APPENDIX I

Classification and Contents of Chapters in Tolkāppiyam

Tolkāppiyam is divided into three major parts, each of which is, in turn, into nine chapters. The three major parts are Eluttatikāram, Čellatikāram and Porułatikāram.

Eluttatikāram (463)

1. Nūnārapu (23). This chapter deals with the enumeration and classification of significant speech sounds (phonemes), the symbols for certain phonemes and a few consonantal clusters. The demonstrative and interrogative clitics are also enumerated here.

2. Molīmarpu (49). It is about a few allophones, the distribution of phonemes, the duration (quantity) of a few speech sounds and the phonemic free variation.

3. Pīrappiyal (82) This chapter contains information on the production of significant speech sounds and of a few allophones of some phonemes in Tamil language.

4. Pūnariyal (40) The interest of this chapter is the general principles and the classification of sandhi. The case markers, the 'cāriyeis' and their modification in form according to different environments and the relation of case markers and 'cāriyeis' with nouns are also accounted here.

* The total number of sūtras of each part or chapter is given in brackets against the names of parts and chapters.
5. *Sahiseruppu* (30) It gives us the collection of traditional rules on sandhi and the rules governing the general principles of sandhi as well.

The formation of oblique forms of pronouns and the interrogative pronouns are also discussed here.

6. *Utripāya* (30) The sandhi that occurs between noun-stems and case markers is the subject-matter of this chapter. The 'cāriyais' that intervene between the nouns and the case markers are also dealt with here.

7. *Uyirimāyakīyal* (93) It is an interesting section on sandhi occurring between the vowel-ending words and other words. While enumerating the sandhi rules, a number of word forms are also referred to.

8. *Pūlimāyakīyal* (110) This chapter deals with the sandhi occurring between the consonant-ending words and other words. A few forms of verbal nouns, pronouns, and adverbial participles are also sporadically mentioned.

9. *Kurriyalukara-puṇeriya* (78) It is a chapter on sandhi occurring between the words with final shortened -u and other words. The numerals are also elaborately discussed in this chapter.

Collatikāram (463)

1. *Kilaivaikam* (61) Syntax is the major content of this chapter. A few morphological structures are also sporadically described.
2. Vėrvmayiyyal (22) It is about cases. The subject predicate relationship, the definition of nouns, and the nominal compounds are also discussed here.

3. Vėrvmayiyyal nayankiyal (34) This chapter is concerned with the functional syncretism of cases and case markers. Metonymy and different aspects that are governed by the verbs are also enumerated here.

4. Vilmerapu (37) The vocative case is dealt with in this chapter.

5. Peyariyel (43) The nouns are discussed in this chapter. The classification of nouns into different classes (tipai), genders and numbers is made here.

6. Vēnpaiyiyyal (51) It is about verbs. Three tenses, various pronominal terminations, different types of verbs (optatives, negatives, etc.), non-finite verbs and the functional syncretism of tenses are treated in this chapter.

7. Itaiyiyyal (48) It gives an account of the bound forms, i.e., particles (uninflected words) and affixes (bound morphemes). Some of the particles enumerated here were originally independent words which have been reduced to the position of particles and cannot, therefore, now occur as independent words.

8. Uriyiyyal (100) This is an interesting section on 180 obsolete words. Many of these are root words, i.e., words formed of roots and words which cannot be segmented into parts. A few words can be segmented into roots + affixes. A few qualificiere
are also included in this chapter.

9. **Evąviyal** (67) It is a chapter on miscellanea. It includes all those that are not dealt with in the previous chapters.

---

**Porulatikāram** (68)

1. **Akattinaiiyiyal** (56) It is about the conduct of love affairs, i.e., about the love-themes or noumenal experience.

2. **Purattinaiiyiyal** (58) It deals with the non-love themes, i.e., phenomenal experience.

3. **Kalaviyal** (50) It treats of the interesting theme of premarital love or secret love.

4. **Kappiyal** (53) This chapter is on marital love or wedded love.

5. **Poruliyal** (27) This section touches on various aspects of erotic love.

6. **Mayppiyiyal** (27) It is an interesting section on sentiment and their physical manifestations.

