Chap 8

GRAMMAR II
SENTAMIL

THE GRAMMAR OF HIGH TAMIL

1. "WHEN, WHY, WHAT?"

Beschi had promised while writing his Kodun Tamil to write another Grammar for High Tamil and the welcome which his Kodun Tamil received in 1728, and the insistence of friends that he should pass on to others what he had, by many years of mad study ('insano plurium annorum studio') gathered from the learned books of ancients, made him start writing the grammar of high Tamil the very next year, 1729. But heavy and more urgent work delayed the fulfilment of this work longer than he expected; and he, who could manage so many works at the same time, compares himself, to a pitcher that cannot contain everything (cum urceus pluris capera non posset). And so the grammar was over only the following year, as is evident from the date of the preface: 19th September 1730.

Beschi forestalls a question about the why of this grammar of high Tamil. If a Christian missionary is to work for the people, it is understandable that he should know and use the living language of the people by means of the Grammar of Kodun Tamil, but why should he busy himself with the 'dead language' of the past which is the language of high Tamil, why study the poetry of ancients? Beschi answers this age-old question by depicting the condition of his times which was conspicuous for its absence of real scholars. If the missionaries,
can fill up this void, by becoming learned in high Tamil, they will be an object of admiration to the natives. And the missionaries who have come to teach the natives, will easily be listened to as they are admired for learning. 3 St. Jerome was found fault with for making use of secular poets and he had answered the charge by quoting the example of St. Paul; he had quoted from poets in his epistles and some of the famous Fathers of the Church; he had not only brought in examples from secular poetry but wrote their own poems which, far from degrading, adorned the literature of the Church. Such a service through poetry, says Beschi, can be effected here too, as the natives assent more to authority than to reason and what authority can a missionary bring forward to confirm the truth of his preaching except the poems of the poets? And everything, not excluding the elements of language, is written in poetry; hence he who knows not poetry is considered to know nothing. To read poetry and to study poetry, therefore, is in these regions, a necessity to an apostle.

After giving a brief history of Tamil Grammar and the description of the contents of various grammars, Beschi proposes his plan in this grammar. As he is instructing Masters in Western RHEMI Rhetoric he will omit the third part (Qumay) and 5th part (TH ) of Tamil grammars as they deal with amplification of the subject matter and the figures of speech - in which these missionaries have nothing new to
learn. And about the first part, on letters, he will hardly add a few things as he has dwelt on it at length in the Grammar of common Tamil. Hence the book has only two parts: the first part on the letters and words, the second on verse, where he will add a few observations on the art of Tamil poetry. He will omit much that is found in other grammars, as being not necessary for use or as easily to be learnt by oneself. He thinks it is sufficient for him to hold the torch showing the way for the beginners into the forest of higher Tamil.

2. Common Tamil and high Tamil:

That long high Tamil is meant not exclusively poetic Tamil, but also the prose of the commentators is confirmed by some references in this grammar too. When speaking of honorific pronouns like 'nir' and 'aver' for singular, Beschi remarks (No.52) that the use of these honorific pronouns and their corresponding plural verbs is rare in commentaries, and is found hardly even in poetry. The very last sentence of the book speaks of Beschi's opinion that higher Tamil cannot be equated with poetic Tamil. After referring to the division into triple Tamil (Iyal Tamil - prose, Isai Tamil - poetry, Nataka Tamil - drama), he concludes: "From this one can see whether they speak correctly who insist that higher language should be called poetic".
The difference between common and high Tamil is pointed out in more detail here than in the grammar of common Tamil. For instance: With regard to the letters they are the as in common Tamil; only in high Tamil (Sen Tamil No.1) the letters are called differently; to the name of a short letter ஏம் is added, to that of a long letter ஏன் is added: Thus ஏன், ஏம்; ஐம், ஐன்; thus poet Tiruvalluvar said: ஏன் என அண்டேருந்து. Tamilians never use in high Tamil Sanskrit letters, to the letters enumerated in common Tamil, one consonant must be added called மும் and written as '>'; it is never joined to a vowel, pronounced like the gutteral consonant 'g' which is not fully expressed; it has the force of a consonant wherefore the preceding syllable, though by nature short, becomes long on account of this letter. Thus க is written also as க: and then the first syllable is long, since two consonants follow. The consonant ( மு ) is given the additional name முதையும் in Kodun Tamil (No.1) but in high Tamil it gets the name மு (S.T.No.2).

Common Tamil has some words beginning with ம, ப, ல and ச (as மக, பாக, லப்புக்,சப்ப) which is not so in high Tamil (S.T.No.4). In high Tamil the nominative is often used in preference to accusative (S.T.No.12) whereas in common Tamil the nominative is used at times in place of the accusative which, if often, is not to be praised (K.T. No.91). In common Tamil according to Kodun Tamil (NN.19,80) if the word ends in ஸ and is preceeded by ஸ or வ, then ஸ must be doubled, but in high Tamil, ஸ is changed
into \( \mathcal{L} \) and \( \mathcal{C} \) into \( \mathcal{S} \); \( \mathcal{L} \) and \( \mathcal{C} \) may or may not be
doubled (v.g. மாலப்பும் மாலைத்தும் மூட்டும்)
In high Tamil we should not use 'utaiya' ( உடைய ) for
genitive as it is used in common Tamil (S.T.No.22). What is
expressed by kitta ( கிடை near or at) in common Tamil is
well expressed by kan ( கன ), (the suffix of the seventh case)
in high Tamil (No.23). To treat adiyen ( அடியை ) as a noun
in common Tamil may be excused because of use; but in high
Tamil it will be condemned as an error (No.34). In common
Tamil we may use alla ( அல்ல ) indiscriminately as nanalla,
niyalla, atalla, etc., but in high Tamil it should agree with
the person as nanallen, itanru etc. (No.35). The words
iruttu, poruttu, often used as nouns in common Tamil, not in
high Tamil are in fact appellatives of the third person
singular neuter (No.37), which confirms Beschi's idea referred
to in already, that the words of common Tamil are derived from
those of high Tamil but undergo changes in course of time.
Of the adjectives (uricool) that abound in Tamil, says Beschi,
only a few are used in common Tamil (K.T.No.43), whereas in
high Tamil many more are used and the same words like
\( \mathcal{A} \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S} \mathcal{A} \) etc.) are employed also as adverbs like ( அடை
அணைடு ஆ etc.) (S.T.No.38). In the use of common Tamil
there is a difference in meaning between the inclusive second
personal pronoun 'nam' and the exclusive one 'nankal' (K.T.
No.46); but in the use of high Tamil there is no difference
between nam and nankal; in fact the words nankal, ninkal,
avakal with their cases are hardly used (S.T.No.46). And honorific plural pronouns signifying singular (nir, avar) are in vogue in common Tamil (K.T.No.45), but not in high Tamil (S.T.No.32). And derivative pronouns (S.T.48) (naman, namal etc.) are used in high Tamil, not in common Tamil (K.T.No.45). In high Tamil numbers below 1000 that end in u, take unlike in common Tamil, the suffix an (ஆ) and become like உண்டு, உண்ட்யு (S.T.No.53).

The verbal noun ends in common Tamil in உடனு, but in high Tamil in உடனு (சுழுவுடனு) and is used elegantly very often (S.T.No.54). The present tense ending in kiren (சொருளு) which is used in common Tamil is hardly ever used in high Tamil; which uses instead the endings kinren (சொருளுக) or ninren (சொருளுக), the latter is added to the negative (as natava ninren) (S.T.No.56). The past tense form niriyinan (சொருட்டு) for niruthinan (சொருட்டு) is special only to high Tamil (S.T.No.57). The future tense of common Tamil ends in ven (சொரு) that of high Tamil can also end in kuvan (சொருவன) or al or an (nadappal, nadappan), in u, with um added for plural (valtu, valtum) (S.T.No.58). In the imperative where common Tamil has forms like unnu (சொரு), tinnu (சொரு) high Tamil has un (சொரு) tin (சொரு), or adds mo or ti or tir (unmo, arulti, arultir) (S.T.No.60). The imperative negative of high Tamil is almost never as in common Tamil ceyyate, but ceyyarka (S.T. No.62). In the grammar of common Tamil (K.T.No.73) it was
stated that the future participle could be used for the present; in the grammar of high Tamil it is added that the same participle can be used also for the past (S.T.No.60). To the statement made in his grammar of common Tamil that Vinaie Eccam in Tamil corresponds to Latin gerund in 'dē' (K.T.No.71), Beschi gives a limitation in his grammar of high Tamil saying that not all Vinaie Eccam can be made to correspond to gerund in Latin (S.T.No.68).

3. SPECIAL FEATURES: (1) Different from others or new.

Nannul includes in the list of final letters Ɂ, Ɂ and Ɂ (Sut. 107) but Beschi omits these three from his list (S.T.No.4). As a reason perhaps for the first omission, he says, "In this dialect you will find hardly once or twice an imperative of a verb ending in Ɂ". What is strange is that Beschi should have omitted Ɂ from the list, because in his Tonnul Vilakkam (Sut. 10) he includes all the medial letters as final letters. Is the omission of Ɂ due to its rarity or due to the slip of the copyist of the manuscript? Beschi's description of shortened i (§) is incomplete in S.T. (No.5b) where he says that whenever a word begins with Ɂ for elegance Ɂ is added to it, and it is termed §; whereas in his T.V. (Sut.14) he adds that the Ɂ takes Ɂ when the preceding words end with short Ɂ which is according to Nannul (Sut.93). In his description of shortened Ɂ (S.T.No.5) which is in agreement
with what he says in T.V. (Sut. 16) and what Nannul says (Sut. 95), Beschi adds that the shortened अ is pronounced not as आ, but as if it were आ. The method of expressing the comparative and the superlative mentioned in the grammar of common Tamil (No. 96) by the use of the particle अ, is given a refreshing explanation in the grammar of high Tamil (No. 21), namely that the अ can be understood as keeping its noun apart (अ नुगः of the 5th case). It is interesting to note the clarification for the use of genitive particles अ or अ for singular and अ for plural (S.T. No. 22).

These terminations are affixed to nouns not as these nouns are singular or plural but as the nouns possessed by these genitive nouns are singular or plural: अम अम, अ अक. The small section on appellative nouns (S.T. NN. 30-37) is precious; agreeing with Pavananti that the method of forming appellative nouns has to be learned from ancient authors and no rule can be given for it, Beschi, however, gives five rules. He points out the difference in pronunciation (S.T. No. 31) between the appellative noun and the finite verb of the third person (like श्रमान) namely, when it is an appellative the अ is more open, and when it is a verb it is less open. This distinction, adds Beschi, is mentioned in Nannul; Sutram 286 of Nannul which speaks of the difference that the appellative noun is used in all the three persons whereas the finite verb is used only in the third person, but has no mention of the difference in pronunciation. Beschi's concluding
sentence in this section (S.T.No.37) reveals his insight into the genius of Tamil: "I have written rather at length on the appellations; for in them lies the chief and difficult character of the syntax of this idiom".

The second part of the grammar on Tamil poetry contains good many new elements. Speaking of the Karikai of the monk Amirta Cakaran, Beschi explains (No.74) the three meanings of the word Karikai (a woman, ornament and a particular verse called also கரிகை) and proves how the book is fittingly called Karikai for a triple reason because in every rule a woman is addressed, because the book treats of verse which can be called an ornament of language and because the book is composed throughout in Kalitturai metre. His remark (S.T. No.76) that at times the not abbreviated ஈ (ை) is ஓ ஓ ள ள, i.e. the ஈ not joined to hard consonants but to soft or medial consonants may end the last syllable of Venba, seems to be a new observation; it is verified in Tirukkural (26) (நாயப் பன்முகம் கை கை கை கை). A peculiarity of Tamil verse is insisted upon by Beschi. In Latin verse each word does not close the measure, like a distinct foot; in scanning, the words run into one another, though in reading the words may be kept distinct. But in Tamil, says Beschi (S.T.No.81), as in reading so in scanning each word is like a distinct foot, and so we cannot cut a word and make part of it belong to another word and form another foot. If part of a word is made to join another word, then the two words must form one foot like eg.,
the word கிளோன்ஸி forming one foot கிளோன்ஸி. An exception is made in the particular kind of கிளோன்ஸி which is semiharmonic (S.T.119). It is to be noted that the terminations of cases of appellatives are considered distinct from the primitive word and therefore can be cut in scanning (v.g. பெரி / பெரி; பெரி / பெரி).

