CHAPTER XI

* IMPERATIVES *
XI. IMPERATIVES

11.0. Tolkāppiyamār does not treat the imperatives separately; but fortuitously refers to the imperative signification by the term 'ēval' in 'Euttatikēram', when he speaks about sandhi changes that occur after the so-called expletive particle -niye and after the -a ending optative verbs - both according to him with imperative significations.

In this chapter a study on the imperatives is attempted on the basis of the stray evidences from Tolkāppiyam and on the basis of the interpretations posited by the commentators.

11.1. Second Person Verbs and Imperatives.

Teyvaccilaiyār interprets the sutra in which Tolkāppiyamār says that the second person singular verbs of the pattern 'ceyyāy' are used as those of 'cey' pattern also, that the paradigm 'ceyyāy' with final -ėy may occur as the 'imperative' second person singular pattern 'cey'. Thus he makes it explicit that the forms of the patterns 'ceyyāy' and 'cey' may occur as imperatives. Further, in a different place, where Tolkāppiyamār enumerates the second personal terminations, Teyvaccilaiyār remarks that since the author uses the term 'sunnīlai' - "second person" and not 'sunnīlai vigai' - "second person verbs" to refer to the finite verbs that occur in the second person, they may include the verbs not only those of indicative signification but also those of imperative signification. Thus it is evident that Tolkāppiyamār does not distinguish the imperatives from the second person verbs. Later-day scholar Venkatarajulu Reddiyar also explicitly states that Tolkāppiyamār includes the imperatives under the second person verbs.
It is, thus, obvious that the imperatives have reference only to the second person. It must be pointed out here that all the imperatives occur always in the future. This fact is sporadically referred to by the commentators and by the later-day grammarians. Thus it can be safely concluded that the imperatives have reference only to the future tense.

11.2. Imperatives of 'cey' Pattern.

E.g., kekk (PN, 35), up, tim, etc

Aku (PN, 40)

According to Cēnavaraiyar, the forms of the 'cey' pattern are the shortened forms of 'ceyyay' pattern. As this interpretation cannot be evidenced even from the historical point of view, it is not acceptable to the modern scholars. It may be described that the forms of 'cey' pattern, by nature, occur as imperatives and that they are not the shortened forms of 'ceyyay' pattern.

Teyv. eelaiyar explicitly points out that the verbal roots, in Tamil, occur as imperatives. 'Cey' is the pattern of verbal roots in Tamil.

Here the imperatives must be distinguished from the verbal roots that occur as stems of the verbs and from the verbal nouns of class two (5.2). According to Naccinarkkiniyar, the occurrence of a high stress in the verbal roots changes them into imperatives. Venkataramulu Reddiyar also opines that in the second person singular all the verbal roots with high stress occur as imperatives. Though, to some extent, this view may be accepted, yet there is much to be studied and investigated on the accentual system of the Tamil language, to decide this matter.
At present, the imperatives of 'cey' pattern may be distinguished from other verbal roots or stems by positing a zero morpheme to represent the imperative signification. It is worthy of notice that Prof. Emeneau, in his description of Kolami language sets up a zero to represent the imperative ending. In Kannada also, where the verbal roots occur as second person singular imperatives, the suffix is described by positing a zero. Thus the imperatives of 'cey' pattern may be described as cey-∅.

cey - verbal root or stem.
-∅ singular imperative marker.

11.3. Imperatives of 'ceyyāy' Pattern.

Teyvaccilaiyar makes it clear that the verbs of the 'ceyyāy' pattern may also be used as imperatives in the place of the forms of 'cey' pattern.

E.g., kēlay (NT, 61) kēl-ay
vāry (NT, 250) vār-ay

Kēl- and vār- are verbal stems and -ay is singular imperative marker.

The singular imperative termination -ay need not be segmented into parts, since -ay, as a whole, functions as the singular imperative marker. It occurs immediately after the verbal stems, whereas the second person pronominal termination of the indicative verbs -āy, which may be analysed into -ā-y (second person marker + singular number marker, 9.6.3), occurs after the tense markers. It must be pointed out here that according to Tolkāppiyāgar -āy, the termination of the second person, is common to both the indicative and imperative verbs of the second person. In the present
study the indicative termination -a-y and the imperative termination -a-y are distinguished from each other (9.6.3).