7. **Uvamaiyiyal** (37) This chapter deals with a figure of speech called 'uvamai' - "simile or comparison". The particles of comparison are also enumerated in this chapter.

8. **Giyulyiyal** (244) It deals with prosody and poetics.

9. **Marapiyal** (110) It gives an account of traditional usages of words.
has already refuted him. Hence Dr. Sastri infers that Čēṇāvavaiyar
might have commented on Kuttakāraṇam also.¹

Čēṇāvavaiyar's style is subtle and simple, but at the same
time, it is rigid. It is evident from his commentary that he was a
profound scholar in Tamil and Sanskrit. His commentary on Collatikāraṇa
is considered to be the best one. His critical acumen and expository
capacity are well seen throughout his work.

In some places he has been criticized and his views are
refuted by Naccipāṅkkinīyar and hence he is considered to be the
predecessor of Naccipāṅkkinīyar. He is said to belong to the 14th
century A.D.

Nārciṇiyar

Nārciṇiyar's commentary is available only for the last four
chapters of Porulatikāraṇam.

His style is refined and concentrated but in some places
pedantic. He is also the author of the commentary on Tirukkōvaiyār
by Nāpikavēcakar.

Nothing is definitely known about the are in which he
lived.

Naccipāṅkkinīyar

It is said that Naccipāṅkkinīyar has commented on the whole
of Tolkāppiyam, but his commentary on the 6th, 7th and 8th chapters of
Porulatikāraṇam has not seen the light of day.

His commentary is very elaborate and is not as short and
lucid as Iliamūrtiyar's nor is it as terse as Čēṇāvavaiyar's. He tries
to bring in all the changes and developments of his time under the
drama-work of Tolkāppiyam. Sometimes he condemns his predecessors,
Ilampūraṇar and Čandavaṟaiyar, even though they are opposed to each
other.

He is the most popular among the commentators. He has
commented upon Pattupāṭṭu (Ten Idylls), Kalittokai and
Cīvakacintāmaṇi also. He seems to have been well versed in Tamil
language and literature. In his commentaries on literary works, he
 paraphrases the text and points out the grammatical peculiarities;
he quotes sutras from Tolkāppiyam throughout, explains obsolete
words and gives the various readings which existed in his age. His
impartial mind, vast erudition, and his minute and critical
observation are appreciable.

His commentary on Ecceviyal, 19 and 61 bears testimony to
the fact that he should have lived later than Pavaṇanti, the author
of Nambūl. There he refers to the later-day grammarians by the
phrases 'pin̄ḍūl ceytavarkal' and 'pinpu nūl ceytōr'. However, he is
said to have lived in the 14th century A.D. and he should have been,
as Dr. P.S. Baski thinks, an younger contemporary of Čandavaṟaiyar²

Teyvaccilaiyar

Teyvaccilaiyar’s commentary is available only for the
second part of Tolkāppiyam, i.e., Collatikāram.

His commentary on some sutras and his exposition of some
grammatical aspects are especially very interesting. His knowledge
in Sanskrit is not of so high an order as that of Čandavaṟaiyar.
His age is not definitely known. Some scholars think that he lived later than Naccinärkkiniyar and some others hold that his period was earlier.

Kallétanar

Kallétanar's commentary is available only for Collatikāram and that too is from the first sūtra of Collatikāram to a few sūtras in Īṣaiyai. Recently this commentary has been published.

A close study of this commentary will reveal the fact that Kallétanar has studied the commentaries of Ilampūranar, Čenavaiyar and Naccinärkkiniyar and has adopted the meaning which appealed to him to be correct.

His age is not definitely known. He must have been later than Naccinärkkiniyar. Since the author of Pirīyokes Vivekānanda quotes him, he must have lived earlier than the 18th century A.D., to which Pirīyokes Vivekānanda is assigned.

An Unknown Commentator.

There is an anonymous commentary on Collatikāram, from the beginning up to the 33rd sūtra of Vēṟṟumaiyaiyal. This commentary is also recently published along with that of Kallétanar. A careful study of this commentary will show that it is mainly based on Ilampūranar's. In some places the commentary of Naccinärkkiniyar is followed and in some other places the views of Čenavaiyar are also referred to.

