CHAPTER XVII

* A STUDY OF THE SO-CALLED 'ITAICCOL' *
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XVII. A STUDY OF THE SO-CALLED 'Iṭāiccol'

17.1. Why is 'Iṭāiccol' Called so?

Tolkāppiyānār groups the different kinds of affixes and particles (17.6) in Iṭāiyiyal and terms them 'Iṭāiccol'.

Gēnēvaiyar and Nācĉinārkkīṇiyar think that they are called 'Iṭāiccol', because they mostly occur within words. This reason does not hold good, since out of the seven sub-classes (17.4) of 'Iṭāiccol' enumerated in Tolkāppiyam only one sub-class (vāriyais’ or flexional increments) occurs within words and that too is suffixed to the nouns. Others may attribute a reason that they occur between nouns and verbs; but this too is not always the case. A third reason may be pointed out here that the traditional grammers might have considered them to have only a partial status of words and that thus they named them 'Iṭāiccol' which literally means mid-words. Of course the particles that come under 'Iṭāiccol' (17.6) are uninflected words. But the affixes (17.7) that are included under 'Iṭāiccol' are dependent morphemes (i.e., bound morphemes).

17.2. Characteristics of 'Iṭāiccol' According to Tolkāppiyānār.

Tolkāppiyānār explicitly states that 'Iṭāiccols' do not occur in isolation and that they form part of, or occur with nouns or verbs. Thus it is evident that according to Tolkāppiyānār they are not independent forms.

Tolkāppiyānār says that 'Iṭāiccols' may occur before or after other words. It must be pointed out here that affixes (17.7) in Tamil always occur after the words, i.e., they are suffixed to
the words. There are no prefixes in Tamil. Dr. P.B. Sastry cites
the example koṇṇuṟ as an approximation to preposition in early
literature 5. But it is really a compound formed of two nouns.
However, the particles may occur before or after other words.

E.g., maṅkuṟ-ai

Erren uṭampin elīnalam "The beauty of my body is
a past thing"

Here the particle erru occurs before another word.

yāṇe marulven? (Kuru., 76) "Will I get confused"?

Here the particle -ė occurs after another word.

According to Tolkāppiyar, one 'īṭaiccol' may be followed
by another 6. For instance the flexional increments will be followed
by the case markers, e.g., atu-an-ai; -an- is flexional increment and
ai is case marker. In the sentence 'varukatil-lamma eṅkari'
(AN, 278) "Let him come to our quarters and . . . . . ." the particle
'til' is followed by another particle 'amma'.

Further, 'īṭaiccol' may be modified in form 7. Here the
changing shapes of 'cāriyais' (-attu-, -tt-, -ttu: 7.7) and of
the case markers (-ai>-a ; -ku>ka) may be cited as examples. The
commentators cite the examples like uṭanuyir pōkuka tilla (Kuru., 57)
in which 'til' has become 'tilla'.

17.3. 'Iṭaiccol' and Meaning.

Cēṇvaiyar and Naccippēkkinīyar state that 'īṭaiccols'
do not have meaning of their own 8. Tolkāppiyar clearly states
that all 'col' denote meaning 9. Here it must be remembered that
according to Tolkien 'itaiiccol' is also a kind of 'col'.

Dr. P.S. Sastri seems to give a better explanation, by stating that nouns and verbs connote their meanings, while case suffixes, verbal terminations, etc., which are classified under 'itaiiccol' suggest their meaning. Thus according to him the particles and affixes suggest meanings.

... referring to the specific function of 'itaiiccol'.

Tolkien states that they differentiate the meaning of other words. Here it evidently means that they differentiate the relation between the governing base words to which they are suffixed or between words in sentences. For instance, the case marker -ai in 'nectr-ai' specifically defines the character of the verb's relation to the following verb as its object, since the stem 'nectr', by itself, admits of several kinds of relation such as the subject, instrument, recipient, etc. Similarly the particle -o in ventano takes the ascertainment verb vento in interrogative verb and so on.

17.4. Classification of 'itaiiccol' According to Tolkien.

Tolkien divides 'itaiiccols' into seven sub-classes. They are:

1. the sandhi or flexional increments ('cariyeit'),
2. the verbal terminations which occur with tense markers,
3. the case markers,
4. the expletive particles,
5. the euphonic particles,
6. the suggestive particles and
7. the particles of comparison.
17.5. Is 'Itaaccol' a Word-class in Tamil?

