

## ANMOLITTOKAI

K. THILAGAWATHI

### Introduction

Both the Tamil grammatical works, namely, the *Tolkāppiyam* (895)<sup>1</sup> and the *Nannūl* (361) state that there are six types of *tokai*<sup>2</sup> or 'compound'<sup>3</sup> namely, *vērrumaittokai* ('casal compound'), *uvamattokai* ('similative compound'), *vinaittokai* ('verbal compound'), *paṇputtokai* ('qualitative compound'), *ummaittokai*

<sup>1</sup>The numbers given after the name of the books, the *Tolkāppiyam* and the *Nannūl*, indicate the numbers of *nūrpā* as found in *Tolkāppiyam Mūlam* and *Nannūl Kāṇṭikaiyurai* respectively.

<sup>2</sup>The term *tokai* means a compound; hence *tokaiccol* in Tamil is equivalent to 'compound word' in English. In Tamil, especially the Tamil grammars, the term *tokai* is generally used to denote the nominal compounds.

The *Nannūl* (361) defines *tokai* as that in which two or more words combine and function as one word; combination can take place between a noun and noun or a noun and a verb as a result of eliding the suffixes or particles that denote the meanings such as case, etc.:

"peyarot̄u peyarum vinaiȳum vērr̄umai  
mutaliya porul̄iṅ avarr̄iṅ urup̄it̄ai  
ol̄iya ir̄aṅṅu mutal̄āt toṭar̄ntoru  
mol̄ip̄ōl naṭapp̄ana tokainilait toṭar̄ccol."

The *Tolkāppiyam* does not give an explicit definition for the term *tokai*; but it refers to the nature of a compound in two *nūrpā*: one (*Tolkāppiyam* 551) in the chapter on cases (*Vērr̄umaiyiyal*) and the other (*Tolkāppiyam* 903) in the chapter on miscellany (*eccaviyal*) where the compounds are dealt with. The *nūrpā* 551 states that there are compounds made up of nouns and they too will function just like nouns; this *nūrpā* has been written to imply that nominal compounds also will take all the case suffixes, i.e., they will occur in all cases, just like nouns:

"peyar̄iṅ ākiya tokaiȳumā ruḷavē  
av̄vum uriya app̄āl āṅa."

The *nūrpā* 903 states that all compounds 'have the nature of'/'function like' words:

"ell̄āt tokaiȳum orucol naṭaiya."

<sup>3</sup>A comprehensive definition that can be given for a compound is: a compound is that which is made up of two or more words which bear some syntactic relationship between them and that which behaves as a single word. Compounds are essentially reduced forms of larger phrasal constructions in which those parts which explicitly indicate the syntactic relationship between the constituent words have been deleted.

The *Tolkāppiyam* introduces the six 'compounds' in *nūrpā* 895. In his commentary to this *nūrpā*, Cēṅāvaraiyar (412) defines the term *tokai* thus: "When two or more nouns are put together in a certain relationship,

('coordinate compound') and *anmolittokai* ('a compound that indicates a thing other than that indicated by its constituents'). It is the sixth compound, *anmolittokai*, which is the subject-matter of the present article.

*Anmolittokai* differs from the other five compounds. When the latter are used to denote a thing different from the total meaning of the combined constituents of the compounds concerned, the compounds are said to be functioning as *anmolittokai*:

*Example 1. karuṅkūntal* 'black hair' (qualitative compound).

*Example 2. karuṅkūntal naṭantu ceṇṇāl*  
'(A girl with) black hair walked by.' (*anmolittokai*)

When *karuṅkūntal* is stated separately, it is understood to be a qualitative compound; but in the second example, *karuṅkūntal* denotes 'a girl with black hair' because of the context in which it occurs; hence in *Example 2*, *karuṅkūntal* functions as *anmolittokai*. It is to be noted that a compound can be identified as *anmolittokai* only when it is used in a sentence or a phrase.