Speaking of பெரியையுள்ள் Beschi states that rarely the first line may have three feet only and the second four feet and cites as examples two couplets from Kural:

- வைக்கு மலை சென்ற
   வாய்வு நல்லு போல
- வாய்வு மலை சென்ற
   வைக்கு நல்லு போல

The only example for வைக்கு மலையுள்ள் says Beschi, is the poem in பௌத்த பலயம் பாத் கவிதை... After speaking of the strictness of metre in வைக்கு மலை Beschi dwells upon the kind of language required for it (S.T. No.101), that it should have elegant and more laconic language, epigrammatic thought and its manner so artistically involved that though individual words are understood there must be something more to scrutinise as in the Kural (No.667) மூன்றாம் கவிதை

If there is no depth of thought, the venba must have at least a striking sentence as in Kural (32). 

"தன்னின் காதலுக்கு அடைய வேண்டி
நேர்வாய்வு கேரளை"
As he gives in T.V. a poem that is at the same time an example of and contains the rules (Sut. 236) so here he has given a poem that exemplifies and states the rules for (S.T. No. 111).

The treatment of in this grammar is an important contribution towards understanding the nature and variability of . The section on (NN. 112-122) is rather long, mentions the usual divisions like , etc., which other grammars have, and, what is important contains a valuable answer to the question where lies the equality of lines in number and metre required in and how to create diversity of feet and secure various tones ( ). It mentions also the discovery made by Beschi of two special kinds of , one in and the other in .

The last chapter on the art of Tamil poetry is definitely a unique novelty, in the sense that it gives, probably for the first time, the characteristics of Tamil poetry together in one place and as part of the grammar. Having had no separate book for rules for Tamil poetry, Beschi gathers from the literature of ancient authors the peculiarities of Tamil poetry. Tamil poetry has a separate diction, ornamented with adjectives, filled with metaphorical phrases, rich in alligories, revelling in similies (perhaps not according to the taste of Europeans, but praised by natives and bringing in for
comparison good moral counsels) and employing hypotyposes (vision) called by some, images which are graphic pen pictures (S.T. No. 125-129). Western Scholars, says Beschi, are at pains to defend Homer because others attacked him for making a horse speak. But in Tamil the use of fiction in imagining the deeds of Gods and in making animals speak (like the swan in Sūra) is nothing out of the way. But there is so much consistency in fiction and so much connection with what follows that the common folk take the dreams of poets for history (S.T. No. 130). Beschi deals with invocation as a requisite for Tamil poetry, mentions the three books of Manike (Sūravārtti) which contain hardly any rule except the rule about invocation, (S.T. No. 130-131) about different authorships for different letters etc. (S.T. No. 135). The last section of this valuable chapter enumerates and describes the kinds of poems more frequently used: 4\textbf{vōrōvō}, 4\textbf{hōrvō}, 4\textbf{lōrō} and \textbf{Uə} (S.T. No. 137-144). At the end (No. 145) we have the remark about the position of drama in those times which will be given in detail a little later) and the meaning Beschi attributes to the triple Tamil \textbf{yəf yəf} for him as explained in Kodun Tamil \textbf{yər} stands for prose Tamil (not for prose and poetry as understood today), \textbf{yəf yəf} for poetry (not for music in general as today) and \textbf{yəf yəf} for dramatic Tamil.
2. Reference to prose:

As in Tannul Vilakkam, here too Beschi refers to prose as distinct from poetry. Speaking of argument (S.T. No. 6) Beschi says that whereas போட்டல் is used only in poetry, though rarely, போட்டல் is used in prose also, e.g., in connection with a word that ends in ல் and to it is added ல்: தேர் taking தேர் in தேர் தேர். Words which are written with the same letter duplicated (போட்டல், போட்டல்) can often omit reduplication provided the doubling letter is soft or medial according to the exigence of metre, or even in prose if it is required by the harmony of the period. Thus instead of writing சிற்றண் we may write சிற்றண் instead of சிற்றண், சிற்றண் etc, provided the sense be not ambiguous (S.T. No. 8). To make the meaning of a poem taken from Cintāmani (S.T. No. 5) in which the poet use five times 'கீத' to express similitude, Beschi translates it into prose (S.T. No. 21)

"உயிரை கொண்டு என்று அல்லங்களை சுற்றிக்கொள்வது ஓய்வுதொடர்த்தியுள்ளன, மற்றும் ஒருவளவு பொருள்களை செய்தப்பட்டு, போல் குறுக்காக பலவழையில் நடைபெறுகிறது, இவ்விலை அல்லங்களை வைக்கின்றன அல்லங்களை குறைந்து அரியக் மைசு மறைச்சித்து."


To give an example for an adjective formed from a noun, Beschi cites \textit{溥摩讴} from \textit{Aavumandu} and adds that this example is found in the prose section of the book (S.T. No. 39). Finally, as already mentioned, Beschi says that \textit{பார்யாழ வர்த்த} means prose Tamil, and \textit{தார்யாழ வர்த்த} means poetic Tamil and closes the book with the note that they are not correct who would restrict the meaning of high Tamil to poetic Tamil. Thus is confirmed the fact that according to Beschi the rules of Tamil grammar, except obviously those on prosody, can be applied to prose as well as to poetry.

(3) References to his life and times:

It is a source of pleasure to find in this book of Grammar remarks that relate to Beschi's personal life, which reveal some glimpses of his personality and reflect a little the literary status of those days. In the introduction, Beschi speaks of the sad experience he had in his study of high Tamil, when without a comparison he dared enter the wild way rough with bumbles, stopped in fear and was many a time forced to trace back from the wrong path.\textsuperscript{10} The English translation of B.G. Babington (second edition No. 9) has an example of \textit{ஏன்} in the 5th case, the sentence \textit{ஏனின் ஏன் பூர்வமொத்த TPM மாராத்தை} which is evidently a reference to Beschi's stay in the place Tirukkavalur at the time of writing this book. While explaining the meaning of the words \textit{ஏன்} and \textit{ TN உலகுக்கு} his religious impulse of
a preacher makes him see here a means of expressing God's nature which is simple and indivisible and so he says that for God (Ens simplex, incompositum) \( \text{κακός} \) can be used, while for other composite beings \( \text{κακός} \) can be used (S.T.No.30). The negative verb of the second person is used for imperative positive both in singular and plural; thus \( \text{κακός} \) means here (sing.) \( \text{κακοίς} \) means hear (plural).

It is very necessary to note this. For, Beschi is humble enough to admit, "At the beginning, when I did not know this rule, this way of speaking gave me not a little trouble" (S.T.No.60). The word \( \text{κακός} \) as occurring in the rule for \( \text{κακός} \) \( \text{κακοίς} \) \( \text{κακοίς} \) must have certainly perplexed Beschi by its special meaning, as it does today. And so he takes care to warn the students.

"The word \( \text{κακός} \), although it signifies 'before' must be taken as if it meant 'after', and the reason is that while the verse flows through its feet, the Tamils say, whatever precedes must be said to be left behind and whatever follows must be said to precede" (S.T.No.83).

Some of Beschi's remarks in prosody while being personal references speak also of contemporary conditions he says, is such a difficult kind of verse to the natives "that they term it the tiger of the poets, and in these days there are very few who knowing its rules can scan even one \( \text{κακοίς} \) much less compose it. Whereas for us
it requires the study of one hour" (S.T. No. 101). Devoting only a short paragraph each for the words, Beschi gives the reason: "There are many and diverse modes of  giving in ; but as they are hardly used I do not think they should be mentioned" (S.T. No. 103). About "this much will do as this kind of verse is now scarcely known by name" (S.T. No. 104). Concerning ; "This variety has not got, like the others, subdivisions... nor used" (S.T. No. 105). In too he leaves out many varieties as they are rarely used and adds: "Today some sing under the name of and in its tone, some poems which are really (S.T. No. 110).

The section on which is rather long (as already mentioned) because it is the kind most used, contains a touching autobiographical note. After explaining the requisite that a stanza in must have four verses which are equal to one another not only in number but also in metre, Beschi continues (S.T. No. 113): "In what did this equality of metre consist I could find in no author and all the experts I consulted said they did not know; it seemed to me that, as they do not at all read the poems but sing them in a simple tune, led by the ear they feel this equality of verse, which is however difficult for externs and too mechanical for the noble science of poetry". Then he mentions how he could observe no fixed rule in the actual poems of authors,
he himself tried to compose but with no success, how the word 
*கூர்* in epic poems to indicate different tones (*கூர்* or 
*கூரி*) was an unexplained mystery to him - how for instance 
Kambar could have in Ramayananam 87 kinds of viruttam each 
different in tone. "Finally, after reading many works, which 
I did not without labour and diligence, I found, by God's grace, 
the rule from which the diversity of tone arises."

He distinguishes five classes of feet: those which end 
in *கூர்*, those in *கூரி*, those in *நி*, those in 
*நி நி நி நி* and those in *நி நி நி நி நி* From a combination of these five 
groups arises the diversity of *கூர்* (S.T.No.114). 
Knowing this rule, Beschi contends, one can easily find new 
tones. Those who do not know this rule praise Kambar for 
giving 87 cadences in his Ramayananam that has 12016 stanzas; 
"but in the poem called Tembavani that has 3615 stanzas only, 
I have, without any trouble given 90 different cadences. May, 
as many different cadences as there are stanzas could have 
been given, which however would not be recommended; for it 
is customary to sing under one cadence ten, fifteen or more 
stanzas together". (S.T.No.114).

When describing the various styles of *கூரி* found 
in authors, Beschi points out a unique *கூரி* in Cintamani 
(in the stanza 'ஒறப் கூரி கூரி கூரி கூரி கூரி' 86). 
Many who were great experts in singing verses could not sing 
this one in a harmonious cadence; for the lines were not similar 
to one another; if one line had a syllable in *கூரி* the next
had the corresponding syllable in ஓசிலூ. Finally Beschi found that the poem had been according to the strict rules of ஓசிலூ. "I proposed therefore that they should sing it in the cadence of ஓசிலூ and at once the measures fell in harmony" (S.T. No. 121).

In the chapter on the art of Tamil poetry there is evidence of Beschi's dislike for too much ornamentation which obscures the sense, which, therefore, at time like the face that is covered by a veil, must be called not ornament but mask" (S.T. No. 125). But he has a liking for the figurative phrases in Tamil like ஓசிலூ யார் கூறிய் ஒளியூ which is seen in his determination "to gather together, if God gives years and opportunity, such phrases called from authors of repute, and thus to write a Tamil Parnassus" (S.T. No. 126).

When describing, though briefly, the ஓசிலூ Beschi must have remembered his own ஓசிலூ and the difficulty he had in combining different kinds of verses and the pleasant result. For he remarks: "On account of this variety, this poem is pleasant to the hearers but difficult to the poet and the singers" (S.T. No. 141). In those days of Beschi ஓசிலூ and ஓசிலூ seem to have been in a low status. It is very good, but not necessary if ஓசிலூ keeps ஓசிலூ says Beschi; the natives compose this poem not according to art but led by the ear. The language in it must be very ordinary, without any figures (S.T. No. 142). In connection with ஓசிலூ Beschi remarks
that the last four stanzas (श्लोक) deal with women belonging to or in relation with the hero "in these mostly such things are treated as no chaste eye can read" (S.T.No.143). "The poem श्रीमद् बुद्धपा is reckoned so low that the learned are ashamed to sing it" (S.T.No.144). These remarks were not mere destructive criticisms but incentives to raise, as far as possible, these kinds from the low level to a descent and religious use as seen in his minor poems स्वाभाविक द्वारा and स्वाध्यायः.

