

GRAMMAR OF OLD TAMIL FOR STUDENTS 1st Edition

Eva Wilden

► To cite this version:

Eva Wilden. GRAMMAR OF OLD TAMIL FOR STUDENTS 1st Edition. Eva Wilden. Institut français de Pondichéry; École française d'Extrême-Orient, 137, 2018, Collection Indologie. halshs-01892342v2

HAL Id: halshs-01892342

<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01892342v2>

Submitted on 24 Jan 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

GRAMMAR OF OLD TAMIL
FOR STUDENTS

1st Edition

L'Institut Français de Pondichéry (IFP), UMIFRE 21 CNRS-MAE, est un établissement à autonomie financière sous la double tutelle du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères (MAE) et du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS). Il est partie intégrante du réseau des 27 centres de recherche de ce Ministère. Avec le Centre de Sciences Humaines (CSH) à New Delhi, il forme l'USR 3330 du CNRS « Savoirs et Mondes Indiens ». Il remplit des missions de recherche, d'expertise et de formation en Sciences Humaines et Sociales et en Écologie dans le Sud et le Sud-est asiatiques. Il s'intéresse particulièrement aux savoirs et patrimoines culturels indiens (langue et littérature sanskrites, histoire des religions, études tamoules...), aux dynamiques sociales contemporaines, et aux écosystèmes naturels de l'Inde du Sud.

The French Institute of Pondicherry (IFP), UMIFRE 21 CNRS-MAE, is a financially autonomous institution under the joint supervision of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MAE) and the French National Centre of Scientific Research (CNRS). It is part of the network of 27 research centres under this Ministry. It also forms part of the research unit 3330 "Savoirs et Mondes Indiens" of the CNRS, along with the Centre de Sciences Humaines (CSH) in New Delhi. It fulfils missions of research, expertise and training in Human and Social Sciences and Ecology in South and South-East Asia. It works particularly in the fields of Indian cultural knowledge and heritage (Sanskrit language and literature, history of religions, Tamil studies...), contemporary social dynamics and the natural ecosystems of South India.

French Institute of Pondicherry, 11, St. Louis Street, P.B. 33, Pondicherry—605001, India

Tel: (413) 2231609, Email: ifpcom@ifpindia.org Website: <http://www.ifpindia.org>



L'École française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO), fondée en 1900 à Hanoï, est un établissement relevant du ministère français de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche dont la mission scientifique est l'étude des civilisations classiques de l'Asie. Son champ de recherches s'étend de l'Inde à la Chine et au Japon et, englobant l'ensemble du Sud-Est asiatique, comprend la plupart des sociétés qui furent indianisées ou sinisées au cours de l'histoire. Autour de ses dix-sept centres et antennes, installés dans douze pays d'Asie, se sont constitués des réseaux de chercheurs locaux et internationaux sur lesquels l'École a pu s'appuyer pour construire son essor. L'EFEO aborde l'Asie par des recherches pluridisciplinaires et comparatistes, associant l'archéologie, l'histoire, l'anthropologie, la philologie et les sciences religieuses. À Pondichéry, les projets de l'EFEO portent essentiellement sur l'indologie classique : sanskrit, tamoul ancien, histoire, histoire de l'art et des religions.

The mission of the French School of Asian Studies (EFEO), founded in 1900 in Hanoi and today under the aegis of the French Ministry of Higher Education and Research, is to study the classical civilisations of Asia. Stretching from India, in the West, across the whole of South-East Asia to China and Japan, the EFEO's research areas cover most of the societies which have been 'Indianised' or 'Sinicised' over the course of history. A network of international scholars working at the EFEO's seventeen centres and branch offices, which are spread across twelve Asian countries, has been essential in the development of the School's research programme. Interdisciplinary projects bring together scholars in the fields of anthropology, archaeology, history, philology and religious studies. In Pondicherry, the projects of the EFEO focus mainly on classical Indology: Sanskrit, Old Tamil, History, and History of art and of religions.

École française d'Extrême-Orient,
22, avenue du Président Wilson,
75116 Paris, France.

Tel: (33) 1 53 70 18 60

Website: <http://www.efeo.fr/>

Pondicherry Centre of the EFEO
16 & 19, Dumas Street,
Pondicherry—605 001, India.

Tel: (91) (413) 2334539/2332504

Email: administration@efeo-pondicherry.org

NETamil Series

Classical Tamil is among the oldest literary traditions of the Indian sub-continent, one that reaches back to the first centuries CE and that produced many literary, devotional and theoretical works for more than a thousand years.

The palm-leaf manuscripts at our disposal for the study of this literature are, at best, approximately three hundred years old, and the paper manuscripts for the most part are more recent still. In sharp contrast with current printed editions, these manuscripts exhibit an often bewildering degree of textual variation, from simple variants and occasional glosses to wide-ranging commentaries, many of which still await a first publication.

This wealth of primary material is inexorably yielding to the ravages of the sub-tropical climate and are for the most part not even properly catalogued. With each crumbling leaf, our chances of arriving at an understanding of how the Tamil intellectual universe was construed and interacted with other parts of the Indian world diminish.

Since 2012, an international team of scholars in India and in Europe has been studying these materials from the early stages of digitisation through collation to studies of codicology, text-critical analysis and cultural history.

The aim of this NETamil Series, the direct outcome of their endeavour, is to present significant studies in the field, and thereby to attempt to reconstruct the processes of interaction and transmission that took place prior to the putative ‘Tamil renaissance’ of the 19th century.

This series is published with the generous funding of the European Research Council within the framework of the NETamil Project - Going from Hand to Hand - Networks of Intellectual Exchange in the Tamil Learned Traditions (ERC Advanced Grant no. 339470).

Collection Indologie 137
NETamil Series 3

**GRAMMAR OF OLD TAMIL
FOR STUDENTS**

1st Edition

Eva Wilden

ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'EXTRÊME-ORIENT
INSTITUT FRANÇAIS DE PONDICHÉRY

Comité Scientifique / Advisory Board

Diwakar Acharya (Oxford University),
Nalini Balbir (Université de Paris III et École pratique des hautes études),
Peter Bisschop (Leiden University),
R. Champakalakshmi (Jawaharlal Nehru University, retired),
Alexander Dubianski (Moscow State University),
Arlo Griffiths (École française d'Extrême-Orient),
François Gros (École pratique des hautes études, retired),
Pascale Haag (École des hautes études en sciences sociales),
Oskar von Hinüber (University of Freiburg im Breisgau, retired),
Jan E. M. Houben (École pratique des hautes études),
Padma Kaimal (Colgate University),
Kei Kataoka (Kyushu University),
Vempati Kutumba Sastry (Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, retired),
R. Nagaswamy (Tamil Nadu State Department of Archaeology, retired),
Leslie Orr (Concordia University),
Aloka Parasher-Sen (University of Hyderabad),
Pierre Pichard (École française d'Extrême-Orient, retired),
Herman Tiekens (Leiden University).

Comité de Lecture / Peer-review

Les éditeurs font appel à des spécialistes de leur choix.
The publishers call on experts of their choice.

© École française d'Extrême-Orient, 2018 (ISBN 978-2-85539-232-5)
© Institut Français de Pondichéry, 2018 (ISBN 978-81-8470-227-9)

Typeset by: T. V. Kamalambal

Cover design: Ink and Paper Works and Emmanuel Siron

Printed at Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press, Pondicherry

Table of Contents

Preface.....	3
Abbreviations.....	6
Schedule.....	8
Introduction.....	9
Lists of Literary Works.....	14
GRAMMAR.....	20
SCRIPT AND PHONETICS.....	21
0.1 Table of Letters.....	21
0.2 Sandhi.....	22
NON-VERB WORD CLASSES.....	31
1.1 Nouns: types and declension.....	31
1.1.1 Cases.....	31
1.1.2 Types of Nouns.....	34
1.1.3 Indo-Aryan Loan Words.....	38
1.2 Pronouns.....	42
1.3 Adjectives.....	47
1.4 Adverbs.....	50
1.5 Numerals.....	52
1.6 Ideophones.....	54
1.7 Particles.....	56
NOUN PHRASES.....	58
2. Nominal Sentences.....	58
3. Attribution.....	63
4. String Attribution.....	66
5. Denominative.....	72

VERBS.....	76
6. <i>Viñaiyeccam</i>	83
7. Infinitive.....	92
8. <i>Peyareccam</i>	98
9a. Verbal Root	106
9b. Verbal Noun.....	111
10. Moods.....	117
11. Coordination and Question	122
12. Embedded Clauses	131
13. Conditional, Concessive, Causal Clauses.....	138
14. Negation	147
15a. Double Verb Forms.....	154
15b. Auxiliaries	160
SYNTAX.....	166
16. Particles and Word Order: -ē	166
17. Modal Particles	172
18. Circular Construction.....	179
19. Formulaic Repertoire	185
20. Metres.....	190
INDEXES	201
Index of Quotations.....	201
Index of Suffixes	206
Index of Grammatical Categories.....	213
Literature.....	220

Preface

A map of Old Tamil grammar would still show many blank patches, although the existing descriptive works are numerous, at least in comparison to what has been published for other Dravidian languages. One reason for this is that most of such descriptions have been written by people who approach the subject from the vantage point of modern Tamil and who see Old Tamil primarily as a precursor of their own language. Another reason is that the prolific, fascinating and invaluable tradition of *ilakkaṇam*, grammar, has been in certain respects as much of an obstacle as it has been of help in understanding. Moreover, the current grammatical representations of Old Tamil are lopsided in that they pay considerable and very detailed attention to morphology (which is in fact relatively simple) and next to none to syntax (which is in many languages hard to grasp and which, for Old Tamil, is now very hard to reconstruct fully). But it is perhaps an attitude of devotion to this ancient and remarkable literary language – a natural devotion may be, but one that has for political ends too often been whipped up into an unreflecting and distortive fervour – that has hampered the dispassionate study of Old Tamil. In consequence, the language is less well taught than it could be: to this day there is no grammar for students, no manuals, and few readers. Tamil has the aura of a religion, something not to be learned by the rod, but to be imbibed. It has become an emotive identity-marker for many Tamilians, and this often seems to mean that students from all backgrounds feel discouraged from asking questions about, for instance, how a given sentence is to be construed. Instead, they gradually school themselves to be content with a vague exposition of sentence-meanings that does not reveal details of sentence-structure.

That is the situation the Classical Tamil Winter and Summer Seminars (CTWS/CTSS) have been trying to remedy for the last fifteen years. This year the CTWS/CTSS went into its 16th year, which means that the beginners course was held for the 8th time. Although the Reader and the Grammar that grew out of these courses

are still far from adequate, significant progress has been made and it seems now time to put the Grammar to press so that it can serve a wider audience. The Reader will soon follow, but for now it has been put online on the NETamil website (www.netamil.org) under “Learning”, along with further (advanced) readers with full analytical glossaries, based on the material produced for the CTWS/CTSS. The grammar will doubtless continue to grow from continued scrutiny of the growing corpus whose language it attempts to describe, which we might characterise as almost all surviving Tamil literature of the first millennium. I say “almost”, since I am conscious that we are not making a concerted effort to work through the language of Tamil epigraphs. Since for most texts reliable editions, let alone statistics for their morphology and lexicon, are not available, the coverage is inevitably still patchy. Nonetheless, within the last ten years a number of critical editions have appeared and several more are under preparation by the NETamil team, and electronically searchable texts have also become markedly more numerous. Still, whenever I open a new book, I come across a form not yet included in these pages.

One strategy would be to distinguish strictly between the grammars of Early, Middle and Late Old Tamil as well as Middle Tamil, but such a periodisation, although it might make the task of grammatical description somewhat easier to order, would necessarily be distortive, since both absolute and relative chronology of Old Tamil literature is for the most part not well established and since many texts cover several strata. Moreover it would not be practical for students, who want a single reference work where they can find anything they might need. Thus both students and teachers will have to live with the fact that the area covered will continue to grow, along with the descriptive text and the account of syntax. Things might be speeding up because the community of scholars working in the field has definitely increased over the last ten years.

The book is still conceived as a companion volume to a one-month course, true to the original scheme of the CTWS/CTSS. It is thus divided into chapters that correspond to lessons numbered from 1 to 20, but arranged and numbered in such a way that the whole can be consulted as an independent grammar, starting with introductory

material, a treatment of sandhi, nominal morphology and syntax, verb morphology and syntax, poetics and metrics. The schedule page names the order in which the chapters are supposed to be taught and names the example texts brought together in the Reader. **Please note that examples throughout this grammar, when rendered in Tamil script, appear spaced according to scholarly conventions, namely with sandhi and metrical splitting, while the transcriptions in roman script mark instead the divisions between words.**

A select bibliography including the editions of the texts quoted as examples (in so far as no critical editions are available) and the works on grammar and lexicography mentioned in this grammar are added at the end.

There are many people I should thank for enabling me to bring together the material for this book and for helping me to correct it, first of all, of course, the scholars with whom I studied Tamil: S.A. Srinivasan, T.V. Gopal Iyer and T.S. Gangadharan, but also the colleagues from the *Caṅkam* project and now the NETamil project, who have been reading and discussing with me over all these years: my husband Jean-Luc Chevillard, Sascha Ebeling (with whom I first devised the Reader and with whom I was able to discuss the whole manuscript), Thomas Lehmann, G. Vijayavenugopal, T. Rajeswari, Indra Manuel, Emmanuel Francis, Suganya Anandakichenin, T. Rajarethinam, K. Nachimuthu, as well as all the students of the various CTWS and CTSS, many of them by now also colleagues, who have been coming to Pondicherry and asking questions. Special thanks for one final full round of discussions and correction go to the Hamburg team, Jonas Buchholz, Giovanni Ciotti, Victor D'Avella and Erin McCann. Further last-minute corrections were suggested by Hugo David. I am also grateful to Dominic Goodall and Charlotte Schmid, who first encouraged me to organise Tamil winter classes at the centre of the EFEO in Pondy. For the typesetting I thank T.V. Kamalambal. This book is the third to be published in the new NETamil series, generously funded by an Advanced Grant from the ERC.

Puducherry
March 2018

Eva Wilden

Abbreviations of Grammatical Terminology

abs.	absolute
acc.	accusative
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb
C	consonant
comp.	comparative
dat.	dative
f.	feminine
f.v.	finite verb
gen.	genitive
h.	honorific
hab.fut.	habitual future
i.a.	imperfective aspect
id.	ideophone
inf.	infinitive
inst.	instrumental
inter.pron.	interrogative pronoun
ipt.	imperative
loc.	locative
m.	masculine
n.	neuter
neg.	negative
O	object
obl.	oblique
opt.	optative
P	predicate
p.a.	perfective aspect
p.n.	proper name
part.n.	participial noun

<i>pey.</i>	<i>peyareccam</i>
pl.	plural
pron.n.	pronominalised noun
S	subject
sg.	singular
soc.	sociative
sub.	subjunctive
suff.	suffix
_u	overshort - <i>u</i> deleted before vowel
V	vowel
v.n.	verbal noun
voc.	vocative
v.r.	verbal root

Schedule

1 st week	Bhakti (<i>Tēvāram</i>, <i>Tiruvāymōḷi</i>), <i>Tirukkuraḷ</i>
Ch. 1	nominal forms (non-marking of cases, word order)
Ch. 2	nominal sentences (finite verb – participial noun – pronominalised noun)
Ch. 3	attribution (nouns, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs)
Ch. 6	clauses: <i>viṇaiyeccam</i> (absolutive/converb)
Ch. 7	clauses: infinitive
2 nd week	<i>Mutolḷāyiram</i>, <i>Peruṅkāppiyam</i> (<i>Cilappatikāram</i>, <i>Cīvaka Cintāmaṇi</i>)
Ch. 8	clauses: <i>peyareccam</i> , habitual future
Ch. 9a,b	verbal roots (for <i>peyareccam</i> and other forms), verbal nouns
Ch. 4	string attribution (mixed nominal and verbal forms)
Ch. 10	moods (verbal sentences, tenses/aspects)
Ch. 11	coordination and questions (<i>-um</i> , <i>-ō</i> , <i>-kol</i> , <i>kollō</i>)
3 rd week	Poetics and Commentaries (<i>Nakkīraṇ</i>'s preamble, TP)
Ch. 12	embedded clauses (<i>eṇ</i> , <i>āku</i> , <i>pōl</i>)
Ch. 13	clauses: conditional (factual and hypothetical), concessive and causal
Ch. 14	negation (<i>al/il</i> , zero suffix, negative stem, double verb forms)
Ch. 5	denominative (pronominalised nouns as predicate nouns)
Ch. 15	double verb forms, <i>mur̥reccam</i> and auxiliaries
4 th week	<i>Caṅkam</i> (<i>Puraṇānūru</i>, <i>Aiṅkuṛunūru</i>, <i>Kuṛuntokai</i>, <i>Narriṇai</i>)
Ch. 16	particles and word order (<i>-ē</i>)
Ch. 17	modal particles (<i>maṇ/maṇra</i> , <i>āl</i> , <i>amma</i> , <i>tilla</i> , <i>teyya</i>)
Ch. 18	circular construction (<i>pūṭṭuvil</i>)
Ch. 19	the formulaic repertoires and formulae as syntactic matrices
Ch. 20	metre: <i>Ācīriyappā</i> and <i>Veṇpā</i>

Introduction

For the purpose of this grammar, let us call classical Tamil the language that developed, or rather, was developed, out of the various dialects spoken throughout the southernmost part of the Indian subcontinent, as a literary medium and as a medium of intellectual discourse, during the course of the first millennium CE. Here, we shall neither be concerned with exact chronology, taking the beginning of the Common Era as a convenient starting point, nor with the relation of that entity to the language that has officially gained the title of “Classical Tamil” on the part of the Indian government in the year 2004. Our target is not the language of inscriptions, which starts considerably earlier, but the literary and theoretical works that have been preserved in manuscripts, all of them in metrical form, that is, the *Caṅkam*-corpus, the *Kīlkaṇakku*-works, the five “great poems” (Tamil *peruṅkāppiyam* ~ Skt. *mahākāvya*-) of which only three have survived, the Śaiva bhakti corpus called the Twelve *Tirumurai*, the Vaiṣṇava bhakti corpus called the *Nāḷāyirat Tivyappirapantam*, the grammatical treatises and thesauri that start with the *Tolkāppiyam*, a few other great poems that have not been included among the five, as well as a number of other poetic works that still belong to the same period but cannot be conveniently classified as part of a corpus. For an overview of genres and periods, see the attached folding sheets at the beginning.

Again for the sake of convenience we may distinguish three phases of Old Tamil, namely Early, Middle and Late Old Tamil, followed, around the turn of the 10th century, by Middle Tamil, in its turn followed, in the 19th century, by Modern (Formal) Tamil. The table below lists the most tangible features of each phase along with some texts that belong to it, but it has to be kept in mind that not a single text (most of them anthologies) exhibits features of only one of these

phases. The reason for this is partly that many texts were generated over a longer period of time, but partly also that it is not always easy to distinguish temporal from regional variations.

Old Tamil: *0-1000 AD

Early Old Tamil	<i>Kuruntokai, Narriṇai, Aka-nānūru, Puranānūru, Aiṇ-kurunūru, Patirruppattu, Pattuppāṭṭu</i>	stable word order, particles, old pronouns, honorific, formulae, Āciryappā
Middle Old Tamil	<i>Kīlkkāṇakku, Cilappati-kāram, Paripāṭal, Antāti-s, Kalittokai</i>	old morphology, new style/content new pronouns + plural, word order and particle chaos, hybrid forms, rarely present tense, Venpā + <i>etukai</i> rhyme
Late Old Tamil	<i>Tēvaram, Tiruvāymoḷi, Muttollāyiram, Cintāmaṇi, Tirukkōvaiyār, Periyatirumoḷi</i> [<i>Kamparamāyaṇam</i> , 12 th c.]	metrical revolution + <i>etukai</i> , standardisation of present tense, plural and pronouns; less pronouns, fewer formulae, new vocabulary
Middle Tamil: 1000-1900 AD		new auxiliaries, (Commentary prose)

Modern Tamil: 19th century

As for the transition from Old to Middle Tamil, stipulated for example by Zvelebil 1957a, there are no statistics that would demonstrate a clear shift and further morphological changes. Until the literature of the second millennium has been treated in more detail, we may assume that two factors justify the designation, namely, firstly, the gradual vanishing of many older forms except in some frozen expressions and, secondly, the development of commentary prose.

The list found at the bottom of this page shows the most important morphological changes that occur in the transition from Early Old Tamil to Middle and Late Old Tamil. More important than morphology, however, are two shifts in orientation that concern the overall syntactic patterns of the language. To begin with, Early Old Tamil is a language with very little explicit morphological mark-up (especially with respect to case suffixes) and a correspondingly strict word order complemented by a system of particles for modes and tenses, not unlike what is known from languages such as Classical Chinese. Probably through the influence of literary Sanskrit along with the newly developing rhyme patterns (*etukai*), the strict word order is gradually weakened, to be supplanted by more explicit morphology in the course of time, although it never reaches the freedom of a highly inflected Indo-European language. The particle system simply disintegrates and is lost (except as metrical filler). Moreover, the verb in Early Old Tamil is better described as marked by aspect rather than by tense. The two old aspects, imperfective (present, future, hypothetical) and perfective (past, aorist, irreal), in most grammars simply called non-past and past, later become future and past respectively with the development of a modal auxiliary construction based on the verb *kil-tal*, “to be able to”, into the present tense in -கின்ற- *-kinr-*.

- personal pronouns: 1st singular nominative யான் *yān* > நான் *nān*
 2nd singular oblique stem நின் *niṇ* > உன் *uṇ*
- plural suffixes: -கள் *-kaḷ* (first for neuter, then added to old honorific
 -அர்/-ஆர் *-ar/-ār*, then gradually taking over)
 -காள் *-kāḷ* for vocative
 -மார் *-mār* for 3rd plural
 -மீர் *-mīr* for 2nd plural
- present tense: -கின்ற- *-kinr-*
- negative absolute: -ஆமல் *-āmal*

- special conditionals: -ஏல் *-ēl* (after root, after *peyareccam* and finite verb, after noun)
 -ஆகில் *-ākil*
 -இல் *-il*
 -ஆல் *-āl* (mostly already after absolutive, but also found after finite forms)
- special imperatives: -ஏல் *-ēl* (negative)
 -மின்கள் *-minkaḷ* (old form plus plural suffix)
 -ஈர்கள் *-īrkaḷ*

It is possible to be more specific about the genesis of the oldest corpus, that of the *Caṅkam*, at least with respect to those texts for which critical editions have appeared or are under preparation in the Pondicherry *Caṅkam* project. To briefly sum up a complicated process, after an undetermined number of centuries of oral transmission the first anthologies began to be compiled, probably under the Pāṇṭiya aegis. The oldest parts of the corpus are, in Akam (erotic genre), *Kuruntokai*, *Narriṇai*, *Akanānūru* and, in Puṇam (heroic genre), *Puranānūru*, though the latter two especially contain much younger material. Further in linguistic and poetic development, but still rather close appear the Cēra anthologies *Aiṅkurunūru* (Akam) and *Patirruppattu* (Puṇam). The first indication of anthologisation is the former invocation stanza of the *Kuruntokai*, now counted as *Kuruntokai* 1, but in fact a very early form of devotional poem dedicated to Murukaṇ, perhaps from the late 5th century. Probably in the early 7th century, or at least definitely before the pervasive sectarian splits of the bhakti period, there is evidence for the first hyper-anthology containing all the six texts mentioned so far, that is, both Pāṇṭiya and Cēra, on the initiative of the Pāṇṭiyas: We find preserved a series of five invocation stanzas by the hand of Pāratampāṭiya Peruntēvaṇār, and the conjecture is reasonable that there was a sixth in the lost beginning of the *Patirruppattu*.

In parallel, but slightly later, the songs now contained in the second hyper-anthology, the *Pattuppāṭṭu*, developed, with new advances in poetics, morphology and lexicon, and a growing number of Sanskrit loans. Very late, and probably related rather to the later Pāṇṭiya resurrection of the earliest poetry than to the earlier literary production itself, come the last two anthologies that we know today as elements of the *Eṭṭuttokai*, that is, the *Kalittokai* and the *Paripāṭal*. The first references to the actual hyper-anthologies *Pattuppāṭṭu* and *Eṭṭuttokai* are found in the grammatical commentary tradition from the 12th century onwards [for a detailed account, see Wilden 2014].

time	Text traditions					
	Pāṇṭiya, Cēra, Cōla		Cēra	Pāṇṭiya		Pāṇṭiya, Cēra, Cōla
	Akam	Puṛam	Akam/Puṛam	Akam	mixed	mixed
1.-3. c.	Kuṟuntokai Narriṇai Akanāṇūru	Puṛa- nāṇūru				
4. c.	↓	↓	Aiṅkuṟunūru Patirrupattu			Neṭunalvātai Porunarārruppaṭai Cirupāṇārruppaṭai Perumpāṇārruppaṭai
5. c.	↓ KT 1	↓				Malaiṇṭuṭaṭam Kuṟiṇṇippāṭṭu Paṭṭiṇappālai Mullaippāṭṭu Maturaikkāñci
6. c.	↓	↓		Kalittokai	Paripāṭal	Tirumurukārruppaṭai
7. c.	kaṭavuḷ vāḷttu-s	→	→	→	?	
	Pāṇṭiya			Pāṇṭiya		Pāṇṭiya, Cēra, Cōla
12.c.	“Eṭṭutokai”					“Pattuppāṭṭu”

table of basic chronology of the *Caṅkam* corpus

Lists of Literary Works of the First Millennium CE

It is not easy to calculate the precise extent of the works listed below. Those in Ācīriyam metre are simply counted by line, those in stanzas, that is, from Venṇā onwards, are counted by stanza (that is, four or, exceptionally, two lines). But since the various metres range from two metrical feet to eight metrical feet per line and since moreover the works in mixed metres also contain Ācīriyam passages of variable length regarded as stanzas, the count is very imprecise. Still, better some vague idea than no idea at all. The works included into text bodies belonging to the first millennium that were not composed within this time frame have been marked by square brackets.

Complete list of the *Eṭṭuttokai*

1. *Kuruntokai* (402 poems, 2504 lines; no commentary)
2. *Narriṇai* (400 poems, 4180 lines; no commentary)
3. *Akanānūru* (401 poems, 7151 lines; anonymous comm. on AN 1-90)
4. *Puranānūru* (400 poems, 5448 lines; anonymous comm. on PN 1-250)
5. *Aiṅkurunūru* (501+ poems, 2163 lines; anonymous commentary)
6. *Patirruppattu* (80+ poems, 1711 lines; anonymous commentary)
7. *Kalittokai* (150 poems, 4314 lines; comm. by Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar)
8. *Paripāṭal* (22+ poems, 1833 lines; comm. by Parimēlaḷakar)

Complete list of the *Pattuppāṭṭu* (3552 lines)

1. *Tirumurukārruppāṭai* (317 l.; comm. by Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar, Parimēlaḷakar, etc.)
2. *Porunarārruppāṭai* (248 lines; comm. by Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar)
3. *Cirupaṇārruppāṭai* (269 lines; comm. by Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar)
4. *Perumpāṇārruppāṭai* (500 lines; comm. by Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar)
5. *Mullaippāṭṭu* (103 lines; comm. by Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar)
6. *Maturaiḱkāñci* (782 lines; comm. by Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar)

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| 7. <i>Neṭunalvātai</i> | (188 lines; comm. by Naccinārkkiniyar) |
| 8. <i>Kuṛiṇcippāṭṭu</i> | (261 lines; comm. by Naccinārkkiniyar) |
| 9. <i>Paṭṭinappālai</i> | (301 lines; comm. by Naccinārkkiniyar) |
| 10. <i>Malaipatuḱaṭām</i> | (583 lines; comm. by Naccinārkkiniyar) |

Complete List of *Paṭiṇeṇ Kīlkkāṇakku*:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. <i>Nālaṭiyār</i> | (didactic, 400 stanzas; comm. by Patumaṇār, Tarumaṇār, etc.) |
| 2. <i>Nāṇmaṇikkaṭikai</i> | (didactic, anonymous comm.; 101 stanzas) |
| 3. <i>Inṇānāṛpatu</i> | (didactic, anonymous comm.; 40 stanzas) |
| 4. <i>Inṇiyavaināṛpatu</i> | (didactic, anonymous comm.; 40 stanzas) |
| 5. <i>Kārnāṛpatu</i> | (Akam, anonymous comm.; 40 stanzas) |
| 6. <i>Kaḷavalināṛpatu</i> | (Puram, anonymous comm.; 40 stanzas) |
| 7. <i>Aintiṇaiyaṁpatu</i> | (Akam, anonymous comm.; 50 stanzas) |
| 8. <i>Aintiṇaiyeḷupatu</i> | (Akam, anonymous comm.; 69 stanzas) |
| 9. <i>Tiṇaimoliyaṁpatu</i> | (Akam, anonymous comm.; 50 stanzas) |
| 10. <i>Tiṇaimālainūrraimpatu</i> | (Akam, anonymous comm.; 154 stanzas) |
| 11. <i>Tirukkuraḷ</i> | (didactic, comm. by Maṇakkuṭavar, Parimēlaḷakar, etc.; 1330 couplets) |
| 12. <i>Ācārakkōvai</i> | (didactic, anonymous comm.; 100 stanzas) |
| 13. <i>Paḷamoḷi</i> | (didactic, anonymous comm.; 400 stanzas) |
| 14. <i>Cirupaṇcamūlam</i> | (didactic, anonymous comm.; 102 stanzas) |
| 15. <i>Mutumoliḱkāñci</i> | (didactic, anonymous comm.; 10 stanzas) |
| 16. <i>Ēlāti</i> | (didactic, anonymous comm.; 80 stanzas) |
| 17. <i>Kainnilai</i> | (Akam, anonymous comm.; 60 stanzas) |
| 18. <i>Tirikaṭukam</i> | (didactic, anonymous comm., 100 stanzas) |
| [19. <i>Inṇilai</i> | (didactic; 45 stanzas) probably spurious] |

Complete list of the *Paṇṇiru Tirumurai*

TM I-III:	1. Campantar:	<i>Tēvāram</i> (385 decades)
TM IV-VI:	2. Appar:	<i>Tēvāram</i> (312 decades)
TM VII:	3. Cuntarar:	<i>Tēvāram</i> (101 decades)
TM VIII:	4. Māṇikkavācakar:	<i>Tiruvācakam</i> (652 stanzas + 646 lines), <i>Tirukkōvaiyār</i> (400 stanzas; comm. by Pēraciriyar)
TM IX:	5. Tirumālikaittēvar, 6. Karuvūrttēvar, 7. Pūnturutti Nampikāṭanampī, 8. Kaṇṭarāttittar, 9. Vēṇāṭṭaṭikal, 10. Tiruvāḷiyamutaṇār, 11. Puruṭṭottamanampī, 12. Cētirāyar:	<i>Tiruvicaippā</i>
	13. Cēntaṇār:	<i>Tiruvicaippā</i> , <i>Tiruppallāṇṭu</i> (301 stanzas)
TM X:	14. Tirumūlar:	<i>Tirumantiram</i> , <i>Tantiram</i> 1-9 (3000 stanzas)
TM XI:	15. Tiruvālavāyuṭaiyar:	<i>Tirumukappācuram</i> (12 lines)
	16. Kāraikkāl Ammaiṭṭar:	<i>Arputat Tiruvantāti</i> , <i>Tiruviraṭṭaimaṇimālai</i> , <i>Tiruvalaṅkāṭṭu Patikam-s</i> (143 stanzas)
	17. Aiyāṭikal Kāṭavar Kōṇ:	<i>Kṣētirattiruvenpā</i> (24 stanzas)
	18. Cēramāṇ Perumāḷ:	<i>Poṇvaṇṇattantāti</i> , <i>Tirukkayilāyaṇṇavulā</i> , <i>Ārūrmummaṇikkōvai</i> (135 stanzas + 190 lines)

19. Nakkīratēvar: *Kayilaipāti Kaḷattipāṭiyantāti,
Tiruvīṅkōymalai, Eluppatu,
Tiruvālāṅcuḷi Mummaṇikkōvai,
Tiruveḷukūrṛirukkai, Peruntēvapāṇi,
Kōppiracātam, Kār Eṭṭu, Pōrṛit
Tirukkalivenpā,
Tirumurukārruppaṭai,
Tirukaṇṇappatēvar Tirumaram* (189
stanzas + 725 lines)
20. Kallātātēvar: *Tirukkaṇṇappatēvar Tirumaram* (38
lines)
21. Kapilatēvar: *Mūttanāyaṇār
Tiruviraṭṭaimaṇimālai,
Civaperumāṇ
Tiruviraṭṭaimaṇimālai,
Civaperumāṇ Tiruvantāti* (157
stanzas)
22. Paraṇātēvar: *Civaperumāṇ Tiruvantāti* (101
stanzas)
23. Iḷamperumāṇ Aṭikaḷ: *Civaperumāṇ Tirumummaṇikkōvai*
(30 stanzas)
24. Atirāvaṭikaḷ: *Mūttapiḷḷayār Tirumummaṇikkōvai*
(23 stanzas)
25. Paṭṭiṇattup Piḷḷaiyār: *Kōyil Nāṇmaṇimālai, Tirukkaḷumala
Mummaṇikkōvai, Tiruviṭaimarutūr
Mummaṇikkōvai,
Tiruvēkampamuṭaiyār Tiruvantāti,
Tiruvorriyūr Orupā Orupatu* (192
stanzas)
- [26. Nampi Āṇṭār Nampi: *Tirunaraiyūr Vināyakar
Tiruviraṭṭaimaṇimālai, Kōyil
Tiruppaṇṇiyar Viruttam, Tiruttoṇṭar
Tiruvantāti, Āḷuṭaiya Piḷḷaiyār
Tiruvantāti, Āḷuṭaiya Piḷḷaiyār*

*Tiruccaṇpaiviruttam Āḷuṭaiya
Piḷḷaiyār Mummaṇikkōvai Āḷuṭaiya
Piḷḷaiyār Tiruvulāmālai, Āḷuṭaiya
Piḷḷaiyār Tirukkalampakam,
Āḷuṭaiya Piḷḷaiyār Tiruttokai,
Tirunāvukkaracu Tēvar
Tiruvēkāta Mālai (369 st./211 l.)*

TM XII: 27. Cēkkiḷār:

*Tiruttoṇṭar purāṇam =
Periyapurāṇam (3634 st.)]*

Complete List of the *Nālāyirat Tivyappirapantam*

1. Poykaiyālṽr: *First Tiruvantāti* (100 stanzas)
2. Pūtattālṽr: *Second Tiruvantāti* (100 stanzas)
3. Pēyālṽr: *Third Tiruvantāti* (100 stanzas)
4. Tirumālīcaiṽ: *Tiruccantaviruttam, Nāṇmukam Tiruvantāti*
(220 stanzas)
5. Nammālṽr: *Tiruviruttam, Tiruvācīriyam, Periyatiruvantāti,*
Tiruvāymoḷi (1293 stanzas)
6. Periyālṽr: *Periyālṽr Tirumoḷi* (473 stanzas)
7. Āṇṭāl: *Tiruppāvai, Nācciyār Tirumoḷi* (173 stanzas)
8. Tirumaṅkaiṽ: *Periyatirumoḷi, Tirukuruntāṇṭakam,*
Tiruneṭuntāṇṭakam, Tiruvelukūrrirukkai,
Cīriyatirumaṭal, Periyatirumaṭal (1152 stanzas)
9. Kulacēkaraṇā: *Perumāḷ Tirumoḷi* (104 stanzas)
10. Tiruppāṇā: *Amalaṇātippirāṇ* (10 stanzas)
11. Toṇṭaratiṭoṭiyā: *Tirumālai, Tirupalliyelucci* (55 stanzas)
12. Madhurakaviyā: *Kaṇṇinuṇ Cīruttāmpu* (11 stanzas)
- [13. *Irāmānujanūrrantāti* (108 stanzas)]

List of first-millennium “Epics” = *Aimperuṅkāppiyam*

1. *Cilappatikāram* (5246 lines; anon. comm., comm. by Aṭṭiyārkkunallār)
2. *Maṇimēkalai* (4856 lines)
3. *Cīvaka Cintāmaṇi* (3145 stanzas; comm. by Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar)
4. *Valaiyāpati* [lost, except for some quotations]
5. *Kuṇṭalakēci* [lost, except for some quotations]

Peruṅkatai (ca. 16 000 lines; incomplete)

Culāmaṇi (2130 stanzas)

Nīlakēci (894 stanzas; comm. by Camayativākarar)

Further miscellaneous poetic works of the first millennium

Pāṇṭikkōvai (350 stanzas)

Muttoḷḷāyiram (107 stanzas)

Nantikkalampakam (113 stanzas)

Pāratāveṇpā (339 stanzas)

[*Kallāṭam* (100 poems = 3337 lines)]

GRAMMAR

So far no comprehensive grammar of classical Tamil has been published. Among the works dealing also with pre-modern morphology Beythan 1943 and Andronov 1969 can be named, the former being especially useful for its excellent paradigms of the verbal classes, but written in German.¹ There are several grammars restricted to the *Caṅkam* corpus, the most voluminous being Rajam 1992 (without index). Specialised even further (on the *Patirruppattu*) but dealing extensively with the old verb forms is Agesthalingom 1979. Another sub-corpus (that of the poet Kapilar) is treated by Lehmann 1994, again in German. For a brief outline of Old Tamil language, see the article Lehmann 1998. None of them treats the far more important questions of syntax. One further drawback of all the existing grammars is that they had to rely on preliminary text editions with many forms edited out as dialectal or simply “wrong”. A comprehensive grammar based at last on the forthcoming critical editions is under preparation in Pondicherry. The goal of the present work, however, is to give an overview of both morphology and syntax of the Tamil language of the first millennium for didactic purposes into the hands of students.

¹ Although conceived rather as a manual on later pre-modern formal Tamil, many old forms are included in Beythan’s book, if in footnotes, and his extensive remarks on syntax remain useful to this day.

SCRIPT AND PHONETICS

0.1 Table of Letters

The Classical Tamil alphabet is not different from the modern one, except for one special rare letter called *āytam* (mostly used in sandhi). It is, like most Indian scripts, of an abugida type, that is, inherent in the consonant is the letter அ *a* unless cancelled by a dot above the letter (*pulli*). All other vowels are added to the consonant letter either with special characters or in consonant-vowel ligatures. The stand-alone vowel characters are restricted to the beginning of a verse. Except for gemination and nasals, consonant clusters do not exist. Single consonants are voiced if intervocalic or preceded by a nasal, consonants at the beginning of a word and double consonants are unvoiced.

Vowels

அ	ஆ	இ	ஈ	உ	ஊ	எ	ஏ	ஐ	ஒ	ஔ	ஔள
a	ā	i	ī	u	ū	e	ē	ai	o	ō	au

Consonants

guttural:	க k	ங ṅ		
palatal:	ச c	ஞ ṇ		
retroflex:	ட ṭ	ண ṇ	ள ḷ	
dental:	த t	ந n		
labial:	ப p	ம m		
semi-vowel:	ய y	ர r	ல l	வ v
alveolar:	ற் ṛ	ன் ṇ		
retroflex approximant:	ழ ḷ			
<i>āytam</i> :	ஃ ḳ			

0.2 Sandhi in Classical Tamil²

Sandhi in Classical Tamil is a complicated and controversial issue, not only because much of it allows for alternatives, but also because there are in fact several sets of rules (the earliest from the *Tolkāppiyam Eluttatikāram*), and it is often not clear who is following which set. In under-marked Tamil palm-leaf notation it is sandhi in interaction with metre that helps resolve a good number of ambiguities in the script, while at the same time retaining others that will be lost in more modern notation. The most notable case is the oblique form in -இன் *-in*, rendered in modern editions invariably as the locative -இல் *-il*, in sandhi both -இன் *-in*. That is one reason why scribes and early editors painstakingly followed the rules, although it is not always clear which rules exactly. Text editions from the 1940s onwards have gradually done away with sandhi, up to present-day editions which keep just the bare-bone modern Tamil prose rules. [For earlier lists, see Andronov 1969, §§ 15-23, and Beythan 1943, §§ 21-28.]

The first rule that confuses students is that no word, or, properly speaking, no metrical foot (*cīr*), is allowed to begin with a vowel, except at the very beginning of a poem. For that reason the final consonant of any word at the end of a metrical foot is combined with a vowel beginning the next word/*cīr*.

Vowel sandhi

Final அ, ஆ, உ, ஊ, ஒ, ஓ *a, ā, u, ū, o, ō* (back vowels) both within the word and at word boundaries insert the glide -வ- *-v-* before any

² This list is an elaboration of the original one made by Sascha Ebeling for the first CTSS.

other vowel: சேர்ப்ப வோம்புமதி *cērppa-v-ōmpumati*, “Man from the coast, beware!”

Final இ, ஈ, எ, ஏ, ஐ *i, ī, e, ē, ai* (front vowels) both within the word and at word boundaries insert the glide -y- before any other vowel: கொன்றை யிணர் *konrai-y-iṇar*, “cluster of laburnum”.

Elision of the final vowel is mostly restricted to final -உ -u, counted as over-short (metrically discounted) unless at the end of a two-syllable word with short vowel and single consonant (திரு *tiru*, “Śrī”). The over-short final -u is elided before any vowel: வண்டு இனம் > வண்டினம் *vaṇṭu + iṇam = vaṇṭiṇam*, “swarm of bees”.

Overshort -உ -u followed by ய- y- becomes over-short (metrically discounted) இ- i-:

வெள் கோட்டு யானை *veḷ + kōṭṭu + yānai* > வெண்கோட் டியானை *veṇkōṭṭiyānai* “white tusked elephant”³

Exceptions are made for two-syllable adjectives ending in -u, although not regarded as over-short in the grammatical tradition. Such an adjective if followed by a vowel has mostly two options, namely either lengthening its first vowel or doubling the consonant:

சிறு இலை *ciru + ilai* > சிற்றிலை *cirrilai* or சீறிலை *cīrilai*, “small leaf”⁴, but only அரு இரவு *aru + iravu* > ஆரிரவு *āriravu*, “difficult night”.

The lengthening of the vowel also applies to some numerals and to the sociative suffix -ஓது:

ஒரு பெயர் *oru peyar*, “one name”, but ஓரூர் *ōrūr*, “one village”

³ A rare and probably hypercorrect parallel is கான் *kān* + யாறு *yāru* > கானியாறு *kāniyāru*, “forest river”.