Dr. P. S. Sastri infers from the commentary on the last sūtra of Vēṟṟumaiyaiyal that the commentary should have been later than
those of Čaalavareiyar and NaccinEkkānachiyar

P.S. Subrahmanya Sastri

Dr. P.S. Sastri has written an elaborate commentary on Ellutatikāram in Tamil and a commentary on Collatikāram in English. He has collected the different views of the earlier commentators and has put forth his own explanations. In some places his interpretations are entirely new and are interesting to the scholars.

A short commentary in English for Ellutatikāram and Poruḷatikāram has also been published by him.

He lived in the first half of this twentieth century.

---:00:--:00:---

Notes on Appendix II

1. Sastri, P.S., A Commentary on TC, p. XXXV.

2. Ibid., p. XXVII.

3. TC, 1-260, i.e., from the beginning up to 33rd śūtra of Iṣṭāiśval.

4. Recently the commentary on Collatikāram by Kallāṭāgar has been published by the S.I.S.W. Publishing Society.

5. Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, No. 56. Recently (1964) it has been published by the S.I.S.W. Publishing Society.

APPENDIX III

Scholars Who Worked on the Grammar of Tolkāppiyam

Tolkāppiyam has been a neglected field of study after the time of the commentators. The indigenous scholars have been afraid of the rules codified by the author in Tolkāppiyam, since they were looked upon as rigid prescriptions for language. Only recently, i.e. from the fourth decade of the twentieth century, scholars became interested in the study of Tolkāppiyam.

It may be stated that Dr. P.S. Sastrī was the pioneer to initiate interest among the later-day scholars towards the study of Tolkāppiyam. With a purpose of comparing the grammatical theories in Tamil with that of Sanskrit, he studied Tolkāppiyam and other grammatical works in Tamil. His thesis "History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil and Their Relation to the Grammatical Literature in Sanskrit" (Madras, 1954) is the outcome of his deep and intensive study of Tolkāppiyam. Since his concern was mainly to trace the historical developments of grammatical theories in Tamil and to compare them with those of Sanskrit, he could not render full justice to the treatment of grammatical theories in Tolkāppiyam. However, many a rule from Tolkāppiyam has been invariably quoted and discussed in his thesis and in his work on "Comparative Grammar of Tamil Language" (Tiruvadi, Tanjore Dt., 1947).

Then Prof. L.V. Rameswami Aiyar, the well-known Dravidian linguist, in the course of his studies on Dravidian languages in general and Tamil language in particular, quotes many relevant rules from Tolkāppiyam and discusses them briefly. The following
papers and books contributed by him represent the description of soe rules from Tolkappiyam also.

1. The Evolution of Malayalam Morphology (Ernakulam, 1936)
2. Dravidian Nominal Inflection (BR, 42, pp. 589-594; 644-657; 714-726)
3. Dravidian Sandhi - Augments (JJSR, 22, pp. 96-110)
4. The Old Tamil Verb (JJSR, 30, pp. 163-170)
5. Indigenous Tamil Grammars on the Verbs "Come" and "Give" (JAS, pp. 215-216)

Dr. Venkataramulu Reddy’s interest towards the grammar of Tamil language is deeply appreciated by most of the indigenous scholars. He describes a few of the morphological structures treated in Tolkappiyam from his intuitive erudition and deep understanding. His findings and contributions are valuable to students of Tolkappiyam. In this connection the following contributions which he has made may be cited:

1. Innud Eru Tikku (AR, III : II, pp. 1-4)
2. Dravidic Pronouns (Madras, 1939)
3. Vinyankol (AR, IV, pp. 1-29)
4. Eval Vigaiyamaippu (FY, 1941, pp. 323-328)

Then Dr. Varadarajan has worked on the verbs for his thesis "Origin and Development of Verbs in Tamil" (submitted to the Madras University, 1944). He has described the treatment of verbs in Tolkappiyam. The study undertaken by him is of a historic nature rather than of a descriptive one, yet a number of his
findings hold good and are of immense value to a scholar who attempts to decipher Tolkēppiyam. His article "Kurippuvinaî" (Tcult., VIII, pp. 84-94) is an elucidation of the formal and functional characteristics of a morphological structure treated in Tolkēppiyam.