Drama had not been in the days of Beschi, in good repute. "The dramatic poems is so much lacking in esteem that the ancients have neither given any rules, nor left any models" (S.T.No.145). But Beschi mentions the fact that people like dramas very much, and call them श्रीमद् बुद्धपा if they are comedies, भ्रातु if they are tragedies or tragico-comedies; on the sea coast, Such serious plays were called असूरिया or अभ्रकिया.

4. References to literature:

When one knows the difficult times Beschi lived in, the literary stagnation of the period, as suggested above, one cannot but wonder at the vastness of Beschi's literary pursuits and the careful diligence with which he has read books.

In the introduction he speaks of his intention to quote "from the best authors examples which by themselves will clarify the rules and show the way". As already listed, this
introduction contains a short, perhaps the first account
(a quasi history) of the Tamil grammars beginning with Akattiam
and ending with Tandialankaram. He admits that while quoting
from the books of authors, he will not be able to mention
the names of the authors as it has not been the custom to inscribe
the author’s name to the books. As example, he says that the
commentator to Cintamani praises the author, names him the
master of all learned men and, Beschi adds he can be called
the prince of Tamil poet - but he has not given his name.
Tiruvalluvan too is not personal name as also ήον ονομαζεται
and Naladiyar. In this connection Beschi records the popular
belief that ήον ονομαζεται was the sister of Valluvar and the
story that Naladiyar was so termed and came to contain 400
stanzas, because of the 4000 stanzas thrown into the river,
only 400 came up the space of four feet against the current.

Among the oft quoted literatures come Tirukkural,
Cintamani and Kambaramayanam and most of the times the
quotations are translated into Latin and the context explained
where necessary. Though strange it should here be noted that
Beschi quotes two couplets (λοντιεγιον οθονι Kural 34,
λοντιεγιον οθονι K.453 of Tirukkural) as examples for his remarks
about οθονι οθονι that rarely it may have only three feet
in the first verse and four in the second. For depth of
meaning and striking manner of expression, he gives two
examples from Kural (Ku. 667 and K.32).
Beschi’s admiration of the author of Cintamani whom he calls in his preface prince of Tamil poets, is seen in other phrases inside the text. While giving the example ஞானர்சிஷை becoming ஞானர்சிஷ in Cintamani, Beschi adds the qualification ‘that famous author of Cintamani’ (S.T.No.12). For an example of the fifth case used in similitude, Beschi repeats his former title: Thus the prince of Tamil poet in his poem Cintamani” (S.T.No.21). He points out the poet that the poem chosen for example ’மீசுந்தை பொன்னு மீசுந்தை மீசுந்தை’ contains the 5th case suffix five times and to make the meaning of the stanza clearer, he translates it into prose.

Beschi’s minute study of Cintamani can be seen in many instances. The third case termination is கூ (short), the தை is not dropped; only once, Beschi says, he found it omitted in Cintamani (S.T.No.19). Quoting again ”உறை நை நூ கை (கூ)(கூ)(கூ)(கூ)” for formation of adjectives for nouns, Beschi points out that five of his rules so far mentioned are exemplified in this poem (S.T.No.41).

The honorific plural is not used generally in high Tamil, but once only Beschi found it used in Cintamani when the queen out of joy over the birth of her son addressed him ‘உறை நை நை நை நை நை (S.T.No.52). Besides narrating the whole story up to the birth of Civakan Beschi quotes the stanza ’உறை நை நை நை நை நை’ (S.T.No.205)
and

but explaining the grammatical peculiarity word by word, and translating the whole into Latin, he concludes: "It has pleased me to cut this stanza minutely into parts anatomically, because to confirm what I have said (so far), we have in this 24 examples". (S.T.No.52). In connection with the difficulty he had in identifying the unique முருகன் in Cintamani already referred to, Beschi adds that such a kind must rarely be used; he found it only in Cintamani and only in three places where the author introduces some one singing the praise of God (S.T.No.121).

Beschi's detailed study of Kambar is also evident. As already mentioned he asserts that Kambar uses 87 cadences in 12016 stanzas (S.T.No.114). Speaking of the frequent use of episodes in poetic fiction (S.T.No.130), he states that Kambar has used 1500 or 1080 episodes. 11 Where Beschi points out the difference between பெருமாள், தலையை, கோவையை and கூண்டல் Beschi remarks: "Thus the poem called சோழபொய்லூர் enumerates 7 books or கலாத்தில் all of which consists of 128 chapters or பதேல் (S.T. No.138).

Quotations from Cilappatikaram are the following:

"நாட்கூட்டு தலையை கூண்டலெடுக்கு (S.T.No.17) கோவையை தலையை, பெருமாள் பெருமாளை கூண்டலெடுக்கு (S.T.No.39) எனக்கு பெயர் (S.T.No.72) பாறையை (S.T.140.132)"
Beschi speaks of Tolkappiyam first in the preface where he refers to its being obscure on account of its brevity; then inside the book, in connection with the formation of future tense, he says: Thus the very ancient and praiseworthy author கொழும்புக்கானார் in his rules of the language often uses in this way: கேம் கு கு கு கு, குக்கோ க் கே கே (S.T.No.58).

Examples are also cited from என்னையுள்ளே or பாக்கிய மூலம் (S.T.No.46) where the author of என்னையுள்ளே is said to be பூதக்கர்த்தர் (127 and 130) (S.T.No.62, 122); it is in Baratam (S.T.No.62-122) he found a special variety of என்னையுள்ளே in which the மரம் at the beginning of each line is repeated in the middle of the line where we should have மரம் thus giving eight மரம் instead of four.

Twice he quotes from his own Tembavani (S.T.No.91, 118) and often he quotes from anonymous poets (S.T.No.26, 37, 38, 49, 71, 81).
NOTES

1. In his preface to Kodun Tamil, "De sublimi lingua dialecto in posterum Deo favente, Grammaticam daturus et Lexicon... and inside the Grammar No. 69, 105, 176)."


3. Praef. 'Facile magistrum audient quem doctissimum admirantur'

4. eb. en Kodun Tamil. Sec. Common Tamil and High Tamil

5. Grammar on high Tamil No.52. "mix enim aliquando in commentariis pro ṣṭṭh (ah) ṣṭṭh (ab) etc.... legi honorifice dictum ṣṭṭh (ah) ṣṭṭh (ab) ; apud poetas autem, vix unquam inventur".

6. Grammar of high Tamil No.145. 'unde ex hoc videant, an apposite loquantur qui hanc elegantiorem linguam poeticam vocandam esse persistunt.'

7. Dr.Caldwell calls it a sort of gutturoa, p.353, and Tamil Lexicon of the Madras University uses the symbol 'K' for '...'.

8. From this it can be inferred that Beschi takes aytam for a consonant; this is also the opinion of Dr. P.J. Subrahmanya Sastri, of his "History of Grammatical Theories" in Tamil, p.66, op.cit.
9. Tolkappiyam mentions only four words ending in அம்.

10. A stanza in Tembavani reflects the difficulty Beschi must have had when trying to know the rules of prosody:

   Chapt. 28.14. "The poets who in no time weave out of words feet and sweet poetry, did think, before they grasped the rules of the book on prosody, that it was easier to support a mountain than to compose a poem".

11. There are some sutras of T.V. like No. 65, 78, 82, 84, 89, 94-103, 105, 106, 131-134, 137-139, 198, 216, and 250, which have in their explanation references to or quotation from Tolkappiyam. But, as it presents itself, it is difficult to say which portion of the explanation in T.V. is genuinely Beschi's and which the addition of the first editor Vedagiri Mudaliar, these references cannot be made much of.
KODUN TAMIL

Its composition:

Of the four grammars written by Beschi, his Kodun-Tamil is the first. It was written in 1726. The preface is dated 4th January 1728. The example given for the correct use of the gerund refers to the year of the grammar. (No. 7, பொன்னகம் 1728 but பொன்னகம் 1828.)

But the book seems to have been finished at the end of 1728; if the author, when speaking of the final period in the age of world (Kaliukam) says: This year, 1728, from the birth of Christ, at the end of which I write these things, is according to the calculation of the Tamilians, the 4829th completed year of this final age. This was also the first of all his books to be printed, and the only one to be printed during his life. A few details about its publication in 1738 by his rivals in Missionary work, the Lutherans of Tranquebar, and to usefulness which they acknowledged have been mentioned earlier. Another Latin edition was published in 1813 by the College of Madras and signed by the heads of the College like F.W.Ellis, J.Babington etc. An English translation prepared by Mr. Christopher Henry Horst was published in 1831 at the press of the Christian Knowledge Society at Vepery. The Latin edition of 1813 by the College of Madras, says that Beschi's preface was over on the 2 4th of January 1728 (4. Kal. Jan. 1728) whereas the second English translation says it
was over on the 29th Jan. 1728. A second English translation was made from the Manuscript by G.W. Mahon and published in 1848 at the same press.

The author's Introduction in Latin contains valuable information concerning spoken Tamil which are given in a separate section. He states that he has heard frequent complaints about the deficiencies in the grammar of common Tamil. No one, however, he says has attempted to write a regular grammar for this language and this for various reasons.

If he attempts now a regular grammar of the common Tamil, it is not with a view to finding fault with the labour of his predecessors. (This refers certainly to earlier grammars and perhaps also to the Dutch Grammar of Tamil by Philippus Balde in the previous century). Nor has he the presumption that he knew more than others. The only reason is the insistent request of one person, "for long connected with me and outstanding above everyone by singular merit". This person, is none other than Fr. Louis de Bourzes, who was Superior of the Madurai Mission from 1714 to 1717 and who being himself a scholar in Tamil appreciated the talents of Beschi, and asked him to write a Grammar of common Tamil. Though Beschi does not mention Fr. Bourzes by name in this introduction to Kodun-Tamil, because the latter was still alive, he mentions his name in the introduction to the Tamil-Latin Dictionary of common Tamil in 1743. Here he acknowledges the help from
the manuscript dictionary of Fr. Bourses because Fr. Bourses was then no more; he had died in 1735.

After mentioning the main divisions of the book, he adds that he has omitted many things as being not necessary, in his opinion, "lest by a heavy load I may seem to advertise mere learning out of season, or frighten the newly approaching (students) from their purpose by an enormous appearance or load shoulders that are yet tender with an unequal weight." If they want more, they can consult the grammar of high Tamil which Beschi intends to write shortly. Even from among the rules given here (Grammar of Common Tamil) not all have to be proposed to beginners when they teach others; when and how they could be treated depends on the discretion of the teachers.

This valuable preface revealing the nature of common (spoken) Tamil in those days, and Beschi's pedagogical insight ends with a touching request: "If you think that you have received any help from this (book), pray the common Lord of the Harvest that, I too, following your example, may not sit down in slothful idleness in the Vineyard."

CONTENTS

(i) Special Features:

Letters: While praising the Tamil classification of letters into uyir and mey (No.1), Beschi adds a new name to the consonants, namely, Cetelutti (செளுத்து), which brings out the sense that the consonant is a dead letter
without the vowel. Calling ள and ளா dipsongs suggested already by Tolkappiyam⁷ is quite in accordance with modern linguistic conceptions.