⁴ A rare additional possibility is சிறியிலை *ciriyilai*, possibly a precursor of the modern adjectival form சிறிய *ciriyā*.

எழு பிறப்பு *elū pirappu*, “seven births”, but ஏழுலகு *ēlulaku*, “seven worlds”

பெடையொடு சேவல் *peṭaiyoṭu cēval*, “the rooster with [its] female”, but பிணையோ டிரலை *piṇaiyō ṭiralai* ~ *piṇaiyōṭṭu iralai*, “the Iralai stag with [its] doe”

Exceptions are made for some monosyllabic adjectives and some pronouns:

செம் அடி *cem + aṭi* > சேவடி *cēvaṭi*, “red foot”

செம் இழை *cem + ilai* > சேயிழை *cēyilai*, “red jewel”

வெம் வரை *vem + varai* > வெவ்வரை *vevvarai*, “hot mountain”

அ- இடை *a- + iṭai* > ஆயிடை *āyiṭai*, “in between”

அது -ஏ *atu + -ē* > ஆதே *ātē* or அஃதே *aktē*, “that”

An exceptional vowel elision is made with an optative followed by any form of the quotative verb என்னுதல் *ennutal*, “to say”. The form வருகென்றாள் *varukenṛāl* may either be understood as வருகு என்றாள் *varuku enṛāl*, “she said ‘I will come’”, or as வருக என்றாள் *varuka enṛāl*, “she said ‘you may come’”.

Exceptional cases for -அ -*a* merging with அ- *a-* into -அ- -*a-* are found in some particle combinations, such as மன்றம்ம *maṇṛamma* (for மன்ற *maṇṛa* + அம்ம *amma*) and in *peyareccam* compounds with the comparative stem அ(ன்)னை- *a(n)ṇai-*, “to be like that”, as in மறந்தனையேன் *maranta + aṇaiyēn*, “I am like someone who has forgotten”.

Consonant sandhi

The nasal *m* followed by a consonant assimilates within the word and at word boundaries into the class nasal:

$m + k > nk$ பெரும் குன்று *perum + kunru* > பெருங்குன்று
perunkunru, “big hill”

$m + c > nc$ அம் சிலம்பு *am + cilampu* > அஞ்சிலம்பு *añcilampu*,
 “pretty anklet”

$m + t > nt$ குறும் தொகை *kurum + tokai* > குறுந்தொகை
kuruntokai, “anthology of short [poems]”

In compounds or for a case relation, final -ம் -*m* may be substituted by the gemination of the following consonant:

$m + k/c/t/p > kk/cc/tt/pp$ கமலம் கண் *kamalam + kaṇ* >
 கமலக்கண் *kamalakkaṇ* “lotus eye”
 நம் துறந்து *nam + turantu* >
 நத்துறந்து *natturantu*, “having
 abandoned us”

Similarly, in compounds or for a case relation, final -ம் -*m* may be dropped before வ்- *v-* and ய்- *y-*: புகர்முக வேழம் *pukar muka(m) vēlam*, “elephant bull with a spotted face”, கான யானை *kāna(m) yānai*, “forest elephant”.

Final -ம் -*m* followed by a nasal, ம்- *m-*, ந்- *n-*, ஞ்- *ñ-*, is simply dropped, unless -ம் -*m* is at the end of a monosyllabic word with a short vowel, in which case it is assimilated to the class nasal.

$m + m > m$ நாமம் மாறும் *nāmam + mārum* > நாமமாரும்
nāmamārum “the name will change”
 $m + n > n$ மரம் நீண்டது *maram + nīṇṭatu* > மரநீண்டது
maranīṇṭatu “the tree grew long”
 $m + m > mm$ செம் மண் *cem + maṇ* > செம்மண் *cemmaṇ* “red
 earth”
 $m + n > nn$ வெம் நீர் *vem + nīr* > வெந்நீர் *vennīr* “hot water”
 $m + ñ > ññ$ தம் ஞாண் *tam + ñāṇ* > தஞ்ஞாண் *taññāṇ* “their
 string”

The two further nasals possible in final position are retroflex -ண் -ṇ and alveolar -ன் -n.⁵

Word-final -ண் -ṇ followed by த்- *t*- or ந்- *n*- causes assimilation:

$\underline{n} + t > \underline{n}t$ தண் துறை *taṇ + turai* > தண்டுறை *taṇṭurai*,
“cool ghat”

$\underline{n} + n > \underline{nn}$ கண் நீர் *kaṇ + nīr* > கண்ணீர் *kaṇṇīr*, “tears”

The letter -ண் -ṇ followed by க்- *k*-, ச்- *c*-, or ப்- *p*- inside a word must become -ட் -ṭ, thus forming the clusters -ட்க் -ṭk-, -ட்ச் -ṭc-, -ட்ப் -ṭp-, the same is optional at a word boundary: பெரும் பூண் சென்னி *perum-pūṇ cenni* > பெரும்பூட் சென்னி *perumpūṭ cenni*, “Cenni with large ornaments”; கடும் கண் பன்றி *kaṭum kaṇ paṇri* < கடுங்கட் பன்றி *kaṭuṅkaṭ paṇri*, “fierce-eyed hog”.

Word-final -ன் -n followed by ந்- *n*- causes assimilation and is then dropped, unless at the end of a short monosyllabic word with a short vowel:

$\underline{n} + n > \underline{n}$ தோழியின் நெஞ்சம் *tōliyin + neñcam* > தோழியி
னெஞ்சம் *tōliyi neñcam*, “the friend’s heart”

$\underline{n} + n > \underline{nn}$ என் நெஞ்சம் *eṇ + neñcam* > என்னெஞ்சம் *enneñcam*,
“my heart”

Word-final -ன் -n followed by க்- *k*-, ச்- *c*-, த்- *t*-, ப்- *p*- occasionally may change:

$\underline{n} + k > \underline{rk}$ அறத்தின் காக்கும் *aṛattin + kākkum* > அறத்திற்
காக்கும் *aṛattir kākkum*, “that is guarded by
dharma”, but நாடன் கேண்மை *nāṭaṇ kēṇmai*,
“intimacy with the man from the land”

⁵ An exception is the *Caṇkam* word *verin*, “back”.

- $\underline{n} + t > \underline{nr}$ or \underline{rr} என் தோழி *en* + *tōli* > என்றோழி *enrōli*, “my friend”, நின் துறந்து *nin* + *turantu* > நிற்றுறந்து *nir_rurantu*, “abandoning you”
- $\underline{n} + p > \underline{rp}$ இறும்பின் பாம்பு *irumpin* *pāmpu* > இறும்பிற் பாம்பு *irumpir* *pāmpu*, “snake in the thicket”, but தலைவன் பாங்கன் *talaivan* *pāṅkan*, “the friend of the hero”, துன்பம் *tunpam*, “sorrow”

Final -ய் -y can cause ம்- *m*- to geminate: பொய் மொழி *poy* + *moli* > பொய்ம்மொழி *poymmoli*, “false word”

Final -ல் -*l* can change into alveolar nasal or stop in quite an astonishing number of circumstances, many of them optional.

- $\underline{l} + k > \underline{rk}$ திரள்கால் குவளை *tiral-kāl* *kuvalai* > திரள்காற் குவளை *tiral-kār* *kuvalai*, “round-stemmed blue water-lily”
- $\underline{l} + c > \underline{rc}$ or \underline{nc} இல் செறிப்பு *il* + *cerippu* > இற்செறிப்பு *ircerippu*, “being confined in the house”; மெல் சாயல் *mel* + *cāyal* > மென்சாயல் *meṇcāyal*, “soft beauty”
- $\underline{l} + p > \underline{rp}$ or \underline{np} நுதல் பசப்பு *nutal* + *pacappu* > நுதற்பசப்பு *nutar* *pacappu*, “pallor of the forehead”, வல் புலம் *val* + *pulam* < வன்புலம் *vanpulam*, “hard soil”
- $\underline{l} + t > \underline{r}$ or \underline{nr} or \underline{rr} or \underline{kr} அழல் துடங்கினாள் *alal* + *tuṭaṅkiṇaḷ* > அழ் றுடங்கினள் *alaruṭaṅkiṇaḷ*, “she started to cry”; நல் தாய் *nal* + *tāy* > நற்றாய் *narrāy* “real mother”; அல் திணை *al* + *tiṇai* > அஃதிணை *aktiṇai*, “non-class” = neuter
- $\underline{l} + m > \underline{nm}$ சொல் மாலை *col* + *mālai* > சொன்மாலை *conmālai*, “word garland”

$l + n > \underline{n}$ or \underline{nn} நுதல் நீவி *nutal nīvi* > நுதனீவி *nutaṇīvi*,
 “stroking the forehead”; நல் நகர் *nal + nakar* >
 நன்னகர் *nannakar*, “good mansion”

Final -ள் -*l* changes into its class nasal or stop within a word or compound and optionally at word boundaries:

$l + k > \underline{tk}$ or \underline{nk} மகள் *makaḷ* + -கு *-ku* > மகட்கு *makaṭku*, “to the daughter”; வெள் குடை *veḷ + kuṭai* > வெண்குடை *veṇkuṭai*, “white parasol”; but வருந்தினள் கொல்லோ *varuntinaḷ-kollō*, “did she suffer?”

$l + c > \underline{tc}$ or \underline{nc} ஒள் சுடர் *oḷ + cuṭar* < ஒண்சுடர் *oṇcuṭar*, bright glow”

$l + p > \underline{tp}$ or \underline{np} கேட்ப *kēṭpa*, inf. of கேள்-தல் *kēḷ-tal*, “to hear”; மகள் போக்கிய தாய் *makaḷ + pōkkiya tāy* > மகட்போக்கிய தாய் *makaṭpōkkiya tāy*, “the mother who had let her daughter go”; but மீன்கொள் பரதவர் *mīn koḷ paratavar*, “fish-taking fishermen”; ஒண்பழம் *oṇpalam*, “bright fruit”

$l + t > \underline{t}$ or \underline{tt} ஒளிறு வாள் தாணை *oḷiru vāḷ + tāṇai* > ஒளிறுவாட் டாணை *oḷiruvāṭ ṭāṇai*, “an army with shining swords”; நாள் தொறும் *nāḷ + tōrum* > நாடோறும் *nāṭōrum* “daily”

$l + m > \underline{nm}$ பைய்யுள் மாலை *paiyyuḷ + mālai* > பைய்யுண் மாலை *paiyyuṇ mālai*, “sorrowful evening”

$l + n > \underline{n}$ or \underline{nn} தெள் நீர் *teḷ + nīr* > தெண்ணீர் *teṇṇīr*, “clear water”; வாள் நுதல் *vāḷ nutal* > வாணுதல் *vāṇutal*, “bright forehead”

Consonant gemination

க் *k*, ச் *c*, த் *t*, ப் *p* undergo gemination:

- after the accusative suffix -ஐ *-ai*.
- after the dative suffix -(உக்)கு *-(uk)ku*.
- after -உ *-u* preceded by a double consonant (as in the oblique case).
- after the demonstrative clitics அ- *a-*, இ- *i-*, உ- *u-* and after எ- *e-* (also after இந்த *inta*, அந்த *anta*, எந்த *enta*).
- after -அ *-a* of the infinitive.
- after -இ *-i* of the absolutive (including the forms ஆய் *āy* and பேய் *pōy*).
- after -ஆ *-ā* of the positive absolutive:
(கண்புதையாக் குருகி *kaṇputaiyā-k-kuruki*, “nearing [her], covering [her] eyes” AN 9.21).
- after -ஆ *-ā* of the negative *peyareccam* (relative participle):
முதிராத்திங்கள் *mutirā-t-tinkal*, “immature moon”, AN KV.11.
- after monosyllabic words ending in a long vowel.
- in compounds (of *karmadhāraya* or *genitive-tatpuruṣa* kind) after mono- and disyllabic neuter nouns ending in a vowel or -ய் *-y*, -ர் *-r*, -ழ் *-l*: வீதிக்கதவு *vīti-k-katavu* “street door”, அமர்க்கண் *amar-k-kaṇ*, “beautiful eyes”, கீழ்க்கணக்கு *kīl-k-kaṇakku*, “minor series”.

Gemination does *not* occur:

- after a finite verb form.

[- after -ஆ -ā of the negative absolutive:

உண்ணாபோனான் *uṇṇā-pōṇān* “without having eaten, he went off”.]⁶

- after a vocative form.

- after a verbal root.

- after an imperative singular (= verbal root).

- after the clitics -எ -ē, -ஓ -ō, -ஆ -ā.

- after the (declension) endings -இலிருந்து -iliruntu, -ஓடு -oṭu, -
இனின்று -inirru, -உடைய -uṭaiya.

- after the pronouns இது *itu*, அது *atu*, எது *etu*, இவை *ivai*, அவை
avai, எவை *evai*, நீ *nī*.

- after என்ன *enna*, எத்தனை *ettanai*, எல்லா *ellā*, பல *pala*, சில *cila*.

⁶ This beautiful rule does not seem to conform with reality; a spot check in *Akanāṇūru* and *Narriṇai* revealed that there is about an even distribution of gemination and non-gemination.

NON-VERB WORD CLASSES

Old Tamil knows three stages of noun inflection for marking case relations. The first stage is the zero mark that may correspond to the nominative of Indo-Aryan systems, which is used for the subject. But since Early Old Tamil prefers to denote case relation by word order, zero marking leaves room for any other case-relationship, too. The second stage is the oblique minimally marked by gemination of the final consonant, by an oblique stem in -த்து -*ttu* for words ending in -ம் -*m*, or by doubling of the last consonant (mostly for words ending in -டு/-று -*tu/-ru*), or by the oblique suffix -இன் -*in*. The suffix -இன் -*in* may also be added (as a sort of double oblique mark), to any of the others.⁷ This marks a case other than nominative and is liberally employed.⁸ The third stage, then, is the actual explicit marking for case, partly with the help of suffixes, partly with the help of postpositions. For some cases the fluidity is enormous, and some are hardly ever marked.

1.1 Nouns: types and declension

1.1.1 Cases/Non-marking of Cases

zero = nom.

(voc. = nom. or loss of ending in m.sg.: நாடன் > நாட or
நாடா *nāṭaṇ* > *nāṭa* or *nāṭā* “O man from the land”)⁹

⁷ Another possible place holder for the case suffix in metrical texts is the oblique of the 3rd person personal and reflexive pronoun தன்/தம் *taṇ/tam*: அரசன் தன்னை *aracaṇ taṇṇai*, “the king (acc.)”.

⁸ This was never conceptualised in the Tamil grammatical tradition because already the *Tolkāppiyam* implements the Sanskrit case system of seven cases in order to describe Tamil.

⁹ Nouns in -ஐ -*ai* may have a vocative in -ஆய் -*āy*: அன்னை *aṇṇai* > அன்னாய் *aṇṇāy*, “o mother”; later the final syllable may be lengthened: தோழி *tōḷi* > தோழீ *tōḷī* or தோழீஇ *tōḷīi*, “o friend”, நுதல் *nutal* > நுதால் *nutāl* “o [you with a] forehead”, பேதைகள் *pētaikaḷ* > பேதைகள் *pētaikāl*, “o foolish girls”.

oblique	-இன் <i>-in</i> : நிலவு > நிலவின் <i>nilavu > nilavin</i> , “moonlight” -த்து <i>-ttu</i> : மரம் > மரத்து/(மரத்தின்) <i>maram > marattu/</i> (<i>marattin</i>), “tree” geminat <u>ion</u> : கோடு > கோட்டு/(கோட்டின்), <i>kōṭu ></i> <i>kōṭṭu/(kōṭṭin)</i> , “tusk”, ஆறு > ஆற்று/(ஆற்றின்) <i>āru ></i> <i>ār<u>ru</u>/(ār<u>rin</u>)</i> , “path, river”
cases	dative -(உக்)கு <i>-(uk)ku</i> locative -ஆன் <i>-ān</i> , (-இல் <i>-il</i>) ¹⁰ , -அகத்து <i>-akattu</i> , -இடை <i>-iṭai</i> , -கண் <i>-kaṇ</i> , -வயின் <i>-vayin</i> , -மருங்கின் <i>-maruṅkin</i> , -முதல் <i>-mutal</i> , -தலை <i>-talai</i> , -மாட்டு <i>-māṭṭu</i> , -உள் <i>-uḷ</i> ; -தேளத்து <i>-tēettu</i> , -மேன <i>-mēṇa</i> , (etc.) sociative -ஒடு <i>-oṭu</i> / (-உடன் <i>-uṭan</i>) instrumental -ஆல் <i>-āl</i> / -ஆன் <i>-ān</i> ; -ஒடு <i>-oṭu</i> accusative -ஐ <i>-ai</i> genitive -அது <i>-atu</i> ; possessive also: -உடை <i>-uṭai</i> (later -உடைய <i>-uṭaiya</i>) / -கெழு <i>-keḷu</i> (ablative = comparison -இன் <i>-in</i> ¹¹ ; later -நின்று <i>-ninru</i>)

The only case marked fairly regularly is the dative, corresponding to the indirect object. Additional functions of the dative are the dative of direction and the frequent possessive still found in modern Tamil (மாற்கு ஆள் *mārku āḷ*, “servant of Māl”).

¹⁰ The official locative postposition *-il* (derived from the noun *il*, “house”), ubiquitously printed by modern editors where, in fact, due to sandhi it could also be interpreted as the oblique in -இன் *-in*, is in fact a late-comer in the texts, as can be seen from the fact that the three old Akam anthologies (KT, NA, AN) contain less than a dozen definitive instances.

¹¹ Comparative means here a simple comparative particle, often combined with others such as அன்ன *anna*: காலின் சென்று *kālin cenru*, “gone like the wind” (NA 249.1), கொழுந்தின் அன்ன *koḷuntin anna*, “like a tendril” (AN 9.2).

Locative is frequently marked, either by its case suffix or by a large number of postpositions, the majority of which also occur as regular nouns with a clear semantic meaning. Among the remaining cases sociative is the only one found more often than occasionally; besides by -ஒடு *-otu* (in sandhi before vowel -ஒடு *-ōtu*) it can also be expressed by -உடன் *-uṭaṇ*. Instrumental, for instrument and for reason, may be marked in -ஆல் *-āl* or -ஆன் *-ān* (frequently falling together in sandhi); rarely a sociative suffix has instrumental meaning and vice versa. Accusative -ஐ *-ai*, the case of the direct object, is rarely marked (which is still true in modern Tamil for the inanimate direct object). One reason for marking it is deviation from the regular word order of Subject – Object. The genitive, too, is rarely marked, and the ablative has entered the official Tamil case system only because it is there in Sanskrit and is predominantly represented by the comparative suffix -இன் *-in*. Late in the first millennium there is an occasional *vinaiyeccam* நின்று *-ninru* freezing into a postposition that expresses the idea of moving away from something (literally “after having stayed in x”), followed by the modern -இலிருந்து *-iliruntu* based on similar semantics (“having been in x”).

In a passive construction the agent may be marked by an instrumental (late: TVM 8.8.11.2f. திருமாலால் | அருளப்பட்ட சடகோபன் *tirumālāl | aruḷappaṭṭa caṭakōpaṇ*, “Caṭakōpaṇ who is graced by Tirumāl”), and with a neuter singular verbal noun the agent may be marked by a dative, possibly developed out of the possessive dative (Poy 10.1-3 மண்ணும் மலையும் மறி கடலும் மாருதமும் | விண்ணும் விழுங்கியது ...ஆழியாய்க்கு *maṇṇum malaiyum maṛi kaṭalum mārutamum | viṇṇum viḷuṅkiyatu ... āḷiyāyckku*, “Earth, mountain, churning sea, wind and sky were swallowed ... by you with the discus”).

1.1.2. Types of Nouns – List of Nominal Suffixes

Noun formation and the types of suffixes employed are an understudied area; both morphological and semantic studies are as good as absent. The only list of suffixes in the available grammars is found in Zvelebil 1967. The list below is without doubt incomplete, and explanations of use are rather simplistic. As far as genders are concerned, Tamil distinguishes only “high-class” (*uyar-tiṇai*), that is, animate, as male and female, and “low-class” (*akṛiṇai*), that is, everything else including abstract nouns, as neuter. The notion of being male or female is generally expressed by the pronominal secondary suffixes (see below), but a few nouns have special masculine or feminine endings.

root nouns	Very common are nominal stems that are identical to verbal roots: அணி <i>ani</i> , “to adorn/adornment”; சுடர் <i>cuṭar</i> , “to glow/glow” A minimal modification is the occasional verbal root with lengthened vowel: பெறு <i>peru</i> , “to obtain” > பேறு <i>pēru</i> , “benefit”
primary suffixes:	
-உ/வு -(v)u	forming neuter nouns often freely variable with -am
-அம் -am	நெஞ்சு/நெஞ்சம் <i>neñcu/neñcam</i> , “heart”
-ஆ -ā	often freely variable with -u: நிலவு/நிலா <i>nilavu/nilā</i> , “moonlight”
-அன் -an	distinction (sometimes free variation with -அம் -am): நலம் <i>nalam</i> , “goodness, beauty”, but நலன் <i>nalān</i> , “virginity”
(-அர் -ar	forming adjectives: காமர் <i>kāmar</i> , “desirable”)

- உள் -uḷ forming neuter nouns; less productive: செய்யுள் *ceyyuḷ*, “metrical text”, பைய்யுள் *paiyyuḷ*, “sorrow”, விளையுள் *viḷaiyuḷ*, “produce” (NA 45.9)
- வி/ச்சி/த்தி -vi/cci/tti forming feminine nouns: புலைச்சி *pulaicci* “washer woman”, பனைத்தோளி *paṇaittōḷi*, “she with bamboo shoulders”
- இ -i forming masculine agent nouns: ஏந்தி *ēnti* “holder” (in bhakti)
- வு/(ப்)பு -vu/-(p)pu forming abstract nouns from verbal roots: செய்வு/செய்பு *ceyvū/ceypu*, “doing”
- வை -vai forming abstract nouns from verbal roots: அளவை *aḷavai*, “measure”
- மை -mai forming nouns (in fact to tradition the basic form from which adjectives are derived): பெருமை *perumai*, “greatness”, அருமை *arumai*, “difficulty”, but also used on verbal roots ஆண்மை *āṇmai*, “courage”, உடைமை *uḍaimai*, “possession”
- (க்)கை -(k)kai செய்கை *ceykai*, “action”, வாழ்க்கை *vāḷkkai*, “livelihood”
- (ச்)சி -(c)ci புணர்ச்சி *puṇarcci*, “union”
- (த்)தி -(t)ti செய்தி *ceyti*, “action”
- அல்/(த்)தல் -al/-(t)tal forming verbal nouns¹²: செயல்/செய்தல் *ceyal/ ceytal*, “to do”, புணரல்/புணர்தல்

¹² The verbal noun in -தல் -tal is the traditional form used to refer to a verb in the grammatical tradition. Note that the short form in -அல் -al is homophonous with the negative root imperative: செயல் *ceyal* can be “to do” or “don’t do”.

puṇaral/ puṇartal, “to unite”, but புணர்த்தல்
puṇarttal, “to bring together”

secondary suffixes:

The main type of secondary suffix is the so-called pronominal suffix usually alternating between short and long vowels in almost all cases. In noun formation they are used for masculine, feminine and honorific in the type of pronominalised nouns that are lexicalised: அந்தணன் *antaṇaṇ*, “brahmin”, வினைவர் *viṇaivar*, “workers”; the feminine often rather adopts the ending -இ *-i* for this type of noun: கள்வன் *kaḷvaṇ* “robber”, but கள்வி *kaḷvi*, “female robber”. Note that also participial nouns are frequently lexicalised (cf. the introduction to Verbs below).

It is also with their help that singular and plural are marked. Marking of plural is optional, especially in the case of the neuter. Old Tamil does not distinguish in the high-class, that is, with animate nouns, between honorific and plural; the suffix -அர்/-ஆர் *-ar/-ār* denotes both and the decision has to be made by context. From bhakti times onwards the modern plural suffix -கள் *-kaḷ* filters in, first with neuters, then also with animate beings. For a long time it was possible to combine honorific and plural suffixes.

Their second function is with participial nouns, a very important category in Old Tamil syntax, as well as with the type of pronominalised nouns which are not lexicalised, but used to creatively form predicate nouns in a sort of denominative, called *kurippuvinaṇai*, “verb by intention” in the Tamil tradition. For both these formations the whole range of persons, numbers and genders is employed.

singular

1. -என்/-ஏன் *-en/-ēn*
2. -இ *-i*, -ஆய் *-āy*, -ஐ *-ai*, -ஓய்/-ஓய் *-oy/-ōy*
- 3.m. -அன்/-ஆன் *-an/-ān*, -ஒன்/-ஒன் *-on/-ōn*
- 3.f. -அள்/-ஆள் *-al/-āl*, -ஒள்/-ஒள் *-ol/-ōl*
- 3.n. -(அ)து *-(a)tu*

plural

1. -அம்/-ஆம் *-am/-ām*, -எம்/-ஏம் *-em/-ēm*, -ஓம்/-ஓம் *-om/-ōm*
2. -இர்/-ஈர் *-ir/-īr* (-ஈர்கள் *-īrkaḷ*, -மீர் *-mīr*, -மீர்கள் *-mīrkaḷ*)
- 3.h. -அர்/-ஆர் *-ar/-ār*, -ஓர்/-ஓர் *-or/-ōr* (-மர் *-mar*, -மார் *-mār*)
(pl. -கள் *-kaḷ*, -அர்கள்/-ஆர்கள் *-arkaḷ/-ārkaḷ*)¹³
- 3.n. -அ/-ஐ *-a/-ai* (pl. -கள் *-kaḷ*)

irr. feminine plural: மகளிர் *maḱalir*, பெண்டிர் *peṇṭir*, “women”; irr. pl. கேளிர் *kēḷir*, “relatives”

Note that in any ending, pronominal or verbal, the distinction between long and short எ/ஏ *e/ē*, ஒ/ஓ *o/ō* is an arbitrary one, since the length of these vowels was not marked in Tamil palm-leaf manuscript notation. Modern editors chose *ad libitum*. The existence of the dichotomy, however, is supported by the fact that we have a visible variance between அ/ஆ *a/ā* and இ/ஈ *i/ī*.

There remains a small group of suffixes that are used for the formation of secondary verbal nouns, namely perfective and negative ones:

-அமை <i>-amai</i>	செய்தமை <i>cey-t_u-amai</i> , “the having done”
-ஆமை <i>-āmai</i>	செய்யாமை <i>cey-y-ā-mai</i> , “the not doing, not having done”

¹³ The pl. suffix *-kaḷ* (in 2nd and 3rd person) can take a lengthened vocative form *-kāḷ*.

1.1.3 Indo-Aryan Loan Words

From the earliest attested texts onwards Tamil admitted loan words from Indo-Aryan, both Sanskrit and Prakrit. Vaidyanathan 1971 collected the ones occurring in Old Tamil (for him the *Caṅkam* corpus, the *Kīlkkāṇakku* and the *Cilappatikāram*), but since he lists only one occurrence per word it is impossible to gain a realistic impression of frequency and distribution. Burrow/Emeneau's *Dravidian Borrowings from Indo-Aryan* has a broader textual outlook but is a very slim volume and only scratches the surface. The first real statistics come with the glossaries to the critical editions of the *Caṅkam* corpus. It is obvious that the number of loans increases over time and virtually explodes with the bhakti works.

Rules for assimilating Sanskrit to Tamil have been laid down in the 12th-century grammar *Vīracōḷiyam*. Many derivations are fairly transparent and regular, others are markedly less so, one of the famous examples being Skt. *asura*- > Tamil அஷுரன் *avuraṇ*. A few remarks may suffice here.

The first obvious consequence from borrowing is a loss of information, because Tamil in writing does not distinguish between voiced and unvoiced consonants and it does not have aspirates:

<i>k, kh, g, gh</i>	> க் <i>k</i>	<i>sanga</i> -, <i>sangha</i> -, <i>śaṅkha</i> - > சங்கம் <i>caṅkam</i> , “union, congregation, conch”
<i>c, ch, j, jh</i>	> ச் <i>c</i>	<i>icchā</i> - > இச்சை <i>iccai</i> , “wish”
<i>ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, ḍh</i>	> ட் <i>ṭ</i>	<i>daṇḍa</i> - > தண்டு <i>taṇṭu</i> , “stick”
<i>t, th, d, dh</i>	> த் <i>t</i>	<i>dāma</i> -, <i>dhāman</i> - > தாமம் <i>tāmam</i> , “string, site”
<i>p, ph, b, bh</i>	> ப் <i>p</i>	<i>bali</i> - > பலி <i>pali</i> , “offering”
<i>ś, s</i>	> ஷ் <i>c</i>	<i>śiva</i> - > சிவன் <i>civaṇ</i> , “lord Śiva”

ṣ	> ḷ ṭ	<i>varṣa-</i> > <i>varuṭam</i> , “year”
<i>h</i>	> க் <i>k</i> ¹⁴	<i>varāha-</i> > வராகம் <i>varākam</i> , “hog”

Prakrit influence is betrayed by the weakening of intervocalic consonants that could be represented in Tamil: *gopāla-* > கோவல் *kōval*, “cowherd”; *bhuja-* > புயம் *puyam*, “arm”; Skt. *kṛṣṇa-* > Pkt. *kaṇha-* > கண்ணன் *kaṇṇan*, “lord Kṛṣṇa”.

Among the vowels, Sanskrit *e* and *o* are represented in Tamil by the long vowels ஏ *ē* and ஓ *ō*, while Skt. vocalic *ṛ* and *ṝ* are not found: *amṛta-* > அமுதம்/அமிர்தம் *amutam/amirtam*, “ambrosia”; *vṛtta-* > விருத்தம் *viruttam*, “circle”.

However, Tamil has one more nasal than Sanskrit, the alveolar ன் *n*, and many Sanskrit intervocalic dental nasal *n* are depicted by a Tamil alveolar: *avani-* > அவனி *avani*, “earth”; *dhana-* > தனம் *taṇam*, “wealth”. Occasionally a Sanskrit *r* is rendered not by Tamil ற் *r* but by ற் *r*: *sthira-* > திறம் *tiram*, “firmness”.

Since Tamil does not begin words with ற் *r* or ல் *l*, corresponding Sanskrit items are prefixed with அ- *a-*, இ- *i-* and உ- *u-*, depending on the surrounding phonemes: *rakṣasa-* > அரக்கன் *arakkan*, “demon”; *rāma-* > இராமன் *irāmaṇ*, “Rāma”; *roma-* > உரோமம் *urōmam*, “hair”; *loka-* > உலகம் *ulakam*, “world”; *laṅkā-* > இலங்கை *ilaṅkai*, “Sri Lanka”.

Consonant clusters are simplified along the lines already in practice in the Prakrits, the two most frequent strategies being assimilation and insertion of vowel glides, although especially in the beginning of the word consonants may simply be dropped: *kṣema-* > ஏமம் *ēmam*, “protection”; *jñāna-* > ஞானம் *ñāṇam*, “knowledge”; *cakra-* > சக்கரம் *cakkaram*, “discus”; *divya-* > திவ்வியம் *tivvīyam*,

¹⁴ Initial sibilant or *h-* may be lost in borrowing: *hara-* > அரன் *aran*, “Hara (~Śiva)”.

“divine”, *bhakti*- > பத்தி *patti*, “devotion”; *prabandha*- > பிரபந்தம் *pirapantam*, “composition”.

A rarer choice is metathesis: *agni*- > அங்கி *aṅki*, “fire”.

Many important words can have several forms: *Śrī* > திரு, சிரீ, சீ *tiru*, *cirī*, *cī*, “the goddess Śrī”.

Since Tamil has a far more restricted use of genders and since the whole system of nominal inflection is much more straightforward, nominal endings are simplified:

-a and consonantal stems	> -am/-u, for m. eventually -an: அரசு/அரசன் <i>aracu/aracan</i> , “king”
-ā (f.)	> -ai n.: <i>senā</i> > சேனை <i>cēnai</i> , “army”
-i (m./n./f.), -ī, -in	> -i (m./n./f.): <i>nadī</i> > நதி <i>nati</i> , “river”
-u (m./n./f.), -ū	> -u (n.) <i>madhu</i> - > மது <i>matu</i> , “honey”

One concomittant is the shortening of words, especially if they have many syllables: *parama*- > பரம், பரன் *param*, *paraṇ*, “the highest, God”

Another frequent strategy besides borrowing are calques, and terminologically important words may have both: *sūtra*- > சூத்திரம் *cūttiram*, “aphorism” and நூல் *nūl*, “text” (literally both *sūtra* and *nūl* mean “thread”); *veda*- > மறை *marai* and வேதம் *vētam*, “Veda”; *karman*- > கருமம் *karumam* and வினை *vinai*, “(past) deeds”; *artha*- > பொருள் *poruḷ*, “wealth - meaning”.

As is to be expected, many words change meaning, thus creating “false friends” for students moving from Sanskrit to Tamil: *kavi*- “poet” > கவி *kavi* “poem”, *lakṣaṇa*- “what explains” > இலக்கணம் *ilakkaṇam* “grammar” paired with *lakṣya*- “what is to be explained” > இலக்கியம் *ilakkiyam* “poetry”.

Verbs are moving over rather late and are always borrowed into the 11th class of strong verbs: *vañj* > *vañci-ttal*, “to deceive”; *cint* > சிந்தித்தல் *cinti-ttal*, “to think”.

1.2 Pronouns

personal pronouns

	base form	oblique
1 st sg.	யான் <i>yān</i> , later: நான் <i>nān</i>	என் <i>eñ</i>
2 nd sg.	நீ <i>nī</i>	நின் <i>nin</i> , later: உன் <i>un</i>
3 rd sg. (m.f.n.)	தான் <i>tān</i>	தன் <i>tan</i>
1 st pl.	யாம் <i>yām</i> (exclusive), நாம் <i>nām</i> (inclusive)	எம் <i>em</i> (exclusive), நம் <i>nam</i> (inclusive)
2 nd pl.	நீர் <i>nīr</i> , நீயிர் <i>nīyir</i>	நும் <i>num</i>
3 rd pl. (h.+n.)	தாம் <i>tām</i>	தம் <i>tam</i>

The system of personal pronouns is simple and stable; only the first person singular base form (யான் *yān*, “I”) and the second person singular oblique (நின் *nin*, “your”) are slowly taken over by நான் *nān* and உன் *un*, respectively, from bhakti times onwards, although for many centuries both forms are used side by side.

The third person pronoun தான்/தாம் *tān/tām* functions for all genders and the plural can also be used for the honorific. It is also used as a reflexive pronoun, gradually being weakened down to the modern-day emphatic: அரசன் தான் *aracan tān*, “the king himself” – “the king!”.

The personal pronouns, occasionally in *Kalittokai* and *Paripāṭal* but more visibly in the bhakti corpus, have a tendency to mark the genitive (எனது *enatu*, நினது/உனது *ninatu/unatu*, etc.) and even to use a short form (என *ena*, நின/உன *nina/una*, etc.) to mark a genitive with a plural object:

Tē 3.4.1.2 உன கழல் தொழுது எழுவேன்
 una kaḷal toḷutu eḷuvēñ

your(pl.) anklet worshipped rise-I
 “I rise in worship of your anklet[ted feet].”

demonstrative and interrogative pronouns

The demonstrative pronoun knows three degrees of deixis, close to the speaker (இ- *i-*), something like the other side of the table (உ- *u-*), and further off (அ- *a-*), of which the intermediate does not much survive *Caṅkam* times. The corresponding interrogative is எ- *e-*, in some forms ய- *y-*. These stems can simply be used in the adjectival position as proclitic vowels (அம்மரம் *a-m-maram*, “that tree”; இவ்வுலகு *i-vv-ulaku*, “this world”),¹⁵ but there is a corresponding system of full forms:

	இ- <i>i-</i>	உ- <i>u-</i>	அ- <i>a-</i>	எ-/ய்- <i>e-/y-</i>
m.sg.	இவன் <i>ivan</i>	உவன் <i>uvan</i>	அவன் <i>avan</i>	எவன் <i>evan</i>
f.sg.	இவள் <i>ival</i>	உவள் <i>uval</i>	அவள் <i>aval</i>	எவள் <i>eval</i>
n.sg.	இது <i>itu</i>	உது <i>utu</i>	அது <i>atu</i>	எது <i>etu</i> , யாது <i>yātu</i> யாவது <i>yāvatu</i> , எவன் <i>evan</i> , என் <i>en</i>
3.h./ pl.	இவர்(கள்) <i>ivar(kal)</i>	உவர் <i>uvar</i>	அவர்(கள்) <i>avar(kal)</i>	யார் <i>yār</i> , ஆர் <i>ār</i> , யாவர் <i>yāvar</i>
n.pl.	இவை <i>ivai</i>	உவை <i>uvai</i>	அவை <i>avai</i>	எவை <i>evai</i>

¹⁵ Note that for these forms the sandhi is special in that the glide before a vowel is always *v* and always doubled. The modern adjectival forms அந்த *anta* and இந்த *inta* are found, though rarely at first, from bhakti times onwards.

Forms in *a-* stand in if the third person pronoun needs to specify gender (அவன் *avan*, “that man” or simply “he”). Only the neuters form a separate oblique stem (sg. இதன் *itan*, அதன் *atan*, pl. இவற்று *ivarrru*, அவற்று *avarrru*). In all other cases the base form is identical with the oblique. The indefinite/universal pronoun is formed by adding the enclitic coordinative *-um* to the interrogative pronoun: யாரும் *yārum*, “anybody, everybody”. The same can be done with nouns: நாள் *nāl*, “day” > நாளும் *nālum* “daily”. A post-position with a similar function is தொறு(ம்)/தோறு(ம்) *toru(m)/tōru(m)*, which is to be added to nouns (நாடோறும் *nāl-tōrum*, “every day”),¹⁶ but also to verbal roots: காண்டொறும் *kāṇ-torum*, “whenever seeing”. The short form seems to be chosen in cases where the compound yields a full metrical foot, the long form when the noun to be modified already corresponds to a *cīr*: வைகல் தோறும் *vaikal tōrum*, “every day” (KT 298.3); தொறு *toru* followed by a vowel also changes to தோறு *tōru*.¹⁷

In order to emulate a Sanskrit relative construction, the *அ-* *a-* stem can be juxtaposed to the *எ-/ஓ-* *e-/y-* stem (*yad – tad ~ யாது yātu – அது atu*).¹⁸

¹⁶ Rhetorically the same effect can be achieved by repeating a noun: ஊழியூழி *ūli-y-ūli*, “aeon after aeon”,

KT 130.3f.: நாட்டின் நாட்டின் ஊரின் ஊரின் | குடி முறை குடி முறை தேரின்
nāṭṭin nāṭṭin ūriṇ ūriṇ | kuṭi murai kuṭi murai tēriṇ
 landⁱⁿ landⁱⁿ villageⁱⁿ villageⁱⁿ | hamlet order hamlet order search-if
 “If [we] search [him] in land by land, village by village, hamlet by hamlet ...”

¹⁷ An alternative to *toru* with a verbal root is repeated verbal root or abstract noun plus *-உழி -uḷi*: தொடுவுழி தொடுவுழி *toṭuvuḷi toṭuvuḷi*, “whenever it touches” (KT 399.3), but also செலுழி செலுழி *celuḷi celuḷi*, “wherever she goes” (AN 49.15). Note, however, that *-உழி -uḷi* can also be used with an absolutive for a temporal clause (cf. p. 98n).

¹⁸ An early example is found in Poy 44.1 தமர் உகந்தது எவ்வுருவம் அவ்வுருவம் தானே *tamar ukantatu e uruvam a uruvam tāṇē*, “whatever forms delights his people is just the form”, i.e., the forms Viṣṇu manifests himself in.

A number of temporal, spatial and modal adverbs are connected with the three stems (the list is not complete!):

here/there:	இவ/உவ/அவ <i>iva/uva/ava</i> இவண்/அவண் <i>ivan/avan</i> ஈங்கண்/ஆங்கண் <i>īṅkaṅ/āṅkaṅ</i> ஈண்டை/ஆண்டை <i>īṇṭai/āṇṭai</i>
here/there/where?	இங்கு/ஈங்கு/உங்கு/அங்கு/ஆங்கு/யாங்கு
and thus/how?:	<i>īṅku/īṅku/uṅku/aṅku/āṅku/yāṅku</i>
where?:	யாண்டு <i>yāṇṭu</i>
in between:	ஆயிடை <i>āyiṭai</i>
beyond:	உம்பர் <i>umpar</i>
before:	ஊங்கு <i>ūṅku</i>
like this/like that/	இங்ஙனம்/அங்ஙனம்/எங்ஙனம்
in which manner:	<i>īṅṅanam/aṅṅanam/eṅṅanam,</i> இங்கனம்/அங்கனம்/எங்கனம் <i>īṅkanam/aṅkanam/eṅkanam,</i>
what, why:	எ(ன்)னை <i>e(n)ṇai</i>
how much:	எனை <i>eṇai</i>
today, that day:	இன்று/இன்றை <i>inru/inrai</i> , அன்று/அன்றை <i>anru/anrai</i> ¹⁹
when?, always:	என்று <i>eṇru</i> , என்றும் <i>eṇrum</i>
now:	இனி <i>inī</i>
even now, again:	இன்னும் <i>innum</i>

In addition to these, there are the pronominal-adjectival stems இ(ன்)னை/அ(ன்)னை *i(n)ṇai/a(n)ṇai* which form a full paradigm of

¹⁹ In an attributive position before a noun இன்று *inru* and அன்று *anru* have the rare alternate (adjectival?) forms இற்றை *irrai* and அற்றை *arrai*: அற்றைத் திங்கள் *arrait tiṅkaḷ*, “that day’s moon” (PN 112.1).

persons and numbers expressing that something/someone is like this (*i-*) or like that (*a-*): கூடலனையாள் *kūṭal anaiyāl*, “she who is like Madurai”. The most frequent forms for neuter singular and neuter plural are இற்று/அற்று *irru/arru* and இன்ன/அன்ன *inna/anna*, the latter of which can also be used adverbially (“thus”), and அன்ன *anna* is one of the more frequent particles of comparison (“like”). Moreover the அ(ன்)னை *a(n)nai* stem can merge with a perfective verbal stem to form a *peyareccam* compound:

KT 106.6 தான் மணந்தனையம் என விடுகம் தூதே
 tān maṇantaṇaiyam ena viṭukam tūtē
 he united-such-we say(inf.) send-we(sub.) message⁵
 “Let us send a message to say we are [still] like when
 he united with [us].”