Gēnavaraiyar and Naceinarkkiniyar point out that the forms of 'ceyyāy' pattern occur as negatives also\(^1\). Gēnavaraiyar rightly describes them by stating that in the negative second person verbs, the negative marker -a- is incorporated\(^2\). Thus the second person negative verbs of the 'ceyyāy' pattern may be segmented as cey-a-a-y.

\[\text{Iyāy (PN, 209) I(-y)-a-a-y.}\]

\[\text{āncāy (PN, 139) anc(u)-a-a-y.}\]

cey, I, ancu : verbal stems; -a- negative marker;
-a- second person marker; -y singular number marker (9.6.3; 15.8). Thus it is evident that the imperatives of the 'ceyyāy' pattern are different from the negatives of the 'ceyyāy' pattern.

It is of interest to note that in the forms of the 'ceyyāy' pattern, whether they are imperatives or negatives, the tense is not marked.

11.4. Imperatives like vanticin, kaṁticin, etc.

Tolkāppiyar includes -cin in the list of second person expletive particles\(^3\). The actual form of this so-called particle is icin (17.10.13). In Cākaṁ literature, it is found to occur in the singular imperatives also. It is evident that the imperatives in which this termination is found, are formed from the adverbial participles of 'ceytu' pattern (13.3) by the addition of -icin. Icin may be segmented as i-cu-icin; i- is the shortened form of the obsolete auxiliary verb I; -cu- is the palatalized shape of the
formative -ku- (17.10.13); -in ( < en < en) is a particle, originally an interrogative used to invite attention (11.6). A zero may be set up to indicate the imperative marker in between the formative -cu- and the particle -in.

The above type of imperatives may be analysed as follows:

vanticin (PN, 125; AK, 175) vantu-i-c(u)-ə-in
kapticin (AK, 108) kaptu-i-c(u)-ə-in
uraitticin (PN, 187) uraittu-i-c(u)-ə-in

The tense of the adverbial participles of 'caytu' pattern is past only in relation to the tense of the auxiliary verb ɪ (>1), which, here, occurs only in the future tense (13.3).

11.5. Imperatives like molimō, uraimō, etc.

Tolkāpīyāgar describes -mō as an expletive particle of second person, for the occurrence of which the commentators cite the examples uraimō (AK, 66), molimō (Kuru., 2), etc. These and other such forms occur as imperatives in Cauṅkam literature. L.V. Ramanaswami Aiyar also rightly classifies them under the imperatives. The forms of the above type may be segmented here.

ullumō (PN, 48) molimō
ullum-ō molim-ō
ull-um-ō moliyum-ō

-um -m denotes plural imperative; -ō is a particle used to invite attention. It is worthy of notice that Jules Bloch also points out that a suffix -m is used in the termination of imperative in ancient Tamil.
One may rightly point out that these forms have mostly rarely reference to singular number and to the plural. It may be assumed here that -um ~ -m was originally (in the pre-Tolkāppiyam period) a plural imperative marker but later on, in addition to its original usage, it began to be used as honorific singular (imperative) marker; yet it has not lost its imperative signification.

Here it is evident that Tolkāppiyamār arrives at the so-called expletive particle -mō by wrongly segmenting the plural or the honorific singular imperatives with the particle -ō at their end.

11.6. Imperatives like ṇēpmin, cēmīn, etc.

Tolkāppiyamār treats -min as one of the terminations of the second person plural verbs19. It is evident from Cankam literature that it occurs only in the plural imperative verbs. Later-day grammar Namūl clearly states that it occurs only in the plural imperatives and that too occurs in the future only.20

L.e.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nirum in</th>
<th>cēmīn (P, 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ṇimpum in</td>
<td>(P, 87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nirum in</td>
<td>(P, 152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nirum in</td>
<td>cēmīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niru- in</td>
<td>cēm- in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nir(u)-um- in</td>
<td>cēr-um- in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-um ~-m is imperative plural marker.