Dr. Ilakkuvēnār in the course of his studies on Tamil language refers to a number of suttras from Tolkēppiyam. His thesis "Origin and Growth of Tamil Language" (submitted to the University of Madras, 1946) and other publications "Semantemes and Morphemes in Tamil Language" (Nagercoil, 1957) and "Tamil Language (Madras, 1961) are the outcome of his studies in Tamil with reference to Tolkēppiyam. Recently in his published thesis "Tolkēppiyam with Critical Studies" (Madurai, 1963), which covers the whole of Tolkēppiyam he has briefly discussed the important grammatical rules treated in Tolkēppiyam.

In 1948, Dr. V.S.P. Manickam made a study on "The Tamil Verbs" (submitted to the Madras University, 1948) in which he refers to the relevant suttras of Tolkēppiyam. He has collected and classified the various types of verbs in Tamil.

Then it must be mentioned that Dr. Zvelebil, K., who has been rendering yeoman service to the description of Tamil language, by his indefatigable and stupendous efforts, has referred to a few aspects of grammar Tolkēppiyam in the course of his attempts to describe the different morphological structures of Old Tamil. 1

Prof. T.P. Neenakahisundaram in his learned article "The So-called Inflexional Increments in Tamil" (II, Turner Jubilee
Volume II, pp. 186-190) describes the 'cāryais' enumerated in Tolkāppiyam and arrives at a few noteworthy conclusions. His work on the "History of the Tamil Language" (Poona, in print) also contains descriptions of a number of morphological structures treated in Tolkāppiyam and paves the way for further study and advanced research in Tolkāppiyam.

In 1980, Miss. R. Seethi-bai prepared an index for the whole of Tolkāppiyam and in that she has made an attempt to trace the pre-Tolkāppiyam grammar. To some extent, she has succeeded in describing the language of Tolkāppiyam. As it has not been her concern to study the treatment of grammar in Tolkāppiyam, she has confined herself to the presentation and classification of the different grammatical structures used and discussed in Tolkāppiyam.

Recently, Miss. N. Rajakshma of Annamalai University has worked on the "History of Tamil with Reference to Declensions" (submitted to the Annamalai University, 1981), in which she frequently quotes the rules from Tolkāppiyam and discusses giving the explanations cited by the commentators. Some of her discussions are worthy of notice.

It is desirable and expected that more and more studies on this most important work in Tamil language from the modern point of view will follow so as to enable the students of Tamil language to get a better understanding of this work.
Notes on Appendix III

1. Zvelebil, K., Inna Nāppatu - A Study on Late Old Tamil
   (Ar. Cr., 25, pp. 56-92).
   ————, Emphasis in Early Old Tamil (TCult., IV, p. 225-254).
   ————, Dative in Early Old Tamil (TCult., VIII, pp. 95-107).
   ————, Lectures on Historical Grammar of Tamil
   (University of Madras, 1963).

2. Seethabai, R., A Study of Index of Words in Tolkkappiyam
   (submitted to the University of Madras, 1960).
APPENDIX IV

A Few Contradictions Between the Grammar of Tolkāppiyam and the Usages of Cankam Literature.

The grammatical rules of Tolkāppiyam are not strictly followed even in the earliest literature called Cankam works. Every language has ever been changing. Tamil is not an exception to this universal truth and this can best be seen when one looks into the history of Tamil language from Tolkāppiyam period to Cankam period, from Cankam to the middle and from the middle to the modern period. Thus the living language Tamil has ever been changing and developing, as Tolkāppiyar himself indicates, discarding many old rules and evolving many new ones.

Changes can be noticed in vocabulary, meaning, phonology and grammar, i.e., morphology and syntax. Here a few changes of grammatical usages from the period of Tolkāppiyam to Cankam period are cited. Those changes may be looked under three different sub-heads:— (1) The restrictions of usages prescribed in Tolkāppiyam and their violation in Cankam works, (2) The usages of Cankam work that are not found discussed in Tolkāppiyam, (3) The treatment of peculiar usages in Tolkāppiyam and their non-occurrence in the literature of Cankam or later period.