Tolkāppiyār explicitly states that, in Tamil, nouns and verbs are the two word-classes. In the immediately following sūtra, he says that 'Itaaccol' and 'Uriclel' form part of, or occur with, the nouns and verbs. Thus it is evident that Tolkāppiyār accords a secondary status to 'Itaaccol' and 'Uriclel' in the system of parts of speech in Tamil. Though he makes a distinction between the former two and the latter two in the very treatment itself, he employs the term 'col' to refer to all the four groups of forms.

The term 'col' in Tolkāppiyām is not a corresponding one to the term 'word' used by modern linguists. The word, according to linguists, is the minimum free form, whereas the term 'col' includes not only the words like nouns, verbs, particles, etc., but also bound morphemes, i.e., affixes that are included under 'Itaaccol'.

The classification of parts of speech is allowed only at the word-level. The part of speech of a word is that of its stem. Since, the affixes which are also included under 'Itaaccolas' are not words, it is evident that 'Itaaccolas', as a whole, do not form a separate part of speech.

17.6. Classification of 'Itaaccol' from the Modern Point of View.

As indicated in the beginning (17.1), from the point of view of modern linguists, the seven sub-classes of 'Itaaccol' enumerated by Tolkāppiyār (17.4) can be classified into two major groups:

1. Affixes, 2. Particles. The first three sub-classes of 'Itaaccol' are evidently affixes and the remaining classes may be considered as
particles. The particles which are separated from the affixes may be identified as a class of uninflected words.

17.7. **Affixes.**

Affixes are bound morphemes or dependent morphemes. They characterize the word-classes in Tamil. The first three sub-classes of 'itaiccol', which are really affixes, are briefly discussed here.

17.7.1. **Sandhi or Flexional Inicements (‘Cāriyas’)**

They occur between the noun and the case markers or other words. They have been studied and analysed in detail in chapter seven.

17.7.2. **Affixes that occur with Tense in Verbs.**

According to Iḷampūrapar this sub-class of 'itaiccol' includes only the verbal terminations, -am, -ām, -am, -ām, etc. But according to Cēnavaraiyar and others, it includes the tense markers also. According to Prof. B. Ilakkuvan, it refers to the tense markers alone. Teyvaccilaivar explicitly points out that the second sub-class of 'itaiccol' includes not only the tense markers but also the pronominal terminations, -am, -ām, etc. A close study of Tolkāppiyas will reveal the fact that it includes the tense markers and the pronominal terminations (person markers + number or number-gender markers), since it is identified by "that which occurs with tense in verbs".

The tense markers are discussed in detail, in chapter fourteen and the pronominal terminations are treated in chapter nine.

17.7.3. **Case Markers.**

The case markers characterize the nouns in Tamil and they are
discussed in chapter six.

17.8. **Particles.**

According to modern linguists, the particles are a part of speech; they are uninflected and hence exhibit no formal categories and they are relatively shorter than other parts of speech. C.F. Hockett terms them as uninflected stems.

In Tamil also, the particles are a class of uninflected stems. *Tolkappiyam* discusses many of them in *Itaiiyal*. Dr. Zvelebil includes the particles as a class of words under the parts of speech system of the Tamil language. He reiterates this view in a number of his contributions.

Referring to the particles, Prof. T. P. Meenakshisundaram says that some of these were originally independent words which have been reduced to the position of mere particles which cannot therefore now occur as independent words. Independent words can themselves compose sentences, e.g., *yaṟṟu* "who", *va* "come", *மாமா "o mother!" etc. Particles cannot themselves form sentences but can suggest difference in meaning in sentences.

17.9. **Particles and Clitics.**

Nida opines that the particles are frequently clitics. Dr. V. I. Subramoniam suggests that all the particles discussed in *Itaiiyal* may be identified by the terminology "clitics." But, here, clitics are treated only as a sub-class of particles. Dr. Zvelebil also distinguishes them from proper particles. Clitics are structurally bound particles which have syntactically permanent distributions. They are bound words which occur in more than one
relative position and whose grammatical attachment may be to the 
expression as a whole.

A few clitics are not included in Itaiiyal by Tolkāppiyarār, 
but are discussed elsewhere. Since they are also structurally 
particles, a brief study of all the clitics is attempted at the end 
of this chapter (17.14).

17.10. Expletive Particles.

Tolkāppiyarār enumerates about thirty forms of 'acainilai' or 
'uraiyacai', which usually occur in poetry. 'Acainilai' or expletive 
particle in its literal sense fills up the metrical requirements only 
and should have no meaning. The commentators on Tolkāppiyaram also claim 
that they do not convey any meaning. Prof. Ilakkuvanar considers them 
as empty words used to fill up the metress.

