THE RELATIVE PARTICIPLE IN -iya OF MODERN MALAYALAM

I. INTRODUCTION

It is a well known characteristic of Dravidian languages that they have no relative pronouns. Instead, they have an attributive noun form which is used in cases where the Indo-European languages have a relative clause, e.g., paṭitta paṭitta puttaṅ (the having-read boy =) 'the boy who has read', paṭitta paṭitta puttaṅ (the boy having-read book =) 'the book which the boy has read'. This so-called 'relative participle' (Tamil peyareccam, Malayalam pereccam) is derived either from a tense stem by suffixation of the marker of the attributive function -a, or direct from the root by means of the suffix -um of the indefinite tense, e.g., ῳτu- 'to run', Ta. ὅτukaṅa, Mal. ὅτunnna 'who runs', Ta. and Mal. ὅτiya 'who ran', Ta. and Mal. ὅτum 'who runs, will run'.

By the nature of the problem under discussion, the present study is restricted to those roots in -u which have a past stem in -i, like ὅτu : ὅτi- 'to run', vāṅku- : vāṅkti- 'to receive' etc. In classical Tamil, the relative participle of the past tense is formed as indicated above: ὅτi-y-a 'who ran', ὅτi-y-a 'who danced', ὅτi-y-a 'who spoke'. The corresponding finite forms, however, are based on a lengthened past stem in -in- : ὅτin-ēn 'I ran', ὅτin-ēn 'he ran', ὅτin-ēl 'she ran', ὅτin-ēr 'they (animate) ran', ὅτi-y-a 'they (inanimate) ran'. The only exception is the inanimate (neuter) third person singular ὅτi-y-atau, which contains the stem form ὅτi- (and the following glide). These forms are still in use in modern standard Tamil, whereas modern Malayalam has replaced them by a single form ὅτi for all numbers and genders.1

By the side of the relative participles of the type ὅτiya, Tamil has in the past centuries developed an alternative formation of the type ὅτina. Clearly this formation is due to the analogy of the finite forms such as ὅτin-ēn.2 This is apparent from the fact that in cases where no such finite forms existed, the new formation in -ina did not develop. A case in point are the attributive forms of the type ὅτum and ὅτiya 'cruel', which are commonly called 'adjectives'. Although morphologically fully

---

1 The past tense suffix -i is found in all the South Dravidian languages (see Appendix II). In Toda, Kota and Tulu, it has secondarily become -y-. Relative participles in -iya and -ina are also found in Kodagu where they have become -ivē and -inē. Outside South Dravidian, the -ina type is also found in Telugu where the suffix -in- occurs after almost every verb stem. In some definable cases both -ina and -a occur, e.g., pad-ina and padō-a 'which fell'. The -iya type is here non-existent. See Subramanyam, P. S., Dravidian Verb Morphology (A Comparative Study), Annamalainagar (1971), p. 142, pp. 217-219 and p. 234.

2 Another problem which is closely connected with this development is the alternation of the conditional verbal participle forms such as collinād/colliyād 'if (one) said'. The analogical form collinād has the same history as that of the relative participle form collina 'who said'. At present, it is not our intention to pursue further the historical development of these conditionals.
parallel to ṭum and ṭiya, they have no variant *kotina because in Tamil they do not belong to a verbal system, such as present tense ṭukinrēn ‘I run’, past tense ṭinēn ‘I ran’.

II. DEVELOPMENT IN TAMIL

As for the historical development in Tamil of -ina by the side of -iya, it is possible to give a fairly accurate account on the basis of the available literary, inscriptive and dialectal material. In the Tamil-Brahmi inscriptions starting from the second century B.C., only the -iya type is found.3

The Sangam texts of the first centuries A.D., too, have, with a few exceptions, only forms in -iya. In Puranāñāraru there is only one instance of -ina in muraliṇa ‘which was covered’ (90.4).4 Besides, there is a variant reading eytiṇa ‘which attained’ for eytiya in Puranānura 47.10,5 niṭiṇa ‘which was long’ for niṭiṇa in Kuruntokai 309.36 and pōṇa (from pōyinā) ‘which went’ for pōya in Pariṇpātal 22.11.6 From the other Sangam texts, viz. Akanāṇāru,7 Pattuppattu and Eṭṭuttokai no instance of -ina has been recorded in the indexes quoted.

From the centuries immediately following the Sangam literature one of the first texts that call for mention is the epic Cilappatikāram, which may be attributed to the sixth century. It is said to have been composed by the Cēra prince ḫaṅkōvaṭikal, accordingly a speaker of a West coast dialect. Some characteristics of Malayalam have, indeed, been pointed out in this text.9 It has only one instance of an -ina form, viz. urina ‘which soaked’ (6.7.8)10 against many instances with -iya. A work dating from the seventh century is Appar’s Tēvārum. The first ten patikams (consisting of about 400 lines) show an exclusive use of -iya, with the sole exception of āna (for āya) ‘when happened’ in āna nāl ‘the day when it happened’ (47.1).11

4 V. I. Subramoniam, Index of Puranānāru, Kerala University, Trivandrum (1962).
5 Ibid., p. 151.
7 Ibid., p. 1148.
8 S. V. Subramanian, Grammar of Akanāṇāru with Index, University of Kerala, Trivandrum (1972).
9 For example, the word tunnakār ‘tailors’ (Cilappatikāram, 5.32) which is not found in any Sangam text, is in vogue in modern Malayalam. The equivalent word in modern Tamil is tāiyārkārān. The word tunnavināṭhar, but not tunnakār, is found in Maṇimēkalai (28.36). Aṭṭiyārkunāḷār, the mediaeval commentator of Cilappatikāram, has pointed out the word putaittal ‘covering’ found in this text, as a usage of the West coast. See Cilappatikāram: Text, Arupmatavur and Aṭṭiyārkunkunāḷurul, Ed. Dr. Ü. Vē. Cāmināṭaiyar (1968), p. 152.
10 S. V. Subramanian, Cilappatikāram — Descriptive Grammar with Index, University of Kerala, Trivandrum (1965).