Restriction of Usages Formulated in Tolkāppiyam and Their Violation in Cankam Works.

1. The use of 'viyakhol' - optatives is restricted to the third person only in Tolkāppiyam. An explanation has already been cited (12,1,2) in the present study only for the rare violation of this
restriction, but one can find a number of usages violating this restriction in Can/kam literature.

E.g., ṛāliyaṁ ṛañ (PN, 365) "May I live long"

ni ṛāliyaṁ (PN, 137) "May you live long"

ceyten ṛakka (PN, 71) "May I be considered to have done it".

(Ref. PN, 2, 6, 9, 72; NT, 34; AN, 13, 46, 54, 59)

2. The use of plural forms to denote one person or one object (to denote honorific singular) was only allowed in speech (i.e., in colloquial dialect) at the time of Tolkëppiyâññ (17.8.2). But it became classical (i.e., came into vogue in literature) in Can/kam period.

E.g., ṛotiry añar ehmunu kejñ añar (Kuru., 87)

ūrīr polac urattitai iruntanir (PN, 141).

The words ṛotiry and ūrīr are plural nouns. Here they are used in honorific singular. These plural forms are not formed from the singular nouns by the addition of rational plural termination (2,9,2).

3. In Tolkëppiyâññ simile or comparison is divided into four kind, viz., comparison of action, comparison of effect, comparison of shape and comparison of colour (17.7.1). Tolkëppiyâññ classifies the particles of comparison into four groups and ordains severally their usages for specific similes or comparisons of defined purposes and types (17.13,2). But there is not anyone of the Can/kam classics which has not broken this classified usages.

4. According to Tolkëppiyâññ, the case marker -ni is invariably present with the rational and common nouns (2.3, 5; 6.7) in the
accusative. But there are instances in Cankam literature for the elision of -si after the rational nouns in the accusative case.

E.g., vēntar- ottiya antvel mappam (NT, 70)

6. Tolkappiyar codifies that all non-rational nouns take -ē, when they occur in the vocative case (6.7). But in some instances this rule is violated in Cankam literature.

E.g., varuntinai valiy-onneņam (NT, 356)

6. The verbs cel and kotu are permitted to be used only with reference to third person and ve and tē only with reference to first and second persons, according to the rule of Tolkappiyar. This restriction is violated throughout Cankam literature.

7. According to Tolkappiyar, the use of plural suffix -kal was restricted to the non-rational nouns only and that too optionally (3.4). But a few occurrence of the suffix -kal is found with the rationals in Cankam literature.

E.g., mārrai-var-kal (TK, 263)
puvīyar-kal (TK, 919)
sivar-kal (KT, 28)

6. According to Tolkappiyar, the subject and the predicate must agree in number-gender (2.8.5). But there are occasional instances of usage violating this rule found in Cankam Tamil.

E.g., ariyunar inru (NT, 309)

It must be pointed out here that 'inru' is not cited as a common verb either by Tolkappiyar or by the commentators.
Usages of Canikam Period That are not Found Treated in Tolkkappiyam.

1. Though Tolkkappiyam recognizes the imperative aspect of verbs, he includes the imperative verbs under second person verbs only. There also the plural imperative markers -um -m are not mentioned with the second person verbal terminations. But a number of imperative verbs with the marker -um (-m) are found to occur in Canikam literature (11,10)

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{L.e., } um & (PN, 173) & u\text{-}m \\
&\text{vam} & (AK, 411) & v\text{-}m \\
&\text{varum} & (Perl., 14) & \overline{v}\text{-}r\text{-}um
\end{align*}\]

Such forms occur as plural or honorific singular imperative in Canikam literature.

2. The use of -an as a terminal suffix in the first person singular verbs is not mentioned in Tolkkappiyam. But a number of first person singular verbs with -an termination are found in Canikam works.

