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Dravidian family

The Dravidian family of languages comprises more than thirty languages mainly spoken in the Southern India. Robert Caldwell is the person who first coined the term Dravidian as a generic name for the south Indian family of languages.

There are differences of opinion regarding the subgrouping of the Dravidian languages. The general acceptance is the tripartite arrangement. Telugu, Kui, Kuvi etc are classified in South Central Dravidian due to their characteristics of language.

The North Dravidian language Brahui is the first to be independent from the protodravidian language spoken in Pakistan and Afganistan. More or less 5000 years ago Brahui separated from the ancestral language. Then after Kurukh Malto separates nearly five thousand years ago and then after separates each other. The Central Dravidian languages like Gondi, Konda, Kolami, Parji are separated three thousand five hundred years back from Proto Dravidian. The languages Tamil, Malayalam, Kannada, Tulu, Toda, Kota etc are the South Dravidian. Telugu, Kui, Kuvi etc are classified as South Central Dravidian due to their dual characteristics.

South Dravidian languages

The major South Dravidian languages are Tamil, Malayalam, Kodagu, Toda, Kannada, Tulu etc of which Tulu may be considered as the first language of South Dravidian, to be separated from it. Kannada is the second and Kodagu, Toda, Koda etc are the third, which separated from South Dravidian. Tamil Malayalam group considered being the one language in a very long time. Tamil and Malayalam both languages show resemblances with each other, so they might have originated from a common proto language called Proto Tamil Malayalam. The degrees of relationship of these two languages are comparatively closer than any other group of languages in the South Dravidian family.

In every speech community, the languages have tended to change and which spread to all the speakers of that language. But if the community is broken up due to migration, or due to invasion from outside or due to other external factors, the changes which begin or spread in that speech community cannot spread to other sub communities. Then the speech habits of the communities diverge and they cannot understand each other. Thus a
different or an independent speech sub community emerges. The languages of these communities are related and constitute family of languages. (Hockette, 1935)

**Linguistic theories**

There are different theories regarding the origin of Malayalam language by different scholars. Caldwell is the first one who opined on an authoritative basis about the origin of Malayalam language. AR Raja Raja Varma, Attur Krishna Pisharadi, LV Ramaswami Aiyar, Godavarma, Swaminatha Aiyar, Ullur S Parameswara Aiyar, K M George, Elamkulam Kunjan Pillai, Gundert, Kovunni Nedungady, S.V. Shanmugham, K.M. Prabhakaravarier, Namboodiri E.V. N are the scholars who put forward their theories regarding the origin of Malayalam Language.

The main theories about the Origin of Malayalam Language are

- **samskrtajañjavaatam** (from sanskrit)
- **svatantRavaadam** (Malayalam is an independent Language directly derived from the Proto Dravidian).
- **upacaakhaa vaadam** (Malayalam is an offshoot of Tamil)
- **misRabhaaṣaavaadam** (From the mixed language of Sanskrit and Malanaatu Tamil, a dialect of Chentamil)
- **puurva tamiļ malajaažavaadam** (From Proto Tamil Malayalam)

After the separation of other languages like Kannada, Tulu, Kodagu from the South Dravidian, there existed a language in Tamizhakam including Kerala and called as Proto-Tamil Malayalam. The Modern Malayalam and modern family develops an independent language from the Proto-Tamil Malayalam.

**Malayalam is derived from Sanskrit (samskritaJaña vaadam)**

The author of Liilaatilakam, Kovunni Nedungadi, Swaminatha Iyer, Vadakkumkuur Raja Raja Varma, C.V. Vasudeva Bhattatiri are the scholars who supports this theory.

**Liilaatilakam**, a 14th century grammatical treatise mentions that

‘ihataaval samskṛta maṇḍaadi

antjadaadimal

tasja samskṛtaal prabhavaasjtaal’

He again states that the language of kerala is different from the language of Chola Pandya countries. All the languages are evolved from the aadi bhaasa, Sanskrit.

**Kovunni Nedungadi**

He in his work Kerala Kaumudi mentioned as,

‘samskṛtahimagirigajita

draavīḍvaanji kalindaḷa miḷita

keeralabhaaṣaaganga
Swaminatha Iyer

He indicates that there are about one hundred suffixes employed in the cultivated Dravidian languages for the purpose of indicating the tenses and modes of verb forms. Most of the suffixes are of Indo-Aryan origin. The personal termination of Dravidian finite verbs and the pronouns of which in these termination are in many cases early forms and most of them are Aryan origin. The basic portion of the Dravidian vocabularies consists largely of words of Indo-Aryan origin, though owing the extremely limited character of Tamil and the other early Dravidian alphabets. These words have been greatly corrupted and are very difficult of recognition. These factors clearly indicate that Dravidian languages are in all their present essential features, a creation of Aryan and Aryanised immigrants from the north. The existence in the Tamil language of words and terms which are met within the Vedas and in the Avestic language. These words have disappeared from the post vedic Indo-Aryan tongues. This would show that these immigrants must have separated from the main body of Indo-Aryan in the north-west in pre-historic times. The Saint Augusta’s immigration to the south is the part of Dravidian civilization of the south, is the civilization of Aryans and Aryanised immigrants.

Vadakkumkur Raja Raja Varma

He said that the base of a language is its phonemes. The phonemes in Malayalam are developed from Sanskrit. All the Sanskrit phonemes are present in Malayalam language. The trivarnikas uses Sanskrit words in their own form and shape in the bhaasha in accordance with their certain rules.

e.g. karma > karmam, vrkṣa > vrkṣam, ūṣṭa > ūṣṭa, kṛttam > kṛttaaavu, anīm > oruma
deevaan > teevvar

svajameeva, keelanti, poṭibhi (Sanskrit case and gender system), panjiakaaran (by adding slet words) candrakala > candrkkala, varṣam > variṣam etc are some of the such words. Ramacaritam is a Tamil work. The words denoting home appliances, body, soul etc are the words from Sanskrit. The nouns are more important than verbs, which take resemblance with tamil. In certain grammatical system in Malayalam also is that of Sanskrit rules. The literary works also similar to that of Sanskrit. In education system the keralites gives more important to Sanskrit.

C.V. Vasudeva Bhattachariri

He mentions that Kannada is transformed as Tulu in Tulu region and in Kerala (malanaattu region) Tamil into Malayalam. These two languages are mixed language of Sanskrit and Prakrit. Malayalam belongs to Dravidian family. The Malayalam language departed from Tamil due to the influence of Prakrit, Sanskrit, Kannada, Tulu and other regional differences. He has not a strong opinion
regarding this. He states Malayalam and Sanskrit are same family members and is a mixture of Tamil and Sanskrit. He holds some grammatical resemblance with that of Sanskrit which Malayalam possess. In the phonological level, old Malayalam is too much complicated than Modern Malayalam. The increase in the phonemic units, new clusters etc keep Malayalam language differ from that of Sanskrit influence. The suffixes –l, –tti, –cci, –tti, for the feminine gender, neuter gender marker –am etc are from Sanskrit. In certain sandhi changes the Sanskrit rules are affected, like akasavarneedhiirgha in kari + ila > kariila. There are resemblances even in the syntactic pattern. These are the arguments to hold his arguments.

This theory is discarded by the Modern linguists as the Sanskrit and Malayalam are two languages comes under two different families.

**Malayalam is an independent language directly derived from the Proto Dravidian**

(svantantravaadam)

Attur Krishnapisharadi and K.M. George were the two scholars who had this theory. Godavarma, C.A. Menon and Ullur S. Parameswara Iyer are the scholars whose arguments partially support this theory.

