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XIII. NON-FINITE VERBS

13.0. Introduction

Immediately after the finite verb, the non-finite verbs are taken up for study.

Tolkāppiyāṅkār treats the non-finite verbs in Vīṇaiyīka, immediately after the finite verb. Further he instantaneously speaks about the non-finite verbs of various endings in Flatt tikīram, when he deals with the external sandhi. He discusses the complement which the non-finite verbs take, in Pratīyāṅkār.

The constituents of the non-finite verbs are the verbal stem, the tense marker and the non-finite verbal 1 marker or the verbal stem and the non-finite verbal 1 marker. Though tense is not marked in a few patterns of non-finite verbs, the commentators attempt to attribute certain tense significations to almost all of them and assign them to different tenses.

The non-finite verbs, usually, do not take any pronominal terminations, i.e., they are not inflected for person, gender, etc., thus they are not restricted to a particular person, gender or number. Tolkāppiyāṅkār includes them in the list of common verbs, i.e., the verbs common to both the rational and the non-rational classes.

According to the Tamil grammarians, the non-finite verbs may be divided into two classes; the first is that which occurs as adjunct of verbs and the second is that which occurs as adjunct of nouns. Though Tolkāppiyāṅkār does not explicitly attempt such a classification, he is also agreed to this, since he treats both of them always adjacently, one after another.
The non-finite verbs, as a whole, occur as attributes in their free form. It is evident from Tolkāppiyam that the former class requires a verb to follow as its complement and the latter requires a noun to follow as its complement.

12.1. The Problem of Terminology

Tolkāppiyam terms the non-finite verbs as 'encukilavi'; the class of non-finite verbs which occur as attributes to the verbs as 'vipai-y-encukilavi' (vipaiyeccam) and the class of non-finite verbs which occur as attributes to the nouns as 'peyre-encukilavi' (peyreccam). Dr. Caldwell, G.U. Pope and others term the former as "the verbal participles" and the latter as "the relative participles". John Lazarus, Denys De.S. Brey and S.K. Chatterjee term them the adverbial and the adjectival participles respectively.

The problem of terminology is often confronted in the study of languages. In many cases, the grammatical terms of one language do not find equivalents in another, for every language has its own structure and therefore needs its own terminology explaining it. Here what the Tamil grammarians mean by the terms 'vipaiyeccam' and 'peyreccam' cannot be exactly conveyed in single linguistic terminologies, e.g., the term 'vipaiyeccam' includes, I. the verbal participles, II. the purpose participles, III. the conditional participles, IV. the infinitive participles and V. some other adverbial

Dr. Caldwell attempts to translate 'vipaiyeccam' as verb-defects, or verbal complements i.e., words which require a verb to complete the sense and 'peyreccam' as noun-defects, or noun complements - i.e., words which require the complement of a noun to complete their signification. Even the terms translated by
Dr. Caldwell fall short of exactness and are misleading, though his definition is up to the mark.

In the present study, for the sake of convenience, it is preferred to employ the term "adverbial participles" for 'vina-y-eccam' as a whole, collectively for all its different types and adjectival participles for 'peyareccam' as a whole, as they are only participles having the function of adverbs and adjectives respectively. Wherever these terms pose some difficulties they may be replaced by the Tamil terminologies 'vinaiyeccam' and 'peyareccam'.

10.2. Adverbial Participles

Tolkäppiyar gives nine patterns and six terminations of adverbial participles. He considers the adverbial participles as one among the ten types of 'eccams': "the forms requiring another form or an understood meaning to complete their sense.

He explicitly points out in a separate sūtra that the adverbial participles take 'vina' or 'kurippu' as their complements. 'Kurippu' may, here, be taken to refer to the defective verbs only, as the pronominalised nouns are not modified by the adverbial participles.