A few more pronominal adjectives exist: பல் *pal*, “many”; சில் *cil*, “few”; பிற *pira*, “other”; மற்று *marru*, “other”; வேறு *vēru*, “other, different”.

1.3 Adjectives

Old Tamil has a limited number of “real”, simple adjectives, but a variety of techniques for marking a noun as an adjective. All of them have in common that they cannot be directly looked up in a dictionary, since they are all perceived as noun derivatives (for அரு *aru*, cf. அருமை *arumai*, etc.). The simplest manner is to put another noun in attributive position directly before another noun.

The most frequent Old Tamil adjectives are:

அரு *aru*, “rare, difficult, precious”

கடு *kaṭu*, “fast, fierce, harsh”

சிறு *ciru*, “small, little”

இரு *iru*, “big”, “dark”

பெரு *peru*, “big, great”

குறு *kuru*, “short”

நெடு *neṭu*, “long”

புது *putu*, “new”

பழ *paḷa*, “old”

நறு *naṛu*, “fragrant”

கரு *karu*, “black”

செம் *cem*, “red”

பசு *pacu*, “green”

வெள் *veḷ*, “white”

இள *iḷa*, “young”

முது *mutu*, “aged”

தட *taṭa*, “broad, large”

நல் *nal*, “good”

தொல் *tol*, “old”
 புல் *pul*, “low, mean”, “tawny”
 மெல் *mel*, “soft, tender”
 வல் *val*, “strong”
 இன் *in*, “pleasing”
 ஒள் *ol*, “bright”
 தண் *tan*, “cool”
 திண் *tin*, “firm, solid”
 தூ *tū*, “pure”
 தெள் *tel*, “clear”
 நுண் *nuṇ*, “fine”
 வள் *val*, “generous, liberal”
 செம் *cem*, “straight”
 தீம் *tīm*, “sweet”
 வெம் *vem*, “hot”
 பை *pai*, “fresh”
 மா *mā*, “big”, “dark”
 வை *vai*, “sharp”

The following seven are the established techniques for adjective formation:

- 1 adj. with consonant stem: நல்லா *nal-l-ā*, “good cow”
- 2 adj. in -u/-a + class nasal: அருஞ்சுரம் *aruñ-curam*, “difficult desert”
- 3 verbal root as adj.: உயர்வரை *uyar-varai*, “high mountain”

- 4 noun in attributive position: குண்டுநீர் *kuṇṭu-nīr*,
“deep water”
கானமஞ்ஞை *kāṇa maññai*,
“forest peacock”
- 5 noun + suffix -அ -a: கால...குருகு *kāla...kuruku*,
“legged ... heron”
- 6 noun + suffix -அம் -am²⁰: தண்ணந் துறைவன் *taṇṇam*
turaivan, “cool ghat-he” (“a man
from the cool ghat”
கள்ளியங் காடு *kaḷḷiyam kāṭu*,
“spurge forest”
- [7 modern form: பெரிய *periya*, “big”]

A comparative is not expressed by changing the form of the adjective, but the preceeding noun takes the comparative suffix -இன் -*in* plus -உம் -*um*: நிலத்தினும் பெரிதே வானினு முயர்ந்தன்று ... அன்பு, *nilattinūm peritē, vāninūm uyarntaṇṇu ... aṇpu*, “bigger than the earth, higher than the sky (...) is love” (KT 3.1+4). Equal degree in quality is expressed by simple -இன் -*in* without -உம் -*um*: கூந்தலின் நறிய ... பூ *kūntalin nariya ... pū*, “flowers as fragrant as the tresses” (KT 2.4f.).

²⁰ In traditional grammar -அம் -*am* is taught as an increment (*cāriyai*) with tree names in particular (cf. *Tolkāppiyam Eḷuttatikāram*, 416i).

1.4 Adverbs

Old Tamil has six strategies for forming adverbs, in addition to the pronominal adverbs already discussed, and a very small number of “natural” adverbs that are without etymology or cognate forms: நனி *nan̥i*, “much”, தவ *tava*, “very”.

1. Any adjective used in the neuter form, either singular or plural, can stand for an adverb: சிறிது *ciritu*, “a little” (KT 14.6), கடிய *kaṭiya*, “loudly” (KT 194.3).

The oblique form is also possible, sometimes even a double oblique: நுண்ணிதின் *nuṇṇitiṇ*, “subtly” (KT 167.6); எளிதனின் *eḷitanin*, “easily” (NA 239.3).

2. In isolated cases we see what looks like the dative of an adjective: நற்கு *narku*, “well”.
3. The enclitic particle -ஏ *-ē* can be added to an adjective to form the adverb: வல்லே *vallē*, “strongly”.
4. The infinitive -என *-ena* of the quotative verb என்னுதல் *ennutal*, “to speak”, is not only employed in the formation of ideophones (see below), but also of adverbs: தண்ணென *taṇṇena*, “coolly”.
5. Infinitives can be used as adverbs. Some of them are frozen and lexicalised as such: மிக *mika*, “much”. But they are also used productively: இறப்ப *irappa*, “exceedingly” (NA 338.4).
6. Absolutes can be used as adverbs, especially when they stand in concatenation with another absolute: விரைஇ *viraii*, “fragrantly” (KT 62.2).

For want of a better place we may add here the small number of nouns that are used as postpositions or adverbs of position:

மேல் *mēl*, “upon”

கீழ் *kīl*, “beneath”

முன் *mun*, “before”

பின் *pin*, “after”

உடன் *uṭan*, “along with”

உள் *ul*, “inside”

எதிர் *etir*, “opposite”

வெளி *veli*, “outside”

புறம் *puram*, “outside”

Note that முன் *mun* and பின் *pin* have a number of alternate forms such as: முன்னர் *munnar*, பின்னர் *pinnar*, பின்றை *pinrai*, etc.

1.5 Numerals

cardinal:

	adjectival	vowel sandhi	predicative
1	ஒரு <i>oru</i>	ஓர் <i>ōr</i>	ஒன்று <i>onru</i>
2	இரு <i>iru</i>	ஈர் <i>īr</i>	இரண்டு <i>iraṇṭu</i>
3	மு <i>mu</i>	மூ <i>mū</i>	மூன்று <i>mūṇru</i>
4	நால் <i>nāl</i>	நாலு <i>nālu</i>	நான்கு <i>nāṅku</i>
5	ஐ <i>ai</i>	ஐம் <i>aim</i>	ஐந்து <i>aintu</i>
6	அறு <i>aru</i>	ஆற் <i>ār</i>	
7	எழு <i>eḷu</i>	ஏழ் <i>ēḷ</i>	
8	எண் <i>eṇ</i>	ஏண் <i>ēṇ</i>	எட்டு <i>eṭṭu</i>
9	ஒன்பது <i>onpatu</i>		
10	பது <i>patu/</i> பதின் <i>patin</i>		பத்து <i>pattu</i>
11	பதினொரு <i>patinoru</i> , etc.		
100	நூறு <i>nūru</i>	நூற்று <i>nūrru</i>	
200	இருநூறு <i>irunūru</i> , etc.		
900	தொள்ளாயிரம் <i>tollāyiram</i>	தொள்ளாயிரத்து <i>tollāyirattu</i>	
1000	ஆயிரம் <i>āyiram</i>	ஆயிரத்து <i>āyirattu</i>	

ordinal: ஒன்றாம் *onrām*, ஒன்றாவதும் *onrāvatu*

When numbers are put in juxtaposition, the rule of thumb is that bigger numbers followed by smaller number have to be added, and smaller numbers followed by bigger number have to be multiplied:

Pū 41.1 ஏழு மூன்று முடியனைத்தும் *ēlum mūṇrum muṭi aṇaittum*, all the seven [plus] three heads” but Poy 35.3f. ஈரைந்து முடியான் *īr aintu muṭiyān*, “he with twice five heads”. Sanskrit numerals are borrowed freely from bhakti times onwards.

The numeral *oru/ōr* has a number of special usages. It may function as an indefinite article (“a”), but also as an attribute (“unique”). Moreover, from bhakti times on the sandhi form *ōr* may be used even if the following word starts with a consonant.

1.6 Ideophones

Old Tamil has a very special formation in what has recently been termed ideophones [Chevillard 2004], formerly called onomatopoeia, though only a minority among them are based on sound imitation. They consist of one or more syllables, with often, though not always unclear semantic meaning, combined with the quotative verb என்னுதல் *ennutal*, “to say”, in any of its forms. This means they are not only used as adverbs (abs. -என்று *-enru* or inf. -என *-ena*), although that is by far the most common usage, but also as adjectives (verbal root -என் *-en* or *peyareccam* -என்ற *-enra*) or even as finite verbs. This flexible type of ideophone is not to be confused with poetic refrain words found in bhakti songs and often also with an onomatopoeic elements, such as தாலேலோ *tālēlō* (Periyālvar fourth decade). Some ideophones also take other forms such as குக்கூ *kukkū*, denoting the call of the rooster. Also, exclamations exist, as in any language, and they might be closer to ideophones than to particles, because they usually have an emotive and onomatopoeic value. For lament, for example, there is the old அன்னோ *annō* and the bhakti-time அந்தோ *antō*.

The most common ideophones are:

அம்மென் <i>ammen</i>	denoting something overfull
இம்மென் <i>immen</i>	denoting a humming sound
இழுமென் <i>ilumen</i>	denoting noise or sweetness
ஒய்யென் <i>oyyen</i>	expressing urgency
ஒல்லென் <i>ollen</i>	denoting sound
கதுமென் <i>katumen</i>	denoting quickness
கம்மென் <i>kammen</i>	denoting silence
கல்லென் <i>kallen</i>	denoting excitement or noise

கிடினென் <i>kiṭinen</i>	denoting tinkling
ஞேரேரென் <i>ñerēren</i>	denoting suddenness
தண்ணென் <i>taṇnen</i>	denoting coolness
தவ்வென் <i>tavven</i>	denoting heat
துட்கென் <i>tuṭken</i>	denoting alarm
துடுமென் <i>tuṭumen</i>	denoting something falling into water
துண்ணென் <i>tuṇnen</i>	denoting 1. startling 2. fright 3. suddenness
நள்ளென் <i>naḷlen</i>	denoting silence
புல்லென் <i>pullen</i>	denoting futility/emptiness

1.7 Particles

Particles belong to the least understood elements of Old Tamil syntax, where they were one strategy, in coordination with word order, for marking sentence structures, periods, modes, moods, etc. [A detailed discussion can be found in Wilden 2006]. The system is already disintegrating in the younger parts of the *Caṅkam* corpus itself and only partly understood in the grammatical tradition (where a certain amount of confusion prevails between what is semantically empty and what is without function, both called *acai*, “expletive”). For many particles today we have no idea what their function might have been, and some of them do not have a sufficient number of occurrences to venture a sustainable hypothesis. For a few basics, see Chapters 16 and 17 under “Syntax”.

Just for illustrating the numbers, what follows is an (incomplete) list of particles from the *Caṅkam* and bhakti corpus; many of them may also combine into particle clusters such as கொல்லே *kollō*:

அம்ம <i>amma</i>	lament; invitation of attention
அரோ <i>arō</i>	?
ஆ <i>ā</i>	interrogative (late)
ஆர் <i>ār</i>	?
ஆல் <i>āl</i>	assertive
இகா <i>ikā</i>	?
ஏ <i>ē</i>	sentence-final; focalising; interrogative (late)
ஓ <i>ō</i>	interrogative
கொல் <i>kol</i>	interrogative
கொன் <i>kon</i>	?
தில்ல <i>tilla</i>	wish
தெய்ய <i>teyya</i>	admonition

மற்று <i>mar<u>r</u>ru</i>	adversative; ?
மன் <i>ma<u>n</u></i>	assertive
மன்ற <i>ma<u>n</u>ra</i>	assertive
மாது <i>mā<u>t</u>u</i>	?
மாதோ <i>mā<u>t</u>ō</i>	rhetorical question
மாள <i>mā<u>l</u>a</i>	?
யாழ <i>yā<u>l</u>a</i>	?

NOUN PHRASES

2. Nominal Sentences and Pronominalised Nouns

Nominal sentences are very common in Old Tamil. The regular word order is: **S O P**. In addition there are complicated focalisation (emphasis) patterns that are marked by particles. There is no copula, but occasionally emphasis can be expressed with a verb of existence:

NA 400.6 எவன் பிழைப் புண்டோ *evan pilaipp_u uṇṭō*
what mistake it-is^o “What mistake is there?”

KT 207.1 செலவரி தாகும் *celav_u arit_u ākum*
going difficult-it become-it. “Going WILL be difficult.”

The simplest form of a nominal sentence is an unmarked juxtaposition of noun to noun:

KT 35.5 வாடையும் பிரிந்திசினோர்க் கழலே
vāṭaiyum pirinticinōrk_u alālē
north-wind^{um} separated-they(dat.) fire^e
“Even the north wind [is] fire to those who are separated.”

[Here the particle *-ē* is not a means of focalisation, but just the sentence ending particle of the classical Ācīriyam metre.]

Pēy 53.4 வேங்கடமே யாம்விரும்பும் வெற்பு
vēṅkaṭamē yām virumpum verpu
Vēṅkaṭam^e we desiring- mountain
“The mountain we desire is Vēṅkaṭam.”

Here the sentence structure is the same, but the particle *-ē* is used to mark a focalisation, namely the anteposition of the predicate noun.

The second possibility is a minimal mark on a noun with a pronominalised noun employed either as an adjectival predicate noun or as a denominative.

- KT 18.5 உயிர்தவச் சிறிது காமமோ பெரிதே
uyir tavaḥ ciritu, kāmamō peritē
 life very small-it, desire^o big-it^e
 “Life is very small, desire, ah, it is big.”
- NA 101.5f. துறைநணி யிருந்த பாக்கமு முறைநணி | யினிதுமன்
turai naṇi irunta pākkamum urai naṇi | inituman
 ghat nearness been- village^{um} staying much | pleasant-it^{man}
 “Staying in the village, too, that was near the ghat, was very pleasant indeed.”
- KT 12.4 கவலைத் தென்ப வவர்சென்ற வாரே
kavalaitt_u enpa avar cenra āre
 crossroad-it they-say he(h.)- gone- way^e
 “It has a crossroad, they say, the way he has gone.”
- [The following two examples elucidate the option of choosing between a verbal sentence and one with a pronominalised noun:
- KT 325.4 யாண்டுளன் கொல்லோ where he-is^{kollō}
yāṇṭ_u uḷaṇ kollō “Where is he?”
- KT 379.1 இன்றியாண் டையனோ தோழி today where-he^o friend
inru yāṇṭaiyaṇō tōḷi “Today, where is he, friend?”]

The feature here called pronominalised noun is one of the most intriguing aspects of the early language. They constitute half of the explanation as to why in Tamil the border line between noun and verb is far weaker than, say, in an Indo-European language. In their productive form, which may be called, with the traditional term *kurippuvinaimurru*, or, in English, denominative, they come close to being verbs, while on the other side of the border the distinction between a participial noun and a finite verb is often morphologically unmarked and many strategies for cross-over exist.

The formation of pronominalised nouns of the type that can be lexicalised (already mentioned in the Introduction) is simple and has been well-described in Lehmann 2004. To a noun or adjective, in base or oblique form, a pronominal suffix is added:

N/adj.(-obl.)-pron.suff.

noun	நாடு <i>nāṭu</i> “land”	செல்வம் <i>celvam</i> “wealth”	அறம் <i>aram</i> “duty”	வண்ணம் <i>vaṇṇam</i> “colour”	நெஞ்சம் <i>neñcam</i> “heart”
stem	நாடன் <i>nāṭan</i> “man from a land”	செல்வர் <i>celvar</i> “wealthy people”	அறவன் <i>aravan</i> “dutiful man”	வண்ணன் <i>vaṇṇan</i> “man with a colour”	
oblique stem	நாட்டன் <i>nāṭṭan</i>				நெஞ்சத்தன் <i>neñcattan</i> நெஞ்சத்தான் <i>neñcattān</i> “man with a heart”
oblique suffix	[நாட்டினன் <i>nāṭṭinan</i>]			முகம் <i>mukam</i> “face”	முகத்தினள் <i>mukattinaḷ</i> “woman with a face”

Normally, the pronominal endings with the vowel ஒ/ஓ *o/ō* are reserved for participial nouns. There are, however, cross-overs, some even lexicalised. The vowel is changed from long *ā* to long *ō* regularly for metrical-euphonic reasons at the poems end (காதலர் *kāṭalar* – காதலோரே *kāṭalōrē*).

The productivity of pronominalised nouns is highest in the early corpus and diminishes gradually until only frozen forms remain. The following tables record a few of the more productive words in their attestations in *Kuruntokai*, *Narriṇai* and *Akanānūru*.

noun	adjective
அன்பு <i>anpu</i> , “love”	இளம் <i>ila(m)</i> , “young”
2.sg. அன்பினை <i>anpinai</i>	
3.m. அன்பினன் <i>anpinan</i>	இளையோன் <i>ilaiyōn</i>
f.sg.	இளையோள் <i>ilaiyōl</i>
3.h. அன்பினர் <i>anpinar</i>	இளையர் <i>ilaiyar</i> , இளையோர் <i>ilaiyōr</i> , இளையவர் <i>ilaiyavar</i> (full pronoun)
n.pl. அன்பின <i>anpina</i>	

The defective verb stem உடை *uṭai*, “possess”, whether it be verbal or nominal, is attested for the full paradigm:

உடையேன் <i>uṭaiyēn</i>	1.sg.
உடையை <i>uṭaiyai</i>	2.sg., உடையோய் <i>uṭaiyōy</i>
உடையள் <i>uṭaiyaḷ</i>	f.sg.
உடையன் <i>uṭaiyan</i>	m.sg.
உடைத்து <i>uṭaittu</i> , உடையது <i>uṭaiyatu</i>	n.sg.
உடையம் <i>uṭaiyam</i>	1.pl.
உடையீர் <i>uṭaiyīr</i>	2.pl.
உடையர் <i>uṭaiyar</i>	3.h., உடையோர் <i>uṭaiyōr</i>
உடைய <i>uṭaiya</i>	n.pl.

The following types of relation are well-attested:

possessive, alienable	செல்வன் <i>celvan</i>	“he who is prosperous”
possessive, inalienable	முடியினள் <i>mutiyinal</i>	“she who has a hair knot”
locative	நாடன் <i>nāṭan</i>	“he who is from a country”
objective	அளியள் <i>aḷiyal</i>	“she who is to be pitied”
subjective	அறவர் <i>aravar</i>	“they who adhere to duty”
attributive	பெரியர் <i>periyar</i>	“they who are big”
	முன்னர் <i>munnar</i>	“they who are before”

Note that for a feminine formation the special feminine suffix -இ *-i* is an alternative to the pronominal ending -அள்/-ஆள் *-aḷ/-āḷ*:
தோளி *tōḷ-i* “she who has a shoulder” (post-*Caṅkam*).

3. Attribution

Attribution is a poetic phenomenon that gains supreme syntactical importance in a language that is dependent on word order and that does not originally have relative pronouns. First, we shall focus here on the simple type containing nominal forms (noun, pronominalised noun, participial noun, pronoun, adjective, adverb), but no nonfinite verbal forms. The word order **S O P** is observed here as well, and the point to be taken in is that **attribution is always left-branching**, unless *etukai* (the rhyme pattern; see Chapter 20 under “Venpā”) distorts the order of words.

Attribution may be minimally marked with an oblique:

- KT 24.1 கருங்காற் வேம்பி னொண்பு யாணர்
karum kāl vēmpin oḷ pū yāṇar
black leg Neem-treeⁱⁿ bright flower freshness
“the freshness of the bright flower of the black-trunked
Neem tree”

Attribution may be marked with an adjective suffix:

- KT 16.5 அங்காற் கள்ளியங் காடு *am kāl kaḷḷiyam kātu*
pretty leg Kaḷḷi^{am} forest “a pretty-trunked spurge forest”

Attribution may be marked with a possessive *-uṭai* or *-kelu* + a pronominalised noun:

- KT 56.3 வளையுடைக் கையள் *vaḷai-y-uṭaik kaiyaḷ*
bangle possess- hand-she “she with hands that possess
bangles”

Attribution can remain completely unmarked, with the consequence that relations may be ambiguous:

- KT 286.4 பேரமர் மழைக்கண் கொடிச்சி
pēr_a amar malai kaṇ koṭicci

big beauty rain eye creeper-she

“creeper girl with big beautiful rain eyes”

“big, beautiful rain-eyed creeper girl”

“creeper girl with eyes [that are like] a big beautiful rain”

Relations may be bracketed and asymmetrical:

KT 15.4f. ஆய்கழல் சேயிலை வெண்வேல் விடலை

āy kaḷal | cē ilai veḷ vēl viṭalai

select- anklet | red leaf white spear warrior

“warrior with choice anklets [and] a red-tipped white spear”

Relations may be bracketed and symmetrical:

KT 101.4f. பூப்போ லுண்கண் பொன்போன் மேனி

மாண்வரி யல்குற் குறுமகள்

pū pōl uṇ kaṇ poṇ pōl mēni

māṇ vari alkul kuru makal

flower similar kohl eye gold similar body

fame line hip short woman

“small woman with flower-like kohl eyes,

a gold-like body [and] hips of glorious outline”

A minimal string is achieved by adding the verbal root to the above-mentioned elements, another peculiarity of Early Old Tamil especially:

KT 2.1 கொங்குதேர் வாழ்க்கை யஞ்சிறைத் தும்பி

koṇku tēr vāḷkkai am ciṛai tumpi

pollen search- livelihood pretty wing bee

“pretty-winged bee whose livelihood is searching for pollen”

A further typical element is the use of comparisons:

- KT 23.2f. மனவுகோப் பன்ன நன்னெடுங் கூந்த | லகவன் மகளே
manavu kōpp_u anna nal neṭum kūntal | akaval makaḷē
 chunk-bead string like good long tresses | Akaval woman^ē
 “sooth-saying woman with good long tresses [white] like
 chunk beads!”

Adverbs may also be integrated:

- KT 37.1 நசைபெரி துடையர் *nacai perit_u uṭaiyar*
 longing big-it(adv.) “He greatly possesses
 possess-he(h.) longing.”

Adverbial phrase of place may be head nouns:

- KT 138.2f. எம்மி லயல தேழி லும்பர் | ... நொச்சி
em il ayalat_u ēḷil umpar | ... nocci
 our- house neighbourhood-it Ēḷil(-hill) beyond | ...
 Nocci-tree
 “the Nocci tree ...
 beyond the Ēḷil hill that is near our house”

4. String Attribution

The phenomenon called string attribution is basically an extension of the attribution already seen, but additionally includes nonfinite verbal forms, beginning with the verbal root, but also both types of *peyareccam*, the verbal noun, the absolutive and the infinitive. In other words, what distinguishes string attribution from subordinate clauses in the Indo-European sense is the fact that syntactically it always ends with a head noun on the right side. Very frequent extensions are subject appositions and comparisons or similes. This form of subordination extends over anything from one line up to thirty or even more – some of the long songs in the *Pattuppāṭṭu* consist of a single sentence.

Absolutive + imperfective *peyareccam* + verbal root:

KT 88.2f. சிறுகட் பெருங்களிறு வயப்புலி தாக்கித்
தொன்முரண் சோருந் துன்னருஞ் சாரல்
ciru kaṇ perum kaḷiru vayam puli tākki
tol muraṇ cōrum tunṇu arum cāral
little eye big elephant-bull strength tiger attacked
old antagony diminishing- approach- difficult slope
“the slope difficult to approach, where the old antagony
diminishes after the small-eyed big elephant bull
attacked the strong tiger”

Comparison + infinitive + perfective *peyareccam*:

KT 35.2-5 சினைபசும் பாம்பின் சூன்முதிர்ப் பன்ன
கனைத்த கரும்பின் கூம்புபொதி யவிழ
நுண்ணுறை யழிதுளி தலைஇய
தண்வரல் வாடை
cinai pacum pāmpin cūl mutirppa anna

kaṇaitta karumpin kūmpu poti avila
nuṇ urai aḷi tuḷi talaiiya
taṇ varal vātai
 twig green snakeⁱⁿ egg ripeness like
 ripened- sugar-caneⁱⁿ close- bud open(inf.)
 fine drip- perish- drop offered-
 cool coming north wind
 “the coolly coming north wind
 that offered finely dripping dispersing drops
 so that the closed buds on the ripened sugar cane open,
 like the ripe state of the eggs of the twig-green snake”

Causal absolutive + abs. + abs. + imperfective *peyareccam*:

KT 69.1-5 கருங்கட் டாக்கலை பெரும்பிறி துற்றெனக்

கைம்மை யுய்யாக் காமர் மந்தி
 கல்லா வன்பறழ் கிளைமுதற் சேர்த்தி
 யோங்குவரை யடுக்கத்துப் பாய்ந்துயிர் செகுக்குஞ்
 சார னாட
karum kaṇ tā kalai perum piritu urrena
kaimmai uyyā kāmar manti
kallā val paraḷ kiḷai-mutal cērtti
ōṇku varai aṭukkattu pāyntu uyir cekukkum
cāral nāṭa
 black eye rushing male-monkey big other-it had-because
 widowhood escape-not desirable female-monkey
 learn-not strong young-one horde(loc.) united
 high mountain mountain-side- sprung life destroying-
 slope land-he(voc.)

“o man from a land of slopes,
 where the desirable she-monkey that did not escape
 widowhood,
 because the black-eyed rushing male monkey had
 experienced the great other,
 joined [her] untaught young one to the horde
 [and] destroyed [her] life by jumping from the side of the
 high mountain”

Causal absolutive + absolutive + infinitive + comparison +
 imperfective *peyareccam*:

KT 139.1-5

மனையுறை கோழிக் குறுங்காற் பேடை

வேலி வெருகின மாலை யுற்றெனப்

புகுமிட னறியாது தொகுபுடன் குழீஇய

பைதற் பிள்ளைக் கிளைபயிர்ந் தாஅங்

கின்னா திசைக்கு மம்பல்

maṇai urai kōli kurum kāl pētai

vēli veruk_u inam mālai urrena

pukum iṭaṇ ariyātu tokup_u uṭaṇ kuḷīya

paital piḷḷai kiḷai payirntāṇku

iṇṇāt_u icaikkum ampal

house remain- fowl short leg she-bird

hedge wild-cat group evening had-because

entering- place know-not gathered together crowd(inf.)

trouble child relations called-like

unpleasant-it sounding- rumour

“rumours that sound unpleasant

as if the short-legged hen of the fowl living near the house

kai ara naralum nallēn yāmattu
 fireⁱⁿ like red head Anril(-bird)
 shrimpⁱⁿ like curved mouth female-bird-with
 treeⁱⁿ high twig nestⁱⁿ separated-they(h.)
 action end(inf.) calling- deep(id.)- midnight-
 “deep midnight,
 when the Anril bird with a head red like fire
 in the nest on a high branch of the tree, calls
 for [its] female with a beak curved like a shrimp
 so that action ends in those separated”

NA 190.5-7 வண்டுமூசு நெய்த னெல்லிடை மலரு
 மரியலங் கழனி யார்க்காட் டன்ன
 காமர் பணைத்தோள்
vaṇṭu mūcu neytal nel itai malarum
ariyalam kaḷaṇi ārkkāṭṭu aṇṇa
kāmar paṇai tōl
 bee swarm- blue-water-lily paddy middle blossoming-
 nectar^{am} field Ārkkāṭu(p.n. of a town)- like
 desirable bamboo shoulder
 “[she with] desirable bamboo shoulders
 who is like [the town] Ārkkāṭu with nectary fields
 where bee-swarmed water-lilies bloom amidst the
 paddy”

As a conclusion, here is a simile typical of *Caṅkam* literature, one that has earned the poet his name Cempulappeyaṇīrār:

KT 40.4f. செம்புலப் பெயனீர் போல
 வன்புடை நெஞ்சந் தாங்கலந் தனவே

cem pulam peyal nīr pōla

aṇp_u uṭai neñcam tām kalantaṇavē.

red soil raining water be-similar

love possess- heart self(pl.) they-mingled(n.pl.)^ē

“Like red soil [and] pouring water

[our] loving hearts themselves have mingled.”

5. Denominative (*kurippuviṇaimurru*)

Pronominalised nouns are not only used as a means of enlarging the lexicon, but they can also be employed in the function of predicate nouns – *kurippu-viṇai-murru*, “a finite verb by intention”. In this capacity they are very frequent in Early Old Tamil, but the numbers are decreasing towards the end of the millennium. Spontaneous literary forms are found as well as established patterns with many occurrences.

KT 7.1f. வில்லோன் காலன கழலே தொடியோண்

மெல்லடி மேலவுஞ் சிலம்பே

villōṇ kālana kaḷalē toṭiyō!

mel aṭi mēlavum cilampē

bow-he leg-they(n.pl.) anklet^ē. armlet-she

tender foot above-they(n.pl.)^{um} tinkling-anklet^ē.

“Anklets [are on] the feet of him with the bow, and anklets

[are] on the tender feet of her with bracelets.”

If lexicalised items are employed in the function of predicate nouns, they may optionally be endowed with a special mark, any slight alteration of their usual form; one of the poetic designations of the poetic hero in the Marutam tract is ஊரன் *ūraṇ*, literally “the man from the village”, and as such entered into the Tamil Lexicon. In KT 97.3 the female speaker wants to make a different sort of point, by stating that the man is currently staying in his village with his own people, i.e., ஊரான் *ūr-āṇ*:

KT 97.3 துறைவன் றம்மு ரானே ghat-he their- village-he^ē

turaivan tam ūrāṇē

“The man from the ghat is
in their village.”

- KT 242.1-4 கானங் கோழிக் கவர்குரற் சேவ
 லொண்பொறி யெருந்தின் றண்சித ருறைப்பப்
 புதனீர் வாரும் பூநாறு புறவின்
 சீறா ரோளே மடந்தை
kānam kōḷi kavār kural cēval
oḷ porī eruntin taṇ citar uraiṇṇa
putal nīr vārum pū nāru puravin
cīr, ūrōḷē maṭantai
 forest fowl seize- voice rooster
 bright spot neckⁱⁿ cool drop drip(inf.)
 shrub water overflowing- flower smell- woodlandⁱⁿ
 little village-she^e girl
 “[My] girl is in a little village
 in the flower-scented woodlands, where shrubs over-
 flow with water
 so that cool drops drip on the bright-spotted neck
 of the rooster of the forest fowl with a seizing voice.”
- NA 59.6-8 வன்புலங் காட்டுநாட் டதுவே யன்புகலந்து
 நம்வயின் புரிந்த கொள்கையொடு நெஞ்சத்
 துள்ளின னுறைவோ னுரே
val pulam kāṭṭu nāṭṭatuvē anpu kalantu
namvayin purinta koḷkaiyoṭu neñcatt,
uḷḷinaḷ uraivōḷ ūrē
 hard field wilderness- land-it^e love mingled
 us(loc.) desired- principle-with heart-
 remembered-she remain-she village^e
 “It is in the wild lands of hard soil,

These forms are by no means restricted to the third person, but they occur throughout the paradigm:

Indeed some noun stems form virtually full paradigms (and have in consequence also been analysed as defective verbs by some scholars); the table for ḡ-ḡḡ *utai* has already been shown on p. 61:

NA 183.6-8

வயின்றோ
றின்னா தலைக்கு மூதையோ டோரு
நும்மில் புலம்பின் மாலையு முடைத்தே
vayin̄-tōr_u
innā talaikkum ūtaiyōṭ_u ōrum
num il pulampin mālaiyum uṭaittē
side-ever
pleasant-not whipping- cold-wind-with listening-(?)
your(pl.)- house lonelinessⁱⁿ evening^{um} possess-it^ē
“Does your house possess evenings of loneliness too,

when you listen to the unpleasantly whipping cold
wind?”

Another candidate for an almost complete paradigm is அளி *ali*, “pity” or “love”, intriguing for the formulaic systems it is part of and to be treated under formulae in Chapter 19:

KT 30.6 தமிழேன் மன்ற வளியேன் யானே
 tamiyēn-manra aliyēn yānē
 alone-I^{manra} pity-I I^ē
 “Alone indeed, pitiable am I.”

KT 212.4f. அளிதோ தானே காமம்
 விளிவது மன்ற நோகோ யானே
 aḷitō tāṇē kāmam
 viḷivatu-manra nōkō yānē
 pity/love-it^ō self^ē desire
 perish-it^{manra} I-ache^ō I^ē
 “Pitiable it is, desire.
 It will perish for sure. Ah, I ache.”

[An outstanding case is NA 355.10 with the imperative அளிமதி *aḷimati*, “have pity!”, that semantically does not relate to the existing verbal root அளி *ali*, “to care”, but to the well-established denominative, that is, a noun plus an imperative suffix.]

VERBS

The Old Tamil verbal system was clearly based on a dual distinction that is better described as aspectual than as temporal; the basic dichotomy is imperfective – perfective/inchoative [see the discussion for modern Tamil in Deigner 1998]. Since other modes besides the indicative are at best in rudimentary existence, what is hypothetical or irreal has to be expressed along with any type of past, present and future with these two groups of forms. This is one of the reasons why particles were important, although they were later increasingly replaced by adverbs. The two most frequent functions of the perfective aspect are the past tense and what would be called, in Vedic Sanskrit, an aorist: அணிந்தாள் *aṇintāl*, “she was adorned” or “she has put on her ornaments”. The imperfective covers present and future. The present *tense* infiltrates from the bhakti period onwards but takes a long time to become firmly established. Even as late as the 12th(?) century conservative texts like, for example, the *Kallāṭam* make do without it. The present tense very likely developed out of an early auxiliary construction consisting of a verbal root in combination with the verb கில்-தல் *kil-tal*, “to be able to”: யாரோ பிரிகிற்பவரே *yārō pirikirpavarē*, “who are those that will be able to separate?” (KT 22.2), with a regular imperfective of a 10th-class verb. In the early Vaiṣṇava *Antāti*-s, then, we find that type of form along with a formation like அறிகின்றேன் *arikiṇṇēn* (Pēy 87.1), which at first sight looks like a corresponding perfective, “I was able to know”, but which in context might well already be understood as “I know”.

Tamil has a simple verbal system that can be represented in twelve classes plus a thirteenth for a moderate number of irregulars.²¹ They

²¹ There are two commonly used systems of counting the verb classes, the one of the Tamil Lexicon with twelve classes in Arabic numbers, as well as one in seven classes (+ sub-classes) with Roman numbers going back to Graul 1855. This book follows the division of the Tamil Lexicon as the most important work of reference.

are counted as weak, intermediate and strong, depending on the suffixes they take for forming the perfective and the imperfective aspect. In fact the twelfth class is a mixed class in that it has a “weak” perfective, but a “strong” imperfective. The present tense is almost identical for all of them, with one minor deviation in the last two classes. Note that it took some time before the modern period the present suffix -கின்ற- *-kinr-* was weakened into -கிற- *-kir-*. For an overview of the principal forms see the two folding tables (one for the twelve classes and one for the irregulars) at the back of this book, adapted into English from the immensely useful tables found in Beythan 1943.

One further peculiarity of the Tamil verbal system is that it has positive and negative forms for almost all finite forms (indicative, imperative, optative) as well as for some of the nonfinite forms (absolutive and *peyareccam*). The latter will be treated along with their positives. For the phenomenon of main verb negation, see Chapter 14.

The suffixes for the twelve verb classes:

root	Perfective	imperfective	(present)
weak			
1. செய் <i>cey</i>	<i>cey-t_u</i>	<i>cey-v-</i>	<i>(cey-kinr-)</i>
2. ஆள், ஆளு <i>āl(u)</i>	<i>aṇ-t_u</i>	<i>ālu-v-</i>	<i>(ālu-kinr-)</i>
3. கொல்(லு) <i>kol(lu)</i>	<i>koṇ-r_u</i>	<i>kollu-v-</i>	<i>(kollu-kinr-)</i>
4. அறி <i>ari</i>	<i>ari-nt_u</i>	<i>ari-v-</i>	<i>(ari-kinr-)</i>
5. தூங்கு <i>tūṅku</i>	<i>tūṅk_u-in-</i>	<i>tūṅku-v-</i>	<i>(tūṅku-kinr-)</i>
6. விடு <i>viṭu</i>	<i>viṭ-t_u</i>	<i>viṭu-v-</i>	<i>(viṭu-kinr-)</i>
intermediate			
7. உண் <i>uṇ</i>	<i>uṇ-t_u</i>	<i>uṇ-p-</i>	<i>(uṇ-kinr-)</i>
8. தின் <i>tin</i>	<i>tin-r_u</i>	<i>tin-p-</i>	<i>(tin-kinr-)</i>
9. கேள் <i>kēḷ</i>	<i>kēṭ-t_u</i>	<i>kēṭ-p-</i>	<i>(kēṭ-kinr-)</i>
10. கல் <i>kal</i>	<i>kar-r_u</i>	<i>kar-p-</i>	<i>(kar-kinr-)</i>
strong			
11. தீர் <i>tīr</i>	<i>tīr-tt_u</i>	<i>tīr-pp-</i> <i>(tīr-kk-)</i>	<i>(tīr-k-kinr-)</i>
12. நாட <i>naṭa</i>	<i>naṭa-nt_u</i>	<i>naṭa-pp-</i> <i>naṭa-kk-</i>	<i>(naṭa-k-kinr-)</i>

In some classes there is a complementary relation (**intransitive** – **transitive** 4th to 11th class: புணர்தல் *puṇartal*, “to unite” – புணர்த்தல் *puṇarttal*, “to bring together”; **transitive** – **causative** 6th to 11th class: விடுதல் *viṭutal*, “to let go”; விடுத்தல் *viṭuttal*, “to cause to let go”) but with the early *Kīlkkanaṅku* and bhakti corpus also a **causative formation** in analogy to an 11th class verb, develops: imperfective/perfective செய்விக்கு-/செய்வித்து- *ceyvikkū-/ceyvittu-*, “to cause to do”.

There is in general a very great fluidity of category between finite and nonfinite forms. In the simple regular formation (type 1 below) the distinction between a participial noun and a finite verb is not marked, although a number of strategies have been developed to disambiguate.

formation of participial nouns:

imperfective

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | root- <i>v/p/pp</i> -pron. suff. | செய்வர் <i>cey-v-ar</i> , “they who do” [or “they do”, finite form] |
| 2 | root- <i>p/pp</i> -pronoun | அணிபவர் <i>aṇi-p-avar</i> , “they who adorn” ²² |
| 3 | root- <i>(u)n</i> -pron. suff. | சொல்லுநர் <i>col-l-un-ar</i> , “they who speak” |
| 4 | root- <i>um</i> -pron.suff./pron. (late) | அறியுமோன் <i>aṛi-y-um-ōn</i> , “he who knows” |

perfective

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | root- <i>nt/t/iy/(in)/tt</i> -pron. suff. | அறிந்தம் <i>aṛintam</i> , “we who knew” |
| 2 | root- <i>nt/t/iy/(in)/tt</i> -pronoun (late) | அகன்றவர் <i>akan-r-avar</i> , “they who departed” |
| 3 | root- <i>nt/nr-icin</i> -pron. suff.
(except for the 5 th class) | அறிந்திசினோர் <i>aṛi-nt-icin-ōr</i> , “they who knew” |

Note that for type 3 after -இ *-i* and -ஐ *-ai* palatalisation is possible: அறிஞர் *aṛiñar*. Note further that, just like the pronominalised nouns, participial nouns, especially of the type 3 imperfective, are frequently lexicalised: செருநர் *cerunar*, “enemies”,

²² The particularity of this type appears to be that the weak stem in *-v-* is not used; all classes employ *-p-* while the 11th and 12th double into *-pp-*.

பொருநன் *porunan*, “warrior/dancer”. This formation even spills over to noun stems: வினைஞர் *viñaiñar*, “workers”.

The most frequent basic forms are the first in each aspect, and they are ambiguous forms: வருவன் *varuvan*, “he who comes” or “he comes”. If a poet wants to mark the participial noun, he may either use forms of the types 2 and 3, or he chooses the pronominal ending that employs ஒ/ஓ *o/ō* as a vowel (possible in 2nd and 3rd person animate singular as well as in 1st and honorific plural; see below). Like so many rules for Old Tamil this is a rule of thumb, but it holds good surprisingly frequently.

If, on the contrary, the poet wants to mark a form as a finite verb form, he may choose a suffix *-ku-* for the imperfective (வருகுவள் *varukuval*, “she comes”) or the suffix *-an-* for the perfective (செய்தான் *cey-t_u-an-an*, “he did”). Frequently of course the finite verb is also marked by the use of particles or simply by position.

[Note that *-an-* rarely also occurs as a suffix with the imperfective, with unclear rhetorical impact: விரைவனள் *viraivanal*, “she is in a hurry” (AN 16.14).]

Additional confusion is brought about by an extraordinary finite form, traditionally called a *mur_{re}ccam* (“what has a finite verb for its complement”), that occurs within a sentence and which a commentator usually will gloss as an absolute, to be treated in more detail in Chapter 15a.

The verbal suffixes are almost identical to the pronominal suffixes:

sg.

1 st	-என்/-ஏன், -அன் <i>-en/-ēn, -an</i>	
2 nd	-இ <i>-i</i> , -ஆய் <i>-āy</i> , -ஐ <i>-ai</i>	-ஓய்/-ஓய் <i>-oy/-ōy</i>
3 rd m.	-அன்/-ஆன் <i>-an/-ān</i> ,	-ஒன்/-ஒன் <i>-on/-ōn</i>
3 rd f.	-அள்/-ஆள் <i>-aḷ/-āl</i>	-ஒள்/-ஒள் <i>-oḷ/-ōḷ</i>
3 rd n.	-(அ)து <i>-(a)tu</i>	

pl.