But a deep and detailed study of the expletive particles listed 
by Tolkāppiyarār and of their occurrence in Caukam literature will 
reveal the fact that they are not mere expletives but they are used 
with certain significance, such as emphasizing a thing, inviting the 
attention, expressing a feeling, desire or command, etc. In the end 
of Itaiiyal, Tolkāppiyarār says that learned men should assign to 
them such meanings not specified here (in the chapter on 'itāiccal') 
but suggested in the particular combinations with nouns and verbs, 
even though it has been shown that each particle denotes a particular 
meaning. It is interesting to notice that Tolkāppiyarār does not 
mention anywhere that 'acainilai' does not convey meaning. Since the 
expletive particles also are a sub-class of a kind of 'col' (itāiccol), 
according to him, they should also convey meaning because he says
that all 'col' (words) denote meaning.

According to Dr. Zvelebil, they are of emphatic or intensity function. He says that it is very difficult to analyze the origin and exact nature of some of those particles termed 'acaicool' or 'uraiyacai'. Further he opines that the so-called 'acaiccool' are lexical means to express emphasis. Dr. V.I. Subramoniam also, in personal communication, has expressed his disagreement with the view of Converseiyar, that the expletive particles are meaningless.

Thus it may be reasonable to conclude that the so-called expletive particles convey some shades of meaning, which can be identified in the contexts of their occurrence alone. Sometimes it may be hardly possible to determine the specific significance of a particular particle; but still it gives the impression that it conveys meaning (i.e., it denotes a shade of difference in meaning).

A few of the so-called expletive particles enumerated in Tolkëppiyam have been arrived at those shapes (forms) due to metanalysis, e.g., ika, ciq, miya, mō, etc. Some others are verbs in form and are used as expletive particles with different shades of meaning, having lost their original sense, e.g., ēka, ēkal, appatu, etc. Some forms of the expletive particles may be segmented into constituent morphemes; but with regard to their function as particles in ancient literature, they must be taken as single units, e.g., ēkal, ēka, etc. Here one is prone to assume that some of these forms must have coexisted as particles and as full words in ancient Tamil. Such forms are said to be homophonous in nature.

The expletive particles, enumerated by Tolkëppiyam are, here, arranged in the alphabetical order and are discussed briefly.
(1) until (TC, 287), (2) arē (TC, 279), (3) ānka (TC, 277)
(4) ākē (TC, 280), (5) ākal (TC, 280)

Tolkāppiyāṅgēr says that ākē and ākal occur in duplication, when they are particles. According to Cēṅvāraitār, they are used to suggest disagreement or doubts on a statement.

(6) īr (TC, 271)

(7) īka (TC, 274) According to Tolkāppiyāṅgēr, īka occurs only in the second person

E.g., kantikē kant(u)-īka (kant(u)-ī-ka)

In the examples cited by the commentators, it is found that Ā-īka is suffixed to the 'ceyu' pattern of adverbial participles. Since Tolkāppiyāṅgēr prescribes the use of ā-īka in the second person, āka may be segmented as ā-ī-ka and ā-ī- may be identified as second person marker. It is evident from the examples that the verbs with ā-īka termination are of optative signification. So, one may assume that ā-ī is an optative marker. But it must be remembered here that according to Tolkāppiyāṅgēr, the optatives usually occur in the third person (12,1.2). Perhaps, this might have been the reason why he groups ā-īka which occurs in the second person, with the expletives, considering the preceding second person marker also as a part of it.

(8) ikum (TC, 274, 275) According to Tolkāppiyāṅgēr, ikum occurs in all the three persons.

E.g., kantikum (AK, 121) First person.

The form ikum may be considered as an obsolete form of auxiliary verb formed from the verbal root ī. Thus the form may be segmented as ī-k(u)-um. Ī might have been shortened to ī- on the analogy of the initial short vowels found in most of the auxiliary
verbs, e.g., iru, nāl, viṭu, arul, etc.

I-    - root
-k(u)-   - formative
-um    - suffix which can be identified with

the termination of the 'ceyyum' pattern finite verbs.

The form ilum is in the 'ceyyum' pattern. Since
Tolkāppiyānar restricts the use of the finite verbs of 'ceyyum'
pattern to the third person only (12.2.1), he might have treated
the form ilum which occurs in all the persons under the expletives.
Further it is interesting to note that Nānngul also groups some of
the auxiliary verbs (e.g., iruntu, iṭṭu, nirmu, etc.) under 'iṭaiṭcol'.
So, it may not be wrong to assume that the grammarians are accustomed
to group the obsolete and rare forms of auxiliary verbs under
'iṭaiṭcol'.

