

An Introduction to  
**DRAVIDIAN  
PHILOLOGY**



An Introduction to  
**DRAVIDIAN  
PHILOLOGY**

Lectures delivered on behalf  
of the Oriental Research  
Institute, Madras University,  
on the 29th Jan. 1929  
and the succeeding days.

# An Introduction to **DRAVIDIAN PHILOLOGY**

**C. Narayana Rao**



**ASIAN EDUCATIONAL SERVICES  
NEW DELHI 1984**

**ASIAN EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**  
**C-2/15, SDA, P.B. No. 4534**  
**New Delhi-110016**

**Price : Rs. 65.**  
**First Published : 1929**  
**First AES Reprint : 1984**  
**Published by J. Jetley**  
**For ASIAN EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**  
**C-2/15, SDA, NEW DELHI-110 016**  
**Printed at Gran offset Printers**  
**New Delhi-110035**

## PREFACE.

[ *The following is the second of the four lectures delivered by Mr C. Narayana Rao under the auspices of the Madras University as a part of the scheme of the Oriental Research Institute attached to the University. The first lecture made a survey of the research carried on with respect to the Dravidian languages and proposed to give a fresher orientation and newer outlook to Dravidian research in accordance with the latest advances made in Philological investigation. The second and the third dealt with the Dravidian racial and culture complexes and sought to establish the relationship of the Dravidians racially and culturally with the Indo-Europeans. In the fourth, a detailed examination was made of the close connection between Telugu and Kanarese.* ]

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

I must thank the M a d r a s University for having given me an opportunity to collect my thoughts on the Dravidian linguistic problem in the shape of the following lectures. Ever since I became acquainted with Caldwell's Comparative Grammar, I have been feeling that the opinion of the native Dravidian scholars has not received the attention that it deserved. In these lectures, therefore, I have endeavoured to present the other side, the native side, of the picture. How far I have succeeded in my attempts, it is for scholars to judge. But I rest satisfied with the thought that I have not allowed the question of the affiliation of the Dravidian languages to be set at rest once for all, and hope that a keener interest will be revived in solving this intricate problem.

These lectures were originally delivered in Telugu, but I have

preferred to publish them in an English garb for the benefit of a wider circle of scholars.

It will not be possible to make a list of all the books which I have consulted in preparing these lectures. Especial mention must be made of the volumes of Dr. Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India, the latest Census Reports, the works of Drs. Beames and Hoernle, the *Encyclopædia Britannica* and the various Prakrit grammars. For a good part of the first lecture dealing with the Anthropological problem, I have drawn upon Mr. Panchanan Mitra's "Prehistoric India."

In the following pages, the mark  $\bar{\hspace{.1em}}$  is used to denote the length of vowels and to distinguish the cerebral from the dentals, and the palatal from the dental s.

## THE DRAVIDIAN CULTURE-COMPLEX.

---

**S**OUTH India, along with the rest of India, has been the meeting-ground of many races and many cultures. The stratigraphical method of the geologist, the paleontological method of the fossil-collector, the method of the Ethnographer, and the typological method, have all contributed to the construction of the pre-history of man, and when applied to India have brought to light a whole vista of facts necessitating a readjustment in the old-world theories and a revaluation and newer synthesis of the various points of view that have been advanced from time to time on the discovery of isolated facts. Thus, while the scholars of a former generation postulated the migration of peoples into India from the North beyond the Himalayas and would not think of any other,

five cycles of migration from the East and the West have been sought to be established by later researches. In the first place, the rudest Paleolithic culture of Tasmania represented by the rudely chipped stones, implements of wood and stone, a lance-like staff, primitive rafts and simple leaf-shelters, finds its counterpart among the Andamanese nearer home. Secondly, the rude Neo-lithic culture represented by the Boomerang and shelters with roof and wells of Australia is echoed among the pre-Dravidian or Negroid tribes in the Deccan. Then, a later culture represented by elaborate sociological divisions, conical huts and propulsuers characterising the totem of Australia, call to mind the corresponding totemistic organisation among the Todas and pre-Dravidians of Chota Nagpur. Again, what is called the Cycle of Marks denoted by agriculture in a primitive form and the use of masks and

so on is a characteristic of the Australians, the Sinhalese and such other people. Lastly, the bow of warfare represents a further advance and is found in many varied forms among the aborigines of Australia on the one side and the Nagas of Assam on the other.

Now, the same points of contact in prehistoric culture that subsist between the Australians and the Indians are found among the inhabitants of South Africa. The existence of close affinities between the **flora** and **fauna** of these three portions of the world leads to the postulate of a remote continuous stretch of land extending from Australia through India to Africa. Geologists also assert the connection of this vast stretch of land with China, to all of which they give the name of **Lemuria**.

The problem of the Todas is still involved in obscurity. In the

Nilgiris are found pottery figurines which ethnologists would connect with the Todas. If so, they show a connection with the Armenoid culture and the terracotta figurines riding on horse-back with prominent noses and flowing beards suggest affinities with Asia Minor. Again, it is urged that certain cultural elements of the proto-Egyptian civilization still survive in the Deccan. The antiquarian remains of Crete, Mycenae, and Hissarlic (Troy) point to some connection with South India. It has been asserted once more that the bulk of Indian historical culture is Aryo-Erythraen, which in its Erythraen aspect is at least as old as the Bronze Age I or the pre-Mycenaen epoch or the Chalcolithic stage in Egypt, Sumer, Elam and Enau. Anthropological research does not stop here, but takes us back to Late-Tertiary and Quaternary times. On top of all this comes the contact of South India with

Aryan culture, leading us down to the proto-historic age in India.

Thus, the panorama of history is ever widening before us and India is being brought in cultural relation with the various races and nations of the earth. The recent excavations at Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro have given rise to another train of thought and laid before us the scene of a stage of civilization whose contacts with other civilizations await to be properly evaluated. The world is anxiously looking forward to the results of the labours of scholars in the interpretation of the pictographs found on these sites.

While this is so, speculation has been set on foot to go still further behind the point where the anthropologists have reached with respect to India. The study of Paleolithic forms with their successive phases of pre-Chellean, Chellean, Acheullean,

Mousterian, Aurignacian, Solutrian, Magdalenian, and Azelian, is now intently carried on, extending our vision beyond the Metallic and Neolithic ages. Thus, samples of culture of India are found at various places and a tentative chronological classification is advanced:—

...	...	...	Early Paleo-lithic age, Nerbudda.
...	...	...	Mid Paleo-lithic age, Neanderthaloid, Kurnool.
...	...	...	Upper Paleo-lithic age, Cromagnoid, Negroid
		9000 B.C. (Solla's date for the Azilian phase ... ..	Late-Paleolithic, Australoid
Indo Australian		7000 B.C. (Neolithic, Egypt and Elamite culture) ...	Early Neolithic-Veddaici
		5500 B.C. Pietrie and Mancho's date for the coming of dynastic peoples in Egypt) ....	Neolithic, Indo-African, Dravidian.
Indo Erythrean		(4000 B.C. Semitic movements in Asia Minor) ...	Eneolithic-Central-Asiatic and Toda.
		2500 B.C. (Jacobi's date for Rigvedic beginnings) ....	Early copper-Long headed Indo-European
Indo Aryan		1000 B.C. (Oldenberg's date for Rigvedic culture). ....	Bronze and Iron-Broad-headed Indo European

So, through the labours of research workers, the history of man is getting more and more interesting and especially to us in the South where many of the evidences of this evolution of culture have been unearthed. This does not, of course, mean that South India alone is the land of this play of cultures, for, in many places besides are evidences forthcoming in India to show that it had been the meeting ground of the cultures of Primitive Man.

Now, it has become a matter for speculation whether all these cultures are indigenous to India and radiated in different directions to all quarters of the globe, or India is only the central meeting ground and a halting place for the various cultures which had found their origin in various parts of the world. It is not necessary here to enter into the merits of this controversy, but we may be satisfied with the generally

received opinion of Lord Avebury that "it is in the warmer regions of the Earth that we may reasonably find the earliest traces of the human race," and of Dr Haddon that "there can be little doubt that man evolved somewhere in Southern Asia, possibly during Pliocene and Miocene times."

Granting, then, that India was the early scene of Man's evolution, where and in what part exactly did Man first appear? This question is as futile as it is unnecessary at the present stage, considering the paucity of materials to build theories upon. As Sir Arthur Keith says, "It (India) is part of the world from which the student of early Man has expected so much and so far has obtained so little". No systematic survey of the pre-historic remains has been carried on and the little glimpses that we have of early history are based on the chance discoveries of isolated

scholars during the last fifty years. No doubt, there has been a respectable collection of pre-historic remains, but they are simply deposited in the various museums of India and still await systematic study. It has become a fashion for some time past and especially among writers in South India to attribute everything to a Tamilian origin. The investigations into the Tamil language by early Missionaries like Pope, Winslow, Rottler and others, and the one-sided conclusions of Caldwell with regard to the antiquity of the Dravidian languages and culture have emboldened others to pursue the theme to the entire exclusion of other and more important factors that ought to enter into any impartial account of the development of any culture. A certain author argues the case, in contravention of the impartial attitude adumbrated at the beginning of his book, and arrives at his preconceived conclusions and

says, "Hence, we shall not be far wrong if we infer that South India gave a refuge to survivors of the Deluge, that the culture developed in Lemuria was carried to South India after its submergence and that South India was probably the cradle of the post-diluvian human race. As the centre of gravity of the Dravidian peoples, as determined by the density of their population, lies somewhere about Mysore, South India must be considered as the home of those peoples whence they might have spread to the North," And again, "Nevertheless, it is perhaps not too bold to assert that future discoveries and dispassionate researches may ultimately lead to the universal acceptance of the view that the Dravidians were living in South India from the remotest antiquity". Others again are not wanting who would restrict the original home of Man to a particular corner of the Tamil country. Thus,

we find a large number of Southern writers who are harping on this theme, which, if not by the soundness of argument, at least by a process of repetition, may come to be accepted by the general historian who has not the leisure or the inclination to examine the validity of this contention.

This narrow outlook must, however, be given up, for it does not fit in with known facts. The Burma Rostro-Carinate find of Dr. Noetling, the agate chip from the Godavery, and the **Boucher** from the Nerbudda are considered to belong to types of culture and to times which cannot be brought down later than the earliest Pleistocene stage. These Rostra-Carinates are said to represent pre-Chellean culture and are also recovered from Chakradharpur in Chota Nagpur and Cuddapah. The early and Middle Paleolithic Indians are thought to have mustered strong in the Cuddapah, Guntur and Nellore

Districts and the neighbouring tracts of Madras. Logan says, "The Man of the quartzite and most ancient period appears to have inhabited the coast from Orissa to South Arcot and inland as far as Kurnool. From Arcot, a colony detached itself to Tanjore and Madura where quartzite was used in the place of quartzite, and from Kurnool another branch passed across Tungabhadra perhaps leaving out Bellary, and colonized the Southern Maharatta country" This phase of culture is also illustrated by specimens from Bundelkhand and Jaipur Cuddapah, especially, seems to be the centre of the culture of the Paleolithic Man, as this district is practically the home of the quartzite formation, and thus had the best attractions for the primitive settlers. An advance on this Chellean culture is in evidence in the District of Chengalpat, Arcot, Madras and the Southern Maharatta country. In Kur-

nool have been found the earliest of cave-dwellings in Billa Surgam near Banaganapalli, Yerrazari and Yegunta. These belong to the Pleistocene age. Some remains of Krishna and Kathiawar along with the Ban̄a remains belong to the post-Karnul epoch. The Chakradharpur finds of Mr. PanchananMitra and Anderson represent the close of this epoch and indicate several later stages of culture. Pre-historic art is represented by etchings from Bellary. From the Kappagallu in the Bellary district have been reported more than twenty groups of birds and beasts of various degrees of artistic execution. Among them occur the figures of obscure human beings and elephants. The most interesting of these figures is a hunting-scene in which two men are seen proceeding towards a bull with up-raised right arms, as if for hurling javelins and having something like shields on their left arms. There is

also another part of the delineation of a six-rayed star. All these figures are found in a Neolithic site. Bellary along with Salem and Madura, is considered undoubtedly the centre of Neolithic culture, as Cuddapah was of the early and mid-Paleolithic culture. Bellary is identified with the Kiskindha of the Ramayana, the home of Vali and Sugriva. The monkey-like beings described therein are considered to probably belong to Neolithic times, having their counterparts among the pre-dynastic Egyptians. Dasaratha, the father of Rama, occurs also in Egyptian legend, and the word Ra-amu has a Hamitic ring. However that may be, the Neolithic settlements are of such fascinating interest that it is tempting to say something about them. Here "all sorts of Neolithic weapons and implements were found in abundance. Only from Kappagallu alone 180 celts were recovered. The North

East slope of the hill was apparently a Neolithic factory-site and the largest manufacturing industry of polished stones in India flourished there." "No less than 77 pre-historic sites were discovered near that place and in the outlying tracts, and there is no doubt that a large and extensive civilization flourished there. The people, though they still adhered to the primitive forms of life, offered stubborn resistance to the invading races from the North with higher cultures. The cinder mounds in the contiguous districts retain unmistakable traces of big encampments and huge conflagrations and there was most probably a tussle between some bringer of Northern culture with equatorial tribes flourishing with their older type of civilization. Thus on the road from Bellary to Dharwar Rocks a remarkable mound consisting of slaggy cinders full 50 feet high and 400 ft. in circumference is met with."

The celts found on these sites are in various stages of manufacture. The abundant varieties of mealing-stones, corn-crushers and pounding-stones indicate that they had passed the hunting stage and were settling down to agricultural pursuits. Their peaceful instruments are more abundant than weapons of war, and they were more vegetarian than carnivorous. Their articles of domestic use show that they had a fascination for colour. "The small tools were made of beautiful chert, agate, chalcedony, bloodstone, Indian stone and rock-crystal. Knives, saws, drills and lancets were made from the flakes struck off for them and went to make up the economic comforts of their household. "They had numerous fine rock-shelters. The presence of straw in cinder mounds perhaps indicates that they also lived in thatched houses. But they took their habitation mostly in the citadels on the

hills and on the little shallow sloping valleys. They perhaps knew how to smelt iron."

We now enter on the Megalithic age where proto history begins. References to this age occur in the Vedas and the Brahmanas. A rapid survey of the movements of culture in South India has been given above just to show that the advocates of Tamilikkam being the original home of Man, to the exclusion of every other, are claiming too much for their point of view. So far as we know, there have not yet come to light any traces in Tamilikkam of the Pleistocene Man and of the rest also the finds are not so abundant as to warrant a theory of the kind advanced by the Tamilikkam advocates. The finds at Adichanallur are made much of by them, but with regard to them, it has been said by scholars that the Megalithic skulls of the kind found there range in India from Neolithic (C. 4000 B. C.) to late.

Metallic times (C 5000 B C.) and thus they are useless for their purpose. Their contention based on such meagre evidence, would indeed be less tenable than, for example, if we advance the theory that, because a large number of antiquarian remains have been unearthed in the Andhra country and the Central Deccan Plateau as shown above, representing almost every phase of the life of pre-historic Man, those parts of Southern India must have been the original home of Man. In fact these evidences are ubiquitous throughout the whole of India and no one portion can definitely be said to represent the original home of Man. We are yet in the beginning of studies in this direction and it is too soon to hazard any theory on the existing facts.

The truth, however, seems to be that the so-called Dravidians are not indigenous to India in pre-historic

times. Ruggeiri, the great anthropologist says, "Every thing induces us to hold that the Dravidians have really been a small number of invaders who have introduced their languages, and even that not everywhere, since in the Munda-Kol Zone languages more ancient have been preserved. It is logical to hold that, if those languages have remained in spite of the Dravidian influences, those who speak them should also have been little contaminated. There is, therefore, no reason to consider them as Platyrrhine Dravidians, but certainly as Veddaic or Australoid, and from the fact that between the Munda-Kols of the North and the Veddass of the South, there intervene other Platyrrhines (Paniyans etc.,) these latter also represent the same ancient pre-Dravidan formation which, at one time, extended over the whole of India and has always been much less affected by the

newcomers (Dravidians, Aryans etc.,) Thus by the time proto history begins, the Dravidians could not have been in Southern India. And as this stratum of culture is widely held to be Austro-Indo-African, we cannot assert that Dravidian affinities should be discovered among the people of this region

The term "Dravidian" has been a much abused word. Ever since Caldwell wrote his "Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages" a new turn has been given to its signification which has so much established itself in philological and anthropological discussions that there seems to be no chance at present for its being properly understood in its historical light. But from the earliest times, as the name of a set of languages or of a particular language, it was understood to constitute one of the Prakrit languages. It was con-

sidered a 'vibhasha', which Caldwell renders as 'a minor Prakrit', but which must be considered as one of those Prakrits which the grammars did not take special notice of, being one of the many widely distributed Prakrits which had not been specially studied because there was no extensive literature found written in them to allow them to formulate the principles on which they were constructed. At least, they were perhaps not acquainted with those languages. The 'Dravidi Prakrit' was evidently included among the so-called Paisaci Prakrits, about which we shall deal presently. That at least the Telugu language had its origin in a variety of Paisaci seems to be the opinion of some of the Telugu Grammarians. The term Dravidi as the name of a Prakrit has been consistently used by scholars till the time of Caldwell. Babu Rajendralal Mitra speaks of the Dravidi as one of the

recognized Prakrits equally with the 'Sauraseni' and as being, like it, the parent of some of the present vernaculars of India

Even if we take 'Dravida' as the name of a set of people, we come to the same conclusion. Dravida, Karnata, Gurjjara, Maharashtra and Talinga are alluded to as constituting the five Dravidian tribes and are brought in juxtaposition with the five Gauda tribes Kannoja, Gauda, Maithila, Utkala and Saraswata. If the Gurjjars and the Maharashtras have racial affinities with the five Gauda tribes, the connection between the Gaudas and the Dravidas also is established. Thus, racially and linguistically alike, ancient writers seem to have thought there were affinities with the modern Aryans of North India and the Dravidians of the South.

'Dravida' is a very ancient word in the Sanskrit literature. Manu includes the Dravidas among the Vrishalas or out-castes along with Pundrakas, Odras, Kambhojas, Yavanas, Sakas, Paradas, Pallavas, Chinas, Kiratas, Daradas and Khasas. But he acknowledges them as once having belonged to the Kshatriya Aryan tribes and says that they were gradually excluded from the Aryan fold because they did not conform to the Brahmannic practices as they were then understood. If the Andhras are to be included under the Dravidians and identified with the Telugus, they also once belonged to the Aryan tribes, for they are found mentioned in the Aitareya Brahmana along with the Pundras, Sabaras and Pulindas as degraded descendants of Viswamitra. This statement is confirmed by the Mahabharata. The dynastic names of the Pandyas, Cholas and Cheras who all held sway in Southern

India are Aryan in their ring and there were free marital relations between them and the Aryan dynasties of North India.