Beschi’s reform in Tamil orthography is well known. It must however be stated that only the reform in syllabic letters of யா, யா, யாம, யாந etc., has been acknowledged by Beschi as his own, in this grammar (No.3) and in his preface to Caturakarati.⁸ The Tamil-Latin Dictionary of Common Tamil mentions under ள that in order to distinguish long vowel ṭ from short vowel ṭ, the end of the letter is rounded; but under ள the change in the letter for vowel ọ long, is not mentioned. The change for the long ọ and ṭ long e in syllable (2.5) is mentioned clearly in this dictionary. Beschi's position in the literary world of 18th century can be gauged from the remark he makes that the new mode in writing introduced by him "has sufficiently pleased many and they have not disdain'd to follow it".⁹

Beschi arranges all the syllables (2.5) under three heads according to three different diacritical marks used in Tamil to express u short and long. The first group contains letters that are written similar to ள, ள; the second group, similar to ள, ள and the third, similar to ள, ள. In the paradigm given by Beschi, in which he arranges all the letters under these three heads, he could place them together before the eye, ள has no other letter for
it, for, says Beschi, this (letter) is hardly ever joined to a vowel. த் has just one more ஐ, and nothing else, for, says Beschi, the other letters are absent in the common tongue. (The English translations have either ஐ and த் in all the forms - as in the edition of 1848 - or த் alone in all the forms - as mentioned by Prof. T. P. Meenakshisundaram in 'An Eighteenth century Tamil Grammar'. Such a new classification of letters according to their forms reveals Beschi's unifying mind.

Beschi's observation that the sound of the letters த், ஜ், ய் changes according to their position in the word, has been, in the opinion of scholars, the basis for Caldwell's enunciation of the law of convertibility of surds into sonants. Another remark of Beschi has also been useful to Caldwell, namely that 'a' short at the end of a word which is a poly-syllable and which has after 'a' one of the six consonants ப், ல், ம், ஜ், ய், ர் is pronounced with such a gentle sound that it seems to be 'e' soft. Thus மாவு is pronounced not, pagal, but paguel.... 'i' short before ப் (No.10) is mostly so softly pronounced that it seems not to exist, e.g., மன்றம் is pronounced as pragasam, மன்றம் as sicram. So much so, that in verse, where there is need, the 'i' need not be counted. This principle is verified not only in Sanskrit words as மண்டகம் and மண்டகம், but also in Tamil words like Irukiratu, ceykiratu which are pronounced as Irukratu and ceeykratu. 'e' long or short,
before $i$ is pronounced mostly as 'u'; thus $\delta$ is pronounced as Tamul - which helps us to see the reason for the European custom then prevailing, e.g., as in the title of this very grammar: "Grammatica Latina-Tamulica". 'i' long before $-$ and is pronounced as 'u'; Thus $\delta$ is pronounced as Wudu - which is seen even in today’s speech of Tamilians in some parts.

When a word ends in a vowel and the following word begins with one of the plosives $\delta, \gamma, \varphi, \nu$ the plosive is generally doubled. It is however a bugbear, even for native students of Tamil, to be sure when the doubling is necessary and when not. Knowing this, Beschi has given us (No.17-32) sixteen rules with their exceptions, and adding here and there the reason for the rule. He does not pretend that all possible circumstances of doubling or otherwise are exhausted within these rules; still these are "more common and more easy" and the result of his "long experience and accurate study" (No.16). "This is an important contribution and the writers of the 19th century had all taken advantage of these rules in writing their grammar books in Tamil".12

Among the Sanskrit letters used in Tamil (No.33) $\eta$ is used above the other letters with which it combines. Thus $\eta$ - in $\xi\sigma\eta \nu \mu \nu \tau \lambda \alpha \rho$ (No.46). This seems to be a custom prevalent then and this prevails in Malayalam even today.
Nouns and pronouns:

In Chapter II on nouns and pronouns, Beschi states the rule (No. 41) that nouns ending in 'u' double k while taking the plural form 'kal'; thus Kurukkal, Catturukkal, Cammanasukkal, Pendukkal, etc. The last example may have been prevalent in Beschi's days, though it is not so today. His remark that the Tamils "clearly teach that neuter nouns are often used in the singular for plural number has paved the way for Caldwell's theory that primitive Dravidian nouns are destitute of number." 13

Beschi translates uricol as adjectives, (voces proprietatis), - which Latin term means not only a quality, but also ownership, thus bringing out the idea that adjectives belong to, are owned by nouns.

Modern scholars have rightly objected to the translation of uricol into adjectives 14 and have pointed out that uricol denotes the nominal or verbal root.

Beschi's remark about செருண்டகம் (No. 44) is noteworthy. If it is placed before the noun, it drops ଲ୍ୟ: thus செருண்டகம் கொண்டான்,செருண்டகம் சம்பந்தல். It is is placed after the noun, it is better that it takes ல୍ୟ: as செருண்டகம், செருண்டந்தா. It should be noted that in the usage today the suffix ଲ୍ୟ is added to the noun which follows செருண்டகம் (செருண்டந்தா குறிக்குறி). This is not mentioned by Beschi. And even when செருண்டகம் follows the noun, ଲ୍ୟ is required according to him only for elegant use. This shows the usage of the time round about 1726.
The prose works of Beschi like Veda Vilakkam and Vediyar olukkam which were written about this time, have examples of omitting 2-lo when தொன்றுமில் precedes the noun. 15

But in the Tamil-Latin Dictionary composed in 1743, against the word அக்கும (which means தொன்றுமில்) Beschi says that when அக்கும is placed after the noun 2-ல் is added: (மூன்று அக்குமில்); when it is placed before the noun 2-ல் is added to the noun (அக்கும் மூன்றுமில்) for elegant use (eleganter). Against the word தொன்றுமில் or தொன்றுமில்தெல் Beschi says that if it is placed before the noun, it loses ல்; he gives தொன்றுமில்தெல் as a separate word that can be declined through all cases. Under the particle 2-ல் Beschi states that it is elegantly added to all words that signify 'all'. Thus தொன்றும் மூன்றுமில், அக்கும் மூன்றுமில்

Here the evolution of the language can be traced, which taking what was elegant as necessary (2-ல் after அக்குமி), creates a new elegant use (2-ல் after nouns). Today this elegant use (அக்கும் மூன்றுமில்) has become the rule, just as in life what was luxury yesterday becomes a necessity today.

The second person singular is (No.45) given as 2-ல் not 2-ல் (as we use today). 17 The Grammar of High Tamil, written in 1730 has only 2-ல் (No.46) and the prose works too use only 2-ல். It may be that the different copyists or editors of later editions of these books have corrected 2-ல் into 2-ல் or the 2-ல் of the Koduntamil Grammar may refer to
the use of the common people in ordinary speech and writing.

Beschi has the honour of stating for the first time the existing existence of the double second personal plural (மல் and மல்வை) (No.46) and the difference between them. "This is the difference: மல்வை includes the speaker, and others whom, as it appears from the context, he wants to include, and it always excludes him or them with whom we are speaking; but மல் includes those who speak and those who hear". This inclusive and exclusive second person plural is not given in Tonnul Vilakkam and the reason for it is found in the Grammar of High Tamil (No.46). "Besides in this dialect (i.e., High Tamil) there is no difference made between மல் and மல்வை, as it is in the common Tamil; in fact, மையை and மல்வை, தம்பை with their cases are hardly ever used".

The demonstrative and interrogative pronouns கிழ, கிழ், இல்ல் are called by Beschi adjectival pronouns (No.48) because in meaning they are like pronouns and in use they are like adjectives, preceding the noun and like Tamil adjectives not made to agree with the noun in gender or number or case. His remark (No.49) that in place of இல்லி, இல்ல் and இல்லாத, the words இல்லி நூல், இல்லி புத்து and இல்லாத புத்து can be used in the same meaning, cannot be accepted today, as இல்லை நூல் means which tree and இல்லாத புத்து means what kind of tree.

The pronouns that, according to Beschi (No.49) can be formed from these adjectival pronouns (இல்லி நூல், இல்லி புத்தித்து, இல்லி புத்து சுருந்து, இல்லாத புத்து சுருந்து)
have become rarer, at least some of them. Among the masculine nouns, remarks Beschi (No. 51), God and Angels are used in the neuter gender; to those men whom they want to honour most they (The Tamils) give the neuter gender: thus பட்டனர் கோட்டையாளை This gives a clue to modern linguists\(^9\) to justify the modern use of neuter for brothers or sisters or relatives, and call it honorific use of neuter.

The verb:

Chapter III deals with the verb, the important item in a Dravidian sentence. With regard to the present tense (No. 53), Beschi gives only kiru, not kinru and aninru, probably because the common language of his day did not use the two last. The third person neuter, he says, may end in எள் (ேம்பேள்) or also in வே (ேம்பே, வேம்பே). It should be noted here that the form ending in எள் (ேம்பேள்) is not given to the present third person neuter, because in his mind எள் is a verbal noun. His observation that the present is often used in place of the future, especially in the epistolary style makes linguists suspect that the present and the future are not well distinguished, the real distinction being between the past and the non-past.\(^{20}\)

The formation of tense offers greater difficulty; it has many rules, says Beschi (No. 54) and none of them is without many exceptions. He summarises the chief rules in a Latin verse of eight lines. He divides the verbs into classes: some end in தலை, others in துறை. The former are given
three rules, and the latter five rules. These rules of thumb must have been of valuable help to the student-missionaries.

At the end of the treatment of the present, past and future tenses Beschi states, what Caldwell repeats later, that the Tamils do not have, besides these three tenses, imperfect or pluperfect (No. 67) or optative or subjunctive (No. 69) though there are methods of supplying them, which he will give in the chapter on Syntax.

After the ordinary way of forming the imperative, Beschi mentions other ways. One is to form honorific imperative (No. 68) by adding 'um' to the imperative root (மும்மு); exceptions are po which takes m (pom) va and ta which take 'rum' (varum, tarum). If you add காணும் to this imperative, it becomes second person plural (மும்முகாணும்). For the other persons, future is used. Another elegant way of forming imperative for any person is to use the infinitive, e.g., குறுகிற குறுக்கை; this is used especially in regard to very noble persons like the king, the priest etc., e.g. குறுகிற குறுக்கை (often 'um' is used to this infinitive, e.g., குறுக்கை).

A third method is to add நர் to the future of any person; thus நராம்புச், நருக்காசு. . . . This is not, strictly speaking imperative, for as Beschi points out in his Grammar of High Tamil (No. 63), this form belongs more to the one who requests than to the one who orders.

'Vinaiseccam' (விநாயூக்கம்) called by Caldwell verbal
participal, known among modern linguists as conjunctive participle, is translated by Beschi as a defect of the verb (that which falls short of a verb) and is equated with Latin gerund in 'do' for, says Beschi, the gerund has the force and meaning of the verb; still as it is not conjugated according to person and time, it is said to fall short of the nature of the verb. It may be true that orthodox grammarians may not accept such an explanation, but it serves the purpose of the grammar, i.e., teaching the Latin-trained foreign students common Tamil. In the grammar of High Tamil (No. 68), Beschi admits that the Latin gerund cannot be fully equated with the Tamil பெருமேசீடு 22

"Peyarecoam" (பெருமேசீடு) is translated by Beschi (No. 72) as defects of the noun (that which falls short of the noun) and equated with participle, for it has the meaning of the noun, but it is not declined through cases, genders and numbers; hence it is rightly said to fall short of the nature of noun. This explanation too may not be accepted by all. 23

"It was probably Beschi who first realized the importance of the negative verbs". This can be verified in the three numbers (Nos. 74-76) he devoted to it. "It is special to this language", says Beschi, "to have a method of expressing the negative meaning of any verb without any particle implying negation. Although Tamil grammarians would point to the very absence of any tense particle between the root and the suffix, as the negative particle, although Caldwell would recognize 'a' as the negative particle, and although modern
linguists would speak of zero tense morpheme as the negative morpheme, "Beschi's analysis seems to hold good". He describes how to form the ordinary negative, honorific negative, imperative negative, gerundial negative and participal negative. After these negatives which may be called synthetical negatives - which express the agent, action and negation is one word, he speaks of the analytical negative, which expresses the agent, action and negation by separate words (Nan ceykiren illai or Nan ceykiratu illai')

"In this language", remarks Beschi (No.77), "there are no words which are truly passive in themselves; but all words can be made passive by the addition of ṣiṣnuṣ which means 'to suffer'." It is perhaps this remark that has helped Dr. Caldwell to generalise and say that the Dravidian Languages are without proper passive voice. Beschi makes the true observation that "Tamilians use very often the active voice in the passive sense: thus 'connatur potum' (what is said is enough). This is especially true in participles: thus 'connu sutiram' (the said rule). For the sake of clarity perhaps, he adds, "still it is better to add the verb 'patukiratu' and say 'collappatta'."