**Attur Krishnapisharady** was of the opinion that at the age of Mahabali the Proto-Dravidian language begins to divide itself. There exist five independent regions like Andhram, Cholam, Pandyam, Keralam and Karnatakam, after the age of Mahabali. Telugu, Kannada and Malayalam became independent languages. The language in the Chola Pandya region named as Tamil like the proto Dravidian language.

The main arguments were,

-a ending words. ‘a’ is a vowel and ‘ai’ is a vowel closure. ‘a’ is easy to pronounced and so it is a character of Proto Dravidian. In Telugu -a is preserved as before, which is the first language family descended from proto Dravidian. Palatalised native of Centamil cause the change of a to ai. E.g. ciitai, katai etc. The author of mozhinuul says that ‘a’ forms are ancient. Later times due to difference in pronunciation changed into ‘ai’ forms. Tolkappium and Nannul hold that ‘a’ forms are pre forms.

**Personal Termination:**

The verbs in the proto-Dravidian language have both with and without Personal terminations. In chola Pandya regions the verbs seen with Personal terminations. Malayalam has forms without personal terminations. The word Tamil in certain books like Brahmandapuranam, Ramcharitam etc only denotes bhaasa and not centamil. The similarity of the certain words for home appliances is alike in centamil and Malayalam. This is not evidence for the theory of Malayalam is an offshoot of Tamil. Cognates are seen in other languages as Telugu, Kannada and Tulu. There are abundance of Tamil words in ancient works due to the another languages belongs to South Kerala. The Tamil kings were attacked the Southern Keralites in several times and established their supremacy. Their language thus becomes written language. The colloquial language in old Kerala were not considered as Tamil as if the works show Tamil influence. Centamil is also the language for education like that as Sanskrit. Tolkappiyar mentions four divisions for words as iyarcol, torcol,
ticaicol and vadacol. The twelve Kodumtamil countries which are adjoined to centamil countries use ticaicol. That means Tolkappiyar consider it as an independent language.

**Godavarma**

He mentions that the various linguistic changes are taken places from Proto Dravidian to Modern Malayalam. The ai-form in Tamil, e-form in Kannada and a-form in Telugu Malayalam are the various reflections of *ay-* in Proto-Dravidian. The verbal form with personal termination seen in Proto Dravidian language. So the presence of personal termination in the verbs of Tamil and Malayalam is from the Dravidian and later it is disappeared from the Malayalam language. The ṉR form in Tamil corresponds to -ṇ- form in Malayalam taken place in very old time. Like that of Kannada ṉd-forms (Malayalam) and the other branch shows ṉR-forms (Tamil).

**K.M.George**

The verbs without personal termination are also seen in the Malayalam language. The verb forms in important moods does not use the personal termination. So the pre forms of verbs are derived of personal termination and it is a later change. Majority of all changes, languages does not have personal terminations in the imperative verbs. The presence of samvrtookaara is the another character to show the independendancy of Malayalam language. The presence of certain proto form such as present tense marker -aan, the markers of personal pronoun such as nin-, plural marker-in for the imperative and the alveolar stop R in -attu etc are the proto form. These proto forms are underlying changes and Malayalam is directly derived from Proto Dravidian. These are certain words which is entirely different in Malayalam compared to other Dravidian languages. The Tamil word paṇ is very common in that language. In Malayalam it is used in peculiar meaning and if the Malayalam language is an offshoot of Tamil, the Malayali does not ignore the above words. The geographical isolation helps the language to be independent. The western ghats helps to departed the keralites from Dravidian and helps to mould an independent language.

R.Narayana Panickkar, C.A.Menon, Unnikkitavu etc are the other scholars who argues to support this theory.

**Malayalam is an offshoot of Tamil (upaçaakhaavaadam)**

Robert Caldwell, P.Govindapillai, A.R. Raja Varma, P.Sankaran Nambiar, L.V.Ramaswami Iyer, Ullur S.Parameswara Iyer are the scholars who make arguments to support this theory.

**Robert Caldwell**

Caldwell talks that Malayalam is an offshoot of Tamil differing from the disuse of the personal termination of the verbs and the larger amount Sanskrit derivatives. It is regarded as a dialect of Tamil rather than a distinct member of the Dravidian family. The separation from Tamil must have taken place at a
very early period. He illustrated that the word, which denote east is kiḻakkku means beneath, downwards. The word meelkku corresponds to denote west means upwards. These words are originated not in the western cost but in the Tamil Country.

A.R.Raja Raja Varma

The inhabitants of Malayalam land or Malainadu were Tamilians. Their literary language was called centamil and colloquial, kodumtamil, one of the varieties of Tamil from which the Malayalam language originates. He said that though the Sanskrit has influenced the language outwardly, the foundation and roof are those of Tamil. He has the view that the Dravidians are indigenous to South India who had spread all over the country before the Aryan invasion.

In the piidika (introduction) of his Grammatical work, Keralapaniniyam, he states that the dialect of Tamil, Kodumtamil changes into Malayalam due to the following reasons (1) Geographical Peculiarities (2) Cultural differences (3) Intermingling of Aryan and Dravidian (4) The author illustrates the six nayas or rules by which Kodumtamil changes into Malayalam. The rules are (a) aṉunaasikaatiprasaram (Nasalisation) (b) taalavjaadeeçam (Palatalisation) (c) sarasamvarançam (contraction of vowels) (d) puruṣabhedeñirasanam (Abandonment of personal termination) (e) kiloñpasamgraham (Retention of Archaic forms) (f) angabhaṅgam (Elision of contraction of letters.)

Geographical peculiarities

The old southern kingdoms of Chera, Chola and Pandya always quarrelled each other and at times Pallavas and other outsiders conquered their country. The Western coast belonged to the Chera. The chieftains of the country were independent. As long as Kerala was under the Tamil Kings, the literary language was Tamil. Even the old Perumals were the representatives of the Tamil Kings. By the beginning of the 14th century the power of the Tamil Kingdom declined. Ravivarma of Quilon was the last Kerala King whose time in South India is remarkable in the history. There was no central power in Kerala until the English entered into.

Cultural indifferences

The matriarchal system of inheritance, hairstyles, peculiar way of wearing clothes etc are considered peculiar customs of Kerala differs from that of Tamilians. Even if the political supremacy of Tamilians was there, there increase a social conscious between the two and it increase when the Tamil land get separated from Kerala. It indirectly influence to create a language differs each other.

The Brahmin Predominance and the Intermingling of the Arya–Dravida cultures

The Brahmin colonisation occurred in South India during the 6th century AD onwards, though their isolated immigration in small numbers already began before the beginning of the Christian
The Brahmins became powerful in Kerala during the time between 600-774 A.D. The beginning of Kollam era (825 A.D.), Sankaracharya’s intellectual conquest, Decline of Tamil Kings and the spread of anarchy brought forward a new age. The spiritual and temporal power of Brahmins increased and the sanskrit language and culture conquered the Dravidian elements. The Nambudiris changed their traditional customs to suit the social conditions of Kerala. The Aryans got intermingled with the Dravidian society and the Sanskrit influence is the predominant factor in the Evolution of Malayalam literature.