1 st	-அம்/-ஆம் <i>-am/-ām</i> , -எம்/-ஏம் <i>-em/-ēm</i>	-ஓம்/-ஓம் <i>-om/-ōm</i>
2 nd	-இர்/-ஈர் <i>-ir/-īr</i> , (-மிர் <i>-mīr</i>)	
3 rd h.	-அர்/-ஆர் <i>-ar/-ār</i>	-ஒர்/-ஒர் <i>-or/-ōr</i>
3 rd pl.	-கள் <i>-kaḷ</i> , (-மார் <i>-mār</i>)	
3 rd n.	-அ/-ஐ <i>-a/-ai</i> , -அவை <i>-avai</i>	

Note here in particular the potential ambiguity arising from the use of -அன் *-an* for both the first person singular and the third person singular masculine.²³

Additional forms exist which might be explained as fossils from regional variations or verbal systems that did not make it into the classical literary idiom that was more or less codified by the second half of the first millennium (perhaps when the textual tradition changed from oral to written).

²³ Note further that both neuter singular and neuter plural occasionally have short forms, homophonous to the absolutive in the singular, homophonous to a perfective *peyareccam* in the plural (NA 220.9cf. குறுமகட் | கயலோ ராகலென் றெம்மொடு படலே *kuṟu makaṭku | ayalōr ākal enru emmoṭu paṭalē*, “what happens to us means that he will become the neighbour of the little woman”; NA 5.9 மயங்கிதழ் மழைக்கண் பயந்த தூதே *mayan̄ku itaḷ malai kaṇ payanta tūtē*, “rain eyes with dishevelled lashes have brought forth a message”).

1.sg. i.a.	v.r.-asp. suff.- <i>al</i>	போல்வல் <i>pōl-v-al</i> , “I resemble” (KT 103.6)
		செறிப்பல் <i>ceri-p-pal</i> , “I tighten” (NA 206.9)
[1.pl. p.a.	v.r.-asp. inf.- <i>ikum</i>	கண்டிகும் <i>kaṇ-ṭ-ikum</i> , “we saw” (NA 20.1)]
3.pl. i.a.	v.r.- <i>pa</i>	என்ப <i>eṇ-pa</i> , “they say” ²⁴
3.pl. i.a.	v.r.- <i>mār</i>	நோன்மார் <i>nōṇ-mār</i> , “they suffer” (NA 208.6)
3.sg. (m.f.n.)	v.r.- <i>um</i>	மல்கும் <i>mark-um</i> “it increases”

The latter form is the famous habitual future that is formally identical with the imperfective *peyareccam*. The first rule of thumb for distinguishing them is that the *peyareccam* never comes with a particle. Note that the form does not only cover the third person singular in all the three genders, but also at times the neuter plural (examples are discussed at the end of Chapter 6 on the *peyareccam*).

Most grammars of Tamil would include here also the forms in -கு, -கம், -கும், -தும், -தி, -திர -*ku*, -*kam*, -*kum*, -*tum*, -*ti*, -*tir*. In this grammar these forms are understood as another, complementary paradigm and tentatively termed “subjunctive”, discussed in Chapter 10 under “Moods”.

²⁴ This frequent form for the high-class plural is also used occasionally as an honorific: காணா கழிப *kāṇā kaḻipa* “he (the lover) passes by without seeing [me]” (KT 231.4).

6. *Viñaiyeccam*

(Also known as: Absolutive/Co(n)verb/Verbal Participle/Gerund)

The Old Tamil system of nonfinite verbal forms is complex and it serves to express the main forms of subordination. The basic functions and clauses have been described in Zvelebil 1967, the only major contribution to Tamil syntax, but his description was more oriented by the perspective of later pre-modern formal Tamil in that many peculiarities of the older language are not noticed.

Among the forms called *viñaiyeccam* (“that which needs a verb as a complement”) in the grammatical tradition the most frequent and syntactically important form is what has since been variously termed verbal participle, coverb, converb or absolutive. This book follows the latter designation, simply for the obvious similarity this form has with what Sanskrit scholars nowadays refer to as an absolutive.

The basic official rule, in Tamil as in Sanskrit, is that there should be subject identity between the absolutive and the main verb in a sentence. In fact, statistically about 30% of early Tamil absolutives *change* the subject. This fact is silently acknowledged by the commentarial convention of glossing a subject-changing absolutive by an infinitive (செய்து *ceytu* by செய்ய *ceyya*). The rule of thumb accordingly is: first, try to understand the construction as using the same subject; second, if that does not work, accept a change of subject.

Note also that in narrative poetry the absolutive is used, rather than a finite verb, to advance the action when the subject remains identical.

forms of the absolutive:

positive

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. perfective stem | செய்து <i>ceytu</i> , “having done” ²⁵ |
| | புணர்த்து <i>puṇarttu</i> , “having united” |
| 5 th class | அஞ்சி <i>añci</i> , “having feared” |
| | [special, metrically lengthened form for 5 th class in - <i>uvu</i> : தழுவு <i>taluvu</i> : தழீஇ <i>talīi</i> , “having embraced”] |
| 2. verbal root + (p) <i>pu</i> | செய்பு <i>ceypu</i> , “having done” |
| | உணர்ப்பு <i>uṇarppu</i> , “having perceived” |
| 5 th class | அஞ்சுபு <i>añcupu</i> , “having feared” |
| 3. verbal root + - <i>ā</i> | செய்யா <i>ceyyā</i> , “having done” (homophonous with the neg. abs.!)) |
| 4. verbal root + - <i>ū(u)</i> | தேடுஉ <i>tēṭūu</i> , “having sought” (rare) |
| negative | |
| 5. verbal root + - <i>ā</i> | செய்யா <i>ceyyā</i> (homophonous with the positive absolutive!) |
| 6. verbal root + - <i>ātu</i> | செய்யாது <i>ceyyātu</i> |
| 7. verbal root + - <i>āmal</i> | செய்யாமல் (later: from <i>Kalittokai</i> on) |
| [8. verbal root + - <i>āmai</i> | செய்யாமை <i>ceyyāmai</i> (homophonous to negative verbal noun; transitional form)] |

²⁵ Note that கொள்-தல் *koḷ-tal*, “to take”, abs. கொண்டு *koṇṭu*, has, from bhakti times onwards, கொடு *koṭu* as an alternate form of the absolutive (PeTM 187.2: கஞ்சனைக் கால்கொடு பாய்ந்தாய் *kañcaṇaik kāl koṭu pāyntāy*, “taking Kañcan by the leg you lept”).

Note that from bhakti times onwards there is a small number of absolutes that may serve as postpositions:

நின்று <i>ninru</i>	“from” ²⁶
கொண்டு/கொடு <i>koṇṭu/koṭu</i>	“with”
நோக்கி <i>nōkki</i>	“thanks to, in consideration of”
பற்றி <i>parri</i>	“on the basis of, with respect to”

The classical absolute clause with subject identity looks like this:

KT 69.2-4	மந்தி கல்லா வன்பறழ் கிளைமுதற் சேர்த்தி யோங்குவரை யடுக்கத்துப் பாய்ந்துயிர் செகுக்கும் <i>manti kallā val parai kiḷai-mutal cērtti</i> <i>ōṅku varai aṭukkattu pāyntu uyir cekukkum</i> female-monkey learn-not strong young-one horde(loc.) united high mountain mountain-side- sprung life destroying- “the female monkey joins [her] untaught young one to the horde, jumps from the side of the high mountain [and thus] destroys [her] life.”
-----------	---

The subject can be left open, a possibility exploited by poets:

KT 4.2,4	... கண்ணீர் தாங்கி	... <i>kaṇṇīr tāṅki</i>
	... நோமென் னெஞ்சே	... <i>nōm eṇ neñcē</i>
	... eye-water endured	“enduring tears
	... aches my- heart ⁶	my heart aches.”

²⁶ Even later comes -இலிருந்து *-iliruntu*, “from”, the modern postposition of the ablative.

The relations can be ambiguous, again possibly deliberately:

KT 21.1-4 வண்டுபடத் ததைந்த கொடியிண ரிடையிடுபு

பொன்செய் புனையிழை கட்டிய மகளிர்

கதுப்பின் றோன்றும் புதுப்பூங் கொன்றை | கானம் ...

vaṇṭu paṭa tatainta koṭi iṇar iṭaiyitupu

poṇ cey punai ilai kaṭṭiya makalir

katuppin tōṇrum putu pūm koṇrai | kāṇam ...

bee happen(inf.) been-full- creeper cluster between placed
gold make- adorn- ornament tied- women

hairⁱⁿ appearing- new flower Laburnum(-tree) | forest

“forest of laburnum with new flowers that appear like the
hair of women who have tied in decorative ornaments
made of gold,

inserting clusters full of creepers full so that bees visit
[them]”

Debatable and sanctioned by the gramatical tradition are cases where the subject of the absolutive can be understood as a part or possession of the main verb subject:

NA 369.1 சுடர்சினந் தணிந்து குன்றஞ் சேர

cuṭar ciṇam taṇintu kuṇṇam cēra

sun anger decreased hill join(inf.)

“when the sun joins the hill, [its] anger decreasing”

There are many obvious cases of change of subject like the following:

KT 88.2f. சிறுகட் பெருங்களிறு வயப்புலி தாக்கித்

தொன்முரண் சோருந் துன்னருஞ் சாரல்

ciru kaṇ perum kaḷiru vayam puli tākki

tol muraṇ cōrum tunṇu arum cāral
 little eye big elephant-bull strength tiger attacked
 old antagony diminishing- approach- difficult slope
 “slope difficult to approach where the old antagony
 diminishes
 after the small-eyed big elephant bull attacked the
 strong tiger”

The following is an example of poetic multiple subject change:

NA 328.1-3 கிழங்கு கீழ்வீழ்ந்து தேன்மே றாங்கிச்
 சில்சில வித்திப் பல்பல விளைந்து
 தினைகிளி கதியும் பெருங்க னாடன்
kiḷaṅku kīl vīḷntu tēṇ mēl tūṅki
cil cila vittī pal pala viḷaintu
tiṇai kiḷi katiyum perum kal nāṭaṇ
 bulbous-root below descended honey above hung
 few few(n.pl.) sown many many(n.pl.) ripened
 millet parrot chasing-away- big stone land-he
 “man from a land of big stones, where
 bulbous roots descend beneath, honey hangs above,
 they sow but a few [and] many many ripen,
 they chase the parakeets from the millet”

The following quotation contains, along with a rare example of the
 absolute in -ஊ(உ) -ū(u), also both the செய்யா *ceyyā* and
 செய்யாது *ceyyātu* types for the negative absolute:

AN 113.9f. நல்காது துறந்த காதல ரென்றுங்
 கால்பொருஉ மெலியாப் பாடின
nalkātu turanta kātalar eṇrum

kāl porūu meliyā pāṭin

grant-not abandoned lover(h.) always

time beaten become-soft-not sing-if

“if [we] sing without softening, [and] always beating
the time,

the lover who has abandoned us without granting [his
presence]”

செய்யா *ceyyā* type for the positive absolute:

KT 341.1-3 பல்வீ பட்ட பசுநனை குரவம்

பொரிப்பூம் புன்கொடு பொழிலணிக் கொளாஅச்

சினையினி தாகிய காலையும்

pal vī paṭṭa pacu naṇai kuravam

pori pūm puṇkoṭu polil aṇi koḷāa

cinai init_u ākiya kālaiyum

many blossom happened- green bud bottle-flower-tree

be-parched- flower Puṇku-tree-with grove adornment
take

twig pleasant-it become(p.)- time^{um}

“Even at a time when the twigs have become pleasing,
after the grove has taken for decoration the bottle-
flower tree

with green buds that fall as many blossoms, along with
the Puṇku tree with flowers [looking like] parched rice”

செய்யாமல் *ceyyāmal* type for the negative absolute (late):

Kali 1.3 கூறாமற் குறித்ததன்மேற் செல்லுங் கடுங்கூளி

kūrāmal kuṛittataṇ mēl cellum kaṭum kūḷi

tell-not intended-it- upon going- fierce demon

“the fierce demons who go according to what is intended [by you] without [your] telling”

Occasionally the negative verbal noun in -ஆமை *-āmai* can stand in for a negative absolutive:

Kali 2.16ff. கல்லிறந்து செயல்குழந்த பொருள்பொரு ளாகுமோ

தொல்லியல் வழாஅமைத் துணையெனப் புணர்ந்தவள்

புல்லாகம் பிரியாமை பொருளாயி னல்லதை

kal irantu ceyal cūlnta poruḷ poruḷ ākumō

tol iyal valāamai tunai eṇa puṇarntavaḷ

pul ākam piriyāmai poruḷ āyiṇ allatai

stone traversed going considered- wealth wealth it-is⁶

old conduct deviate-not companion say(inf.) united-she

empty chest not-separating wealth if except

“will the wealth that considers going, traversing rocks, be wealth

unless it is the wealth of not separating from the empty breast

of her who is united [with you] as a consort without deviating from ancient conduct?”

One more special function is fulfilled by the absolutive in comparative clauses (probably to be analysed as a compound form), where it allows, beyond a simple comparison from noun to noun, a comparison of processes. Two subtypes of this are found, namely absolutive plus ஆங்கு *āṅku* and absolutive plus அன்ன *anna*.

The ஆங்கு *āṅku* type demands an absolutive connection and quite naturally implies a change of subject:

KT 18.4f. சிறுகோட்டுப் பெரும்பழந் தூங்கியாங்கிவ

ளுயிர்தவச் சிறிது காமமோ பெரிதே.

cīru kōṭṭu perum palam tūṅkiyāṅk_u ival
uyir tava cīritu kāmamō peritē.
 small twig big fruit hung-like she-
 life very small-it desire^o big-it^e
 “Like a big fruit hanging on a small twig,
 her life is very small, [her] desire, ah, it is big.”

The அன்ன *anna* type generally, though not always, corresponds to a *peyareccam* connection, as such justifying the question whether the analysis as absolutive plus அன்ன *anna* actually is correct, or whether it does not rather fall under the type of *peyareccam* form with irregular sandhi that is mentioned above on p. 46:

KT 386.5 நிலம்பரந் தன்ன புன்கணொடு
nilam parantanna puṅkaṇoṭu
 ground spread-like sorrow
 “sorrow that is as if spread on the ground”

A special type of absolutive forms a causal clause formed by adding the quotative என *ena*:

KT 42.2f. கருவி மாமழை வீழ்ந்தென வருவி
 விடரகத் தியம்பும்
karuvi mā maḷai vīḷṇteṇa aruvi
viṭar akatt_u iyampum
 amount big rain fallen-because waterfall
 cave inside- sounding-
 “the waterfall resounds inside the cave
 because rain large in amount has fallen.”

Another less frequent combination is a temporal clause of absolute plus -உடன் -uṭaṇ in the sense of “as soon as”:

NA 63.3f.

புன்னை

விழவுநாறும் விளங்கிணர் விரிந்துடன் கமழும்

punnai

vilavu nārum viḷaṅk_u iṇar virintuṭaṇ kamaḷum

mast-wood

festival smelling- shine- cluster expanded-together
being-fragrant-

“where shining clusters of mast-wood, smelling of
festival, are fragrant as soon as they expand”

7. Infinitive (Different Types = Modalities)

There are a number of forms that mostly go by the designation of “infinitive”. Here the rule of thumb is the opposite to that for the absolutive: expect a *change* of subject,²⁷ although very occasionally the same subject can be found. The obvious exception is an auxiliary construction based on infinitive plus auxiliary (such as the passive with படுதல் *paṭutal*). The most frequent type and the only one to survive up to modern Tamil is the infinitive in -அ *-a*. Its primary functions are subordinate clauses that are resultative (“so that”) or simultaneous (“when, while”), but occasionally causal (“as, since”) or final (“in order to”), rarely conditional (“if”). In narrative poetry this form is used, rather than a finite verb, to advance the action when the subject changes.

forms of the infinitive

1. -அ *-a* added to the root in classes 1-8, to the imperative stem classes 9-12:
செய்ய *ceyya*, “to do”
நிற்ப *nirpa*, “to stand” (later நிற்க *nirka*)
தீர்ப்ப *tīrppa*, “to end” (later தீர்க்க *tīrkka*)
2. -மார் *-mār* தருமார் *tarumār*, “in order to give” (less frequent)
3. -இய *-iya* காணிய *kāṇiya*, “in order to see”
(often with *aḷapeṭai*²⁸) உணீஇய *uṇīiya*, “in order to eat”
4. -இயர் *-iyar* கடையர் *kaṭiyar*, “in order to chase”
(often with *aḷapeṭai*) கொடஇயர் *koṭṭiyar*, “in order to give”

²⁷ For this reason Jean-Luc Chevillard for one (for personal communication) insists on calling the *ceyya* type infinitive an absolutive.

²⁸ I.e., the metrically lengthened form explained in Chapter 20.

5. -வான் *-vān*, அளப்பான் *aḷappān*, “in order to measure”
 -(பு)பான் *-(p)pān* (less frequent; rarely found in the old texts)

Type 2 seems to cover more or less the same function as type 1, but is much less common, while the types 3-5 seem predominantly to appear in final function (“in order to”). Final infinitives need not involve a change of subject. Note that type 3 (-இய *-iya*) and type 4 (-இயர் *-iyar*) are homophonous with the optative, type 3 as well as to the perfective *peyareccam* of the 5th class. Type 5 (-வான்/-(பு)பான் *-vān/-(p)pān*) is homophonous with the imperfective masculine singular.

A number of verbs take an infinitive:

- KT 114.3 செலவியங் கொண்மோ
cela viyam koṇmō
 go(inf.) order take(ipt.)
 “take the order to go!”

-அ -a

The normal resultative function is “so that”

- KT 65.1-3 வன்பரற் றெள்ளறல் பருகிய விரலைதன்
 னின்புறு துணையொடு மறுவந் துகளத்
 தான்வந் தன்றே தளிதரு தண்கார்
val paral teḷ aṛal parukiya iralai taṇ
inp_u uru tuṇaiyoṭu maruvant_u ukalā
tāṇ vantaṇṇē taḷi taru taṇ kār
 hard pebble become-clear- water drunk- Iralai[-deer] own-
 joy have- companion-with mixed-up jump(inf.)
 self it-came^e drip- give- cool rainy-season

“It has come, the dripping cool rainy season,
so that the Iralai deer that drank clear water between
hard pebbles leaps in union with its joyful mate.”

The normal temporal function: “while/as”

KT 195.1-3 சுடர்சினந் தணிந்து குன்றஞ் சேரப்

படர்சுமந் தெழுதரு பையுண் மாலை

யாண்டுளர் கொல்லோ

cuṭar ciṇam taṇintu kuṇṇam cēra

paṭar cumant_u elutaru paiyuḷ mālai

yāṇṭ_u uḷar-kollō

sun anger decreased hill join(inf.)

affliction laden rise- give- sorrow evening

where he-is(h.)^{kollō}

“Where is he,

in sorrowful evening that rises laden with affliction,

while the sun joins the hills, [its] anger decreasing?”

One special function is indirect speech: “that”

KT 24.5f. ... கொடியோர் நாவே

காதல ரகலக் கல்லென் றவ்வே

... *koṭiyōr nāvē*

kāṭalar akala kallenṇavē

... cruel-they tongue^ē

lover(h.) depart(inf.) ‘kal’-they-said(n.pl.)^ē

“The tongues of cruel people

foretold that [my] lover would depart.”

One rarer function is temporal bordering on conditional “when/if”. Note that Old Tamil does not have a clear-cut distinction between temporal and conditional; even actual conditional forms may express simultaneity.

KT 127.4f. ஒருநின் பாணன் பொய்ய னாக

வுள்ள பாண ரெல்லாம்

oru nin pāṇan poyyaṇ āka

uḷḷa pāṇar ellām

one your- bard liar become(inf.)

be(pey.) bard(h.) all

“If your one bard is a liar,

all bards that exist [are].”

Also causal function is attested: “since”

KT 212.1-3 கொண்க னூர்ந்த கொடுஞ்சி நெடுந்தேர்

தெண்கட லடைகரைத் தெளிமணி யொலிப்பக்

காண வந்து

koṇkaṇ ūrnta koṭuñci neṭum tēr

teḷ kaṭal aṭai karai teḷi maṇi olippa

kāṇa vantu

man-from-the-sea(?) mounted- handle long chariot

clear sea settle- shore clear bell sound(inf.)

see(inf.) come

“since clear bells are sounding on the set shore of the

clear sea, come to see the chariot long with a pole(?)

mounted by the man from the sea”

-மார் -*mār*:

KT 155.5f. மாலை நனிவிருந் தயர்மார்
 தேர்வரும்
mālai naṇi virunt_u ayarmār
tēr varum
 evening abundant feast be-engaged-in(inf.)
 chariot coming-
 “the chariot is coming
 so that [she] will be preparing an ample feast for the
 evening”

The following three are examples of infinitive 3-5 in final function:
 “in order to”

-இய -*iya*:

KT 269.4-6 யாயு
 முப்பை மாறி வெண்ணெற் றரீஇய
 வுப்புவிளை கழனிச் சென்றனள்
yāyūm
uppai māri veḷ nel tarīya
uppu viḷai kaḷani cenṛanaḷ
 mother^{um}
 salt(acc.) exchanged white paddy give(inf.)
 salt ripen- field she-went
 “Mother
 has gone to the field where salt ripens
 in order to bring white paddy in exchange for salt.”

-இயர் -*iyar*:

KT 141.1f. வளைவாய்ச் சிறுகிளி விளைதினைக் கடிஇயர் | செல்க

vaḷai vāy ciru kīḷi viḷai tiṇai kaṭṭiyar | celka
 curve- mouth little parakeet ripen- millet chase(inf.)
 may-go(opt.)
 “You may go in order to chase away parakeets with
 curved beaks from the ripening millet.”

-வான் -vāṇ/-(ப)பான் -(p)pāṇ:

Pari 7.57 அவனைக் கைப்பிணை நீக்குவான் பாய்வான்
avaḷai kai piṇai nīkkuvāṇ pāyvāḷ
 she(acc.) hand tie remove(inf.) she-jumps
 “she jumps in order to remove the tie of [his] hand on her”

Finally here comes one of the rarer examples for the temporal infinitive not changing the subject:

KT 285.1-3 வைகல் வைகல் வைகவும் வாரா

ரெல்லா வெல்லை யெல்லையுந் தோன்றார்
 யாண்டுளர் கொல்லோ தோழி
vaikal vaikal vaikavum vārār
ellā ellai ellaiyum tōṇrār
yāṇṭ_u uḷar-kollō tōḷi
 day day being-kept(inf.)^{um} come-not-he(h.)
 all daylight edge^{um} appear-not-he(h.)
 where he-is(h.)^{kollō} friend
 “He who does not come as he is kept back day after day,
 he who does not appear at all the borders of daylight
 (~evenings),
 where is he, friend?”

8. *Peyareccam* – Habitual Future/Temporal Clauses

What is called *peyareccam* (“that which needs a noun as a complement”) in the Tamil grammatical tradition is sometimes referred to as an adjectival participle, relative participle (etc.), but since it is another indeclinable with no counterpart in any Indo-European tradition it is best to stick to the Tamil word. It is the feature developed in Tamil to deal with relative construction. It establishes a connection between the verbal action and the head noun, and this relation may be any type of subject, object or modal relation. Peculiar in Early Old Tamil is the possible range of its influence. It frequently is merely attributive or governs one further noun besides its head noun, but it may also govern clauses, sometimes of considerable length. It appears that the distribution of “power”, so to speak, is uneven. While the perfective *peyareccam* is merely attributive or governs short clauses, the imperfective *peyareccam* may in addition govern long clauses. In early Akam poetry that capacity is linked to the poetic feature of the *uḷḷurai*, “inset”, a coded message hidden in such a clause of landscape description (cf. Wilden 2006: 293-307). As a later development, the present tense *peyareccam* does not differ from the other two and has a restricted scope just as the perfective one.

There are a number of formalised *peyareccam* + noun formations with the purpose of forming temporal and modal clauses:

temporal	-ஞான்று <i>-ñāṇru</i> , -கால் <i>-kāl</i> , “time”; -இடை <i>-iṭai</i> , “between”; -இடத்து <i>-iṭattu</i> , obl. of இடம் <i>iṭam</i> , “place”; -முன் <i>-mun</i> , “before”; -பின் <i>-pin</i> , “after” ²⁹
modal	-ஆறு <i>-āru</i> , “way”; -படி <i>-paṭi</i> , -வகை <i>-vakai</i> , -வண்ணம் <i>-vaṇṇam</i> , “manner”

²⁹ The only postposition that forms a temporal clause with an absolutive, not with a *peyareccam*, is -உழி *-uḷi*, a construction not yet found in the *Caṇkam* corpus: Cilap 11.14 இளமரக் கானத் திருக்கை புக்குழி *iḷa marak kāṇatt_u irukkai pukk_u-uḷi*, “when they entered the seat in the forest with young trees”.

The formation of the *peyareccam*:

perfective <i>pey</i> . 5 th class	past stem + <i>a</i>	செய்த <i>cey-t-a</i> , “that did” அஞ்சிய <i>añc-i-y-a</i> , (அஞ்சின <i>añc-i-n-a</i>) “that feared” உணர்த்த <i>uṇar-tt-a</i> , “that informed”
imperfective <i>pey</i> .	imperf. stem + <i>-um</i>	செய்யும் <i>cey-y-um</i> , “that does/will do” அஞ்சும் <i>añc-um</i> , “that fears/will fear” உணர்க்கும் <i>uṇar-kk-um</i> , “that informs, will inform”
[present <i>pey</i> .	root + <i>-kinra</i>	செய்கின்ற <i>cey-kinra</i> , “that does”]
negative <i>pey</i> .	root + <i>-ā</i>	செய்யா <i>ceyyā</i> , “that does not”
negative <i>pey</i> .	root + <i>-āta</i>	செய்யாத <i>ceyyāta</i> , “that does not”
p.a. attributive:		
KT 77.3	உழந்த வம்பலர் died- traveller(h.)	<i>uḷanta vampalar</i> “dead travellers”
KT 35.3	கனைத்த கரும்பின் ripened- sugar-cane ⁱⁿ	<i>kaṇaitta karumpin</i> “ripe sugar cane”
p.a. in minor clauses:		
KT 86.1	சிறைபனி யுடைந்த சேவரி மழைக்கண் <i>cirai paṇi uṭainta cē ari maḷai kaṇ</i> check- dew broken- red streak rain eye	

“red-streaked rain eyes from which the checked tears
broke forth”

KT 79.1f. கான யானை தோனயந் துண்ட

பொரிதா னோமை வளிபொரு நெஞ்சினை

kānam yānai tōl nayant_u unṭa

pori tāl ōmai vaḷi poru neṭum ciṇai

forest elephant skin longed- eaten-

be-parched- foot toothbrush-tree wind beat- long branch

“wind-beaten long branch of the toothbrush tree with a
parched trunk

from which the forest elephant had eaten, desiring the
bark”

KT 348.2f. புலந்தேர் யானைக் கோட்டிடை யொழிந்த

சிறுவீ முல்லைக் கொம்பின்

pulam tēr yānai kōṭṭ_u itai olinta

ciru vī mullai kompiṇ

field search- elephant horn(obl.) middle stayed-behind-

little blossom jasmine twigⁱⁿ

“like a jasmine twig with little blossoms

that had stayed behind between the tusks of an elephant
searching the field”

adverbial clauses of time with *pey*. p.a. (i.a. also possible):

KT 25.5 குருகு முண்டுதான் மணந்த ஞானே

kurukum unṭu tān maṇanta ṇāṇrē

heron^{um} it-is he united-time^ē

“the heron was there at the time he united [with me].”

adverbial clauses for anterior time (“before”) with **negative** *peyareccam*:

KT 352.5f. சிறுபுன் மாலை யுண்மை
யறிவேன் தோழியவர்க் காணா வுங்கே
ciru pul mālai uṇmai
arivēn tōli avar kāṇā-v-ūṅkē
little empty evening existence
know-I friend he(h.) see-not-before^e
“Before I see him I shall know, friend,
of the existence of small empty evenings.”

adverbial clauses of manner with *pey. p.a.* (i.a. also possible; late):

AiAi 26.1+4 பெருநகை யாகின்றே ... இடருற்ற வாறு
peru nakai ākinrē ... iṭar urravāru
big laughter it-became^e ... affliction experienced-way
“‘It became big laughter, ... the way [he] experienced
affliction.’”

i.a. attributive:

KT 58.1 இடிக்குங் கேளிர் *iṭikkum kēḷir*
admonishing- friends “admonishing friends”

i.a. minor clause:

KT 143.2 பழியு மஞ்சம் பயமலை நாடன்
paḷiyum aṇcum payam malai nāṭan
blame^{um} fearing- yield mountain land-he
“the man from the land of fertile mountains who also
fears blame”

i.a. relative clause:

KT 25.3-5 தினைத்தா ளன்ன சிறுபசங் கால
 வொழுகுநீ ராரல் பார்க்குங் | குருகு
tinai tāl anṇa ciru pacum kāla
oluku nīr āral pārkkum | kuruku
 millet foot like small green legged
 flow- water Āral(-fish) looking-out- | heron
 “heron, with legs a little green like millet stalks,
 who looks out for Āral fish in the flowing water”

i.a. adverbial clause of place:

KT 38.1-3 கான மஞ்ஞை யறையின் முட்டை
 வெயிலாடு முசுவின் குருளை யுருட்டுங்
 குன்ற நாடன்
kāṇam maññai arai īṇ muṭṭai
veyil āṭu mucuvīṇ kurulai uruṭṭum
kunram nāṭan
 forest peacock rock bring-forth egg
 sunlight play- langurⁱⁿ young-one rolling- hill land-he
 “man from a land of hills,
 where the young one of the langur playing in the
 sunlight
 rolls the egg laid on the rock by a forest peacock”

i.a. ambiguous relations:

KT 8.1f. கழனி மாத்து விளைந்துகு தீம்பழம்
 பழன வாளை கதூஉ மூரன்
kaḷani māttu viḷaintu uku tīmpaḷam

paḷanam vāḷai katūum ūraṇ

paddy-field mango-tree(obl.) ripened shed- sweet fruit

pond Vāḷai(-fish) seizing- village-he

“man from a village where the Vāḷai fish in the pond seizes
the sweet fruit dropped ripe from the mango tree by the
paddy field”

i.a. adverbial clause of time:

KT 141.3-7

கொல்லை

நெடுங்கை வன்மான் கடும்பகை யுழந்த

குறுங்கை யிரும்புலிக் கோள்வ லேற்றை

பைங்கண் சென்னாய் படுபதம் பார்க்கு

மாரிரு ணடுநாள் வருதி

kollai

neṭum kai val mān kaṭum pakai ulanta

kurum kai irum puli kōḷ val ērrai

paim kaṇ cem-nāy paṭu patam pārkkum

ār_u iruḷ naṭu-nāḷ varuti

clearing

long hand strong stag fierce enmity borne-

short hand dark tiger taking strong male

green eye red dog happen- carcass looking-

difficult darkness middle-day you-come(sub.)

“You would come at midnight in difficult darkness,

when the green-eyed red dog looks out for the fallen carcass

of the male, strong in taking, of the short-handed dark tiger

that had borne the fierce enmity of the long-handed strong

male (~ elephant)”

tōṇrum comparison clause:

KT 47.1f. கருங்கால் வேங்கை வீயுகு துறுக
 லிரும்புலிக் குருளையின் றோன்றுங் காட்டிடை
karum kāl vēṅkai vī uku turu kal
irum puli kuṟulaiyīn tōṇrum kāṭṭu itai
 black leg Vēṅkai blossom shed- thick stone
 dark/big tiger youngⁱⁿ appearing- wilderness middle
 “in the middle of the wilderness,
 where the thick stone on which the blossom of the
 black-trunked kino tree had fallen,
 appears like the cub of the big tiger”

Since the habitual future in *-um* and the imperfective *peyareccam* in *-um* are homophonous and thus only distinguishable by syntax, the following examples are added to illustrate the practical problem. Possible indications that allow to distinguish one from the other would be found in the wider contexts of the source poems. In poetry at times, to be sure, both are possible. Again, note that the habitual future covers all 3rd persons singular (m./f./n.) as well as the neuter plural.

m.sg.

KT 8.2+6 ஊரன் ... | மேவன செய்யுந்தன் புதல்வன் றாய்க்கே
ūraṇ ... | mēvaṇa ceyyum taṇ putalvaṇ tāykkē
 village-he ... | wish-they(n.pl.) he-does self- son
 mother(dat.)^ē
 “The man from the village does what is wished for by
 the mother of his son.”

f.sg.

KT 45.4 மறுவருஞ் சிறுவன் றாயே
maruvarum ciruvaṇ tāyē
 is-upset little-he mother^ē
 “The mother of the little one is upset.”

n.pl.

KT 193.6 இன்று முல்லை முகைநா றும்மே
iṇru mullai mukai nārumē
 today jasmine bud they-are-fragrant^ē
 “Today the jasmine buds are fragrant.”

n.sg. (or pey.)

KT 4.1 நோமென் னெஞ்சே நோமென் னெஞ்சே
nōm eṇ neñcē nōm eṇ neñcē
 it-aches my heart^ē it-aches my heart^ē
 “Ah, my heart aches, my heart aches.”

KT 6.3f. நனந்தலை யுலகமுந் துஞ்சு
 மோர்யான் மன்ற துஞ்சா தேனே
naṇam talai ulakamum tuñcum
ōr yān-manra tuñcātēṇē
 wide place world^{um} sleeping-
 one I^{manra} sleep-not-I^ē
 “The whole world of vast area is sleeping.
 I alone am the one who does not sleep.”
 or “When the whole world of vast area is sleeping,
 I alone am the one who does not sleep.”

9a. Verbal Root for *Peyareccam* (Absolute, Infinitive, Verbal Noun)

The ubiquitous and extremely variable use of the verbal root is one of the most intriguing features of Early Old Tamil. Employed in attribution, compounds and auxiliaries, the verbal root can moreover stand in for any nonfinite verbal form in any type of subordination. The simplest most common usage is attributive, that is, a verbal root stands in for an adjective. This is called *vinaittokai*, “verbal compound” in the grammatical tradition. According to Tamil grammarians, the most frequent function of a verbal root is that of a *peyareccam*, often with a discernible temporal/aspectual impact. As such it can also be clause-governing, but mostly not over more than three elements (N^1 -v.r.- N^2). In an important article Chevillard puts forth the thesis of complementarity between marked and unmarked syntax, venturing to say that the scope of the verbal root does not exceed a single line of verse [Chevillard 2007a]. More intriguing is the fact that it may also correspond to the other nonfinite forms, namely absolute, infinitive and verbal noun [Wilden 2016]. Moreover it is used with some auxiliaries such as *taru-tal* or *kil-tal* (வரை இழதரும் அருவி *varai ili-tarum aruvi*, “a waterfall that tumbles from the mountain”), and finally also with the indefinite தொறும் *torum*: ஓதல் மல்குதொறும் *ōtal malku-torum*, “whenever the flood increases” (KT 9.5).

attributive without aspectual impact:	ஓங்குமலை <i>ōṅku malai</i> , “high mountain”
attributive for <i>pey</i> . p.a.: AN 1.4	அறுகோடு <i>aṟu kōṭu</i> , “broken tusk”
attributive for <i>pey</i> . i.a.: KT 299.4	புணர்குறி <i>puṇar kuri</i> , “sign for uniting”

minimal clause for *pey*. p.a.:

KT 79.2	வளிபொரு நெடுஞ்சினை wind beat- long branch	<i>vaḷi poru neṭum ciṇai</i> “long branch beaten by the wind”
KT 118.3	பலர்புகு வாயில் many(h.) enter- door	<i>palar puku vāyil</i> “a door entered by many”

minimal clause for *pey*. i.a.:

KT 7.6	வேம்பயி லழுவம் bamboo rustle- thicket	<i>vēy payil aḷuvam</i> “thicket rustling with bamboo”
KT 150.3	சாந்துபுல ரகலம் sandal dry- chest	<i>cāntu pular akalam</i> “chest on which sandal dries”

Less common is the verbal root in clause-governing function, but still some examples can be found:

KT 53.3	வேலன் புனைந்த வெறியயர் களந்தொறும் <i>vēlaṇ puṇainta vēri ayaṛ kaḷam-torūm</i> spear-he practised- Veri-dance immerse- floor-ever “on every dance floor where they are immersed in the Veri dance practiced by the spear-bearing [priest]”
---------	---

KT 163.1-5	பூழியர் சிறுதலை வெள்ளைத் தோடுபரந் தன்ன மீனார் குருகின் கானலம் பெருந்துறை வெள்வீத் தாழைத் திரையலை நள்ளென் கங்குலும் <i>pūḷiyar</i> <i>ciru talai veḷḷai tōṭu parantaṇṇa</i>
------------	--

mūn ār kurukin kāṇalam perum turai
veḷ vī tālai tirai alai
nallen kaṇikulum

Pūliyar(h.)

little head goat multitude spread-like
fish become-full- egretⁱⁿ seashore-grove- big ghat
white blossom screwpine wave slap-
deep(id.)- night^{um}
“at deep night,
when the waves slap against the white-blossomed
screwpine tree
at the big ghat with a seashore grove with fish-eating
egrets
spread like a multitude of small-headed white goats
of the Pūliyar.”

verbal root for infinitive:

KT 70.5 அணை மெல்லியள் *aṇai mellīya!*
touch- soft-she “she is soft to touch”

NA 108.2c-3 கடும்கண் யாணை
அணையக் கண்ட வங்குடிக் குறவர்
kaṭum kaṇ yāṇai
aṇaiya kaṇṭa am kuṭi kuṛavar
fierce eye elephant
approach(inf.) seen pretty hamlet hill-people(h.)
“the hill people with [their] pretty hamlets,
who have seen a fierce-eyed elephant approach”

KT 398.8	கண்கலி முகுபனி eye weep- shed- dew	<i>kaṇ kalil uku paṇi</i> “dew shed while the eyes weep”
----------	---------------------------------------	---

verbal root for verbal noun:

KT 132.5	தாய்காண் விருப்பின் mother see yearning ⁱⁿ	<i>tāy kāṇ viruppin</i> “with yearning to see the mother”
AN 66.11ab	காண்டல் விருப்பொடு seeing desire-with	<i>kāṇṭal viruppoṭu</i> “with the desire to see”
KT 88.3	துன்னருஞ் சாரல் approach- difficult slope	<i>tunn_u arum cāral</i> “a slope difficult to approach”
KT 344.7	பெறலரும் பொருள் obtaining difficult wealth	<i>peṛal arum poruḷ</i> “wealth difficult to obtain”

But see also:

Tē 1.73.9.1	அந்தமாதி யயனு மாலு மார்க்கு மறிவரியான் <i>antam āti ayaṇum mālum ārkkuṁ ariv_u ariyāṇ</i> end beginning Ayaṇ ^{um} Māl ^{um} who(dat.) ^{um} knowledge difficult-he “As for beginning [and] end, he is difficult to know for Brahmā, Māl and everybody.”
-------------	---

verbal root for absolute:

KT 134.5	கதழ்வீ ழருவி haste- descend- waterfall	<i>katal_i vīḷ aruvi</i> “a hastily descending waterfall”
AN 19.13cd	கதழ்ந்துவி ழவிரறல் hastened descend- shine- water	<i>katal_{ntu} vīḷ avir aral</i> “hastily descending shining water”

KT 86.2b-3c நோயொடு புலம்பலை கலங்கிப்

பிறருங் கேட்குந ருளர்கொல்

nōyoṭu pulamp_u alai kalaṅki

pirarum kēṭkunar uḷar-kol

pain-with loneliness harass- agitated

other^{um} hear-they(h.) they-are(h.)^{kol}

“are there others too who hear [it],

agitated, harassed by loneliness along with pain?”

The final examples are intriguing since here the verbal root stands in for a form that does not actually exist in Tamil, namely a gerundive:

KT 63.2 செய்வினை *cey viṇai* “the work to be done”

NA 24.8 செய்பொருள் *cey poruḷ* “the wealth to be made”

TV 2.4 தொழுநீ ரினையடி *toḷu nīr iṇai aṭi*
“the foot pair of a nature to be worshipped”

9b. Verbal Noun

Verbal nouns in -அல் *-al* and -(த்)தல் *-(t)tal* may be used as *nomina actionis* and as verbal complements, for example with வேண்டுதல் *vēṇṭutal*, “to be necessary”, or with வல்லுதல் *vallutal*, “to be able to”. In the oblique they stand for temporal/conditional (“when”) or causal (“since”) clauses, in the dative they have a final sense (“in order to”); verbal noun plus -உம் *-um* may be a sub-variety of temporal clause (“as soon as”). Strangely, verbal nouns too can be found in attributive position, with unclear semantic impact. Note that the short form in -அல் *-al* is homophonous with the negative imperative: செயல் *ceyal*, “doing” or “don’t do”. To express anteriority there is a perfective verbal noun in -அமை *-amai*. The negative verbal noun is formed with the verbal root plus -ஆமை *-āmai*. A very different type is formed in homophony with the participial noun n.sg., both perfective and imperfective (செய்வது/செய்தது *ceyvatu/ceytatu*), though very often the aspect does not seem to play a role. The most peculiar function of this n.sg. verbal noun develops in narrative texts where it can stand in for a finite verb with any person or number.

verbal root + <i>-al</i>	செயல் <i>ceyal</i> , “doing”
verbal root + <i>(t)tal</i>	செய்தல் <i>ceytal</i> , “doing”, சேறல் <i>cel-tal</i> , “going”
perfective stem + <i>-amai</i>	செய்தமை <i>ceytamai</i> , “having done”
verbal root + <i>-āmai</i> (neg.)	செய்யாமை <i>ceyyāmai</i> , “not doing”
perfective n.sg.	செய்தது <i>ceytatu</i> , “doing” (homophonous to part.n. n.sg.)
imperfective n.sg.	செய்வது <i>ceyvatu</i> , “doing” (hom. to part.n. n.sg.)

Some verbal nouns are lexicalised like simple nouns: உணங்கல் *uṇaṅkal*, lit. “drying”, but used to refer to something dried such as fish or corn. There are examples without clear etymology such as பைதல் *paital*, “suffering”.

nomen actionis:

KT 353.3 ஆடுத லினிதே *āṭutal iṇitē*
bathing pleasant-it^ē “bathing is pleasant”

verbal complement:

KT 79.8 அகறல் வல்லு வோரே *akaraḷ valluvōrē*
departing able-he(h.)^ē “those who are able to depart”

final, especially if marked as dative:

KT 100.7 மணத்தற் கரிய பணைப்பெருந் தோளே
maṇattark_u ariya paṇai perum tōlē
uniting(dat.) difficult-they(n.pl.) bamboo big shoulder^ē
“they are difficult to unite with, the big bamboo
shoulders.”

attributive:

KT 79.3 அலங்க லுலவை *alaṅkal ulavai* “swaying twig”

KT 35.5 தண்வரல் வாடை *taṇ varal vāṭai* “cool coming
north wind”

KT 28.4 அலமர லசைவளி *alamaral acai vaḷi* “whirling
moving wind”

[*figura etymologica*:

KT 276.4 அறிதலு மறியார் *aritalum ariyār*
knowing^{um} know-not-they(h.) “they don’t know at all”]

From the bhakti period onwards, a verbal noun plus -உம் *-um* can be used as a temporal clause: “as soon as”

TVM 4.6.10.3f.