The treatment of defective verbs - verbs which lack one or other form of conjugation - besides showing Beschi's insight into the genius of the language, has been of valuable help to missionary-students; it is the presence of defective verbs in the Dictionary of Common Tamil by Beschi more than
in the dictionary prepared for many years by Lutheran Missionaries that made the Lutherans of Tranquebar decide to print Besshī's dictionary in preference to their own. Under 'venum' Besshī regrets (No.80) the fact that to the negative which occurs in third person neuter, "the custom had prevailed in low common idiom of adding ὅ and they say ἑσώστι ὅ. Even today scholars fight against this addition of ὅ."

Today it seems strange, but in Besshī's times it must have been the ordinary thing to use the future positive kattuva (κατ' ὅστις), I will be able, matuva (ματήσω) you will be able. Though etymologically matten (μετήνω) (I am unable) and ventam (κατέστης) are quite distinct, in the days of Besshī, (as today) these two were explained by 'I do not want' (Nolo). Still there is a subtle distinction. "When the act of not willing and the action not willed refer to the same subject, use the word λοιπόν ὅ; but when they refer to different subjects, we must use ἑσώστι ὅ." (No.81). Thus to say, "I do not want to speak" since here the act of not willing (I do not want) and the action not willed (speaking) refer to the same subject (I), one must use λοιπόν ὅ; ἑσώστι καὶ λοιπόν ὅ. To say, "Do not speak", since in this the act of not willing refers to the speaker (I), and the action not willed (not speaking) refers to another person (you), one must use ἑσώστι γάρ, ἑσώστι ἑσώστι γάρ. After giving two more examples: ἑσώστι καὶ λοιπόν ἑσώστι, ἑσώστι ἑσώστι ἑσώστι and explaining their difference Besshī concludes: "This rule is to be diligently observed, as it is very necessary
and in no instance changeable". This holds good even today, although native writers and speakers may not be conscious of it.

It is a discovery that Beschi makes (No. 82) when he points out the difference between the two most common words இல்லை and அல்லை. Illai denies existence, alla denies essence or quality. To the question 'Is there rice at home?' the negative answer is 'illai'. To the question "Is this rice?" the negative answer is 'alla'.

Beschi mentions gerunds: இல்லை மை அல்லை மை which with the subjunctive particle become இல்லைய மை அல்லைய மை in the sense of இல்லைய மை; though not used today, they must have been in vogue in his days as seen from his prose works. But Illai and Alla can be promiscuously added after the neuter verbal noun: இல்லைய எடுத்து அல்லைய எடுத்து or இல்லைய எடுத்து

Undu means 'is', and implies existence not essence. When it is joined to 'Akiratu' it becomes undakirathu, and means, says Beschi, "to be", in the place of 'to have'; besides, it means also to become. If the active verb இல்லைய மை is added to it, it becomes 'undakiratu' and means to make, to create. The first meaning for undakiratu (to be, to have) is not found in today's use.

Kadavatu is truly a defective verb, meaning 'the duty of doing something' as it has only the future (செய்வதிய கடவுதை etc.) The verbal noun கடாவது is used also to express desire and corresponds to the Latin 'utinam'. Some have
considered this to be an imperative; but, points out Beschi, an imperative in any language does not have the verb in the first person, but கதவா தில்லி has first person கதவா. This kadavatu has been more fully treated in Beschi's Dictionary of Common Tamil, where he adds that when Kadavatu is used in the sense of 'utinam', the infinitive ஐதிதை is put either after it or before it: ஐதிதை ஏற்றமைந்தது கதவா or before it: கதவா ஐதிதை ஏற்றமைந்தது.

The word 'takka,' டாக்கா, Beschi points out, is from the verb takukiratu (to be fit, convenient) and differs from the other verb takukiratu used to express that the possession of a thing remains with some one, and the difference is exemplified in the sentence: கேட்டுக்கிருந்து போன்று விளக்கம் கேட்டுக்கிருந்து விளக்கம்

In Beschi's time this word takka has been in usage, unlike today, as seen from Beschi's Dictionary of Common Tamil which has against கேட்டுக்கிருந்து has the sentence கேட்டுக்கிருந்து என்ன என்ன? and the proverb: கேட்டுக்கிருந்து என்ன என்ன என்ன?

Kudum is an irregular verb, not when it means 'come together' but when it means that something can be done, and then the possibility of the effect, not the potency of the cause is in the nominative. In this sense, says Beschi, Kudum is used only with the third person neuter: குடம் குடம். To-day, however, Kudum is used with other persons also: குடம் குடம் குடம்

Pola, admits Beschi, is not a defective verb in the High Tamil, as it has got all the tenses and persons; but as in the common Tamil, of those forms only four are used (Pola, polum, pol, pele), the enumerates them among the defective verbs out of indulgence to usage.
Syntax:

The systematic treatment of Tamil Syntax as a separate study, consisting of the uses of the different cases, use of appellative nouns, the different ways of expressing in Tamil imperfect, pluperfect, optative, subjunctive verbs and relative pronouns, the modes of making compound verbs, the uses of the infinitive and some particles - is a valuable contribution of Beschi, who perhaps was the first to do so. 28 "Just as a work", states Beschi (No.89), "is adorned more by the art than by the material, so any idiom acquires value not so much from the selection of words as from the quality of syntax". He speaks of the Europeans who speak Tamil in the style of their own native tongue, and the misleading translation of the Bible into Tamil for want of correct knowledge of Tamil Syntax. It is a true remark that the Tamil construction "will be the more elegant the more it is closer to the more elegant style of Latin language", although there are differences, as Beschi points out later (Nos.92, 93, 111, 123, 124, 126). Tamil is fond of being laconic: "the fewer the words in which you express your idea, the more elegantly you speak". Hence long phrases like ஐயர்க்கர்க்கும் பலரும் and பலரும் ஐயர்க்கர்க்கும் would be better as ஐயர்க்கும் and பலரும் ஐயர்க்கும் respectively. The word என்று (be) in the sense of am, are, is, etc., is generally omitted in other languages it is used with a double nominative: என்று பாடல் is better than என்று பாடல் பாடல்.
In Tamil, according to Beschi, it is better to use dative (as in Latin: quod tibi nomen) and say இடத்தில் பெயரிட்டான் rather than இடத்தில் பெயரிட்டது (No.93). But perhaps the influence of English (what is your name?) has changed the Tamil construction to what it is today.

Beschi requires two accusatives after verbs like 'to teach' (No.94) (as in Latin) உயர்வி மற்றும் நூற்றை and he condemns the habit of some who say உயர்வி மற்றும் in place of உயர்வி மற்றும் as barbarism, if not excused as solecism. And the word உயர்வி மற்றும் takes more elegantly two accusatives. Thus அந்தச் சதுஸ்க நூற்றை and அந்தச் சதுஸ்கோம் is better than அந்தச் சதுஸ்கோம் etc.... though the latter is not to be condemned. However when the praise or blame is transferred from one object to another (say from him to me) then the new object must be in the dative as the praise or blame do not affect the latter directly; thus: அப்படி ஆனால் அளிக்கும்வடை அன்னையே என்ன அண்டு.

It is a refreshing discussion that Beschi presents us (No.99) about the four kinds of constructions to express an action that affects directly a part of a whole; when for instance the tail of a cat has been cut, it can be said in Tamil in four ways: சித்ர விளங்கும் பலன் படங்கல் or பைல்லுத் தோற்ற பயன்படும் சித்ரட்டை or சுமார் மற்றும் பலன்படும் சித்ரட்டை or சுமார் மற்றும் பலன்படும் சித்ரட்டை. According to Beschi the second way is more elegant, the fourth though allowed by Tamil Grammars, does not sound well.
Coming to appellative nouns, Beschi says (No.103) that குருதி can be added to form appellative nouns that express work like (சென்று கேட்டு மாடி) or emotion of mind or body (வெளிப்பட்டு குருதி, பேச்சித் தெருது) but that குருதி should not be added to nouns of places; thus one should not form from மையா, மையா குருதி from செல்லாய் குருதி "At such formations even an old woman could laugh". Today's usage however allows these.

Beschi rightly condemns (No.107) the custom of calling verbal nouns like வந்து தியா இnfinitive; if வந்து is infinitive, வந்து தியா, வந்து தியா too must be infinitives. These are only present participles to which are added the pronouns அத்து, அவரும் and அவனே

The section dealing with the ways of expressing in Tamil imperfect, pluperfect, optative etc., shows the European student the correct manner in consonance with the genius of Tamil. It also warns him against other ways pointed out, which are against Tamil idiom. An author had suggested that for expressing imperfect வந்து தியாகத்தை வைத்து, வந்து தியாகத்தை வைத்து and for pluperfect வந்து தியாகத்தை வைத்து பாதுகாக்து தியாகத்தை வைத்து. But these phrases "I have never read nor heard among natives" (No.113). உயிர்கள், உயிர்கள் (No.119) are used to express time (when?) and cause (since) என் தேவீன் என்று என்று என்று or என் தேவீன் என்று since you have been disobedient to me, you will be beaten. 'Since' can also be expressed through the particle இணை, இணை இணை இணை
since you say. And Beschi who remarks this method is very
elegant used this word abundantly in his prose works.30

Ablative absolute according to some (No.120) may be
expressed thus: நீண்டு யாரியல்வா நாமாக, நாமயயல்வா, அவர்
Beschi asserts that such a phrase cannot be used according to
rules be stated in No.71. Others again teach that instead of
மேற்கு செய்ய முற்ற காலம் can be used (உண்மைக்கு, உண்மைக்கு) "which
however" says Beschi, "is altogether barbarous and so foolishly
brought in by the rude crowd that you will not find it prevalent
in general use even among the common folk" உண்மைக்கு .... etc.
are used by common people in some places today.

Though Tamil has not got compound verbs as Latin has
(like adsum, respicio, protraho etc.) many verbs are elegantly
compounded by joining to the gerund of one verb to another verb.
Here certain subtle shades of meaning are pointed out, which
reveal the genius of Tamil. Speaking of the compound verb
that can be formed by adding உண்மைக்கு like உண்மைக்கு விளக்கம்
and உண்மைக்கு குறிப்பு. (No.126), Beschi disagrees from some who
see no difference between உண்மைக்கை and உண்மைக்கை in சுமார்
Beschi says that these two differ at least as much as the
Greek preterite and future differ from the aorist. And he
explains at length the difference between the three sentences:

 Hence Tamil has three preterites and three futures. Likewise
in the use of the compound verb உண்மைக்கு (No.127) Beschi
points out the difference between அதன் எனதோ அத்தனூர்
மிக்க என்றன் and அத்தன் எனதோ அமல்பெற்று கூறிக் namely
that the former because of அதன் refers to the essence of quality,
and the latter refers to mere existence. Also யூவர்க மூடு
(No.128) is added to verbs whose action refers to the agent
(பிற்கு மூடு என்று) and யூவர்க மூடு is added to those verbs
whose action refers to one different from the agent யாது
(சுண்டு எல்லோ). The addition of verbs like யூவர்க
or யூவர்க மூடு to other verbs had no special significance in
Beschi's times as he states (No.131) but today there is a
difference at least in some circumstances between அதன் மூடு
and அத்தன் எனதோ between அதன் மூடு and அத்தன் எனதோ.