The Six Nayas or Rules Illustrated by A.R. Raja Raja Varma by which Kodumtamil changes into Malayalam

**anunaasikaatiprasaram (Nasalisation)**

" anunaasikaatiprasaram: anunaasika varnam tankku atutu pinnaale varunna varnam kharamaanenkil atineekuunti katunnu kayari aakRamiccu anunaasikamaaktittirikkum, anunaasikam mumpum kharam pimpum aayi kuttaksaram vannaal anunaasikam iraticca phalam ceyyum, kharattinRe uccaaranam veertiriccuc keelkkate aakum atinaal nk=nn, nc=nn, mp=mm, nR=nn

**Udaaharaṇam:** niṅkal = niṅaṅal; neṅcu=neṅnu tintaṅ=tiṅnaṇaṁ cimmuka= cimmuka vantaṁ= vannaṇaṁ
tiruppuka= tirummuka paṅci=paṅṇi cenRaṅ=ceṇṇaṅ maṅkaay=maṅna oṅRu=onnu paṅcam=paṅṇam

kaṅRu=kannu

kharavṛṇṇam oru pRaṭajāttinRe aadyaṅkṣaṅramaṇaṁ varunittēttēlaṁṁ iṁ niṇjam saaraṅvatRikamaṇaṁ kaṇuṁ. anāṅγeṇuḷḷa pRaṭayāṇaṅgā raṇṭennam unṭu. Tu ena bhuṭtaṅkalacihṇaṁ, kal enna bahuvaṇcenaṁ, maRRuḷḷiṭattu iṁ niṇjam cilappool pravarttiyykkumenne uḷḷu. anunaasikattuṇu atuttu varunna varṇaṭṭekkuṭti taṅṅil laįippiccu saaṛuupjam koṭṭkkattakka oru prabha čakti malajāaṭṭil katānnukūṭukājaḷ atu malajaṭṭikalute samskṛutoocchaaraṇaṭṭinježum baadhisṭṭaṛuṇṭu. samskṛtattilakumpool kharatteekkaladhiṁkam mṛduvīṇaṇu iṁ maarRam sabhavikkuka

maṅgalam- maṅṇalam, maṇṭapam- manṇapam, ambaa-amma

aṅγaṁ- aṅṇaṁ, caṇḍaṁ- caṇnaṁ

enaaḷ tadḥbhavāṇaļļaḷaṭte tatsaṃaṇaļḷi aṇunaasikaatiprasaram eḻutumpoḷ ceyyaRaRilla.

( Raja Raja Varma , 1917, p:58)

(Nasal assimilation: The surds that changed into nasals, change into nasals in clusters with nasal as first member and surd as second member, the nasals get doubled, the pronunciation of surds become indistinct. Thus ṇk-ṇṅ, ṇc=ṇṅn, nt=nn, mp=mm, nR=ṇṅ The rule will be applicable when the first sound in suffix is a surd. The past tense marker ‘tu’ and the plural marker kaḷ are two such suffixes. The rule is optional elsewhere. The tendency in Malayalam to assimilate the sound following a nasal into a nasal effects the pronunciation of Sanskrit as well. In Sanskrit the change is more among sonants than surds.

maṅgalam=maṅṇalam (marriage)
aṅγaṁ=aṅṇaṁ (charcoal)
manḍapam=manṇapam (stage)
candaṇam=cannaṇam (sandalwood)
amba=amma (mother)

Normally the nasal assimilation is effected only in tatbhavas and not in tatsamas in writing.)

(Roy, 1999 p:15)

taalavjaadeecam (Palatalisation)


ala-alaintaṇ=alaṇcaṇ=alaṇṇaṇ
aRi- aRintaṇ= aRincaṇ= aRinṇaṇ
piṭi-piṭittaṇ=piṭiccaṇ
vai-vaittaṇ=vaiccaṇ(veccaṇ, vaccaṇ)
vaa-vaaṭṭtu=vaajccu
cii-ciintu=ciṣcu=ciṣṇu
tee-teeantu=teencu=teeṇṇu
aintu=ançu
nerukkam=nerukkam
naṇ=ṇaṇ
naṇṭu=ṇaṇṭu
narampu=ṇarampu (Raja Raja Varma, 1917,p.59)

Palatalisation: The t-class of sounds according to the tamil alphabet consist of t and n only. Their combinations result in three clusters namely tt, nn, nt. If the vowel preceding them is one of the palatal a, i, e, or ai, the palatal quality extends to these dentals making them palatals. The rule was named
as the palatalisation in view of the dentals getting changed into palatals. the change should be according to
correspondences or instance.

t→c, tt=cc, n=ɲ, nn=ɲɲ, nt=ɲc

This rule also is obligatory in the case of suffixes only the main examples being past forms
ending in ttu and ntu. Note that when nt changes to ɲc, nasal assimilation also occurs making the final
form as nn.

ala-alaintaan=alaɲcaɲ (he roamed)
arI- arIntaan = aRijɲcaɲ=aRijɲnaɲ (he knew)
pitI-piɲttaaŋ=pitIccaɲ (he caught)
vai-vaittaaŋ=vaiccaɲ=vaccaaɲ, veccaaɲ (he placed)
vaav- vaajtu=vaajcu (insceased)
cii-ciɲtu= ciiɲcu=ciiɲu (decayed)
tee-teentu=teenɲu (become)
aintu=anɲcu (five)
naan=naan (I)
nerukkam=ɲerukkam (poverty)
naɲtu-ɲanɲtu (crab)
narəmpu = ɲarəmpu (vein) (Roy, p.16)

svara samvaranəm (contraction of vowels)

Here the vowel is not pronounced sufficiently opened and with clarity but closed and
with reservation. This is visible mainly in the pronunciation of ‘u’, because it is pronounced with contraction (closed) it is called ‘samvruta’ or contracted u. This occurs in Tamil also but as a defect in pronunciation not affecting grammar or meaning. As for Malayalam, the difference generally indicates whether a verb is finite or non-finite. The rule is open u means finite verb or a predicate form and other u means non-finite verb or verbal participle. Finite verb     kaɲʈu (saw) keeʈʈu (heard)

verbal participle (kaɲʈu (having seen) keeʈʈu (heard)

Nominals

canɲku (name of a person) veelu (name of a weapon) caɲ ku (heart)

Closed u is not usually taken as a vowel, but as a vowel shade to ease the difficulty in
pronouncing consonants occurring finally. It undergoes elision when followed by another vowel and does
not cause gemination etc. In Tamil grammar it is relevant as other vowels. As in Tamil usages with gemination like muttukkuṭa (umbrella decorated with pearls) and maṭṭuponṭkal (a festival of animals are still available in Malayalam)

The ai at the end of stems and suffix was become a. Tamil malai, ilai, vilai, uṭaija, uṭainta, ainantu. Malayalam mala (hill) ila (leaf) ila (of) aṭṭan. (he obtained) aṇcu (five) as in the example cited last non-final ai also occasionally becomes a. In Sanskrit ai is considered as a diphthong resulting from a=a+ai. In Malayalam however it is the Tamil pronunciation which is warranted. The sense behind the nannul sutra

“ ammuṉikaramj akaraneRivai jejiţajaa-

tticaikkku mavvootuvum vavvumauvoorannaṉ” Gives the exact structure of the vowels ai and au.

ai=a+i or a+j

au=a+u or a+v

Of these two types of splitting, Karnataka adopted the first and Malayalam the second.