Syntactically, the five compounds other than *anmolittokai* have one derivational phase while *anmolittokai* has two derivational phases. The first phase will be the derivation of any one of the five compounds, and the second phase will be the derivation of *anmolittokai* from a sentence/phrase formed with one of the five compounds.

*Example 3. a. muttāl ākiya caram > muttuccaram* (casal compound)  
'(The) chain which is made of pearl' > pearl-chain.

b. *muttuccarattai aṇinta peṇ > muttuccaram* (*anmolittokai*)  
'One who wears the pearl-chain'.

they behave like a single unit'. Teyvaccilaiyār (407) is also of the same opinion, while others like Nac-  
ciṇṇārkkiniyar (412) and Iḷampūraṇar (406) are of the view that the *tokai* denotes a sequence of words in  
which certain suffixes or particles have been elided. The commentators of the *Nannūl* are also of the same  
view. The author of the *Nannūl* is quite aware that some syntactic relationship like *casal*, etc., is existent  
between the two constituents of a 'compound' when he says "*vērrumai mutaliya poruḷin avarriṇ uruṇṇai*  
*oliya*" in *nūṇpā* 361.

Cēṇāvaraiyar's statement, namely, "when two or more nouns are put together in certain relationship they  
behave like a single unit" implies that the compounds are the transformed results of some larger construc-  
tions like phrases or sentences in which the respective syntactic relations were explicitly indicated by suitable  
morphemes whether they be words, particles or suffixes.

The significance of saying that all compounds function like single units is to be noted. This criterion helps us  
to differentiate the compounds from the phrases, i.e., this fact implies the cohesive nature of the compounds.  
By this criterion, *karuṅkutirai* ('black horse') is a compound, but *kariya kutirai* ('black horse') is a phrase;  
in other words, the former will be written and uttered as a single unit.



Example 4. a. *malaraiṭ pōṇṇa kaṇ > malarkkaṇ* (similitive compound)  
 '(The) eye which is like a flower' > 'flower-(like)-eyes'.

b. *malarkkaṇṇai uṭaiya peṇ > malarkkaṇ (anmolittokai)*  
 '(The) girl who has flower-like-eyes'.

From the illustrations given above it can be seen that the casual and similitive compounds are formed by combining the two nouns which are in some syntactic relation within the construction; as for *anmolittokai*, the compound noun in the construction represents the meaning of the entire construction generally and denotes another noun in the construction in particular. In Example 3b, the compound noun *muttuccaram* represents the entire phrase, *muttuccarattai aṇinta peṇ* and it denotes *peṇ* ('girl') in particular. In *anmolittokai*, the item elided is a separate noun which is in syntactic relation with the compound concerned; in Example 3b, the head noun, *peṇ*, of the nominal phrase, is elided in which case, the relative participle, *aṇinta*, is also dropped. As regards the other five compounds, the items elided are those which syntactically relate the two nouns which make the compound.

#### The Two Controversies about Anmolittokai

Apart from the fact that *anmolittokai* occupies a unique place among the six compounds, the *nūrpā* of the *Tolkāppiyam* which refers to *anmolittokai*, has also given rise to two controversial points. *Tolkāppiyam* 901 defines *anmolittokai* thus:

"paṇṇu toka varūṇi kīlaviyāṇum  
 ummai tokka peyar vayiṇāṇum  
 vērrumai tokka peyar vayiṇāṇum  
 īrru niṇṇiyalum anmolittokaiye."

This *nūrpā* gives the general impression that *anmolittokai* arises only from three compounds, namely, qualitative, coordinate and casual. All the other later grammarians have mentioned clearly that all five compounds, namely, casual, similitive, verbal, qualitative and coordinate compounds, can be used as *anmolittokai*. The *Nannūl nūrpā* 369 for example states: "*aintokai molimēṇ piratokal anmolī*." This *nūrpā* implies that *anmolī* is a compound which appears from the five compounds and in which some other word other than the compounds has been elided.