(9) enpatu (TC, 230). According to Tolkāppiyānar, enpatu occurs
in duplication, when it is a particle. Cenāvaraiyar says that if one
says in reply 'enpatu enpatu', it suggests the meaning "well said"
or "ill said". Such a usage is not current in modern Tamil.

(10) ē (TC, 272, 252), (11) kā (TC, 279), (12) kural (TC, 272)

(13) cin (TC, 274, 275). Tolkāppiyānar includes cin in the list
of second person expletive particles and adds that it may occur in the
first and third persons also. A number of forms with -cin terminations
occur in Cankam literature. Those forms are either verbs or
participial nouns (5.4). Tolkāppiyānar does not consider -cin as a
verbal termination.

Naccinārkīniyar rightly indicates that the existence of the
termination -cin is found in the form of icin also.
E.g., uratticin (PN, 107) uratt(u)-icin
kanticin (PN, 22) kant(u)-icin
pomaricin (AI, 74) pomar(u)-icin.

Here, it is evident that the form icin is added to the 'cesitu' pattern of adverial participles. The so-called expletive particle 'cin' might have been arrived at by Tolkampiyagar by wrongly segmenting th -icin ending words.

All the forms, in which icin occurs, can be divided into two groups on the basis of their different moods:— (1) imperatives (2) indicatives. It is evident from Ganjam literature that all the imperative forms with icin (cin) are used only in reference to the second person singular and that all the indicative verbs, which occur mainly in the first and third person and rarely in the second person, refer to the past tense only.37

The imperatives with the termination icin are already described (11.4). Dr. Sathasivam thinks that ic which occurs before cin is formed from the verbal root I and is used in the imperatives as an imperative marker.35 A different way of identification is cited in the present study (11.4). Icin is identified as an obsolete auxiliary verb formed from the root I. Thus icin is segmented as i-cu-in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>verbal root</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I &gt; i</td>
<td>on the analogy of the short initial vowel found in the auxiliary verbs, arul, iru, itu, vitu, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-c(u)-</td>
<td>formative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-in- &gt; -cu- due to palatalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-in</td>
<td>is identified as particle in the imperatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be used to invite attention.
In the indicative verbs the final morph -'ag has to be identified in a different way. It may be identified as a past tense marker. Tolkāppiyantar also makes use of a few indicative forms having the so-called expletive particle -icin.

\[ \text{nunwaricin} (\text{TC, 102}) \hspace{1cm} \text{nunwaru-icin-o} \]
\[ \text{unarxicin} (\text{TC, 116}) \hspace{1cm} \text{unarntu-icin-o-r} \]

Thus it may be concluded that -icin (icin) is not an expletive particle; that it has been arrived at by wrong segmentation; that the proper form icin is an auxiliary verb formed from the verbal root ḫ that the final morph is a particle in the imperatives and that it is a past marker in the indicative verbs.

(14) piṃa (TC, 279)  
(15) piṇakkū (TC, 279)
(16) pō (TC, 279)
(17) pōlum (TC, 278)  This may be used to suggest doubt on something.

(18) mati (TC, 274)  
(19) mātu (TC, 274)  
(20) mētu (TC, 279)
(21) mā (TC, 273)  An expletive particle with optative significance (12.1.1)

(22) miya (TC, 274)  This form has been well described under the imperatives (11.7)

\[-m(-1)-yā\]

- a second person honorific singular imperative marks
- i- exccrescent sound (phoneme)
- yā particle (11.7, 11) used to invite attention.

(23) mō (TC, 274)  The occurrence and the description of this form also are cited under imperatives (11.5)
-m- second person plural or honorific singular imperative marker.

-ō particle (11, 5, 11) used to invite attention.

(84) yā (TC, 279)

In Accaviyal Tolkāppiyar cites a few verbal forms which can occur as expletive particles. He says that the words kaṇṭīr, koṇṭīr, cennatu, and poṣirru, when followed by an interrogative particle are said to function as 'acemicol' - 'expletives'.

E.g., kaṇṭīru, koṇṭīre, cennatu, poṣirru (TC, 426)

When these words do not convey the sense of verbs + interrogative particle, they are said to be used to invite attention and therefore according to Tolkāppiyar, they are of expletive function.