The section in the use of the infinitive in general
(Nos. 133-139) is indeed a treasure trove that contains the
twelve uses of the infinitive, six of these are dealt with in
detail, in comparison with Latin and French and Portuguese
sentences. Others are referred to as already explained.
Among specific infinitive, the infinitive Aka (Nos. 140-144)
is given five special uses, one of which is worth mentioning.
It is used in place of Latin 'sponte' 'ex seipso' அதன் எனதோ அத்தன்
எனதூர், சுண்டு எல்லோ உந்து அறுமிகே.
Although இன்றை can be used in place of இன்றை it gives
room to ambiguity, for இன்றை எனதூர் may mean 'whether
he himself, not another did it' or 'whether he did it of his
own accord'. Using இன்றை with இன்றை (No.143) to mean 'in place
of' சுண்ட்டு எனதோ இன்றை (you go in my place) is not done
today. Aka in the sense of 'being useful to' is used as
but, says Beschi, must not be used as which must be ‘‘. But today this usage seems to be current. 31

Beschi’s treatment of Ideicool ( ) and particularly when he distinguishes six uses for ( ) and eight uses for ( ) and four for ( ) are valuable for understanding intricacies of Tamil and for translating foreign languages into Tamil. 32 Akkum (No.150), if used at the end of a sentence, means ‘perhaps’ ( ), if used inside the sentence, it gives emphatic affirmation like (indeed) ( ). The particle mun, pin, ( ) (No.151) are, according to Beschi, not prepositions but nouns, since they are declined as ( ). But this may be accepted by scholars. 33 Beschi distinguishes the use of the particles and (No.156) and says that is used for all the four kinds of measures, that for all except number and only for number. This distinction is not kept today.

Likewise, the use of ( ) with (No.160) in the sense of ‘together’, the use of (No.163) as an affirmative reply restricted to a question relating to essence, not existence, (e.g., as a reply to the question ‘what is in the box? Is it bread? ’), the use of ( ) for either – or’ (No.164) the use of (No.171) to mean
absolutely, or perfectly' (அறிவுடன் விளக்கப்பட்டது, ஏற்படுத்த என்று கொண்டு நானும்), the use of கொண்டு in the sense of 'hurrying' - all these are either rare today or given up.

In fine, this chapter on Syntax is important in giving us an insight into the genius of Tamil by presenting systematically the Tamil construction, by showing subtle nuances in the use of words or phrases, by helping us to see the root meaning of words and affording us help to translate from other languages to Tamil and vice versa.

Varia:

The last chapter on what are necessary for daily use, like numbers, measures, relationship, knowledge of day, month and year, directions, signs of the zodiac and phases of the moon is a practical guide for the missionary student. It is interesting to know the difference in meaning between some words and phrases which are daily used. (No. 180) means a crore of rupees, but (No. 181) equals three hundred and the former hundred; (No. 181) equals ten, (No. 188) distinguishes day time for night; is a day of 24 hours prescinding from month and week; or is a day in relation to week ( ), is a day in relation to the month ( ), and is a day in relation to the phase of the moon ( ). It was the
custom in Beschi’s time that (No. 181) the smaller number must be multiplied by the bigger one; e.g. \( ने \times त्\) ; this custom, even then not observed in high Tamil, as Beschi says, has perhaps disappeared even in ordinary usage. The days of the week, remarks Beschi, (No. 189) are called \( मुन्नाक \) and at times \( हुस्न \). “There is no name for week in this language”, it is strange. The word \( मुहुः \) which today means weak, has meant according to the Tamil-Latin Dictionary of Beschi, first a portion, e.g., of harvest (thus: \( रुमुहुः \) ); secondly a day (a portion) of the week (thus: \( रुमुहुः \) etc.).

At the end, there is a list of 140 Latin particles, adverbs etc., in the Alphabetical order, with reference to the Numbers in the Grammar book, where one can find their corresponding Tamil equivalents.

At the end, Beschi gives a precious suggestion. Let the student after reading the grammar, put it aside; after a year or two when he has made progress in Tamil let him take it up again, and undoubtedly he will discover new things, not to be despised.

There are many modes of speaking Tamil different in different parts; Beschi has not thought it necessary to treat them individually. Anyone in Europe who would teach Italian to a foreigner will not propose what is added or suppressed in every Italian book and corner, but will be content to teach the common idiom of the learned. Likewise he has not considered
it necessary to give the slangs of the ignorant but only the
rules of Tamil idiom. "Let them (the students) know what is
to be aptly said, and they can find fault with even natives
if they err. Experience will teach the rest with any labours."

COMMON TAMIL AND HIGH TAMIL:

This grammar of Common Tamil (Kodun Tamil) affords us
plenty of evidence to know Beschi's idea of what he meant by
common Tamil and High Tamil.

In his preface to Kodun Tamil, Beschi speaks of the
existence of two idioms in Tamil, high and common. Some, he
says call, not correctly, that which differs from the common,
poetical Tamil. But Tamilians have used high Tamil not so
much in those writings that are bound by metre, as in those
which are written by learned men in prose, as is evident in
the commentaries of poetry, and so it is better to call this
language more elegant or high language than poetical. Tamilians
call these two kinds டமில் and டமில் meaning
that the former is elegant, and the latter rough. "About the
high dialect I shall give later, God willing, a Grammar and
Lexicon; hence I shall speak here only of the rough or common
idiom of the Tamil language."

Why these two kinds of Tamil should be treated separa-
tely, he answers in the preface to his Tamil-Latin Dictionary
of common Tamil. In it he gives a comparison. High Tamil and
common Tamil differ as much as Latin and Portuguese differ. "And although there are many words common to Latin and Portuguese, not on that account has any one up to now dreamt of mixing together all the Latin words with the Portuguese in one vocabulary". Likewise he does not want to give the words of the two dialects in one dictionary and similar it may be concluded he does not want to give the rules for the two dialects in one grammar.

Hence it is the common language of the people of his days that Beschi intends to describe and give rules for, in this Grammar. This common Tamil, thinks Beschi, originates from the higher Tamil as from a fountain, and contains many (words and phrases) vitiated in course of time, and the native too, who are not completely rustics, rightly condemn such vitiated forms. This language includes writing as well as speaking. In his preface to his Tamil-Latin Dictionary of the common Tamil, he says: "Here as the title of the book sufficiently indicates, I shall record, arranged in alphabetical order, those words only which are commonly used in speaking and writing and belong to பொருள். His rules in this Grammar, therefore, apply not merely to speaking - though spoken Tamil is explicitly mentioned in places like Ch.I. sec. ii on the force of letters, and in No.197 to 200 - but to writing also as when he cautions about the wrong way of writing or refers to written books. This common Tamil is not left to
the caprice of any who uses it, but is bound by rules and so unwarranted usages in speaking or writing are condemned by the author. It has another quality, that it has different kinds of expressions: ordinary, elegant and very elegant. And still the distinction is clearly kept between the common and high Tamil by expressly pointing out their different usages; e.g.,  என்றை is used in high Tamil, என்றை in common Tamil (No. 41); derivative pronouns are used in அவன், அவள் not in common Tamil (No. 45) while அவன், அவள் are common in high Tamil, but அவன், அவள் in the common Tamil (No. 45).

There is also difference in the spelling of Sanskrit words. Where the common Tamil uses the hard 'i' like அருள்விவான் etc., the higher Tamil uses the medial like அருள்விவான் Beschi draws our attention to this fact in his preface to the Dictionary of common Tamil (No. 11) and concludes 'Let no one say that I am contradicting myself; but let him know that I write differently according to the diversity of the idiom'. Even the dictionary before starting the word அருள்விவான் he reminds us of this note which he has given in the Preface and in the grammar of Common Tamil.

PEDAGOGICAL PRINCIPLES:

Although modern linguists may differ from Beschi with regard to some points in his treatment of the common Tamil,
they cannot but approve of the principles of pedagogy enunciated by him in this grammar. The Jesuit Missionary students for whom this book is meant are all masters of arts, having had the full formation of the rather long Jesuit training. Knowing their position, Beschi aims, while instructing them in the art of Tamil Grammar, at making them Masters who could later instruct others in this very subject. 40 Hence he proposes to add the root of every spoken word, so that the students can find out by themselves such roots for other words. And he has the humility to add that there are words whose roots and get-up are not known and "although we make use of them we can never glory that we know them." Indeed, the parrot may falsely glory that it knows many things. 41

In the section on the Force (Phonology) of Tamil letters, Beschi states the truth, accepted by modern linguists 42 that the sound of letters must be learned from the mouth of teachers and imitated (No. 4); still in order to complete the treatment of letters, he intends to touch upon sound, not explain it. When he had done so, some one asked him, as he tells us (No. 5) to describe the sound in which the Tamils distinguish the long from short. He makes a comparison between Tamil and Latin and French and still adds rightly "it is as difficult to write about sound as it is easy to speak". 43

"In fact we call writing also a dead language as it unfolds words without sound. We know what Cicero wrote, but many are not sure in what sound he uttered what he wrote". 44 Closing
the section on the Force of letters, Beschi says (No. 7): "Let these suffice, that I may not waste time any more as if I would change the object of the senses and teach sound to the eyes."

Beschi brings examples from Latin, from French and Portuguese to make the Tamil rules clearer. It is to suit the mind of his students that he arranges the eight cases of Tamil into six (No. 35) as it is in Latin: Nominative, Dative, Accusative, Vocative and Ablative, as Balde did in his Dutch Grammar of Tamil. Knowing that the Catholic missionaries are at home in Latin, Beschi gives them a Latin versicle containing the modes of forming the Tamil past tense (No. 54). In a number of places Beschi points out the correspondence between Tamil and Latin, between Tamil and Hebrew, between Tamil, Latin, French and Portuguese, and also the difference between Tamil and European languages taken together. He cautions also against speaking Tamil in a western manner, not according to Tamil syntax. Like an interesting teacher, he mentions a humorous incident in which when a European missionary had long been preaching, an old woman frankly urged him: "What you discourse so elegantly in your language, please say it in ours." And the Missionary was put to shame, for he thought he was speaking Tamil. These instances and particularly the short index for 140 Latin particles and adverbs given at the end of the book justify the opinion of scholars that the Kodun Tamil Grammar of Beschi is an anticipation of the modern Transfer grammar, which teaches a foreign tongue on the basis of the learner's mother tongue.
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Mr. F. W. Ellis had a search made through A. Muthuswamy Pillai, at the beginning of last century, for Beschi's manuscripts. The manuscript of Clavis was one of the consequent acquisitions of Ellis, and later it was found in the library of Dr. Babington. It was first printed in 1876 at the Tranquebar Mission Press which had also printed the first edition of Beschi's Kodun Tamil. Mr. A. Burnell, Collector of Tanjore, who was a scholar as well as an administrator, saw to the printing of it and wrote a small introduction which ends with a justifiable pride; "The Tranquebar Mission Press which printed the first Edition of Beschi's Kodun Tamil Grammar in 1738, now also publishes the first Edition of his more important work."

Mr. J. Winson has raised a question about the authorship of this Grammar basing himself on the fact that the translations of the couplets of Tirukkural found in his book are different from Beschi's translation of the two parts of Tirukkural. As Besse suggests, being a master of both languages, Beschi could easily translate from one to the other, both accurately and without repeating himself. On that basis, namely the difference in translation of Kural, one could also raise a doubt about Beschi's authorship of Grammar of High Tamil and the
Tamil-Latin Dictionary of Common Tamil; for the first two couplets of Kural are differently translated in these books too.