E.g., ceytu vantān "having done came-he"

ceytu ilam "having done - not he"

In the said sūtra, Tolkäppiyar says that if the adverbial participles take 'kurippu' - 'the so-called appellative verbs 'as complements, the latter will be followed by a verb formed from ā - "become", e.g.,

avan karu vallār avyan
The defective verbs already classified (20.8) need not be followed by another verb, e.g., vantu ilan, koştutu ulan, etc. Only if the adverbial participles occur before the pronominalised nouns, the latter will be followed by a verb formed from ā "become". In that case too, the modified head is the verb which follows the so-called 'kurgupu' and not the pronominalised nouns.

E.g., karpu vallap āyipun

Here karpu modifies āyipun and not vallap

The nine patterns and the six terminations of adverbial participles listed and two other types of the same referred to in Tolkāpiyām¹² may be classified into sub-groups, according to their different usages.¹³

I. Verbal Participle Patterns

1. ceytu  2. ceyyu  3. ceypu

īti (TE, 236) ceyū (TE, 232)

4. ceytēna

II. Purpose Participle Patterns

5. ceyiyā  6. ceyiyar  7. ceyākū

III. Conditional Participle Pattern

8. ceypū

IV. Infinitive Participle Pattern

9. ceypa

V. Adverbials, consisting of 'eyerecča' and nouns and having the function of adverbs. These are formed by the juxtaposition of the following terminations to the adjectival participles.
Vāla, muna, kāl, kātai, vali, itattu

ceytapin, ceyyāmun, ceytakkāl, ceytakkaṭai, ceytavali and ceytaviṭattu are the patterns of adverbials (13.13)

**Verbal Participles**

13.3. (1) *ceyṭu* pattern

This pattern of forms may be segmented as cey-t-u, cey-verbal stem, -t- past tense marker and -u may be identified as verbal participle marker.

The tense of this participle pattern poses a difficult problem, for this pattern of forms occurs without any modification as the modifier of the past, present and future tense verbs. Tolkāppiyār says that the pattern 'ceyṭu' which denotes past tense may also occur in the future tense.¹⁴

E.g., avan uṇṭu vantān

avan uṇṭu varuvān

Thus it is clear that one and the same pattern 'ceyṭu' denotes an action done previous to that which is denoted by the verb, which it modifies, i.e., the tense of the participle is relative to the tense of the following verbs. Regarding this pattern, Dr. Caldwell asserts that, in Tamil, the preterite participle is used to express all subordinate actions, whether simultaneous with the main action or antecedent to it; but though that participle is always in preterite form, it possesses the force of a participle of the present tense when the connection requires it.¹⁵ Finally it may be stated that if the verbal participle is stated to be in the past tense form, it
that the action denoted is past only in relation to the action of the
finite verb in the sentence. When it is followed by a present tense or
future tense finite verbs, it only means that the action of the particip
takes place before the occurrence of the action of the finite verb.

13.4. Verbal Participles with Final -i

Tolkāppiyar refers to the verbal participle forms with final
-i in ṛuttatiṟkaram\(^\text{16}\) when he deals with the external sandhi rules.
The commentators prefer to treat these forms also under the pattern
'ceytu', since the -i ending verbal participles also show the same
significations as those of the pattern 'ceytu'.

ati, pati, kuri, etc., may be cited as examples for the -i
ending verbal participles. Čengēvaraiyar and Naccinārkkikīyari segment
and identify the constituent morphemes of these forms. According to
them the final -u in 'ceytu' pattern and the final -i in the above
forms are verbal participle markers and are complementary. But it
seems that it is more reasonable and proper to identify -i in the
forms like āti, kuri, etc., as past tense marker.

There are a few forms of this type with final -y, e.g., pōy,
āy, etc. It may be pointed out here that, according to Tolkāppiyam,
-i and -y may interchange in the final position\(^\text{17}\). So, -i and -y may
be identified as the past tense markers. Naccinārkkikīyar also
considers -y as the past tense marker here\(^\text{18}\). One may argue that -y
cannot be the past tense marker, for in the forms like tūyinān,
āyinān, etc., -in- is the past tense marker and not -y- and in the
above instances (pōy, āy) a zero may be posited to represent the tense
marker. This argument does not stand in the light of the interpreta-
tion that -y- may be taken as a glide, when it is followed by the past tense marker -in-; otherwise it is a past tense marker.