In the immediately following sūtra, Tolkāppiyar states that when the words koṭṭai, nimre, kattai and kaṇṭai (TC, 426) do not denote second person, they are also 'acemicol' - 'expletives'. As expletive particle, these forms might have been used to invite attention.

Cēvaramāiyar points out that the eight forms mentioned above may occur in duplication, when they function as expletive particles.

The maximum limit for the repetition of expletive particles is twice (20.2.2).

17.11. Euphonic Particles.

The fifth sub-class of 'acemicol' is identified by Tolkāppiyar as 'icainirai' - 'the euphonic particles'.

According to the commentators, they do not convey any meaning.
and they are particles which help to give sweet melody in poetry.
Prof. T. P. Neelakandram also considers them as sound-fillers or metre fillers. 40

No overt significance can be assigned to the euphonic particle and thus their conveying any meaning is doubtful.

Tolkāppiyār enumerates only two particles of this sub-class.
They are -ē (TC, 272) and kuraŭ (TC, 272).

Tolkāppiyār prescribes the maximum limit for the repetition of euphonic particles to four times. (TC, 2.1).

17.12: Suggestive Particles.

The sixth sub-class of 'īṭaiccol', according to Tolkāppiyār, is the suggestive particles, to which he himself assigns specific meanings. Some of the suggestive particles occur in different shades of meanings in different contexts, which are to a large extent identified by Tolkāppiyār.

A few of these particles are real clitics, a sub-variety of particles, of which a detailed study will be attempted at the end of this chapter (17.14).

About twenty-five suggestive particles are cited by Tolkāppiyār. Out of these, four forms seem to be real nouns. They are (1) el (TC, 269) "brightness"; (2) xon (TC, 254) "fear: uselessness: time: greatness"; (3) teśccean (TC, 266) "state of being easy" and (4) marvaiyat (TC, 264), denoting objects of the same class as those which have been excluded. The occurrences of these forms in Čanaṅa literature also glean the fact that they are nouns. Vaiyapuri Pillai (TL) also identifies the first three as nouns. It is not known why Tolkāppiyāraṇa
includes them under 'italic'.

The remaining forms are arranged in the alphabetical order and are discussed here.

1. Until (TC, 267) A particle denoting the meaning "there".
2. Into (TC, 282) A particle which may be used to suggest surprise, pity or wonder.
3. Am a (TC, 276) A particle which is used to invite attention.
4. Ann a (TC, 282) A particle which may be used to express exclamation.
5. Ann a (TC, 282) A particle which may be used to denote negative interrogation.
6. -um (TC, 255) An enclitic (17.14.6) signifying
   1. incompleteness, 2. speciality (of superiority or inferiority), 3. doubt, 4. negation, 5. universality,
   6. copulation (conjunction), 7. definiteness and 8. becoming.

Yakkṣayāṇa describes the syntactical peculiarities for the usage of the enclitic -um in several sūtras (TC, 252, 254, 256, 257, 251, 254). They are not discussed here.

7. An (TC, 256) A particle used to indicate pity or wonder.
   According to Vaiṣṇavī Pillai (TL), it is a tenseless finite verb of neuter singular. If it is so, it can be segmented as
   en-tu (en-tu)
   en- interrogative particle.
   -tu neuter singular termination.

However, being a particle it functions as a single unit.

8. En a (TC, 256) A particle functioning as a connector;
9. En a (TC, 289) A particle functioning as a connector.
(10) unā (TC, 289) A particle functioning as a connector.

(11) amū (TC, 269) A particle functioning as a connector.

The immediately preceding four forms are real adverbial participles in form. They are formed from the verbal root en-. Tolkepiyār describes their function as particles (connectors) in Italiyiyal. According to the terminology of Hockett, they may be identified as impure markers. (13, 8).

Tolkepiyār discusses the syntactical peculiarities of the usage of these forms in a few sūtras (TC, 287, 289, 290, 293, 294). They are not discussed here.

(12) -ē (TC, 257) An enclitic (17.14.6) signifying
   1. emphasis, 2. interrogation, 3. disjunction,
   4. conjunction.

(13) -oṭu (TC, 294) An enclitic used as a connector

(14) -ē (TC, 250) An enclitic (17.14.6) signifying
   1. disjunction, 2. interrogation, 3. negation,
   4. ellipsis, 5. definiteness, 6. speciality of
   superiority or inferiority.

(15) au (TC, 261) A particle.

(16) kol (NC, 308) A particle used to express doubt.

