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V. VERBAL NOUNS AND DERIVATIVE NOUNS

5.0. Introduction:

Tolkāppiyātēr makes mention of a sub-class of nouns called 'toliṟṟpeyar' - "verbal nouns" in his work. Though structurally these nouns are formed of, or formed from verbal roots, their function is the same as of nouns. Like all other nouns, they occur as subjects and are capable of taking case markers (2.1).

The classification of parts of speech, in Tamil, can be made only to a certain extent at the morphological level, as there are a good number of forms which possess both the nominal and verbal functions. On investigation, it can be understood that many of the forms which will be discussed in the following pages (5.1-8) are veritable verbs in form. But at the syntactical level where their function is explicitly seen, one can find in them the nominal characteristic feature of functioning as subjects or taking case markers and hence may not hesitate to group them under the nouns, as a sub-class. It will be evident from the following study that the part of speech to which many of the verbal nouns belong can be decided only at the syntactical level.

5.1. Different Types of Verbal Nouns.

Tolkāppiyātēr refers to 'toliṟṟpeyar' "verbal nouns" in different places in his work. All those verbal nouns sporadically referred to, may be divided into three classes mainly from the point of view of their internal structural differences. A type of 'toliṟṟpeyar' which is discussed in Ḍuttatikēras while dealing with sandhi changes, is formed of verbal roots only. Another type,
which is referred to while defining nouns (§ 1.1), is formed from verbal roots by the addition of certain suffixes (markers). The third one is formed from verbal roots and is conjugated for tense, person, and number-gender, like the finite verbs. Much importance is given to internal structure to distinguish clearly the three classes of verbal nouns and the sub-classes are grouped under a particular class on the basis of their similarity in external distribution.

The three structural classes of verbal nouns are summed up here:

1. Verbal roots occurring as nouns,
   e.g., urif, porun, map, etc.

2. Verbal roots plus suffixes occurring as nouns,
   e.g., ceystal, uŋ탈, arulal, etc.

3. Finite verbs occurring as nouns,
   e.g., uyarton, ceystan, akuvatu, etc.

There is a sub-class of nouns, which is formed from verbal roots by the addition of certain nominalising suffixes, identical with the verbal nouns of class two in internal structure. They are set apart under a separate head, namely "Derivative nouns" (§ 5.9).

5.2. Verbal Noun Class I.

Tolkāppiyār speaks of the first class of verbal nouns in Eḻuttatikāram. These verbal nouns are structurally the same as the verbal roots (or stems). Some verbal stems without the addition of any formative or suffix form themselves into nouns and occur in the subject-slots.
According to Tolkāppiyār, the verbal roots with the final consonants -ṅ, -ṇ, -n, -m, -l and -l can occur as nouns, e.g., uriṅ, un, porun, tirum, val and tul.

These verbal nouns do not denote tense but occur as subjects and are capable of taking case markers, as all other nouns. (Many of these nouns ending with the above consonants are not in current use).

E.g., maṇṇu hāṉretu
porun-in-ai
uriṅ-in-ai (-ai is case marker)

These verbal nouns can be modified by the adjectival participles (13.16), e.g., tanta tirumāntetu.

It may be pointed out here that these verbal nouns may occur as preponds (14.7) of declensional compounds, which can be only nouns.

E.g., maṇṇu-k-kaḻumai
ceṇṇu-k-kaḻumai

According to Āḻavaiyer, the preponds of verb compound (19.9) belong to this class of verbal nouns, e.g., kolyaṇai, ceḻkum, etc.

Tolkāppiyanar points out that the verbal nouns with the final consonants -ṅ, -ṇ, -m, etc., may be followed by a euphonic (formative) -u⁴, e.g., uriṅu, porunu, ceṇṇu, etc.

Though Tolkāppiyanar mentions such verbal nouns, occurring only with the final consonants given above, he makes use of some others with final vowels also, e.g., aṣai, aṭi, uṇai, coḷ, icai, etc.
5.3. **Verbal Noun Class II.**

By way of defining the nouns in a *sūtra*, Tolkāppiyānār says that all nouns, except a class of 'tollippayar', do not denote tense. In the said *sūtra*, he makes use of a phrase 'tollilnilai-y-ottum' - "words which are identical with the verbs to refer to 'tollippayar'. There, all the commentators unanimously state that 'tollippayar' is of two kinds: one, which denotes tense and the other, which does not denote tense. For the former kind of 'tollippayar' tinṟan, uṇṭan, etc., and for the latter tinṟal, uṇṭal, etc., are given as examples. The examples uṇṭal, tinṟal, etc., fit in with the structure of the second class of verbal nouns.