The attitude of Caldwell towards the problem of the affiliation of the Dravidian languages is puzzling to a degree. He appears to have made up his mind with regard to the Scythian theory, and although he is fair enough to take notice of Indo-European affinities, he would brush them aside and hunt after the Scythian languages for light and would fain make use of such far-fetched scraps of analogies as he would get at. There is not a detail discussed in his Grammar to which he cannot find an analogy in the Indo-European tongues, and yet he cannot bring his mind to acknowledge it. And yet from very early times the writers of Dravidian Grammar have perceived some sort of connection between Sanskrit and the Southern Indian languages and have called

them 'vaikritas'. But the pity is, they have not worked up their contention and taken pains to show how the two are connected. It is not strange that they did not do it, because no direct connection could be perceived on the surface in point of grammar between the two. However, they contented themselves by showing a direct connection in point of vocabulary, by formulating the 'Tatsama' and 'Tadbhava' divisions of each of the Dravidian languages, and contented themselves with relegating the rest to the class of 'desya'. Under 'tatsama' and 'tadbhava' again, they made a distinction between Samskritsama and Prakritasama and Samskritabhava and Prakritabhava on the other. Indeed their Prakritasamas and Samskritabhavas could be traced to Prakrit originals. But in the affiliation of languages, vocabulary does not count, unless analogies and derivations could be established

with regard to the grammatical structure also.

Now, however, the Scythian theory of Caldwell is generally rejected by scholars and in thus rejecting it, they have also declined to see any affinity between the Dravidian and the Aryan languages. Caldwell's achievement, therefore, lay only in the perception of unity and homogeneity among the Dravidian languages. Thus, by the rejection of relationship either with the Scythian or the Indo-European, the Dravidian languages have come to acquire a unique position, a position of isolation from any of the known families of languages. It must, however, be acknowledged that the complete unity among the Dravidian languages established by Caldwell was no small an achievement in itself. We shall now proceed to examine whether this isolation of the Dravidian family of languages can be accepted or

whether we can reopen the question of Indo-European affinities.

The problem of the Brahui language of Baluchistan and the statements with regard to the Paisaci languages made by grammarians may come to our aid in establishing fresh contacts. We shall consider the Paisaci languages first. The Aryan family of languages is well-known to belong to the Indo-European languages. This Aryan family, according to the latest researches is sub-divided into (1) Iranian (Eranian or Erano-Aryan) languages (2) Indo Aryan or Sanskritic Indo-Aryan languages, Iranian being also grouped into Persian and non-Persian. Of these the Paisaci languages include Pashai, spoken in Laghman in Afghanistan; a number of Kafir dialects of which the principal are Bashgai, Wai, and Kalasha; Khowar, the language of Chitral; and Shina, that of Gilgit in the

neighbourhood. Shina is the basis of Kashmiri, which is the most Southern of the Dard group of the Paisaci languages, and also of many mixed dialects spoken in the Indus and Swat-Kohistans, now being superseded by Pashto. Khowar occupies an independent position and the Kaffir dialects, at least five in number, differ widely from one another. Wasin Veri, the most Western of them agrees in some phonetic peculiarities with the purely Eranian Munjani. At the present day, these Paisaci languages occupy the three-sided tract of country between the Hindukush on the North-Western Frontier of British India.

This present position of the great Paisaci languages accords to a great extent with the place assigned to them by the Prakrit grammarians. Markandeya (17th century) mentions Kancidesiya, Pandya, Panchala, Gauda, Magadha, Vracada, Dakshi-

natya, Saurasena, Kaikeya or Kaikaya, Sabara and Dravida as countries where the Paisaci languages are spoken. Of these, he says, only three, namely, Kaikeya, Sourasena and Panchala are Nagara or civilized. Ramatarkavagisa, perhaps also of the 17th century, mentions two varieties of Paisaci. Viz, Kaikaya and (?) Chaska. He adds that the main Prakrits like the Magadhi when incorrectly used become asuddha Paisacikas. Lakshmidhara refers to Paisaci as being spoken in Pandya, Kekaya, Bahlika, Simha(la), Nepala, Kuntala, Sudheshna, Bota, Gandhara, Haiva and Kannojana.

From a perusal of the above lists, it would appear that the Paisaci-speaking peoples had distributed themselves over the whole of India. No doubt, the lists given above do not agree one with the other, but one at least, Kekays, is common to all of them. Markandeya speaks of

the Kekaya as the standard Paisaci in which Gunadhya is reputed to have written his Brihatkatha. It is, however, contended by some scholars that Gunadhya was a South Indian and the Brihatkatha was composed in the Chulika Paisaci, centuries before that late literary development in Kashmir which produced Kshemendra, Bilhana, Somadeva and Kalhana, and that, therefore, it is as much possible that original Chulika Paisaci belonged to the Vindhya as to Kashmir. Even granting that this contention is correct, it does not affect the north Western origin of the Paisaci. The main characteristics of Paisaci as laid down by Prakrit grammarians are reflected in the inscriptions of Asoka at Shahabazgarhi, a village on the river Makam, nine miles from Mardan, the capital of the Yusufzai Taluk in Peshawar District of the N.W. Frontier province of India. This points to Kekaya as being the original home of

this dialect. Kekaya, as we know, was a great centre of culture from very early times, of which Takshasila is the chief seat, where Panini, and before him Buddha himself appear to have received their education. The standard Paisaci can therefore be most certainly located as a local dialect of Kekaya and Eastern Gandhara, lying in the extreme North-West of India.

Of the rest of the Paisaci speaking tracts mentioned by Markandeya Kanchidesiya, Pandya, Dakshinatyā, Sabara and Dravida belong to India South of the Vindhya mountain, as also the Sahya, Simhala, and Kannojana named by Lakshmidhara. Gauda and Magadha belong to the East of India above the Vindhyas. Pancala is the Panjab. Sourasena is identified with modern Gujarat. Vararuci says the Sauraseni is the basis of the Paisaci. Vracada is modern Sindh. Nepala is well known. Kuntala is

the country where the Narmada takes its rise of which Vidarbha is the capital. Sudhesna is a certain forest tract. Bota is the hilly country of Assam. Haima is a hilly country at the foot of the Himalayas. Some call it Haiva and identify it with Hai, in the forest region of Nepal and Bhutan. These languages are perhaps to be designated as the Asuddha Paisacikas mentioned by Markandeya.

The wide distribution of these languages throughout India and the general concensus of opinion that the language of Kekaya represents the standard Paisaci points to the fact that there must have been at a very remote time, long before the Sanskritic Aryans entered India, an extensive eruption of the Paisaci speaking people overrunning the whole of India in gradual stages and mixing themselves with the aboriginal peoples. While these advanced in civilization

in certain places, they succumbed to the aboriginal influences in certain others, and continued to live in a low state of culture.

Grierson, however, considers that these people left the main body of Aryans after the great fission which resulted in the Indo-Aryan migration but before all the typical peculiarities of Iranian speech had fully developed. They are thus, he says, the representatives of a stage of linguistic progress later than that of Sanskrit and earlier than that recorded in the Iranian Avesta. The separation between the Iranians and the Indian Aryans, however, may not have taken place all at once, but might have begun even before the entry of the Aryans into India, and when they came to India, they had to encounter once more with their ancient rivals of Iran. The immigrants into Kashmir and the surrounding country may perhaps be taken to

represent a later migration of allied tribes into those parts.

In the light of the above we come to understand why Manu should have included the Pundrakas, the Odras, Dravidas, Kambhojas, Yavanas, Sakas, Paradas, Pallavas, Chinas, Kiratas, Daradas and Khasas among the Vrishalas. He does not consider them to be non-Aryan but only as apostates from the Aryan religion. We know that the Yavanas, Sakas, Paradas, Pallavas, Chinas and Daradas, all belong to the region beyond the North-Western Frontier of India and that even now, we find those races being represented there. We also have in this a glimpse into the reason why in the Aitareya Brahmana the Andhras, Pundras, Sabaras and Pulindas should be treated as Vratyas, the degraded descendants of Viswamitra. At any rate, their origin and relationship with the Indo Aryans has never been question-

ed. We have also here a clue as to why all these tribes should have been brought together under the common contemptuous name of the Pisacas.

Why these were called the Pisacas can easily be surmised. We know that there was a great schism between the Iranians and the Aryans before they separated over religious and social practices. "Asura" in the Avesta is the mighty God, and "Daeva" the evil one, while the reverse is the case with the Aryans. There was a perpetual fight between the two, during the course of which some of the Asuras seem to have called truce and agreed to occupy a subordinate and yet important position in the Aryan fold. Varuna, for instance, is an Asura and yet a god of the Aryans. How this came to pass may be accounted for by the fact that originally he was a powerful rival of Indra and passages can be quoted from the Rigveda to show

that for some time they were each contending for the upper hand. But in course of time, Varuna contented himself with remaining in the Aryan fold by accepting sovereignty over the 'Antariksha' and administering the Rita or the Law. He seems to have occupied a portion of the Aryan realm acting as a buffer between the Aryan domain in the Punjab and the wild Iranian tribes beyond the Himalayas. Similarly with the Maruts, originally Asuras, but accepting a subordinate yet important position in the hierarchy of the Aryan gods. It is remarkable that no Suras are mentioned in the Rigveda, but only Asuras and the word Suras is only a late formation on mistaken etymology. That is why also the Asuras are called the Purvadevatah. Of the individual enemies of the Aryans, Ahi the dragon-cloud fiend, is found as Ajidahak, the biting serpent, among the Iranians. Vritra, the enfolder, is

not also unknown among them. Of the tribes opposed to the Rigvedic Aryans, the Panis, the wealthy robber tribe, have a suggestive identity with the Parthians, whom the Greek philosopher Strabo described as nomads- a sort of Eranian Bedouins having their abodes along the Oxus (modern Amu Darya). The Paravatas or mountaineers and the people whom the vedic Aryans fought are held to be the Parouetai, dwelling in the mountains, also of foreign Aryan stock (Hillebrandt). We now come to the Dasyus, who seem to have molested the Aryans in various ways. The word 'Dasyu' occurs in old Persian and the Achæmenian inscriptions as 'Dahyu' also and consistently means only 'peoples' or 'nations'. But in the Veda, its meaning had gradually changed first as enemies and afterwards as fiends and evil demons. Some of the Dasyus are 'Krishna Tvachah' or dark-skinned

and some not. Perhaps, they represent in a general way all those who were originally in occupation of the land and presented a stout opposition to the Aryan advance. The Dasyus are surmised to have been later on included, after their subjugation, into the Aryan society as the fourth caste or Sudras when the system of caste settled itself as an institution. However that may be, scholars like Edward Meyer, seek to identify them with the 'Dahae' a tribe nearly akin to the Eranians, located in the Kirghiz-Turkman steppe which extends from the Caspian Sea beyond the Yaxartes, now Syr Darya. The war-cry of the Dasyus 'he' layo, for 'he' rayo, i. e., the substitution of l for r is in consonance with the rule of the Culika Paisaci laid down by the Prakrit grammarians.

The term Brahui is the Cynderella of Dravidian philology and the

race itself has been an ethnological mystery. Various attempts have been made to classify the Brahuīs with the Dravidians, the Scythians, the 'Tatar Mountaineers,' the Arabs and the Iranians. Some derive the word from the Persian 'Ba-rohi' meaning 'of the hills'. Others say it is connected with the eponym Braho or Brahīn i. e., Ibrahim. Sometimes they are said to have relationship with the Jats or the Jadgal (Jagdal) consisting of the three tribes—the Mengals, the Bizangos and the Zehris. The Zaghar, Mengal, a superior division of the Mengal tribe, believe they had come from a district called Zughd, somewhere near Samarkhand in Central Asia. 'Men' without the 'gal' appears in the lists of Behistun inscriptions as the name of a tribe deported by Darius, the Achaemenian, for their turbulence. Sajdi, a Brahui tribal name, and Saga the name of a class of that tribe, are

identified with the Sagatae and Saki of ancient writers and referred to the Scythian stock. The Brahuis say their ancestors came from Aleppo, but there is no evidence to confirm this. The latest and widely held opinion seems to be that they are of Dravidian stock lying isolated in the middle of Iranian tongues, away from their kinsmen and much Arabized. They are distinguished from the Baluchis and Pathans by being smaller and sturdier with rounder faces and flat, blunt and coarse features.

Amidst this diversity of opinion with regard to the Brahuis there is one very significant suggestion expressed by Dr. Gustav Oppert which may give us some insight into the problem. He believes that the word is in some way related to, if not identical with, that of the Baluchis and recognises their origin in the names of 'Paratas' and 'Paradas' who dwelt in North-Eastern Baluchistan.

He thinks that 'bra' is a contraction for 'bara' and says, "Thus in Brahui, is a name whose resemblance to that of the Paratas and Paravar and their kindred the Marathi Paravari and Dravidian Parheyas of Palaman is striking'. If this identification of the Brahuīs with the Paratas or Paradās is correct, as most probably it is, it gives us a clue to the history of this race and takes us back to Rigvedic times. The Baratas or Bharatas are, we know, a Rigvedic race. Sudas was the chief of the Tritsus. Against him a confederacy of ten tribes was formed, among whom the Bharatas are the most important. Visvamitra was originally the chief priest of Sudas, but he fell out with him and went over as the chief priest to the side of the Bharatas. Moreover, the Kusikas, to whom Viswamitara belonged were closely connected with the Bharatas. The Bharatas came to the Vipas and Sutudri accompanied

by Viswamitra. The rivers were in full floods and gave way to them through his prayers, But Vasishta, the successor as chief priest and his rival, came to the aid of Sudas by his invocations and got a victory for the Tritsus. This information is important, for Viswamitra is always found connected with the opponents of the Aryans and all his descendants are known to be Vratyas, i e., those who had gone out of the Aryan fold. Thus there appears to exist some connection between the Iranians and the Bharatas and though there exists some relationship between them and the story of the Mahabharata, they had gradually lost their individuality and gave place to, or got themselves merged in, the more powerful Kuru race. Possibly they contented themselves after their defeat to settle themselves in their original locality and it is just probable that the modern

Brahuis are representative of the that Rigvedic race.

Thus we have reason to believe that racially the Brahuis are connected with the Iranians, just like the Baluchis alongside of whom they live. Most probably they belong to the group of the Paisaci speaking peoples, those non-Sanskritic Iranians who entered India before the Aryan immigration. But now they are, like the Baluchis, so much influenced by Arab and Turkish influences that their Iranian identity is much obscured.

According to the census of 1921, the Brahuis number 137,082 souls in Baluchistan and are a little more than 200,000 including those found in Sindh. In Baluchistan itself they are the majority group. In Kelat, they number 130,437 and in Chagal 1,404. But they form the minority in Quetta, Pishin, Sili and Las Bela and Bolan. There are no Brahuis in the rest of

the Districts of Loralai, Zhob and the Mari-Bugti country. They live among the Pathans, Sayyids, Baluchis, Jats, Dehwars, Lasis and Medes, all of whom form the indigenous population, while there is also a small amount of semi-indigenous and alien population.

The vernaculars of Baluchistan belong to three families, the Eranian Indian and Brahui, if this last with its much changed phonetic character could be regarded as separate from Eranian. Between these three, there is a perpetual struggle for mastery. There is a contest also among the dialects of each family. Thus Pashto and Baluchi on the one hand, and Jadgali and Sindhi on the other are at close grips. Brahui is alone in its heroic struggle and friendless and solitary, it is gradually losing ground.

So far, an attempt has been made to show that, considered historically, the so-called Dravidian

people possess a prominently Iranian character and that the origin of most of the South Indian people can be traced to an Iranian origin, represented by the Paisaci speaking people once living beyond the North West of India. These peoples had overspread the whole of India at a very early age, in fact, long before the advent of the Aryans and superimposed themselves on the aboriginal population represented by the earliest Austro-Indo-Erythraen peoples. These prevented the Aryan advance at every step and presented a resolute fight inch by inch but they had to give way and allow themselves to be absorbed in or themselves absorb the Aryan element. Thus we find that ethnically the Dravidians present such complex features which are historically demonstrated and ethnologically supported. An endeavour will be made in the next lecture to treat this Dravidian ethnic complex in the light of

the Dravidian culture-complex as represented by the various elements that go to constitute the so-called Dravidian languages.

---

## DRAVIDIAN PHILOLOGY.

---

### A Retrospect and a Prospect.

It was in the year 1856, now 73 years ago, that Dr. Caldwell, inspired by the missionary zeal that characterized many of the pioneers of Christian endeavour in India, brought out his first edition of "*A comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian family of Languages.*" The publication was unique of its kind and epoch-making in the field of philological research in India. Contemporaneously with him and even before, missionaries had taken to the study of individual South-Indian languages and evinced such loving interest in them that their labours stand to the present day as models of patient and persevering evangelical enterprise. Their interest was, no doubt, in the beginning brought about by the immediate necessity of carrying the gospel of Christ

to the masses of South India, but this practical outlook was soon transformed into a scientific, dispassionate attitude towards their studies, and the result was that, whatever the immensity of the Christian influence they succeeded in infusing into them, their linguistic enterprise had borne everlasting fruit and laid future generations under a debt of deep gratitude to them. Their attempts at understanding the Indian peoples through their languages was also encouraged by the then rulers of India, the East India Company, for administrative reasons. It is not possible to refer to all the work turned out by these early philologists with respect to these several South Indian languages. It is only sufficient here to call to mind some of the names of those early pioneers.

In the field of Tamil studies, Father Beschi, the missionary Sanyasi and pandit, stands prominently at the

head of the list. His "*Grammar on the common dialect of the Tamil language*" and "*Grammar of High Tamil*" and his more important Tamil dictionary, the "*Sadur-agaradi*" need especial mention. So ably had he mastered the Tamil language that his "*Tembavani*", a religious epic, is considered to bring its author into the first rank of Tamil poets. Ellis says that the Tamils could not believe that it was the work of a foreigner.

Beschi died in 1747 and his studies were followed up by equally enthusiastic missionaries like Rottler, Caldwell and Pope. Mention may here be made also of the members of the Tranquebar Danish Mission founded by Ziegenbalg and Plutsch, who produced some grammars and school books in Tamil, besides translations of the Holy Bible. We cannot pass over the missionary effort for the Tamil language without paying a tribute to Winslow whose "*A comprehen-*

*sive Tamil and English Dictionary of High and Low Tamil* " had superseded all earlier work in that direction and to this day stands as the most authoritative and comprehensive piece of Dravidian scholarship.