The commentators of the *Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram* have also been aware that all the five compounds can be used as *anmolittokai*; but they give different reasons for their interpretations of the *nūrpā* 901 of the *Tolkāppiyam*.

Ḥampūraṇar (412)<sup>4</sup>, Cēṇāvaraiyar (418) and Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar (418) say that the very ordering of the three compounds in the *nūrpā* indicates that the verbal and similitive compounds also can give rise to *anmolittokai*. According to Ḥampūraṇar, the mention of the casual compound after the qualitative compound implies that the verbal and similitive compounds also can be used as *anmolittokai*, while Cēṇāvaraiyar and Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar say that although *anmolittokai* originating from the coordinate compound is much less in number than that originating from the casual compound, the casual compound is mentioned after the coordinate compound, to imply that the similitive and verbal compounds also can give rise to *anmolittokai*. Though these three commentators may be correct in their observation that all the five compounds can give rise to *anmolittokai*, their reasons do not seem plausible to the present author.

Teyvaccilaiyār (413) says that since the verbal and similitive compounds are not included in the *Tolkāppiyam nūrpā* 901, they are to be taken as examples for the *ākupeyar*<sup>5</sup> formed from the compound made of two nouns, *irupeyarottu ākupeyar*, which is mentioned in *nūrpā* 598 of *Tolkāppiyam*<sup>6</sup> (Teyvaccilaiyār:111). Ḥampūraṇar and Cēṇāvaraiyar are also of the same opinion. It is not proper to treat *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* and *anmolittokai* as being similar to one another. If they are similar, *Tolkāppiyar* need not have mentioned *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* in *nūrpā* 598. Teyvaccilaiyār's treatment of *Tolkāppiyam* 901 is also not plausible.

The second point of contention is to equate *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* with *anmolittokai*. Before attempting to show that *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* and *anmolittokai* are two different things, the controversy about the possible sources for *anmolittokai* may be clarified.

<sup>4</sup>The numbers given next to the name of the commentators indicate the numbers of the *nūrpā* in their respective commentaries for the *Tolkāppiyam-Collatikāram*.

<sup>5</sup>An *ākupeyar* is a noun which is used to denote a thing which is different from but related to that indicated by the noun concerned:

eg. *talaikku oru vellī koṭu*  
 'head-to one dollar give', i.e.,  
 'Give a dollar to a person'

In this sentence, 'head' is used to denote a person, and therefore it is used as an *ākupeyar*.

<sup>6</sup>The *Tolkāppiyam nūrpā* 598 gives the different kinds of *ākupeyar*  
 The *nūrpā* is:

*mutalir kūrūm ciṇaiyari kilaviyūm (a)*  
*ciṇaiyir kūrūm mutalari kilaviyūm (b)*  
*piṇantavalik kūrūm(c) paṇpukoḷ peyarum (d)*  
*iyānratu molitalum(e) irupeyarottum(f)*  
*viṇaimutal uraikkuṁ kilaviyotu(g). tokaii*  
*aṇaimara piṇavē ākupeyark kilavi*



### Clarification of the First Controversy

The present writer is convinced that the *nūrpā* 901 of the *Tolkāppiyam* implies that the similitive and verbal compounds can also give rise to *anmolittokai*; however, the reason for this claim is different. If the *nūrpā* 901 is read carefully, it will be noted that while the expressions *ummai tokka* and *vēyrumai tokka* are used in the case of the coordinate and casual compounds, the expression *paṇpu toka varūum* is used in the case of the qualitative compound. The author of the *Tolkāppiyam*, must have had his own reason to write the first line as *paṇpu toka varūum kilaviyānum* although he would have easily written it as *paṇpu tokka peyar vayinanum* to be more rhythmic with the next two lines. By wording the first line in such a manner, he must have wanted to suggest one common point between the three compounds, i.e., the similitive, verbal and qualitative compounds. On careful scrutiny it would be realised that all these three compounds indicate 'some nature of a thing', implicitly or explicitly. This fact is very clear as far as the qualitative compound is concerned. As regards the verbal compound, it indicates the nature of a noun with regard to its potentiality 'to do a particular action' (or 'to undergo a particular action')<sup>7</sup>:

- 
- a. a 'part' denoted by the name of the corresponding 'whole':  
*teṅku tinṛān* 'He ate coconut'  
*teṅku* which is the name of the tree is being used to denote its fruit.
- b. a 'whole' denoted by the name of its 'part':  
*mallikai naṭṭān* 'He planted the jasmin plant'.  
*mallikai*, the name of the flower, is used to denote the entire plant.
- c. denoting an object by the name of the place (its origin):  
*avan kāñcipuram aṇintān* 'He wore the cloth made in Kanjeevaram'.  
*Kāñcipuram*, the name of a place, is used to denote the cloth made there.
- d. An object denoted by its quality viz. colour, taste, etc.:  
*avan kāram cāppiṭṭān* 'He ate hot (of taste) edibles'.  
*Kāram* which means hot taste is used to denote hot edibles.
- e. denoting an object by the material of which it is made:  
*aval poṇ aṇintā* 'She wore golden jewellery'  
*poṇ* which is the name of the metal is used to denote the jewellery made of it.
- f. combination of two nouns: this is the compound that is discussed along with *anmolittokai* in this article.
- g. denoting an object by the name of a person who made it:  
*avan kampanaip paṭikkiran*  
 'He reads the book written by kambar'  
*kampan*, the name of the author, is used to denote the book written by him.

<sup>7</sup>The commentators also express different views regarding the verbal compound when they write their commentary for *Tolkāppiyam* 898.

Example 5. *kuṭinīr* < *kuṭikkum takutiyai uṭaiya nīr*

‘drinking water’ < ‘water which is suitable to drink’.

As far as the similitive compound is concerned, the fact that it is also indicative of a particular nature of a thing, may not be very obvious; but when one says *ponmēni* (‘golden body’) it means *pon pōnra nīrattaiyutaiya mēni* (‘body which has the colour as that of gold’). In other words, the expression *ponmēni* is formed on the basis of the ‘golden colour’ of a person. This characteristic of the similitive construction is stated by Tolkāppiyar in the *nūrpa* 1225. This *nūrpa*, which is found in *uvamaviyal*, reads:

“*cirappē nalanē katal valiyoṭu*

*annār paṇpum nilaik kalaṇ eṇpa.*”

The *nūrpa* implies that the four characteristics, *cirappu* (‘pre-eminence’), *nalan* (‘beauty’), *katal* (‘love’) and *vali* (‘strength’) are the basis for *uvamai* (‘similitive’) expressions.

Hence it is not only correct to say that some attributive aspect of a thing is inherent in the similitive compound, but also it is justifiable to say that Tolkāppiyar has included all the three compounds, i.e., the similitive, verbal and qualitative compounds, in the expression *paṇpu toka varūum kilavi*; however, one may well ask why Tolkāppiyar did not say in short that all the five compounds will give rise to *aṇmolittokai*; or some may say that it would have been more clear if he had named all the five compounds explicitly in the *nūrpa* 901. The later grammarians have followed either one of these two ways.

Ilampūraṇar (409), Naccinārkkinīyar (415) and Teyvaccilaiyār (410) say that the verbal compound is one in which the relative participle is elided; but Cēṇāvaraiyar (415) says that the term *vinai* in *Tolkāppiyam* 898 means the verbal roots like *tiṇ* ‘eat’, *uṇ* ‘eat’, etc., Cēṇāvaraiyar’s argument is that if a verbal compound like *kolyānai* is expanded (in terms of the corresponding relative participles) the corresponding expansion will not be hundred percent equivalent to that of the compound. Cēṇāvaraiyar is fully correct in his argument because *kolyānai* actually means an elephant which has the nature of killing; in other words *kol* in the expression *kolyānai* is inherent of all the three times and therefore it can be said to perform the habitual/perpetual indicative function here. This function of the *ceyyum*-type of verb is clearly stated in *Tolkāppiyam* 725. If *kolyānai* is expanded as *koṇra yānai*, *kollukinra yānai* or *kollum yānai*, the past, present or future actions of the elephant will be indicated and not the inherent ‘killing nature’ of the elephant. Therefore, Cēṇāvaraiyar’s interpretation is more apt as far as the concept of the verbal compound is concerned. It will be worthwhile to note that P. Kothandaraman also agrees with Cēṇāvaraiyar (1976:16).