Since -i is accepted as the past tense marker in the -i ending verbal participles, for the sake of descriptive convenience and regularity a zero may be set up to represent the participle marker, e.g.,

\[ \text{āt-i-} \quad \text{ānu-i-} \]
\[ \text{po-y-} \quad \text{c-y-} \]

10.5. The forms inū, inru, etc.

Tolkāpyāyana refers to these forms in Kuttatikaram, when he deals with the external sandhi changes. He says that in poetry the final -i of the adverbial participle inū may become -u. Thus according to him inū becomes inru in poetry; inrī and anru are also the forms of the same type. These forms are formed from the negative stems il- and al- respectively (15.4), which are elsewhere identified as the defective verbal stems in the present study (10.6). Thus these non-finite verbal forms may be identified as the defective non-finite verbs (10.8).

The forms inru and anru may be segmented as in- (~il-) ru (~tu) and an- (~al-) ru (~tu). ~ru ~tu may be identified as the adverbial participle marker occurring after the negative stems or markers (15.9). In the forms inrī and anrī -rī is the participle marker. Here it is possible to assume that the forms with final -u, inru and anru, might have been the earlier ones and that they might have changed their ending -u into -i on the analogy of -i ending verbal participles like āti, ōti, etc.
13.6. (ii) 'ceyyu' pattern.

This pattern of forms may be segmented into cey-pu cey- verbal stem; -pu participle termination.

According to Čepävarasiyär, this denotes an action simultaneous with that denoted by the modified verb. According to Teyvaccilaiyär, it denotes the three tenses according to the different context in which it occurs. Maccinärkkiniiyär points out that it mainly denotes an action done previous to that of the following verb and rarely the future tense. It is of interest to note that no explicit marker to denote all these tense variations is found in the pattern and so the suggestions of the commentators are mere assumptions.

This form has become obsolete.

13.7. (iii) 'ceyyu' and 'ceyyā' patterns.

Telkēpiyär includes 'ceyyu' in the list of adverbial participle patterns but only refers to the pattern 'ceyyā' in Muttattikīrṇam, while dealing with the external sandhi changes of words with final -ā. These patterns ceyyū and ceyyā may be segmented as cey-ū and cey-ā respectively. cey- verbal stem; -ū and -ā participle markers.

According to Čepävarasiyär, the forms of the pattern ceyyū denote a subordinate action antecedent in point of time to the principal action, i.e., the past tense. Teyvaccilaiyär mentions that they denote either past or present. Maccinärkkiniiyär, they denote past tense. As there is no tense marker in the above two patterns of forms, they may be taken to denote different tenses, according to the contexts.
The forms of these patterns have also become obsolete.

13.8. (iv) 'ceytena' pattern

This pattern consists of the verbal participle pattern 'ceytu' and the infinitive participle pattern 'ena'. The form 'ceytu' may be segmented and the constituent morphemes identified as done previously. (11.3). 'ena may be analysed into en-a; en- verbal stem; -a infinitive participle marker.

The form ceytena occurs in the past tense. This pattern of forms has become obsolete.

An alternative description of the form ena may be considered here. It may be identified as a connector, which seems to do nothing but connect, e.g., uṇṭeṇa-婆-paci keṭṭatu. According to the definition of Hockett, it may be classified as an impure marker. According to the definition of Hockett, it may be classified as an impure marker. Hockett says that in English most connectors are verbs. Here it is of interest to note that the connector ena is actually a non-finite verbal form functioning as a connector.