In the field of Malayalam, linguistic studies by missionaries began even earlier. A Portugese grammar with a Malayalam vocabulary published in 1738, a Malayalam Dictionary completed by German and Italian missionaries in 1746, Malayalam grammars by Peter Clemens (1784) and Robert Drummond (1799), and studies by J. Adam Cellarius in 1781, form the early contributions of missionaries to Malayalam. Rev. Bailey's Dictionary of Malayalam-English and English-Malayalam needs to be mentioned here. But of far greater importance and Dravidian philological interest is Dr. Gundert's Malayalam dictionary to which Caldwell refers as "the truly scientific dictionary." As

a piece of lexicography it stands out as a specimen of accurate scholarship and painstaking research

Schulze, the Danish missionary was the first European to make a thorough study of the Telugu language. A Telugu grammar was printed in 1807. The work of the Morris brothers needs also to be specially noted. A. D. Campbell's "*A Grammar of the Telugu language, commonly termed the Gentoo*" was acquired for publication by the East India Company in 1813 and actually published in 1819. It ran into three editions. "*The Telugu and English dictionary*" by Morris was published in 1835. To the Telugus, the work of Charles Philph Brown is of lasting value. His translation of Vemana's verses brought him into prominence and was followed by his "*An analysis of Telugu Prosody*" with an explanation of the Sanskrit system of metres for which the Company granted him an honorarium of 1000

pagodas. Brown's English - Telugu and Telugu - English dictionaries and his Telugu grammar are monuments of patience and loving endeavour. He thinks his Telugu grammar the most difficult and intricate of all his works, and certainly it is so, considering that it was the first systematic attempt at formulating the grammatical principles of spoken Telugu. Brown's name ought to be most endearing to the lovers of the Telugu language, for, at a time when, to quote his own words, "Telugu literature was dying out and the flame was just glimmering in the socket, and the Madras College founded in 1813 preserved but a little spark," he whipped up pandits into activity and gave rise to an outburst of native authorship. Around him gathered a large number of native scholars, great alike for their erudition and enthusiasm, and the result was the preparation of good editions of Telugu classics, and the collection

of rare and valuable manuscripts, which would otherwise have never seen the light of day. His careful collection and preservation of the Macenzie Manuscripts which now lie in the Oriental Manuscripts Library. Madras, in immediate and most urgent need of resuscitation, is a heritage handed over by that great soul to the Telugus. It would be a calamity for South India and the Telugus in particular, if they are allowed to fall into decay.

In Canarese, Schulze and the great Serampore missionaries were pioneers in the production of many books. In 1822 were published Rev. Reeve's Kannada - English and English Kannada dictionaries in four volumes, and although they are now superseded by the dictionaries of later scholars, they show against what unfavourable odds the early workers had to contend. Says Reeve, "The rareness of ancient manuscripts, the end-

less blunders of drivelling and hireling transcribers, the paucity of duplicates for collation, and the comparatively small number of men to be found among the natives possessing appropriate philological information, soundness of judgment or zeal for literary research and improvement have occasioned no little annoyance and embarrassment." These circumstances do still drag on the heels of even present day lexicography in South India, and although collections are made of a large number of manuscripts, no attempts are made to utilize them for purposes of collation and the other conditions depicted by Reeve still continue to operate. Rev. Kittel followed Reeve. He was to Canarese what Brown was to Telugu. His "Kannada - English Dictionary" is not yet superseded and stands along with Winslow's Tamil dictionary and Gundert's Malayalam dictionary, a monument of linguistic

enterprise and scholarly patience. Kittel brought out good editions of some of the best Canarese classics and showed the way for future work. Rice was another gentleman who took great interest in Canarese studies and not only did much for its literature but also trained some natives in the methods of textual criticism, so that the output of publications of old Canarese books was very remarkable during his time.

Alongside of literary and linguistic studies there was to be perceived at that very time a beginning made in bringing to light a large number of South Indian Inscriptions. South Indian Epigraphy which owes its inception again to foreign enterprise has rendered great service in the construction of South Indian History, and although its importance for linguistic purposes was not generally recognised at that time, the materials that have been gathered are there for those

that have the inclination to utilize them. The importance of epigraphical records as aids to philological research can never be overestimated. They form trustworthy materials for determining the state of a language at any particular time and serve as checks on the readings found in manuscripts. It is obvious that manuscripts *qua* manuscripts cannot be absolutely relied on. The personal element of copyists, the difficulty of understanding ancient forms aright and hence substitution of forms with which the scribe is acquainted, errors of commission and omission, interpolations, the general defect of the absence of manuscripts which are more than three hundred years old, and many other factors besides must give us caution to proceed carefully in the editing of texts and show us the necessity to take in the aid of contemporary inscriptions. And yet this is a method which is very often neglected.

Greater reliance is placed on the statements of grammars, manuscripts of which also are liable to the same defects as others, and whose statements themselves are very often open to serious question. It thus becomes evident how important is the aid which the readings of inscriptions contribute towards the construction of the history of the individual languages. The labours of the early epigraphists like Burnell, Buhler, Kielhorn, Temple, Grierson, Hultsch and a host of other workers in the field are now beginning to bear fruit, and the greater use is made of them by philologists the greater will be the accuracy of results, the chief characteristic of all scholarship. It was so kind of the Epigraphical Department that they have issued the IV, V and VI volumes of the South Indian Inscriptions in quick succession and scholars would indeed be greatly indebted to them if they speed up the publication of the rest of the

vast records of which they are still in possession. In this connection, it may be suggested that a more profuse supply of the facsimiles of the original inscriptions would be of immense help in verifying readings and that no record need be held back on the ground that it is not historically important or that it is insignificant, for in the philologist's view even the least scrap of information may come in handy in the solution of intricate linguistic problems.

One other general feature that we notice in the work of the early South Indian philologists is the regard which they had not only for the ancient classics in each of the languages, but also for the ordinary everyday speech of the people with whom they came into contact. It was a practical necessity for them, and they early perceived that unless they could converse freely with the people, their immediate object of carrying the

message of Christ to them would be frustrated. Hence it is that they recorded the ordinary spoken dialects for the guidance of future missionaries. It was fortunate that in their time the fateful *gramya* - *grandhika* controversy was not present, and the pernicious tradition set up in later years that only the language of the poets, and that also a particular class of poets, should be accepted as the standard of all writing had not yet shown its head. There was no *gramya* for them, in its contemptuous sense, but only the language of the people, bubbling up with life, the language in which they laughed and wept, loved and hated, defied others and feared them. To grasp the inner life of the people, to enter into the innermost recesses of their minds, and share in active and intimate sympathy the joys and the sorrows of those for whose uplift as they thought, they most honestly dedicated their lives, it was

an imperative necessity to study the colloquial dialects. Father Beschi's grammar of Low Tamil and the Telugu grammars by Campbell, Morris, Arden and Brown are instances of the interest which the early workers took in the spoken languages.

Still, it cannot be said that they seriously took to utilizing the local dialects for philological purposes. Dialectal study is a science of later growth and at the present time it is held to be of the highest importance from the philological point of view. The various influences that tend to bring about change in language are found in living activity only in the dialects. Contemporary dialects are the realities of a language, pulsating with life, whereas the recorded language, much more that of a previous generation, is, at best, an approximate and inadequate representation of the living word, unless it is before us phonetically transcribed and tonically

represented in an agreed and intelligible system of signs or unless we have some means, like the gramophone record, which can bring, when we will and care, the living sound to our ears as it existed at a particular period. By the side of the spoken word the so-called standard language would be but a shadow and an illusion. A standard language, to the philologist, is a misnomer. It exists nowhere. It occurs only in the imagination and is, at best, artificial. It is a vague something which defies analysis or definition and is but very remotely connected with living reality. When we, at the same time, recognize that even in the so-called standard language, we can perceive dialectal variations, we are irresistibly led to the conclusion that there is never a standard language but only dialects.

An attempt has been made above to refer to the activities of the early pioneers of Dravidian studies in Tamil,

Malayalam, Telugu and Canarese. But these are all cultivated languages, possessing a vast amount of written records and spoken by people with whom scholars could come into intimate contact with the least inconvenience to themselves. They could induce the natives to teach them or get access to them without any difficulty. The languages that they studied had already received great attention at the hands of the native grammarians, whose labours they fully utilized. They could all work in the plains in healthy surroundings, seated in arm-chairs in well-furnished bangalows. But of a far different kind was the work of others who risked their health, their personal comforts and all the amenities which they could command in the plains, and sometimes their very lives, and went forth into the hills and the forests, infested with dangerous wild beasts and malarial and other fevers. Theirs

was the spirit of the Cross, the spirit to suffer for the sake of mankind. Even now, as I contemplate on the figure of that great Savara scholar, my master, Rao Saheb G. V. Ramamurti Pantulu of Parlakimidi, disabled for life through deafness brought about by malaria among the Savaras in the forests, and yet his enthusiasm for Savara studies undiminished, but ever on the increase, I can picture to myself the greatness of the noble band of souls who had, in those early days, when hill and forest life was extremely more dangerous, ventured out on a civilizing mission among people who have been driven into a life of isolated existence, in haunts cut off from the rest of mankind and all the common amenities that humanity ought to be heir to. Living, as they do, no better than the beasts among whom they dwell, in uncouth and evil-smelling huts which, even for courtesy, cannot be called human

habitations, amidst insanitary surroundings, disease and death claiming them in thousands and the population subjected to decimation year after year, it is no wonder that in each succeeding census we find the mention of whole races of these hill and forest tribes obliterated. To preserve those races from extinction, to bring them within the pale of civilization and let them share in the common joys and sorrows of mankind, is a mission worthy of the highest praise. And yet, to reach their inner thoughts, to understand them aright and make them understand you, it is highly necessary to be acquainted with their language, which is the only instrument granted to man for inter-communication. Let us realize for a while that the forest dweller is extremely afraid of the approach of the civilized man and flees away from him even as the timid deer on hearing a rustle among the bushes, that it is very

difficult to coax him to come to you and lay bare his thoughts before you, that it requires great patience and long time to understand him and then to express yourself to him in his own language, that his dialects vary from place to place, and then the intricacies and difficulties of the problem of learning and recording the languages of the hill and forest tribes will become manifest. Hence it is that we value all the dearer the attempts, however fragmentary they may be, made by the early missionaries in this direction. The labours of Rev. F. Batsch among the Oraons, of Rev. J. Dawson among the Gonds, of Lieut. Col. Marshall, Rev. F. Metz, Rev. G. U. Pope and Par M. De Quatrifages De Brean among the Todas, and of Col. Tickell among the Ho people, not to mention those of the Rev. J. Brigel among the Tulus and Major R. A. Cole among the Coorgs, besides those of a host of

other disinterested workers, inspire us with hope regarding the future destiny of mankind.

This is the humanitarian side of the study of language, but to the philologist, the study of these dialects is of far greater importance. It is only by such a study that fresh contacts will be established, the range of philological vision extended and a proper foundation laid for the commencement of a comparative study of languages representing the cultures and thoughts of the peoples speaking them. The problem of the determination of the relationship of individual languages, of these again with families and these once more with one another, leading to the establishment of a linguistic commonwealth of nations, lending a helping hand to the realization of the poet's dream of "The Parliament of Man, the Federation of the world", is a problem of fascinating attraction and beauty and

will serve as a useful co-ordinating adjunct to the problem of the ethnologist and the anthropologist working in a similar direction so that we might in time see that—

“Through the ages

One increasing purpose runs,

And the thoughts of men are widened

With the process of the suns.’

This problem of the relationship of the South Indian languages and their ultimate affiliation was for the first time tackled by Dr. Caldwell. His attempt was the first of its kind in the field of Indian languages. This was followed after some time by Mr. Beames and later by Dr. Hoernle for the modern Aryan languages. Their work was further extended by the studies of European scholars and has received wide attention, but Dr. Caldwell’s speculation has remained where he had left it. No one, except perhaps Dr. Grierson in his short monograph in the *Linguistic Survey of*

*India* Vol. IV has even thought of testing the conclusions reached by Caldwell, or worked on the suggestion thrown out by him. Caldwell never claimed finality for his views but most intently hoped that, by his work, interest would be kindled in the studies that he loved and laboured for. He frankly admitted that he was intimately acquainted only with Tamil which he studied for thirty-seven years and expected light from others who had as intimately studied the other languages. He said, "I trust it will be found that I have not left much undone that seemed to be necessary for the elucidation of Tamil; but I hope that this branch of work will now be taken up by persons who have made Telugu, Canarese, Malayalam or Tulu their special study, so that the whole range of Dravidian languages and dialects may be fully elucidated." This is a suggestion which is highly worthy of being taken up, for, may it

not be that Tamil being the most advanced and the most ancient of the Dravidian languages, it is the most corrupt, corrupt in the philological sense that it has been subjected to the widest phonetic decay, so that its affixes and prefixes, its declensional and conjugational forms, in fact, its whole structure had undergone such great changes that it would be difficult to arrive at the proto-Dravidian language by beginning with Tamil? May it not be more useful to start the enquiry from the standpoint of Telugu, Canarese, Malayalam or Tulu? May it not then result in the finding out of a relationship of the Dravidian with the recognised modern Aryan languages of India, claiming their descent from the ancient Prakrits? In Caldwell's time the Prakrit languages were not studied, at least they did not receive that wide attention which they have been subjected to in later times. May it not be that Caldwell himself,

had he paid attention to the Prakrits would have been led to conclusions far different from those he had arrived at? Or again, if Caldwell could not perceive the derivation of Dravidian languages from Sanskrit, could it not be that a relationship can be established with some other group of languages akin to Sanskrit, say the Iranian or the non-Sanskritic Iranian languages? Otherwise, how is it that the ancient grammars of almost all the Dravidian languages have claimed them to be *vikritis i e.* derived from or having affinities with Sanskrit? How is it that among the five Dravidian races of South India are included the Marathis and the Gujeratis whose relationship with the Gaudians is not called in question? How is it that we find such a striking similarity of culture between the North and South of India? How is it possible to make such a sharp division between the North and the South, so that as soon

as the Vindhya are crossed, we should postulate a complete contrast in civilization and culture? What was it that prevented the Aryan—speaking people who could overrun the whole of Northern India and a good portion of the South to do likewise in the so-called Dravidian area? Or, is it that the original inhabitants of South India and their languages had been absorbed or fused into or probably superseded by the Aryan races and languages as in the North of India? If you postulate extra-Aryan influences in the Prakrit languages, why not credit the Dravidian languages also with a Prakritic character? Is the extra-Aryan character of the South Indian languages greater in proportion to that found in the North Indian idioms? I hope all this will not turn out to be the airy musings of an unsubstantial imagination. I am sure that this line of inquiry will bear good fruit and serve to establish

the fundamental unity of the races of India. At least, a painstaking investigation in this direction in the spirit with which Caldwell applied himself to his task was what he expected to see carried out.

And in the carrying out of this investigation, Caldwell hoped that the talent of South Indian native scholars would be forthcoming. He had the highest respect for their intellectual acuteness. He meant his work not so much for the foreign scholar who has but a remote interest in it, as for the natives of South India itself. He says, "It has been my earnest and constant desire to stimulate the natives of the districts in which the Dravidian languages are spoken to take an intelligent interest in the comparative study of their own languages; and I trust it will be found that this object has in some measure been helped forward. Educated Tamilians have studied Tamil-

educated Telugus have studied Telugu—the educated classes in each language district have studied the language and literature of the district—with an earnestness and assiduity which are highly creditable to them, and which have never been exceeded in the history of any of the languages of the world—except perhaps by the earnestness and assiduity with which Sanskrit has been studied by the Brahmans.” But while this intensive study of the individual languages has developed much intellectual acuteness in the native scholars and resulted in the progressive refinement of the individual languages, he thinks that this specialization has brought about a narrowness of outlook and has not helped them in the acquirement of grasp and comprehensiveness. What was gained in the shape of acuteness was not balanced by a broad vision. Thus, their philology had remained as rudimentary and

they are too far away removed from India to study the subject on the spot. It, therefore, devolves on the South Indian native scholars themselves to take up this study and advance its cause, and thus justify the hope and confidence reposed in them by Dr. Caldwell

Things, however, are a little encouraging just at present. There is, here and there, a scholar who is working on this problem at odd moments, but this work does not seem to be well planned out or co-ordinated with the work of other scholars in the field. An attempt was made fifteen years ago by the Madras University to encourage Dravidian philological research by the appointment of readers but it proved unsuccessful. It is encouraging, however, to find that the University has not lost hope of resuscitating interest in this direction as evidenced by the establishment of the

Oriental Research Institute as a part of which scheme, I feel the honour to talk to you this evening. I may be permitted to say in passing that the work turned out in the Institute can only bear fruit or attain tangible results if it is properly directed and coordinated, instead of being left to the option of the individuals who happen to form members of the Institute. I do not wish to be misunderstood, but only wish to emphasize the fact that we have to pool all our efforts in a particular direction not only the efforts of the members of the Institute but also of those who are working outside it.

It may be pertinent, here, to refer to Dravidian philological activity, such as it is, since the time of Caldwell. Prof. Seshagiri Sastri did some work in this field, but his conclusions now only form curios in the philological museum. There was, afterwards, an attempt made by Mr.

K. V. Subbiah in the Indian Antiquary to write on Dravidian phonetics, but he has not pursued his investigations. Latterly, under the auspices of the Madras University four pamphlets were issued as the result of the work of the Readers appointed fifteen year ago. Of the work done in recent years, prominent mention must be made of that turned out by the late Mr. R. Swaminatha Aiyar of Madras. His study of the Dravidian tense-suffixes and Dravidian pronouns embodied in two papers read before the Oriental Conference at Poona in 1919 and Madras in 1924, forms a noteworthy contribution to Dravidian philology. He was a scholar disinterestedly devoted to philological studies. He opened up a new line of investigation and much was expected of him, but he was cut off from his studies all too soon.

This is, so far as I am aware,

all the output of work in this field. The editors of Caldwell's Comparative Grammar had added precious little, almost nothing, to the information contained in it. On the other hand, they clipped it of much matter which was very interesting in the second edition of the book. We may not grudge them the liberty to remove the portion concerning the history of Tamil literature, although from an editorial point of view it was objectionable. But they were most certainly not justified in suppressing the controversial portion which Caldwell took particular care to include in his book. It referred to topics about which there was wide divergence of opinion. The controversy was very keen, and Caldwell himself took great pains to controvert the views advanced against the position which he took up. Though we may not be in a position to endorse all the opinions and arguments expressed by the scholars of

the time, they at times throw very valuable light on certain problems. Therefore, to withhold that information from the readers of Caldwell was an injustice done not only to him, but an insult in addition to the memory of scholars whom he honoured by criticising. Caldwell always kept an open mind on all the problems which he elucidated, and although at times he dissented from others, he always mentioned his opponent's views with the consideration and respect which they certainly deserved. Therefore to say that those who were ranged against Caldwell are now forgotten and negligible and then to suppress their views is a procedure that he would have much resented. Caldwell's editors cannot even be merited with the claim they have made of having revised and brought the book up-to-date, for they did no such thing.