These verbal nouns are formed from the verbal roots by the addition of -al and -tal or its phonologically conditioned allomorphs -ṭal and -ṟal. Though Tolkāppiyānār does not explicitly describe this class of verbal nouns, a number of forms of this class are found to occur in his work.

E.g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>affc(u)-al</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ancal</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>var-al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṁtal</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>ṁtal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nigral</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>nir-ṟal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uṇṭal</td>
<td></td>
<td>uṇṭal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Dr. Caldwell, these suffixes are generally added, not to the crude root, but to the formed verbal theme, e.g., the verbal noun that is formed from in-u is not in-al but iruttal and sometimes they are added to the ultimate base, e.g., pṟ-ṭal, ṁ-tal, etc.
These verbal nouns occur as subjects and are capable of taking case markers. Generally they do not denote tense.

E.g., pētal māryu “going is good”
awān varutul-ai-k- ūntē “I saw him coming.”

These verbal nouns are identical with the derivative nouns with regard to their formation. For example, cey-kai, akal-am, kol-kai, etc. These derivative nouns are not considered by Tolkëppiyayar or by the commentators of 'tolirpayar'. The word 'ceytal' is a verbal noun; but cey-kai is a derivative noun. Both are formed from the verbal root cey. The former means "doing" and the latter "action". The derivative nouns have completely lost their verbal significance, though they are also formed from verbal roots. Dr. Caldwell points out that though both are formed from the verbal roots, the former is construed as verbs whereas the latter merely as nouns\(^6\) (5.3).

One very important distinction that is observed and traced here is, that the verbal nouns of this class can be modified by the adverbial participles as other regular verbs, whereas the derivative nouns cannot be modified by the adverbial participles but only by the adjectival participles (12.16) as regular nouns.

E.g., cērntu varal (78, 1) (var-al)
ul̄utu nilam (nil-am)

Here, the verbal noun var-al is modified by the adverbial participle cērntu but the derivative noun nil-am is modified by the adjectival participle ul̄utu.
Thus it is concluded that the former, though occurs as a noun, has some characteristics of a verb, whereas the latter has completely lost the verbal significance (5.3).

5.3.1. Verbal Noun Class II Taking Tense.

A few forms of verbal nouns, though they are conjugated for tense, do have the function of verbal nouns of class two, i.e. though they are verbal nouns of class three in form, they are, functionally, verbal nouns of class two.

The neuter verbal forms, as Dr. Caldwell considers, are used in three different significations, viz., as third person neuter of the verb, as a neuter relative-participial noun, and as a verbal-participial noun. For example, ceytatu in the first connection means it did; in the second, that which did and the third the doing or to do. Dr. Caldwell explicitly distinguishes the verbal noun class two from the finite verbs and participial nouns (5.6) and identifies them as verbal participial nouns. Dr. Zvelebil refers to them as "conjugated noun" and points out that they are the forms ending in -tu and that they do not agree with the subject. Further he cites a few examples as to show their occurrence in Cañkam literature.

Evan kol tōli annai kappiyatu? (NT, 53)

"O friend! what is the mother\'s thinking?"

Nēm ceytatu onrillai (NT, 27) "We did nothing"

Here the nouns annai and nēm are not attributes. They and the verbal nouns, kappiyatu and ceytatu are in predicative relation but they are not in agreement. Thus they differ from the finite
verbs by their disagreement with the subjects. Here, it must be pointed out that the participial nouns (5.6) are not taken to occur as predicates. So, even if the verbal nouns taking tense occur as predicates they are not participial nouns (5.6).

5.4. Verbal Noun Class III.

Tolkāppiyār explicitly points out that a class of nouns denotes tense. He identifies this class also by the term 'toliippayar'. Sometimes he names the verbal nouns of this class as 'vipål' and as 'vinaippayar'. In the present study, though this class of verbal nouns is discussed under the common terminology "verbal nouns", it is specifically identified as verbal nouns class III or participial nouns. It may be mentioned here that Dr. Caldwell, considering this group as a class of verbal nouns particularly identifies it as "participial nouns". A large number of participial nouns are found to occur in Tolkāppiyam. Since the distinctive present tense was not developed at the time of Tolkāppiyār, one can find only the participial nouns of past and future tenses in Tolkāppiyam.

E.g., uyartõm (TC, 417) uyart-nt-o-m
parinto (TP, 41) pari-nt-o-l
umarnticær (TC, 116) umarntu-icu-in-ær
ceytatu (TC, 246) cey-t-a-tu
ottavaï (TP, 171) o-tt-a-vaï
ãkuvaï (TC, 77) ã-ku-v-a-tu
piripavai (TC, 50) piri-p-a-vaï

The participial nouns take tense markers. They occur as subjects and are capable of taking case markers. Tolkāppiyār
explicitly points out in Vilimarapu that this class of verbal nouns takes the vocative form of case.