வண்டுவராபதி

மன்னனை யேத்துமி னேத்துதலுந் தொழுதாடுமே

vaḷ tuvarāpati

mannanai ētumiṇ ēttutalum toḷut_u āṭumē

generous Dvāravatī

king praise(ipt.) praising^{um} worshipped dancing- [she]^ē

“Praise the generous king of Dvārakā;

as soon as you praise [him] she will dance in worship.”

The oblique of the verbal noun in -அலின்/-(த)தலின் *-alin/- (t)alin* can form temporal/conditional clauses: “when, upon”

KT 167.5f. இனிதெனக் கணவ னுண்டலி

னுண்ணிதின் மகிழ்ந்தன் றொண்ணுதன் முகனே

in_{it_u} ena kaṇavan uṇṭalin

nuṇṇitiṇ makiḷntan_{r_u} oḷ nutal mukanē

sweet-it say(inf.) husband eatingⁱⁿ

fine-itⁱⁿ delighted-it bright forehead face

“when the husband ate it, saying ‘it is excellent’,

the face of [her with] bright forehead was subtly

delighted.”

Occasionally other cases are marked, as the accusative in the following example:

KT 305.4 களைதலை யவராற் றலரே

kaḷaitalai avar ārralarē

removing(acc.) he(h.) able-not-he(h.)^ē

“he is not able to remove.”

the perfective verbal noun:

NA 282.4 காதலன் றந்தமை யறியாது

kāṭalan̄ tantamai ariyātu

lover having-given know-not

“not knowing that the lover has given”

KT 92.2,5 பறவை | ... | இரைகொண் டமையின் விரையுமாற்
செலவே

paravai | ... | irai koṇṭamaiyīṇ viraiyumāl celavē

bird | ... | food having-takenⁱⁿ hurrying-^{al} going^e

“The birds, because of having taken up food, hurry in going.”

the negative verbal noun in -ஆமை -āmai:

NA 50.1 அறியாமையி னன்னை யஞ்சி

ariyāmaiṇ aṇṇai añci

not-knowingⁱⁿ mother feared

“being afraid of mother for her not knowing”

In this function, in some bhakti texts the suffix -ஆமை -āmai can be weakened into -ஆமே -āmē:

Tē 1.80.1.1f. சுற்றாங்கொரி யோம்பி கலியை வாராமே

ceṇṇār vāṇṇi tillaṇṇi

karrāṇṇi eri ōmpi kaliyai vārāmē

ceṇṇār vāl tillaṇṇi

learned-like fire protected Kaliyuga(acc.) coming-not
prevented-they(h.) live- Tillai

“Tillai where live [the brahmins] who have prevented
the Kaliyuga so that it may not come, protecting the
fires like they have learned”

The verbal noun in neuter singular:

verbal noun as a subject:

NA 272.9 அம்பன் மூதா ரறிந்தது
 நோயா கின்றது நோயினும் பெரிதே
 ampal mūt_u ūr arintatu
 nōy ākinratu nōyinum peritē.
 rumour old village knowing
 pain became-it pain^{inum} big-it^ē.
 “That the gossiping old village should know
 has become a pain greater than pain.”

relative construction of n.sg. verbal noun plus *ōr* (the numeral):

KT 377.4f. நாடனொடு
 செய்து கொண்டதோர் சிறுநன் னட்பே
 nāṭanoṭu
 ceytu koṇṭatōr ciṛu nal naṭpē
 land-he-with
 made taken-it one little good friendship^ē
 “A good little friendship that has been made
 with the man from the land.”³⁰

verbal noun in place of a finite verb:

PV 172.2f.

செருவில் | வலியார் வலியா ராய்மண் ணாள்வது
 ceruvil | valiyār valiyār āy maṇ ālvatu

³⁰ Note that this is an early example also of the auxiliary கொள்-தல் *koḷ-tal* in middle function: a friendship that has been made by the girl for herself with the man.

fight(loc.) | strength-they(h.) strength-they(h.) become(abs.) earth
ruling

“Those strong in battle, being strong, they rule the earth.”

A similar impersonal construction occurs with the verbal nouns of the செயல் *ceyal* or the செய்தல் *ceyatal* types, but this is more frequently found in theoretical texts:

TC 19i இயற்கைப் பொருளை யிற்றெனக் கிளத்தல்
iyarkai porulai irru ena kiḷattal
nature meaning(acc.) this-it say(inf.) stating
“[There is] stating about the natural meaning: ‘[it] is
such.’”

10. The Moods (Imperative, Optative, Subjunctive?)

Moods are weakly developed in Early Old Tamil and further weaken in the course of time. At the same time the old texts record a bewildering variety of forms for the same simple function of, say, imperative, probably letting shine through some of the original regional and dialectal variation that was gradually eliminated with the creation of a supra-regional poetic idiom. In short, we find many imperatives, traces of two very different varieties of optatives and probably an old, disintegrating paradigm of what might have been a subjunctive.

Imperative

imperative (2nd person)

- | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 1a verbal root | எழு <i>elu</i> | “rise!” (KT 11.4) |
| 1b (plural) v.r. + -īr | சொலீர் <i>colīr</i> | “speak!” (Tē 2.2.8.3) post- <i>Caṅkam</i> |
| 2. -m-ō/-ē/ēṇa | மொழிமோ <i>moḷimō</i> | “speak!” (KT 2.2) |
| | தெளிமே <i>teḷimē</i> | “let it be clear!” (KT 273.8) |
| 3. -min | ஓம்புமின் <i>ōmpumin</i> | “beware!” (KT 184.2) |
| 4. -mati | இனைமதி <i>inaimati</i> | “despair!” (KT 19.3) |
| 5. -āy | கேளாய் <i>kēlāy</i> | “hear!” (KT 390.1) |
| 6. v.r. + -um | சொல்லும் <i>collum</i> | “speak!” (PK 4.3) post- <i>Caṅkam</i> |

negative imperative (2nd person)

- | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 7. v.r. + -al | செல்லல் <i>cellal</i> | “don’t go!” (KT 179.3) |
|---------------|-----------------------|------------------------|

With the imperative it is especially difficult to distinguish between singular and plural, probably because many forms expressed degrees of politeness and/or familiarity. Definitely type 1, the root imperative, was impolite then as it is now, although an exception has to be made for the *bhakti* works where god is often addressed with the mere verbal root. Note that the plural suffix -kaḷ(ē) may be added to type 1b and 3: உரையீர்கள் *uraiyīrkaḷ*, “tell” (TVM 9.7.10.1),

அறிமின்களே *aṛimīṅkaḷē*, “know” (PK 201.4). Type 2 ending in simple -ம் -*m* is always followed by a particle -ஓ -*ō* or -ஏ -*ē*, unless embedded in direct speech with என *ena*. Type 5 in -ஆய் -*āy* is homophonous with the negative 2nd person singular: கூறாய் *kūrāy*, “you don’t talk” or “talk!”. Type 7, the negative imperative, is homophonous with the short form of the verbal noun: செயல் *ceyal*, “doing” or “don’t do!”. Later further imperative suffixes such as -மின் -*min* may be added to the negative imperative: துன்னன்மின் *tunnānmin* “don’t approach!” (Cint 799.4).

Perhaps an isolated form is a negative imperative plus a suffix of the 3rd person plural attested in NA 64.13: காணன்மார் *kāṇ-al-mār*, “may they not see”.

The early bhakti texts and *Kīlkkāṇakku* show the first occurrences of an imperative based on a perfective stem, although seemingly without aspectual impact. Note that these forms are homophonous with the perfective of the 2nd person: கண்டாய் *kaṇṭāy*, pl. கண்டீர் *kaṇṭīr*, “you saw” or “see!”.

Optatives

One of the forms called optative in modern times is used frequently and with all persons and numbers:

1. -iya வாழிய *vāḷiya* “may you live” (KT 19.3)
2. -iyar இறீஇயரோ *iṟīyarō* “may they break” (KT 169.2)

It is homophonous with the second type of infinitive and has to be distinguished by context and its final position in the sentence. Like the infinitive, it is often metrically lengthened, and especially the form in -இயர் -*iyar* adds a particle -ஓ -*ō*, perhaps of politeness.

An isolated survivor of the same form in the first person plural may be உரைக்கியம் *uraikkīyam*, “we will tell” (TV 55.2).

Another independent form exists that is difficult to analyse, with many occurrences and presumably an optative impact:

perfective stem + -இசின் *-icin*

It is used predominantly for 1st and 2nd, but occasionally also for 3rd person. As a rule of thumb it goes with a 2nd person unless another person is specified by adding a pronoun: உரைத்திசின் நெஞ்சே *uraitticin neñcē*, “may you speak, heart” (KT 63.2), but யானே ... படர் கூர்ந்திசினே *yānē ... paṭar kūrtticinē*, “let me have affliction in abundance” (KT 216.3f.).

Subjunctive/Optative?

Finally there is the already mentioned row of further stray forms which adds up from two incomplete, but complementary paradigms, as suggested by Chevillard 1991. In my view they are best described as a subjunctive paradigm already weakening in the *Caṅkam* period itself and slowly merging into the “modern” optative in -க *-ka* for all persons. The main reason for that suggestion is that, although occurrences exist that seem to express a future, the majority of cases suggest a possibility, an uncertainty, a wish for something to happen.

1.sg. *-ku/kku* யான் எவன் செய்கோ *yāṇ evaṇ ceykō*,

“what will/can I do?” (KT 25.2)

2.sg. *-(t)ti* எம்மை யுய்த்தியோ *emmai uyttiyō*,

“will you send us?” (KT 63.4)

3.sg. *-ka* நாடன் வல்லே வருக *nāṭaṇ | vallē varuka*,

“let him come fast” (KT 111.5f.)

1.pl. *-kam* நாணுகம் சிறிதே *nāṇukam ciritē*,

“we may be a little ashamed” (KT 14.6)

-kum கேட்கும் நின் குரலே *kēṭkum niṇ kuralē*,

“we can hear your voice” (KT 163.5)

-*tum* எவ்வழி யறிதும் *evvaḷi aritum*, “how can we know?”
(KT 40.3)

2.pl. -(*t*)*tir* சேறினோ *cērirō*, “will you go?” (KT 268.1)

3.pl. -*ka* பலருங் கூறுக *palarum kūruka*, “let many people talk”
(KT 170.1)

In the ubiquitous formulaic address of the female friend வாழி தோழி *vāḷi tōḷi*, literally “may you live, friend”, but actually no more than a pronounced vocative “o friend”, வாழி *vāḷi* might be analysed as an irregular (simplified) form in -தி -*ti*; cf. ஆழி *āḷi*, “immerse yourself” (TVM 1.4.10.4).

However, already in the *Caṅkam* corpus itself “modern” optative forms occur where -க -*ka* can be used for all persons and numbers:

KT 14.2f. சின்மொழி யரிவையைப் | பெறுக தில்லம்ம யானே
cil molī arivaiyai | peruka-tillamma yāṇē
few word girl(acc.) may-obtain^{tillamma} I^ē
“Ah, let me obtain the girl of few words!”

KT 23.3 அகவன் மகளே பாடுக பாட்டே
akaval makaḷē pāṭuka pāṭṭē
Akaval woman^ē may-sing song^ē
“soothsaying woman, please sing a song!”

Moreover, the 2nd person singular in -தி -*ti* sometimes goes in the direction of a request and is counted by most modern grammars among the imperative suffixes:

KT 63.2 செய்வினை கைம்மிக வெண்ணுதி
cey viṇai kai mika eṇṇuti
do- work action much consider-you
“Consider well the work to be done!”

The corresponding negative forms certainly seem to go in the direction of a negative optative:

v.r.-*al-ka* வாறற்க தில்ல *vārarka-tilla*, “may you not come” (KT 198.8)

v.r.-*ā-ti* சிதையாதி *citaiyāti*, “may you not waste” (AiAi 42.4)

In the bhakti corpus, hybrid forms of indicative and subjunctive are found: என் செய்கேன் என் திரு மகட்கே *en ceykēn en tirumakaṭkē*, “what can I do for my splendid daughter?” (TVM 7.2.8.4), a clear sequel to the *Caṅkam* formula யான் எவன் செய்கோ *yān evaṇ ceykō*, “what can I do?”.

A presumable periphrastic construction of a perfective stem plus ஈதல் *ītal*, “to give”, as root imperative or optative, is in existence, though rare: வந்தீக *va-nt_u-īka*, “come!” (NA 221.12), also attested with a short vowel சென்றிக *ceṇ-ṛ_u-ika*, “go!” (NA 321.8). Corresponding forms continue in the early *Kīlkkāṇakku*, *Kalittokai* and *Cilappatikāram*: வந்தீ *va-nt_u-ī*, “come!” (Kali 85.20), வந்தீக *vant_u-īka*, “may you come!” (Kali 86.10), எழுந்தீக *eḷu-nt_u-īka*, “may you rise!” (AiE 55.2), காயந்தீயல் *kāy-nt_u-ī-y-al*, “don’t be angry!” (AiE 7.1), கேட்டமின் *kēṭ-t_u-īmin*, “listen!” (Cilap 21.40). The negative counterpart, based on negative absolutive plus ஈதல் *ītal*, is fairly common in the *Caṅkam* corpus: செல்லாதீமோ *cellātīmō*, “don’t go!” (KT 390.2), வாராதீமே *vārātīmē*, “don’t come!” (NA 336.11).

In an intermittent period of *Kīlkkāṇakku* into the bhakti period -ஏல் *-ēl* may be added to verbal roots and even finite forms in order to express a negative imperative: போகேல் *pōkēl*, “don’t go!” (TVM 10.3.8.1), but also, and here with a 1st person plural, சொல்லுதுமேல் *collutumēl*, “let us not speak!” (PK 297.1), காயந்தீயேல் *kāy-nt_u-ī-y-ēl*, “don’t be angry!” (AiE 7.1v).

11. Coordination and Question

Among the basic syntactic structures that are marked by particles there are coordination and interrogation. One of the few surviving forms from Old Tamil to modern days is the enclitic -உம் *-um*, used on word level for the indefinite (“any”, “every”), for completion (“all”), for accentuation (“too”) and on phrase level for coordination of nouns and clauses. Contrary to the rule taught in any modern Tamil grammar book, however, in Old Tamil -உம் *-um* also coordinates sentences. A question may be marked, first of all, by an interrogative pronoun, often in combination with -ஏ *-ē* to mark the end of the sentence or to focalise. The old interrogative particles are -ஓ *-ō* and -கொல் *-kol*, generally the former for questions of evaluation and the latter for questions of information. Both of them can be combined into the rhetorical question கொல்லோ *kollō*, while -ஓ *-ō* coordinated with another -ஓ *-ō* marks an “either-or” question. Note that from bhakti times onwards -ஏ *-ē* can also be used to mark a question, and very rarely -ஆ *-ā* (the modern interrogative) can be seen in the same function.

-உம் <i>-um</i> , “and”	enclitic, coordinates not only nouns and clauses, but also sentences; on all members or only on the last
interrogative pronoun	question
-ஏ <i>-ē</i>	end of a question and focalisation
-ஓ <i>-ō</i>	question (of evaluation)
-கொல் <i>-kol</i>	question (of information)
கொல்லோ <i>kollō</i>	rhetorical question
-ஏ <i>-ē</i>	interrogative particle in bhakti texts

noun coordination with -உம் -um:

- KT 20.1 அருளு மன்பு நீக்கி
 aruḷum anpum nīkki
 consideration^{um} love^{um} discarded
 “having discarded consideration and love”

For the coordination of two items there is a possibility of using sociative -ஒடு -otu instead:

- KT 190.1 நெறியிருங் கதுப்பொடு பெருந்தோ ணீவி
 neri irum katuppoṭu perum tōḷ nīvi
 curl- dark hair-with big shoulder stroked
 “stroking the big shoulders and the curly dark hair”

-உம் -um can occur on every member of a long row of coordinated nouns:

- Poy 29.1f. இறையு நிலனு மிருவிசும்புங் காற்று
 மறைபுனலுஞ் செந்தீயு மாவான்
 iraiyum nilaṇum iru vicumpum kārrum
 arai puṇalum cem tīyum āvāṇ
 lord^{um} ground^{um} dark sky^{um} wind^{um}
 dash- flood^{um} red fire^{um} he-becomes
 “The lord, the ground, the dark sky, the wind
 the dashing flood and the red fire is he.”

When -உம் -um coordinates clauses it is added to the nonfinite verb forms (infinitives or absolutives) to be coordinated:

- Pēy 76.1f.+4 பொருப்பிடையே நின்றும் புனல்குளித்து மைந்து
 நெருப்பிடையே நிற்கவுநீர் வேண்டா ...
 லஃகாவே தீவினைக ளாய்ந்து

porupp_u iṭaiyē nin_{rum} puṇal kuḷittum aintu

nerupp_u iṭaiyē nirkavum nīr vēṇṭā ...

akkāvē tī vīṇaikaḷ āyntu

height middle^ē stood^{um} flood bathed^{um} five

fire middle^ē stand(inf.)^{um} you(pl.) need-not(a.)

pass-away-not(n.pl.)^ē evil deeds dwindled

“Without that you must stand on heights, bathe in

floods and stand between five fires, ...

[your] evil deeds will dwindle [and] pass away.”

When -உம் -um coordinates sentences, it is usually added to the first member of the main clause (that is, not to an attribute but to the subject or object).

simple coordination:

KT 31.4,6 யானுமோ ராடுகள மகனே ...

பீடுகெழு குரிசிலுமோ ராடுகள மகனே

yānum ōr āṭukaḷam makaḷē ...

pīṭu keḷu kuricilum ōr āṭukaḷam makaṇē

I^{um} one dance-floor daughter^ē ...

excellence have- lord^{um} one dance-floor son^ē

“I am a woman on the dance floor ...

and the excellent lord is a man on the dance floor.”

KT 51.3-6

சேர்ப்பனை

யானுங் காதலென் யாயுநனி வெய்ய

ளெந்தையுங் கொடஇயர் வேண்டு

மம்ப லூரு மவனொடு மொழிமே

cērpṇanai

yānum kātalen yāyum naṇi veyyaḷ

entaiyum koṭīyar vēṇṭum

ampal ūrum avaṇoṭu moḷimē

coast-he(acc.)

I^{um} love-I my-mother^{um} abundant hot-she

my-father^{um} give must(hab.fut.)

rumour village^{um} he-with it-speaks^ē

“The man from the coast,

I love him and my mother is very keen on him

and my father must give [me to him]

and [even] the gossiping village is speaking in his
favour.”

However, poetic license comes into play for example if one of the coordinated clauses does not contain the required element or for the sake of poetic parallelism (-உம் *-um* added to the first foot of the line).

KT 17 மாவென மடலு மூர்ப பூவெனக்
 குவிமுகி மெருக்கங் கண்ணியுஞ் குடுப
 மறுகி னார்க்கவும் படுப
 பிறிது மாகுப காமங்காழ்க் கொளினே
mā eṇa maṭalum ūrpa pū eṇa
kuvi mukil erukkam kaṇṇiyum cūṭupa
maṛukiṇ ārkkavum paṭupa
piṛitum ākupa kāmam kālkkoliṇē
horse say Palmyra-stem^{um} they-mount flower say
heap- bud Yarcum chaplet^{um} they-wear
streetⁱⁿ shout^{um} they-suffer
other-it^{um} they-become desire coming-to-a-climax-if^ē

“They will mount palmyra stems as horses and they
will wear chaplets of heaped Yarcum buds as flowers
and they will be shouted at in the streets
and another thing will happen, when desire is over-ripe.”

KT 113.1f. ஊர்க்கு மணித்தே பொய்கை பொய்கைக்குச்
சேய்த்து மன்றே சிறுகான் யாறே
ūrkum aṇittē poykai poykaikku
cēyttum aṇrē ciṟu kān yāṛē
village(dat.)^{um} close-it^ē pond pond(dat.)
distance-it^{um} not-so-it^ē little forest river^ē
“Close to the village is the pond and from the pond
not far is the little forest river.”

-உம் -um only on the second member:

KT 62.4f. நல்லோண் மேனி
முறியினும் வாய்வது முயங்கற்கு மினிதே
nallōḷ mēni
muriyinum vāyvatu muyaṅkarku minitē
good-she body
shoot^{inum} more-excellent-it embracing(dat.)^{um} pleasant-it^ē
“The body of the good one,
it surpasses a sprout [in softness] and is pleasant to
embrace.”

KT 74.2f.,5 குன்ற நாடன்
யாந்தன் படர்ந்தமை யறியான் றானும் ...
சாயின னென்ப
kunram nāṭan

yām taṇ paṭarntamai ariyāṇ tāṇum ...
cāyinaṇ eṇpa

hill land-he

we him- thought-we(acc.) know-not-he self^{um} ...

he-was-emaciated they-say

“The man from the hilly land

does not know that we have been thinking of him

and he himself has become emaciated, they say.”

Rarely coordination can be asyndetic, that is, coordinate unrelated sentences of different syntactic structure:

KT 161.1f.,4 பொழுது மெல்லின்று பெயலு மோவாது

கழுதுகண் பனிப்ப வீசு மதன்றலை ...

அன்னா வென்னு மன்னையு மன்னோ

polutum el inru peyalum ovātu

kalutu kaṇ paṇippa vīcum atanralai ...

annā ennum annaiyum annō

time^{um} light is-not raining^{um} stop-not-it

demon eye shiver throwing- that(obl.+loc.) ...

mother(voc.) saying- mother^{um} alas!

“Time without light and the rain without stopping

hurls down, so that demon eyes shiver, and on top of

that

mother who says “mother!”, alas.”

interrogative pronoun:

KT 158.6 இஃதெவனே

this what^e

ikt_u evaṇē

“What is this?”

- KT 18.3 யாரஃ தறிந்திசி னோரே *yār akt_u arinticinōrē*
 who that known-they(h.)^ē “Who are those who
 understand that?”

inter.pron. + focalisation:

- KT 140.4f. எவ்வம் | யாங்கறிந் தன்றிவ் வழுங்க லூரே
evvam | yāṅk_u arintanru i aluṅkal ūrē
 trouble | what it-knew this- noise village^ē
 “What has it understood of the trouble, this noisy
 village?”

questions with -கொல் -kol:

- KT 28.1 முட்டு வேன்கொ றாக்கு வேன்கொல்
muṭṭuvēṇ-kol tākkuvēṇ-kol
 I-attack^{kol} I-strike-against^{kol}
 “Shall I attack? Shall I strike?”
- KT 177.4f. இன்றவர் | வருவர்கொல் வாழி தோழி
inru avar | varuvar-kol vāḷi tōḷi
 today he(h.) | he-comes(h.)^{kol} live(sub.) friend
 “Will he come today, o friend?”

Also -கொல் -kol and -ஓ -ō can appear in coordination with -ஏ -ē for focalisation:

- KT 5.1 அதுகொ றோழி காம நோயே
atu-kol tōḷi kāma nōyē
 that^{kol} friend desire pain^ē
 “Is that, friend, the pain of desire?”
- KT 160.6 இஃதோ தோழிநங் காதலர் வரைவே
iktō tōḷi nam kātalar varaivē

this^o friend our- lover(h.) marriage^e

“Is this, friend, the marriage with our lover?”

KT 2.4f.

அரிவை கூந்தலி

னறியவு முளவோநீ யறியும் பூவே

arivai kūntalin

nariyavum ulavō nī ariyum pūvē

young-woman tressesⁱⁿ

fragrant-they(n.pl.)^{um} they-are(n.pl.)^o you knowing- flower^e

“Do [flowers] exist that are as fragrant as the tresses
of the young woman, among the flowers you know?

Double -ஓ -o can be employed for either-or:

KT 142.2f.

பூங்கண் பேதை

தானறிந் தனளோ விலளோ

pūm kaṇ pētai

tāṇ arintaṇalō ilalō

flower eye innocence

self she-knew^o not-she^o

“The flower-eyed innocence,
did she know or did she not?”

A rhetorical question, that is, a question that does not really ask for information but is meant to vent the speaker’s feelings, can be marked with கொல்லோ *kollō*:

KT 16.1

உள்ளார் கொல்லோ தோழி

remember-not-he(h.)^{kollō}

uḷḷār-kollō tōḷi

“Does he not
remember, friend?”

KT 279.4 இதுபொழு தாகவும் வாரார் கொல்லோ
itu poḷut_u ākavum vārār-kollō
 this time become(inf.)^{um} come-not-he(h.)^{kollō}
 “Although the time is this, will he not come?”

KT 180.5 எய்தினர் கொல்லோ பொருளே *eytiṇar-kollō poruḷē*
 he-obtained^{kollō} wealth^ē “Did he obtain it –
 wealth?”

In bhakti texts also -ஏ -ē may be found as an interrogative particle:

Poy 95.2f. மூவாத | மாகதிகண் செல்லும் வகையுண்டே
mūvāta | mā kati-kaṇ cellum vakai uṇṭē
 age-not great way(loc.) going- means it-is^ē
 “Is there a means to go on the ageless great way?”

12. Embedded Clauses with *ākutal*, *enṇutal* and *pōl-tal*

As a rule, Old Tamil has one finite verb per sentence. However, there are four productive exceptions, namely an insertion (of an imperative or optative: காண் *kāṇ*, “see!”, என்ப *enpa*, “they say”), a *murreccam* (a finite form standing in for a nonfinite one), a double verb form (such as some forms of negation), and finally embedding – a small number of verbs have special dispensation to be preceded by a finite form. The former three are treated in Chapter 15a; both on serial verbs and embedding, see Steever 1988, 1993.

The three primary embedding verbs are:

என் <i>en</i> , “to say”	verbal root (என் <i>en</i>), infinitive (என <i>ena</i>), absolutive (என்று <i>enru</i>), perfective <i>peyareccam</i> (என்ற <i>enra</i>), finite forms [occasionally other verba dicendi]: direct speech or thought
ஆகு <i>āku</i> , “to become”	verbal root (ஆ <i>ā</i>), absolutive (ஆகி/ஆய் <i>āki/āy</i>), infinitive (ஆக <i>āka</i>), perfective <i>peyareccam</i> (ஆய/ஆகிய <i>āya/ākiya</i>), verbal noun (ஆகல்/ஆகுதல் <i>ākal/ākutal</i>): concomitance and attribution (“when”, “since”, “that”)
போல் <i>pōl</i> , “to be similar”	verbal root (போல் <i>pōl</i>), absolutive (போன்று <i>pōṇru</i>), infinitive (போல <i>pōla</i>), perfective <i>peyareccam</i> (போன்ற <i>pōṇra</i>): comparative clause; habitual future (போலும் <i>pōlum</i>): “it seems that”

direct speech or thought:

KT 82.2 அழாஅ லென்றுநம் மழுதகண் டுடைப்பார்
aḷāal enru nam aḷuta kaṇ tuṭaippār

don't-cry said our- cried- eye he-wipes(h.)

“‘Don't cry!’ he says [and] wipes our eyes that cried.”

KT 141.1-3 வளைவாய்ச் சிறுகிளி விளைதினைக் கடிஇயர்

செல்கென் றோளே யன்னை யெனநீ

சொல்லி னெவனோ தோழி

vaḷai vāy ciṟu kiḷi viḷai tiṇai kaṭṭiyar

celka eṇrōḷē annai eṇa nī

collin evaṇō tōli

curve- mouth little parakeet ripen- millet chase(inf.)

may-go said-she^ē mother say(inf.) you

say-if what^ō friend

“What if [you] said, friend:

‘Mother is one who said, ‘let her go

in order to chase from the ripening millet

the little parakeets with curved beaks’?”

KT 187.5 வலிய னென்னாது மெலியுமென் னெஞ்சே

valiyaṇ eṇṇātu meliyum eṇ neñcē

hard-he say-not softening-it my- heart^ē

“Without saying ‘he is hard’ my heart is softening.”

The quotative verb என்னுதல் *eṇṇutal* may on occasion be replaced by an other *verbum dicendi*:

KT 148.6 கனவோ மற்றிது வினவுவல் யானே

kaṇavō marr_u itu viṇavuval yāṇē

dream^{ōmaru} this I-ask I^ē

“‘Is this but a dream?’ I ask.”

An additional possible function of the quotative verb is that of concluding an enumeration:

KT 32.1-3 காலையும் பகலுங் கையறு மாலையு
 மூர்துஞ்சு யாமமும் விடியலு மென்றிப்
 பொழுதிடை தெரியிற் பொய்யே காமம்
kālaiyum pakalum kai aru mālaiyum
ūr tuñcu yāmamum viṭiyalum enr_u i
polut_u itai teriyin poyyē kāmam
 morning^{um} midday^{um} action cease- evening^{um}
 village sleep- midnight^{um} dawn^{um} said this-
 time-of-day between distinguish-if lie^ē desire
 “Morning, midday, action-ending evening,
 midnight when the village sleeps and dawn –
 when one [still] distinguishes between these times,
 desire is only a lie.”

An additional special function of the embedding verbs is as a quasi postposition in the sense of taking something for something else (என *ena*) or using something as an instrument (ஆ, ஆக *ā, āka*):

KT 17.1f.மாவென மடலு மூர்ப. பூவெனக்
 குவிமுகி மெருக்கங் கண்ணியுஞ் குடுப
mā ena maṭalum ūrpa. pū ena
kuvī mukil erukkam kaṇṇiyum cūṭupa
 horse say(inf.) Palmyra-stem^{um} they-mount flower say(inf.)
 heap- bud Yarcum chaplet^{um} they-wear
 “They will mount palmyra stems as horses and as flowers
 they will wear chaplets of Yarcum in heaped buds.”

Poy 1.1-3 வையந் தகளியா வார்கடலே நெய்யாக

வெய்ய கதிரோன் விளக்காகச் – செய்ய

சுடராழியா னடிக்கே சூட்டினேன் சொன்மாலை

vaiyam takali ā vār kaṭalē ney āka

veyya katirōṇ viḷakk, āka – ceyya

cuṭar āliyāṇ aṭikkē cūṭṭinēṇ col mālai

earth bowl become- flow- sea oil become(inf.)

hot ray-he light become(inf.) red

glow- discus-he foot(dat.)⁶ I-put-on word garland

“With the earth as the bowl, the flowing sea as oil

[and] him with hot rays as the light I put a word garland

on the feet of him with the red-glowing discus.”

The use of the infinitive ஆக *āka* in an embedding construction allows more or less the same range of shades as the verbal root + *a*-type of infinitive sub-clause (cf. infinitive type 1, p. 93f.), with the advantage of being able to clearly mark person, number, aspect and mood:

“when”

KT 265.7f. யான்றனக் குரைத்தனெ னாக

தானா ணினன்

yāṇ taṇakk, uraittanen āka

tāṇ nāṇiṇan

I him(dat.) I-told become(inf.)

he he-was-ashamed

“When I told him

he himself became ashamed.”

“so that”

KT 172.3f. எமிய மாக வீங்குத் துறந்தோர்

தமிய ராக வினியர் கொல்லோ

emiyam āka īnku turantōr
tamiyar āka iṇiyar-kollō
 our-we become(inf.) here abandoned-he(h.)
 alone-he(h.) become(inf.) pleasant-he(h.)^{kollō}
 “He who abandoned [us] here so that we are on our own,
 is it pleasing to him to be alone?”

The absolutive ஆகி *āki* allows the correlation of independent events and can often be rendered by “since”:

KT 329.5,7 பயிலிரு ணடுநாட் டுயிலரி தாகி ...

naṇmalaṛ maṇṇaṇṇiṇṇ kelaivavaṇṇ paṇiyē
payil iruḷ naṭunāl tuyil arit_u āki ...
nal malar maḷai kaṇir_u eḷiyavāl paṇiyē
 be-dense- darkness midnight sleep difficult-it
 become(a.)...
 good blossom rain eye(dat.) easy-they(n.pl.)^{āl} dew^ē
 “Since sleep is difficult at midnight in the dense darkness,
 tears [come] easy indeed to the rain eyes, good blossoms.”

“since” (~ apposition)

NA 215.8f. இன்றுநீ யிவணை யாகி யெம்மொடு

inru nī iṇṇai āki emmoṭu
taṇkiṇ evaṇō teyya
 today you here-you become(abs.) us-with
 stay-if what^ō teyya
 “Since you are here today,
 what if you stayed with us, please?”

The perfective *peyareccam* ஆய/ஆகிய *āya/ākiya* can be used for specified attribution.

attribution

KT 181.1,7 இதுமற் றெவனோ தோழி ...
 பெருமுது பெண்டிரே மாகிய நமக்கே
itu-marr_u evaṇō tōḷi ...
peru mutu peṇṭirēm ākiya namakkē
 this^{marru} what^o friend ...
 big old women-we become(p.)- us(dat.)^e
 “What is this, friend
 to us who have become great old women?”

temporal clause

KT 178.5-7 யாநுமக் | கரிய மாகிய காலைப்
 பெரிய நோன்றனிர்.
yām numakk_u | ariyam ākiya kālai
periya nōṇṇanir.
 we you(dat.pl.) | difficult-we become(p.)- time
 big-they(n.pl) you-suffered(pl.).
 “At the time we were difficult for you [to reach],
 you suffered greatly.”

Less frequently the verbal noun ஆகல்/ஆகுதல் *ākal/ākutal* can be found to express indirect speech or thought content: “that”

KT 386.4-6 மாலை
 நிலம்பரந் தன்ன புன்கணொடு
 புலம்புடைத் தாகுத லறியேன் யானே
mālai

nilam parantanna punkaṇoṭu
pulamp_u uṭaitt_u ākutaḷ ariyēṇ yāṇē
 evening
 ground spread-like sorrow-with
 loneliness possess-it becoming know-not-I I^ē
 “That the evening would possess loneliness
 along with sorrow as if spread on the ground
 I did not know.”

Embedded comparison clauses with போல்-தல் *pōl-tal* are considerably less frequent:

- KT 147.3f. நுண்பூண் மடந்தையைத் தந்தோய் போல
 வின்றுயி லெடுப்புதி கனவே
nun pūṇ maṭantaiyai tantōy pōla
iṇ tuyil eṭupputi kaṇavē
 fine ornament girl(acc.) given-you be-similar(inf.)
 pleasant sleep you-arouse(sub.) dream^ē
 “As if you brought [my] girl with fine ornaments
 you would rouse [me] from sweet sleep, dream.”
- AN 177.13 வல்லே வருவர் போலும்
vallē varuvar pōlum
 quickly come-he(h.) it-seems
 “He will come quickly, it seems.”

13. Conditional (Factual and Hypothetical), Concessive, Causal Clauses

Old Tamil starts off with two clear forms for the conditional, one the simple verbal root plus the suffix -இன் *-in*, the other based on the frozen conditional form of the embedding verb ஆகுதல் *ākutal*, i.e., ஆயின் *āyin*, “if”. The former does not allow for marking aspect, tense or mood, but can take a subject; the latter embeds a finite verb. Occasionally the frozen conditional of the embedding verb என்னுதல் *ennutal* is already found in the same function, i.e., எனின் *enin*, “if”. From the early *Kīlkkāṇakku* corpus onwards and for a number of centuries we find a bewildering variety of further suffixes and postpositions that express conditional, some on the verbal root as was the case with -இன் *-in*, some on finite forms, and some on the absolutive, as will be the case later. Almost all of them are transitional, but one of them is the one form destined to make it into modern formal Tamil, that is, absolutive plus -ஆல் *-āl*. As mentioned before on p. 95, the distinction between a conditional and a temporal clause has never been clear-cut, and often “if” rather means “when”.

By adding -உம் *-um* to any conditional form a concessive can be formed (“although”), but also absolutive or infinitive plus -உம் *-um* can stand either in coordination or for a concessive.

One further form of the embedding verb ஆகுதல் *ākutal*, the oblique of the verbal noun, under the two forms ஆகலின் *ākalin* and ஆதலின் *ātalīn*, is frozen into a postposition that allows forming causal clauses (“because”). Moreover there are a few demonstrative pronouns from the அ- *a-* stem that are frozen into quasi conjunctions, namely ஆனால் *ānāl*, அதனால் *ataṇāl* (“therefore”), அதன்றலை *ataṇṇalai* (“moreover”, literally “on top of that”) and அதனெதிர் *atanetir* (“in view of that”).

forms of the conditional

verbal root + -இன் <i>-in</i> (strong verbs + <i>-ppin</i>)	பொய்ப்பின் <i>poyppin</i> , “if he lies”
finite verb + ஆயின் <i>āyin</i> (embedding)	வாரார் ஆயின் <i>vārār āyin</i> , “if he does not come”
finite verb + எனின் <i>enin</i> (embedding)	(rare in the old corpus)
finite verb + ஆகில் <i>ākil</i> (embedding)	later (bhakti)
verbal root + -இல் <i>-il</i> , -ஏல் <i>-ēl</i> (strong verbs + ப்பில்/க்கில் <i>-ppil/-kkil</i> , ப்பேல்/க்கேல் <i>-ppēl/-kkēl</i>)	வருந்தேல் <i>varuntēl</i> , “if x suffers”; transitional உகக்கில் <i>ukakkil</i> , “if x rejoices”
(finite verb + -ஏல்/-ஆல் <i>-ēl/-āl</i>)	transitional
abs. + -ஆல் <i>-āl</i>	செய்தால் <i>ceytāl</i> ; post- <i>Caṅkam</i> ³¹ up to modern

forms of the concessive

abs. + -உம் <i>-um</i>	செய்தும் <i>ceytum</i> ; coordinated or concessive
inf. + -உம் <i>-um</i>	செய்யவும் <i>ceyyavum</i> ; ig.
v.r. + -இனும் <i>-inum</i> (strong verbs + <i>-ppinum</i>)	
f.v. + ஆயினும் <i>āyinum</i> (embedding)	
f.v. + எனினும் <i>eninum</i> (embedding)	(rare in the old corpus)
f.v. + ஆகிலும் <i>ākilum</i> (embedding)	later (bhakti)
f.v. + -ஏலும் <i>-ēlum</i> (embedding)	later (bhakti)
v.r. + -இலும் <i>-ilum</i> (strong verbs + <i>-ppilum</i>)	transitional
abs. + -ஆலும் <i>-ālum</i>	post- <i>Caṅkam</i> up to modern

³¹ A few isolated forms such as *kaṇṭāl* in PN 390.25 can be found.

postpositions and conjunctions of reasoning

ஆகலின்/ஆதலின் *ākalin/ātalin* causal clause: “because”

ஆனால்/அதனால் *ānāl/ataṇāl* “therefore”

அதன்றலை *ataṇralai* “moreover”

அதனெதிர் *ataṇetir* “in view of that”

conditional clauses

-இன் *-in* type impersonal:

KT 102.1 உள்ளி னுள்ளம் வேமே
uḷḷin uḷḷam vēmē
 remember-if inside burn(hab.fut.)^e
 “when remembering, the inside burns.”

-இன் *-in* type unmarked for subject:

KT 280.4f. ஒருநாள் புணரப் புணரி
 னரைநாள் வாழ்க்கையும் வேண்டலென் யானே
oru nāl puṇara puṇarin
arai nāl vālkkaiyum vēṇṭalen yāṇē
 one day unite(inf.) unite-if
 half day life^{um} I-need-not I^e
 “If I can be in union [with her] for a single day,
 I will not need living for [another] half day.”

-இன் *-in* type marked for subject:

KT 316.2f. அன்னை யறியி | னுளெனோ வாழி தோழி
annai ariyin | uḷenō vāḷi tōḷi
 mother know-if | be-I^o live(sub.) friend
 “If mother gets to know, will I [still] exist, friend?”

ஆயின் *āyin* type:

- KT 174.5f. பொருள்வயிற் பிரிவா ராயினிவ் வுலகத்துப்
 பொருளே மன்ற பொருளே
poruḷvayin pirivār āyin i ulakattu
poruḷē-manra poruḷē
 wealth-for he-separates(h.) if this- world-
 wealth^{ē manra} wealth^ē
 “If he separates for the sake of wealth, in this world
 truly only wealth is wealth.”

ஆயின் *āyin* type hypothetical:

- KT 148.5f. காரன் றென்றி யாயின்
 கனவோ மற்றிது வினவுவல் யானே
kār anr_u enri āyin
kaṇavō marr_u itu viṇavuval yāṇē
 rainy-season is-not-so you-say(sub.) if
 dream^{ō marru} this I-ask I^ē
 “If you were to say ‘this is not the rainy season’,
 I should ask ‘is this but a dream?’”

ஆயின் *āyin* type with past tense and hypothetical:

- KT 350.2f. செல்லா தீமெனச்
 சொல்லின மாயிற் செல்வர் கொல்லோ
cellātīm-eṇa
collīṇam āyin celvar-kollō
 don’t go say(inf.)
 we-spoke if go-he(h.)^{kollō}

“If we were to say ‘don’t go!’,
would he [still] go?”

- KT 274.8 அணிமுலை யாக முள்கினஞ் செலினே
aṇi mulai ākam uḷkinam celinē
 adorn- breast bosom we-remembered go-if^e
 “If we were to go, we would remember [her] bosom
 with adorning breasts.”

ஆயின் *āyin* type as subject clause:

- KT 98.1-3 அவர் | துன்ன சென்று செப்புநர் பெறினே
 நன்றுமன் வாழி தோழி
avar | tunṇa cenru ceppunar perinē
nanru-man vāḷi tōḷi
 he(h.) | approach(inf.) gone saying-he(h.) obtain-if^e
 good-it^{man} live(sub.) friend
 “If we were to obtain someone who goes to approach
 [and] talks to him, that would be good indeed, o friend.”

எனின் *enin* type:

- NA 334.8f. மின்னுவசி விளக்கத்து வருமெனி
 னென்னோ தோழிநம் மின்னுயிர் நிலையே
minṇu vaci viḷakkattu varum enin
en-ō tōḷi nam in uyir nilai-ē
 lightning split lamp- coming- say-if
 what^o friend our- pleasant life state^e
 “If he comes with a split of lightning for a lamp,
 what, friend, will be the state of our sweet life?”