Hence it will be correct to say that verbal compounds like *kolyānai* are derived from constructions like *kollum iyalpai uṭaiya yānai*.



Tolkāppiyar is always noted for preciseness; but he is only precise to the extent where certain facts will not be excluded altogether. By composing the *nūrpā* 901 in such a way he has brought out the commonness between the three different compounds viz., verbal, similitive and qualitative, without having to compose many more *nūrpā* to bring out the following point: “though the verbal, similitive and qualitative compounds have their separate distinctive nature at the surface level, they have a common base and function in reality; the commonness is that they have some sort of a nature/characteristic of a thing implicit in them.”

Though the *nūrpā* 901 has been giving rise to a lot of confusion and controversies among scholars, the present interpretation, especially of the first line, helps to overcome all such confusion and controversies. Moreover, in the light of this interpretation Tolkāppiyar’s deep insight into the syntax and semantics of these compounds is also seen clearly.

### Clarification of the Second Controversy

It was stated earlier that the second controversy arises as a result of equating *iruṭṭu ākupeyar* with *anmolittokai*. Both *ākupeyar* and *anmolittokai* are related in their function in that both indicate things which are different from those indicated by the respective words but somewhat related to the latter:

*Example 6. mallikai nattān (ākupeyar)*

‘(He) planted jasmin (plant)’

*Example 7. ponvalai ennōṭu pēcināl (anmolittokai)*

‘(The girl who wears) golden bracelet spoke to me’.

In *Example 6*, *mallikai* which is the name of jasmin flower denotes the corresponding plant while in *Example 7*, *ponvalai* (‘golden bracelet’) denotes the girl who wears it.

The *kalakam* group of commentators for the *Nannūl* positively state that *ākupeyar* and *anmolittokai* are two different things. According to their commentaries for the *Nannūl nūrpā* 290, there are four differences between the two:

- 1) *ākupeyar* occurs as a single word while *anmolittokai* is made up of two or more words.
- 2) *ākupeyar* occurs in common usage; *anmolittokai* occurs as an emotional expression of a poet.

- 3) *ākupeyar* denotes the meaning by means of some syntactic relationship between the two nouns concerned, i.e., the name of a whole can be used to denote its part, etc.,<sup>8</sup> *aṇmolittokai* originates from the five different compounds and denotes the different meanings.
- 4) *ākupeyar* comes into use through traditions; *aṇmolittokai* is created newly from time to time by the poet.

All these four differences are generally accepted by the Tamil scholars. The second difference seems very true when one realises that even a simple, common word as *kaṇ* ('cup') is used as an *ākupeyar* when one says *iraṇṭu kaṇ koṇṭu vā* 'Bring two cups' while ordering for two cups of coffee in a coffee shop; but the first difference is not satisfactory as *ākupeyar* also can be made up of more than one single word as is suggested by the term *iruṇṇeyarottu ākupeyar*, i.e., 'an *ākupeyar* formed by combining two nouns'. Hence, it becomes necessary to differentiate *ākupeyar* and *aṇmolittokai* on the basis of more concrete and scientific terms than on more superficial criteria.

Of the scholars who have been writing on the topics *ākupeyar* and *aṇmolittokai*, P. Kothandaraman (1973) makes a clear distinction between these two by using syntax. He makes a useful syntactic observation that an *ākupeyar* maintains concord with the verb while the compound nouns which occur as *aṇmolittokai* do not maintain concord with the verb:

Example 8. *ūr cirittatu (ākupeyar)*

'The village laughed'.