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{E.g., } apikvan & (PN, 109) \\
&\text{kugvan} & (NT, 233) \\
&\text{u\text{-}linan} & (NT, 326) \\
&\text{ilan} & (Kug., 311)
\end{align*}\]

3. Tolkkappiyam describes the dropping of the final -u- and the preceding consonant in the adjectival participles only. But in Canikam literature the dropping of the final vowel -u- or the vowel -u- and the preceding consonant is found not only in the finite verbs of 'cayyum' pattern but also in the imperatives of the same pattern.
E.g., 1. 'cayyum' pattern indicative verbs
   molimē (Kurū., 51)
   ασ (FM, 104)

2. 'cayyum' pattern imperative verbs
   um (FM, 178) vam (AK, 411)

4. Tolkēppiyānār does not give the patterns of -παν, -ναν and -πακκου ending adverbial participles. But they are found used in Caṅkam literature and the later works.
   L.c., kānpān (KT, 97) kān-παn
   varuvaṇ (KT, 113) varu-vān
   eṇpakkku (TK, 156) eṇ-pākku

5. Tolkēppiyānār does not give -I or -Imo in the list of second person terminations; but he gives -mō as an explosive particle of second person. The forms with the ending -Imo are also found to occur in Caṅkam Tamil. -Imo may be segmented as I - mō; -I may be identified as second person marker; -mō (mild) imperative plural marker and -ō as an original interrogative particle; but used here to invite attention.
   E.g., conrimō (KT, 67) conru-I-mō
   karaṇtintimō (AK, 281) karaintu-I-mō
   vantimō (KT, 156) ventu-I-mō

6. The usages like vantīku (KT, 221), ayerantīkam (KT, 31), etc., are not discussed in Tolkēppiyām. Here, Ī-ku may be identified as an auxiliary verb (17.10.8), which is formed from the root Ī and is, here, added to the past adverbial participles.
7. Though Tolkāppiyār discusses the numerals elaborately in Kuttatikēram, the numeral kōṭi "crore", which does not find a place in his treatment, is found to occur in Cakkam works (PW, 16; TX, 377). He cites the variants of different numerals also in Tolkāppiyār, but he does not mention nan (AN, 104) and nālku (AN, 104) as the variants of nālku "four" which are found to occur in Cakkam literature (4.6).

Treatment of a few peculiar usages in Tolkāppiyār and their Non-occurrence in Cakkam or later period.

1. The words like tān and pān as proper nouns, and the words alān and mulaṅ are not found to occur in Cakkam works.  

2. The constructions 'ellānamsīyum', 'ellānammoṭum', etc., are not found used in Cakkam literature (4.4).

3. In a sutra, Tolkāppiyār refers to the -i ending demonstrative and interrogative words, for which all the commentators cite atoli, itoli, utoli, and etoli as examples. These words are not found to occur in Cakkam literature.

Therefore, it stands to reason that Tolkāppiyār must have proceeded all the earliest extant literature. If the erudite descriptive grammarian had lived at the time of or after the Cakkam works, he could not have made rules in disregard of the usages found in all these classic poems.
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Notes on Appendix IV

1. TC, 452.
2. TC, 226.
3. TC, 27.
4. TF, 276.
5. TC, 286-291.
7. TC, 151.
8. TC, 28-30.
9. TC, 11.
10. TC, 222.
11. TC, 236.
12. TC, 274.
13. TC, 192, 361, 384.
14. TT, 188, 190.
15. TL, 159.

16. It may not be wrong even if one assumes that at least a few stanzas of the eight anthologies (eight collections) might have been composed earlier than Tolkāppiyam, if they do not contradict the grammatical theories expounded in Tolkāppiyam.
APPENDIX V

POETIC OR LITERARY VOCABULARY

Tolkappiyar divides the words that are used in poetry into four groups. They are 'iyarcol', 'tiricol', 'ticaiccol' and 'veticol'. Since all the earliest extant literary works are in poetic form, the words that are employed in them may be identified as literary vocabulary.

(Onveraiyar states that 'ticaiccol' and 'veticol' are found only as nouns. According to MacCánrubishiyar they are mostly found as nouns and sometimes as verbal nouns. Teiyvaccilaiyar thinks that mostly they are found as nouns and sometimes as verbs.

'iyarcol' - natural words, i.e., native words or common indigenous words.