ஆகில் *ākil* type:

Poy 88.4 என்னாகி லென்னே யெனக்கு
eṇ ākil eṇṇē eṇakku
 what if what^ē me(dat.)
 “If anything should happen, what [is it] to me?”

finite verb plus -ஏல் *-ēl*:

AiAi 9.2 அழிய வேண்டா தெரிதியேல்
aḷiya vēṇṭā teritiyēl
 be-desolate(inf.) need-not(n.sg.) understand-you(sub)^{ēl}
 “If you understood, it wouldn’t be necessary [for you]
 to be desolate.”

verbal root plus -இல் *-il*:

Pēy 82.1 உணரி லுணர்வரியன்
uṇaril uṇarv_u ariyaṇ
 perceive-if perception difficult-he
 “When perceiving, he is difficult to perceive.”

absolutive plus -ஆல் *-āl*:

Pēy 25.1 தொழுதால் பழுதுண்டே
tolutāl palut_u uṇṭē
 worshipped-if mistake it-is^ē
 “If you worship, is it a mistake?”

concessives

absolutive plus -உம் *-um*:

KT 64.4f. நோயே மாகுத லறிந்துஞ்
 சேயர் தோழி சேய்நாட் டோரே

nōyēm ākutaḷ arintum

cēyar tōḷi cēy nāṭṭōrē.

pain-we becoming known^{um}

distance-he(h.) friend distance land-he(h.)^ē

“Even though knowing that we would feel pain,
he is distant, friend, in a distant land is he.”

infinitive plus -உம் -*um*:

KT 311.2f. வலவன் றாங்கவு

நில்லாது கழிந்த கல்லென் கடுந்தேர்

valavaṇ tāṅkavum

nillātu kaḷinta kalleṇ kaṭum tēr

charioteer restrain(inf.)^{um}

stand-not passed-by noisy fast chariot

“Even though restrained by the charioteer
[there was] a noisy fast chariot that passed by without
stopping.”

verbal root plus -இன் -*in*:

KT 210.4,6 எழுகலத் தேந்தினுஞ் சிறிதென் றோழி ...

விருந்துவரக் கரைந்த காக்கையது பலியே

eḷu kalatt_u ēntiṇum cirit_u eṇ tōḷi ...

viruntu vara karainta kākkaiyatu paliyē

seven pot- offer-if-even little-it my- friend ...

guest come(inf.) cried- crow(gen.) offering^ē

“Even if we were to offer seven pots [of rice], small,
my friend,

would it be as a gift to the crow that cawed that a guest
would come.”

ஆயினும் *āyinum*:

KT 42.1,4 காம மொழிவ தாயினும் ...
 எந்தொடர்புந் தேயுமோ
kāmam olivatu āyinum ...
em toṭarpum tēyumō
 desire ceasing-it if-even ...
 our- attachment^{um} dwindling-^ō
 “Even if passion is something that ceases,
 will our attachment dwindle, too?”

ஆகிலும் *ākilum*:

Poy 55.1f. அவன்றம ரெவ்வினைய ராகிலு மெங்கோ |
 னவன்றமரே
avaṇ tamar e viṇaiyar ākilum em kōṇ | avaṇ tamarē
 he their-people(h.) what- karma if-even our- king | his
 people^ē
 “His people, whatever [their] karma, are our king’s
 people.”

-ஏலும் *-ēlum*: Note that -ஏல்/-ஏலும் *-ēl/-ēlum* may even occur with predicate nouns:

Pēy 81.1f. நெஞ்சா னினைப்பரிய னேலு நிலைபெற்றென்
 னெஞ்சமே பேசாய்
neñcāl niṇaipp_u ariyaṇēlum nilai perru eṇ
neñcame pēcāy
 heart(inst.) thinking difficult-he^{ēlum} position obtained my-
 heart^ē speak(ipt.)
 “Though he is difficult to think of by the heart, take a stand,
 my heart, speak.”

causal clause with ஆகலின் *ākalin*:

NA 99.9f. பிடவுங் கொன்றையுங் கோடலு

மடவ வாகலின் மலர்ந்தன பலவே

piṭavum konrai_uyum kōṭalum

maṭava ākalin malarntaṇa palavē

large-flowered-jasmine^{um} laburnum^{um} white-Malabar-lily^{um}

ignorant-they(n.pl.) because they-flowered(n.pl.) any(n.pl.)^ε

“large-flowered jasmine, laburnum and white Malabar lily,

because they are foolish they have flowered, many [of
them].”

அதனால் *ataṇāl*: “therefore”

NA 67.9f. எமரும் வேட்டம் புக்கனர். அதனா

றங்கி னெவனோ தெய்ய

emarum vēṭṭam pukkanar. ataṇāl

taṇkin evaṇō teyya

our-they(h.) hunt they-entered. therefore

stay-if what^δ

“All our people have entered the hunt. Therefore,
what if you stayed?”

14. Negation

Old Tamil knows no less than six distinct forms of negation. It is not clear whether they are vestiges of older regional forms or whether there are fine semantic distinctions between them which remain elusive today. There were two verbs of negation to begin with; the difference between them was clear-cut since one negated quality and the other negated existence, but the border between them became blurred in the course of time:

அல் *al*, “not to be so” (complementary to இரு *iru* “to be present”)

இல் *il*, “not to be” (complementary to உள் *ul* “to exist”)

Derived from இல் *il* there is an indeclinable form இல்லை *illai*, “not”, valid for all persons, attested already, if rarely, in the *Caṅkam* corpus and the main negation form surviving until today. All other forms are inflected. With one exception negation does not mark aspect or tense. The simplest form of negative is the mere verbal root, without aspectual suffix, followed directly by the pronominal ending for person and number. The same can be done with the negative stem (செய்யாது *ceyyātu*). Next, the negative verbal root அல் *al* can be added between the verbal root and the pronominal suffix. The use of இல் *il* is more difficult to describe. To begin with, it was employed in several subtypes of nominal negation, denoting people who are without something. There also was an additional construction of perfective aspect plus இல் *il* followed by a pronominal suffix, more frequent from early bhakti on; however, the aspect does not appear to influence semantics. Finally, for the cases where it seemed important to mark aspect, tense or mood, there was a double verb form consisting of an ordinary positive finite verb followed by the corresponding form of அல் *al*. With negative forms the distinction between finite form and participial noun is almost totally absent;

all forms are ambiguous, except for those that make use of pronominal endings with the vowel ஒ/ஓ *o/ō*.

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| (1. இல்லை <i>illai</i> | “not” | up to modern Tamil) |
| 2. zero suffix | v.r.-pron.suff. | அறியேன் <i>ariyēn</i> , “I don’t know” |
| 3. negative stem | v.r.- <i>ā</i> -pron.suff. | ஓவாது <i>ōvātu</i> , “it does not stop” |
| 4. -அல் <i>-al</i> as a suffix | v.r.- <i>al</i> -pron.suff. | காணலர் <i>kāṇalar</i> , “they don’t see” ³² |
| 5. -இல் <i>-il</i> as a suffix | perf. stem- <i>il</i> -pron.suff. | கொண்டிலை <i>koṇṭilai</i> , “you do not take” (late) |
| 6. double verb forms | positive + negative form | ஒள்வாள் அல்லள் <i>olvāl allal</i> , “she will not agree” |

For type 2 in the third person there is a marked preference for forms with -ஆ *-ā* before the ending (செய்யான் *ceyyān*, செய்யாள் *ceyyāl*, செய்யார் *ceyyār*), which might be analysed in two ways, namely either as a verbal root plus pronominal suffix, to which the rarer alternative would be செய்யன் *ceyyan*, etc., or, tentatively, as a short negative stem செய்யா *ceyyā* plus just a pronominal ending -ன் *-n*, that is, as an intermediate form between type 2 and 3. Note that type 3 is mostly restricted to negative neuter singular and plural and to negative participial nouns: அறியாதோர் *ariyātōr*, “those who do not know”. The mere negative stem is one of the most ambiguous forms that exist: செய்யா *ceyyā* corresponds to neg. *pey*. (“who does

³² A variant form with -(க்)கல் *-(k)kal* instead of -அல்(ல்) *-al(l)* is fairly well attested in the *Kalittokai*: அறிகல்லாய் *arikkallāy*, “you don’t know” (Kali 47.17).

not do”), neg. abs. (“not having done”), negative n.sg. (“it does/did not do”) and negative n.pl. (“they do/did not do”).

இல்லை *illai*:

KT 25.1 யாரு மில்லை *yārum illai*
who^{um} not “Nobody is there.”

zero suffix:

KT 200.4 மறந்தோர் மன்ற மறவா நாமே
marantōr maṇra maravām nāmē
forgot-he(h.)^{manra} forget-not-we we^ē
“He has forgotten indeed. We, we won’t forget.”

neg. stem, long (more often neg. part.n.):

KT 6.4 ஓர்யான் மன்ற துஞ்சா தேனே
ōr yāṇ maṇra tuñcātēṇē
one I^{manra} sleep-not-I^ē
“I alone, indeed, am one who does not sleep.”

neg. stem, short, for n.sg.:

KT 254.2df.+7 கோங்கின்
தலையலர் வந்தன வாரா தோழி ...
எய்தின ராலென வருஉந் தாதே.
kōṇkiṇ
talai alar vantaṇa vārā tōḷi ...
eytiṇarāl eṇa varūum tūtē.
Kōṇkuⁱⁿ
head blossom they-came(n.pl.) not-come-it friend
he-reached(h.)^{al} say(inf.) coming- messenger^ē.
“The first Kōṇku buds have come. Not come, friend,

has the messenger who comes to say [our man] has reached.”

neg. stem, short, for n.pl.:

KT 261.5f. என்கண் | துஞ்சா வாழி தோழி
eṇ kaṇ | tuñcā vāḷi tōḷi
 my- eye | sleep-not-they(n.pl.) live(sub.) friend
 “My eyes don’t sleep, o friend.”

verbal root -அல் -*al* as a negative suffix:

KT 290.1f. காமத் தாங்குமதி யென்போர் தாமஃ
 தறியலர் கொல்லோ வனைமது கையர்கொல்
kāmam tāṅkumati eṇpōr tām aḷ
aṇiyalar-kollō aṇai matukaiyar-kol
 desire bear(ipt.) say-they(h.) they(pl.) that
 know-not-they(h.)^{kollō} such strength-they(h.)^{kol}
 “Those who say ‘bear desire’, do they not
 know it? Are they that strong?”

Here there are two *Caṅkam* examples for the negative verbal root -இல் -*il*, first on a verbal root, then on a perfective stem as is fairly normal from bhakti times onwards:

KT 113.3f. இரைதேர் வெண்குரு கல்லது யாவதுந்
 துன்னல்போ கின்றாற் பொழிலே
irai tēr veḷ kuruk_u allatu yāvatum
tunnal pōkinrāl polilē
 prey search- white egret except anything
 approaching go-not-it^{āl} grove^ē
 “Nothing except the white egret searching for prey

will go near the grove.”

(lit. “anything other than the egret will not go”)

Pari 9.25 ஆய்வந்திலர் *āyvantilar*
research-not-they(h.) “The don’t research.”

There are rare occurrences too of a negative present tense – unclear, again, whether with temporal impact or not:

TVM 7.7.5.4 ஒன்று மறிகின்றிலே னன்னைமீ ரெனக்கும் விடமே
onrum arikinrilēn annaimīr enakk_u uyv_u iṭamē
one^{um} know-not-I mother(2.pl.) me(dat.) escaping
place^ē
“I don’t know of any place, mothers – for me to
escape to.”

Special Constructions with -இல் -il

negation of action (expressed verbal noun):

KT 168.6 மணத்தலுந் தணத்தலு மிலமே
maṇattalum taṇattalum ilamē
uniting^{um} departing^{um} not-we^ē
“We can neither unite nor depart.”
(lit. “we are without uniting or departing”)

negation of quality:

NA 143.6 வழுவில ளம்ம தானே *valu ilaḷ-amma tānē*
fault not-she^{amma} self^ē “she, alas, is without fault.”

negation of fact:

NA 193.5 தீதறிந் தன்றோ விலமே *tīt_u arintaṇrō ilamē*
evil-it it-knew^ō not-we^ē “We did not know of any evil.”
(lit. “we were without knowing...”)

nominalisation:

- KT 93.4 புலவியஃ தெவனோ வன்பிலங் கடையே
pulavi aḷ_u evanō anp_u ilam-katāiyē
 sulking that what^o love not-we(loc.)^e
 “What is that, sulking – in us who are without love?”
- KT 115.6 நன்மலை நாட நின்னல திலளே
nal malai nāṭa nin alatu ilalē
 good mountain land-he(voc.) you- not-so-it not-she^e
 “Man from a land of good mountains, without you she does not exist.”

Probably an isolated case is an impersonal construction with இலம் *ilam* instead of இல்லை *illai*:

- TV 31.1 தூதென் றிசைத்தா லிசையிலம்
tūt_u enru icaittāl icai ilam
 messenger said speak-if speak-absence
 “If [I] speak ‘speak as [my] messenger!’ there is no speaking.”

Double verb forms with -அல் *-al*

negation of quality with a pronominalised noun:

- KT 47.4 நல்லை யல்லை நெடுவெண் ணிலவே
nallai allai neṭu veḷ nilavē
 good-you not-so-you long white moonlight^e
 “You are no good, long white moonlight.”

past tense negation:

- AN 98.6 அறிந்தன ளல்ல ளன்னை *aṛintanaḷ allaḷ annai*
 she-knew not-so-she mother “Mother did not know.”

verbal negation with a neg. v.n. as direct object:

NA 376.11f. வறும்புனங் காவல் விடாமை

யறிந்தனி ரல்லிரோ வறனில் யாயே

varum puṇam kāval viṭāmai

arintaṇir allirō araṇ il yāyē

poor field guarding letting-not

you-knew(pl.) not-so-you(pl.)^o duty- not- mother^e

“Haven’t you understood that [our] virtueless
mother won’t let [us] guard the empty field?”

-அல் *-al* with a subjunctive:

KT 224.6 துயர்பொறுக் கல்லேன் *tuyar porukk_u allēṇ*

misery I-bear(sub.) I-not-so “I cannot bear the
misery.”

Negative double verb forms allow for (multiple) rhetoric
ambiguity:

KT 52.5 பரிந்தனெ னல்லனோ

parintaṇeṇ allāṇō

I-sympathized not-so-I^o/no-so-he^o

“Did I not sympathise?”

or “I sympathised, did I not?”

or “I sympathised, did he not?”

A double negation is to be understood as an emphatic positive:

KT 244.3 கேளே மல்லேம். கேட்டனம் பெரும

kēlēṇ allēm. kēṭṭaṇam peruma

hear-not-we not-so-we we-heard great-one(voc.)

“It is not that we did not hear. We heard, great one.”

15a. Double Verb Forms, *Murreccam*, Complex Verb Forms

Old Tamil knows a considerable variety of complex verb forms, both in the sense of lexical compound verbs and of auxiliary constructions. These usually consist of a nonfinite item (noun or verb) followed by a finite item. Apart from those there are a number of exceptions to the rule of having only one finite verb per sentence. First, there is the possibility of insertions; these usually consist in *verba dicendi/sentiendi* (cf. p. 132f.) and in optatives or imperatives. Double verb forms, that is, two finite verbs following directly upon each other, occur with the negatives (see Chapter 14), with emphatic verbs of existence (இருதல் *irutal*/உள்-தல் *uḷ-tal*/ஆகுதல் *ākutal*) and with some exceptional constructions, for example with செல்-தல் *cel-tal*, later also வருதல் *varutal*. Moreover there is the *murreccam* (“what demands a finite verb as a complement”), a construction where a finite verb is integrated somewhere in the clause but understood as nonfinite.

insertion of *verbum dicendi*:

- KT 12.4 கவலைத் தென்ப வவர்சென்ற வாறே
 kavalaitt_u enpa avar cenra āre
 crossroad-it they-say he(h.)- gone- way^ē
 “It has crossroads, they say, the way he has gone.”

insertion of optative:

- KT 19.3 இனைமதி வாழிய நெஞ்சே
 inaimati vāḷiya neñcē
 despair(ipt.) may-live heart^ē
 “Despair, may you live, heart!”

An added verb of existence, especially if it does not agree in number and gender with the main verb, can indicate an emphatic presence, if it is in agreement with the main verb, it may also signify a change of state. In such cases one might take the main verb as a participial noun:

Pū 20.1f. பல்காலு நின்னை
வழிவாழ்வார் வாழ்வரா மாதோ
pal kālum ninṇai
vali vālvār vālvār ām-mātō
many time^{um} you(acc.)
way live-they(h.) live-they(h.) becoming-it^{mātō}
“Is it not³³ that those who walk (lit. live) you as the path
for a long time, shall live?”

NA 128.3 எனக்குநீ யுரையா யாயினை
eṇakku nī uraiyāy āyiṇai
me(dat.) you talk-not-you you-became
“You have become one that does not talk to me.”
or “It is the case that you don’t talk to me.”

The special construction with செல்/வரு *cel/varu* seems to express an exhortation:

KT 198.5 படுகிளி கடிகஞ் சேறும்
paṭu kiḷi kaṭikam cērum
happen- parakeet we-chase we-go
“Let us go and chase parakeets that come down [into
the millet].”

³³ Here the negation is an attempt at rendering the flavour of the particle -மாதோ *-mātō*, politely suggesting that something is the case.

murreccam with aspectual impact:

KT 275.2 கண்டனம் வருகஞ் சென்மோ தோழி
kaṇṭaṇam varukam ceṇmō tōḷi
 we-saw we-come go! friend
 “Up! Let us come [back] after we have seen, friend.”

AN 398.20f. பல்பூங் கானத் தல்கி யின்றிவண்
 சேர்ந்தனை செலினே சிதைகுவ துண்டோ
pal pūm kāṇatt_u alki inr_u ivaṇ
cēṛntaṇai celinē citaikuvat_u uṇṭō
 many flower forest- abided today here
 you-joined go-if^ē being-wasted-it it-is^ō
 “If you were to go after joining [us] here today, abiding
 in the forest with many flowers, would there be [any]
 harm?”

epic *murreccam* with an infinitive for a following change of subject:

Cilap 12.53 விருந்தின் மூர லரும்பின ணிற்ப
viruntin mūral arumpiṇaḷ nirpa
 feastⁱⁿ smile budded-she stand(inf.)
 “while she stood, as one who broke out in a smile like a
 feast”

murreccam for rhetorical effect:

NA 373.3f. மைப்படு மால்வரை பாடினள் கொடிச்சி
 யைவன வெண்ணெற் குறுஉ நாடன்
mai paṭu māl varai pāṭiṇaḷ koṭicci
aivaṇam veḷ nel kuṛūum nāṭaṇ
 kohl happen- big mountain she-sang creeper-she
 wild-rice white paddy pounding- land-he

“the man from a land, where the creeper woman pounds
white paddy, singing about the cloud-covered big
mountain”

Compound Verbs

The simplest type of compound verb combines an adverb or a noun with a verbal root. While a compound of verb and adverb often can be understood on the basis of its etymology, a verb compounded with a noun can be employed in order to intensify the meaning of the basic verb or can be semantically productive. Many compound verbs are lexicalised but by no means all of them, and with some of them the meaning depends on the context. The verbal class remains that of the simplex. The “prepositions” compounded with verbs are மேல் *mēl*, “upon”; கீழ் *kīl*, “beneath”; முன் *mun*, “before”; பின் *pin*, “after”; உடன் *uṭaṇ*, “along with”; உள் *uḷ*, “inside”; எதிர் *etir*, “opposite”; வெளி *veḷi*, “outside”. The most frequent nouns are basic words for body parts such as தலை *talai*, “head”, கை *kai*, “hand”, புறம் *puram*, “back”, but see the following (incomplete) list of examples:

எதிர்கொள் <i>etir-kol</i>	2. “to receive”
வெளிப்படு <i>veḷi-p-paṭu</i>	6. “to come out”
ஆற்றுப்படு <i>ārru-p-paṭu</i>	11. “to bring on the way”
கண்படு <i>kaṇ-paṭu</i>	6. “to close one’s eyes”
தலைப்பிரி <i>talai-p-piri</i>	4. “to separate”
புறந்தா <i>puram-tā</i>	13. “to protect; to defy”
வழி(ப்)படு <i>vaḷi-(p)-paṭu</i>	6. “to follow, to worship”

A small group of verbs, in the early time most frequently உறுதல் *urūtal*, “to experience”, may function as verbalisers by incorporating a noun, occasionally lexicalised: இன்புறுதல் *inpu-urūtal*, “to feel pleasure”; காழுறுதல் *kāmu-urūtal*, “to desire” (contracted and lexicalised from காமம் உறுதல் *kāmam urūtal*); அலம்வருதல் *alam-*

varutal and அலமருதல் *alamarutal*, “to be agitated” (lexicalised in both the uncontracted and the contracted form).

In this context the phenomenon of spontaneous noun incorporation should be mentioned, frequent especially in devotional and epic Tamil and recognisable by an accusative mark where a genitive would be expected:

Kul 1.4.1 மாவினை வாய்பிளந்து *māvinai vāy-piḷantu*
 horse(acc.) mouth ripped “mouth-ripping the horse”
 ~ “ripping the mouth of the horse”

Compounds of two verbs also exist, such as போதருதல் *pōtarutal*, “to come”; மேவருதல் *mēvarutal*, “to be fitted for” (contracted from மேவு-வருதல் *mēvu-varutal*), but there are cases where it is difficult to distinguish between a verbal compound and an auxiliary construction.

As in any language, there are also a number of verbs that take verbal complements, in which case there is a frequent variation between the infinitive and various forms of the verbal noun, occasionally also with the absolutive. Some of them are:

அயர்தல் <i>ayartal</i>	4. “to be engaged in”
ஆ(கு)தல் <i>ā(ku)tal</i>	13. “to be possible” (bhakti)
ஆற்றுதல் <i>ār_rutal</i>	5. “to bear”
இசைதல் <i>icaital</i>	4. “to be possible”
இயறல் <i>iyal-tal</i>	3. “to befall”
இயைதல் <i>iyaital</i>	4. “to be agreeable”
உவத்தல் <i>uvattal</i>	12. “to rejoice”
எய்தல் <i>eytal</i>	11. “to grow weary”
ஒல்லுதல் <i>ollutal</i>	5. “to be possible”

ஒழிதல் <i>olital</i>	5. “to stay behind, to cease”
ஓவுதல் <i>ōvutal</i>	5. “to stop”
குறித்தல் <i>kurittal</i>	11. “to intend”
கூடுதல் <i>kūṭutal</i>	5. “to be appropriate”
செல்லா/போகா <i>cellā/pōkā</i>	3./13. “not to be possible”
துடங்குதல் <i>tuṭaṅkutaḷ</i> ,	
தொடங்குதல் <i>toṭaṅkutaḷ</i>	5. “to begin”
பிழைத்தல் <i>pilaittal</i>	11. “to fail”
மறுத்தல் <i>maruttal</i>	11. “to refuse”
மாட்டா <i>māṭṭā</i>	5. neg. “not to be able”
வல்லுதல் <i>vallutaḷ</i>	5. “to be capable, to master”
வேண்டுதல் <i>vēṇṭutaḷ</i>	5. “to be necessary”

15b. Auxiliaries

Old Tamil already has a complicated system of auxiliary verbs. Some of them are still employed in the same function in modern Tamil, most notably the auxiliaries for passive and middle voices, but the majority is transitory; in fact each period and often each genre has certain favoured constructions. Not much useful work has been done in this area, and the following can only be counted as a few preliminary remarks and observations. The three most frequent nonfinite forms that enter into an auxiliary construction are the verbal root, the infinitive, and the absolutive, but we also find the verbal noun in -தல் *-tal*.

Auxiliaries that more or less seem to vanish after the *Caṅkam* corpus:

v.r. + கிற்றல் <i>kil-tal</i>	“to be able to”
v.r. + வருதல் <i>varutal</i>	starting an action
abs. + உறைதல் <i>uraital</i>	remaining in a stable state
abs. + அமைதல் <i>amaital</i>	reaching a new stability
[abs. + ஈதல் <i>ītal</i>	benefactive: already frozen into imperatives]

Auxiliaries that start in or continue into later Old Tamil:

v.r. + தருதல் <i>tarutal</i>	an action outside the control of the speaker or moving towards the speaker (since <i>Caṅkam</i> , prevailing, though ignored by the tradition)
------------------------------	--

செய்யா *ceyyā* abs.

+ நிற்தல் *nil-tal* continuous form³⁴

³⁴ Both ஒழுகுதல் *olukutal*, “to flow” and இருதல் *irutal*, “to be”, have to be regarded as less successful predecessors of *nil-tal* for the continuous form; both

abs. + அருளுதல் <i>aruḷutal</i>	general benefactive (bhakti)
abs. + இடுதல் <i>iṭutal</i>	completion of an action (<i>Kīlkkanaḱku</i>)
விடுதல் <i>viṭutal</i>	completion of an action (late <i>Caṅkam</i>)
abs. + போகுதல் <i>pōkutal</i>	concluding an action with negative outcome
v.n. + உறுதல் <i>urūtal</i>	beginning or undertaking of an action

Auxiliaries that appear to be fairly stable:

inf. + படுதல் <i>paṭutal</i>	passive (stray occurrences already in <i>Caṅkam</i>) ³⁵
abs. + கொண்டல் <i>koḷ-tal</i>	middle voice (stray occurrences already in <i>Caṅkam</i>)

கிற்றல் *kil-tal*, “to be able to”:

KT 22.1f.	நீயிவ னொழிய யாரோ பிரிகிற் பவரே <i>nī ivaṇ oḷiya yārō piri-kirpavarē</i> you here stay-behind(inf.) who(h.) ⁵ separate- able- he(h.) ⁶ “Who will be able to separate while you stay behind?”
-----------	---

வருதல் *varutal* (inchoative/inceptive; onset of an action):

NA 298.5	அருஞ்சுரங் கவலை யஞ்சுவரு நனந்தலை <i>arum curam kavalai aṇcu varum naṇam talai</i> difficult desert crossroad fear- coming- wide place “the vast area where the crossroads in the difficult desert become frightening”
----------	---

are occasionally found, preceded by an absolutive, from the *Caṅkam* corpus onwards.

³⁵ In the bhakti period, infinitive plus உறுதல் *urūtal* can rarely be found as a passive construction instead of infinitive + படுதல் *paṭutal*.

உறைதல் *uraital* for remaining in a stable state:

KT 65.4 வாரா துறையுநர் வரனசைஇ
vārāt_u uraiyunar varal nacaii
 come-not staying-he(h.) coming longed-for
 “longing for the coming of him who stays away”

அமைதல் *amaital* for reaching a new (stable?) state:

KT 137.2-4 நிறுற்றுந் துமைகுவெ னாயி னெற்றுறந்
 திரவலர் வாரா வைகல்
 பல வாகுக
niṇ turant_u amaikuven āyin eṇ turantu
iravalar vārā vaikal
pala ākuka
 you- abandoned I-become-quiet if my- abandoned
 beggar(h.) come-not day
 many(n.pl.) may-become
 “If I were to abandon you completely,
 may the days the beggars abandon me [and] don’t come
 become many.”

தருதல் *tarutal* for an action outside of the control of the speaker:

KT 95.1 மால்வரை யிழிதருந் தாவெள் ளருவி
māl varai ilī-tarum tū veḷ aruvi
 big mountain fall-giving- purity white waterfall
 “the pure white waterfall that tumbles from the tall
 mountain”

continuous form with செய்யாநிற்றல் *ceyyā + nil-tal*:

Poy 43.1+4 மனமாக தீரு மருவினையுஞ் சாரா ...

தாந்தொழா நிற்பார் தமர்

maṇam ācu tīrum aru viṇaiyum cārā ...

tām tolā-nīrpār tamar

mind blemish end-it difficult karma approach-not-it

they(pl.) worship-stand-they(h.) his-people(h.)

“Blemishes of the mind will end, and difficult karma
will not approach those of his people who keep
worshipping.”

[Here a rare example of a *Caṅkam* predecessor to the continuous with
another type of absolute:

NA 242.10 தேடுஉ நின்ற விரலை யேறே *tēṭūu-ninra iralai ērē*

sought stood- Iralai stag

“the Iralai stag that
kept seeking”]

அருளுதல் *aruḷutal* as a benefactive:

Tē 7.70.4.4 எனை யஞ்சலென் றருளாய்

enai aṇcal enṛ-aruḷāy

me(acc.) don't-fear said grace(ipt.)

“Graciously tell me “do not be afraid!”

இடுதல் *iṭutal* for the completion of an action:

TVM 6.2.7.1f. கடன்ஞால முண்டிட்ட | நின்மலா

kaṭal ṇālam uṇṭ-iṭṭa | niṇmalā

sea world eaten-placed | spotless-one(m.voc.)

“o spotless one who has eaten up the ocean[-girded]
world”

விடுதல் *viṭutal* for the completion of an action:³⁶

Kali 94.44f. துகடர்பு காட்சி யவையத்தா ரோலை
 முகடு காப்பு யாத்து விட்டாங்கு
tukaḷ tīrpu kāṭci avaiyattār ōlai
mukaṭu kāppu yāttu-viṭṭāṅku
 dust ended sight assembly-they(h.) palm-leaf
 top guarding tied-let(abs.)-like
 “like a palm-leaf of the insight[ful scholars] of the assembly,
 firmly tied with the top protection after the dust is wiped off”

போகுதல் *pōkutal* for the completion of an action with negative outcome:

Pēy 74.1f. நஞ்சுட்டு வன்பேய்
 நிலமே புரண்டுபோய் வீழ்
nañcu ūṭṭu val pēy
nilamē puraṇṭu-pōy vīḷa
 poison fed strong demoness
 ground^e rolled-gone fall(inf.)
 “so that the strong demoness, having fed [him] poison,
 fell to the ground, rolling in contortions”

படுதல் *paṭutal* for the passive:

KT 288.5 இனிதெனப் படுஉம் புத்தே ணாடே
inītu eṇa-p-paṭūum puttēḷ nāṭē
 pleasant-it say(inf.) it-happens god land^e
 “The land of the gods is called pleasant.”

³⁶ Clear examples for *viṭutal* as an auxiliary are difficult to find in the early period, except in similes such as this, attested since the early anthologies (cf. KT 168.3 *viṭiyal virittu-viṭṭanna*, “as if dusk had spread”).

[passive with உறுதல் *ur_utal* instead of படுதல் *pa_ut_utal*:

Cilap 12.13.1 சீறா ரொருமகனா னிரைகொள்ள வுற்ற காலை

cī_r ū_r oru makaṇāṇ_ṇ nirai koḷḷa-ur_ra-kālai

little village son(inst.) herd take(inf.)-experienced-time

“at the time the herd was taken by one man from the little village”]

கொள்-தல் *koḷ₋tal* for middle voice:

Poy 36.4 மண்ணிரந்து கொண்ட வகை

maṇ_ṇ irantu-koṇṭa vakai

earth begged-taken manner

“the way that he (Vāmana) took the earth for himself”

TVM 9.4.8.4 கண்ணனைக் கண்டுக்கொண்டேனே

kaṇṇanai kaṇṭu-koṇṭēṇē

Kaṇṇan(acc.) seen-taken-I^e

“I have for myself seen Kaṇṇan.”

உறுதல் *ur_utal* for the beginning or undertaking of an action:

Tē 4.34.6 நீள்வரை எடுக்கல் உற்றான்

தோள்முடி நெரிய வைத்தார் தொல்மறைக்காடனார்

nīḷ varai eṭukkal ur_rāṇ

tōḷ muṭi neriya vaittār tol maraikkāṭaṇār

“the one from ancient Maraikkāṭu (Śiva) put down [his toe] in order to crush head [and] shoulders of the one who undertook to lift [his] tall mountain (i.e., Rāvaṇa)”

SYNTAX

16. Particles and Word Order: -ē as a Full Stop and as Rhetorical Mark

The observation of syntactical patterns reveals the distribution of particles (cf. chapter 1.7, p. 56): the majority are found in main sentences, not in subordinate phrases [Wilden 2006]. These are patterns fairly strictly observed (though not without deviation) in the early *Caṅkam* texts. Afterwards things start to disintegrate: already in the *Aiṅkurunūru* constructions may be found that would not be possible in the *Kuruntokai*, and by the time of the *Kuraḷ* confusion prevails. [Note: this is also true of the *sūtra*-s in the theoretical texts (why?).]

The end of a sentence, i.e., a full stop, used to be marked by the particle -ḡ -ē. Main sentences may be verbal and nominal clauses, including exclamations and forms of address. Subordinate clauses comprise absolutive, infinitive, *peyareccam*, verbal root, conditional, concessive, causal, comparison, and embedded constructions (which can evidently contain other main sentences marked by particles, though rarely by -ḡ -ē, since the sentence-final function is taken over by the embedding verb or particle). Exceptions to particle marking are made for finite verb forms that are unambiguous such as the imperative or optative, negative forms (which consequently often cause problems, since they mostly do not distinguish finite verb from participial noun anyway) and also double verb forms. An exception for rhetorical purposes is a sentence beginning with the predicate; the end of a poem (depending on the metre) is always marked with a particle. A similar exception is the poetic subtype beginning with an aphoristic prelude, usually not marked by a particle. Sentence-final -ḡ -ē can be accompanied or substituted by a vocative (since the vocative for most nouns does not have a separate form, it can be marked by -ḡ -ē).

The basic distribution patterns account for “normal” word order and various types of focalisation:

normal word order:	S O P(= f.v./pr.n.)-ē
postposition of subject:	O P S-ē
postposition of object:	S P O-ē
postposition of adverb:	S O P adv.-ē
focalisation:	
focalisation of subject:	S-ē O P(-ē)
anteposition of object:	[O-ē P S] rare
anteposition of adverb:	[adv.-ē O P S] rare
anteposition of predicate (closed):	[O] P-ē S-ē
anteposition of predicate (open-ended):	[O] P-ē S
address:	N-ē

S O P-ē verbal sentence:

KT 13.3f.	நாட னோய்தந் தனனே தோழி <i>nāṭaṇ nōy tantanē tōḷi</i> land-he pain he-gave ^ē friend “The man from the land gave pain, friend.”
-----------	--

S O P-ē nominal sentence:

KT 35.5	வாடையும் பிரிந்திசினோர்க் கழலே <i>vāṭaiyum pirinticinōrkk alalē</i> north wind ^{um} separated-they(dat.) fire ^ē “Even the north wind is fire to those who are separated.”
---------	--

S O P with an imperative not marked by a particle:

KT 2.1f.	தும்பி காமஞ் செப்பாது கண்டது மொழிமோ <i>tumpi kāmam ceppātu kaṇṭatu molimō</i>
----------	--

bee | desire say-not seen-it speak

“O bee, speak of what you have seen without speaking according to [my] desire.”

S O P double verb form not marked by a particle:

KT 80.3 யாமஃ தயர்கஞ் சேறும்
yām aḱt_u ayarkam cērum
 we that immerse(1.pl.sub.) go(1.pl.sub.)
 “Let us go immerse ourselves in that.”

O P S-ē subject postposition:

KT 170.4f. மலைகெழு நாடன் கேண்மை
 தலைபோ காமநற் கறிந்தனென் யானே
malai keḷu nāṭaṇ kēṇmai
talaipōkāmai nark_u arintanen yānē
 mountain have- land-he intimacy
 not-having-come-to-an-end well I-knew I^ē
 “Me, I knew well that the intimacy with the man from
 a land having mountains had not come to an end.”

S P O-ē object postposition:

KT 50.5 புலம்பணிந் தன்றவர் மணந்த தோளே
pulamp_u aṇintan_{r_u} avar maṇanta tōlē
 loneliness it-adorned he(h.) united- shoulder^ē
 “Loneliness has come to adorn the shoulder he united
 with.”

S O P adv.-ē adverb postposition:

KT 14.6 யா நானுகஞ் சிறிதே
yām nāṇukam ciritē

we be-ashamed(1.pl.sub.) small-it^ē
 “We may be ashamed, a little.”

S-ē O P-ē subject focalisation (emphasis):

KT 24.5f. ... கொடியோர் நாவே
 காதல ரகலக் கல்லென் றவ்வே
 ... *koṭiyōr nāvē*
kātalar akala kallenṛavē
 cruel-they tongue^ē
 lover(h.) depart(inf.) ‘kal’-said(n.pl.)^ē
 “The tongues of the cruel ones,
 they foretold that the lover would depart.”

O-ē P S anteposition of the direct object (rare):

KT 73.1 மகிழ்நன் மார்பே வெய்யை யானீ
makilṇan mārpē veyyaiyāl nī
 delight-he chest^ē hot-you^{āl} you
 “On the delightful man’s chest you are keen indeed.”

O-ē P S anteposition of the indirect object (rare):

KT 140.3 சுரனே சென்றனர் காதலர்
curaṇē cenṛanar kātalar
 desert^ē he-went(h.) lover(h.)
 “To the desert the lover has gone.”

P-ē S-ē predicate anteposition (strong emphasis):

KT 112.4f. அற்றே | கண்டிசின் றோழியவ ருண்டவென் னலனே
arrē | kaṇṭicin tōli avar uṇṭa eṇ nalanē
 thus-it^ē | see(ipt.) friend he(h.) eaten- my- innocence^ē

“Just like that – look, friend – is my innocence, which he had eaten.”

P-*ē* S predicate anteposition without particle to mark the end of the sentence, i.e., the sentence goes on by coordination:

KT 113.1f. ஊர்க்கு மணித்தே பொய்கை பொய்கைக்குச்
சேய்த்து மன்றே சிறுகான் யாறே
ūrkkum aṇittē poykai poykaikku
cēyttum anrē ciru kān yārē
village(dat.)^{um} close-it^ē pond pond(dat.)
distance-it^{um} is-not-so^ē little forest river^ē
“Not far from the village is the pond, and from the pond
the little forest river is not distant.”

P-*ē* S predicate anteposition as a rhetorical device, when the subject is part of the next sentence too:

KT 92.2,5 அளிய தாமே கொடுஞ்சிறைப் பறவை ...
இரைகொண் டமையின் விரையுமாற் செலவே
aḷiya tāmē koṭum cirai paravai ...
irai koṭamaiyiṇ viraiyumāl celavē
pity-they(n.pl.) self(pl.)^ē curved wing bird ...
food having-takenⁱⁿ they-hurry(n.p.)^{al} going^ē
“Pitiful are they, the bent-winged birds,
in a hurry indeed in [their] going since they have taken
food...”

S-*ē* = address:

KT 23.1-3 அகவன் மகளே யகவன் மகளே
மனவுகோப் பன்ன நன்னெடுங் கூந்த
லகவன் மகளே

akaval makaḷē akaval makaḷē
maṇavu kōpp_u aṇṇa nal neṭum kūntal
akaval makaḷē

Akaval woman^ē Akaval woman^ē
 chank-bead string like good long tresses
 Akaval woman^ē
 “Soothsaying woman, soothsaying woman,
 with good long tresses [white] as strings of chank bead,
 soothsaying woman!”

A rare exception in the old corpus is -ஏ -ē in a subordinate phrase,
 here attached to the absolutive:

KT 52.2 சூர்நசைந் தனையையாய் நடுங்கல் கண்டே
cūr nacaintaṇaiyai āy naṭuṅkal kaṇṭē
 fearful-spirit longed-for-thus-you become(abs.)
 trembling seen^ē
 “seeing [you] tremble as one longed for by a spirit”

17. Modal Particles

In early *Caṅkam* Tamil, particles are employed also to express modality. Usually they work in coordination with -ஏ -ē. The interrogative particles -கொல் -*kol*, -ஓ -*ō* and கொல்லோ *kollō* have already been treated in Chapter 11. In Chapter 1.7 there is a list of particles, which is not complete and does not list the various particle combinations that are possible. For many of them no hypothesis as to their function has been ventured so far; some are not attested in a number sufficient to form a hypothesis.³⁷ Some of the more important particles that seem fairly comprehensible are:

மன் <i>maṇ</i>	assertive with shades of evaluation; irrealis
மன்ற <i>maṇra</i>	assertive with shades of evaluation
ஆல் <i>āl</i>	assertive with shades of evaluation
அம்ம <i>amma</i>	lament; inviting attention
தில்ல <i>tilla</i>	wish
தெய்ய <i>teyya</i>	admonition
மாதோ <i>mātō</i>	particle of emphatically doubtful (rhetorical) question
மற்று <i>marru</i>	adversative/contrastive? (also change of subject, topic/perspective)

Among the unexplained particles remain the following: அத்தை *attai*, -அரோ -*arō*, -ஆரும் -*ārum*, கொன்- *kon-*, மாள *māla*, யாழ *yāla*. From the middle *Caṅkam* texts onwards the system deteriorates and from the bhakti texts onwards very often the old patterns are no longer heeded and the old functions often do not appear to make sense anymore. However, it is important to bear in mind that

³⁷ For கொல் *kol* as an interrogative and மன் *maṇ* and மன்ற *maṇra* as assertive particles see also Sivaraja Pillai 1932, appendices.

particles actually have to be described in two ways. They form syntactic patterns which can easily be demonstrated to exist. The determination of their function, then, is a second step, that may be controversial. The *Tolkāppiyam Collatikāram* contains a chapter on particles, *Itaiyiyal*, which does not describe syntactic patterns and which, in an additive manner, names ways in which particles have been used. The commentators accordingly had the choice of identifying one of those uses in a given passage or of calling the particle “expletive” (அசை *acai*). Notable is, first of all, that the vast majority of particles is either enclitic (if it is shorter than a regular metrical foot) or added in a separate metrical foot (*cīr*) after the predicate or focalised noun. Exceptions are the particle மற்று *marrru*, which may appear between sentences, and the particle கொன் *kon*, which appears to be proclitic and entered into the dictionaries like a noun with the four functions identified by the *Tolkāppiyam* (TC 249i: அச்சம் *accam*, “fear”, பயமிலி *payamili* “uselessness”, காலம் *kālam*, “time”, பெருமை *perumai*, “greatness”).