We have, therefore, to begin the study of Dravidian philology from

where Caldwell had left it. It may be that, before doing so, we have to verify his statements in the light of the later advance made in the methods of philological study. For example, it is now generally recognized that sounds constituting speech should be studied not simply from their acoustic standpoint but also from the organic point of view. The organic study of sounds is, in fact, more important for the scientific philologist than their acoustic aspect. The transition of sounds in combination with others is a phenomenon that can be studied only by the observation of the movements which the speech organs undergo in producing them. Thus, the scientific philologist is no longer satisfied with statements like the euphonic permutation of consonants or euphonic nunnation. To say that a change has been effected for the sake of euphony is not no explanation at all, but only a device to escape out of a philologi-

cal difficulty. To explain a change as being due for euphonic purposes would be on the same par with saying that it came about for purposes of laziness or ease or any of those general causes which affect the phonetic character of any language. There is no language that does not pay regard to euphony or that wilfully resorts to harsh and jarring sounds. Again, it is unscientific to say that certain consonants come in between vowels to prevent hiatus. This would be no philological explanation but only an empirical statement of an observed fact. It is not possible according to this principle to say why a particular consonant should have been employed to prevent hiatus and not any other, for example, why *Katti + a* should in certain places become *Kattiya* and *Kattina* in certain others, why in Telugu 'h' should come in in *Padihenu*, *padahaidu* &c, 'n' in '*padunenu*' &c and none intervenes in *dadaidu*, *padenu* and *pada*, *Ru* &c, and

why once more in 'podarillu' and 'balentara,lu', a 'r' should come in. Do these consonants serve any function, grammatical or otherwise? Did they exist there incipiently before and become manifest in combination? Such and similar problems have to be tackled philologically and explained in a rational manner

Again, the speech habits of a people have to be studied. This forms the basis for all dialectal studies. For example, a certain group of people throw the accent on the first syllable of a word, others carry it forward. The partial or total loss of accent on certain syllables brings about such wide and far - reaching changes in words that it gives rise to dialectal variations whose resemblances are obscured from the surface. Sometimes to explain two different forms of the same word, we have to postulate certain intermediate hypothetical forms, which according to the

laws of phonetic change ought to have existed and which may have been either lost or on investigation may be found in the speech of a limited class of people, or in a particular dialect. For example, we have in Telugu the word పలుచ (*paluca*) meaning 'thin'; we have a shrewd suspicion that it must somehow be connected with the Sanskrit word 'స్వल्प (svalpa)'; but to account for పలుచ (*paluca*) from స్వల్ప (svalpa) we expect an intermediate form పలుప (*salupa*) or చలుప (*calupa*); this word on investigation is actually found in usage in the Ceded Districts and in Mysore Kannada is found as పలుప (*salupa*), a tadbhava word.

It was believed by a former generation of philologists, under the influence of the Darwinian theory of evolution and the biological fact of the ontogeny of the human race being repeated with some breaks in the phylogenetic development of the human child within the womb, passing through

all the stages of evolution, that the laws which operate in human evolution are also found at work in the process of the acquirement of language by the child. This view finds few supporters at the present time, because it has been demonstrated that a child born of parents speaking a particular language does not show any tendency to take to the language of its parents if removed from that speech atmosphere at an early age and acquires a completely new language in altogether different linguistic surroundings. But so far as I am aware, no one has attempted to know if in the language which the child acquires, some of the changes undergone by sounds in the history of that particular language are reflected or not. This is a point worth investigation at the hands of philologists. I have a suspicion that the changes, at least some of them, can be observed in the gradual yet rapid transition which the child's lan-

guage undergoes before it attains the standard pronunciation of the society to which it belongs. If this supposition is correct, we may turn for light on the etymology of words to the language of children. The languages of children and of the illiterate section of society have a great deal in common in phonetic resemblances, and if the speech of the illiterate sometimes illuminates the derivation of the forms of words, there is no reason why the language of children also may not be expected to do the same. I shall illustrate my point. The numeral for two in the Dravidian languages is రెండు, ఇరెండు, ఎరెండు, రెళ్లు (Kui) &c. So far, no word has been found in any known families of languages to correspond to any of those forms. But, on turning to the language of a Telugu child, we find the form దొండు (dondū) for two, which in his own language soon passes into రొండు (ronḍu)! దొండు (dorḍu) is also found in the

language of very backward classes, but the *z* (o) of *ro* (ro) in *roṇḍu* (rondu) is evident in the speech of the upper classes also. Now, the connection of *donḍu* (dondu) with the Sanskrit *dvandva* is so evident that the derivation of the one from the other cannot be resisted, if a parallel phonetic change of *ṣ* (d) into *ṛ* (r) can be found out. It is remarkable that *ṣ* (d) is changed into *ṛ* (r) not only in the Dravidian languages but also in the Prakrits and the North Indian vernaculars. Skt. *सप्तति* (saptatih) — Prak *सत्तदि* (sattadi) — E. H. *सत्तर* (sattar); Skt *द्वादश* (dvadasa) — Prak. *बारहा* (baraha) or *बारसा* (barasa) — E. H. *बारह* (barah); Skt. *गद्गदिका* (gadga-dika) — Prak *गग्गारि* (gaggaria) — E. H. *गग्गरी* (gaggari). Dravidian examples are: Tamil *விடைய* (videi) *விరைய* (virei); Kan. *ಇದಾರ* (idara) besides *ಮರಾದ* (marada). Similarly in *lonḍu* (londū) in the child's language, forming the next stage in

the phonetic development has its counterparts in the Prakrits, the modern Aryan vernaculars and the Dravidian idioms also. In Bengali and Marathi ల (l) comes in instead of ద or త (d or t) as a sign of the preterite and passive participles. In Malayalam తత్య (tat-parya) is pronounced తల్ప (talparya.) Here then we see d = l = r ద్య ద్య = దొం ద = లొండు = రొండు and then the subsequent changes are well known. Cp also children అత్త - అక్కడ Kan. అత్త, అత్త, అత్తయి. Prak అ, అత్త - Skt అత్త. We thus see the importance of paying attention even to the language of children and of the backward classes. I shall leave this point by referring to an example of how affinities may be suspected in the language of the backward classes who in very many cases preserve old forms. Take the form అవు in Telugu occurring in the speech of very backward Telugu people, meaning 'it becomes'; take also the

Prakritic verbal form హోది, హవది Skt. భవతి. You may consider this very suggestion a point in which philology has run mad, but who knows that, after all, on further thorough-going study of the Prakrits, a connection may be established between the two. I have cited the above example to show that a scientist should not be swayed by prejudice of any kind, but follow the lead of any light that may be forth-coming, and if the light leads into blind alleys, well, there is nothing lost, we may return the way we have gone to the place from where we started, and begin our enquiries afresh

Change in language is never so sudden as it is generally supposed to be. Mark Twain tells us of a man who, having somewhere read that the glaciers on the Alpine tops move downwards, wanted to enjoy the pleasure of sliding down on the glacier from the mountain peak. He

went and sat on it for hours together and fell into a sleep, hoping that by the time he woke up he will find himself at the foot of the mountain. Night passed and on waking he found to his disgust that he remained just where he sat before he went to sleep, and having returned home fell foul with the scientist who attributed motion to the Alpine glaciers. He seems to have found out afterwards that the glacier moves only one inch in twenty-four hours. Change in language also is just of that nature. This must take away the fright out of those linguistic purists who dread the mention of dialects as vehicles of literary expression. There are so many conservative influences within language which do not allow words and forms to go their own way. Still, the movement and change go on in spite of ourselves, steadily and imperceptibly. There is a gradual transition from one dialect into

another, and the various phases of the changed language represent its several dialectal stages. But in course of time, certain intermediate stages are lost and all traces of them are obliterated, so that a wide gulf is created between dialect and dialect, when they become separate languages. This loss of intermediate dialects is a feature of almost all families of languages, and this phenomenon occurs mostly when the barriers between two dialects are removed and free inter-communication is established. When thus smaller dialects merge themselves into larger groups, they tend to disappear. In this way, it is believed that many dialects which must once have bridged over the gulf between Slavonic and Iranian, Armenian and Greek. Latin and Celtic have been extinguished. Similarly, many Armenian dialects are said to have disappeared and the existing Iranian languages,—Pushtu.

Persian, Kurd and Baluchi— “resemble the bagshot sand which crown the heights of London, remnants of a once continuous formation, now extensively destroyed by denudation.” Three links — the Dacian, Illyrian, and Thracian — are now known to philologists to be wanting between the European languages. The Dacian and the Thracian might have formed the transition between the Slavonic to the East, the Celtic to the West and the Greek to the South. Phrygian and Thracian might have bridged the gulf between Armenian and Greek, Sarmatian between Slavonic and Iranian. It is on the supposition of the disappearance of so many of the central links that we can explain why the North and Southern languages of Europe have so little in common.

European philologists are engaged in determining the character of these intermediate links, so that the

transition from one language into another may be thoroughly explained. A similar search for lost dialects among the Dravidian idioms will be of great advantage in settling many of the problems of Dravidian philology. But before such a thing is undertaken, it is necessary to take stock of and record the existing dialects. An attempt in this direction has been made by Dr. Grierson in his "*Linguistic Survey of India*" Vol IV, but it remains only an attempt. A more extensive survey is required for this purpose. Caldwell recognized the importance of such a study. He said, "A comparison of all the dialects that exist will be found to be our best and safest guide to the knowledge of the primitive speech from which the various existing dialects have diverged; and not only the Shen-Tamil, but every existing dialect, even the rudest, will be found to contribute its quota of help to-

wards this end. The Tamil pronouns of the first and second persons cannot be understood without a knowledge of ancient and classical Canarese; and the khond or Ku, one of the rudest dialects, the grammar of which was reduced to writing only a few years ago, is the only dialect which throws light on the masculine and feminine terminations of the Dravidian pronouns of the third person." Although Caldwell's illustrations may be questioned when viewed from another standpoint, still the principle enunciated by him is a very sound one and deserves to be followed.

Modern philology is based on the phonetic study of the languages. A phonetic notation is, therefore, a desideratum without which no progress can be made. The present Dravidian alphabets although generally exhibiting a phonetic character, do not serve our purpose because we want a common script for the whole

of the Dravidian languages. The Tamil system of signs, even though supplemented by Grantha characters is still very defective. Similarly with the other Dravidian systems, of characters viz., Telugu and Malayalam. The Telugu alphabet, for instance although generally phonetic, still requires some additions. There are also some letters in it which do not exactly represent their phonetic values as e. g., జ (jna) క (ksha) హ (hma) etc. Moreover, we have to be in touch with the European philologists, seek their co-operation and be comparing notes with them. It will have, therefore, to be considered if the international phonetic script with the necessary modifications and diacritical marks may not advantageously be adopted. But a phonetic transcription alone does not lead us far in the representation of the spoken sound. It should also be supplemented by a system of signs

for the rising and falling of tones, which also subserve a very important semantic function, and exert great influence in bringing about a change in language. These changes in tones may be advantageously represented by rising and falling curves, supplemented by numbers to denote the number of *matras* included in the tone. All this, of course, will be supported by gramophone records, so that the observation of sounds may be tested and verified as often as desired. Germans are now studying Indian languages in this way, but specimens supplied to them are said to be vitiated by their being reproductions of made-up speeches learned by rote beforehand, and not representations of naturally spoken sounds. This defect may be avoided.

One more aspect of the modern study of languages is its insistence on the psychological and ideological in-

terpretation of linguistic facts. From this standpoint, it is no longer sufficient to study the word in its isolated aspect, but as a part of the sentence. The sentence forms a unit of expression and the words have no existence apart from the sentence, in the same way as a perception is a complete unit with simple ideas forming its elements. A simple idea, unrelated with other ideas, cannot exist. An idea in the mind of the advanced animal, man, is by its very nature complex. Ideas are always found clustered together and have to be interpreted in various ways according to the several degrees of distance or nearness which they assume one to another within the group. It has to be borne in mind that the spoken sound is but an imperfect and conventional representation of the idea that it stands for, and that the more of the content of the idea that it denotes, the more accurately is it com-

prehended. And then, these ideas when communicated to others or when they occur to the same mind at different times, in various surroundings, and in various contexts, enter into a variety of complex relations with the mental content of others or of oneself as it exists at a particular moment. The result of this is that ideas get various shades of meaning and evoke a variety of corresponding trains of ideas and feelings. These shades of meaning may gradually diverge to such an extent that their connection with the original idea and the word that represented it in the beginning may be completely obscured. Again these mental processes give rise to a free play of the analogical formation of words which occupies no small and unimportant a portion of philology. Future Dravidian philological studies, therefore, cannot be pursued without paying regard to this psychological aspect of the

problem.

One thing more and I have done. It may be pointed out that in determining the inter-relationship of languages, there are two ways of approaching the problem. One from the top beginning with those languages which present fuller forms of words and elements of grammatical expression, and then to trace the changes down through all the stages of corruption. This seems to me the natural procedure to be adopted. Secondly, the problem may be approached from the bottom, starting from the most advanced, i. e., the most corrupt dialect and then to work our way up to the original. This method is fraught with many difficulties and sometimes leads us into by-lanes and blind alleys, as it has done in the case of Caldwell. It had led him nowhere and ended in the formulation of a solecism that the origin of the Dravidian languages should be

found in the Dravidian languages themselves. If, on the other hand, we study it from the standpoint of, say, Telugu or Canarese which preserve the fuller forms, a clue may be found for the ultimate affiliation of the Dravidian languages. Standing on the deck of the leaky Tamil ship in the uncharted sea of Indian languages, looking out from the wrong end of the philological telescope, Caldwell had his vision blurred with respect to the linguistic harbours near about, he lost all his moorings, and getting up on to the top of the mast, thought he perceived in the distant Scythian country a possible goal for his difficult voyage. May it not be that a harbour can be found nearer home, where we can rest a while to take in fresh coal and start afresh on a journey to more distant lands?

I have tried so far to present the salient features of the problem of

**Dravidian philology** I have alluded to the pioneer work done by the early missionaries and the disabilities under which they worked. I have taken stock of the present state of Dravidian philological studies. I have put before you the method which Caldwell followed in his grammar, and pointed out how the problem can be approached from another point of view which may prove to be more fruitful of results. I have referred to the problems that may usefully be tackled and noticed the modern methods of studying languages. In the next lecture, I shall make an attempt to give you a picture of Dravidian culture by putting before you the various elements that have contributed to make it what it is, and approach the problem from the linguistic standpoints.

---

# THE DRAVIDIAN LANGUAGES.

---

## Their Prakritic Character.

THE term Prakrit is generally used as opposed to Sanskrit, and Prakrit words and forms are attempted to be traced to Sanskrit originals. But this does not seem to be the procedure to be adopted considering the history of the Indo-Iranian dialects, although in most cases parallelisms for Prakrit ones may be found in Sanskrit. Sanskrit, however, seems to be only one of the many Indo-Aryan dialects, the dialect of the Midland of Aryavarta, raised to the position of a standard literary language and maintaining its position as such in a crystalized form, although even in it there is to be found a change, however imperceptible it may be. But the history of the Prakrits takes us back into Indo-Iranian times. As pointed out in the pre-

vious lecture, there were many Iranian dialects which found their way into India long before the Aryans entered the land. These, it was pointed out, formed what the Aryans called the Pais'a'ci languages, being the speeches of those with whom they had to contend in their struggle for expansion in India. We find a continuous chain of these Paisaci dialects located in almost all places of India. This stratum, overlaid on, or perhaps supplanting the earlier Munda-Kol dialects representing the Austro-Indo - Erythraen civilization, formed the basis of the so-called Dravidian languages. Close parallels in Grammatical forms and vocabulary in Nepali, Baluci, Brahui and other languages which form some of the Iranian dialects indicate to us the origin of the Dravidian languages. Now, the Aryan dialects dating their existence even into Vedic times, had gone through

three stages of transformation. The first stage is represented by the Primary Prakrits, one of which, that of the Madhyadesa, crystallized into Sanskrit and the rest developed in their natural way according to phonetic laws giving rise to what are called the Secondary Prakrits. One of these again, at an early age attained a literary position and under the name of Pali has been widely studied. At a later stage, other Prakrits of this group also were cultivated and reduced to a standard, as for example, by the Jains and others, both for secular and religious purposes. Those that still remained underwent a further natural change and went by the name Apabhramsa. But some Apabhramsa dialects themselves received literary cultivation, and the rest proceeded on their course of development giving rise to the Tertiary Prakrits which gave rise to the modern Indo-Aryan languages-

Some Prakrit grammarians say that Sauraseni was the Prakrit *par excellence*, while others give that credit to the the Maharashtri, and still others to both. Sauraseni claims importance as being the nearest neighbour to Sanskrit and being that which was the least affected by phonetic decay through its influence. But Maharashtri is the best known Prakrit. It attained greatness as a literary dialect at an early time. It received the best attention of the grammarians. It was the language of lyric poetry like that in the *Sattasai* of Hala, and of the formal epic (Kavya) like the '*Setubandha*' or '*Ravana Vaho*' of Pravarasena, '*Ganda Vaho*' of Vappai Raa and '*Kumarapalacharita*' of Hemachandra. Dramas were composed in it like the '*Karpuramanjari*' of Rajasekhara. Even in Sanskrit dramas, Maharashtri is used by the higher rank of characters. This dialect again was the language

of an extensive territory from the Narmada to the Krishna and sometimes included the southern part of the modern Bombay Presidency and Hyderabad. It lay just south of the Sauraseni and together with the Maharashtra had the greatest influence on the South Indian languages. The rest of the languages in the order of their importance are the Magadhi, the language of Magadha, but once extending far beyond that country, the Paisaci with its two varieties and and Apabhramsa. Besides these which are generally mentioned by the grammarians, there are the Prakrits of the Jain Canonical works, namely Ardha Magadhi, Jain Maharashtra and Jain Sauraseni.

The cultivated Prakrits remained in books and were systematised and reduced to strict rules by the grammarians, but the language of the people went on changing giving rise to various Apabhramsa dialects. In

fact, every one of the literary or high Prakrits had a corresponding Apabhramsa. Of such Apabhramsas several are mentioned. Abhiri (Sindhi and Marwari), Avanti (E. Rajaputana), Gaurjari (Gujarati), Bahlika (Panjabi), Sauraseni (W. Hindi), Magadhi or Prachya (E. Hindi), Gaudi (Bangali), Dravidi (Tamil and Malayalam), Dakshinatya or Vaidarbhi (Marathi, Telugu, Kanarese), and Saippali (perhaps Naipali). Besides the above, we meet in the grammars and commentaries on Sanskrit dramas the names of such Apabhramsa dialects as Dhakki, Sabari and Sakki.

These Apabhramsa dialects are variously identified by scholars and no sort of agreement is reached with regard to this point. It is not to our purpose here to enter into this question, but one thing must be pointed out that the ancient grammarians have greatly confounded the

Apabhramsas with the Paisaci languages. Lists of Paisaci and Apabhramsa dialects greatly overlap each other showing that the grammarians did not pay much regard for these uncultivated dialects. Maharashtra received their greatest attention, then came Samaseni, then Magadhi, then Paisaci and lastly the Apabhramsas are dismissed with a bare mention. Except Ramasarma and to some extent Markandeya, no one seems to have dealt with the Apabhramsas. The latest opinion of scholars seems to be that the Apabhramsas are the uncultivated spoken dialects of which the Secondary Prakrits represent the cultivated phase, while the Paisaci languages are those non-Sanskritic Iranian dialects which had early found their way into India and of which Kashmiri and other languages of the north-west part of India form the existing links.

In the two previous lectures, an

attempt had been made to suggest that the so-called Dravidian languages are the representatives in South India of the original Paisaci tongues. But this suggestion is not so easy to work out, for the whole question is complicated by the diffusion into this substratum of many of the later Prakrit languages. To disentangle all these elements and present them in their proper perspective would be a task that would take much time and study. The utmost that we can do in the present state of our knowledge is to point out the general features of the Dravidian languages which bring them into intimate relationship with the Indo-Iranian languages.

### Iranian.

We shall begin with the language of the Avesta and note where it differs from Sanskrit and presents parallels with the Dravidian languages. In the Avesta, all final vowels are shortened

except *O*, and as examples of words with final *O* are not generally found in the Dravidian languages, that tendency of shortening final vowels is a common characteristic of both.