Tamil Malayalam Karnataka
malai malaj madai, made (hill)

The j is auspicious in sandhi only. Due to this feature the resulting a can be distinguished from the regular a as in taṭai-taṭa-taṭajunnu (obstructs)

taṭa-taṭa-taṭavunnu (smears) in which the resulting form ai is supported by v. The ai of Tamil ai changed to e in Karnataka; Because of this is in areas adjacent to Karnataka. Based on this the a in Malayalam had to differentiated as palatal a and pure a. ‘a’ was replaced by e till recently in certain forms particularly those followed by suffixes beginning with kk as in maṇekku (for rain) marekkunnu (gets frozen). Several such instances are found in the dictionary compiled by Gundert.

Though not to the extent of generalization here are instances of interchanging of a and e as well as i and u

Tamil Malayalam
coleṉam colleṉam (should recite)
parumaaRRam perumaaRRam (dealing behavior)
paṭuka peţuka (get involved)
puraavu piraavu, praavu (dove)
piraṉ puraṉ (lord)
colkinRaṉ colunnu (recites)
nāṭṭiṉpuram naṭṭumpuram (village)
samajattįṅkal samajattįṅkal (during)
The change of enam to anam and inRaan to unnu is regular) (ROY p.16, 17 and 18)

purusabheedaniraasam (abandonment of personal termination)

In Tamil suffixes of gender, number and persons are added to finite verbs.
e.g. avan vantaan ‘he came’
avar vantaar ‘they came’
nii vataaj ‘you came Sg’
niir vantiir ‘you came pl’
niir vanteen ‘I came’ (malayalam has abandoned these suffixes)

If samvṛta u (ɯ) is pronounced as full-u (eg. vannu ‘came’) it showed the verb was complete. In malayalam, vannu denotes an incomplete verb and elided the personal termination and it differs from Tamil.

In Sanskrit the independent words and their changed forms like the suffixes are so different that one cannot recognize their connection.

Eg. aham ‘I’ + -mi (First person Sg suffix) = bhavaami
But in Tamil, avan connaan ‘he said’
niir conniir ‘you said’

khiloopasamgramham (Retention of Archaic forms)

Some old usages in Tamil are now obsolete in Tamil have been retained in Malayalam.

Eg. In Malayalam,(piviojajeccam) Future participle marker -aan kuljikkaan vannu.

In Tamil kuljikka vantaan

vaan / paan, the future participles said by Nannuul is no more used in Tamil language, but retained in Malayalam language.

Malayalam uses (muviojajeccam), past participles even when (naτuviojajeccam) present participles is used in Tamil.

Eg collattuτaŋki aa (Tam.) > colittuτaŋŋi (Ma.)

Present participle (nατuviojajeccam) exist only in passive voice in Malayalam.

Eg.collepeτum and some words like collaam ‘may say- permissive’

Another change in the addition of particle eŋkil instead of the conditional suffix il.

Eg. pookil ‘if you go’ > poojeŋkil ‘if you went’ pookunneŋkil ‘if you go’ etc
In imperative II person plural, Malayalam retains the personal suffix by adding -in to the root or -um ending future

Simple root form
Malayalam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tamil</th>
<th>Malayalam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ín-</td>
<td>-um-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varuvin</td>
<td>varum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keelum</td>
<td>keelkuvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keeil</td>
<td>keeilpiin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tamil poetry -iŋ is used rarely. In Nannul -miŋ/ -piŋ is given just like vaan/ paañ. According to A R Raja Raja Varma, the -iŋ the suffix of imperative plural and -aan the suffix of future participle had become obsolete even at the time of Bhavanandi, the writer of Nannul, hence it has assumed that Malayalam had begun to follow an independence status in many ways even before the grammar was stabilised in Tamil.

angabhangam (contraction of letters)

angabhangam

cila paajaja draavidia praktikaaliejum pratijanñaliejum malayalaabhaa saukarjattinuu veenți akšaraloopam ceju curukkiįtuntu. ii vaka ruupaanñal vaalum talayum muRijkkumpool unťtaakunna vairuupjam koňtu kantaal aRijaatta vidham maaRippojirikkunnu.ivañjil cilatinRe aagamatteppaRRi vaijaakaraňnaarkku tăiąge tarkkam tiirr南宁lla.eetaanum udaaaharaľnaal.

In Tamil, the suffix of imperative plural and -aam the suffix of future participle had become obsolete even at the time of Bhavanandi, the writer of Nannul, hence it has assumed that Malayalam had begun to follow an independence status in many ways even before the grammar was stabilised in Tamil.

angabhangam (contraction of letters)

“angabhangam

cila paajaja draavidia praktikaaliejum pratijanñaliejum malayalaabhaa saukarjattinuu veenți akšaraloopam ceju curukkiįtuntu. ii vaka ruupaanñal vaalum talayum muRijkkumpool unťtaakunna vairuupjam koňtu kantaal aRijaatta vidham maaRippojirikkunnu.ivañjil cilatinRe aagamatteppaRRi vaijaakaraňnaarkku tăiąge tarkkam tiirr南宁lla.eetaanum udaaaharaľnaal.

In Tamil, the suffix of imperative plural and -aam the suffix of future participle had become obsolete even at the time of Bhavanandi, the writer of Nannul, hence it has assumed that Malayalam had begun to follow an independence status in many ways even before the grammar was stabilised in Tamil.

angabhangam (contraction of letters)

“angabhangam

cila paajaja draavidia praktikaaliejum pratijanñaliejum malayalaabhaa saukarjattinuu veenți akšaraloopam ceju curukkiįtuntu. ii vaka ruupaanñal vaalum talayum muRijkkumpool unťtaakunna vairuupjam koňtu kantaal aRijaatta vidham maaRippojirikkunnu.ivañjil cilatinRe aagamatteppaRRi vaijaakaraňnaarkku tăiąge tarkkam tiirr南宁lla.eetaanum udaaaharaľnaal.

In Tamil, the suffix of imperative plural and -aam the suffix of future participle had become obsolete even at the time of Bhavanandi, the writer of Nannul, hence it has assumed that Malayalam had begun to follow an independence status in many ways even before the grammar was stabilised in Tamil.
“(Mutilation:- Malayalam has reduced the size of some of the Dravidian roots and suffixes by elision of certain sounds for the sake of convenience. As in deformities occurring when the head and the tail are cut off, the forms have changed to the extend of beyond recognition. Disputes regarding the original forms of some of them still continue.)

A few examples

a) Markers of the purpose denotative (chaturthi) and sociative (sasti) cases namely ‘kku’ and ‘uṭaija’ respectively are occasionally reduced to u and uṭe/ṭe.

avaṇ (he) avaṇu-avaṇu-
avaṇuṭaija>avaṇuṭe-avaṇṭe - avaṇRe (his)
avaḷ (she)- avaḷku-avaḷuṭe (her)

The rule followed is that the highly reduced forms ‘u’ (it can be ṇu or ṇu) and ṭe will occur in nouns ending in ‘ṇ’ either by itself to with the linkmorph ‘iṇ.....’