Syntactical patterns:

-மன் *-man* (certainty): S PrN/(f.v.)-*man*

postpositions marked by -ஏ *-ē*; combinations: மன்றில்ல *manrilla*,
மன்னோ *manṇō*, மன்னே *manṇē*

மன்ற *manra* (certainty): PrN/(f.v.) *manra* S-*ē*

P *manra*

combinations: மன்றம்ம *manramma*

-ஆல் *-āl* (surprising fact): [O] P-*āl* S-*ē*

focalisation: [S] P-*āl* O-*ē*;

[S] P-*āl* adv.-*ē*

S-*ē* O P-*āl*

O-*ē* P-*āl*

combinations: -ஆலம்ம *-āl-amma*, -ஆற்றில்ல *-āl-illa*

அம்ம *amma* (“alas”): P *amma* S-ē(.)

focalisation in combination: P *maṇr’ amma* S-ē
P-āl *amma* S

call for attention: அம்ம வாழி தோழி *amma vāli tōli* (?)

தில்ல *tilla* (wish): P(opt./sub.) *tilla*
 (“would that...!” – desire)
P(opt./sub.) *tillamma* (“if
only...!” – irrealis)

தெய்ய *teyya* (admonition): S O P-ē/-ō *teyya* (“please”)

மாதோ *mātō*: S O P-*mātō* (“is it not that...?”)

மற்று *marru*: S-*marru*
marru-S
(not restricted to the main sentence;
also in a period; position more
fluid)

combinations (always on the predicate): மற்றே *marrē*, ஓமற்றே
ōmarrē, மற்றில்ல *marrilla*

Examples:

assertive மன் *maṇ*:

KT 153.3 அஞ்சும னளித்தென் னெஞ்ச மினியே
añcum-maṇ alittu en neñcam iniyē
fearing-it^{man} pity-it my- heart now^ē
“Fearful indeed, pitiful is my heart now.”

மன் *maṇ* in combination with நன்று *nanru* for an irrealis:

KT 98.1-3 அவர் | துன்னச் சென்று செப்புநர்ப் பெறினே

நன்றுமன் வாழி தோழி

avar | tunna cenru ceppunar perinē

nanru-man vāli tōli

he(h.) | approach(inf.) gone saying-he(h.) obtain-if^ē

good-it^{man} live(sub.) friend

“If we were to obtain someone who goes to approach
[and] talk to him, that would be good indeed, o friend.”

மன்னே *mannē*:

KT 191.6f.

ஓதியும் புனைய

லெம்முந் தொடாஅ லென்குவெ மன்னே.

ōtiyum punaiyal

emmun toṭāal enkuvem mannē

hair^{um} don't-adorn

us^{um} don't-touch we-say^{mannē}

“Don't adorn [our] hair

and don't touch us, we shall indeed say.”

மன்னோ *mannō*:

KT 229.4

ஏதில் சிறுசெரு வுறுப மன்னோ

ēt_u il ciru cer_u urupa mannō

reason-not little quarrel they-have^{mannō}

“For sure they have a little quarrel without reason?”

assertive மன்ற *manra*:

KT 35.1

நாணில மன்றவெங் கண்ணே

nāṇ ila manra em kaṇṇē

shame not-they(n.pl.)^{manra} our- eye^ē

“Our eyes indeed, they are without shame.”

assertive -*āl*:

- KT 120.2 அரிதுவேட் டனையா னெஞ்சே
aritu vēṭṭanaiyāl neñcē
 difficult-it wanted-you^{āl} heart^ē
 “Indeed you wanted something difficult, heart.”

lamentative *amma*:

- KT 45.5 தெறுவ தம்மவித் திணைபிறத் தல்லே
teruvat_u amma i tiṇai pīrattalē
 scorch-it^{amma} this- family being-born^ē
 “A torment it is, ah, to be born into this family.”

தில்லம் *tillamma* for an irreal wish:

- KT 56.4 வருக தில்லம் தானே *varuka tillamma tāṇē*
 may-come^{tillamma} self^ē “Would that she came, she herself.”

தில்ல *tilla* for a wish:

- KT 57.4 உடனுயிர் போகுக தில்ல *uṭaṇ uyir pōkuka tilla*
 together life may-go^{tilla} “May we go from this life together.”

தெய்ய *teyya* for (gentle) admonition:

- NA 215.8f. இன்றுநீ யிவணை யாகி யெம்மொடு
 தங்கி னெவனோ தெய்ய
iṇru nī ivaṇai āki emmoṭu
taṅkiṇ evaṇō-teyya
 today you here-you become(abs.) us-with
 stay-if what^ō teyya
 “Since you are here today,
 what if you stayed with us, please?”

மாதோ *mātō* as a question suggesting that something is the case:

- KT 253.4 நாட்டுயர் கெடபி னீடலர் மாதோ
nāl tuyar keṭa piṇ nīṭalar mātō
 day misery be-lost(inf.) after delay-not-he(h.)^{mātō}
 “Surely he will not delay further, so that [your] days are
 lost in misery?” ~ “Will he delay further...?”

adversative மற்று *marru*:

- KT 299.1 இதுமற் றெவனோ தோழி *itu marr_u evaṇō tōḷi*
 this^{marru} what^ō friend “This again, what is it,
 friend?”

மற்று *marru* as a mark of subject change, frequently used in narrative Tamil:

- Kural 1155 ஒம்பி னமைந்தார் பிரிவோம்பன் மற்றவர்
 நீங்கி னரிதால் புணர்வு
ōmpin amaintār piriv_u ōmpal marr_u avar
nūṅkiṇ arit_u-āl puṇarvu
 protect-if suitable-he(h.) separation protecting^{marru}he(h.)
 leave-if difficult-it^{āl} union
 “If [you want to] protect [me], protect [me] from
 separation from the one suited [to me]. When he, on his
 part (*marru*), leaves [re-]union will be difficult indeed.”

Supplement on -ō

The particle -ஓ -ō is one of the most complex. There is an old layer (shared by Akam and Puṇam) where -ஓ -ō is a tonal particle of lament or mourning. This concerns metrical patterns within the old stock of Akam and Puṇam formulae: நோகோ யானே *nōkō yāṇē*, “ah, I ache”. Its main function, however, as already shown, is that of an

interrogative particle (for examples, see Chapter 11). The syntactical pattern is:

S [O] P-*ō* (interrogative pronoun possible)

S-*ō* [O] P-*ē*

All types of postposition are possible ([O] P-*ō* S-*ē*, S P-*ō* O-*ē*, S [O] P-*ō* adv.-*ē*), but anteposition is rare. Perhaps as such -*ō* is a possible addition to some types of imperative or optative forms, presumably adding a nuance of politeness (a doubtful “would you?”): KT 169.2 இறீஇயரோ *irīiyarō*, “let them break”. Moreover, -*ō* is frequently used for a demarcation of topic, also plausibly to be developed out of the interrogative function.

KT 221.1 அவரோ வாரார் *avarō vārār*
 he(h.)^δ come-not-he(h.) “He? He did not come.”
 ~ “As for him, he did not come.”

KT 21.4f. காரெனக் கூறினும்
 யானோ தேறேனவர் பொய்வழங் கலரே
kār enak kūṛinum
yānō tērēṇavar poy valaṅkalarē
 rainy-season say talking-if-even
 I^δ believe-not-I he(h.) lie use-not-he(h.)^ē
 “Even if you say it is the rainy season,
 I for one don’t believe it. He does not use lies.”

18. Circular Construction (*pūṭṭuvil*)

One of the traditional patterns of syntax within the poem is of utmost importance, as it is followed, in the old corpus, by roughly 30% of the material. Its Tamil name பூட்டுவில் *pūṭṭuvil* (“the drawn bow”), first attested in Nakkīraṇ’s commentary on *Iraiyaṇār Akapporuḷ* 56 (under the name of விற்பூட்டு *virpūṭṭu*), then obtaining its own *sūtra* in *Nannūl* 414. It concerns special poetic licences for postpositions which distort regular word order. The normal word order can be restored by reconnecting the end of the poem to the beginning, just as the bow string connects the two ends of a bow. [In the editions and translations published by the NETamil team a special punctuation mark has been used to mark this phenomenon, namely ∞, the mathematical infinity sign.]

If the same phenomenon is described in terms of particle syntax, we can say that the -ஏ -ē at the end of the poem is exempt from the normal rules of postposition: **not only nouns**, that is, subject or subjects in apposition (cf. p. 69), object and adverbial phrases, can be postpositioned, **but also nonfinite verb forms**, such as infinitive, absolutive and conditional.

Nominal postposition varies only with respect to length, that is, the final noun at the end of a poem can be the head noun of a longer phrase.

subject/subject apposition:

KT 16.1,5 உள்ளார் கொல்லோ தோழி ...
அங்காற் கள்ளியங் காடிற்றந் தோரே
uḷḷār kollō tōḷi ...
am kāl kaḷḷiyaṇ kāṭ_u iṛantōrē∞
remember-not-he(h.)^{kollō} friend ...
pretty leg spurge- wilderness traversed-he(h.)^ē

“Won’t he remember, friend, ...
the one who has gone to traverse the wildernes of
pretty-trunked spurge trees?”

object (direct or indirect):

KT 181.1,7 இதுமற் றெவனோ தோழி ...
பெருமுது பெண்டிரே மாகிய நமக்கே
itu marr_u evaṇō tōḷi ...
peru mutu peṇṭirēm ākiya namakkē
this^{marru} what^ō friend ...
big old women-we become(p.)- us(dat.)^ē
“This, what is it, friend, ...
for us who have become great old women?”

adverbial phrase of location:

KT 85.1,6 யாரினு மினியன் பேரன் பினனே ...
யாண ஞரன் பாணன் வாயே
yārinum inīyaṇ pēr aṇṇaṇē ...
yāṇar ūraṇ pāṇaṇ vāyē
who^{inum} pleasant-he big love-he^ē ...
fertility village-he bard mouth^ē
“Sweeter than all [and] great in loving is he ...
in the mouth of the bard, the man from the fertile village.”

nonfinite postpositions

absolutive:

KT 66.1,5 மடவ மன்ற தடவுநிலைக் கொன்றை ...
வம்ப மாரியைக் காரென மதித்தே
maṭava maṇra taṭavu nilai konrai ...

vampa māriyai kār eṇa matittē

foolish-they(n.pl.)^{manṛa} breadth standing Laburnum(-tree)

...

new-they(n.pl.) shower(acc.) rainy-season say
estimated^ē

“Foolish indeed are the broad-standing laburnum trees,

...

having taken the unseasonal shower for the rainy season.”

infinitive:

KT 157.1,4 குக்கூ வென்றது கோழி ...

வாள்போல் வைகறை வந்தன்றா லெனவே

kukkū eṇratu kōli ...

vāl pōl vaikarai vantanrāl eṇavē

‘kukkū’ said-it fowl ...

sword similar dawn it-came^{āl} say(inf.)^ē

“*Kukkū* crowed the rooster ...

to say dawn has come like a sword.”

conditional:

KT 245.2,6 நலமிழந் ததனினு நனியின் னாதே ...

பல்லோ ரறியப் பரந்துவெளிப் படினே

nalām ilantataninum nani innātē ...

pallōr ariya parantu veḷipaṭiṇē

innocence lost-it^{inum} abundant pleasant-not-it^ē ...

many(h.) know(inf.) spread come-out-if^ē

“Much more unpleasant than [our] innocence’s being lost

...

if it comes out, spreading for many to know.”

It appears possible to distinguish several stylistic types of circular construction:

1. The most frequent and simple type is a poem that contains one single sentence where the head fits to the tail. Occasionally, if the poem contains more than one sentence, the end of the poem will fit its first sentence.
2. The poem contains more than one sentence (two, three, four), but one central element, perhaps the (logical!) subject or an apposition to this subject, follows in postposition. A subtype of this is a conditional postpositioned to the end, which is nevertheless valid for all preceding clauses.

In addition there is something that may be called the status of a visual circular structure, where what is postponed to the end grammatically cannot be counted, strictly speaking, as part of the first sentence of the poem, but of a subsequent sentence, although its presence is necessary in order to understand what is going on at the beginning of the poem, too:

3. The part of the poem postpositioned to the end is, grammatically speaking, an element of the immediately preceding sentence, but should, according to the normal word order, be read in front of it. It is also relevant to the sentence/s at the beginning of the poem.
4. The poem consists of grammatically and syntactically clear-cut and well-ordered sentences, which nevertheless seem to lean on one another, because, for example, the keyword for the understanding of the whole poem is its very last word.

The last type can be exemplified by *Kuruntokai* 1:

செங்களம் படக்கொன் றவுணர்த் தேய்த்த
செங்கோ லம்பிற் செங்கோட் டியானைக்

கழறொடிச் சேஎய் குன்றங்
 குருதிப் பூவின் குலைக்காந் தட்டே.
cem kaḷam paṭa konr_u avuṇar tēytta
cem kōl ampin_i cem kōṭṭu yānai
kaḷal toṭi cēey kuṇram
kuruti pūvin_i kulai kāntaṭṭē.

red field happen(inf.) killed demon(h.) reduced-
 red stem arrowⁱⁿ red horn elephant
 anklet bracelet redness hill
 blood flowerⁱⁿ bunch Malabar-glory-lily-it^e.
 “Red the ground from killing, the demon reduced
 by red-stemmed arrows, red-tusked [his] elephant,
 anklets, bracelets – the Red One’s hill
 is full of Malabar lilies, bunches of blood-flowers.”

Note that in contradistinction to verses in Āciriyaṭṭā metre, stanzas in Veṇṭā metre end in a short metrical foot (see Chapter 20) and are exempt from “normal” postposition rules. They may finish with an absolutive postpositioned with respect to the main verb:

Pū 5. அடிமுன்றி லிவ்வுலக மன்றளந்தாய் போலு
 மடிமுன் றிரந்தவனி கொண்டாய் – படிநின்ற
 நீரோத மேனி நெடுமாலே நின்னடியை
 யாரோத வல்லா ரறிந்து
aṭi mūn_ril i ulakam an_r_u aḷantāy pōlum
aṭi mūn_ru irant_u avan_i koṇṭāy – paṭi niṇ_ra
nīr ōtam mēn_i neṭu mālē niṇ_i aṭiyai
yār ōta vallār aṭintu

foot three-it(loc.) this- world that-day measured-you
seeming-it

foot three-it begged earth taken-you earth stood

water flood body tall Māl^ē you foot(acc.)

who recite(inf.) capable-they(h.) known

“You who, it seems, that day in three steps measured
the world,

you who took the earth by begging for three steps, tall Māl

with the water flood[-coloured] body who stood on earth,

who knows [and] can sing your feet?”

19. Formulaic Repertoires and Formulae as Syntactic Matrices

Old Tamil has several sets of formulaic repertoire, beginning with *Caṅkam* poetry, but then also epic and devotional poetry. Only the first of them has been described to some degree, but it will be sufficient to point out the basics which can then be adjusted to various metrical conditions and delimitations of content. To recall briefly Lord's famous definition: a formula is a repetition under identical metrical conditions. As already discussed in the introduction, it is highly likely that Old Tamil poetry originated in an oral tradition since it is easy to show that its basic elements of composition were formulae, however, clearly overlaid with a written tradition since it can be shown how formulaic systems disintegrate. Another aspect which is important to stress is that formulae function as signals in the interaction between bard and listener: even today an educated reader will know what to expect from the way keywords of the construction are positioned within a poem. Formulaic attribution and the interplay between formula, theme and system have first been described by Kailasapathy 1968, which has since been supplemented by more than a dozen publications by Vacek, summed up in his 2007 book.

A few examples are the descriptions of birds, forests and warriors:

KT 246.1 சிறுவெங் காக்கை *ciru-veṅ kākkai*, “small white crow”

KT 103.3 இரைதேர் நாரை *irai-tēr nārai*, “prey-searching heron”

KT 163.3 மீனார் குருகின் *mīṇ-ār kurukin*, “fish-eating heron(obl.)”

KT 16.5 அங்காற் கள்ளியங் காடு *aṅ-kār kaḷḷiyaṅ kāṭu*,
“pretty-trunked spurge forest”

KT 67.5 நிலங்கரி கள்ளியங் காடு *nilaṅ-kari kaḷḷiyaṅ kāṭu*,
“spurge forest with parched ground”

KT 216.2 வாடா வள்ளியங் காடு *vāṭā vaḷḷiyaṅ kāṭu*,

“unfading Vaḷḷi forest”

(KT 124.2 ஓமையம் பெருங்காடு *ōmaiyaṁ peruṅkāṭu*,

“a big forest of toothbrush-trees”)

KT 15.5 சேயிலை வெண்வேல் விடலையொடு

cēy-ilai veḷ-vēḷ viṭalaiyoṭu

“warrior(soc.) with a red-tipped white spear”

KT 378.4 சுடர்வாய் நெடுவேல் காளையொடு

cuṭar-vāy neṭu-vēḷ kālaiyoṭu

“young man(soc.) with a fire-tipped long spear”

A case in point are also the designations for the hero belonging to a particular *tiṇai*, such as தண்ணந் துறைவன் *taṇṇan turaivan*, “the man from the cool ghat”, மெல்லம் புலம்பன் *mellam pulampan*, “the soft giver of loneliness”, நன்மலை நாடன் *nal-malai nāṭan*, “the man from a land of good mountains. These formulae then may again fall into subsystems (பெருவரை நாடன் *peru-varai nāṭan*, “the man from the land of big mountain”, குன்ற நாடன் *kunra nāṭan*, “the man from a land of hills). Formulaic analysis also reveals how close the relation is between Akam and Puṇam; there are clear structural similarities in, say, the epithets used for warriors, women, and trees. Equally similar is the repertoire of mourning: there is no fundamental difference between an absent lover and a king fallen in battle.

The distribution of just one productive formula demonstrates the close relation between the old anthologies:

person/text	PN	KT	NA	AN	AiN
அளியான் யானே <i>aḷiyān yānē</i>	–	30.6, 293.8	152.9, 289.9	–	460.5
அளியை நீயே <i>aḷiyai nīyē</i>	228.5	–	(14.12)	383.14	–
அளியன் தானே <i>aḷiyaṇ tāṇē</i>	257.5	–	–	–	–
அளியள் தானே <i>aḷiyaḷ tāṇē</i>	143.7, 254.11, 293.6	–	(324.1), 352.12	(73.7), (118.4), 146.8, 153.4, (224.18), 287.3, 339.11, 373.19, 381.18	–
அளிதோ தானே <i>aḷitō tāṇē</i>	5.8, 109.1, 111.1, 243.11	149.1, 212.4, 276.8, 395.7	101.6, 114.5	239.1	–
அளியம் யாமே <i>aḷiyam yāmē</i>	–	–	368.10	–	–
அளியர் தாமே <i>aḷiyar tāmē</i>	51.8, 52.8, 81.3, 237.8, 345.12	7.3	–	43.13, (78.12)	381.3
அளிய தாமே <i>aḷiya tāmē</i>	248.1	92.2	163.7	–	284.1, 455.3

Specific about the Tamil repertoire is the employment of formulae for structuring (and announcing) syntax, with sensitive spots especially

at the beginning of a poem (அம்ம வாழி தோழி *amma vāli tōli*) and the poem end (நோகோ யானே *nōkō yānē*), as described in Wilden 2006: 235ff.

A typical and very productive formula to end a poem is:

காடு *kātu*, “wilderness”³⁸

சுரன் *curan*, “waste land”³⁹

இறந்தோரே *irantōrē* “he who traversed”

மலை *malai*, “mountains”⁴⁰

குன்று *kunru*, “hills”⁴¹

This formulaic end appears to be complementary to the following poem beginnings or main sentences:

உள்ளார் கொல்லோ தோழி *uḷḷār kollō tōli*,

“won’t he remember, friend?”⁴²

யாண்டுளர் கொல்லோ தோழி *yāṇṭuḷār kollō tōli*,

“where is he, friend?”⁴³

கேளா ராகுவர் தோழி *kēḷā rākuvar tōli*, “he doesn’t hear, friend”⁴⁴

வருவர்கொ நோழி *varuvar-kol vāli tōli*, “will he come, o friend?”⁴⁵

வாரார்கொ நோழி *vārār vāli tōli*, “he hasn’t come, o friend”⁴⁶

கொடியர் வாழி தோழி *koṭiyar vāli tōli*, “cruel [is] he, o friend”⁴⁷

³⁸ KT 16.5, 67.5, 216.2; NA 14.11, 189.10; AN 1.19, 25.22, 133.18, 151.15, 395.15.

³⁹ KT 211.7, 215.7, 260.8, 314.6; NA 92.9, 274.9; AN 141.29, 171.15, 201.18.

⁴⁰ KT 232.6, 253.8, 287.7, 285.8; AN 111.15, 155.16, 173.18, 185.13, 291.16, 247.13, 249.19, 313.17, 321.17, 347.16, 389.24.

⁴¹ NA 18.10.

⁴² KT 16.1, 67.1, 232.1; NA 92.1, 241.1.

⁴³ KT 195.3, 176.5, 285.3, 325.4; cf. AN 47.14.

⁴⁴ KT 253.1.

⁴⁵ KT 177.5, 215.3, 260.4.

⁴⁶ KT 314.4.

⁴⁷ KT 278.4.

எஞ்சினம் வாழி தோழி *eñcinam vāli tōli*,

“we have left behind x, o friend”⁴⁸

Other elements to be taken into consideration are optical strategical points, such as the end of a penultimate line, where so often an imperfective *peyareccam* with a long sub-clause is found, or topical strategical points, such as the designation of the hero, for example நாடன் *nāṭan*, giving rise to the expectation of the same type of sub-clause.

⁴⁸ KT 211.3.

20. Metres: Ācīriyappā and Veṇṇpā – Theoretical and Practical Rules

Metre is a very complex topic, and here only a most basic introduction can be given.⁴⁹ The primary sources for the traditional descriptions of metre are the *Tolkāppiyam Ceyyūḷiyal*, the *Yāpparuṅkala Virutti* and the *Yāpparuṅkalak Kārikai*. The former started on the basis of the old system relevant for the metres of the *Caṅkam*, that is, basically Ācīriyappā, occasionally contrasted with Vañcippā. Vañcippā never appears independently all on its own, Ācīriyappā has been used also later in epic and epigraphical Tamil, for treatises, as well as for a few archaising texts such as the *Kallāṭam*. The *Tolkāppiyam Ceyyūḷiyal* also accounts for Veṇṇpā, as well as for Kalippā and Paripāṭal, the metres for the two latecomers in the *Eṭṭuttokai*. Veṇṇpā is the main metre of the *Kīlkkāṇakku*, still used for some early bhakti works. It is also the main metre through the ages to write mnemonic stanzas such as author stanzas. Metrical calculation or scansion underwent a profound change during the late *Caṅkam* period, and the bhakti corpus sees an explosion of new metres based on rhythm and music with a fair amount of disregard for word boundaries, described in the two works mentioned above, that is, one treatise with two commentaries.

The metrical units:

எழுத்து <i>eḷuttu</i>	graphic unit that in Tamil may be either a vowel, a consonant or a consonant with a vowel
அசை <i>acai</i>	smallest metrical unit which can have up to three syllables
சீர் <i>cīr</i>	metrical foot made of <i>acai</i>
அடி <i>aṭi</i>	line made of <i>cīr</i>

⁴⁹ For further reading consult the introductions of Niklas 1988 and Zvelebil 1989, for details on classical Ācīriyappā see Wilden 2014, for a detailed account of the bhakti metres see Chevillard 2014a+b.

Early metres regulate the number of metrical units per foot, the number of feet per line and the number of lines. It is only from Venpā onwards that stanzas are formed.

According to the old metrical system, two pairs of metrical units exist, நேர் *nēr* and நேர்பு *nērpū* along with நிரை *nirai* and நிரைபு *niraipu*. The later system of scansion does away with the two latter subtypes. In other words, while originally overshort *-u* was discounted metrically, later it was simply calculated as a short vowel.

The அசை *acai*-units:

<i>nēr</i> (C)Ṽ ⁵⁰ (C)ṼC (C)Ṽ (C)ṼC	<i>nērpū</i> (C)Ṽ-C _u (C)ṼC-C _u (C)Ṽ-C _u (C)ṼC-C _u
<i>nirai</i> (C)Ṽ-CṼ (C)Ṽ-CṼC (C)Ṽ-CṼ (C)Ṽ-CṼC	<i>niraipu</i> (C)Ṽ-CṼ-C _u (C)Ṽ-CṼC-C _u (C)Ṽ-CṼ-C _u (C)Ṽ-CṼC-C _u

There are two possible “anomalies”, namely *aḷapeṭai*, that is, a metrical lengthening to three morae (spelled by adding a short vowel to a long vowel: சேய்ம் *cēy*). Metrical lengthening may in rare cases be a lexical feature of a word, and it is often done as a poetic adornment or for musical reasons. But it is also a means of stretching what is metrically too short into an acceptable *cīr*. It is also possible to have a hypermetrical foot or a கூன் *kūṇ*, literally a “hunch”.

⁵⁰ A rare special case is a metrical foot that is complemented by a *nēr* consisting of a consonant cluster: NA 98.2 சேய்ம்ம்ம் *ceyymm*, which has to be analysed as *ceyy-mm = nēr-nēr*.

The possible combination of *acai*-units in a metrical foot (*cīr*) in Ācīriyappā:

+	<i>nēr</i>	<i>nirai</i>	<i>nēṛpu</i>	<i>niraipu</i>
<i>nēr</i>	• (2)	• (3)	• (3)	• (4)
<i>nirai</i>	• (3)	• (4)	• (4)	• (5)
<i>nēṛpu</i>	• (3)	• (4)	• (4)	• (5)
<i>niraipu</i>	• (4)	• (5)	• (5)	• (6)

Ācīriyappā allows two *acai* per *cīr* in any combination of *nirai*, *nēr*, *niraipu*, *nēṛpu* – regular (black), permitted (blue), irregular (red). In exceptional cases there may be three *acai* (listed below). The figure in brackets refers to the number of syllables they comprise. In theory combinations between *niraipu* and *nēṛpu* are irregular; in fact they do occur, but rarely. Lines have four *cīr*, the penultimate only three *cīr*, with the exception of Nūrpā, the adaptation of Ācīriyappā for theoretical texts. The number of lines is almost unrestricted, ranging from three-line poems in the *Aiṅkurunūru* up to 782 in the *Maturaikkāñci*, although an anthology may fix the number of possible lines (4-8 for the *Kuruntokai*). A poem ends in the particle -ஏ -ē (rarely in -ஓ -ō or -ஔ -āy).

Practical Rules for Ācīriyappā:

There is a close interaction between metre and sandhi. The end-consonant of a *cīr* often merges with the beginning consonant of the next. A *cīr* can start with a vowel only at the beginning of a poem. Inside the poem every *cīr* must begin with a consonant; the preceding

final consonant or final consonant with elided over-short *-u* go to the next *cīr* and bear the vowel.

- 1) An *acai* should not be counted across word-boundaries (this being the second fundamental difference between early and later metrical theory).
- 2) A *nēr* consisting of a single short open syllable can never begin a *cīr*.
- 3) Words should not be split across different *cīr*, apart from the final consonant or the final consonant plus over-short *-u* which is elided. Exempt from this rule are word forms of four *acai* and more (very rarely nouns, frequently finite verbs and participial nouns).
- 4) Word forms of three *acai* are borderline cases and can be accepted as a *cīr* in basically three situations:
 - a) verb form + particle: வருவர்கொல் *varuvar-kol* (KT 177.5) = *nirai-nēr-nēr*, விடுநண்மன் *viṭunaḷ-man* (NA 68.7) *nirai-nēr-nēr*.
 - b) noun + case ending: வருவிருந்தின் *varu-viruntin* (NA 53.8) = *nirai-nirai-nēr*.
 - c) inserted pronoun: யிறுத்தன்றவர் (*y*)*iruttanr*’ *avar* (NA 68.10) = *nirai-nēr-nirai*.
 - [d) problematic *cīr*: னறையறையாத் (*n*)*araiyaraiyāt* (NA 46.7) = *nirai-nirai-nēr*.]

For verb forms plus particle of three *acai* there are different ways to lengthen them to four *acai* which can be split into two *cīr*:

- a) nominal or pronominal complement: காடிற்றத் தோரே *kāḍiṭṭrē* (KT 16.4) = *nēr-nirai nēr-nēr*; அவராற் றலரே *avar ārralarē* (KT 305.4) = *nirai-nēr nirai-nēr*.
- b) metrical doubling of consonants: முகைநா றும்மே *mukai nārumē* (KT 193.6).

- 5) Similarly a number of hypo-metrical feet can be accepted, especially with *vinaiyeccam*-s (*ceytu/ceypu* type = absolutive) that make up a *cīr*: *ceṇru*, *vantu*... (i.e. analyse not as *nērpū*, but as *nēr-nēr*). This does not exclude, however, having *cīr* like *vīrruvīrruk* (PN 35.22) that count as *nērpū-nērpū*. Somewhat less frequent is the *nirai/niraipu* variation: *taṇintu* (KT 195.1) = *nirai-nēr* against *puṇantulaṛntu* (KT 214.1) = *nirai-niraipu*.

[For *niraipu/nērpū* nouns similar allowances can be made, but they are rare. Verbal roots in *niraipu/nērpū* are not acceptable. Their occurrence before a *cīr* beginning with a nasal has to be understood as *peyareccam* in *-um*.]

- 6) *Aḷapeṭai* and sandhi gemination can be metrically disregarded if necessary.

The rules for *Veṇṇā*:

Veṇṇā allows for two or three *acai* per *cīr* in alternating combinations of value, that is, a two-*acai* *cīr* ending in *nirai* must be followed by one beginning in *nēr* and vice versa. A three-*acai* *cīr*, always ending in a *nēr*, must be followed by a *nēr*. *Veṇṇā* accepts four *cīr* per line, but only three in the last, and that last *cīr* is short, i.e., a mere *acai*, no full *cīr*. *Veṇṇā* stands on the border between the old and the new type of metrical calculation. Within the verse it no longer counts நிரை *niraipu* and நேர *nērpū*, but the short third foot in the final line allows them, under the designations of பிறப்பு *pirappu* and காசு *kācu*. The short foot at the end has syntactic consequences: a *Veṇṇā* does not follow the “normal” postposition rules and frequently ends in an absolutive even outside a *pūṭṭuvil*. The number of lines may vary, but the standard *Veṇṇā* stanza has four lines; the *Kuraḷ* with only two lines is counted as a “dwarf *Veṇṇā*”.

An earlier poetic figure occasionally encountered becomes regular and obligatory from *Veṇṇā* times on, namely *etukai*, a rhyme pattern

that concerns the first feet of each line. The minimum is a rhyme between the second syllables of the foot, but often the repeated parts will be longer. The two most frequent patterns are 1a+2a+2d and 3a+4a (Nēricaivenṇpā) or 1a+2a+3a+4a (Inṇicaivenṇpā). In a Nēricaivenṇpā the rhyme word in line 2d is counted as a *taniccol*, a “solitary word”, which often entails a syntactic caesura after the third foot of line 2, as is indicated in print by a hyphen before 2d. *Etukai* gives rise to two forms of poetic licence, namely semantic weakening of the repeated elements and changing of letters by insertion or deletion for the sake of the rhyme: Pēy 12.3f. நன்கோதி *nanṅ_k-ōti* – பைங்கோத *paim-k-ōta*, with -k- inserted for the rhyme. Note that also the word order can be affected: Poy 100.1 ஓரடியஞ் சாடுதைத்த *ōr aṭiyum cāṭu utaitta*, “one foot that kicked the cart”, with a *peyareccam* following its head noun because of *etukai* with line 2 ஈரடியங் *īr-aṭiyum*.

The second possible and frequent but not obligatory feature is *mōṇai*, alliteration within a line.

From bhakti times onwards metrical feet form rhythmical patterns based on combinations of *cīr* made from mostly two or three *acai*, traditionally using standard examples as autonyms:

<i>cīr</i> with two <i>acai</i>	<i>tēmā</i> <i>puḷimā</i> <i>karuṇḷam</i> <i>kūṇḷam</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i> <i>nirai-nēr</i> <i>nirai-nirai</i> <i>nēr-nirai</i>		
<i>cīr</i> with three <i>acai</i>	<i>tēmāṇkāy</i> <i>puḷimāṇkāy</i> <i>karuṇḷaṇkāy</i> <i>kūṇḷaṇkāy</i>	<i>nēr-nēr-nēr</i> <i>nirai-nēr-nēr</i> <i>nirai-nirai-nēr</i> <i>nēr-nirai-nēr</i>	<i>tēmāṇkāṇi</i> <i>puḷimāṇkāṇi</i> <i>karuṇḷaṇkāṇi</i> <i>kūṇḷaṇkāṇi</i>	<i>nēr-nēr-nirai</i> <i>nirai-nēr-nirai</i> <i>nirai-nirai-nirai</i> <i>nēr-nirai-nirai</i>

The most frequent stanza type still has four lines, but the number of *cīr* is variable from two to eight. With the disappearance of

niraipu and *nērpū*, over-short *-u* is counted as a normal syllable and word boundaries often become blurred by musical patterns. There is also an influence from the syllable-counting Sanskrit metres, and some metres count both, *cīr* and syllables.

Possibilities of metrical adjustment become more numerous in the later metres. Frequently there are doublets like என்ன *enna* (inf.) for என *ena* (inf.): ஓருரிதுவென்ன *ōr-ūr-itu-v-enna* (Tē 1.1.3.3), or the reverse, அன *ana* for அன்ன *anna*: வாளை *vāl-ana* (Tē 7.20.1.2).

Metrical analysis of a verse in Ācīriyappā: KT 3

நிலத்தினும்	பெரிதே	வானினு	முயர்ந்தன்று
<i>nirai-nirai</i>	<i>nirai-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nirai</i>	<i>nirai-nērp<u>u</u></i>
<i>nilat-tin<u>u</u>m</i>	<i>peri-tē</i>	<i>vān-in<u>u</u>-</i>	<i>muyarn-tan<u>r</u>u</i>
நீரினு	மாரள	வின்றே	சாரற்
<i>nēr-nirai</i>	<i>nēr-nirai</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>
<i>nī-rin<u>u</u>-</i>	<i>mā-raḷa-</i>	<i>viṇ-rē</i>	<i>cā-ral</i>
கருங்கோற்	குறிஞ்சிப்	பூக்கொண்டு	
<i>nirai-nēr</i>	<i>nirai-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nērp<u>u</u></i>	
<i>karum-kōl</i>	<i>kuriñ-ci<u>p</u></i>	<i>pūk-koṇ<u>ṭu</u></i>	
பெருந்தே	னிழைக்கு	நாடனொடு	நட்பே
<i>nirai-nēr</i>	<i>nirai-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-niraipu</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>
<i>perum-tē-</i>	<i>niḷaik-ku(m)</i>	<i>nā-ṭano<u>ṭu</u></i>	<i>naṭ-pē</i>

Metrical analysis of a verse in Venṇā: Poy 1

வையந்	தகளியா	வார்கடலே	நெய்யாக
<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nirai-nirai</i>	<i>nēr-nirai-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr-nēr</i>
<i>vai-yam</i>	<i>taka-ḷi-yā</i>	<i>vār-kaṭa-lē</i>	<i>ney-yāka</i>
வெய்ய	கதிரோன்	விளக்காக	செய்ய
<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nirai-nēr</i>	<i>nirai-nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>
<i>vey-ya</i>	<i>kati-rōṇ</i>	<i>viḷak-kā-ka</i>	<i>cey-ya</i>
சுடராழி	யானடிக்கே	சூட்டினேன்சொன்	மாலை
<i>nirai-nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nirai-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nirai-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>
<i>cuṭa-rā-ḷi-</i>	<i>yā-naṭik-kē</i>	<i>cūṭ-ṭinēn-col</i>	<i>mā-lai</i>
யிடராழி	நீங்குகவே	யென்று	
<i>nirai-nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nirai-nēr</i>	<i>nērpu</i>	
<i>yīṭa-rāḷi</i>	<i>nīṇ-kuka-vē</i>	<i>yenru</i>	

Metrical analysis of a verse in (slightly irregular) Ārucīr
Ācīriyaviruttam: TVM 5.5.1

எங்ங	னேயோ	வன்னை	மீர்கா	ளென்னை	முனிவதுநீர்
<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nīrai-nīrai-nēr</i>
<i>eñ-ña</i>	<i>nē-yō</i>	<i>vañ-nai-</i>	<i>mīr-kā-</i>	<i>ḷeñ-nai</i>	<i>muñi-vatu-nīr</i>
நங்கள்	கோலத்	திருக்குறுங்	குடிநம்	பியைநான்	கண்டபின்
<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nīrai-nīrai</i>	<i>nīrai-nēr</i>	<i>nīrai-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr-nīrai</i>
<i>nañ-kaḷ</i>	<i>kō-lat</i>	<i>tiruk-kuruñ</i>	<i>kuṭi-nam-</i>	<i>piyai-nān</i>	<i>kañ-ṭa-pin</i>
சங்கி	னோடு	நேமி	யோடுந்	தாமரைக்	கண்களொடுஞ்
<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nīrai</i>	<i>nēr-nīrai-nēr</i>
<i>cañ-ki</i>	<i>nō-ṭu</i>	<i>nē-mi-</i>	<i>yō-ṭum</i>	<i>tā-maraik</i>	<i>kañ-kaḷo-ṭum</i>
செங்கனி	வாயொன்	றினோ	டுஞ்செல்	கின்ற	தென்னெஞ்சமே
<i>nēr-nīrai</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nēr-nīrai</i>
<i>cem-kani</i>	<i>vā-yoñ-</i>	<i>ri-nō</i>	<i>ṭum-cel</i>	<i>kiñ-ra-</i>	<i>teñ-neñ-came</i>

Metrical analysis of a verse in Kaṭṭalaikkalitturai
(5 cīr and 16 syllables): PK 1

பூமரு	கண்ணினை	வண்டாப்	புணர்மென்	முலையரும்பாத்
<i>nēr-nirai</i>	<i>nēr-nirai</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nirai-nēr</i>	<i>nirai-nirai-nēr</i>
<i>pū-maru</i>	<i>kaṇ-ṇiṇai</i>	<i>vaṇ-ṭāp</i>	<i>punar-mel</i>	<i>mulai-yarum-pāt</i>
தேமரு	செவ்வாய்	தளிராச்	செருச்செந்	நிலத்தைவென்ற
<i>nēr-nirai</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nirai-nēr</i>	<i>nirai-nēr</i>	<i>nirai-nirai-nēr</i>
<i>tē-maru</i>	<i>cem-vāy</i>	<i>taḷi-rāc</i>	<i>ceruc-cem</i>	<i>nilat-taiven-ṛa</i>
மாமரு	தானையெங்	கோன்வையை	வார்பொழி	லேர்கலந்த
<i>nēr-nirai</i>	<i>nēr-nirai</i>	<i>nēr-nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nēr-nirai</i>	<i>nēr-nirai-nēr</i>
<i>mā-maru</i>	<i>tā-ṇaiyem</i>	<i>kōṇ-vai-yai</i>	<i>vār-poḷi-</i>	<i>lēr-kalan-ta</i>
காமரு	பூங்கொடி	கண்டே	களித்தவெங்	கண்ணினையே
<i>nēr-nirai</i>	<i>nēr-nirai</i>	<i>nēr-nēr</i>	<i>nirai-nirai</i>	<i>nēr-nirai-nēr</i>
<i>kā-maru</i>	<i>pūm-koṭi</i>	<i>kaṇ-ṭē</i>	<i>kaḷit-tavem</i>	<i>kaṇ-ṇiṇai-yē</i>

INDEXES

Index of Quotations

Abbreviations:

AiAi	<i>Aintiṇai Aimpatu</i>
AiE	<i>Aintiṇai Elupatu</i>
AN	<i>Akanāṇūru</i>
Cilap	<i>Cilappatikāram</i>
Cint	<i>Cīvaka Cintāmaṇi</i>
Kali	<i>Kalittokai</i>
KT	<i>Kuruntokai</i>
Kul	<i>Kulacēkaraṇālvār Perumāḷ Tirumōḷi</i>
Kuraḷ	<i>Tirukkuraḷ</i>
NA	<i>Narrīṇai</i>
Pari	<i>Paripāṭal</i>
PeTM	<i>Periyālvār Tirumōḷi</i>
Pēy	<i>Pēyālvār Antāti</i>
PK	<i>Pāṇṭikkōvai</i>
PN	<i>Puraṇāṇūru</i>
Poy	<i>Poykaiyālvār Antāti</i>
Pū	<i>Pūtattālvār Antāti</i>
PV	<i>Pārataveṇpā</i>
TC	<i>Tolkāppiyam Collatikāram</i>
Tē	<i>Tēvāram</i>
TV	<i>Tiruviruttam</i>
TVM	<i>Tiruvāymoḷi</i>

- AiAi 9.2 (p. 143), 26.1+4 (p. 101), 42.4 (p. 121)
- AiE 7.1 (p. 121), 7.1v (p. 121), 55.2 (p. 121)
- AN KV.11 (p. 28), 1.4 (p. 106), 9.2 (p. 32n), 9.21 (p. 28), 16.14 (p. 80), 19.13 (p. 109), 49.15 (p. 44n), 66.11 (p. 109), 98.6 (p. 152), 113.9f. (p. 87f.), 177.13 (p. 137) 398.20f. (p. 156)
- Cilap 11.14 (p. 98n), 12.13.1 (p. 165), 12.53 (p. 156), 21.40 (p. 121)
- Cint 799.4 (p. 118)
- Kali 1.3 (p. 88), 2.16-18 (p. 89), 47.17 (148n), 85.20 (p. 121), 86.10 (p. 121), 94.44f. (p. 164)
- KT 1 (p. 182f.), 2.1 (p. 64), 2.1f. (p. 168f.), 2.2 (p. 117), 2.4f. (p. 49, 129), 3 (p. 197), 3.1+4 (p. 49), 4.1 (p. 105), 4.2+4 (p. 85), 5.1 (p. 128), 6.3f. (p. 105), 6.4 (p. 149), 7.1f. (p. 72), 7.6 (p. 107), 8.1f. (p. 102), 8.2+6 (p. 104f.), 9.5 (p. 106), 11.4 (p. 117), 12.4 (p. 59, 154), 13.3f. (p. 167), 14.2f. (p. 126), 14.6 (p. 50, 119, 169), 15.4f. (p. 64), 15.5 (p. 186), 16.1 (p. 129), 16.1+5 (p. 179f.), 16.4 (p. 193), 16.5 (p. 63, 185), 17 (p. 125f.), 17.1f. (p. 133), 18.3 (p. 128), 18.4f. (p. 89f.), 18.5 (p. 58f.), 19.3 (p. 117, 118, 154), 20.1 (p. 123f.), 21.1-4 (p. 86), 21.4f. (p. 178), 22.1f. (p. 161), 22.2 (p. 76), 23.1-3 (p. 170f.), 23.2f. (p. 65), 23.3 (p. 120), 24.1 (p. 63), 24.5f. (p. 94, 169), 25.1 (p. 149), 25.2 (p. 119), 25.3-5 (p. 102), 25.5 (p. 100f.), 28.1 (p. 128), 28.4 (p. 112), 30.6 (p. 75), 31.4+6 (p. 124), 32.1-3 (p. 133), 35.1 (p. 175f.), 35.2-5 (p. 66f.), 35.3 (p. 99), 35.5 (p. 58, 112, 167), 37.1 (p. 65), 38.1-3 (p. 102), 40.3 (p. 120), 40.4f. (p. 70f.), 42.1+4 (p. 145f.), 42.2f. (p. 90), 45.4 (p. 104), 45.5 (p. 176), 47.1f. (p. 104), 47.4 (p. 152), 50.5 (p. 168), 51.3f. (p. 74), 51.3-6 (p. 124f.), 52.2 (p. 171), 52.5 (p. 153), 53.3 (p. 107), 56.3 (p. 63), 56.4 (p. 176), 57.4 (p. 176), 58.1 (p. 101), 62.2 (p. 50), 62.4f. (p. 126), 63.2 (p. 110, 119, 120), 63.4 (p. 119), 64.4f. (p. 143), 65.1-3 (p. 93f.), 65.4 (p. 162), 66.1+5 (p. 180f.), 67.5 (p. 185), 69.1-5 (p. 67f.), 69.2-4 (p. 85), 70.5 (p.

