CHAPTER XII

IMPERSONAL FINITE VERBS
XII. IMPERSONAL VERBS

12.0. Tolkëppiyânar gives a list of verbs common to both the rational and non-rational classes (8.2). The second person verbs, the optatives, the adverbial participles, the verbs denoting negation, the form 'ceymanâ', the 'ceyyum' pattern finite verbs, the adjectival participles and the word 'vēru' are included in the list\(^1\).

The second person verbs are already discussed under the personal finite verbs (8.6, 7). Though the non-finite verbs (the adverbial participles and the adjectival participles) do not denote person and number-gender like the impersonal verbs, they are discussed in a separate chapter since they occur only as adjuncts to verbs or nouns, whereas the other kinds of verbs in the list occur as predicates.

The verbs which do not denote person and number-gender, but occur as predicates may be identified as impersonal verbs. Their person, number, etc., may be identified on the basis of the person, number, etc., of the subjects with which they occur.

The impersonal verbs which are discussed in this chapter are the optatives, the 'ceyyum' pattern finite verbs and the verbs denoting negation. According to Tolkëppiyânar, the forms of the ceymanâ pattern and the word vēru are also impersonal verbs. They are also studied and their characteristics are assessed in this chapter.

\(^1\) TC, 222.

Note
XII. I. OPTATIVE VERBS

12.1.0. The optative verbs, in Tamil, convey request, wish, command, injunction, etc. Tolkappiyar terms them as viyankol. 'Viyam' means 'eval' - 'command'. When a command is expressed in the polite form of a wish it is termed as an optative. This is what Tolkappiyar means when he uses the phrase 'eval kanniya viyankol kilavi' - 'the optatives expressing the imperative signification'.

12.1.1. References to Optative Signification.

In a sutra, Tolkappiyar refers to the optatives with final - in Clutatikaram, when he deals with the sandhi changes. In the immediately following sutra, he says that -ya of valiya may be dropped. Tolkappiyar does not mention that the form 'valiya' is an optative verb; but all the commentators are agreed in considering it an optative verb.

In Itaiyiyal, he refers to the optative signification, when he says that -ma is an expletive of 'viyankol' - 'optative'.

E.g., purkal unka ma korkeyone "0 Lord of Korkai! let us take gruel"

12.1.2. Usages and Restrictions.

Tolkappiyar sanctions the usage of the optative verbs in the rational and non-rational classes.

E.g., avar valka "May he prosper"
    avar valka "May she prosper"
    avar valka "May they prosper" (rational)
    atu valka "May it prosper"
    avar valka "May they prosper" (non-rational)
Further, Tolkëppiyangär says that the optative verbs do not occur in the first and second persons\(^7\). Thus it is evident that the use of optative verbs was restricted to the third person only at the time of Tolkëppiyangär.

But in Cankam literature, the optatives appear to have been used in the first and second persons also, e.g., \(vāliyar yē\) (\(PN\, 385\)) "May I live long"; \(nī vāliyar\) (\(PN\, 157\)) "May you live long"

To explain such usages, the commentator Ĉānavareiyar points out that the sūtra, which restricts the usage of the optatives, employs a phrase ‘\(mannētūkum\)’, which means "does not stand permanently" and that, therefore, it does not embody an absolute rule\(^8\). Perhaps this may be a much better explanation than the suggestion recently made by Dr. P.S. Sastry, that the verses containing the optatives used in the first and second persons might have been composed after the time of Tolkëppiyangär\(^9\)