E.g., (1) unṭan vantān "He who ate came"
       (2) vantān-ai-k- kāṇṭan "(I) saw he who came"

The participial nouns are morphologically the same as the finite verbs. Tolkieniyar makes this fact clear by a phrase 'tolinilai-y-oṭṭum', which means "the words which are identical with the verbs". So, it is evident that the participial nouns cannot be distinguished from the finite verbs at the morphological level. Generally the internal morpheme composition of a finite verb is stem tense marker person marker number-gender marker. So it is with the participial nouns too.

E.g., svan unṭan (finite verb) "He ate"
       unṭ-ṭ-e-n
       unṭan (participial noun) vantān "He who ate came"
       unṭ-ṭ-e-n

The participial nouns are capable of being modified by the adverbial participles as regular verbs. Thereby, though they function as nouns, they preserve the characteristics of verbs also, e.g., vantu cēṇṭan-ai-k-kāṇṭan.

Finally it may be summed up that though the participial nouns are structurally the same as the finite verbs, at the syntactical level they are substitutable for nouns.

5.6. Formation of the Participial Nouns.

Dr. Caldwell thinks that the greater number of these nouns are formed by suffixing the demonstrative pronouns, or their
terminations to the present and preterite relative participles. Thus according to him (ceykar-Aug / -avan = ceykar / ceykavan ) ceyta-Aug / -avan = ceytān / ceytavan is the formation of participial nouns. It must be remembered here that the present tense participial nouns had not developed at the time of Telkāppiyānār. L.V. Ramaswami Aiyar spines that the participial nouns are formed from the verbal participles with personal endings. Both the scholars describe that the participial nouns are formed from the participles, though they differ in explaining the type of participles.

In such a description they have to account for the participle markers. It would be better if the participle markers are dispensed with in the description of their structure. From a historical point of view, their description may hold good to some extent. According to Dr. Caldwell’s theory, only the past (and the present) tense participial nouns of the third person can be described. His theory fails to work in the case of first and second person participial nouns of different tenses and in the case of a number of future tense participial nouns. L.V. Ramaswami Aiyar’s assumption also does not hold good in the case of non-past participial nouns. So, it would be better and befitting to describe that the participial nouns are formed from the verbal stems by the addition of tense markers, person markers and number-gender marker, like the finite verbs.

5.6. Participial Nouns and Finite Verbs at the Syntactical Level.

L.V. Ramaswami Aiyar says, "The forms with -ār, -āṭ, -āy, -ār are genuine participials, wherever they occur in Cankām texts."
The grammarians describe some of them as "finite" forms; but this, I think, is due to the peculiar usage in Tamil and (in other Dravidian dialects) whereby a participial noun may be employed as a sort of predicate to complete the sense of verb-action. Dr. Zvelebil also cites a few examples with terminations -ēn -ēl, etc., as to the predicative usage of participial nouns in Cankam literature.

On makkam nokkiyēl (NT, 55) "She looked at my face".
Aiyilai varuvōl (NT, 308) "The woman with fair jewels will come".

Tolkāppiyar evidently states that -ē in the verbal terminations -ēn, -ēl, -ēr, -ēy may change into -ē in poetry. The commentators cite the following as examples for such a change.

1. vinēvi nilpantē (AN, 48) "He gave you after asking"
2. nakēm-p- pesantē (*AN, 348) "She moved smiling".
3. unti kotuttēr uyor kotuttē (PN, 18) "Those who gave food gave life".

Many of the forms with the terminations -ēn, -ēl, etc., in the cited examples occur as predicates. Here it is a difficult problem to decide whether they are verbs or (predicative) nouns. According to Tolkāppiyar, they are finite verbs occurring as predicates. According to the scholars I.V. Ramaswami Aiyar and Dr. Zvelebil they are participial nouns occurring as predicates. According to Tolkāppiyar, the verbal forms are nouns only when they function as nouns, i.e., when they occur as subjects or take case markers.
Thus in order to make a clear-cut distinction between the nouns and the verbs at the syntactical level, one must take all these verbal forms that fill up the predicate-slot, agreeing with the subjects, as finite verbs and not as participial nouns. This really helps to avoid the overlapping of the word-classes in Tamil language.

Thus it is concluded that the participial nouns are not taken to occur as predicates and that only when the finite verbal forms occur as subjects or take case markers, they are considered as "participial nouns".