The change in the sixth case marker ‘uṭaija’ to uṭe at first and then to ṭe=Re might have happened gradually. The highly reduced form ṭe was generally acceptable only when preceded by ṇ. The reduced form kuṭṭiṭe(of child) is not usual in writing as the forms avaṇRe (his), naattuṇRe (of sister in law). Elision of the fourth case marker kku is likely with the view to remove the uneasiness felt when it follows unrounded u as in avaṇukku(to him) and viṭṭukku (to house) where kku is appropriate as in avaḷku (to her) and avar-kku (to them). It is maintained. The tendency in Malayalam is to pronounce samvṛta to the minimum extent possible.

veṇṭum=veṇṭum=veṇṭum=veṇṭam=aṉam (wants)
cejjaveṇṭum, this changed into cejjaṇam (wants to do) aakum=aam
cejjaakum=cejjaam (will do)’’ (Roy, 2002 p.22-23)

The Malayalam language is a dialect of kodumtamil, one of the Tamil dialects as mentioned in a Tamil poem,

“teṇpaanṭ i kuṭṭam kuṭam karkka veṇ πuṛi
panRi aruvaa atani vaṭakku nanRaaja
ciitam malanaaṭu puṇanaaṭu centami ṭu ceer
eetami ṭ panniru naa ṭ ten’’

Malayalam, 12.Punalnadu. Among these twelve countries, five like, Kuttam, Kudam, Karkka, Venadu, Puzhinadu are in Kerala. Centamil was the language of Madurai region around which the Kodumtamil land situated.

L.V.Ramaswami Aiyer

He argues that Malayalam is mostly related to Early Middle Tamil. He mentions phonological and morphological features that of Tamil-Malayalam group.

Phonological features:

The alveolar plosives and the sandhi contests in which they occur.

The persistence of l and R, c from k.

The difference between dental n and alveolar ṇ.

The regular sonatisation of intervocal surds.

The uniform sonatisation of surds and affricates in the consonant group with nasals.

The development of the affricate c from k.

The palatalization of -k- in internal position.

External sandhi of different types particularly in compounds.

Many internal sandhi changes.

Morphological features:

Many suffixes associated with gender.

Plural formation with -maar.

Casal terminations, augments and mant post positions.

Verb bases with the kaarika affix.

Transitival bases.

Present tense ending.

Formation of past stems.

Infinitive participles with vaam etc.

Many imperatives.

Negative tenses and forms.

He again points out some of the Malayalam morphological features which can be historically derived from a stage corresponds to middle Tamil. Among the nominal inflections the instrumental aal,
singular genitive –ṉRe, the locative -il, and –ka]. The use of the plural –ka] for rationals as well as irrationals and of the double plurals in the –maar, -gal post positions like koṇṭu, kuRiccu, vare , pillal etc the comparison -il and kaaṭṭil.

The pronouns niṉṇa[< nimka], ṇanṇa[ of naṅgal, eṇṇa[< enga] avarga] and the use of ava in the oblique forms without the augment. Verb bases of the type pe đukk, beside pe đuutt- bales like nirutt-irutt- (absent in old Tamil), the causative endings ( from middle tamil vi type) the old Malayalam personal endings-aan, -aar, -een, -oom, -aaj, the present tense –inn,-unn ( from middle Tamil –g, ind) the conditionals with -il, the concessives with –aanum, -eenum, -eelum, the use of optical endings –ga for the first and the second person, the employment of the infinitive participles with –vaan, -ppaan, and many negative verb forms. It concludes with that Malayalam is most intimately related to early middle Tamil.

Ullur S.Parameswara Iyer

The pazhantamil is divided into North and South Dravidian in a very early stage prior to the contacts with Aryans and Dravidians. This South Dravidian branch develops into a colloquial language with its own peculiarities. The literary works were originated on the third century B.C. in the artificial mixture of Centamil. The spoken language of the South Dravidians were slightly differs in their dialect in eastern and western region of the western ghats. Kodum Tamil in Kerala differs from that of the Chola region. The dominance of centamil in the centamil region makes the Kodumtamil to diffuse into the supremacy of Centamil language. But in Kerala the South Dravidian language exist thereafter with its own peculiarities. Ullur S Parameswara Iyer illustrates his own arguments to prove that Malayalam is older than that of Tamil. According to Tolkappiyam, Sutra 399, -a ending forms in Malayalam are older form. Malayalam does not abandoned the personal termination, as the Centamil has forms with Personal Termination. Aytam is not seen in pazhantamil. Aytam develops in Centamil like that of visarga in Sanskrit. In Malayalam there is no Aytam. The word paṇakika, atakkiña in Malayalam is older than that of Tamil words like paṇakiṇa, atakkiṇa etc. The suffix -aañ is present in Pazhantamil and Malayalam. But is absent in Tamil. In pazhantamil, the case marker for madhyama purusan is niṉ- and in middle tamil it is up-. The Malayalam preserves older form. The forms in Malayalam like aaji, aavum etc is more older than the forms present in Tamil aaki, aakum etc. The Nasalization and Palatalisation is not only a feature of Malayalam. This is a feature of South Dravidian and is prior to the origin of Centamil. Malayalam preserves the protoforms. The augment –attu in maṇajattu, nilaavattu etc are present in Old Tamil as well as Malayalam. There are some archaue forms in centamil works that cannot understand by a Tamilian, but easily by a Malayali. These are arguments regarding the Origin of Malayalam language to support this theory.
From the mixed language of Sanskrit and the Malainattu Tamil, a dialect of Centamil (miçrabhaṣaavaadaṁ)

Elamkulam Kunjanpillai

This theory was brought by Elamkulam Kunjan pillai, who was a historian rather than a linguist. His theory is mainly on the socio-regional aspect than the linguistic features. The migration of Nambudiris and their dominance in Kerala were the cause of the origin of Malayalam language. This migrated Arya Brahmin may speak Sanskrit or Prakrit. When they communicate to natives, they speak their own language intermingled with that of Centamil. Thus a mixed language known as bhaasaamisRam or misRabbaasa is modulated. The trivarnikas in the Kerala might speak in centamil. The trivarnika’s language may be called as bhaasa or Tamil. But this time does not indicate the eastern Tamil. Nambuudiri’s misRabhaasa also influences the malanaadu Tamil. In the early stage, the Sanskrit was dominated in this misRabhaasa. Thereafter Tamil get dominated and the character are quite difficult to ascertain because the non-availability of concrete evidence.


(Kunjanpillai, 1953, P; 36)

(…the domain power of Nambudiris prior to the beginning of the Kollam era and the political dominance after the tenth centuries make the Malanattu Tamil as a separate one. MisRabhaasa, the mixed language of Sanskrit and Tamil is evolved out before this period. But it came to an absolute power over Malanattu Tamil only after getting the supremacy of Nambudiris. Their absolute power tends to change the language of common people. So the supremacy of Namudiris and the influence of misRabhaasa helps to modulate the malanattutamil as a separate one.)

Proto-Tamil Malayalam

This theory is based on the linguistic families and the new changes taken place in the respective periods. Kamil Zvelebel, A.Govindankutty, S.V.Shanmugham, Namboodiri. E.V.N etc are the scholars who hold this view in their own different ways.

Kamil Zvelebel

Proto South Dravidian may divide into two branches on the basis of the occurrence of protoforms and the new changes. One is Tamil- Malayalam (more accurately as proto literary Tamil) and Kannada. Tamil-Malayalam shows its own peculiar characteristics such as (1)retroflex continuant (l) (2) Alveolar stop (R) and the new changes such as Proto-Dravidian e\o vowels changed in Malayalam as i\u if the next syllable
follows a. $k > c$ because of palatalisation if the next syllable not preceded by $t, n, l, R$. Morphologically certain other similarities also observes, the unity of Tamil-Malayalam like changes in present tense marker, suffixes -$aa$, praşıyaka suffix $vu/ppu$ etc. In the middle of this Proto-Tamil Malayalam, the west coast language departed and become an independent language. According to the inscription the new changes begin in a 9th and 10th century onwards.