An argument by way of strengthening the view of Ĉānavareiyar may also be cited here. Tolkëppiyangär enumerates eight kinds of common verbs (8.2) in a sūtra\(^\, 10\). In the following two sūtras he discusses the second person verbs which are restricted to second person only\(^11\). Immediately after that he mentions in a separate sūtra that the remaining common verbs occur in all the three persons and five genders\(^12\). Then, immediately follows the sūtra that restricts the use of optatives to the third person\(^13\). Thus, by the way in which the usages of these verbs are discussed in Tolkëppiyang, it can be inferred that Tolkëppiyangār is prone to think that, though it may be the common feature for the optatives to occur in the third person, they may also rarely occur in the first and second persons.
Venkataramulu Reddiyar suggests that since Tolkāppiyar explicitly refers to the optatives with final -a only in his work, he means them only, when he restricts the use of the optatives to the third person; that in the first and second persons the optatives with some other endings may occur and that the occurrence of the optatives with final -ka in the persons forbidden by Tolkāppiyar, is against the rules of traditional grammar. It must be pointed out here that Reddiyar interprets the optatives with -a ending as the optatives with the suffix -ka, e.g., celka, valka, etc. 14 However, the explanation of Reddiyar does not elucidate the grammatical rule further and it has to be interpreted only in the light of the arguments cited already.

Tolkāppiyar sanctions the use of the same optatives as predicates, even when the subjects consist of both the rational and the non-rational nouns. 15

i.e., āṇuṣāṇum celka "May the cow and the herd go"

Such a usage is possible, as there is, in them, no pronominal termination to restrict them to particular numbers and genders.

12.1.3. Various Forms of Optatives.

Though Tolkāppiyar refers to the -a ending optatives, he does not enunciate their actual forms. For them, the commentators and Venkataramulu Reddiyar cite the following examples: celka, vāliya, valka, etc. 16 As mentioned earlier, the form vāliya referred to by Tolkāppiyar may be taken as an optative verb.

It is worthy of notice that Tolkāppiyar uses the forms maṭike (TP, 41), ṭomal (TC, 13), orāl (TC, 443), ṭklīyar (TP, 79) etc., as optatives.
Naccinnarkkiniyar interprets the form ventus which occurs after
the verbal nouns like ceytal, unnal, otal, etc., as an optative verb, e.g.
cettan otal ven'tum "cettan shall learn". L.V. Ramanaswami Aiyar also
agrees that this kind of usage, in Tamil, occurs in the optative
function. However, this interpretation has to be studied and investiga-
ted with the help of sufficient data, before arriving at a decisive
conclusion.

12.1.4. Structural Analysis.

It is evident that the optatives are formed from the verbal
stem by adding certain suffixes (optative markers). The optatives take
neither tense marker nor any pronominal terminations. The later-day
grammarians assign them to the future tense.

The optative verbal forms referred to and used by Tolkappiyar
may be segmented and the constituent morphemes may be identified here.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{velka} & \quad \text{vel}-ka \\
\text{velliya} & \quad \text{vel}-iya \\
\text{omopal} & \quad \text{omp(u)}-al \\
\text{orval} & \quad \text{or}-al \\
\text{akiyar} & \quad \text{ak(u)}-iyar
\end{align*}
\]

According to Naccinnarkkiniyar ven'tum may be segmented as
ventus(u)-um and -um may be identified as an optative marker.

Thus, the allomorpha of the optative marker, according to
Tolkappiyam are -ka, -iya, -al and -ail.
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XII. II. Finite Verbs of 'ceyyum' Pattern

12.2.0. Tolkappiyar speaks about the finite verbs of the 'ceyyum' pattern in a few āstras. This pattern of finite verbs, in Tamil, is peculiar both in structure and behaviour. They are formed by adding the suffix -um directly to the verbal stem and they do not take any pronominal termination. Thus, since there are no markers to exhibit person and number-gender in them, they are of the impersonal type of finite verbs.

  E.g., kol-um (Pa, 307)
  u-um (Pa, 48)
  nētu-um (Pa, 20)

12.2.1. Distribution.

Tolkappiyar says that the finite verbs of 'ceyyum' pattern do not occur with the first and second person subjects and with the epicene plural subject of the third person. Thus the use of 'ceyyum' pattern of finite verbs was, at the time of Tolkappiyar, restricted to the third person with an exception in the case of epicene plural.