First Kural: ஆன் தேவன்...

Tamil-Latin Dictionary
"Ubique gentium litterarum incipient ab uno A, non secus ac universus orbis ab uno Deo initium summit"

Clavis
"Alphabetical litterarum omnes incipient ab A et orbis universus a Deo initium summit" (p.46)

Second Kural: தேவன் தேவன்

A Grammar of High Tamil
"Quid prodest scientiarum nisi ad cultum Dei summis sapientissimi"

Clavis
"Quid didicisse prodest, si sapientissimum i.e. Deum non adorant".

Positively, very many instances can be brought forward to show that Beschi is the author of Clavis. In the very first sentence of the book the author calls himself the author of the Grammar of Common Tamil. And the same Grammar of Common Tamil is referred to many times in the book. Speaking of particles, the author remarks that தாங்க வங்க என்று have been sufficiently explained in the Grammar of Common Tamil and also in the Dictionary of Common Tamil. He refers to his Dictionary of Higher Tamil (namely திருத்தக்கொரி) where he says he has given examples of இனோர் தேவன் under இனோர் தேவன் 5. In his இனோர் the author
speaks of the fact that in தூரையன் நூல் (T.V.) he has written about the amplification of a particular topic following rules of Western rhetoric. And to exemplify the rules, particularly of Prosody and Figures of Speech, the author gives abundant quotations from or references to Tembavani and Tirukkaivalur Kalambakam. Such proofs and the personal touches it has to Beschi’s life and times (to be mentioned a little later) would make one think that the only excuse for Vinson’s doubt was his usual hurry which did not allow him time to read the book fully, as Fr. A. Solier, S.J., the Jesuit Mission historian opines.

Purpose of the Book:

Unlike the other grammars, Clavis has no preface by the author where he usually states the purpose of the book. It can however be inferred from the contents. In the chapter on Prosody before referring to the many rules like காண்டன் தூரையன், தூரையன் ஒருநாள் etc., which he terms useless, Beschi speaks clearly of his purpose. “But my intention here is not to blame or correct the ancient Tamils, but with the help of this key to open and expose for the benefit of the students, the precepts of the ancients, whatsoever they are” (p.120).

Here the title of the book 'Clavis......' (key) is also explained. The students Beschi had in view were the Catholic missionaries. As to the reason why he says, "as I am addressing masters of that art, it would be foolish to repeat them here" (p. 51).
The concluding paragraph of the book, serving as an epilogue, pinpoints the purpose further, namely, that the students are the missionaries of the Society of Jesus, to whom he had promised the writing this book. Here he stresses as he did in his preface to A Grammar of High Tamil, the necessity of knowing Tamil poetry; he urges the Jesuit Missionary to spare no pains to make use of his key (Clavis). "As soon as that is obtained, I will rejoice that I have received the reward of my study and labour, with a large interest" (p.160) as the position of the Missionary student for whom it was intended required.

**SPECIAL FEATURES:**

Though Clavis is just a Latin counterpart of Tonnul Vilakkam (தொண்ணுல் விளக்கம்), with its five parts, பகுதி, புதுமை, மகிழ்ச்சி, அரசியல், குறிக்கள், it is different from it in a few particulars as the position of the Missionary student for whom it was intended was different. It describes the letter ஸ் (p.8) and (p.3) that it is pronounced almost as the consonant 'g' with a heavy guttural sound, which is absent in Tonnul Vilakkam (suti. 13). With regard to the extension of letters (தொண்ணுல்) treated briefly in Tonnul Vilakkam (Suti. 18) Clavis (p.5-6) mentions a few more details like the place of சலிமூலம் in poetic measure and its use even in prose. Tonnul Vilakkam just mentions the fact (suti. 47) that சலிமூலம் and சலிமூலம் are not the same. Clavis states
clearly (p.16) how they are different in their simultaneous and non-simultaneous significances of many things. It also adds how ◀ differs from them in signifying many things at the same time, while not being one word. The five classes of enumerated in Tonnul Vilakkam (St.49) are given in Clavis (p.6) but neatly arranged under the three general headings of Synechdoche, Metonomy and Metaphor - terms familiar to students trained in the West. After exemplifying the terminations of imperative in the second person singular as in Tonnul Vilakkam (St. 113), Beschi adds in Clavis (p.38) a note about the terminations ▼ and ▶. From the verb ▼ comes the imperative ▶. "Thus Kambar in his poem Ramayanam, speaks of an ascetic, who while cursing his adulterous wife, had said:

'Become a stone'.

"<a class="" typeof="" foaf:Document"" about="" http://example.com/example"" xmlns:foaf="" http://xmlns.com/foaf/0.1/"" xmlns:xsi="" http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema-instance/"" xmlns:dc="" http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1/"" xmlns:rdf="" http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#"">""</a> Then he cautions the student to be careful to distinguish the positive imperative from the negative finite verb of the second person singular both of which end in ▼ ( Governments, Officials)

And ▶ also can be the ending of second person singular of the past as well as of the second person imperative. "Thus ▼ is explained as ▼. Thus ▼ is imperative for ▼ but here ▼ means ▼; these therefore have to be distinguished according to context."
The fact that the ஓவம் செய்து when it becomes a finite verb ஓவுவது will not require doubling of the following hard consonant (stated in Tonnul Vilakkam, Sut. 116 and Munnul Sut. 168) as in ஓவது போம் is given a reason in Clavis "The reason is that ஓவம் செய்து is ஓவது போம் that is to say, because with that word the sentence is complete" (p.39). A note is added to the effect that "the negative imperative ending ' ஓவார் ' and the positive imperative ending ' ஓவ் ' can be said to be ஓவம் செய்து as both those endings can be used also for the first person and the third person. Thus ஓவார் வைஏன் என்றும் ஓவ் வைஏன் என்று, குளள் குளள் என்று where குளள் is the same as ஓவார் Thus குளள் மடுகு குளள் என்று மடுகு குளள், குளள் குளள்

It is in the chapter on Porul that Clavis streamlines its difference from Tonnul Vilakkam. Nearly one third of the Porulatikaram of Tonnul Vilakkam is omitted in Clavis; it is, the first part dealing with "the development of a particular topic ( மன் மை ) which is new in Tonnul Vilakkam made by Beschi who is rather disappointed with the Tamil Grammatical tradition of restricting Porul to love and war, omitting in Akapporul other emotions than love and in purapporul, other things like sciences, government, commerce and other such things. But this insertion in Tonnul Vilakkam of how to develop a topic, Beschi realised, would be useless in Clavis.
which was meant for European Missionaries who were masters of that art. 12

In the chapter on Ani, Clavis mentions along with ஆசிரியர் and இயற்கையுடன் described in Tonnul Vilakkam (sut. 330) புரீட்டு பொய்யை, not found in Tonnul Vilakkam Ani iyal. The description of புரீட்டு in Clavis is a little different from that in Tonnul Vilakkam. Following the traditional explanation (as found in Tandialanka-ram sut. 36) Tonnul Vilakkam (Sut. 341) says that புரீட்டு sheds all distinction between the comparison and the object compared. Clavis (p. 145), besides the usual mention that புரீட்டு does not express cause of similarity nor the form (புரீட்டு), points out that it contains only the comparison and the object compared, and the object is placed before the comparison; for if it is placed after, then we have புரீட்டு இயற்கையுடன். Here Beschi's synthetic talent gives us one single phrase used in four different ways exemplifying ஆசிரியர், இயற்கையுடன், புரீட்டு, and புரீட்டு 12.

(ii) Latin Language and Literature:

Another characteristic of Clavis, is its frequent reference to Latin Language and Literature, mostly to show similarity to Tamil (more than Grammars of Kodun Tamil and High Tamil). In the treatment of the eight cases there is repeated mention of correspondence to Latin case, e.g., that the second case 'corresponds to our accusative', the third 'to our ablative of cause of association', the fourth 'to our dative' (p.18). The Tamil gerund (என்ன என்னம்)
different for each tense, does not fully correspond to Latin gerund; the past உடன் அம்முடு corresponds to Latin Gerund in 'do', but the present உடன் அம்முடு corresponds to Latin ablative absolute and the future உடன் அம்முடு to Latin gerund in 'di' or 'dom' or to participle in 'urus'... (p.41). And what is in Latin a conjunctive word (si) is placed by Tamilians among உடன் அம்முடு of the future ending in உடன் or உடன் (p.42)

In Porulatikaram, in connection with the propriety of season (கிளைன் பரவலா), Clavis remarks that to mix up in Tamil the fauna and flora of a particular time with those of another is as culpable as in Latin to attribute fruits to spring and flowers to winter (p. 54)

While speaking of உடன் அம்முடு (propriety according to place), Clavis quotes a Latin saying that not every part of the earth brings forth everything ("non omnis fert omnia tellus", p.58). In உடன் அம்முடு (propriety in regard to the conditions or qualities) Clavis asserts that the Tamil books say the same thing as Latin books of rhetoric with regard to the emotions of the soul, whether we want to create various feelings in the hearers or we want to describe the effects of each feeling (p. 59). To the Tamil custom called உடன் அம்முடு (which hiding the defeat or deformity) of a thing, names it as one possessing the opposite quality), there is a Latin example cited, namely, "that which does not
at all shine, like a dark thicket of trees is called lucus" (which means "that which shives") and one of the goddesses of Fate who spares no one is called Parca (which means she who spares).  

In prosody, the last syllable ( \( \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{e}}} \) ) of a word that is left over in something, is compared to the Latin Caesura (p. 66) although the way in pentametric verse is quite different. Two quotations are given from Virgil's Enèid and it is shown how the last syllables of some words are left over in scanning, and counted as long though in themselves they are short. This custom, "which among us is allowed as a license, is a necessary rule among the Tamils, and they are at fault who do not count as long, the caesuras though they are short in themselves". Just as Latin has ode, elegy, satire, epigram, etc., so Tamil has different poems with different requisites (p. 106) " \( \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{e}}} \) \( \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{e}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{e}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{e}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{e}}} \) " is among Tamils, the chief poem as among us the Heroic poem" (p. 109).  

The figure called \( \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \) which transfers the qualities of one object to another is the Latin metaphor (p. 129) \( \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \) \( \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \) which takes cause for effect and vice versa is the Latin metonymy (p. 129); \( \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \) \( \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \) by which we mean something other than what the words directly signify is the Latin metalapsis as in Virgil: "Post aliquot mea regna videns mirabor aristas" E.I. 70. And \( \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \text{\textcircled{\text{a}}} \) which exaggerates something incredibly and beyond measure is the Latin hyperbole (p. 130); The figure called
alias ιεροτήτης corresponds to seuma (p.132). The repetition of a word (αμαρτία) is called by our rhetoricians epizeuxis and polilologia. Thus in epizeuxis, Virgil wrote: "Ah Corydon, Corydon" and in polilologia wrote: 'Amma viri, ferte arma etc.' (p.134) which is the same as οὐκοσμήσον which is the same as οὐκοσμήσον in prosody is in Latin polyptoton (p.134). For the use of various synonyms to express the force of sorrow, anger, love, hatred and joy (εὐδαιμονία) an example is quoted from Cicero: abluit, excessit, evasit, erupit. "οἱ σκληροὶ is the same as among us 'similiter cadens, similiter docidens" (p.138) is consonance at the end of a line as is the case among us in the verses of ordinary language' (p.138). The figure of that uses words equal in everything except in a word or a syllable has a parallel in Latin, called Paranomasia e.g.

Hi morbis megrorum, aprorum litibus illi

Dant patienter opem, dum potiuntur opum (p. 139).