Malayalam shows,
The phonemisation of the enunciative vowel $u$
Alveolar and Dental Nasal have got different phonemic status.
$-\text{aj}>a$
Nasalisation
Palatalisation of past tense marker and it also in the colloquial Tamil
$\text{aj}>e$ in the accusative case marker
The sixth case markers $u\text{taj}>u\text{te}, \text{nte}>\text{nRe}$
The fifth case markers $i\text{nukku}>\text{n}/\text{nnu}$
$\text{kinRu}>\text{unnu}$ (may be from $u\text{n}tu$) for the present tense marker
Abandonment of personal termination.

The language prior to the 12th century shows similarity with the colloquial language of Proto Middle Tamil and Middle of the Middle Tamil. After that the Westcoast Tamil dialects undergoes continuously new changes and the Malayalam becomes a new independent language in the Dravidian family.

Govindankutty
There is a common proto stage for Tamil and Malayalam. The west coast dialects get departed from Proto-Tamil Malayalam at a very early stage. The west coast dialects preserves proto forms like the palatal nasal($n$). In Tamil ‘n’ is seen instead of $n$, prior to the sangam age. The inflectional base of the second person singular for the proto forms preserves $i$ in Malayalam. In Tamil $i>u$ due to new changes. For e.g. $u\eta, u\eta, u\eta, u\eta$ Tolkappiyam 367, illustrates sandhi changes $l+k > Rk$. Malayalam does not show this change because malayalam language may separate from Tamil prior to this change taken place in Tamil.

S.V. Shanmugham
He points out the origin as well as the evolution of the Malayalam language. Tulu as the first language get departed from the south Dravidian language. Secondly Kannada and there after Kodagu. Toda and Kota get separated independently. After that there was a common or a proto stage for Tamil and Malayalam.
The linguistic changes in this stage are

*$k > c$ e.g. *kevi > cevi
Certain Numerals like toŋŋuuRu, toļaajiram
The masculine gender markers like *aajan *valaijan *paarppaŋ etc and the feminine gender markers like aajatti, vaŋŋaatti, paat̚ṭi, ciRumi etc.

There are also some characteristic features of Malayalam language originated prior to that of Sangam age. Some language changes influence west coast dialects. These changes are

The dropping of j- initial position.

e.g. jaaRu > aaRu, jaamai > aamai/ aama jaanai > aaŋai/ aaŋa

Palatalisation of aaŋtti> aaacci/aacci, iżaatti> iṭaacci/iṭacci, viḷaintu> viḷaiŋcu/ viḷaŋnu.

Plural suffix -maar
Augments seen in numerals aŋ > in e.g. iraŋnaŋai > iraŋṇine/raŋṇine

At the Sangam age, the literary language of Keralites was Centamil and the spoken language is Proto Malayalam. This has acquired only a status of a dialect and it is the conscious of the Keralites felt that this language is different from that of Tamil.

There are also some scholars who have their own observations regarding the origin of Malayalam language. Vellaykkal Narayana Menon, C.L.Antony, R.LeelaDevi, V.I.Subramanyam, S.Shajahan, K.M.Prabhakaravarrier etc are the scholars who made their observations.

K.M.Prabhakara Varrier

There is a common proto stage for Tamil- Malayalam. There are different reasons like historical, cultural, geographical and social factors, which help to modulate Malayalam as an independent language. Malayalam shows similarity with Tamil in grammatically and morphologically. It is difficult to ascertain the period of separation of Malayalam as an independent language from Proto – Tamil Malayalam. The evolution takes place through centuries. The preservation of Proto Dravidian features is not an important factor to deal with the origin. Naturally these features are found in independent languages which derived from the proto-Dravidian. The new changes found common in Tamil Malayalm except other South Dravidian languages shows there is a proto stage for Tamil- Malayalam. The separation of Tamil- Malayalam begins prior to the Sangam age. The dialect of west coast differs from that of eastern dialects prior to sangam age, this does not mean that it has an independent status. It differs like Lakshadweep Malayalam with that of common malayalm like that there exist in Kerala a similar difference after the Sangam age. The literacy language is not a reflection of colloquial language. These two were not so different because of education, political unity, conscious of the society and easiness for intermingling. But in olden days, this is a very difficult situation and
Ramacaritam does not show the reflection of colloquial language. The term Tamil used by some older poets in their works does not refer to a general term 'bhaasa'. tamiḻaajikontaRijikkunneṉ is the style existed at that period. The centamil became a literary language at a very early age. In kerala also the literary language was centamil. The colloquial language was not independent and distinct. Ramacaritam is the work of Northern Kerala and is used for daily reading in the houses. The folksongs are not the written records and it can’t be dependable for a linguistic observation or on historical evidence. The new evolutionary change is the development of Malayalam taken place through the inscriptions and literary languages. The 14th century grammatical treatise Liilatilakam mentions that Keralabhasa is different from Pandya Tamil; Sanskrit language helps to modulate the language of Kerala. There are no written regional evidences in Kerala until 9th century. The reflection of regional developments in this language are seen in Vazapally and Tarisapally inscriptions. The characters of west coast dialects are seen in Ramacaritam and Bhaasakautaliiyam and totally changed at the age of Krishnagatha. There is an evolutionary change between 9th-13th centuries. There lies a half-truth in the misRabhaasaavaadam of Elamkulam Kunjanpillai and samskrtaavadam of antony to illustrate the development of prose language as inscriptive language.

“�ங்ஙே க்ருட்டுவர்ஷாங்கோம்வள்ளம் ப்ராதீஸ்கற்காங்கைக்காக்காண்கையுனால்பாழமலாயலாக்கொழுத்தோம் வரையுள்ளோம் அதிச்சேம் வெக்டாட்டில்மாளாய்மிழ்று. அம்பாடூர்மான் வெட்டை கூட்டட்டில்வெண்டங்களித்துவருகைவல்லறுக்கு வாழ்வால் காப்பினூட்டக்கர்வாடனர். அதிச்சேம் வாரமுத்தில்குறுத்தந்ததற்காலினும் ஈடுக்கியம் யாராவரையாலும் ப்ராசர்மின் ஓர்ந்தவிடுமுன்முன்விளக்கை. அம்பாட்டூர்மான் ஓர்ந்தவிடும்விளக்கையுள்ள கொட்டைலையை பாராஜான் கோட்டிக்காட்டு.”

(Prabhakara Varrier, 1982. P;206)

(In the beginning of Christian era, the proto Malayalam as a regional dialect became slowly changed until 9th century. Thereafter a thorough increase in this change. The spoken language of the 9th century Kerala is very much separated from the spoken language of Tamilakam. The literacy language also show the reflection of the changes in the spoken language. The language between 9th and 13th centuries may not be called as Tamil or Malayalm. It may be named as early proto Malayalam. Regional dialect after the 13th century might be called as Malayalam in absolute power.)

E.V.N. Namboodiri

In his book, malayalabhaashacaritram, he said that at the 12th century onwards the malayalam became independent, that is at the end of the period of the Kulasekhara empire.

Centamil is the only language for administration at the time of first chera empire. Even the names of the king were in Tamil like Utiyanceralan, neduceralatan, cerancenkuttuvan etc. But at the time of second chera empire the Sanskrit became dominant. The relation with the Tamil language
gradually decreases in the keralites and inclined to Sanskrit. The people of Chola Pandya countries gradually think that keralabhasha is different from their language.