Purpose Participle

13.9. (v, vi) 'ceyyiva' and 'ceyyivar' patterns

These patterns consist of the verbal stem cey and the suffixes -iya and -iyar respectively. Ilampūranar is silent regarding the tense of these patterns of forms. All the other commentators are agreed in attributing the future tense signification to them. There is no overt marker to denote the tense in them.

It is worthy of notice that L.V. Ramaswami Aiyar also treats the forms of these patterns under the purpose participles.
Dr. Varadarajan claims the identity of these patterns with the optative verbal patterns.  

The forms of these patterns have also become obsolete.

13.10. (vii) "ceyantu" pattern

This pattern is used to denote a purposive significance. This consists of the verbal noun ceyal (३.३) and the dative case marker -ku. Čeṇāvareyiar and Naccinrēkkiniyar deny the fact that it is a dative, but Kelleśar admits that it is a dative case marker.

According to Čeṇāvareyiar and Teveccilaiyar the forms of this pattern denote future tense.

It is interesting to note that Pavananti, the later-day grammar, does not include this in the list of adverbial participle patterns.

Conditional Participles

13.11. (viii) 'cevin' pattern

This participle pattern consists of the verbal stem and the suffix -in. Scholars claim that the suffix -in here occurs as the ablative case marker. It is inexplicable how the occurrence of ablative marker -in with the verbal stem to form adverbial participles suits. So it is safer to describe here -in as a separate suffix denoting the participle of condition.

According to Čeṇāvareyiar, the forms of this pattern denote three tenses but according to Teveccilaiyar and Naccinrēkkiniyar they denote future tense only.

L.V. Ramaswami Iyiar considers that the forms with the terminations -kāl, kātai, etc., which are treated in this thesis as
adverbials, are conditional participles. Though some of them may be of conditional significance, they are treated separately, since they are of entirely different structure (13.13).

**Infinitive Particles**

13.12. (ix) 'ceya' pattern

The Dravidian linguists Dr. Caldwell, L.V. Ramaswami Aiyar and others also consider 'ceya' as the pattern of infinitive participles. L.V. Ramaswami Aiyar establishes the infinitive significance of this pattern by the following arguments: "As participles, the instances in Cankam texts signify only simultaneous action or 'effect', the idea of 'purpose' appears but rarely:-

cf. tēr tōr vanta (PN, 63) yaṁ urākka vantatu (PN, 28), which appear to be border-line instances to which either the signification of 'effect' or derived idea of 'purpose' could be ascribed. Such instances are but rare in Cankam texts, the usual rule being that 'purpose' is denoted by other formations."

The form ceya consists of verbal stem cey and the suffix -a.

It is evident that tense is not marked in this form and it may be taken to denote one of the three tenses according to the contexts.

13.13. Adverbials

Tolkāppiyamē lists six forms also as terminations of adverbial participles. They are pin, mun, kāl, kāṭai, valli and īṭettu. The commentators cite the examples as the following, for their occurrence as terminations of adverbial participles

1. vanta-pin
2. varu-mun
3. vanta-k-kāl
4. vanta-k-kāṭai
5. vanta-vāli
6. vanta-vittattu

The above are the patterns of some of the adverbial expressions.

On investigation it is found that the six forms enumerated in Tolkāppiyam are not terminal suffixes; but are real free forms, i.e., they are nouns denoting place or time. It is evident that all the examples cited above are phrases, consisting of two free forms (i.e., a ācayē pattern of adjective participle and a noun), which, as single units, have the function of adverbs. Though Čāvooraiyār denies the fact that they are formed of āyē pattern and nouns, Naccipārkkāniyār states it as the reason for Tolkāppiyānār's placing them in a separate sūtra.

These adverbs modify the verbs that follow them in sentences. Since they are of adverbial function, similar to that of the adverbial participles, Tolkāppiyānār treats their second members as the terminations of adverbial participles.