Example 9. *tēmoli vantāḷ (aṇmolittokai)*

'Tēmoli came', i.e., 'The girl who has honey-like words came'.

He accounts for this difference thus: *tēmoli* is not a noun that has been used to denote just a girl but it is a reduced form of the phrase *tēmoliyai uṭaiya peṇ* 'the girl who has honey-like-words'; therefore the concord is maintained at the

<sup>8</sup>In the *nūṇpā* 598, Tolkāppiyar has listed out the different kinds of syntactic relations which give rise to *ākupeyar*. (Refer not 6 above).

This may be an indication for the generally prevalent notion that *ākupeyar* is brought into use by traditional application while *aṇmolittokai* is something which is brought into existence by the imaginative talent of the creative writers. The fact that Tolkāppiyar did not give such syntactic relations out of which *aṇmolittokai* could appear implies that there is less restriction for the creation of *aṇmolittokai* than for the creation of *ākupeyar*.



deep structure of the *Example 9*. As for the *Example 8*, *ūr* is not a reduced form of *ūr makkaḷ* 'village people', but the spatial noun *ūr* becomes expanded in its meaning to cover 'the people of the village' also; it denotes the people of the village on the basis of the relation, 'place — things in the place'. Hence the word *ūr* undergoes change in its meaning and not in its syntactic form, i.e., it is not a contracted form of a larger construction. In other words, the *Example 9* can be expanded as *tēmoliyai utaiya peṇ vantāl*; though the *Example 8* can be given the meaning as *ūril uḷḷa makkaḷ cirittārkaḷ*, this cannot be considered as an expansion of the *Example 8*. This distinction made by P. Kothandaraman seems quite useful; whether this criterion would apply well for all *ākupeyar* and *anmolittokai* is to be confirmed.

As regards *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* P. Kothandaraman gives the example *kollaiikkūttam vantatu* ('The gang of robbers came'); but, as he himself says, it is the word *kūttam* which acts as an *ākupeyar* denoting the people who constitute the gang and the word *kollai* just modifies the *ākupeyar*, *kūttam*. Hence *kollaiikkūttam* is not an ideal example for *irupeyarottu ākupeyar*.

*Irupeyarottu ākupeyar* and *anmolittokai* have been sources of confusion even for the outstanding commentators of the *Tolkāppiyam*. Iḷampūraṇar (114) and Cēnāvaraiyar (110) are of the opinion that both *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* and *anmolittokai* are identical and give the example *porroṭi vantāl* ('The girl wearing golden bangles came') for *irupeyarottu ākupeyar*. Naccinārkkiniyar (115) rightly points out that *porroṭi* in this example is an *anmolittokai* and not an *irupeyarottu ākupeyar*. He cites *makkaṭ cuttu* ('that which denotes people') from the *Tolkāppiyam nūrpā* 484 as an example of *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* since the head noun *cuttu* ('that which points') of the compound functions as an *ākupeyar*, meaning *cuttuṁ poruḷ* ('an object that points out'). As in the case of *kollaiikkūttam*, in *makkaṭcuttu* also it is only the word *cuttu* that functions as an *ākupeyar* and *makkaḷ* ('people') merely acts as a modifier of *cuttu*. Hence *makkaṭcuttu* also does not seem to be an ideal example of *irupeyarottu ākupeyar*.

As said earlier Teyvaccilaiyār (111) differs entirely from the other three commentators as he says that the verbal and similitive compounds function as *irupeyarottu ākupeyar*. He is of this opinion because in *nūrpā* 901, *Tolkāppiyar* has not explicitly mentioned the fact that the verbal and similitive compounds also give rise to *anmolittokai*. It has been shown earlier that the verbal and similitive compounds can be used as *anmolittokai* and this fact is subtly indicated in the *Tolkāppiyam nūrpā* 901. Hence Teyvaccilaiyār's view about *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* is also not plausible.