There are certain evolutionary changes which separates the Malayalam and Tamil which occurs before the modulation of Centamil. 1. The phoneme aytam(˚˳˚), The author of Lilatilakam, 15th centuary grammatical treatise said that Ayta varnnam is not occur in Keralabhasha. Tolkappiyam,Nannul, Virachozhiyam etc consider the Ayta varnnam as carppezhuttu but it differs from kuttiyalukaram,kuttiyalikaram because it has a script.Aytam is consider as a Tamil alphabet and malayalam separates from Tamil at the time when Tamil language possess the Aytam script. 2. Personal pronoun - first person singular tamil-naan malayalam ṇaṇ. The changes jaan > naaŋ > naaŋ is natural unlike jaan > naaŋ > naaŋ( A Raja Raja Varma). 3. Second personal pronoun Singular Malayalam- niŋ ( eg. niŋñe,niŋakkü) Tamil- uŋ ( Ṉññe, Ṉñakkü). Malayalam form is the proto form. In Kannada it is like malayalam niŋ- ( eg. niŋña, niŋnage). 4. Demonstratives malayalam and Kannada possess a, i.e. Tamil have anta, inta, enta. So malayalam forms are older than that of Tamil. 5. nR- nn formsnR> nd>nn in Malayalam as in Kannada. But in Tamil nR > nn eg. onRu> onnu.

Modern Linguist are of the opinion that Malayalam language is from Proto- Tamil Malayalam. The proto forms of all the Dravidian languages are Proto Dravidian. Brahui is the first language to be separated from the Proto- Dravidian language, more or less fivethousand years back. It is the language of Pakistan and Afghanistan. The Kurukh- Malto separated from the Proto- Dravidian language first four thousand years back. Later they separated as two languages as Kurukh and Malto. They are the North Dravidian Languages. The Gondi,Konda, Kolami, Parji etc are the central Dravidian languages,separated three thousand and five hundred years back. The South Dravidian languages were formed after the separation of Central Dravidian. Tamil, Kannada, Malayalam, Tulu, Kodagu, Toda, Koda etc are the South Dravidian Languages formed after the separation of Central Dravidian. The languages like Telugu,Kui,Kuvietc shows the dual characters of central and south Dravidian and are known as South Central Dravidian.

Tulu is the first language separated from the South Dravidian. Kannada,Kodagu, Toda and Koda getting separated after the Tulu in respectively. Tamil and Malayalam to be continued as a single language in a very long time. Their stage is known as Proto- Tamil Malayalam. Modern Linguist are of the opinion that Malayalam is originated from the Proto- Tamil Malayalam. It is considered generally that the Malayalam and Tamil get separated nearly between 5-9th century A.D.
Gopinathan Nair. B.

The sub-grouping of PSDr. Based on the phonological isoglosses diagrammatically represented as follows.

(Gopinathan Nair, 1978, p: 665)

Limited Examples of words which shows assimilated and nonassimilated forms from 9th century to 15th century (inscriptions (9, 10, 11, 12), Ramacaritam (RC) KannasaRamayana (KG) and Krishnagatha (KG) works.

Anunaasikaatiprasaram (Nasalisation)

9

N+ H.S. N+N

ŋk>ŋŋ

aŋkaṭi
aṭaŋka
catāŋku
taŋka[
tiŋka[
tuṭaŋki
teeŋkaaj
Itnækzi
ijaæamaŋkalam
tuțæki
teeŋkaaj
paŋku
maŋkalam maŋnalam

Itnækzi
uellotŋka
paatuaŋkum
paatuaŋŋu
maŋnalam

Itnækzi
ciŋŋaaajiru
ceŋkottaaru
paŋku
aŋkanaŋlil
aŋkatæn
aŋki
aŋku
aŋkuliijam
aŋŋu
aŋŋuliijam

aŋkam
aŋki
aŋkitam
aŋŋu
aŋŋæi
atæjaalæŋŋaı
aravan[ŋ]
cavan[ŋ]
cavameedhan[ŋ]
aabharan[ŋ]

ang
angada
angam
angul
angulijam
mangala

KG
ankanam
ankam
anki
ankitam
ankuram
alaṅkaaram

agra[ŋ]
agnane
agnaatī
agnū
attanī
agnān[ŋ]

X

9

aṅcuvan[ŋam
aiṇṇauRu
paṅcakaṇṭi
praṇjali
manjiiram
manjula
manjulam

ntnt
9
iranțu
jaanțu
10
iranțu
jaanțu
11
iranțu
jaanțu
12
raṇțu
jaanțu

RC
aanțu
aanțu
iranțu
iranțu
kaṇṭaka
kaṇțam
kaṇți
kuṇṭalam
tanțu
tanțaar

tonțuuRu
paṇțu

pukaṇṇa
peṇṇu
naṇṇṇa
aṭiyantiram
aṇupantam
amainta
intu-kotaivāṁmar
kovintaṇ
cantaṇa
cantiraceekaraṇ
caanti
carṇnavarajaka
tantati
pantiranṭu
pantiṟaṭi
nantaavijakkku
panniranṭu
pannirunaṇji
munnaṇji
cenneṇaṇ
tantati
pantirukajaiṇu
munnaṇji
munnuurRuvər
vannu
vaajanna

11
iruntu
irunnu
ciaanti
carṇnavarajaka
tantati
pantirukajaiṇu
munnaṇji
munnuurRuvər
vannu
vaajanna

12
arantai
irunnu
kovintaṇ
caanti
camantar
tantati
toruvaangantapurattu
nantaavi|akku vanna
vaajaran

RC
akantu akannu
akintu
aanganta
aangantaram
aanganta
antam
antaram
anti

KR
akanna
atjantam
aangantaram
anta
antakan
antam
anti

annu
amirnna
alintaar
alintu

nd>nn
indiraan
indiivar
konnu
cenna
cennu
toonni
poonna

**mp:mp**

9 aimpattunaalu
10 ampatinaali
cempoŋ
11 ajmpatiŋ
neţumpuRattu
12 nampi

RC
akampaṭi
akampaṇaŋ

KR
akampaṇa
akampaṇaŋ
ampalam
ampu
amma

**mb:mb**

 jihadists
jambdviipu

KG

**mp:mp**
akampaṭi
ampaŋ
amma

mb:mb
  kambu
  cumbāṇam
  cumbitam

NS clusters change into NN clusters except mp and ṇṭ. The inscriptions(9th century) show only one word with NN cluster except few words like taŋŋal, maŋŋalam etc in later centuries. The rules are partially operated in RC and KR. The assimilation is fully operated at the time of KG.

Taalavjaadeëam (Palatalisation)

Example words of palatalisation
(t=c, tt=c, n=ŋ, nn=ŋŋ, nt=ŋc)

9
Without palatalisation
  amaitta
  aintu
  cantiraatittar
  cejvitta

with palatalisation
  aiŋŋuuRu
  ilakkiccu
  cejviccu
  camaiccu

10
  ceentan
  amaitta
  aŋŋaaŋi

11
  naaŋ
  amaitta
  aaticcaŋkootai
  eŋtuccitu

12
  naanku
  amaicca
The palatalized forms in rare occurrences are seen in the 9th century inscriptions along with words without palatalized forms. The later inscriptions show an increase in the number of palatalized words compared to the words without palatalisation. The RC shows only 31% of palatalized forms due to the imitation of Tamil language (GopalaKrishnan Nair). In KR, it is partially operated. In KG there are all palatalized words except one ‘uratta=says’
Svara samvaranam (contraction of vowels)

Samvrtookaaram

The u after the canonical pattern CVCV+V will take V glide. The u elsewhere before a vowel will become zero. The zero u will be samvrtookaaram. The preserved u will be the rounded u.

