and night rate. The same sound may have to be taken in two different ways. This has already been explained. This is with reference to the spoken language.
But when it is written there is no system of marking the juncture; the written system does not contain any provision for marking the juncture leading naturally to a homophonous compounds. They can be resolved only by attending to the context. e.g. camponpatintoti may be comproppatintoti or camponpatintoti. Though the word eluttu is used in both the sutras yet the word ica makes it clear that in ff. 14 the reference is to speech and in ff. 142 the reference is to writing.
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