(17) til (TC, 253, 260) A particle used to signify
   1. desire, 2. time or 3. suggestion.

Tolkepiyār says that when the particle 'tily denotes desire, it occurs along with the verbs of the first person.

(18) mārē (TC, 202) A particle which may be used to signify
   approval.

(19) marru (TC, 265) A particle used to express the change of
   action.
(20) **man** (TC, 252) A particle used to signify the idea of the past, becoming and of ellipsis. K.N. Sivaraja Pillai says "that 'man' is a particle expressing certainty can be clearly established from its connection with the verbal root 'man' - "to exist or to persist". Thus he claims that the particle 'man' is derived from the verbal root man.  

(21) **manra** (TC, 255) A particle used to denote certainty. Sivaraja Pillai thinks that man and manra are of the same significance. He says "Though Tolkāppiyarār tries to draw a distinction between man and manra in the usage of the early poets they differ only in quantity and not in meaning, both import certainty."

17.13.0. **Particles of Comparison.**

Tolkāppiyarār identifies the seventh sub-class of 'īṭaiccor' the particles of comparison by the phrase 'oppil valiyāl porul ceykmunavum' - "those which are not derived from the roots denoting similarity but are conveying the idea of similarity. Dr. P.S. Sastri interprets this as particles of comparison not derived from the roots which mean similarity. However, it is evident that by this phrase Tolkāppiyarār refers to the forms which he speaks of in ēvamaiyaiyal. There he enumerates thirty eight forms as representatives of this sub-class of 'īṭaiccor'. He divides the particles of comparison into four groups according to the different kinds of comparison they denote.

17.13.1. **Classification of Similes or Comparison.**

Tolkāppiyarār classifies the similes or comparisons into four kinds. They are: (1) the simile of action (vipai ēvamai), (2) the simile of effect (payam ēvamai), (3) the simile of shape or form.
Classification of Particles of Comparison

Tolkāppiyar divides the particles of comparison also into four classes according to their occurrence in different kinds of similes or comparison. They are particles of comparison (1) that are employed to denote the similarity of action, (2) that are employed to denote the similarity of effect, (3) that are employed to denote the similarity of shape and (4) that are employed to denote the similarity of colour.

Particles that are Employed to denote Similarity of Action (vinsī)

In the first kind of simile, the point of comparison is action, e.g., one talks like an elephant (kaliramaṇa nata). Here one's act of walking is compared to that of an elephant. According to Tolkāppiyar the following particles are used, when such a point of comparison is stated.

1. any  s-apa  (Tq. 287, 288)
2. thi  th-ka  (Tq. 287)
3. impa  imp-pa-a  ( " )
4. urāla  ural-a  ( " )
5. amu  un-a  ( " )
6. takaiya  tak(u)-ni-a  ( " )
7. nōka  nōkk(u)-a  ( " )
8. nhōs  ušh-a  ( " )

Particles that are Employed to denote Similarity of Effect (Payan)

In the second kind of simile, the point of comparison is
effect, e.g., the patron offers gifts like a cloud (kīrma koṭai). Here the effect of giving is compared to that of a cloud (which gives rain). The following particles are used, when such a point of comparison is stated.

1. anna   (TP, 288)
2. ella   el-a   (TP, 289)
3. kaḷa   kal-a   ( )
4. pulla  pul-s   ( )
5. poruva  poru-(v-)-a   ( )
6. matipā  mati-pp-a   ( )
7. vilaiya vilai-(y-)-a   ( )
8. vilā   vil-a   ( )
9. veḷa   vel-a   ( )

17.10.5. Particles That are Employed to denote Similarity of Shape or Form (May).

In the third kind of simile, the point of comparison is shape, e.g., the elephant has a winnow-like ear (maṇgam anna cevi). Here the shape of the ear of the elephant is compared to that of the winnow. To express such a point of comparison, the following particles are used.

1. anna   (TP, 288)
2. avippe avip-p-p-a   (TP, 290)
3. oṭṭa   oṭṭ(u)-a   ( " )
4. oṭṭukka oṭṭuk(u)-a   ( " )
5. oṭpa   oṭ(u)-a   ( " )
6. kaṭuppa kaṭu-pp-a   ( " )
7. nikarppa nikar-pp-a   ( " )
8. puraiya purai-(y-)-a   ( " )
Particles That are Employed to denote Similarity of Colour (Uru).

In the fourth kind of simile, the point of comparison is colour, e.g., The tresses of hair of the lady are dark like clouds (kāranna kūntal). Here the colour of the locks of hair is compared to that of the clouds. To express such a point of comparison, the following particles are used.