5.7. Participial Nouns Formed from the Defective Verbs.

A few forms of the participial nouns (verbal nouns class III) formed from the defective verbs are found to occur in Tolkappiyam. This type of participial nouns are formed either by modifying the defective finite verbs or by preposing some nouns to them, e.g., "al(1)-a-tu (TE, 326), ul(1)-a-tu (TC, 314), al(1)-a (TE, 483), al(1)-aₐₐₐ, etc. (See note 28 on chapter X).

E.g., uyirmey allaga moli mutal akā (TE, 80)

ulła, alla (TC, 188). These participial nouns may be taken to be formed from the defective verbs ula and ila respectively.

A few examples from Cankam literature may also be cited here.

illor (PN, 95), uṭaiyar (PN, 223), uḷḷavai (PN, 326), allor (PN, 343). In all these forms, the defective verbal forms have undergone slight modification in form to form themselves into nouns and mostly they are preceded by some nouns,
5.8. **Other Participial Nouns.**

There is a different type of non-rational plural participial nouns, formed from the verbal roots, found to occur in Tolkāppiyam. The tense is not marked in them. But in the place of tense marker, an unassignable sub-morphemic element occurs.

i.e., ḍukuna (TE, 151) ḍ-ku-n-a

ceykuna (TC, 250) cey-ku-n-a

tirine (TE, 483) tiri-n-a

nukina (PK, 166) niku-n-a

varuna (TC, 250) varu-n-a

A few scholars consider the dental -n- which occurs in these forms, as a phoneme which might have replaced the alveolar -r. For instance, R. Seethapal in her thesis states that the dental in the place of alveolar can be explained as dialect variation. She further assumes "ceyun and ceyum may .... be pre-Tolkāppiyam singular and plural forms which later on lost such a distinction and came to be replaced by ceyum for both singular and plural."\(^{24}\)

L.V. Ramaswami Aiyar considers the above forms as of a type of future or aeristic participial nouns.\(^{25}\) According to his proposition, one can infer that they are formed from 'ceyun' pattern of non-past adjectival participles by the addition of pronominal termination. -a might have changed into -n- and it might have lost its tense significance in course of time. A few examples from Cankam literature will glean this inference more evidently.

E.g., var(u)-un-a-r (PM, 10) pṣṭ(u)-un-a-r (PM, 135)

ṭḥ-n-a-r (PM, 135) ḍnu-ṭṭ-n-a-r (PM, 361)
5.9. **Derivative Nouns.**

This class of nouns is formed from the verbal stems by the addition of certain noun-forming suffixes. The words belonging to this class is not dealt with but found used by Tolkäppiyawär. There is no evidence in Tolkäppiyaw to support for the inclusion of these nouns under 'tolirpeyar'. But Dr. Caldwell considers them as a sub-class of verbal nouns. The distinction between the verbal nouns class two and these derivative nouns is already described (5,3). Though the derivative nouns are true nouns and though their formation from verbal roots is not explicit, they deserve enumeration here, as all the nouns formed from the verbal roots are taken up for study in this chapter.

The different nominalising suffixes of the derivative nouns are listed here and a few examples are cited as to show their occurrence in Tolkäppiyaw.

1. **-ai**
   
   sat(u)-ai (TE, 110)
   
   tok(u)-ai (TE, 223)

2. **-am**
   
   akal-am (TC, 364)
   
   nil-am (TC, 81)

3. **-kai**
   
   iyar-kai (TE, 15)
   
   iyal ~ iyar-
   
   uva-kai (TC, 305)

4. **-cai or -ci**
   
   punar-cai (TE, 142)
   
   upar-cci (TC, 393)
   
   ḫat-ci (TE, 85) (kāṇ~kāṭ-)
5. -ti
   \underline{\text{ur-ti}} \quad (TC, 72)
   \underline{\text{vey-ti}} \quad (TC, 80)

6. -ttu
   \underline{\text{va\text{\textsuperscript{\text{-}}}ttu}} \quad (TP, 76)

7. -ppu or -pu
   \underline{\text{icai-ppu}} \quad (TI, 53), \underline{\text{iyal-pu}} \quad (TE, 288)

8. -mai
   \underline{\text{icai-mai}} \quad (TE, 39)

9. -vi
   \underline{\text{kila-vi}} \quad (TI, 34)

10. -vu
    \underline{\text{ele-vu}} \quad (TE, 50)
    \underline{\text{tele-vu}} \quad (TC, 249)

11. -i
    \underline{\text{veku\text{\textsuperscript{\text{-}}}i}} \quad (TC, 72)

---
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