For example,

  avel terum  "he gives"
  avel terum  "she gives"
  tītu terum  "it gives"
  nēnu terum  "they give" (non-rational)

Since the verbs of 'ceyyum' pattern are not restricted to particular genders and numbers, they are capable of occurring as predicates for nouns of different genders and numbers as masculine singular, feminine singular, neuter singular and neuter plural. This characteristic has been well recognized and described by the other indigenous grammarians also (Nan., 348)
12.2.2. **Tena.** According to Tolkæppiyægar, the finite verbs of 'ceyyum' pattern denote present tense³. It is evident that the terminal suffix -um is not a pronominal termination, since it does not restrict the use of the 'ceyyum' pattern verb to a specific gender or number. One can rightly assume that it is a tense marker. At the time of Tolkæppiyægar it might have mainly denoted the present tense meaning (14.1, 9)

But in a later sūtra Tolkæppiyægar shows that the finite verbs of the present tense (i.e., the finite verbs of 'ceyyum' pattern) were used to denote aoristic significations which may be said to be true of the past, the present and the future⁴.

Tuyvecilæiyæ indicates that the 'ceyyum' pattern finite verbs occur in the future tense also⁵. Later-day grammarians Pavapanti also points out that they denote both the present and the future tense. So, it can be inferred that the finite verbs of 'ceyyum' pattern might have begun to denote aoristic future tense at a very early date. Only at a period, later than Cænakæ age, they began to denote the distinctive future tense.

12.2.3. **Special Uses.**

Tolkæppiyægar says that these finite verbs should be used to denote things which are common to all times - past, present and future⁷.

E.g., mæli niypæm "The hill stands"

tiækel iyækkæm "The moon moves"

In this connection, the observations of L.V. Rameswami Aiyar are worthy of quoting. He says, "Though the term niækækæsæm (present tense) is used by TC, 227 for the force of these finite endings,
there is little doubt that in view of the *āṭra 240 which explicitly defines the use of these forms to denote what is true of the past, present and the future alike, the sense in which the author of this early grammar used *nīlakhālam denoted a kind of "habitual" or "universal" present which was not distinctively restricted to the actual present tense alone but was used to denote actions that were true of all times." 

According to *vōlkāpiyēgar, the verbs of the same pattern are also used in a general statement to denote the fruit of an extraordinary action, even though a particular man has not done it.

I.e., *tevel ceytān turākkam pukum "He who does penance reaches heaven"

"Nīl-k-konep niryēm pukum "He who kills his mother enters hell"

10.2.4. Rare Function of ('Ceyum' Pattern Finite Verbs in)

Determining Gender.

*Vōlkāpiyēgar says that the finite verbs of 'ceyum' pattern may indicate the particular singular gender (i.e., masculine or feminine gender) in the rational class, if they are suited to it.

I.e., Čattān yēl-cūmm "Cattan plays upon the fiddle"
(rational masculine singular)

Čatti cantu-arākkum "Catti grinds sandal-wood"
(rational feminine singular)

In the ancient Tamil country only males used to play the fiddle and only females used to grind sandal-wood.

The examples cited above are according to the interpretations of Čēnavaraiyēgar, Vēyacchilaiyēgar and Kallāppēgar."
According to Ḍhamapūrenār and Dr. P.B. Sastrī, the finite verbs of 'ceyyum' pattern may determine the particular class of a common noun, if they are suited to it.\(^1\)

\[\text{Cāṭṭāṇ yāl-cıłumă} \quad \text{"Cāṭṭāṇ plays upon the fiddle"} \quad \text{(rational class)}\]

\[\text{Cāṭṭāṇ pul-tıṃmŭ} \quad \text{"Cāṭṭāṇ eats grass"} \quad \text{(non-rational class)}\]

Neccinārkkinīyar accepts both the interpretations. Dr. P.B. Sastrī states that the 'tipai' (class) is determined by the meaning of the stem of the verbs and not by the verbal termination.\(^2\)

But it may be pointed out here that not the verbal stems alone but they with the preposed nouns which stand as ICC (the immediate constituents) with the following finite verbs, determine the gender or class of the noun in the nominative case.