1. anna (TP, 283)
2. oppa o-pp-a (TP, 291)
3. kēyatta kēy-tt-a (TP, 291)
4. nanta nant(u)-a ("")
5. naliya nali-(y)-a ("")
6. nēra nēr-a ("")
7. pōlē pōl-a ("")
8. məruppa məru-pu-a ("")
9. viyappa viy-pu-a ("")

It must be pointed out here that according to Tolkāppiyar, anna is used to denote all the four kinds of similes.

Particles That are not Classified.

Tolkāppiyar does not include six particles of comparison under any of the classes above stated. They may be taken as common to all the kinds of similes.

1. epa ep-pu(u)-a (TP, 283)
2. onna onu-a ("")
3. nāpunka nāpunk(u)-a ("")
4. nāṣa  nāṣ(u)-a  (  "  )
5. pṛppa  pṛpp(u)-a  (  "  )
6. māppa  māpp(u)-a  (  "  )

17.3.8. **Particles or Non-finite Verbs.**

It is, indeed, a very difficult problem to decide whether these forms are real particles or a type of non-finite verbs. The non-finite verbs are grouped and discussed under the class of words called verbs (13.1-20). These forms of comparison resemble the non-finite verbs in structure and behaviour to some extent. Like many of the non-finite verbs (i.e., adjectival participles and infinitive participles) these forms also have the terminal suffix -a, which may be identified with the non-finite marker. Besides, except a very few forms (Anna, ḫāka, etc.), all the forms are formed from verbal roots, i.e., their derivation can be traced back to the verbal roots. Thirdly, these forms occur in attributive construction with nouns or verbs, like the non-finite verbs. So, can they be treated as a sub-class of non-finite verbs? It is yet to be investigated before arriving at any definite conclusion.

On the contrary, they exhibit to a large extent, the characteristics of particles also. Usually the non-finite verbs are dependent on the following complements, which are modified by them; but these particles of comparison are dependent on and bounded by both the preceding and the following words. For example, one can say

pirante ḫāippu (PN, 6) "The sun which rose"

(or)

ceytu vantān  "having done came he"
but not

Anna mukan  "like face"

One has to say 'tamarai anna mukan' - "lotus-like face" etc. Thus it is evident that the particles of comparison are less free than the non-finite verbs and that they are more syntactically related.

Secondly, the non-finite verbs are usually formed from the roots (stems), which are capable of occurring as imperative finite verbs, e.g., 'ceyta' is formed from the stem 'cey', which can itself occur as an imperative finite verb. But most of the stems from which the above particles of comparison are formed can not occur as imperatives in the same sense with which they occur in the particles. Thus, there is a distinction even between the stems of the finite verbs and those of the particles of comparison.

None of the above particles of comparison, as enumerated by Tolkāppiyar, is inflected for tense. One of the main characteristics of particles is that of not being inflected (17.3). It may be pointed out here that though a few of the stems from which the above particles are formed are capable of being inflected for tense, the forms, as listed by Tolkāppiyar, are not inflected for tense.

Particles may be formed by derivation. A number of particles of comparison are also formed by derivation.

The above evidences, perhaps, might have been the reason why Tolkāppiyar groups them under 'itaiccol'. These forms cannot be considered as full-fledged non-finite verbs. Thus one may arrive at the conclusion that they may be of a special type of
particles which are semi-bound and uninflected but are derived.

17.13.9. **Particles of Comparison Derived From Clitics.**

Out of the thirty-eight particles of comparison enumerated by Tolkâpâyanâr, a couple of forms are derived from root clitics (17.14.6). They are *anna* and *ënka*. They may be segmented as *a-∂n*- and *e-∂nk*-; *−* ~ *ë* demonstrative root clitic.

These forms are not at all capable of being inflected for tense.

17.14. **More About Clitics.**

17.14.1. **Clitics - A Grammatical Unit.**

Every language has different types of grammatical units. The different grammatical units are morphemes, clitics, words, phrases and utterances. Of these units, clitic is a peculiar and rare grammatical unit, which is not found in many languages. Clitic is a layer of morphemes, which is either bound or dependent upon some free forms. Though they are grammatically loosely bound, phonologically they depend upon a free form to which they are adjacent. They never occur in isolation.

17.14.2. **Clitics and Affixes.**

According to Nida, clitics and affixes are bound forms.