108), 73.1 (p. 169), 74.2f.+5 (p. 126f.), 77.3 (p. 99), 79.1f. (p. 100), 79.2 (p. 107), 79.3 (p. 112), 79.8 (p. 112), 80.3 (p. 168), 82.2 (p. 131f.), 85.1+6 (p. 180), 86.1 (p. 99), 86.2b-3c (p. 110), 88.2f. (p. 66, 86f.), 88.3 (p. 109), 92.2+5 (p. 114, 170), 93.4 (p. 152), 95.1 (p. 162), 97.3 (p. 72), 98.1-3 (p. 142, 174), 100.7 (p. 112), 101.4f. (p. 64), 102.1 (p. 140), 103.3 (p. 185), 103.6 (p. 82), 106.6 (p. 46), 111.5f. (p. 119), 112.4f. (p. 169), 113.1f. (p. 126, 170), 113.3f. (p. 150f.,), 114.3 (p. 93), 115.6 (p. 152), 118.3 (p. 107), 120.2 (p. 176), 124.2 (p. 186), 127.4f. (p. 95), 130.3f. (p. 44n), 132.5 (p. 109), 134.5 (p. 109), 137.2-4 (p. 162), 138.2f. (p. 65), 139.1-5 (p. 68f.), 140.3 (p. 169), 140.4f. (p. 128), 141.1f. (p. 96f.), 141.1-3 (p. 132), 141.3-7 (p. 103f.), 142.2f. (p. 129), 143.2 (p. 101f.), 147.3f. (p. 137), 148.5f. (p. 141), 148.6 (p. 132), 150.3 (p. 107), 153.3 (p. 174), 155.5f. (p. 96), 157.1+4 (p. 181), 158.6 (p. 127), 160.1-5 (p. 69f.), 160.6 (p. 128), 161.1f.+4 (p. 127), 163.1-5 (p. 107f.), 163.3 (p. 185), 163.5 (p. 119), 167.5f. (p. 113), 167.6 (p. 50), 168.6 (p. 151), 169.2 (p. 118,), 170.1 (p. 120), 170.4f. (p. 168), 172.3f. (p. 134f.), 174.5f. (p. 141f.), 177.4f. (p. 128), 177.5 (p. 193), 178.5-7 (p. 136), 179.3 (p. 117), 180.5 (p. 130), 181.1+7 (p. 136, 180), 184.2 (p. 117), 187.5 (p. 132), 190.1 (p. 123), 191.6f. (p. 175), 193.6 (p. 105, 193), 194.3 (p. 50), 195.1 (p. 194), 195.1-3 (p. 94), 198.5 (p. 155), 198.8 (p. 121), 200.4 (p. 149), 206.5 (p. 74), 207.1 (p. 58), 210.4+6 (p. 144), 212.1-3 (p. 95), 212.4f. (p. 75), 214.1 (p. 194), 216.2 (p. 186), 216.3f. (p. 119), 221.1 (p. 178), 224.6 (p. 153), 229.4 (p. 175), 231.4 (p. 82n), 242.1-4 (p. 73), 244.3 (p. 153), 245.2+6 (p. 181), 246.1 (p. 185), 253.4 (p. 177), 254.2df.+7 (p. 149f.), 261.5f. (p. 150), 265.7f. (p. 134), 268.1 (p. 120), 269.4-6 (p. 96), 273.8 (p. 117), 274.8 (p. 142), 275.2 (p. 156), 276.4 (p. 112), 279.4 (p. 130), 280.4f. (p. 140), 285.1-3 (p. 69, 97), 286.4 (p. 63f.), 288.5 (p. 164f.), 290.1f. (p. 150), 298.3 (p. 44), 299.1 (p. 177), 299.4 (p.

106), 305.4 (p. 113f., 193), 311.2 (p. 144), 316.2f. (p. 140), 325.4 (p. 59), 329.5+7 (p. 135), 334.8f (p. 142), 341.1-3 (p. 88), 344.7 (p. 109), 348.2f. (p. 100), 350.2f. (p. 141f.), 352.5f. (p. 101), 353.3 (p. 112), 377.4f. (p. 115), 378.4 (p. 186), 379.1 (p. 59), 386.4-6 (p. 136f.), 386.5 (p. 90), 390.1 (p. 117), 390.2 (p. 121), 398.8 (p. 109), 399.3 (p. 44n)

Kul 1.4.1 (p. 158)

Kural 1155 (p. 177)

NA NA 5.9 (p. 81n) 20.1 (p. 82), 24.8 (p. 110), 45.9 (p. 35), 46.7 (p. 193), 50.1 (p. 114), 53.8 (p. 193), 59.6-8 (p. 73f.), 63.3f. (p. 91), 64.13 (p. 118), 67.9f. (p. 146), 68.7 (p. 193), 68.10 (p. 193), 98.2 (p. 191n), 99.9f. (p. 146), 101.5f. (p. 59), 108.2f. (p. 108), 128.3 (p. 155), 143.6 (p. 151), 183.6-8 (p. 74), 190.5-7 (p. 70), 193.5 (p. 151), 206.9 (p. 82), 208.6 (p. 82), 215.8f. (p. 135, 176f.), 220.9cf. (p. 81n), 221.12 (p. 121), 239.3 (p. 50), 242.10 (p. 163), 249.1 (p. 32n), 272.9 (p. 115), 282.4 (p. 114), 298.5 (p. 161f.), 321.8 (p. 121), 328.1-3 (p. 87), 334.8f. (p. 142), 336.11 (p. 121), 338.4 (p. 50), 355.10 (p. 75), 369.1 (p. 86), 373.3f. (p. 156f.), 376.11f. (p. 153), 400.6 (p. 58)

Pari 7.57 (p. 97), 9.25 (p. 151)

PeTM 187.2 (p. 84n)

Pēy 12.3 (p. 195), 25.1 (p. 143), 53.4 (p. 58), 74.1f. (p. 164), 76.1f.+4 (p. 123f.), 81.1f. (p. 145), 82.1 (p. 143), 87.1 (p. 76)

PK 1 (p. 200), 4.3 (p. 117), 201.4 (p. 118), 297.1 (p. 121)

PN 35.22 (p. 194), 112.1 (p. 45n), 390.25 (p. 139n)

Poy 1 (p. 198), 1.1-3 (p. 134f.), 10.1-3 (p. 33), 29.1f. (p. 123), 35.3f. (p. 53), 36.4 (p. 165), 43.1+4 (p. 163), 44.1 (p. 44n), 55.1f. (p. 145), 88.4 (p. 143f.), 95.2f. (p. 130), 100.1 (p. 195)

Pū 5 (p. 183f.), 20.1f. (p. 155), 41.1 (p. 53)

- PV 172.2f. (p. 115)
- TC 19i (p. 116)
- Tē 1.1.3.3 (p. 196), 1.73.9.1 (p. 109), 1.80.1.1f. (p. 114f.), 2.2.8.3 (p. 117), 3.4.1.2 (p. 42f.), 4.34.6 (p. 165), 7.70.4.4 (p. 163), 7.20.1.2 (p. 196)
- TV 2.4 (p. 110), 31.1 (p. 152), 55.2 (p. 118)
- TVM 1.4.10.4 (p. 120), 4.6.10.3f. (p. 113), 5.5.1 (p. 199), 6.2.7.1f. (p. 163f.), 7.2.8.4 (p. 121), 7.7.5.4 (p. 151), 8.8.11.2f. (p. 33), 9.4.8.4, (p. 165), 9.7.10.1 (p. 117), 10.3.8.1 (p. 121)

Index of Suffixes

-அ - <i>a</i>	neuter plural (p. 37, 81), adjective suffix (p. 49), infinitive (p. 92), perfective peyareccam (p. 99)
-அகத்து - <i>akattu</i>	locative (p. 32)
-(அ)து -(<i>a</i>) <i>tu</i>	neuter singular (p. 37, 81), genitive (p. 32)
-அம் - <i>am</i>	adjective suffix (p. 49)
-அம்/-ஆம் - <i>am/-ām</i>	1 st person plural (p. 37, 81)
-அம்ம - <i>amma</i>	particle of lament or inviting attention (p. 56, 172)
-அமை - <i>amai</i>	perfective verbal noun (p. 37, 111)
-அர்/-ஆர் - <i>ar/-ār</i>	honorific/plural (p. 11, 37, 81)
-அரேர - <i>arō</i>	unexplained particle (p. 56)
-அல் - <i>al</i>	with imperfective stem: 1 st person singular (p. 81), with verbal root: verbal noun (p. 111), negative imperative (p. 117), with perfective stem: negative suffix (p. 148)
-அவை - <i>avai</i>	neuter plural (p. 81)
-அள்/-ஆள் - <i>al/-āl</i>	feminine singular (p. 37, 81)
-அன் - <i>an</i>	3 rd person singular (p. 37, 81), verb: 1 st person singular (p. 37); suffix for perfective finite verb (p. 80)
-ஆ - <i>ā</i>	[later interrogative particle (p. 56)], with verbal root: negative absolutive (p. 84), positive absolutive (p. 84), negative

	<i>peyareccam</i> (p. 99), negative neuter singular and plural (p. 148f.)
-ஆகலின் <i>-ākalin</i>	causal postposition (p. 140)
-ஆகில் <i>-ākil</i>	conditional postposition (p. 12, 139)
-ஆகிலும் <i>-ākilum</i>	concessive postposition (p. 139)
-ஆதலின் <i>-ātalin</i>	oblique of verbal noun of <i>ākutal</i> = causal postposition (p. 140)
-ஆத <i>-āta</i>	negative <i>peyareccam</i> (p. 99)
-ஆது <i>-ātu</i>	negative absolutive (p. 84), negative neuter singular (folding table 3)
-ஆமல் <i>-āmal</i>	negative absolutive (p. 11, 84)
-ஆமை <i>-āmai</i>	negative verbal noun (p. 37, 111), negative absolutive (p. 84)
-ஆய் <i>-āy</i>	vocative (p. 31n), 2 nd person singular (p. 37, 81), imperative (p. 117)
-ஆயின் <i>-āyin</i>	conditional postposition (p. 139)
-ஆயினும் <i>-āyinum</i>	concessive postposition (p. 139)
-ஆரும் <i>-ār(um)</i>	unexplained particle (p. 56)
-ஆல் <i>-āl</i>	instrumental (p. 32, 33), with absolutive or finite verb: conditional (p. 12, 139), with finite verb or predicate noun: assertive particle (p. 56, 172)
-ஆலும் <i>-ālum</i>	concessive (p. 139)
-ஆன் <i>-ān</i>	instrumental (p. 32), locative (p. 32), masculine singular (p. 37, 81)
-இடை <i>-iṭai</i>	locative (p. 32)
-இ <i>-i</i>	2 nd person singular (p. 37, 81), absolutive of the 5 th class (p. 84)

-இகா - <i>ikā</i>	unexplained particle (p. 56)
[-இகும் - <i>ikum</i>	imperfective 1 st person plural (p. 82)]
-இசின் - <i>icin</i>	optative (p. 119), suffix for perfective participial noun (p. 79)
-இய - <i>iya</i>	infinitive (p. 92), optative (p. 118), perfective <i>peyareccam</i> 5 th class (p. 99)
[-இயம் - <i>iyam</i>	optative 1.pl. (p. 118)]
-இயர் - <i>iyar</i>	infinitive (p. 92), optative (p. 118)
-இர்/-ஈர் - <i>ir/-īr</i>	2 nd person plural (p. 37, 81); feminine plural (p. 37), irr. plural (p. 37)
-இல் - <i>il</i>	locative (p. 32+n), with verbal root conditional (p. 12, 139), with perfective stem suffix for the negative (p. 148)
-இலிருந்து - <i>iliruntu</i>	later ablative (p. 33, 85n)
-இலும் - <i>ilum</i>	with verbal root: concessive (p. 139)
-இன் - <i>in</i>	oblique (p. 31, 32), comparative (p. 33, 49), with verbal root: conditional (p. 139)
-இன - <i>ina</i>	perfective <i>peyareccam</i> 5 th class (p. 99); perfective neuter plural 5 th class (folding table 3)
-இனும் - <i>inum</i>	comparative (p. 49), concessive (p. 139)
-ஈர்கள் - <i>īrkaḷ</i>	2 nd person plural (p. 37), imperative plural (p. 12, 117)
-(உக்)கு - (<i>uk</i>) <i>ku</i>	dative (p. 32)
-உடன் - <i>uṭaṇ</i>	sociative (p. 32, 33)
-உடை - <i>uṭai</i>	possessive (p. 61), genitive (p. 32)

-உடைய - <i>uṭaiya</i>	later genitive (p. 32)
-உம் - <i>um</i>	coordinative and indefinite particle (p. 44, 122ff.); imperfective <i>peyareccam</i> (p. 99), habitual future (p. 82, 104), [imperative (p. 117)], with conditional, absolutive and infinitive: concessive (p. 139)
-உள் - <i>uḷ</i>	locative (p. 32)
-ஊ(உ) - <i>ū(u)</i>	with verbal root: absolutive (p. 84)
-எம்/-ஏம் - <i>em/-ēm</i>	1 st person plural (p. 37, 81)
-என்/-ஏன் - <i>en/-ēn</i>	1 st person singular (p. 37, 81), quotative (p. 131)
-என - <i>ena</i>	adverbial suffix (p. 50), causal absolutive (p. 90), quotative (p. 131)
-எனின் - <i>enin</i>	conditional of <i>ennutal</i> and conditional postposition (p. 139)
-ஏ - <i>ē</i>	adverbial suffix (p. 50), sentence final and focalising particle (p. 56, 122, 166ff.), interrogative particle (p. 122)
-ஏல் - <i>ēl</i>	with verbal root, absolutive or finite form: conditional postposition (p. 12, 139), with verbal root or finite form: negative imperative (p. 121)
-ஏலும் - <i>ēlum</i>	with verbal root, absolutive or finite form: concessive postposition (p. 139)
-ஐ - <i>ai</i>	accusative (p. 32, 33), 2 nd person singular (p. 37, 81), neuter plural (p. 37)
-ஓடு/-ஓடு - <i>oṭu/-ōt_u</i>	sociative (p. 32, 33), instrumental (p. 33)

-ஓம்/-ஓம் <i>-om/-ōm</i>	1 st person plural: participial noun (p. 37, 81), [pronominalised noun (p. 60)]
-ஓய்/-ஓய் <i>-oy/-ōy</i>	2 nd person singular: participial noun (p. 37, 81), [pronominalised noun (p. 60)]
-ஓர்/-ஓர் <i>-or/-ōr</i>	honorific/plural: participial noun (p. 37, 81), [pronominalised noun (p. 60)]
-ஓள்/-ஓள் <i>-ol/-ōl</i>	feminine person singular: participial noun (p. 37, 81), [pronominalised noun (p. 60)]
-ஓன்/-ஓன் <i>-on/-ōn</i>	masculine singular: participial noun (p. 37, 81), [pronominalised noun (p. 60)]
-ஓ <i>-ō</i>	particle of doubt, interrogation (p. 56, 122), mourning (p. 177), demarcation of topic (p. 177f.)
-க <i>-ka</i>	optative all persons (p. 120), [subjunctive 3 rd persons singular and plural (p. 119)]
-கண் <i>-kaṇ</i>	locative (p. 32)
-கம் <i>-kam</i>	subjunctive 1 st person plural (p. 82, 119)
-கள் <i>-kaḷ</i>	plural (p. 11, 37, 81)
-காள் <i>-kāḷ</i>	pl. vocative (p. 11, 31n)
-கி(ன்)ற் <i>-ki(n)r</i>	suffix of the present tense (p. 11, 77)
-கி(ன்)ற <i>-ki(n)ra</i>	present tense <i>peyareccam</i> (p. 99)
-கு <i>-ku</i>	suffix for imperfective finite verb (p. 80)
-(க்)கு <i>-(k)ku</i>	subjunctive 1 st person singular (p. 82, 119)
-கும் <i>-kum</i>	subjunctive 1 st person plural (p. 82, 119)
-கெழு <i>-keḷu</i>	genitive (p. 32)
-கொல் <i>-kol</i>	interrogative particle (p. 56, 122)

-கொல்லோ <i>-kollō</i>	rhetorical interrogative particle (p. 122)
-கொண்டு <i>-koṇṭu</i>	postposition “with” (p. 85)
-(த்)தல் <i>-(t)tal</i>	verbal noun (p. 111)
-த <i>-ta</i>	perfective <i>peyareccam</i> (p. 99)
-தது <i>-tatu</i>	(perfective) verbal noun (p. 111)
-தமை <i>-tamai</i>	perfective verbal noun (p. 111)
-தலை <i>-talai</i>	locative (p. 32)
-(த்)தி <i>-(t)ti</i>	subjunctive 2 nd person singular (p. 82, 119, 120)
-(த்)திர் <i>-(t)tir</i>	subjunctive 2 nd person plural (p. 82, 120)
-தில் <i>-tillamma</i>	particle of irreal wish (p. 174)
-தில்ல <i>-tilla</i>	particle of wish (p. 56, 172, 174)
-த்து <i>-ttu</i>	oblique (p. 31, 32)
-(த்)து <i>-(t)tu</i>	n.sg. (p. 37, 81), absolutive (p. 84)
-தும் <i>-tum</i>	subjunctive 1 st person plural (p. 120)
-தெய்ய <i>-teyya</i>	particle of admonition (p. 56, 172)
-தேஎத்து <i>-tēettu</i>	locative (p. 32)
-தொறு(ம்) <i>-toru(m)</i>	indefinite suffix (p. 44)
-தோறு(ம்) <i>-tōru(m)</i>	indefinite suffix (p. 44)
-நின்று <i>-ninru</i>	ablative postposition (p. 33, 85)
-ப <i>-pa</i>	imperfective 3 rd person plural, rarely honorific (p. 82)
-(ஃ)பல் <i>-(p)pal</i>	imperfective 1 st person singular (p. 81)
-(ஃ)பான் <i>-(p)pān</i>	infinitive (p. 93)
-(ஃ)பு <i>-(p)pu</i>	abstract noun (p. 35), absolutive (p. 84)

-மதி - <i>mati</i>	imperative (p. 117)
-மர்/-மார் - <i>mar/-mār</i>	plural/honorific (p. 11, 37)
-மருங்கின் - <i>maruṅkin</i>	locative (p. 32)
-மற்று - <i>marru</i>	adversative particle (p. 57, 172)
-மன் - <i>man</i>	assertive particle (p. 57, 172)
-மன்ற - <i>manra</i>	assertive particle (p. 57, 172)
-மாட்டு - <i>māṭṭu</i>	locative (p. 32)
-மாது - <i>mātu</i>	unexplained particle (p. 57)
-மாதோ - <i>mātō</i>	particle of rhetorical interrogation (p. 57, 172)
-மார் - <i>mār</i>	imperfective 3 rd person plural (p. 11, 82), infinitive (p. 92)
-மாள் - <i>māḷa</i>	unexplained particle (p. 57)
-மின் - <i>min</i>	imperative (p. 117)
-மின்கள் - <i>minkaḷ</i>	imperative plural (p. 12)
-மீர் - <i>mīr</i>	2 nd person plural (p. 11, 37, 81)
-மீர்கள் - <i>mīrkaḷ</i>	2 nd person plural (p. 37)
-முதல் - <i>mutal</i>	locative (p. 32)
[-மே - <i>mē</i>	imperative (p. 117)]
-மேன - <i>mēna</i>	locative (p. 32)
-மோ - <i>mō</i>	imperative (p. 117)
-யாழ - <i>yāḷa</i>	unexplained particle (p. 57)
-வது - <i>vatu</i>	(imperfective) verbal noun (p. 111)
-வயின் - <i>vayin</i>	locative (p. 32)
-(வ)ல் - <i>(v)al</i>	imperfective 1 st person singular (p. 81)
-வான் - <i>vān</i>	infinitive (p. 93)

Index of Grammatical Categories

absolute	29f., 44n, 50, 66, 80, 83ff. , 92n, 98n, 106, 109, 123, 138, 158, 160, 166, 179, 181, 183, 194
negative	11, 29, 87, 89, 121
positive	29, 88
abstract noun	34 et p., 44n.
<i>acai</i> (metrical element)	190 et p., 192
<i>acai</i> (expletive)	56, 173
accusative	29, 32, 33, 113, 158
adjective	23, 24, 34f., 46, 47ff. , 50, 54, 60, 63, 106
adjectival participle	cf. <i>peyareccam</i>
adverb	45, 50ff. , 54, 63, 65, 76, 157
agent noun	35
<i>aktinai</i>	cf. gender
<i>aḷapeṭai</i>	92f., 191, 194
alveolar	21, 25, 39
anteposition	58, 167, 169f., 178
aorist	11, 76
apposition	66, 69, 179, 182
aspect	11, 76f. , 106, 111, 118, 134, 138, 147, 156
imperfective/inchoative aspect	11, 76f.
perfective aspect	11, 76f. , 147
assimilation	24f., 25, 38, 39
attribution	63ff. , 106, 131, 136, 185
string attribution	66ff.

auxiliary	11, 76, 92, 106, 154, 158, 160ff.
<i>āytam</i>	21
calque	40
causal clause	90, 138 , 140, 146
causative	78
<i>cīr</i>	cf. metrical foot
circular construction (<i>pūṭṭuvil</i>)	179ff.
comparative	24, 32n., 33, 49, 89, 131
comparison	46, 65, 66, 89, 104, 137, 166
complex verb	154ff.
compound	24, 25, 28, 29, 44, 46, 89, 106
compound verb	154, 157
concessive	138ff. , 166
conditional	12, 92, 95, 111, 113, 138ff. , 166, 179, 182
conjunction	138, 140
consonant	21, 22, 23, 24f., 29, 31, 38, 39, 53, 190
converb	cf. absolutive
coordination	56, 122ff. , 138, 170, 172
copula (absent)	58
coverb	cf. absolutive
dative	29, 32, 33, 50, 111, 112
defective verb	61, 74
denominative	36, 58, 59, 72ff. , 75
dental	21, 39
direct speech	118, 131
double verb form	131, 147, 148, 152, 153, 154ff. , 166, 168

embedding (verb)	131ff. , 138, 139, 166
emphasis	58, 169
enclitic	44, 50, 122, 173
<i>etukai</i>	10, 11, 63, 194f.
exclamation	54, 166
finite verb	12, 30, 54, 59, 72, 79, 80, 83, 92, 111, 115, 131, 138, 147, 154, 166, 193
focalisation	58 , 122, 128, 167
formula	10, 75, 120, 121, 177, 185ff.
gemination	21, 25, 29f. , 31, 32, 194
gender	34 , 36, 40, 42, 44, 82, 155
genitive	29, 33, 42, 158
gerund	cf. absolute
guttural	21
habitual future	80, 82, 98, 104f. , 131
honorific	10, 11, 36 , 42
ideophone	50, 54f.
imperative	12, 30, 75, 77, 117f. , 120, 121, 131, 154, 160, 166, 168, 178
negative	12, 35n, 111, 118, 121
indirect speech	94, 136
infinitive	29, 50, 66, 83, 92ff. , 106, 108, 118, 123, 134, 138, 156, 158, 159, 166, 179
causal	92, 95
conditional	95
final	92, 93, 96
resultative	92, 93
temporal	94, 95

instrumental	32, 33
intransitive	78
<i>kūn</i>	191
<i>kurippuvinaḥ</i>	cf. pronominalised noun
<i>kurippuvinaimurru</i>	cf. denominative
labial	21
locative	22, 32, 33, 62
loan word	38
metathesis	40
metre	14, 22, 58, 166, 190ff.
Ācīriyappā/Ācīriyam	10, 14, 58, 183, 190, 192ff. , 197
Vañci	190
Veṇṇā	10, 14, 183, 190, 194f. , 198
metrical foot (<i>cīr</i>)	14, 22, 44, 173, 183, 190ff.
metrical lengthening	191
middle voice	160, 161, 165
<i>mōṇai</i>	195
<i>murreccam</i>	80, 131, 154ff.
negation	131, 147ff. , 155n.
nominal sentence	58ff.
nonfinite verb	63, 66, 83, 106, 123, 179
numeral	23, 52f. , 115
cardinal	52
ordinal	52
oblique	11, 22 , 29, 31 , 42, 44, 50, 60, 63, 111, 113, 138
optative	24, 77, 93, 117, 118f. , 120, 121, 131, 154, 166, 178
negative	121

overshort <i>-i</i>	23
overshort <i>-u</i>	23, 191
palatal	21
participial noun	36, 60, 63, 79f. , 155, 166, 193
particle	10, 11, 23, 50, 56f. , 58, 76, 80, 82, 118, 122, 130, 166ff. , 172ff. , 179, 192, 193
passive	33, 92, 160, 161 , 164f.
penultimate	189, 192
<i>peyareccam</i>	12, 24, 46, 54, 66, 77, 82, 90, 98ff. , 106, 166
imperfective	66, 82, 93, 98f., 104, 189, 194
negative	29, 99, 101
perfective	66, 81n, 93, 98f., 136
present	98f.
possessive	32, 33, 62, 63
postposition (~ suffix)	31, 33, 44, 51, 85, 133, 138, 140
postposition (word order)	167ff., 173, 178, 179, 180, 182, 183, 194
plural	10, 11, 12, 36, 37, 42, 46, 50, 80, 81, 82
present tense	10, 11, 76f. , 98
negative	151
proclitic	43, 173
pronominal suffix	36f. , 60, 81, 147, 148
pronominalised noun	36, 58ff. , 63, 72, 79, 152
pronoun	10, 24, 30, 42ff. , 61, 63, 119, 193
demonstrative	43 , 138

indefinite/universal	44
personal	11, 42
interrogative	43, 122, 178
reflexive	31n, 42
quotative	24, 50, 54, 90, 132, 133
relative participle	cf. <i>peyareccam</i>
retroflex	21, 26
retroflex approximant	21
root noun	34
sandhi	21, 22ff. , 33, 43n, 52, 53, 90, 192, 194
secondary suffix	34, 36
semi-vowel	21
serial verb	131
sociative	23, 33, 123
subjunctive	82, 117, 119f. , 121, 153
negative	121
transitive	78
<i>uḷḷurai</i>	98
<i>uyartiṇai</i>	cf. gender
verb classes (weak, intermediate, strong)	78
verbal noun	33, 35, 37, 66, 106, 109, 111ff. , 118, 136, 138, 158, 160
negative	37, 84, 89, 111, 114
perfective	37, 111, 114
verbal participle	cf. absolute
verbal root	30, 34, 35, 44, 48, 54, 64, 66, 75, 76, 106ff. , 111, 117, 121, 134, 138, 147, 157, 160, 166, 194

verbal suffixes	81
<i>vinaittokai</i>	106
<i>vinaiyeccam</i>	cf. absolute
vocative	11, 30, 31n, 37n, 120, 166
word order	10, 11, 33, 56, 58 , 63, 166ff. , 179, 182, 195
zero mark	31
zero suffix	148

Literature

1. Text Editions

Akanānūru + Old Comm. (1-90), Comm. (91-160), Ed. by U.Vē.Rā.
Rākavaiyaṅkar/Rājagōpalāryaṅ. Mayilapūr 1933.

Cilappatikāram. Ed. + Comm. by U.V. Cāminātaiyar. Chennai 1892
(reprint with glosses Cennai 2001).

Cīvaka Cintāmaṇi + Comm. by Nacciṇārkkiniyar. Ed. by
U.Vē. Cāminātaiyar, Kaḷakam, Cennai 1959.

Iraiyaṅār Akapporuḷ (+ *Nakkīraṅ's urai*). Ed. by Tirunelvēlit Teṇ-
ṇintiya Caivacittāṇṭa Nūṛpatippuk Kaḷakam, Cennai, Reprint 1964.

Kalittokai. Crit. Ed. by T. Rajeswari. 2 vols, École française
d'Extrême-Orient / Tamilmann Patippakam (Critical Texts of
Caṅkam Literature 3.1-2), Pondicherry / Chennai 2015.

Kuṛuntokai. Crit. Ed., Transl., Notes + Word Index by E. Wilden.
3 vols, École française d'Extrême-Orient / Tamilmann Patippakam
(Critical Texts of Caṅkam Literature 2.1-3), Pondicherry / Chennai
2010.

Mutal, Iraṇṭām, Mūṇṭām Tiruvantāti + Maṇipravāḷa Vyākya by
Periyavāccaṇpillai + pratipatam by Rāmānujācāryar. Śrīnikēṭana
Mutrākṣaracālai, Cennaiṇappattāṇam 1901 (various reprints).

Narriṇai. Crit. Ed., Transl., Notes + Word Index by E. Wilden.
3 vols, École française d'Extrême-Orient / Tamilmann Patippakam
(Critical Texts of Caṅkam Literature 1.1-3), Pondicherry / Chennai
2008.

Paṭiṇōṛān Tirumurai. Ed. by Āṛumukanāvalar, Vittiyaṇupālāṇa-
yantiracālai, Cennaiṇappattāṇam, Paritāpi v^o (= 1852/53).

Paripāṭal + Parimēlaḷakar's Comm. Ed. by U.V. Cāminātaiyar.
Cennai 1918, 1935 (reprint without Comm. Cennai 1995).

Pārataveṇpā. Ed. by S. Kirusṇasāmi Aiyāṅkār. Centamiḷ Mantiram
Puttakacālai, Cennai 1925.

- Patineṇkīlkkāṇakku*. Ed. by Es. Rājam. Cennai 1959.
- Perumāl Tirumoli* + Comm. by Periyavāccāṇ Pillai. Ed. by S. Kīruṣṇasvāmi Aiyāṅkār. Śrī Vaiṣṇava Śrī, Tiruccirāppalli 1997.
- Puranānūru*. + Old Comm. Ed. by U.V. Cāminātaiyar. Cennai 1894, 1923 (reprint without Comm. Cennai 1993).
- Tēvāram*. Hymnes Śivaïtes Du Pays Tamoul. Ed. by T.V. Gopal Iyer. Institut Français d'Indologie (Publications de l'IFI 68.1-3), Pondichéry 1984, 1985 and 1986.
- Tirukkural mūlamum Parimēlalakar uraiyum*. Ed. by Vaṭivēlu Cettiṭiyār. 3 vols, Maturaip Palkalaikkalākam [1904], 1972–76 (with Tiruvaḷḷuvar Mālai).
- Tiruvāymoḷi* + various *urai*-s: Ed. by Cē. Kīruṣṇamācāriyar. 5 vols, Nōpil Accukkūṭam, Tiruvallikkēṇi 1924-1929.
- Tiruviruttam*. Ed. by Śrīvaiṣṇava Kranta Mutrāpakasabhaiyār, Śrī Nikētana Mutrākṣara Cālai, Cennappattāṇam 1893/94.
- Tolkāppiyam Eluttu, Col + Poruḷ* + all the Comm. Ed. in 14 vol. by Ti.Vē. Kōpālaiyar. Tamilmann Patippakam, Cennai 2003.

2.1 Grammars

- Agesthalingom, S. 1979: *A Grammar of Old Tamil with special reference to Patirruppattu*. Aṇṇāmalai University, Aṇṇāmalai nakar. [contains a full word index to *Patirruppattu*]
- Andronov, M.S. 1969: *A Grammar of Modern and Classical Tamil*. New Century Book House, Madras.
- Beythan, H. 1943: *Praktische Grammatik der Tamilsprache*. Harrassowitz, Leipzig.
- Graul, K. 1855: *Outline of Tamil Grammar*. Leipzig.
- Lehmann, Th. 1994: *Grammatik des Alttamil*. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart.

- Lehmann, Th. 1998: "Old Tamil". In: Sanford B. Steever (ed.), *The Dravidian Languages*. Routledge, London / New York, pp. 75-99.
- Rajam, V.S. 1992: *A Reference Grammar of Classical Tamil Poetry*. Philadelphia.
- Zvelebil, K.V. 1967: "The Language of Peruṅkuṇṇūr Kilār". In: K. Zvelebil, Yu. Glasov & M. Andronov (eds). *Introduction to the Historical Grammar of the Tamil Language*. Moscow, pp. 9-109.

2.2. Dictionaries and Word Indexes

- Andiappa Pillai, D. 1970: *Descriptive Grammar of Kalittokai*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of Kerala, Trivandrum.
- Dravidian Borrowings from Indo-Aryan*. Ed. by T. Burrow & M.B. Emeneau. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1962.
- Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. Ed. by T. Burrow & M.B. Emeneau. 1st ed. London 1961, 2nd ed. Oxford 1984.
- Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. Supplement. Ed. by T. Burrow & M.B. Emeneau. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1968.
- Elayaperumal, M. 1975: *Grammar of Aigkurunuuru with Index*. University of Kerala, Trivandrum.
- Index des mots de la littérature tamoule ancienne*. 3 vols, Institut Français d'Indologie (Publications de l'IFI 37.1-3), Pondichéry 1967-1970.
- Kamatchinathan, A. 1964: *Grammatical Study of Narrinai with Translation, Transliteration, and Index*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of Kerala, Trivandrum.
- Krishnambal, S. R. 1974: *Grammar of Kuruntokai with Index*. University of Kerala, Trivandrum.
- Lehmann, Th./Malten, Th. 1992: *A Word Index of Old Tamil Caṅkam Literature*. Franz Steiner Verlag (Beiträge zur Südasienforschung

- Südasien-Institut Universität Heidelberg Band 147), Stuttgart.
[Indian ed. IAS 2007]
- Subrahmanian, N. 1966b: *Pre-Pallavan Tamil Index: Index of Historical Material in Pre-Pallavan Tamil Literature*. University of Madras, Madras (reprint Madras 1990).
- Subramanian, S.V. 1965: *Descriptive Grammar of Cilappatikaaram*. Paari Nilayam, Madras.
- Subramanian, S.V. 1972: *Grammar of AkanaanuuRu with Index*. University of Kerala, Trivandrum.
- Subramoniam, V.I. 1962. *Index of Puranaanuuru*. University of Kerala, Trivandrum.
- Sundaram, R.M. 1964: *Grammatical Study of Pattuppaattu with Index, Text and Translation*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of Kerala, Trivandrum.
- Tamil Lexicon*. 7 vols, University of Madras, reprint Madras 1982.
- Tamiḷ ilakkiyap pēraḱarāṭi* [Tamil-Tamil dictionary of classical Tamil literature in 5 vols]. Cānti Cāṭaṇā, Ceṇṇai 2001.
- Tamiḷk kalveṭṭuc collaḱarāṭi* [Tamil-Tamil dictionary of epigraphic Tamil in 2 vols]. Cānti Cāṭaṇā, Ceṇṇai 2002.
- Vaidyanathan, S. 1971: *Indo-Aryan Loanwords in Old Tamil*. Rajan Publishers, Madras.
- Vaiṇava uraiṇaṭai varalār̥ru muraṭi tamiḷp pēraḱarāṭi* [Tamil-Tamil dictionary of Vaiṣṇava Tamil in 3 vols]. Cānti Cāṭaṇā, Ceṇṇai 2001.

2.3. Studies on Individual Linguistic Topics

- Britto, F. 1986: *Diglossia: A Study on the Theory with Application to Tamil*. Georgetown University Press, Washington D.C.
- Chevillard, J.-L. 1991: “Remarques sur l’évolution du système des temps en tamoul”. *Bulletin d’Études Indiennes* 9 (1991), pp. 15-36.

- Chevillard, J.-L. 1996: “The Conception of ‘Coordination’ in Ancient Tamil Grammar”. In: D. Cram, A. Linn & E. Nowak (eds), *History of Linguistics*, vol. 2: *From Classical to Contemporary Linguistics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, pp. 313-320.
- Chevillard, J.-L., 2004, “Ideophones in Tamil: a historical perspective on the X-enal expressives (*Olikkurippu Ārruppaṭai*)”. In: J.-L. Chevillard & E. Wilden (eds), *South Indian Horizons: Felicitations Volume for François Gros on the occasion of his 70th birthday*, Institut Français de Pondichéry / École française d’Extrême-Orient (Publication du département d’Indologie 94), pp. 407-433.
- Chevillard, J.-L. 2007a: “Syntactic Duality in Classical Tamil Poems”. In: C.P. Masica (ed.), *Old and New Perspectives on South-Asian Languages – Grammar and Semantics*, Motilal Banarsidas (MLBD Series in Linguistics 16), pp. 177-210.
- Chevillard, J.-L. 2007b: “The concept of ticaiccol in Tamil grammatical literature and the regional diversity of Tamil classical literature”. In: M. Kannan (ed.), *Streams of Language: Dialects in Tamil*, French Institute of Pondicherry, pp. 21-50.
- Chevillard, J.-L. 2014a: “Metre in Tamil Bhakti Literature and the Problem of Their (Occasional) Description in Treatises (Studies in Tamil Metrics – 2)”. In: *Mapping the Chronology of Bhakti. Milestones, Stepping Stones, and Stumbling Stones. Proceedings of a workshop held in honour of Pandit R. Varada Desikan*, Institut Français de Pondichéry / École française d’Extrême-Orient (Collection Indologie 124), Pondichéry, pp. 39-96.
- Chevillard, J.-L. 2014b: “Enumeration techniques in Tamil metrical treatises (Studies in Tamil Metrics – 3)”. In: Whitney Cox & Vincenzo Vergiani (eds), *Bilingual Discourse and Cross-Cultural Fertilisation: Tamil and Sanskrit in Medieval India*, Institut Français de Pondichéry / École française d’Extrême-Orient (Collection Indologie 121), Pondichéry, pp. 241-322.

- Deigner J. 1998: *Syntaktische Analyse von Verbalpartizip und Infinitiv im modernen Tamil. Unter Berücksichtigung synthetischer und analytischer Strukturen und des Verbalaspekts*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- Kailasapathy, K. 1968: *Tamil Heroic Poetry*. Oxford University Press, London.
- Lehmann, Th. 2004: "Pronoun Incorporation in Old Tamil" In: J.-L. Chevillard & E. Wilden (eds), *South Indian Horizons: Felicitation Volume for François Gros on the occasion of his 70th birthday*, Institut Français de Pondichéry / École française d'Extrême-Orient (Publication du département d'Indologie 94), Pondichéry, pp. 307-322.
- Lord, A. B. 1964: *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, Mass. 1964.
- Niklas, U. 1988: "Introduction to Tamil Prosody", *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 77 (1988): 166-227.
- Sivaraja Pillai, K.N. 1932: *The Chronology of the Early Tamils*. Madras 1932. [containing valuable appendixes on the particles *kol* and *man/manra*]
- Steever, S.B. 1988: *The Serial Verb Formation in the Dravidian Languages*. Delhi.
- Steever, S.B. 1993: *Analysis to Synthesis. The Development of Complex Verb Morphology in the Dravidian Languages*. New York / Oxford.
- Vacek, J. 2007: *Flowers & Formulas. Nature as Symbolic Code in Old Tamil Love Poetry*. Charles University in Prague, The Carolinum Press, Prague.
- Wilden, E. 2006: *Literary Techniques in Old Tamil Caṅkam Poetry: The Kuruntokai*. Harrassowitz (Beiträge zur Kenntnis südasiatischer Sprachen und Literaturen 15), Wiesbaden. [chapter on particles: pp. 49-126]

- Wilden, E. 2014: 30. “*Ācīriyappā* – The Unwritten Rules of Classical Tamil Metre”. *Bulletin d’Études Indiennes* 32 (2014): 293-309.
- Wilden, E. 2016: “Functions of the Verbal Root in Early Old Tamil Poetry”. In: Nikolai Gordiyuchuk (ed.), *Tamiḷ tanta paricu* [felicitatio volume for Alexander Dubianski], *Orientalia et Classica* LXIII, Moscow, pp. 124-139.
- Zvelebil, K.V. 1954: “The Enclitic Vowels (-ā, -ē, -ō) in Modern Tamil”. *Archív Orientalní* 22 (1954): 375-405. (= *Orientalia Pragensia* XIII. Kamil V. Zvelebil. *Tamoulica et Dravidica. A Selection of Papers on Tamil and Dravidian Linguistics*. Ed. by J. Vacek and J. Dvorak. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae Philologica* 3, Prague 1995, pp. 13-39.)
- Zvelebil, K.V. 1955: “On Emphasis and Intensification in Tamil”. *Archív Orientalní* 23 (1955): 435-464. (= *Orientalia Pragensia* XIII. Prague 1995, pp. 41-66.)
- Zvelebil, K.V. 1957a: “Tentative Periodization of the Development of Tamil”. *Tamil Culture* VI (1957): 50-55. (= *Orientalia Pragensia* XIII. Prague 1995, pp. 133-136.)
- Zvelebil, K.V. 1957b: “Emphasis in Early Old Tamil”. *Tamil Culture* VI (1957): 226-234. (= *Orientalia Pragensia* XIII. Prague 1995, pp. 141-145).
- Zvelebil, K.V. 1989: *Classical Tamil Prosody. An Introduction*. New Era Publications, Madras 1989.