12.2.5. **Modification in Form.**

Tolkāppiyānār says that in the non-finite verbs of 'ceyyum' pattern (adjectival participles) also the final vowel and the immediately preceding consonant are dropped.\(^3\) (13,18,2). From this Cāṇāvāraiyaśa infers that in the finite verbs of 'ceyyum' pattern either the final vowel -u- or the final -u- with the preceding consonant is dropped.\(^4\)

Teyaveccilaiyaśa, on the basis of the phrase 'peyar eņcu kilavikkham' - "for the adjectival participle also" used in the sūtre that deals with the modification of form of the adjectival participles interprets that the same changes (dropping the vowel -u- and the immediately preceding consonant) may hold good for the
finite verbs of the same pattern also, since such usages are found in literature.\(^{16}\)

The changes described by the commentators may be simplified by stating that the -u- of the suffix -um or the -u- of the suffix -um and the formative suffix of the verbal stem may be dropped in the 'ceyyum' pattern finite verbs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The change</th>
<th>The new form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kel&lt;ula&gt;m</td>
<td>kel&lt;ula&gt;m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cellum</td>
<td>conm ((RN, 1:3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-u- is dropped)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akum</td>
<td>(\text{-}m) ((\text{RN, 134}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(verbal stem formative -k(u) and -u- are dropped)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to L.V. Ramaswami Aiyar, -um~-a denotes aoristic future.\(^{17}\) According to Dr. Verdaranjan -um~-a denotes future tense.\(^{18}\) Thus, it is evident that the dropping of -u- from -um is acceptable to the later-day scholars also.

12.2.6. -um and -untu

In Itaiiyil Tolk\(\text{\textbar}\)diya\(\text{\textbar}\)y\(\text{\textbar}\) saya that there are instances, \(^{19}\) where -um becomes (changes into) -untu.\(^{20}\) Gund\(\text{\textbar}\)varaiy\(\text{\textbar}\) and Nacc\(\text{\textbar}\)r\(\text{\textbar}\)kk\(\text{\textbar}\)n\(\text{\textbar}\) say that this -um is the termination of the 'ceyyum' pattern adjectival participles.\(^{20}\) Tolk\(\text{\textbar}\)diya\(\text{\textbar}\) recognizes this -um neither as the termination of finite verbs nor as that of non-finite verbs (adjectival participles). He might have considered the -um, from which -untu is evolved, as a particle denoting number, since he does not include the sutra, that deals with the above change in Itaiiyiyal and since he discusses the above in Itaiiyiyal,
while discussing the particles denoting number.

The above is, perhaps, the reason that Tolūppiyar does not observe the suffixation of the neuter pronominal termination -tu to the suffix -um but treats it as a modification of the particle -um. Few instances of the occurrence of -untu will clear the fact further.

\[\text{peyārkuntu (PN, 395) peyārk(k)u-untu (-um-tu)}\]
\[\text{iri-yuntu (PN, 396) iri-untu (-um-tu)}\]

K.N. Sivaraja Pillai also does not consider -untu as formed from the suffix -um, but he treats it as a demonstrative like anta and înte, as a full word or as a demonstrative used with verbs to denote present tense. Criticizing the views of Mr. Pillai, Dr. Varadarajanār rightly describes with sufficient illustrations that -untu is a combination of two morphemes -um + -tu.

\[\text{h. ār-untu (PN, 395) ār-um-tu}\]
\[\text{āk(u)-untu (PN, 380) āk(u)-um-tu}\]

Thus one may easily conclude that the finite verbs with the termination -untu are the pronominalised forms of the 'ceyyum' pattern finite verbs; -um is a tense marker (probably denoting aoristic future); -tu is neuter singular marker.