Skt.	Avest.	Tel.
Se'na'	Haena	సేన (se'na)
Pita'	Pita	పిత (pita)
Na'ri'	Nairi	నారి (na'ri)
Dasyu	Dahyu	దస్యు (పు) (dasyuvu)

The final 'o' of the nom. sing. corresponding to the final 's' of words in Sanskrit is found in the Avesta itself to change into *ao* and *uu*. It will be found that this final *o* of the nom. sing. is found in the Sauraseni Prakrit also and occurs as *u* in the Apabhramsa, Modern Marathi and Sindhi, Old western Hindi and Old Panjabi. The final *o* is changed in Kanarese into *au* with an intervening *v* making *avu*. Old Telugu shows this *avu* which

still persists in most present-day Telugu words, but its final  $\text{ఁ}$  (vu) was early nasalized first into  $\text{ఁ}$  (vu) and then into  $\text{ఁ}$  (mu). This Skt.  $\text{भारः}$  (bha'rah) is found as (ba'ro) in the Avesta and  $\text{भारो}$  (bharo) in Sauraseni and in Kanarese as  $\text{ಭಾರವು}$  (bharavu) which is preserved in the Telugu words  $\text{బారువు}$  (ba'ruvu) a weight, and  $\text{బరువు}$  (baruvu). Thus  $\text{భారవఁ$  (bha'ravu) in time changed into  $\text{భారము}$  (bha'ramu) also in Telugu. We find both the forms in  $\text{ఁ}$  (vu) and  $\text{ఁ}$  (mu) by the time of the earliest extant Telugu records. Even in such neuter nouns as  $\text{ఫలవఁ}$  (phalavu) in Kanarese, it is the  $\text{ఁ}$  (vu) which is earlier than the  $\text{ఁ}$  (mu) in  $\text{ఫలము}$  (phalamu), for in the Ancient Magadhi and Apabhramsa we find all neuter nouns changed into the masculine class, so that they came to be declined like the masculines. This tendency of turning final  $\text{ఁ}$  (o') into  $\text{ఁ}$  (au) existed even in the

Avesta.

Another peculiarity of the Avestan phonology is the extensive use of epenthetic vowels and help-sounds. We may compare this phenomenon with the general phonetic character of the Dravidian languages, especially Telugu, where the law of the Harmonic sequence of vowels is in full operation. They do not allow dissimilar conjunct consonants, but would either assimilate them or introduce a *svara-bhakti* vowel between them. Thus in Tamil, ఆత్మ (atma') is changed into ఆతుమా (a'tuma') and in Kanarese లಕ್ಷ್ಮి (lakshmi') into లಕ್ಕುಮಿ (lakkumi) and in Telugu స్వల్ప (svalpa) into చలుప (calupa) and by metathesis into ప \*చ. Compare Avestan *vahathra* with Skt. वक्त्र (vaktra). Compare again Skt. रथ (ratha) with 'Tel. ఆరదము (aradamu) రాజు (ra'jan) and ఆరసు (arasu), లోక (loka) and 'Tamil ఉலగు (ulagu), with similar changes as Skt. राजत (rajata)

into Avesta ૐຂຂ (erazata). All original aspirate sounds are deaspirated in the Avesta. Thus gh, dh, and bh are changed into g, d and b, in the old Gatha dialect although in the younger dialect they are once more resolved into voiced spirants before consonants and between vowels. This resemblance between the old Gatha dialect in this respect with the Dravidian languages which consistently avoid the use of aspirates is very striking. Cp. Skt. अथ (atha) and Gatha Avesta ada' and Skt. बहः (bha'rah) and Tel. బరువు (baruvu). Again correspondence between Skt. श, ष, स (s', sh, s) and Avestan హ (h), which is a very regular feature, will go a long way in solving many a difficulty in equating Dravidian words with the Indo-European. This will perhaps also serve us to unravel the mystery of the derivation of the Dravidian numerals ఆరు (a'ru) and ఎదు (e'd'u). We find the forms పదహారు (padaha'ru) and పదిహేడు (padihe'd'u)

in which we have హరు (ha'ru) and హేదు (he'd'u) with initial హ (h). It would be interesting if these can be identified with షస్ (shas) and సప్త (sapta) respectively through హర్ (har) హర్ (ha'r) and హరు (ha'ru) and హప (hapta), హత్త (hatta) హేత్త (he'ttha), హేట్టు (he't't'hu) and హేదు (he'd'u) and through the loss of the initial హ (h) along with many other initial consonants with అరు (a'ru) and ఎదు (e'd'u) respectively. We find initial హ (h) dropped in హంస (hamsa)-అంచ (anca); హనుమదు (hanumad'u) -అనుమదు (anumad'u); హర్షము (harshamu)-అరుసము (arusamu) etc. We find Skt. స (s) changed into Drav. హ (h) in Skt. స్వర్ణ (svarn'a)- Tel. హొన్న (honnu); Skt. సార్థ్థ (sa'rtth)- Tel. హత్తు (hattu) &c. Again as Mr. R. Swaminatha Aiyer had attempted to show, we have perhaps to go to Indo-Iranian times to explain the origin of the Dravidian

pronouns. Probably also we have to investigate the Iranian dialects for the history of several grammatical forms in the Dravidian, but the whole structure is so obscured by the later developments through the several Prakritic stages that it is not possible to deal with the Iranian affinities at length in this place. These affinities will be referred to in passing when the affinities with the Prakrits are dealt with.

### **Vedic.**

The Vedic language shows varieties of the Indo-Iranian dialects and forms a link between the Avesta on the one hand and classical Skt. on the other. The Prakrite tradition has to be traced to the Vedic dialects and not to Classical Skt., for classical Skt. represents only the petrified state of but one of the many dialects of the Vedic times. The Prakrits derive their immediate

descent from dialects other than Sanskrit. Hence it is that Caldwell made the initial mistake of attempting direct derivation of the Dravidian idioms from Classical Skt., and lost himself in speculation. He should, on the other hand, have begun with the Prakrits and traced his way back to the originals from which the Prakrits had developed. He should have studied the phonetic laws which made the Prakrits what they are, and then he would have arrived at the proper perspective. The tendencies in grammar and vocabulary common to the Vedic and the Prakrits are noteworthy and put us on the way to the affiliation of the Dravidian languages. A few of such resemblances will be noted here.

(1) The nom, singular in both the Vedic and the Prakrits ends in 'o'

### Vedic Examples.

a'po' asma'n ma'tarah' s'undha-  
yantu; sam'vatsaro' = ja'yata; ju-  
sha'n'o' agni ra'jyasya; Aindra'h'  
pra'n'o' andhi; ayam so' adhvarah';  
r'ishi'na'm putro' adhira'ja e'shah';  
havishma'n de'vo' adhvarah' Cp.  
with these—

### Prakrit Examples.

ta'vade'va so' gaho' (Mriccha-  
katika) Similarly *dev'o, vaccho'*, bha-  
tta'ro', appan'o', savvo', jo', so'  
imo', & c.

(2) The seeds for the effacement of the distinction between the dual and the plural are already found in the Veda. The presence of *a'* as the sign of the dual and of *as* which in certain connections became, *a'* in the plural has led to much confusion and while Sanskrit retained the distinction of the dual from the plural, the Prakrits entirely dropped the dual. This was part of the wide-

spread change in the aspect of the Indo-Iranian dialects which were gradually shedding the old grammatical forms of words based on their endings and taking up a natural turn. In the Prakrits we find the grammatical barriers, prevailing in the Vedic and Sanskrit crumbling down and a reshaping given to them. We find this change with regard to gender also and declensional and conjugational signs receiving a general levelling. To the later Prakrit-speaking peoples, it was difficult to understand why a separate number should be allotted to two things, as distinguished from, say, three, four, or five things. It was illogical. At least they could understand only the distinction between one and many, and the state of the dual in the Vedic dialects helped the gradual dropping of the dual in the Prakrit languages. In such cases as *Mitra' Varuna'*, *Indra' Vaurna'*, *ya' suratha' rathi'tama'*

divispr'is'a' As'vina'' for Mitrau Varun'au ; Indrau Varun'au ; yau surathau rathi'tamau divispr'i'sa' va'svinau &c, we see the germs of the loss of the dual.

3. (a) With regard to the cases the Prakrits present affinities with the Vedic and not with Sanskrit and with them also the Dravidian languages. The Prakrit instrumental singular forms like 'puvve'him, de've'him, gambhi're'him, de'vakamme'him, sute'him, jan'n'e'him etc'' point to the Vedic originals 'pu'rve'bhih', de've'bhih', gambhi're'bhih', de'vakarme'bhih', sute'bhih', yajn'e'bhih' etc.

(b) We find close resemblances between the Vedic ablatiye singular forms 'ni'ca', ucca', pas'ca' etc., and the ablative sing. forms in the Prakrits 'vacca', paccha, de'va', purusa', savva'' etc.

(c) With regard to the use of the dative in the Vedic, it is said to be ,bahula' and most often only the

genitive is used instead.— “Purusha  
mr'iga candramaso' go'dha'ka'laka'  
da'rva'gha't'a'ste' vanaspati'na'm  
kr'ikava'kuh' sa' citro'-sau va'tasya  
na'kro'maka'rah' kulaupayaste' aku'-  
pa'rasya hriyai s'alyakah'" (Mandu-  
kya' 24.36 )

The use of the dative is entirely lost in the Prakrits, only the genitive being recognized: banman'n'a de'hi; aggin'o' sva'ha'; de'van'n'a namah'; aham' te' de'mi, —standing for 'bra'hman'a'ya de'hi; agnaye' sva'ha'; de've'bhyo' namah'; aham' tubhyam dada'mi,' respectively. This is paralleled by the Dravidian usage as in Telugu 'bra'hman'unikiṃmu' etc.

(d) In the Prakrits we find that all final consonants of words are as a rule dropped and all words must end only in vowels. This is in a certain measure the case with most of the Dravidian languages which have become *ajanta*. Especially is this the case with Telugu and Kanarese,

though in their earliest phases there are traces of words having ended in consonants. Even there, it is to be supposed that an incipient vowel was added, which manifested itself in *sandhi* in certain connections and disappeared in certain others. This loss of final consonants which resulted in the *ajantatva* of the Prakrits is traceable to the Vedic language Cp. *yushma'n*—Ved. *yushma'*; *pas'ca't*—Ved. *pas'ca'*; *ucca't*—Ved. *ucca'*; *ni'ca't*—Ved. *ni'ca'* etc

Saraste'jas saro'te'o', pas'ca't  
 paccha', marun maru'  
 Cadrama' tsandamo' tadvad  
 Indrajit punar Indrajit.

(e) Side by side with the changes noted above, there was to be observed in the Vedic itself a tendency to depart from the strict rules of Sandhi "s'iro' apas'yam pathibhis suge'bhih'" 'pum'sa' arisht'u, suja'ta' as'va su'n-r'ite' katham ayam so' Agnir ya'smin so'mamindrah'" 'tasya bhra'ta' ma-

dhyamo' antya sah', 'adhvaryo' adribhis sutam' In these cases, classical Sanskrit requires strict sandhi. But it was left to the choice of the speakers of Vedic Sanskrit to make the sandhi or not, probably according to the exigencies of clear expression of meaning. This latitude has become extended in the case of the Prakrits.

"sun'a'du ajjo', pad'hamam da'va ajjassa mudda'; ajja' an'uge'n'n'a'du (Mudrarakshasa.) Vas'a'gandhe', e's'e'kkhu As's'attha'me' a'kad'd'hida's'ivatte' ido'jje'vva a'acchati (Venisamhara.) The peculiarity with the Prakrits is that even medial consonants are reduced to vowels and these vowels stand side by side without coalescing. This has given rise in the later Tertiary Prakrits and the Modern Aryan languages of India, including the Dravidian, to the interposition of various consonants y, v, m, n, d, r, etc., making the the ety-

mology of many words rather obscure.

(f) In the Vedic we find such genitive plural forms as *r'ishī' anam* *r'itu anam*, *de'va' anam' go' anam* etc., giving rise to the Prakrit genitive plural ending in *n'am* Cp. *na'ha' samar'ahimuhassa* *Harin'o' vi-a mangalam tumha'n'am ho'du.* (*Venisamhara.*)

Caldwell, Kittel and Gundert, proceeding on the assumption that the Dravidian languages are independent of Sanskrit, have prepared lists of words which they thought ought to have been borrowed by Sanskrit from the Dravidian idioms. These words had established themselves so firmly in the Dravidian languages that because the other Aryan languages discarded them and used other words expressing the same meaning, it is rather difficult to avoid the temptation of attributing to them a Dravidian origin in Sanskrit. But on closer examination, it will be found that exact originals,

perhaps here and there with a few modifications can be traced in the existing records of the Iranian or Vedic dialects. I shall attempt here to show that most of the words which Caldwell has cited to show their borrowing into Sanskrit from the Dravidian have their counterparts in the Veda. It is sufficient if one example is given from each of the Vedas.

1. *amba'*: Caldwell admits the existence of this word in the Western Indo-European dialects, but believes it to be Dravidian on the ground that it has many collateral forms in the Dravidian. This word occurs 5 times in the Rig Veda, 2 times in the Yajurveda and 3 times in the Atharva Veda.

*uve' amba sula'bhike' yathe'va'nga bhavishyati*

*bhasan me' amba sakthi me' siro' me' vi'a hr'ishyati vis'vasma' dindra uttarah' R. V. X. 86. 7,*

Being cursed by Indrani, Vrishakapi says, "O mother, who art the giver of good, it will take place just as you have said. Let it be etc."

2. kat'u, kat'u'ka:—Caldwell admits that this word is deep-rooted in Sanskrit but because it has many collateral forms in Dravidian, he would treat it as a Dravidian word. This occurs once in the R. V. and once in the A. V.

Ir'isht'am e'tat' kat'ukam  
e'tad apa'sht'avad' vishavan naitad  
attav ',

su"rya'm yo" Brahma" yidya"t  
sa idva'dhu"yam arhati.—R, V. X.  
85 34

3. kala': This occurs once in the R. V. and three times in the A. V.—

yatha' kala'm yatha' s'apham  
yatha r'in'am sam naya'masi,

e'va' dashshvapnyam sarvam  
a'ptyai sam naya'masy-ane'has'o va  
u'tayah' su u'tayo' va u'tayah'. R. V.  
VIII. 47. 17.

4 kut'i': This is certainly connected with Vedic kut'a and ku't'a. 'kut'a' occurs once in the R. V. and 'ku't'a' once in the R. V. and twice in the A. V.

udno' hr'idayam apibajja rhr'i-sha'n'ah' ku't'am sma tr'imhad-abhi-ma'tim e'ti,

pra mushka bha'rah' s'rava icchama'no' = jiram ba'hu' abharat-sisha'sam. R. V. X 102 4.

5. ku'la: We have 'ku'la' once in the R. V. and 'kulya'', a connected word, five times in the A. V.

a'ditya' ava hi khya ta'dhi ku'la'-diva spas'ah',

suti'rtham-arvato' yatha' nu no' ne'shatha' sugamane'haso' va u'tayah' su u'tayo' va u'tayah' R. V. VIII. 47. 11.

6. na'na': We have this word 17 times in the R. V., 9 times in the A. V., and once in the Y. V.—

yada' va'jamasanad vis'va-ru'pama' dya'marukshad -uttara'n'i

sadma,

Br'ihaspaticam vr'ishan'am var-  
dhayanto' na'na' santo' bibhrato'  
jyo'tira'sa'. R. V. X. 67. 10.

7. ni'ra: This is connected with  
the Vedic na'ra occurring once in the  
Sa'ma' Veda

8 bha'ga: This word occurs in all  
the Vedas, 60 times in the R. V., 35  
times in the Yajur Veda, 3 times in  
Sama Veda and 53 times in the  
Atharva Veda. Its history can be  
traced through all the Prakrits and  
yet Caldwell will have us believe that  
it is Dravidian in origin and borrow-  
ed by Sanskrit.

Ajo' bha'gas tapasa' tam tapasva  
tam te' s'o'cis tapatu tam te' arcih'  
ya's te' s'iva's tanvo' ja'tave'-  
das ta'bhir vahainam sukr'ita'mu  
lo'kam R. V. X. 16. 4.

9. va'la: to surround. cp. Skt.  
valaya. This is found 23 times in  
the R. V., once in the S. V., and 12  
times in the A. V. This is a proper

## Pali

We shall now turn to Pali and see if it can throw any light on our investigation. Here again, we can point out only glossorial affinities, for Pali has not undergone much in the way of grammatical corruption. Only such examples will be given below as are marked Desya in the 'Telugu Dictionaries, because the 'Telugu Lexicographers do not lose any opportunity that presents itself to connect a 'Telugu word with a Sanskrit original and hence when they say that a word is Desya, it is sure to be regarded as such by those who are not inclined to accept any connection between Sanskrit and the Dravidian languages.

Skt.	ali	'Telugu
a'kula	akkula	akkali ankuli
Ved anka	anka	tsanka(for 'ts'
	cf. cakshus	with 'akshi."
angan'am	angan'a	angad'i
akrita	akat'a	akat'a

vikr'ita	vikat'a	vikat'a
a" kro"s"a	akko'sa	akkasu
akshi + vi'ksh	akkhi + vikkhi	akkibikki (dand'a)
avakr'ita	avagad'a	avagad'amu a'gad'amu, agad'u.
agra + pat	agga + pad'	aggapad'u agapad'u.
ihastha	itthattha or icchat't'a	itstsat'a

It is not necessary to make this list very long, but it is sufficient to point out that most of the words which the native scholars considered desyas and foreigners eagerly accepted as such can in very many cases be traced to a Prakrit or Pali original. I have picked up at random 300 Pali originals to Telugn words.

### **Paisaci.**

Unfortunately we know very little about Paisaci which would have furnished us a good deal of light with regard to the Drav. languages.

All that we know from the grammarians is:—

(1) Sauraseni is the basis of the Paisaci.

(2) Vararuci says that the third and fourth letters in each varga are changed into the first and second letters of their class respectively, when they are not initial in words, and Lakshmidhara adds that this change takes place in Chulika Paisaci even initially. This rule agrees to a great extent with the law of the convertibility of surds and sonants formulated by Caldwell, with this reservation that all aspirates are disaspirated, and with regard to medial surds Tamil doubles them while in Telugu and Canarese we find them also single. Further in Telugu and Kanarese, original sonants tend also to remain initially.

(3) The most distinctive characteristic of Paisaci mentioned by all the grammarians is that n'(ॢ)

invariably changes into n (ॢ) and n (ॢ) itself remains unchanged. This applies well to Telugu where all Sanskrit words with n' (ॢ) change it into n (ॢ).

4. s' (ॢ) and sh (ॢ) = s (ॢ). This is characteristic of other Prakrits also.

5. The l' (ॢ) of other Prakrits is found as l (ॢ) in Paisaci. This forms mostly the distinction between Tamil, Malayalam and Kanarese on the one hand and Telugu on the other. Telugu retains the l (ॢ), while in most cases it is found as l' (ॢ) in the others. This l' (ॢ) is further changed into d' (ॢ) in Telugu. (Ko'l'i—Ko'd'i) This preference for the dentals instead of the cerebrals is also evidenced by the non-change of t (ॢ) to d' (ॢ) as in some of the other Prakrits, but also by the change of t'u (ॢ) into the tu (ॢ).