I.V. Ramasāwāmi Aiyār's observations, which seem to support the suggestions posited above, are worth quoting here. He says, "TC, 229 refers to the forms constituted of relative participles (adjectival participles) and kāṭai, kāṭai, etc. The conditional meaning for forms like vantakkāl would arise, when these forms modify "indeterminate" or future verb forms. In the earlier stages of Sahkam Tamil, such conditional forms are rare. The restriction of the force "vantakkāl" to the pure conditional appears to have been comparatively of a later periodrelative period" (13.11).

Tolkāppiyamār mentions in kccaviyal that the adverbial participles too may be of different nature which are not mentioned before. The commentators interpret the above reference of Tolkāppiyamār to the different nature of adverbial participles, as to the difference in form. They treat some of the finite verbal forms functioning as adverbial participles, under the sūtra. They are termed as 'mūrreccam' by the later-day grammarians. Tolkāppiyamār does not explicitly refer to such forms but he uses some of them in his work.

E.g., uṉeṟntaṉar .......... uṉeṟn (Th, 483)
     uṉeṟntaṉar koṉ-1e    (Th, 117, 296)

These forms, unlike the regular adverbial participles, are similar to the finite verbs in form but are similar to the participles in function. The person, gender and number markers in them have no function of denoting person, gender, etc. The termination that occurs after the tense marker, may, as a whole, be identified as the adverbial participle marker. The -mar ending adverbial participles are already discussed (9, 10, 3). In the same way, the above form may be segmented as uṉeṟnt-ṉam; -ṉam is the adverbial participle marker.

13.15. Adverbial Participles Occurring in a Sequence

The adverbial participles of different kinds, which may occur in a linear sequence in a sentence, also become complete, when the last one takes a complement. From this, it can be inferred that the adverbial participles of the same kind too become complete in the above manner. Thus the preceding adverbial participle, according to Tolkāppiyamār, does not modify the immediately following adverbial participle, i.e., the latter does not become the complement of the
former and only the final verb becomes the complement of all the preceding adverbial participles.

E.g., unți tīngōṭip pāṭi ventān
       unți parukī-t tīngupu ventān

13.16. Adjectival Participles

The non-finite verbs which modify the nouns are, herein, termed as adjectival participles. According to Tolkāppiyānār, the adjectival participle is one of the ten 'accents' - "non-finites", i.e., the forms requiring another form or an understood meaning to complete their sense. He treats the adjectival participles mainly in Vipāyaśil, immediately after the adverbial participles and in Lccaviśal. They are considered as common verbs, i.e., the verbs that are common to both the rational and the non-rational classes.

Tolkāppiyānār explicitly states that they take nouns as their complements. The noun-complements, according to him, may be words denoting land, object, time, instrument, agent or action?

Tolkāppiyānār enumerates only two different patterns of adjectival participles, ceyta and ceyyum. The former denotes the past tense and the latter the non-past tense. Here it is evident that only a two-way distinction of tense was clear-cut in ancient Tamil (14.0,1).

13.17.1. 'ceyta' pattern

As per the terminology employed in the description of Kolami by Prof. Emenau, 'ceyta' pattern of forms may be identified as comitative. 48

Tolkāppiyānār does not analyse this form into its constituent morphemes. It is evident that it consists of the verbal stem, the past
tense marker and adjectival participle marker

cey-answered ceyta

13.18.2. **ceyrum pattern**

According to Prof. Emeneau, ceyrum pattern of forms may be identified as the continuative. This pattern may be segmented as cey-um, cey- verbal stem um non-past marker.

Tolkappiyar does not say anything about the tense significant of the 'ceyrum' pattern non-finite verbs. But the finite verbs of 'ceyrum' pattern, which are identical with the 'ceyrum' pattern non-finite verbs, according to Tolkappiyam, denote present tense. There the terminal suffix -um is assigned to the present tense. As there had been no separate patterns of participles for the present and the future tenses, in Tamil, at the time of Tolkappiyar, it may not be wrong to assume that 'ceyrum' pattern non-finite forms might have been used in both the tenses.