The present writer agrees with Naccinārkkiniyar in saying that *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* is different from *anmolittokai*; but as stated earlier Naccinārkkiniyar's example *makkaṭcuttu* is not very suitable. Therefore, suitable examples must be



supplied to show that *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* differs from *anmolittokai* though the first is also a compound.

Though *ākupeyar* and *anmolittokai* are almost alike as far as their function is concerned, one difference can be made between *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* and *anmolittokai* on the basis of the information given by the *Tolkāppiyam nūrpā* 901. According to this *nūrpā*, *anmolittokai* arises from one of the following five compounds: the casual, similitive, verbal, qualitative and coordinate compounds. *Irupeyarottu* must be denoting a compound which will not fit into any one of the five compounds stated in the previous sentence. The commentators of the *Nannūl* explain that *irupeyarottu* is a compound formed by combining two nouns of which the preceding noun will specifically name the second member of the compound. They give *vakarak kiḷavi* as an example and say that when *kiḷavi* denotes 'word', it is a normal compound but when *kiḷavi* denotes the particular alphabet, the compound functions as an *ākupeyar*.

Taking all these facts into consideration, words like *pākarkāy* ('bittergourd') and *kattarikkāy* ('brinjal') can be given as examples for *irupeyarottu*; and these can also function as *ākupeyar*. For instance, if a curry is made of *pākarkāy* or *kattarikkāy* and someone enquires the cook 'what curry is it?', the latter could give the answer as *pākarkāy* or *kattarikkāy*. Although the cook just uses the names of the vegetables, the names indicate the curry which is made of those vegetables. Here the *ākupeyar* meaning of the curry is brought out by the 'material with which it is made' *iyannratu molital*.<sup>9</sup>

Likewise in a school sports if the school children are divided into different groups and if each group is given a name like *vivekānantar illam*, *auvai illam*, etc., the announcer who announces the result of the sports may say thus:

Example 10. *innraiya vilaiyāttup pōṭṭikaḷil mutaliṭattaip*

*peruvatu auvai illamākum/auvaiyākum*

('The one that gets the first place in today's sports is  
auvai house/auvai')

In this example *auvaiyillam* (or *auvai*) functions as an *ākupeyar* denoting the group of students who are the members of the Auvai house. This will, in a way, come under the category where the 'whole' denotes the part because the name of the house denotes its members.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup>Refer note 6c

<sup>10</sup>Refer note 6a



As P. Kothandaraman says, *auvaiyillam* or *auvai*<sup>11</sup> maintains concord with the copula verb *ākum* and the conjugated noun *peruvatu*.

From the foregoing paragraphs one more difference between *anmolittokai* and *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* can be noted. In the case of *anmolittokai*, the compound has to be always used for the required purpose. As regards *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* the compound like *auvaiyillam* or the specific name *auvai* may be used to function as an *ākupeyar*.

Having brought out some differences between *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* and *anmolittokai*, it is necessary to note the difference between *irupeyarottu* and the other five compounds which give rise to *anmolittokai*. There is no confusion as far as the casual, similitive and coordinate compounds are concerned. It may be useful to show the difference between *irupeyarottu* and the verbal and qualitative compounds.

Basically, all the three are compounds made of two nouns; but one distinguishing point can be noticed. In *irupeyarottu*, the first noun of the compound is a specific noun; in the verbal compound, the first member is a verbal noun; in the similitive compound, the first constituent is a noun of colour, shape, nature or some other attributive aspect. This can be seen clearly by giving one example for each.

Example 11. *avarai (eṇap peyariya )*

(*eṇṇum peyarutaiya ) kāy > avaraikkāy (irupeyarottu)*

'The vegetable which is called avarai' > 'a kind of a bean'.