6. According to Lakshmidhara and Simharaja the y (ॢ) in 'hridaya'

(హృదయ) is changed into 'p'(ప)–'hitapa' (హితప).

Of changes in conjunct consonants in Paisaci, the following are known;  $\text{ప్ర} = \text{పట}$  (Vararuci) (but  $\text{పెట}$  according to Lakshmidhara);  $\text{స్న} = \text{సన}$  (Vararuci), but  $\text{సెన}$  (Lakshmidhara); and  $\text{ఋ} = \text{రి}$ . There is some difference of opinion with regard to the change of 'jna'(జ్ఞ). Vararuci says that it changes into  $\text{జ్ఞ}$  but Lakshmidhara asserts that it is changed in to  $\text{న్}$  'n'n'a' generally. An exception is made by Vararuchi and Simharaja to this change in those case forms of 'ra'jan', which exhibit 'jn'a', where they assume the forms 'ra'cina'', 'ra'cino' etc. Vararuci says that 'kanya'' is changed into kan'ja'', but Lakshmidhara would have jn'a = n'n'a generally. Another rule mentioned by Vararuci is that 'jja' from 'rya' of other Prakrits is found as 'cca' in Paisaci.

With regard to grammatical

changes, only the following particulars are known:

1. 'iva' = 'piva': kamalam' piva mukham'

2 The 'at' of Ablative sing' = 'atu' or 'ato'—'Ra'ina'tu' or 'Ra"ma"-to' (Lakshmidhara and Simharaja). I have a shrewd suspicion that this 'to' has some connection with the 'to' of the instrumental singular in Telugu, which sense it sometimes bears in that language.

3. Lakshmidhara and Simharaja say that 'ane'na' = 'n'en'a' and that 'taya' = 'na'ye' in Paisaci.

4 Among verbal forms (a) 'ktva' = 'tu'nam' (V. L) and 'sht'va' = 't't'hu'na' and 'tthu'na' (L.) This 'tu' in 'tu'na' may profitably be compared with the 'tu' in 'ce'stu' etc., in Telugu and 'tta' in 'barutta' etc., in Kanarese. (b) The future finite verb ends in 'e"yya'. (bhavishyati—bhave"yya.) Has this 'e"yya' any connection with the more distinctive

future of the modern Kanarese in 'iy' or 'i'" as in 'ma'diye'nu' etc., and 'ye'" or 'e'" in Telugu 'ce"syē"nu', 'cese"nu', and i'" in 'ce"si"ni'?

Of the distinctive feature of Chulika Paisaci, we know only that 'r' of Sanskrit is found as 'l' in it. Otherwise, say the grammarians, it accords with the Paisaci.

In the absence of further light on the Paisaci, we can only rest contented with a reference to the modern Paisaci languages of which something is known, viz. Kashmiri, corresponding to the Darada and China (modern Shina') of the Prakrit grammarians; Khas Kura, the most important of the languages of Nepal, answering to the Nepali of old; and Sindhi and Lahndi dialects, corresponding to the Vracada of old.

### **Kashmiri**

The most outstanding characteristic of Kashmiri, as, in fact, of all the modern Pisāca languages, is the

numerous epenthetic changes of vowels and consonants corresponding to the Harmonic Sequence of Vowels and changes in consonants noticed by Caldwell as being prominently Dravidian in character. All the vowels must undergo some definite change when followed by an a, i, u, or u' matra. The matra vowels which are a distinctive characteristic of Kashmiri correspond to the short indeterminate vowels at the end of Dravidian words. The consonants gh, jh, d'h, dh, bh, are entirely wanting in it and the corresponding unaspirate sonants are used instead. Sanskrit *gho't'akah'*, Kash. *guru*. Kashmiri has a tendency to use dentals instead of the cerebrals as in Hindi. The most striking phonetic peculiarity is that c, ch and j are changed in Kashmiri into ts, tsh and dz as in Telugu. Ex. Skt. *co'rrah'* Kash. *tsu'r*; Skt. *Chalayati*, Kash. *tshali*; *jalām-dzalam*. The s" and sh of Skt are frequently

represented by 'h', a feature noticed under the Iranian.

Gender in Kashmiri is natural, words referring to males being masculine and those to females feminine, unlike Sanskrit and very like the Dravidian languages. Of other correspondences between Kashmiri and the Dravidian may be mentioned the use of 'Ku' in the genitive case of nouns; the free use made of pronominal suffixes added to verbs to supply the place of personal terminations with the necessary euphonic changes; the presence of a negative voice unlike in Sanskrit where negation has to be expressed by a separate particle 'na,' but by the insertion within the verbal form of the sign of the negative (chuh'—he is; chuna—he is not); the use of 'a' to ask a question as in all the Dravidian languages, but unlike Skt. (c'hva'—is he?); the piling up of suffixes one after another just in the manner of the Dravidian (Karu—was made

Karum—was made by me; 'Karum-akh—Thou wast made by me; Karum-akh-a'—wast thou made by me?, the use of 'un,' cp Kan. 'um', Tam. 'um' to form the infinitive, and the use of a separate auxiliary verb 'yi'—to come, to form the passive of verbs ('Karana yiva'n chuh"—Tel. 'ce'ya vaccu cunnadi'.

### **Sindhi and Lahndi.**

Phonetically Sindhi has the genius of requiring every word to end in a vowel, however indeterminate and however lightly it may be pronounced. The epenthetic changes noticed under Kashmiri affinities exist also in these languages. In the Prakrits, only double consonants have survived and in the modern Aryan languages, one of these consonants is dropped, necessitating a compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel. But in Sindhi this lengthening need not take place as in Telugu and Kanarese. Medial 'd' in Sindhi as in some other North Indian vernaculars is changed into

the hard r(liquid) corresponding to the '२' of the Dravidian. There is a great confusion between the dental and cerebral consonants as in the Vracada Apabhramsa of old and the Dravidian languages. Moreover 't' and 'd' regularly become cerebralized before २ (r). Thus 'putra' - 'put<sup>n</sup>t<sup>n</sup>ru', cp. Drav. put<sup>n</sup>t<sup>n</sup>uvu. With regard to declension almost the only case that has survived is the general oblique or genitive. Other cases are further defined by the help of a postposition. This accords fully with Dravidian usage. The genitive and dative case signs 'Khe', or 'Kho'' are merged, so that there is only one sign for both, corresponding to 'Ki, Ku, Ke, ge,' of the Dravidian languages. This sign is derived from the 'Ka-e' of Maharashtra, or 'Ka-ahi' of Apabharmsa, from Skt.: Kr<sup>n</sup>it'e, or Apabharmsa 'Ka-ahu' from Skt. 'Kr<sup>n</sup>ita<sup>n</sup>t.

Of correspondences in verbal forms we may mention the infinitive and the present, past and conjunctive participles.

	1st conjugation		2nd conjugation	
	Sindhi	Lahndi.	Sindhi	Lahndi.
Infinitive.	....	halan-u	ma'ran-u	ma'ran'-to kill
Present participle	....	halando'	mari'ndo'	mare'ndo'- killing
Past	....	halio'	ma'rio'	ma'rea'-killed
Conjenctive "	....	bali'	ma're'	ma'ri'-having killed

Compare the above for example with the Telugu forms *ce"yan*, *ce'ta*, *ce"sina* and *ce"si*, where 'an' the infinitival suffix, 'a' the gerundive, 'a' the past participial suffix and 'i' the conjunctive participial suffix, exhibit a complete correspondence

### **Khas Kura.**

We now turn to Khas Kura, the chief dialect of Nepal, the modern representative of Nepali mentioned by grammarians as a Pisaca language. This language furnishes the clue to the distinction of masculine and feminine in finite verbs, which is absent in Sanskrit. Another point that may be noticed is the form '-chu' from 'ach' meaning 'to be', used in the formation of present tense verbs and corresponding to the '-cu' of Tel. -'cunna' and '-su' of Kanarese. The further tendency of shortening all final long vowels in this dialect is reflected in the Dravidian languages also. The practice of epenthesis no-

noticed in Kashmiri and Sindhi is found here even, and the genitive sign 'khe' answering to the Dravidian case-sign confirms, along with the others, the affinity of the Dravidian with these Prakrit vernaculars. One more important fact to be noticed is that Nepali furnishes us with the nominative plural case-sign formed by the addition of 'u' to the 'r' of the genitive. Ex. 'de'varu', 'de've'ru', nom. pl. of 'de'va'.

We know little of the rest of the modern Paisaci languages, but one resemblance may be pointed out from the Baluchi where 'gal', the plural forming suffix in all the Dravidian languages is found performing the same function and meaning 'a collection.' Ex. Mengal, the Men people. The singular form of Men-gal' viz. 'Men' is found in the Behistun tablets as the name of a tribe.

### **The Apabhramsa Prakrits**

Next to the Paisaci Prakrits, the Apabhramsa Prakrits afford us the links between the old Prakrits and the Dravidian languages. There is an Apbhramsa dialect connected with each of the cultivated Prakrits, forming the colloquial side of the languages, but these are scantily noticed by grammarians and treated all together, so that it is now rather difficult to disentangle and present them in a proper order. We shall have simply to make the best use of the scraps of information that have been handed down to us.

1. All non-initial surd consonants, aspirate or unaspirate, are turned into their corresponding sonants. We have generally no aspirates in the Dravidian languages and it is a distinctive feature of Tamil and to a great extent of the other Dravidian languages also, that all medial surds, when single, are turned into sonants.

Cp. Skt. 'lo'ka'; Apabh. 'lo'gu'; Tam. 'ulagu' Skt 'ka'ka'; Apabh. 'ka'gu', Tam. 'ka'gei.'

2. 'h' and 'm' in the combination 'hna' change their places: Skt. Bra'h-man"a — Apb. bambhan"a. Cp Aso-kan edicts 'ba"mbhan"a' and 'ba"bha-n"a' with Tel. 'ba"pana.'

3. Skt 'paraspara' —Apb. 'ava-ro"varu' Cp. Kan. 'avaravaru', Tel. 'va"ru va"ru'.

4. The nom. sing. of neuter Skt nouns in 'a' ends in 'u' in Apb.—Skt 'kund'am'—Apb. kund"u, Tel. kun"d'u.

5. In Apb. 'um' comes in the nom. sing. neuter nouns ending in 'ka' and 'ta': Skt. 'kun"d'akam, bhagnam, kr"itam—Apb. kun"d'a-um, bhagga-um, kara-um, respectively. Cp. similar forms in Kanarese.

6. Skt. 'ktva"—Apb. i, i-u, e, avi. Cp. Tel. ce"si, Kan. ma'd'i, and negative Kan. ma'd'ade.

7 Skt. -tum, the infinitive suffix —Apb. an"a, an"aham, an"ahim. Cp.

Tel. an, the infinitive particle, e. g. ce"yan, kot't'an, etc.

8. In 'ta"darthya' i e., the dative, Apb. takes 'ke'him,' corresponding to 'ke' and 'ge' of the Dravidian Dative. Apb. Ra'make'him n'amakka'ro —Telugu, Ra'muniki namaska'ramu, Kan. Ramanige namask'aravu.

9. Though perhaps not easily acceptable, I may be allowed to show certain resemblances between Apb. and Modern Telugu colloquial forms. At first sight they may appear to be fanciful but may lead us somewhere:—

Skt. bhavati, Apb. ho"di, havadi, Tel. avuddi for avutadi.

Skt. abhavat, Apb. ho"-i, hava-i, Tel. ayye.

Skt. bhavanti, Apb. ho"-ira, Tel. ayiri.

Skt. bhava"mi, Apb. ho"ni, Tel. ayitini ('ni' is a back form of 'mi'.)

Skt. bhava"mah", Apb. ho"hum, havahum, ho"ma, ho"mu, havamo", havama & c, Tel. avudunu.

### The other Prakrits.

It has been said above that the Paisaci and the Apabhramsa dialects formed the every-day speech of the people and the other Prakrits noticed by grammarians were their literary aspects. Hence it is that the grammarians deal only cursorily with the Paisaci and Apabhramsa and refer us to the literary Prakrits for further information as 's'e'sham s"auras"eni'vat, s"e'sham maha"ra"shtri'vat, etc. It is therefore necessary to examine these literary Prakrits for any light on the character of the Dravidian languages. But in the course of an evening's lecture it will not be possible to traverse the ground in detail, but an attempt will be made to put in one place the most salient features of the Prakrit languages that are common to them and the Dravidian languages and by the evidence to establish their complete Prakritic character.

### The Phonetic aspect.

It is remarkable how the phonetic character of both the sets of languages are so similar and such variant forms as are found in the Dravidian can be explained by natural phonological tendencies operating in both.

1.  $\text{ఋ}$ ,  $\text{ౠ$ ,  $\text{ॠ}$ ,  $\text{ॡ}$ ,  $\text{ॢ}$  and  $\text{ॣ}$  do not exist in the Prakrits and the Drav. languages alike, and are found in Skt. 'ai' and 'au' in the Dravidian languages are not original but only contractions of 'ayi' and 'avu'.

2. e and o short exist in both unlike in Skt. It is recognized by scholars that these short vowels must have existed in the Prakrits and any opinion to the contrary is only due to the fact that there is no separate letter in the Na"gari alphabet to denote these short vowels. These vowels are believed to be short when occurring before double consonants.

3. The absence of s" and sh, and the non-occurrence of n" and n' in

the beginning of words is in accordance with Prakrit usage. The presence of n' at the beginning of words in Tamil (n'a' uyiru), in Malayalam (n'a'n"), and n" in Mahara"sht'ri' Prak. is a peculiar development in these languages. ण and ण् are either later developments in the Dravidian languages coming in to prevent hiatus or are directly derived from Sanskrit. ण and ण् sometimes occur in the Prakrits also in conjunction with other vargiya letters of their class as in the Dravidian langs.

4. Dissimilar consonants are not found conjoined in both, whereas they do in Sanskrit. They are subjected to such widespread assimilation that the character of the Prakrits and the Dravidian dialects is completely changed.

क, ख, ग, घ, ङ, च, छ, ज, झ, ञ, ट, ठ, ड, ढ, ण, त, थ, द, ध, न, प, फ, ब, भ, म, य, र, ल, व, श, ष, स, ह, ळ, ण, — all these are changed into (kka) in the Prakrits as in the Dravidian.

ꣳ. ꣳ. ꣳ. ꣳ. ꣳ. ꣳ. ꣳ. ꣳ. ꣳ. ꣳ. — these are changed into 'gga', and so on.

5. Mute consonants (ꣳ, ꣳ, etc.) do not occur in the Prakrits but have a vowel 'u' added to them as in the Dravidian langs

6. Short and long vowels interchange in both.

7. Sandhi is optional in Prakrit, while it is subject to definite rules in Skt. Especially 'i' in the Prakrits as in the Dravidian does not coalesce with dissimilar vowels. Similarly ꣳ and ꣳ do not combine with other vowels in both. There has occurred a wide abrasion of consonants in the Prakrits, so that pure vowels occur even in the middle of words. In such places, Prakrit grammarians say that an indistinct 'y' is to be assumed. This hiatus is prevented in the Dravidian languages by the interposition of ꣳ, ꣳ, ꣳ, ꣳ, ꣳ, etc. The phenomenon of the loss of original

consonants and the coming in of entirely different ones with the function of preventing hiatus has given rise to any amount of confusion and obscured the etymology of several words.

8. When a vowel follows another, one of them is elided in both ; cf. the compulsory u-sandhi and the optional a and i-sandhi in Telugu. This rule of elision according to Vararuci is compulsory in S'aurase"ni' and corresponds to the usage in Kanarese.

9. Final consonants are dropped in the Prakrits. The Dravidian languages adopt these clipped forms or add an enunciative vowel to them.

10. Except in the word vidyut, 'a' is substituted for the final consonant of feminine nouns in the Prakrits, which occurs in a shortened form in the Dravidian. Other elisions of consonants are mentioned in the Prakrita Pra'kasa ; ka'la'(y)asa (ka'la'sa) Bha"(j)ana (bha"na, Telugu ba'na, ba'n'ali) etc.

11 a' is substituted for final r of feminine Sanskrit words in the Prakrits.

Exs. dhura"(dhuh"); pura"(puh")  
cf. Telugu dharmu, puramu.

12 For the final consonants in dik, and pra"vr"it, s is substituted. Prakrit diso" Telugu desa.

13. The final consonants of a"yus and apsaras are optionally retained; Prakrit a"uso", a"u" (Telugu a"yusseu' a"yuvu), acharaso", accara" (Telugu apsarasa, accara)

14. The practice in the Drav. languages except in Tamil and Malayalam of using the anusva"ra instead of the anuna"sika letters is Prakritic.

15. Nunnation is a feature of the Prakrits. Cp. Skt. vakra, Prakrit vam"ka Tel. vam"ka; Skt. masta Prak. mantha, Kan. man"d"e; Skt. guccha, Prak. gon"cha Tel. & Kan. gon"ca(lu)

16 (a) tva" = u"n"a in the Prak.

cp. *kr"itva" = ka" u" n"a*: Tel. *ka"vuna*; according to *Kalpatalika* it becomes *ka" u" n"am* cp, Tel *ka"vunan*.

(b) *vat—vanto"* Cp. Tel. *vant"i*.

(c) *iya & du"n"a* are substituted for *ktva"* in the *S'auras'eni* The *du* of *du"n"a* remains in Tam. Mal. and Kanarese, while it is incorporated in the roots of verbs in Telugu. It is also changed into *tu* or *ttu* in Tamil, Kanarese and Malayalam according to strict phonetic laws. The *i* (strictly *iy*) remains in all the Dravidian languages.

17 (a) Denasalization in *vimsati* etc., Prak. *vi'sa'*, Tel. *vi'se*; Cp. also, Sam'skrita-Prak. *Sakka*, Kan. *sakkaja* Tel. *tsakka*; samstuta—Prak. *sattua*, Tel. *sattuva*.

(b) The *anusvara* is optionally dropped in *ma'm"sa &c*. Skt. *ma"m"sa-lam*—Prak. *ma'salam*, Tel. *ma'saramu*; Skt. *Ka'msam*—Prak. *Kamsam*, Tel. *Kan'tsamu*; Skt. *pa'm"su*—Prak. *pa'su'*

Tel. pa'su (in Kam''kara-pa'su.); Skt. e'vam -Prak. e'va, Drav e' (emphatic) Skt. nu'nam -Prak. n'u'n'am, n'u'n'a, Tel. nunna &c.

### **The interchange of vowels.**

18. (1) i' is sometimes substituted for the Skt. a'' in the Prak. in certain words; Skt. mari''cam, Prak mi-ri am. Tel. miriyamu.

(2) Skt. a is changed into Prak. e'', Tel. e; s'ayya'-Prak. se''jja, Tel. sejja.

(3) Skt. a in *arp* is changed into Prak. o, Tel. o optionally; *arpayati*-Prak oppe''i, appe''i, Tel oppagin''cu, appagincu.

(4) Skt. medial a''-Prak. a; Skt. kuma''rah-Prak. Kumara''-Tel. Ku(ko) ma'rud'u.