-in ( < en > en ) is a particle used to invite attention.

Dr. Varadarajanār identifies -in as the modified form of en, which is originally, according to him, an interrogative particle21.
11.7. Imperatives like kenmiya, cenmiya, etc.

Tolkāppiyār refers to the imperative forms with final -miya in "Nuttatikāram" and treats -miya as an expletive particle of the second person in Īṭaiyil. For the occurrence of this, the commentators cite the example ēnmiya, cenmiya, etc., which may be segmented and traced back to their constituents as follows.

kenmiya  cenmiya
kēnmiya  cēnmiya
kēnmiya yā  cēnmiya yē
kēlum-yā  celum-yā
kēlum-yā  celum-yā

-ē is honorific singular imperative marker; yā is a particle used to invite attention. It may be pointed out here that Tolkāppiyār includes yē also in the list of expletive particles (TC, 279).

It is, here, evident that -miya is considered as an expletive particle by wrongly segmenting the imperative verbs taking the particle yā.

11.8. Imperatives like caymē, uraimē, etc.

Tolkāppiyār mentions that the verbs with final -ē preceded by suitable consonants may occur in the second person. The commentators consider -ē as the only consonant for the occurrence of -ē finally in the second person verbs and cite niyame (NT, 300) caymē (PN, 46), etc., as examples. Tolkāppiyār does not indicate whether such forms occur as indicatives or as imperatives. In Čānkkā literature these -ē ending forms occur as imperatives only. L.V. Rāmaswami Aiyyar also treats the forms of the above type under the imperatives.
-m denotes honorific singular imperative significance; -e is an exclamative particle used to invite attention.

The structure and the significance of the forms like the above were not recognized and identified properly, at the time of Tolkāppiyānār.

11.9. Imperatives like kōṭumati, ṇōmēti, etc.

Tolkāppiyānār includes meti also in the list of second 25 person exclamative particles, for the occurrence of which, in Cāndam literature, the examples kōṭumati (PN, 163), ṇōmēti (PN, 200), etc., may be cited.

A scholar ventures to segment the so-called particle meti into -m-ati. Prof. T.P. Keenakshisunderan remarks that the exclamative mati consists of more than one suffix: -m (plural) + a (formative) + -tu (formative) + i (second person singular).

The segmentation of meti into -m-ati is permitted, since it stands in accordance with the patterns already described.

11.10. Imperatives of 'ceym' or 'ceyyum' pattern.

Tolkāppiyānār does not refer to the imperatives of 'ceym' or 'ceyyum' pattern in his work, but they are found to occur in Cāndam literature. Since all the types of plural or honorific singular imperative verbs treated above are formed from this pattern of imperatives with an addition of some particles, a few forms of this
pattern are referred to, here, in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal Stem</th>
<th>Other Particles, if any</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kel</td>
<td>-ay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vantu-icu</td>
<td>-in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus it may be concluded that -ay ~ -∅ occurs as singular imperative marker and that -um ~ -m occurs as plural or honorific singular marker. Tolkāppiyāgar does not recognize -um ~ -m as an imperative marker. In the ancient Tamil the particle like -∅ -ā, -ya, -ati or -in was added to the imperatives to invite attention or to express...
the command emphatically. Some of these may be identified as
expletive particles (17.10).

Dr. M. Varadarajan considers that -ya, -a, -o, -en (> -in) are expletive particles or particles used to draw the attention of
hearers and that they must have been originally interrogative
particles.

------:oo oo:------
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Pope, C.U., describes "en pēril irānkumaṅ! 'Pray have mercy on me'. Here -ēṅ = pray do, is either for ē emphatic, or from ēṅ why not?" (A Hand Book of the Ordinary Dialect of the Tamil Language, p.153) This description further gleans the origin of the particle -īṅ ( <ēṅ <ēṅ) which is found to occur in the vantīcīṅ and kēnāṅīṅ types of imperatives.