"οὐκοσμήσον" is simply our allegory, in which leaving aside the object of which we intend to speak, we expose only the comparison. Care must be had, however, that what we intend should not be altogether imperceptible. But we should see to it that from the context or other circumstances our idea is easily understood. As for instance the line of Virgil: 'Claudite jam rivos, pueri, sat prata biberunt' in order to say 'Be silent now, we have understood enough now' (p. 146).
(iii) **Personal Touch:**

Another special feature of Clavis is its abundance of remarks that reflect the conditions and customs of Beschi's times or his personal life. The very first paragraph of the book tells us of the esteem Nannul enjoyed in his days and the paucity of scholarship in it. "In this book the author promises to treat of प्रेमप्रासाद गामपिता but snatched by death, as they hold, be treated of letters and words only, in a sufficient largely volume. This is all the science contained in the booklet वि न्द्रण which they so much exalt and admire. It is the grammar that teaches Orthography and Syntax. But you will find hardly a few who have greeted it in passing (who have read it superficially); and those who have come up to its heels are considered to be very learned" (p. 1). We learn also that in his days उन्होंने भाषा was praised by all. Beschi points out a flaw in नन्दिका that in हाथ वस्त्र वर्ण items proper to rainy season are attributed to spring (in the नन्दिका 'नन्दिका के फल दृष्टि') and adds that otherwise the book 'is deservedly praised by all' (alias merito ab omnibus laudato') (p. 54)

The example for नन्दिका may perhaps reflect the custom of those days. "Thus to say दाता दाता दाता they often say दाता दाता दाता or दाता दाता दाता or दाता दाता दाता दाता These phrases are not borrowed from Nannul (Sat. 267) but used by Beschi in Toanul Vilakkam
(Sut. 194). If they are from contemporary use, as most probably they are, they echo the cultural level of the Tamils who would raise the ordinary action of eating common to all animals, to a human level by dressing it up with elegant phrases that breathe a philosophical indifference and religious worshipful attitude.

More than once Beschi describes the condition of the so-called poets of his days, whom he calls semipoets of versifiers. The cutting of the last syllable of a word and joining it with the first syllable of the following word, is elegant, states Beschi (p.66) in the metre called रूपत्वं - for which he gives an example from Kambar - and it is permitted in other metres too but never in नवर्षम् and "in this respect the semipoets of today err". Many of the 17 varieties of poems, Beschi tells us again, were hardly used in his days; still he speaks of all of them briefly lest one should charge him with omission (p. 78). After enumerating the different rules and kinds of Venba, Beschi draws our attention to the necessity in Venba of sublimity of thought and strictness and elegance of style. "For although one were to observe strictly the many rules given here, but were to use trivial language and put forth ordinary, despicable thought, he will be like a beast of burden which, clothed in tiger skin is grazing on grass. Most of the poets of today are of this kind. Therefore as models read गृहसूदा हुमल्र (तमिल), प्रदर्शन िवालम, दुनानद सदाबहस (P.82-83).
The variety called சென்குல் மேற்புறம் was very much in vogue in those days (p. 83) and கொலைக் கொன்று seems to have been in use among the learned of those days (p. 93). But the varieties of கொன்று were hardly in use in Beschi's days; but if any கொலைக் கொன்று was so compact as could be sung in tune of கொலைக் it was commonly called (p. 100). It is a pleasure to know that, like the children of our days, the children of the 18th century too learnt at school சென்குல் மேற்புறம் and கொலைக் கொன்று etc. (p. 106)

To make the progress in a short while, the student of Tamil Grammar must, Beschi advises, at the end of the book, read diligently two or three times these rules and reflect over them. At the same time he must be daily making himself familiar with examples from poets and in them try to recognise the rules. "Let him know, however, that among the writers of today, hardly one can be, by chance, found who deserves to be honoured with the name of poet. I would hardly call them versifiers, for they neither know well the rules of versification nor diligently observe (what they know). I would call them, not makers of verses but rather users of the ear (Non versifici versiculares sed auricularious......); for their poems are composed not according to the rules of metre but according to the sound of the ear, so much so that here and there they use often foolishly the common saying முற்றிலும் கொண்டு கொண்டே செய்தே as if, what is alright for the mouth is alright for the metre.
Therefore let the students read the ancient, read the masters of Tamil poetry, e.g., நாயனார், கண்ணவல்லி, சிங்கரசர், புக்கி, சி஡ினி. Let them read ஹரிகிரு, தொன்மா, மோகிரு, கார்மரன், நாதர் தலை தொம், காதா பாங்சா, கனவாசம்.

From Christian books let them read முதல் மார்க்கோஸ், சிங்கரசர் பாவலர், தெய் போன்று செவ்வாய் (p. 160-161)

From this passage we have an idea of the status of Tamil poetry in the 18th century and the Tamil books that were available then.

Besides these indications there are references that manifest Beschi's personal beliefs and philosophy. Beschi's philosophical bent makes itself felt in his treatment of the third case in Tamil (p.18) which, he says, is used to express the different kinds of causes; efficient, material, instrumental and final. And these are the classical divisions of course in philosophy.

Scholastic philosophy generally speaks of three kinds of good that which is honest, useful and enjoyable (bonum honestum, utile, delectabile). Beschi found that these kinds correspond to the Tamil அனுமன், வருணம், குறியும் he calls ஒரு bonum aeternum. This view of the four ends of Tamil learning அனுமர் வருணமா குறியும் பலகை (Mannul Sut.10) under the one aspect of good must have pleased Beschi much as he repeats it three times in the chapter on
Prosody (within pp. 108-15) first in the definition of கூச்சியமுகம் (p.108), then in the description of கூச்சியமுகம் (p.109) and lastly in the definition of புவூர்மை முருகை (p.115). Essence and existence are very important concept in Scholastic philosophy and in their application to God's nature different schools of thought have originated. Beschi uses these important terms for the two Tamil words of negation விநூல் and வீணை the former denying essence, and the latter existence (p.46).

A biographical indication may also be attempted from the study of this book. The beginning has references to Beschi's other works (as mentioned earlier) in phrases like 'Have given precept' in the Grammar of Common Tamil (p.1) 'and under this name I have given them in the dictionary of high Tamil' (p.48), 'in the book called Tonnul Vilakkam I have....... written many things about development' (p.51). Such a first personal reference is not found in other places. Speaking of particles (தொதும கிரு) Beschi says; 'Of these the particles சராசரியா, சராசரியா have been sufficiently explained in the grammar of Common Tamil and even in the Common Dictionary' (p.47). Referring to this is what we find; "this mode is the most elegant of all, though more difficult, in which the poem called Tembavani is unique, where not only the first syllable, but often the second and third fully rhyme in the same stanza" (p.74). Again in connection with the varieties in வோங்கியோ஘ு where there are 3615 stanzas, there
are likewise 90 நோக்கு பாடல் found" (p.102). This impersonal way is striking when we remember the passage in his Grammar of high Tamil, where he describes in detail his search for finding out the secret of the different cadences (நோக்கு பாடல் ) and concludes: "Finally, after reading many works, which I did, not without labour and diligence, I found, by God's grace, the rule from which the diversity of tone arises" (S.T.No.113).

"Those who do not know this rule praises Kambar for giving 87 cadences in his கம்பர் இள்ளானியல் that has 12016 stanzas; I in the poem called கம்பர் இள்ளானியல் where there are 3615 stanzas only, have without any trouble given 90 different cadences" (S.T.No.115).

A self-effacing attitude is more and more evident as the book proceeds. Giving an example from Tembavani for hyperbole (திருமொழியானை) Beschi says: "Thus quite boldly (the author) has written in கிணறு வருநூறு where he brings forward a person in lamentation" (p.130). After citing first an example from Tembavani for கிணறு வருநூறு he brings in a second one, with these words: "The same author, elsewhere...." (p.144). For hypotyposis (திருமொழியானை ) "an example from கிணறு வருநூறு where the way in which a woman was standing immodestly is described" (p.156). It is this modesty that makes Beschi mention his own poem Tembavani and கிணறு வருநூறு at the end of the list of model poems he recommends to the student (p.161).
When written?

In view of this self-effacing humility, evident in Clavis, particularly towards the end, it may not perhaps be too presumptuous to surmise that Clavis was written towards the close of Beschi's life. It is certain, however, that it was composed after the Tamil-Latin Dictionary, as the latter is mentioned in p. 47 of Clavis; and, as has been shown in the chapter on Dictionaries, Beschi's dictionary of common Tamil was completed in 1743 or 1744, and he expired in 1747. And so this much can be said that Clavis was written in the period between 1743 and 1747.

The frequent references to Latin Language and especially the quotations from Latin Literature (as shown earlier) makes one infer that Beschi must have, during the composition of Clavis, been in a place where recourse would be had to books of Latin literature. And from the life of Beschi (Besse p. 168) it is known that in 1746, Beschi was made visitor of the College at Ambalakat. "It must have been for him a true delight to find himself once more in so great a centre of intellectual activity". It was here that at one time young Jesuits were studying Philosophy, Theology and Belles Letters (Besse p. 169). This place must have had the classics of Latin and Greek. And as Beschi was here from 1746, it is probable that the Clavis, even if started earlier, was completed in Ambalakat, in 1746 or early in 1747, as Beschi expired on the 4th February 1747. Clavis may therefore be his very last creation.
Notes


2. Pars Prima οἶ ὁλοκαύτων "Licet in vulgari Grammatica cap. 1. plura de litteris Tamulicis praeceperim, monulla hic repetere..... censui", p. 1

3. 'Quare (1) is finale, ut et in vulgari dixi', p. 7; pluralis masc et fernics, ut in vulgari, p. 23; IN vulgari diximus.... p. 31; Caetera vide in grammatica vulgari p. 31; praetra jam dicta in vulgari grammatica p. 32. De his plura vide in grammatica vulgaria p. 32, etc., etc.

4. 'Ex his particulae α, ή, ο, ει, satis explices sunt in grammatica vulgari et in ipso vulgari dictionario", p. 47

5. οἴ ὁλοκαύτων vocantur etiam illae particulae, quae et dicuntur et sub hoc nomina eas dedi in lexico subliniones idiomaticus", p. 48

6. "Quare in libro, de quo supra, οἴ ὁλοκαύτων dicto, nostras rhetorum leges sequendo plura de amplifications scripsit..... p. 51.

7. pp. 74, 76, 84, 94, 95, 97, 100, 101, 103, 106, 122, 124, 130, 137, 139, 144, 145, 149, 151, 154, 155, 156, 159, 161.

8. Habes jam, amice lector, quam promiaram clavem, eaque reseret habes quique Tamlulici sermonis opes', p. 159

9. Though the editor Vedagiri Mudaliar had made it long with the additions of his numerous examples.

10. Clavis p. 50 'De aliis autem animi affinis affectionibus ac passionibus nihil omnino dicunt."
11. Clavis, p.51. "... neo quidquam aliud nomine explicant. Nihil de scientiis, de regione, de mercatura et hujusmodi quam pluribus".

12. Clavis, p.51 "Quare in libro de quo supra, dicto, nostras rhetorum leges sequendo plura de amplificationes acipai; qua tamen hic, cum illius facultatis magistros alloquar repetere insseptum esset".

13. Clavis, p.61 "ut apud nos dicitur lucus, qui minime lucet, et Parca, quae nemini parcit."


15. In Tonnul Vilakkam taking a couplet of Tirukkural

... Beschi shows a model preface (பாதகம்) to the development of a topic, in which he compares Tirukkural to a lonely star in a dark night, to a rare lotus in a desert land..

As in Tonnul Vilakkam (Sut.163) here also Beschi impelled, by his Christian sense of universal brotherhood, attacks the then prevailing Tamil tradition to be observed in

p.58 -that only Brahmins can teach divine law, only Brahmin kings and merchants can learn it, those
of the fourth estate are forbidden to learn it, "how unjust and unreasonable the tradition is it is needless for me to say here" (p. 59).