12.2.7. **Pronominalised Forms of 'Ceeyum' Pattern Finite Verbs**

To easily establish the above view, one can cite instances from Cēkkem literature for the rare occurrence of the 'ceyyum' pattern finite verbs taking the pronominal terminations other than -tu also.
1. koyyumān (RN, 225) koy-um-ō-ā
2. icaikkumaga (TC, 1) icaï-kk-um-an-a-ō
3. tūŋkuntu (RN, 400) tūŋk(ū)-um-a-ō-tu
4. ūpam (̱st.ı., 24) ūp-m-a-r
5. anamān (AN, 6, 33) an-m-an-ā-r
6. capsār (AN, 157) caps-m-ā-r
7. kāpumār (̱st.ı., 83) kāp-um-ō-r

(In item two zero represents plural number marker and in item three third person marker)

In the above instances koyyu, icaikkum, tūŋkuma, ūpm, am, caps and kāpum are the finite verbs of 'ceyyum' pattern (9.10.3). The finite verbs koyyumān, icaikkumaga, ūpam, etc., are the pronominalized forms of the 'ceyyum' pattern finite verbs, koyyum, icaikkum, ūpm, etc. So it is evident that -untu is not a modified form of -um, but is a combination of the aoristic future tense marker -um and the neuter singular marker -tu (9.10.3).

It may be concluded here that the 'ceyyum' pattern impersonal finite verbs, which had multifarious function at the time of Tolkāpīyaṇār, had, at times, become restricted to a particular gender and number by assuming the relevant pronominal termination, which could occur in agreement with the nouns of the same gender-number alone.

E.g., avam koyyumān
      avar ūpam
      atu pēyuntu
      avai caymaga
Notes on Chapter XII. II.
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II. III. FORMS OF 'CYMMANA' PATTERN

12.1.0. Tolkēppiyānaṁ includes the form 'caymmana' in the list of verbs common to both the rational and non-rational classes.\(^1\)

There is another finite verb "icaikkumana" of the same pattern found to occur in Tolkēppiyāna.\(^2\) Tolkēppiyānaṁ does not analyze such forms into their constituent morphemes.

12.3.1. View of the Commentators on the Formation of the Above Forms

The analysis of the forms of 'caymmana' pattern and the identification of their parts, according to the commentators are cited here.

1. Ilampūranar\(^3\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>icaikkum-man</th>
<th>icaikkum-an</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>icaikkus</td>
<td>'cuyum' pattern adjectival participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>ǐtaiccol (Particle)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He reads the form as icaikkum-an.

2. Cēgaraišyār\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>icaikkum-man</th>
<th>icaikkumana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>icaikkus</td>
<td>a finite verb of 'cuyum' pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>'ǐtaiccol' (Particle)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
map changes into mapa

3. Tevaccilaiyār

icalkkumana - a verbal noun (class II, 5.3) of 'ceymmana' pattern, expanded into ceyyumana

4. Naccimarkkiniyār

icalkkum-map
icalkkum - a finite verb of 'ceyyum' pattern.
-map - 'asi izaiccol' (expletive particle) occurring with verbs.

While he refers to the 'ceymmana' form, he says that it has the nature of a participle and, thereby, he contradicts his own way of treatment.

5. Kollätanar

icalkkum - a finite verb
-map - 'acainilai izaiccol' (expletive particle) occurring with verbs.

Čevaraiyār describes ceymmana as a finite verb of the future tense, but states -map as the termination instead of stating that it is an 'izaiccol', as he does in the case of icalkkumana.

The forms of the ceymmana pattern are not in vogue at present and it is worthy of notice that they were obsolete even at the time of Ilampuranār.

18.3.2. Attempt at the Proper Analysis.

As has already been described (12.2.7), such forms are the
pronominalised forms of the finite verbs of ceymann pattern. So they may be segmented as

\[ \text{cey-} m - \text{en-} a - \theta \]
\[ \text{ica}^i - \text{kk-} m - \text{en-} e - \theta \]

- **cey, ica** - verbal stems
- **-m-r** - tense marker (eoristic future)
- **-en-e** - link morph
- **-a-e** - third person marker
- **-\theta** - plural number marker
- **-kk-** - formative suffix

12.3.3. **Finite Verbal Form**

The above forms are structurally veritable non-rational plural verbs and they can occur in agreement with the non-rational plural subjects.