9  jaaɳʈu + u| > jaaɳʈu| 'in the year'
    ulaku+ um > ulakum 'and the world'
    iranʈu + um> iranʈum 'and two'

10 iccelavu+um> iccelavum 'their expense and'
    uppu + um> uppum 'and salt'

11 veenaat[u + uta]ja > veenaatuta]ja 'for venadu'
    vannu+ iruntu > vanniruntu 'came and sat'

12 irunnu + atil> irunna]il 'sit in it'
    celavu + atu > celavatu 'paid'
    RC kantu + illa > kantuilla 'not see'
    keetu + ilaata > keetuillaata 'defect not'

   tannu + oru > tannor 'that which given'
   vinnu + i]tu > vinni]tu 'put while stands'
   ninnu + ennu > ninnennu 'where stands'
   eetu + oru > eetoru 'which one'
   jaaɳʈu + ul > jaaɳʈu| 'in the year'

The consonants will not geminate after the samvrta u but the words with the gemination are also seen.

In certain compound words duplication takes place with k,c,t,p. There are also examples of words which show without duplication of k,c,t,p.

9 ceppu +pattiram > ceppuppattiram 'copper vessel'
    niiru + tu]li > niirttu]li 'waterdrops'

Without duplication

   maRuku +talai > maRukutalai 'head'
   naalu + ku]t[ > naluku]t[ 'fourfamilies'
   iranʈu +ku]t[ > iranʈuku]t[ 'twofamilies'

   vinnu + i]tu > vinni]tu 'put while stands'
   ninnu + ennu > ninnennu 'where stands'
   eetu + oru > eetoru 'which one'
The duplication of stops takes place after vinayeccam. The words without gemination are also seen.

Without duplication

vaa|jiccu + ko|vitu > vaa|jiccuko|vitu ‘being lived’

KR an|a|ntu + ko|a > an|a|ntukko|la ‘come near by’

Without duplication

vaa|jiccu + ko|vitu > vaa|jiccuko|vitu ‘being lived’
With duplication X

Without duplication

\[
\text{konṭu + vannu} \rightarrow \text{konṭuvannu} \quad \text{‘brought’}
\]

The reduplication with and without are seen after the plural markers

9 X

10 caatukka[ ‘poor people’

11 X

12 X

RC puuvuka[ ‘flowers’

puukka[ ‘flowers’

KR puukka[ ‘worms’

puuvuka[ ‘flowers’

KG peṇṇuṇṇa[ ‘women’

pačukka[ ‘cows’

After postposition and cases, reduplication takes place.

9 iravikku + tan > iravikutta[ ‘a personal name’

10 meetṇaajjiRu + cejta > meetṇaajjiRRucejta ‘in the Malayalam month of medam’

tiruvathikkku + cellaaingRa > tiruvathikkuccellaaingRa ‘for the king to go’

12 X

RC iraamaṇuुkkuccetja ‘for Rama’

KR X

KG X

The final -ai of the words and suffixes contracts to change as-a

9

talai

kai

ellai

vilai
piṟai
eṇṇai

10
aanṭai
illai
ivai
uccai
eṇṇai
kaaraanṭmai
koottai
tuṭai
kai

11
arantai
kai
aamai

12
arimaiṭai
aatai
iRa
oolai
karai
tuṭai
maṭai
kai

RC
aruvai
iṉai
iṇa
irai
In monosyllabic stems ai in the word final and medial position has changed to ‘a’ before word juncture except in KG.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>amaiccu</td>
<td>‘to be settled’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>paRaiŋnu</td>
<td>‘said’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>amaicca</td>
<td>‘to be settled’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>olai</td>
<td>‘palm leaf’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-ai is retained in monosyllabic words and in the first syllable in combination with a consonant in non monosyllabic words.

9  kai  ‘hand’
10  kai  ‘hand’
11  kai  ‘hand’
12  kai  ‘hand’
RC mai  ‘black inn put in eye’
KR aivar  ‘five persons’
KG pai  ‘hunger’

a/e, i/u changes in free variations
The inscriptions shows ‘a’ instead of e in majority of words.

9  paṭṭa  ‘done’
10  muṭṭaavilakkku  ‘lamps in the temple’
11  tanṭam  ‘punishment’
12  tanṭapattu  ‘punished’
RC and KG are words which freely varies with a~e

RC  iviṭakku~iviṭekku  ‘this place to’
KR  atel~atāl  ‘sorrow’
KG  tenṭam  ‘punishment’
i/u  u~i
9  jaṇṭu  ‘in the year’
tarissaappalī~tarisaappalī  ‘Teresa church’
10  celitta~celutta  ‘to execute’
These changes described by A R Raja Raja Varma in the KP, does not affect the grammatical core of the language. The change is only affecting the peripheral system of the language.

**Angabhangam (contraction of letters)**

**The Dative case markers**

9  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tarissappallju</th>
<th>‘for Teresa church’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tarissappaalljikkku</td>
<td>‘for Teresa church’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cuntarangukkku</td>
<td>‘for sundara’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tevaarkku</td>
<td>‘for God’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nakarattukku</td>
<td>‘for the city’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10  
| caantikkku | ‘for peace’ |
| vittinu | ‘for seeds’ |
| iccelevaikkukku | ‘for expense’ |
| perumaikkku | ‘for perumal’ |

11  
| avanku | ‘for him’ |
| iramaanukku | ‘for rama’ |
| celavinu | ‘for expense’ |

12  
| naanku | ‘for me’ |
| avaRRikkku | ‘for them’ |
| onRinu | ‘for one’ |
| viroottatinu | ‘for the enemity’ |

RC  
| iramaanukku | ‘for Rama’ |
| KR | avajkku | ‘for her’ |
|    | atijanu~atiyanu | ‘servant I for’ |
|    | atinu~atinu | ‘that it for’ |
|    | ninakku | ‘you for’ |
|    | tanikkku | ‘oneself for’ |
|    | enikkku | ‘I for’ |
|    | tamukku | ‘of them they for’ |
|    | nammakku | ‘we for’ |
|    | sutajkku~sutakku | ‘daughter for’ |
|    | avarkajkku | ‘that they for’ |
| KG | acchanu~acchanu | ‘father to’ |
|    | kanni~kanni | ‘eye to’ |
|    | namukku | ‘us (incl)-to’ |
|    | tanikkku | ‘oneself to’ |
|    | enikkku | ‘I-to, to me’ |
|    | ammajkku | ‘mother to’ |
|    | aaccimaarkku | ‘cowherdesses-to’ |

### The genitive case marker

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>peRRutaija</td>
<td>‘by birth’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>puRampu</td>
<td>‘of land’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>paRampui</td>
<td>‘of land’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kurRijuuru</td>
<td>‘of kuRRiyur’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>tirukkojilu</td>
<td>‘of temple’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>munnaanaatuvu</td>
<td>‘of munna country’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>koottuttaija</td>
<td>‘give off’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tirunaakkaanattaaru</td>
<td>‘tirunaka country natives of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>atikaru</td>
<td>‘of the authors’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>raamante</td>
<td>‘of Rama’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR</td>
<td>arajaannatti</td>
<td>‘king swan of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aangaaj</td>
<td>‘elephant of’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Origin of Malayalam Language

There is a common proto form for the Dravidian languages known as Proto Dravidian. There is a PSDr after the separation of other Dravidian languages. There is a common proto stage for Tamil and Malayalam known as Proto Tamil Malayalam. Malayalam Language is originated from the Proto Tamil Malayalam. Malayalam were getting independent from the 9th century onwards.
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