Example 12. *kollutal ākiya/kollum iyalputaiya yānai > kolyānai*

(Verbal compound)

'The elephant which has the nature of killing' >

'murderous elephant'

Example 13. *kariya niṛamutaiya kutirai > karuṅkutirai*

(Qualitative compound)

'The horse which is black in colour' > 'black horse'.

<sup>11</sup>Although *auvai* is a proper name of a person, it is used as a name of a house in this example; hence it is used as a neuter noun in this instance.

From the three examples, it can be seen that in *Examples* 12 and 13, the first member of the compound qualifies (in the strict sense) the second member, i.e., the former indicates some attributive aspect of the latter. In *Example* 11, though the first member can be said to perform the attributive function in the broader sense, it actually does nothing but to merely name the second member of the compound. Hence it is to be noted that the syntactic relation between the two constituents of *irupeyarottu* itself is very different from that found between the constituents of the other five compounds viz., casual, verbal, qualitative, similitive and coordinate. Once this fact is clear, there will be no basis at all for equating *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* with *anmolittokai*.

### Conclusion

In summing up, it can be said that *anmolittokai* is always a compound that arises from one of the five compounds, namely, the casual, verbal, qualitative, similitive and coordinate compounds; it comes into existence from time to time depending on the creative talent of the literary composers and it does not necessarily maintain concord with the verb. *Ākupeyar* is usually a single word except for *irupeyarottu ākupeyar*. *Irupeyarottu ākupeyar* is distinctly different from *anmolittokai*, though the first is also a compound.

Tolkāppiyar was fully aware of these facts and in his *nūrpā* 901, he has stated that *anmolittokai* can originate from all the five compounds though implicitly; he has separately mentioned *irupeyarottu* in *nūrpā* 598 which gives the different kinds of *ākupeyar*. Though there has been a lot of confusion as regards, *irupeyarottu ākupeyar* and *anmolittokai* in the minds of later scholars, Tolkāppiyar seems to have been very clear about the difference between those two categories of words.

### REFERENCES

a. *Traditional Grammars – Text and Commentary*

- PAVAṆANTI MUṆIVAR. *Naṇṇūl Kāṅṅikaiyurai*. Madras: South India Saiva Siddhanta Work Publishing Society, Reprint, 1974.
- PAVAṆANTI MUṆIVAR. *Naṇṇūl Viruttiiyurai* (Caṅkaranameccivāyar's commentary edited by Civaṅṅānacuvāmika). Madras: Vittiyaṅupālaṅa accakam, 8th edition, 1957.
- SUBRAMANIYAM, S.V. *Ilakkaṅat tokai-Col*. Nagercoil: Jayakumari Stores, 1971.
- TOLKĀPPIYAR. *Tolkāppiyam – Collatikāram – Cēṅṅavaraiyam*. Madras: Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society, 8th reprint, 1974.
- TOLKĀPPIYAR. *Tolkāppiyam – Collatikāram – Iṅampūraṅar's Commentary*. Madras: South India Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society, Reprint, 1973.



TOLKĀPPIYAR. *Tolkāppiyam – Collatikāram* – Naccinārkkinīyār's Commentary. Madras: South India Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society, Reprint, 1974.

TOLKĀPPIYAR. *Tolkāppiyam – Collatikāram* – Teyvaccilaiyār's Commentary. Madras: South India Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society, 1963.

TOLKĀPPIYAR. *Tolkāppiyam Mūlam*. Madras: South India Saiva Siddhanta Works Publishing Society, 2nd Reprint, 1967.

b. *Linguistic Works*

KOTHANDARAMAN, P. 1973. "Ākupeyar aṇṇolittokai," *Ilakkaṇa Ulakil Putiya Pārvai*. (Madras: Tamil Nulagam), pp. 4–25.

KOTHANDARAMAN, P. 1976. "On Viṇaittokai" *Modern Studies in Tamil* (Madras: Tamil Nulagam), pp. 16–21.

MEETHAM, A.R. and Hudson, R.A. (Eds.). 1969. *Encyclopaedia of Linguistics – Informational and Control*. New York: Pergamon Press Ltd.