Then how do they differ from each other? The grammatical units, which characterize the word-classes (parts of speech) of a language, may be identified as affixes. Clitics do not differentiate the word-classes. For example, in Tamil the clitic − india occurs with *Ir̄mæn* (noun) and *vantœn* (verb); *Ir̄mæn-ō* "Is he Rama?"; *vantœn-ō* "Did he come?". But the affixes are restricted to a
particular word-class. For instance, the case markers occur only
with the nouns and the tense markers only with the verbs. Affixes
bear grammatical meanings, whereas clitics seldom do. Clitics
occur mostly after word-closing suffixes.

E.g., Iravan-si-ā  cay-t-a-n-ā

Affixes are a morphological category, whereas clitics are
mostly a syntactical category.

17.14.3. Clitics and words.

Clitics are different from independent words. Dr. Zvelebil
says "It seems that it is convenient to distinguish between independent
and dependent words. This contrast is based on potential
isolatability". According to him independent words can compose
sentences and dependent words cannot.

Clitics are dependent words which are not isolatable in
the way in which independent words are but which have a more free
distribution than dependent (suffix) morphemes. According to Pike,
clitics are semi-free words. Clitics do not exhibit inflexion,
whereas independent words do. Hence it may be concluded that clitics
are a type of particles, which are intermediate between affixes and
words in freedom. They are semi-free and semi-bound at the same
time.


Clitics do not necessarily form morphological constructions
with the constituents with which they are phonologically bound. They
fill slots on the higher level than the word level itself.
E.g., 1. appēru nāṭu "that big country"
   a-peru nāṭu

2. annāṭu "that country"
   a-nāṭu

In example one, a- does not form morphological construction with the constituent with which it is phonologically bound. It forms a construction with 'peru nāṭu' and not with 'peru' alone.

Clitics can be identified by the criterion of such freedom that other morphemes may come in between them and the form which they modify most directly. For example, the forms nel "good", vaḷa "fertile" cīru "small", etc., can be inserted between a- "that" and nāṭu "country". Thus it is evident that clitics have a greater freedom and only accidentally they form immediate constituents with items with which they are phonologically bound.

Therefore, Nida states that in the inventory of morpheme classes we must list these simple types of clitic structures, but their distribution is described in syntax, since they form immediate constituents with phrases.

17.14.5. The Relation of Clitics to Free Forms:

Clitics fall under two categories according to their presence or absence of relation to free forms.

1. Clitics which are bound alternates of free forms are written separately. Such a type of clitics is not available in Tamil. English has such clitics, e.g., a, the, will, would, etc.
2. Clitics which are not relatable to free alternants are written in combination with other words. Clitics, in Tamil, belong to this category and they are not relatable to any independent words.

E.g., appan "that girl" vantānā? "Did he come?"

appan vantānā

Here a- and -ā are clitics.


Clitics may be divided into three sub-classes according to their position of occurrence in relation to free forms. They are proclitics, enclitics and inclitics.

(1) Proclitics are those clitics which occur before other words. In Tamil proclitics are of two kinds. They are:- demonstrative proclitics and interrogative proclitics. These proclitics which are not treated in Ittaiiyal with other particles are discussed in Aittatttikāraṇam. These may be called root clitics, since the words like evan, ivan, uvan. "he", yeva, eva "who", etc., can be formed from them.

1. Root clitics of Demonstration

a-, i-, u-      (TL, 31)

ē-, i-, u-      (TL, 427)

2. Root clitics of Interrogation

yē-              (TL, 179, 422, 427, 428)

(TC, 21, 210)

e-               (TL, 159; TC, 31, 219)

(ii) Enclitics are those clitics which occur after other words. In Tamil, many of the clitics are enclitics, e.g., -ā, -ē, -ō, (TL, 31)
These enclitics are not discussed in Itaiyiyal. These may occur after nouns and verbs, e.g., araəana? "Is he king?" Ḍiθ "Did he eat?", etc. These three may be identified as interrogative enclitics.

Tolkāppiyanaḥ describes the different shades of meanings in which the enclitics -ē, -ō and -um (TC, 257, 256, 255) occur in Itaiyiyal. It may be assumed that the enclitics -ē and -ō which are described as having different signification must have been original interrogatives (TE, 31; TC, 256, 257).

(iii) Inclitic are those clitics which occur between stems and affixes and between affixes.

E.g., anaiya s-pai-a
     eńka s-ńk-a
     anna s-ńr-a

-ńai-, -ńk-, -ńr- may be tentatively cited as examples for ecl inclitics.

--- :o6o:-- ---
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