The words that are employed in conformity with the usage of Sangoil land without change in their meaning are called 'iyarcol'. They express meaning, naturally and they are intelligible to the ignorant and the learned alike. Their meaning is unchanged all over Tamil-Kad. These words are common both to the colloquial and literary dialects of Tamil. This group of words forms the major portion of the vocabulary of literature.

E.g., nilam, pal, kal, makkal, etc.

'tiricol' - variable words or affected words, i.e., words which are of varied nature (in form or meaning).
Telikappiyar does not define what 'tiricol' is, but classifies it under two sub-groups, viz., different words having one meaning, i.e., synonyms and one word having many meanings, i.e., homonyms. The definition of 'tiricol' is patent from its name which denotes its varying nature.

According to Ceylonese and P.C. Sastri, 'tiricol' is one which is modified in form 7. Dr. Ilakkuvar thinks that it is called 'tiricol', since the meanings of such a group of words will be varied. One may rightly conclude that 'tiricol' is that which is varied either in form or in meaning.

This group of words belongs to literature only and is not current in colloquial dialect; hence it will not be easily understood by the laymen or sometimes even by the scholars.

I.e., synonyms веру, вилаанкаал, вища 'mountain'

homonym ᵇипам 'swan', ᵇор, ᵇор, etc

Ticaiccol - literally means direction words, i.e., regional words or dialectal words.

The words that are adopted in literary Tamil from the dialects current in the twelve divisions of Tamil-Nad are called 'ticaiccol'.

Though chaste Tamil was spoken in the Tamil-Nad with Venkatam on the north and Kunari on the south boundary, there were peculiar usages current in different regions. The words, that were peculiar to a particular region, were at times, adopted in the standard literary Tamil. These dialectal words denoted meanings which were familiar to that region only.
Raghava Ayyangar considers 'ticaiccol' as foreign words and explains his view from the very term 'ticaiccol' itself, which, according to him, denotes non-Tamil words. In considering this view, it must be remembered that Tamil had contact with another language except Sanskrit (and Prakrit) before the time of Tolkāppiyār and the present-day sister languages of Tamil (Telugu, Kannada, Malayalam, etc.) had not developed into independent languages, when Tolkāppiyār formulated the grammar for Tamil. They were different dialects of Tamil and mutually intelligible. Tamil had come into contact with other foreign languages and the different dialects of border areas developed into different independent languages only after Tolkāppiyār. Thus the later-day grammarian Pavaṇānti had to formulate rules to include the foreign words of later period also. So, he included them also along with dialectal words under 'ticaiccol'. Viewing the later contacts and developments in mind, the scholars of to-day claim that Tolkāppiyār refers to the foreign words other than Sanskrit by the term 'ticaiccol'. The commentators also interpret the sūtra dealing with 'ticaiccol', thinking of their own time.

The different dialectal words were current in twelve different parts of Tamil-Nad. Thus it may be concluded that by the term 'ticaiccol', Tolkāppiyār refers to the dialectal words only and not to the foreign words other than Sanskrit.

i.e., tellai for the "mother" (Kuṭṭanad)
accañ for the "father" (Kuṭṭanad).

'Ticaiccol' - words of northern language, i.e., mainly the Sanskrit words.
(Gōvīraiyar and Naccinārkkīniyar consider only Sanskrit words as 'vaṭacol', while Tevaccilaiyar includes words borrowed from Prakrit also. Later-day scholars think that by the term 'vaṭacol', Tolkāppiyar refers to the Sanskrit words only.

According to Tolkāppiyar, the words that are made up of sounds other than those which are peculiar to Sanskrit, may be adopted in Tamil. Gōvīraiyar by way of further elucidation of this view of Tolkāppiyar says that words having sounds common to both the languages are borrowed into Tamil.

E.g., meru, bhūjan, sālim, etc.

Sometimes when Sanskrit words are borrowed into Tamil, they may be modified in sound or in form. Therefore, Tolkāppiyar further approves the usage of such modified words of Sanskrit in Tamil, if they are in agreement with the phonetic system of the Tamil language.

E.g., tejam, pōham, etc. (modified in sound)
neppān, kōrnan, etc. (modified in form and sound)
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