E.g., evai ceymannag "They will do"

col (pl.) icaikkumana (TC, l)

Therefore, it can be surmised that as finite verbs the forms like ceymannag, icaikkumana, etc., are restricted to the third person non-rational plural (neuter plural) only.

12.3.4. **Verbal Mounds of Ceymannag Pattern.**

But Tolkappiyar explicitly states that all the common verbs (8.2), except second person verbs, occur in all the persons and genders. According to all commentators cite examples as to support the occurrence of the forms of 'ceymannag' pattern in all the persons and genders.
Sr. | Pl.
---|---
I $\tilde{y}a$ ceyymana | $\tilde{y}am$ ceyymana
II ni ceyymana | niyir ceyymana
III avan ceyymana | avar ceyymana
aval ceyymana | 
alu ceyymana | avai ceyymana

It is to be pointed out here that according to Teyvaccileiyar 'ceymana' is a 'toliyeyar' (verbal noun class II: 5.3.1). Then arises a question: why Tolkappiyar includes this form in the sutra, which deals with the verbs, while he treats the verbal nouns with regular nouns. It may be surmised here that though Tolkappiyar recognizes the multifarious function of 'ceymana' form, he fails to notice that it functions as a verbal noun as well, when it occurs in different persons and genders. Teyvaccileiyar's statement that in modern times, the form 'ceymana' may be used like the forms cevatu, ceyana, ceypaevai, etc., also further elucidates the functional aspect of ceyymana as a verbal noun.

Hence, it may be concluded that Tolkappiyar refers to the usage of 'ceymana' as a verbal noun in his work. As a verbal noun of rational plural, like the non-rational singular verbal nouns (see note 21 of chapter 5), it occurs in all persons and genders but it is not necessary that it should occur in agreement with the subjects (5.3.1). As a finite verb, it occurs in agreement with the non-rational plural subject alone.
XII. IV. VERBS DENOTING NEGATION.

For the common verbs denoting negation, the commentators cite 'illaı' and 'il' as examples. According to Tolkëppiyagër, they occur in all the three persons and five genders.

The impersonal verb illai is formed from the defective verbal stem (10,6) ıı by the addition of the termination -代表大会。Tolkëppiyagër includes ıı in the list of non-rational "kupipu." 'Ilia' is a non-rational plural defective verb. It may be segmented as ıil-a; -ilı and -a may be treated as allomorphs (avai = s-v-ıı and cila = cil-a; -ilı and -a are allomorphs). Thus one may rightly consider that originally illai might have been a non-rational plural verb.
Thus it may not be wrong to assume here that in the pre-Tolkappiyar period, the form illsai might have been used only in the non-rational plural as a variant of ila and that since at the time of Tolkappiyar its usage might have gained currency in all the persons and genders, its suffix -si must have lost its significance of denoting non-rational plurality.

'il' in its root form functions as a finite verb. These two verbal forms may be identified as impersonal defective finite verbs.

The occurrence of these verbs in all the persons and genders is as shown below.

Pr.       Pn.
I  yam illai  yam illai
II  mī illai  mīyir illai
III avan illai  ur illai
        aval illai  avu illai
        stu illai  stu illai

Il can be used instead of illsai. These examples are cited from the commentaries.

In Tolkappiyar illsai is used in the non-rational singular and plural only (Pr. 47, 64); but il is not used in the work.

---
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It is a unique form. According to Tolkaippattu, it is a common verb (8.2) and it occurs in all the three persons and five genders. It is of a special structure and behaviour.

It is formed of an unidentifiable root. The tense is not marked in this form and it does not take any pronominal terminations.

The commentators cite examples as the following to show its occurrence in all the persons and genders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sr.</th>
<th>Dr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>mi veru</td>
<td>yaa veru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>ni veru</td>
<td>niyir veru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>ooru veru</td>
<td>aver veru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ooru veru</td>
<td>ovei veru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tolkaippattu does not indicate the adjectival function of the word veru. But in modern Tamil it functions as a noun-qualifier also.

atu veru poru! "That is a different thing"

---

**Note**

1. TC, 222, 225.