There is no overt participle marker here. Thus for the sake of descriptive convenience, a zero may be set up to represent the same and accordingly ceyrum may be segmented as cey-um-zero. -um is the non-past marker.

Tolkappiyar describes the changes, which the 'ceyrum' pattern non-finite verbs undergo in some instances. He says that the final -u with the preceding consonant may be elided in the adjectival participles of 'ceyrum' pattern (12.2.5)

\[
\text{ceyrum} \rightarrow \text{avam} \quad \text{avam perevivelah tira}
\]

\[
\text{akum} \rightarrow \text{am} \quad \text{am porul}
\]
Though there is little difference in form between the 'ceyyum' pattern non-finite verbs and the finite verbs of the same pattern, there is explicit difference between them in function. The non-finite verbs occur as attributes to those nouns which the non-finite take as complements whereas the finite verbs occur as predicates.

E.g., 1. parakkum kili  "flying parrot"
2. oṭum kutirai  "running horse"
3. kili paraikkum  "the parrot flies"
4. kutirai oṭum  "the horse runs"

In the first two examples paraikkum and oṭum occur as non-finite verbs whereas in the last two they occur as finite verbs.

Further, the finite verbs of 'ceyyum' pattern, according to Tolkāppiyam, do not occur with the first and the second person subjects and with the third rational plural subjects, whereas the adjectival participles (the non-finite verbs) of 'ceyyum' pattern are common to the subjects of all persons, genders and numbers (12.2.5)

73.19. A Few Other Forms of Adjectival Participles.

Tolkāppiyam refers to a negative form of the adjectival participle ills in luttāṭikēram⁵², when he deals with the external sandhi changes. This form is formed from the negative stem ills-, which is elsewhere identified as one of the defective verbal stems (10.6). Dr. V.I. Subramaniam rightly points out that ills is a case of negative taking a negative suffix before a relative participle marker -a⁵³. Thus it may be cited as an instance for the occurrence of double negation.

By the force of analogy the defective verbal stem il-, which
is already a negative stem takes the negative marker also. The form illā may be segmented as ii-ā-a; -ā- negative suffix -a adjectival participle marker.

It may be pointed out here that Tolkāppiyār considers ii and illāi as alternants of the non-finite verb illā-55.

13.20. A few Common Characteristics of Non-finite Verbs at the Syntactical Level

Tolkāppiyār says that though the non-finite verbs are used in negation, they are of the same nature, i.e., they are treated in the same way as affirmatives. By this, Tolkāppiyār might have meant that their non-finite characteristics, their occurrence as modifiers, their occurrence in all the persons, genders, etc., and their requirement of complements do not change, even if they are used negatively (15.6).

E.g., āgīya-p-porul (TC, 31)

punārāc-cuṭṭuppeyar (TC, 37)

muṭiyātu .................

.................. muṭiyum .... (TC, 233)

tiriyātu............... verūm

......................... molipa (TE, 418)

When the forms are changed into negatives, the negative marker -ā- occurs between the verbal stems and the participle markers (15.9,10).

It is not necessary that the non-finite verbs must be immediately followed by their complements. It may be that some other suitable words occur in between the modifier and the modified. Tolkāppiyār explicitly points out that the use of suitable words between the non-finite verbs and their complements may not be discredited.57
E.g., uḷutu \( \text{cattan} \) vanto
Collum \( \text{kēṭul} \) vanto
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-ā may be assimilated to -k- when followed by dative marker.

45. TC, 233.
46. TC, 430.
47. TC, 433, 234.
49. Ditto.
50. TC, 227.
51. TC, 233.
52. TC, 272.
54. The analogy is caused by the regular non-finite verbs taking the
negative marker -ā- when they become negative non-finite verbs, e.g
  ceyta  ceyya  cey-ā-a
  unta  unna  un-ā-a

55. TC, 372.
56. TC, 236.
57. TC, 237.