(5) A Skt. long vowel before a conjunct consonant is shortened; Skt. chu''rn'am-Prak. chunam - Tel. sunnamu

(6) Sanskrit i = e optionally; Skt. pind'am—Prak. pe"nd'am—Tel. pe"n"d"a or pen"d"a; Sanskrit sindu"ram—Prak. se"ndu'ram — Tel. cendu"ram; Sanskrit vishnuh'—Prakrit ve"nhu" — Tel. vennud'u.

(7) Skt. i" in pa'ni"ya &c,—i; Skt. pradi"pita — Prakrit padivi a — Telugu pamida or pramida.

(8) Sanskrit initial u before a conjunct consonant — o"; Sanskrit tund'am—Prakrit ton"d'am— Tel. ton"-d'amu; Sanskrit mun'd'am — Prakrit mon"d'am — Tel. mon'd'emu; Sanskrit pustakam — Prakrit po"tthaam—Telugu pottamu; Sanskrit vyutkra"nta—Prakrit vo"kkanta—Telugu pokku; Sanskrit Kunti"—Telugu gontj.

(9) Sanskrit initial r = a; vr'ishabha—Pra"krit vasaho"—Telugu basava; Sanskrit vr'iddhih'—Pra"k vad"d"hi"—Telugu vad"d"i.

(10) In certain Sanskrit words initial r'i-i; Sanskrit dr'ishta—Prakrit

dit't'ha-Telugu dit't'a; Skt sringa'ra-  
Prakrit singa"ro"-Tel. singa'ramu.

(11) In certain Sanskrit words  
r"i-u; Sanskrit bhra'tr"ikah"- Prakrit  
bha"uo"-Telugu bha"va or ba"va.

(12) Sanskrit sadr"is"a - Prakrit  
sariso"-Telugu sari.

(13) Sanskrit a"u - o"; Sanskrit  
kra"un"ca-Pra"k. ko"nca-Tel. kon"tsa  
or kon"ga.

### **Changes in Consonants.**

(a) Non-initial and non-conjunct  
consonants preceded by vowels.

19 (1) 'a' the remnant of k, g, c,  
j &c, has the pronunciation 'ay' in  
Prakrit. Cp. the augment 'y' in Tel.  
sandhi.

(2) Sanskrit kh, gh, th, dh, bh-  
Prakrit h;- Sanskrit mukham-Prakrit  
muham - Telugu mohamu, mo"mu;  
Sanskrit me'ghah'-Prakrit me'ho-Tel.  
me'hamu; Sanskrit sa'dhuh'- Prakrit  
sa'hu, cp. Telugu interjection sa'ho';

s"o"b"ha"—Prakrit so"ha—Telugu so"ga,  
cp. Telugu sogayu, sogasu &c.

(3) Sanskrit t"—d"; Skt. nat'a—  
Prakrit nad"a—Telugu nad"a(tsu); Skt.  
bhat"a—Prakrit bhad"o—Tel. bhad"ava  
bad"ava, bad"atanamu, bad"agu &c,

Sanskrit t"—d" or l; Skt. pa"t'a  
(yati)—Prakrit phad'e'i or phat'ei—Tel.  
pa"d" (agu), pa"li (po"vu).

Sanskrit t"h-d"h—Telugu d"; Sans-  
krit kut'ha'rah—Prakrit kud'haro'—Tel.  
god'd'ali, kod'avali.

Sanskrit d"—l; Sanskrit da'd'ima—  
Prakrit da'lima—Tel. da"linma (l is  
further changed into n in da'nimma).

Sanskrit sht'—t't'h: Sanskrit pra-  
tisht'a'—Prakrit pa it't'ha—Tel. pait'a;  
Skt. bahisht'ha'—Tel. bait'a or bayat'a.

(4) Sanskrit p-v; Sanskrit ulapah'  
—Prakrit ulavo"—Telugu ulava.

Sanskrit p-ph: Skt. pushpa—Prak.  
puppha, Cp. Telugu puppod'i.

(5) Initial Sanskrit y-j; Sanskrit  
yas'as—Prakrit jaso'—Kanarese jasa;

Skt. yamah'— Prakrit jamo'— Telugu Jamud'u.

**(b) Changes in conjunct consonants.**

20. (1) Assimilation (regressive) in conjuncts of k, g, t', d', t, d, p, s', sh, s; Sanskrit:—guptam—guttamu etc.

(2) Assimilation (progressive) in conjuncts of m, n, y when they form the second members of the conjuncts: lagna—lagga.

(3) Assimilation (progressive or regressive, of l, v, r, in conjunct consonants, except in the word candra; Sanskrit ulka'—Prak. ukka—Tel. ukka; Sanskrit pakva—Prakrit pikka—Telugu pikka (Skt. candra—Prakrit tsando'—Telugu tsandurud'u)

(4) Vya-Prak. vva-Telugu bba. Sanskrit ka"vyam—Prakrit kavvam—Telugu kabbamu.

(5) jn"a—Prakrit n"n"— Tel. nn— Sanskrit vijn"a'nam—Prakrit vin"n"a'-n'am— Telugu vinna'n'amu; Sanskrit sam'jn"a'-Prakrit san"n"a'-Tel. sanna.

(6) Skt. *stri'*—Prakrit *i'tthi*;—cp. *ti* or *te* (the feminine forming particle of many Dravidian nouns); Sanskrit *vya'khya'nam*—Prakrit *vakkha'n'am*—Telugu *vakkan'amu*.

Doubling does not take place of the single consonants substituted for conjunct consonants following an *anusva'ra*; Sanskrit *sandhya'*—Prakrit *sam'jha'*—Telugu *sandza*, or *sande*.

(7) The process of doubling applies in *samasa*s also; Sanskrit *nadi'gra'ma* (or *navagra'ma*)—*na-i-gga'mo'*—Telugu *navaga'm* (a village); similarly *nad'aga'm*, *bu'raga'm*, *nan-diga'm* etc. (names of villages).

(8) Sanskrit *us'ht'ra* — Prakrit *ut't'ho'* or *ut't'hro*; Telugu *on't'e*.

(9) *tya* (except in the word *caitya*)—*cca*: Sanskrit *nitya*—Prakrit *nicca*—Telugu *nitstsalu*.

(10) Sanskrit *tya*, *thya*, *dva* and *dhva* sometimes become *cca*, *cca*, *jja*, *jja*, respectively: Skt. *jn'a'tva'*,

**Prakrit** n'accha' - **Telugu** natstsu;  
**Sanskrit** budhva' - **Prakrit** bujja-  
**Telugu** bujjagin"cu.

(11) Except in words like **ḍhu'r-**  
**ta** etc., **skt** rta—t': **Sanskrit** kaivar-  
 tāh'—**Prakrit** ke'vat't'o—**Telugu** kaviti  
 (name of a village); **Sanskrit** va'rta'  
 —**Prakrit** vat't'a— **Tel.** va't't'i (ma't'a)  
 a rumour.

(12) **thya**, **s'ca**, **ts** and **ps**, pre-  
 ceded by a short vowel—**echa**; **Sans-**  
**krit** rathya' -**Prakrit** raccha' -**Telugu**  
 ratstsa; **Sanskrit** matsarah'—**Prakrit**  
 maccharo' - **Telugu** matstsaramu;  
**Sanskrit** apsaras - **Prak.** acchara' -  
**Telugu** atstsara.

(13) **Sanskrit** mn and jn"—n':  
**Sanskrit** vijn"a'nam—**Prakrit** vin"n"a-  
 n'am - **Telugu** vinna"n'am; **Sanskrit**  
 sam"jn"a"—**Prakrit** san'n'a—**Tel.** sanna.

(14) **Sanskrit** yya and ryya-j:  
**Sanskrit** s'ayya'—**Prakrit** se"jja—**Tel.**  
 sejja; **Sanskrit** ka'ryyam—**Prak.** kajjam  
 —**Telugu** kajjamu.

(15) Sanskrit shp and sp-ph :  
Sanskrit pushpa- Prakrit puppha cp.  
Telugu puppod"i ; Sanskrit s'ashpa-  
Prakrit sappham-Telugu seppam.

(16) Sanskrit s'na, shn'a, sna,  
nha, hna and kshn'a-n'ha: Sanskrit,  
pras'nah'-Prakrit pan'ho'-Tel. panna;  
Sanskrit vishn'uh'-Prakrit vin'hu";-  
Telugu vennud'u; Sanskrit kr"ishn'ah"  
-Prakrit kan'ho'-Telugu kanna(yya);  
Sanskrit vahnih' - Prakrit van'hi'-  
Telugu vanne (banga'ramu.)

(17) hma-mh: Sanskrit Brahma'  
-Prakrit bamha'-Telugu bamma.

(18) hya-jh: Sanskrit sahyah'-  
Prak. sajho'-Telugu saitsu.

21. Notice the following changes.  
Here the first is Sanskrit, the second  
Prakrit and the third Telugu:—

agnih", aggi', aggi; anga'rah, in-  
ga"lo', ingalamu; atimuktakam, a"n"i-  
mutta am, a'n"imuttiyaamu; antah"-  
puram, ante"puram, antipuramu; ard-  
dhah", addham, Tel. adda, addamu

ad"d"a (Pa"li ad"d"ha); ala'bu"h', ala' u',  
a'napa (ba); a'ca'ryyah', a'irio (a' ario)  
ayyava'ru (Tamil ayyar); a'mram,  
a'mvam, a'va (ka'ya); a'rdram, a'llam,  
(allam), allamu; a'ryyah', a i'ri o', ayya;  
a'li', uli', o'li; a's'caryam, acche"ram,  
acceruvu (acce"ramu); in'gudam, in'gu  
-am, in'guva; i"shat, isi', isi'; ulu"kha-  
lam, o'khalam, ro'kali; u"rdhva, uddha,  
Kan. udda; r"ikshah", rikkho", rikka;  
u'ha', ujjha, ujja; r"ijuh", ujju" Kan.  
ujju - rubbing, smoothing, levelling;  
r'ishih, risi', Tel. rusi, Kan risi, rusi;  
kubjah", khujjo", gujju; ku"shma"n"d"i",  
Sauras'eni', kuhman'd'i, gummad'i;  
ku'rparam, ko'pparam, kopparamu;  
kr'ishn'ah', kan'ho', kanna; gadgadam,  
gaggaram, gaggu; gartah', gad'd'o,  
gad'd'a; gardabhah', gad'd'aho', ga'd'i-  
da; gauravam, ga'ravam, ga"ravamu;  
caturtthi', ca u tthi', tsauti; catvaram,  
caccharam, tsapparamu; ta'mbu"lam,  
ta"mbo"l'am, ta'mbo'i"amu, (coll.) ;  
dam'-sht'ra", da'd'ha', daud"a; das'a,  
daha, dham, (in counting numbers);

de'vakulam, de''va ulam. de'val'am;  
 dva'ram, duva'ram, duva'ramu; dha'-  
 tri', dha' i', da'yi (da'di); paryastam,  
 pallat't'am (pallattham), pallat'illu  
 (pallat''i etc.); parya'n'am, palla'n'am,  
 pallana, (pallanam); palyan''kah'', pal-  
 lan''ko'', pallaki; pa''r'a'vatah', pa'ra o'  
 (pa'ra'va o'), pa'rva''(pa'ruva); pit''ha-  
 rah'', pid''haro' (pihad''ho'), pid''ata;  
 pr''ithivi, pud''havi'', pud''ami; s''ithilam  
 sad''ilam, sad''alu; malinam, ma ilam,  
 maila(mayila); mira', me'ra, me'ra;  
 mu'rkhah'', murukho' (mukkho), mru-  
 kkid''i; mr''ittika' mat''t'i a', mat''t'i;  
 mr''ityuh, macch''u, matstsu; mr''isha,'  
 musu'' (mu''sa'', mo''sa'',) mo''samu;  
 ra''trih, ra''i (ratti), re''yi; la''n'gu''lah,  
 na'n'gu'lo', na'gali'; vr'iddhih, vud'd'hi'  
 vad'd'i; ve''n'uh, ve''lu'', veduru; ve''-  
 tasah', be''diso'', be''d'isa; s''ami', chha-  
 mi'', jammi; s''r''in'khalam, san''kalam,  
 san''kela; smas''a'nam, masa''n'am,  
 (mannu) mas''a''namu; s''mas''ru''.  
 massu'', mi''samu; s''la''gha'', sala''ha'',  
 salaha''; s''ava cp. (Tel. cha''vu);

sukuma"rah, so"ma"lo", so"mari; su"-  
kshmam, ( s'lakshn'am ) san'ham,  
san'n'a (sannamu); stambhah', kham-  
bha o', kambamu; sto"kam, tho"vam,  
to'lemu; sthu'lam, tho"ram, to"ramu;  
snigdham, n"iddham, niddamu; sne"-  
hah", n"e"ho", ne"yi; sphat"kam,  
phaliham, palugu.

### **S'aurase'ni'.**

Apu"rrvam, avaru"vam, apuru"-  
pamu; ksha"ram, ka"ram, ka"ramu.

### **Pra'cyā'**

vakra, vam"ku, vam"ka; he",  
are", (ore", o"ri).

### **Ma'gadhi'.**

m"itam, mad"e", mad"iyu; he",  
ase", ose" (o"si); val"u, vad"uva, va-  
d"ugu; hr"idya, had"d"aka, ed"d"a  
(ed"ada, eda.)

### **Pais'a'ci'.**

t" and t interchange in this Prak.  
as in the Dravidian languages.

### **Apabhram's'a.**

i"dr"is"ah", a i so", naisare".

**Pa'n"ca'li'.**

r and l interchange in this as in the Dravidian languages.

**T'hakka'**

u is added to the end of nearly every word in this as in the Dravidian languages, especially Kan. and Tel.

**A'bhi'ri'.**

l is substituted for r and d" in this as in the Dravidian languages.

---

**N O U N S.****Case-endings.**

(1) Nom. sing. termination, Skt. -su. Prak.-o"(u), Drav.-u. The final 'a' of Sanskrit words is changed in to 'e' in the Prakrits and the -su dropped. Cp. Kan. nouns ending in 'e'.

(2) Nom. and acc. pl. Skt. endings are dropped, and in these and abl. sing. and gen. plural final 'a' is lengthened. Cp. the nom. plurals in 'a' in the Drav. languages; an, am

etc., in the accusative ; a (n) in the Tel. ablative ; 'a' in the genitive in both the singular and the plural.

(3) Similarly the a of am, the sign of acc. sing. is optionally dropped as in the Drav. languages; further in the Drav languages m is dropped and 'a' remains.

(4) Instead of instr. sing a' and gen. plural a'm, n' is substituted. In the Apb. either n' or anusva'ra occurs. Anusva'ra remains in the Dravidian langs.

(5) Inst. pl. takes hi, hin or him Cp. with this Kan. instr. im and Tel. in or n.

(6) Abl. singular takes tto', do', du, hi, hitto'; with hitto' nasalised and thus falling in line with hinto' (abl. plural termination.) Cp. inta in akinta (abl. suffix in Kan) and ant'e (abl. suffix in Tel. kan't'e)

(7) Abl. plural takes tto', do', du, hi, hinto' sunt'o'. See (6) above.

(8) Gen. singular in Ma'gadhi is a'ha, cp. 'a' of the Drav. langs.

(9) Loc. singular takes mmi—Drav. im, il, in &c.

(10) Loc. plural in Apb. takes him and hu' sometimes.

To summarise—

	Sing.		Plural.	
	Prak.	Drav.	Prak.	Drav.
N.	o' (u)	u, e	a'	a
A.	m	am, a(n)	a'	a (n)
I.	n' or m'	m'	him	im (in)
Ab.	hitto'	hinto', inta	hinto'	inta
G.	Mg. aha	a	a'	a
L	mmi	im, in	him	im, in

Thus, a complete connection is established between the Prak. and the Drav. languages with regard to their declension.

In the instr. 'him' which is the pl. sign is also used in the sing.

In the Prakrits, nouns generally end in a, i and u. Sanskrit r'i being changed into ara, or u, they follow

the rules laid down for nouns ending in a or u. There is not much difference in declension between a-endings and i and u endings. No special rules are laid down by Prak grammarians with regard to i' and u' endings; perhaps they thought that the rules for i & u endings should be followed in their case also. Hemacandra, in fact lays down a rule that the final i' and u' of roots which are formed by the suffix kvip to the roots, become short before all case suffixes. This rule, he says, is optional in the vocative singular, thus paving the way for the two forms in 'Tel. and Kan. with short and long final vowels, e. g. hari, hari'.

### **Ka'raka.**

There set in a confusion with regard to the use of the cases in the Prakrits on account of the levelling of case endings. The Prakrit grammarians have left the subject as impossible of a systematic treatment. Some-

times (1) the locative comes in instead of the accusative and the instrumental; (2) sometimes the instrumental instead of the ablative; (2) sometimes the accusative instead of the locative; and (4) the accusative instead of the nominative. All this is in perfect accordance with the Dravidian usage.

### **Gender.**

(7) There is a transition or confusion of the grammatical gender of Sanskrit which resulted in the natural gender of the Dravidian languages observable in the Prakrits.

(i) Pra'vr'it, s'arat and tarun'i', which are fem. in Skt. are masc. in the Prak. Similarly words ending in n and s except da'man, s'iras and nabhas are used in the masc. in the Prakrit.

(ii) gun'a &c. masc. in Sanskrit are optionally neuter in the Prakrit and necessarily in the Drav. cp. Tel. gun'amu (Prak. gun'am'); Tel. Kara-

ruhamu (Prak. kararuham'.)

(8) The final visarga of Sanskrit words is changed into o' in the Prak. which has become the final u which we generally find in Dravidian words. This u was gradually extended in its application to verbs and other grammatical categories. The u as the final of nominative singular forms has certainly a Prakrit form. In this respect, the Drav. langs. accord with Marathi (Gun'e).

### **Prefixes.**

The prefixes of Skt. have generally fused themselves with the words to which they were attached and underwent the phonetic changes peculiar to the Praks. so extensively that it has become practically impossible to separate the prefixes from the roots. For example, the prefixes apa, ava, and nir were all changed into o' in the Prakrits, and if we have to derive a Drav. word from Skt., we have to trace the forms

back through the Praks. by applying the phonetic laws operating in them. Observe the following:—

Skt. prati, Prak. pari' or pa i', Tel. pai or payi; Skt. apasr'i, Tel. o'sarillu; Skt. pratisht'ha', Prak. pa it't'ha', 'Te'. pait'a; cp. Tel. pa't'in'cu with Skt. pratisht'h.

### Suffixes

(1) The Prakrit suffix -ira occurs in the sense of s'i'la (habit or inclination), dharma (innate quality) or sa'dhu (goodness). This suffix is found in Tel. in the form of -ira, -iramu, or -ari.

(2) Sanskrit ktva' = S'aurase'ni' du'n o' or iya. du'n'o' is found in all the Dravidian languages as du, and iya in the form of i, but the y reappears in combination with another vowel.

(3) ima, andttan'a from Skt. tva are found in Telugu as ima and tanamu as also in the rest of the Dravidian languages.

(4) Sanskrit *mat* and *vat* are found in the Prakrits as *illa*, *ulla*, *a'la*, *inta* etc., as also in the Drav. langs. Cp. Kanarese *ul'l'a* = having; Telugu *ba'linta* = having a child, etc.

### **Indeclinables.**

The following comparisons may be made.—

Prakrit *a'ma*; Tamil *a'ina*; Prak. *vale'*, Telugu *vale*(like); 'Sanskrit *e'ta'-vat*, Prakrit *itti am*, 'Telugu *intiya* (*inta, inte*), *it't'i* etc., denoting measure or quantity

### **Conjugation of verbs**

(1) In the Praks. the distinction of *gan'a* or classes of roots is not observed. All roots are conjugated alike as in the Dravidian languages.

(2) There is no distinction between *parasmaipada* and *atmane'pada* roots in the Prakrits except in those ending in *a*. In the *S'aurase'ni'*, all roots are *parasmaipada*. The distinction into *padas* is absent in the Dravidian languages.

(3) The prefixes and suffixes of Sanskrit verbs are fused with the roots in Prakrit verbal forms, so that it is no longer possible to separate them from the roots

(4) The past participles have formed themselves into new bases in the neo-Prakrits to which pronouns or pronominal particles are added to denote the person, gender and number of the finite verbs.

#### **Some other Prakrit features.**

(1) Most of the vocabulary of the Dravidian languages, especially Tel and Kan has a Prakritic source. Names of household objects, domestic animals, common insects, names of relationship, abstract names, names of measures &c., can be derived from one or other of the Prakrits. Tamil and Malayalam have gone further in their development and their Prakritic source can be determined by the application of philological principles.

(2) Most of the ordinary roots

of the Dravidian languages can be ultimately traced to an Indo-European source and very often to a Prakritic source.

(3) The pronouns of the Dravidian languages have their Prakrit counterparts and can ultimately be referred to an Indo-Iranian source.

(4) The numerals of the Dravidian languages cannot by any stretch of imagination be connected with Scythian originals but in many cases with Indo-European or Prakrit ones.

(5) The nominal inflection is mostly of a Prakritic character. The absence of the dual in the Praks. is in perfect conformity with the Dravidian languages, as contrasted with that obtaining in Sanskrit. The genitive case doing duty for the dative, which is absent in the Prakrits, is also in accordance with the Dravidian usage.

#### **Some correspondences.**

The following correspondences may be noticed. Of these the first is

Prakrit and the second Telugu. The Prakrit forms are not mentioned as desyas in the dictionaries.

jampa, jampu; n'ivvara (grief), nivvera; n'i'ra, nit'r(upa'samu); dhu-ma', duma'ramu; o'rumma', o'ru(ga'li) nirppa, nilpu; me'lava, me'lavin'cu; ha'rava(pa'lava), Kan. ha't'u (pa'd'u); ugga, uggamu; ulla'la, ullala(allala); kin'a(kun'a), konu; alli', allu; hava, avu; ran'ha, ran'ke; bukka, pogulu (Kan. bogul'u); payalla, bayalu; sakka, cakka; salha, Kan. saluhu; ve'ad'a, ved'alu; mu'ra, Kan. muri; vira, virugu; vacca, vattsu; an'uvacca, anutsu; vid'hava, vid'atsu; jun'ja (jujja, juppa), jun'jurulu(jajju, tuppa); vad'd'a, vad'd'in'cu; gad'ha, gad'incu

Instances may be multiplied. It may be remarked that after eliminating the *tatsama* and *tadōhava* words in the Dravidian languages, the *des'ya* element would be very insignificant. It will not serve even the elementary purposes of speech. It

may be hoped that on further investigation they may be traced to some Indo-European originals.

### **The Modern Aryan Vernaculars**

We have seen above how nearly we have come to the identification of the Drav. languages with the ancient Prakrits. We are now in a position to combat the opinion of Caldwell that the Dravidian languages are independent of Sanskrit. In this, we will receive great help by referring to the modern North Indian vernaculars which are the direct descendants of the old Prakrits. Caldwell has advanced some arguments, and as he thought, incontrovertible points of difference between Sanskrit and the Dravidian languages. We shall prove that in every one of these points, his point of view was wrong and that he ought to have turned to the Prakrits for light. Let us consider his points one by one—

(1) The non-Sanskritic portion

of the Dravidian languages is very greatly in excess of Sanskrit—

Our reply is that what Caldwell thinks is the non-Sanskritic portion is really the Prakritic portion of the languages in a very much changed shape, changed much further than the Prakritic stage by further developments. That this portion is much larger in extent than the Sanskrit is due to the fact that all words which are really necessary for the expression of thought are already there in a Prakritic shape and the Sanskrit portion is the element which has entered later on with the later Sanskritic culture which it represented, and which still remains unassimilated by the ordinary people. The moment it affects the masses, it tends to change in the Prakritic direction which has been pointed out before.

(2) The pronouns and numerals of the Dravidian languages, their verbal and nominal inflections and

the syntactic arrangement of their words, everything, in short, which constitutes the living spirit of a language were originally and radically different from Sanskrit.

This is too sweeping a statement. It has been pointed out above how the nominal inflection of the Dravidian is in perfect accord with the Prakrits and how the verbal inflection of Sanskrit had crumbled down and been levelled, with its ten conjugations reduced to but one, with the distinction between the *Atmanepada* and *Parasmaipada* gone, with the tense prefixes lost or fused into the roots proper, the whole conjugation taking a new basis of participial forms, and new auxiliary verbs taking the place of the old verbal suffixes. It is no wonder, then, that the Dravidian languages, along with the Non-Indian vernaculars, should present a shape far different from that of Sanskrit, obscured by changes brought

about by phonetic decay of a far-reaching character. With regard to the history of tense-signs and pronouns, I can only refer you to the two papers by the late Mr. Swaminatha Iyer presented to the first and third Oriental Conferences respectively. We may not be able to agree with many of the details shown by him, but I feel sure that his line of investigation is in the main, correct. As for the numerals, Caldwell himself has pointed out many Sanskrit affinities to many of them, but has rejected all of them in order to establish some very distant unconvincing affinities with the Scythian ones. He was, however, himself not satisfied with his own conclusions and his derivations are fanciful. I may be permitted to speak briefly here about the Dravidian numerals.

(1) One: This has two forms ondu, onnu, ond'u &c., and oka, in Telugu. onnu is evidently Indo-Euro-

pean corresponding to Latin *oi-nos'*, unus; Greek *hen*; Gothic *ain-s* and English *one*. Caldwell dismisses this derivation as improbable on the ground that *n* is not changed into *r* in the Dravidian and therefore we cannot get at the forms *oru* and *o'r*. He does not, however, explain why an *n* should come in in *or + du = ondru*. The forms *on + r'u—ondru'* later changed into *ondu* point to *n* as being radical originally in the Dravidian numeral for one, and although a direct representative of this is not found in Sanskrit, still the particle *u'na* in *u'navim'sati* &c, meaning 'one from twenty' &c, points to the continuous tradition of the existence of this 'on' throughout the history of the Indo-European languages down through the Prakrits to the Dravidian languages. 'oka' is directly connected : with Sanskrit *e'ka* found as *yak* in Persian and *ok* in Bengali.

(2) Two: 'ren'd'u, erad'u, iran'du rad'd'a' etc. It may be suggested that this is derived from Sanskrit dvandva. An interesting point to be noted in this connection is the fact that young children and the illiterate among the Telugus always use dondu for two. This is an instance to show how clues for derivation can be found in the language of children and of the illiterate where the language of literature and of the higher classes fails to come to our aid dondu is a perfect derivation from dvandva, later changed into ron'd'u, then into ran'd'u, and then into iran'd'u, erad'u and ren'd'u,

(2) Three: mu'ru, mu'nr'u, mu'd'u, mu'ji etc. The only close resemblance that has so far been discovered in another language is the Brahui mu'r. Brahui is an Iranian dialect and therefore the history of this Dravidian numeral has to be carried to some Iranian dialect still awaiting investigation.

(4) Four: *nal*, *na'l*, *na'lugu*. *nar* is conjectured to stand for *car* in *car sau* (from Sanskrit *catur s'vah'* (four days hence). Here we have a clue to the derivation of Dravidian *nal* and *na'l*.

(5) Five: *e'nu*, *an'ju*, *ein'ju*, *eindu*. This is certainly connected with Sanskrit *pan'can*, in which initial *p* is changed into *h* as in *pada-haidu*, *padihe'nu* (fifteen), and then into 'a', and the *c* has become voiced according to Prakritic laws.

(6) Six: *a'r'u*, older form *ha'ru* appearing in *padaha'ru*, has perhaps to be derived from *shas*, where initial *sh* is changed into *h* and final *s* into *r* according to strict Iranian and Prakritic laws.

(7) Seven: *e'd'u*, *e'l'u*, etc. This may be derived from *sapta* changed into *he'ttha*, and *he'd'*, occurring in *padihed'u* and the initial *h* is lost according to the well-known law of the dropping of initial consonants.

(8) Eight: en't'u, et't'u, enimidi. This is apparently to be connected with Sanskrit asht'an.

(9) Nine: ombattu, tommidi etc. This is probably from 'u'napan'ktih', in which u'na represents 'one'.

(10) Ten: hattu, pattu, padi etc. padi may be from Sanskrit pan'kti as has been suggested by 'Telugu lexicographers, or hat is a clipped form of das'at where s' is first changed into h as in the Prakrits and then d was dropped owing to the shift of the accent to the second syllable.

(100) Hundred: vanda in 'Telugu is a Prakrit word and is perhaps connected with Sanskrit s'atam through its centum branch

(1000) 'Thousand: a'yira, sa'vira. These are recognised to have been derived from Sanskrit sahasra and Tel. ve'(yi) also may be assigned to that source through the intermediate form sa'vira, Prakrit a'via-ve'(yi). The

Telugu ordinal form modat'i, is from modalu (Tamil mudal) from Prakrit mu ala, Mhr. mu ala, Skt mukhara.

Thus, some plausible derivations, at least more plausible than those suggested by Caldwell, are given above. No doubt, in the present state of our knowledge respecting the history of the individual Dravidian languages, some philological difficulties do show themselves, but the resemblances are so striking that it is not easy to discard them. The numeral for hundred (nu'r'u) is the only one that is wanting in an original but it is wanting not only in Skt. and its allied languages but in any family whatsoever. May it not be that it is the representative of a form in a dialect that is awaiting investigation or no longer extant?

(3) We must not be misled by the presence in Dravidian dictionaries of many Sanskrit words in an unaltered shape. There is a class of

Dravidian words which the grammarians recognised as such and honoured by giving them the name 'national' or 'pure'.

This is a piece of flattery and cajolry meant to make us trust him in his view. The term 'a'cchika' in Dravidian grammars is not to be translated by the word 'pure' as Caldwell and others have done, but defined to include all tadbhava and de's'ya words i. e. those which have undergone phonetic decay in varying degrees of corruption. De's'ya is not again to be translated by a high sounding word like 'national'. It means simply that division of words whose derivation from Sanskrit is obscured beyond recognition or whose derivation cannot be made with certainty. This is the sense in which the Prakrit grammarians also had used the word; they had also divided the Prakrit vocabulary into tatsama, tadbhava & de's'ya according to the degree of

divergence the words exhibit from the Sanskrit. Evidently they meant to refer these de's'ya words to some one or other of the colloquial Prakrit dialects which they jumbled up under one common name Apabhram's'a. The De's'i'na'mama'la of Hemacandra gives us such de's'i' words as pillā, pilli, puli, vu'ru &c which are actually found in Telugu and others which are found in one or other of the rest of the Dravidian languages. These evidently, are meant to refer to some Prakritic source and this opinion is being gradually confirmed by the discovery of originals for these words by Western scholars, who are turning round to the view that although, at present, we may not be in a position to trace their history in the present state of our knowledge, still they may be referred to some lost Pais'a'c'i or Apabhrams'a languages.

In passing, it may be pertinent at this point to refer to the list of sixty

words given by Caldwell to show that they have no sort of connection with Sanskrit words. However, we may be permitted to point out that his argument is specious in that he has quoted the wrong Sanskrit originals while actual Sanskrit words with which direct connection may be established with the Drav. are available. I shall give below the forms suggested by Caldwell and the correct ones that ought to have been given. In the following, the first is given by Caldwell, the second is the correct one, and the third is the corresponding Drav. word.

Pitr'i, ambah', appan; matr'i, ma'yi (North Indian). a'yi; dha'tri', Prak. dha'i, da'yi (ta'yi, da'di); su'nu, maha'n, magan; duhitr'i, mahati', magal'; s'iras, tala, talei; karn'a, s'ra-vas, s'evi; mukha, vaktra, va'y; ke's'a, s'mas'ru, mayir; hasta, kara, key; div, vyo'man, va'n; divasa, na'l'i' (d'i'), na'l'; nak, ra'tri, (Prak. ratti or ra'i),

re'yi (iravu); su'rya, Prak. n'e'sar, Kan. ne'sar, Tam. n'ayiru; agni, te'jas, ti'; ap, ni'ra (na'ra), ni'r; matsya, mi'na, mi'n; parvata, malaya, malei; as'man, gra'van, kal; ve's'man, nilaya, nilavu (nelavu, il); gra'ma, pu'r, u'r; hastin, ane'kapa, a'nei; as'va, gho't'a, kudirei; s'va'na, na'yi (like ney from sne'ha); s'u'kara, po'trin, panr'i; va-yas, pa'ra'vata, paravey; ka'la, kr'i (shna), karn; s'ukla, s've'ta, vel'; rakta, s'o'n'a, s'e; mahat, pr'i (thu), peru; alpa, s'rath, s'ir'u; madhura, ikshu, in; bhaksh, tr'in', tinu; stha', nilaya, nil; car, i (e'), e'gu; han, kru' (ra), kol.

(4) There are a large number of uncultivated Dravidian languages in which Sanskrit words are not at all, or but very rarely, employed. Some of the Dravidian languages which make use of Sanskrit derivatives are able to dispense with them altogether, such derivatives being considered rather as uxuries or articles of finery than as necessities.

To this who have to reply that the uncultivated languages are, in the first place but imperfectly studied, and that so far as they are studied, they agree in possessing a common substratum with the cultivated languages. The later Sanskrit words borrowed in varying degrees represent the unassimilated later Sanskrit culture which has not affected the masses and where it has so affected, it is already found there in a Prakritic form. The common irreducible basis of all the Dravidian languages can be referred to a Prakritic origin. The common articles of food (ganji, ni'ru, ambali, ku'd'u); the kitchen utensils (garit'et'd'u, ginne etc.); the 'kat't'elu' meant to cook food; the ordinary things of the household (niccena, visana kar'r'a, man'camu, tsa'pa, god'd'ali, katti etc.); the common household names (mane, illu, kot't'u, an'gad'i, at'aka, tsa'vad'i etc.; names of common animals (me'ka, gor'r'e, gur'-

r'amu, ga"d"ida etc.); names of relationship (appa, amma, ma"ma, atta, ba"va, akka etc.); the pronouns, the numerals, in fact every element that constitutes what Caldwell insists on being the living spirit of a language, has a striking resemblance with words in one or other of the Prakrits, and if we cannot find Prakrit originals for certain ordinary words, it is because their forms lie much obscured by far-reaching phonetic changes which we have yet to trace in the course of our investigation.

### **(6) The Grammatical structure.**

This is the sheet anchor of all arguments calculated to establish the affinities of languages. Caldwell has taken great pains to raise an edifice of great grandeur and beauty which has fascinated the minds of scholars, but he has raised his foundation on loose sands and the whole magnificent structure will crumble down if the basement gives way. It requires long

time and space to examine every one of the points raised by him ; it will be here possible only to refer to the broad generalizations made by him leaving the task of meeting the details to another occasion. The following, Caldwell considers, are the most prominent and essential differences in point of grammatical structure between the Drav. languages and Skt. Let us see how they stand the test of examination from the Prakritic point of view—

(1) The difference in gender between Sanskrit and the Drav.

We have seen while treating of the Prakrits that considerable confusion already prevailed among them, the endings no longer indicating the gender of nouns. This levelling of endings has proceeded much farther in the later modern Prakrits, making it hopeless to ascertain the gender of nouns by the endings alone. A few examples will make this clear.

Skt. gho't'ika', fem ; Mhr gho'd'ia'  
—fem. E. H. gho"ri"—Tel. go'd'iga.

Skt. tailka: masc. — Mgd te'llia"  
masc.—E. H. te"le"—Tel. telika

Sanskrit granthi masc.— Mhr.  
gan"t"hi" masc. or fem.—E. H. gan"t"  
Tel. gant'u.

Skt. hr"idayam neut —Mhr. ha"-  
a am neut.; Mgd. hiya a" masc —Mhr  
hiaani" masc.—E. H. hiya"—Tel. eda.

This reduction of endings to a dead level has led to considerable confusion in the modern Aryan languages and the distinction of gender is only artificially kept up in Marathi and Gujarati which keep to the distinction of the three genders as in Sanskrit and the Prakrits; E.H. of only the masc. and fem.; while Bengali and Oriya distinguish no gender at all. Thus, it becomes clear that the absence of grammatical gender among Dravidian nouns is no bar against the relationship between Sanskrit and the

Dravidian languages. It will have to be noticed also, that owing to this confusion, the several Gaudian languages have taken to the classification of nouns not according to the grammatical gender, but by the rationality or irrationality of the things or persons denoted by the words just in the same way as the mahats and amahats of the Dravidian languages

(2) & (4) 'There are no case-terminations in the Dravidian langs. as in Sanskrit but only suffixed postpositions and separable particles. The only difference between the declension of the plural and that of the singular is that the inflectional signs are annexed in the singular to the base, in the plural to the sign of plurality, exactly as in the Scythian languages. The Dravidian dative ku, ki, ge, bears no analogy to any Dative case-termination which is found in Sanskrit or any of the I. E. langs

Against this, it will be sufficient

to illustrate the declension of a word in Eastern Hindi as a representative of the North Indian vernaculars to show that the same features of declension prevail in the Gaudian as in the Dravidian languages and that these conditions have been brought about by the same phonetic laws operating in common between them.

# Masculine in 'a'

Ra"m.

	Sing.	Simple Pl.	Complex Pl.
N.	Ra'im	Ra'im	Ra'mlo'cg, Ramanlo'g
A.	Ra'im, Ra'mke'	Ra'im, Ra'manke'	Ra'manlo'cg, Ra'manlo'g, Ra'mlo'ganke', Ra'mlo'gke'
761 I.	Ra'mse'	Ra'manse'	Ra'manlo'ganse', Ra'manlo'gse'
D.	Ra'mke'	Ra'manke'	Ra'manlo'cgke', Ra'manlo'gke'
Ab.	Ra'inse'	Ra'manse'	Ra'manlo'cganse', Ra'manlo'gse'
G.	Ra'inkai, Ra'mke'	Ra'imankai, Ra'manke'	Ra'manlo'cgankai, Ra'manlo'ganke', Ra'manlo'gkai, Ra'manlo'gke'
L.	Ra'im me'	Ra'manme'	Ra'manlo'cganne', Ra'manlo'gannc'
V.	he' Ra'im	he' Ra'im	he" Ra"manlo"cg, he" Ra"manlo"g

I consider the plural sign *lu* is a remnant of the Sanskrit word *lo'ka*, Prakrit *lo" a*, and preserved in the modern Gaudian languages. I consider also that the *n* in the simple plural forms noted above was not originally plural in signification but only an inflectional increment and corresponds to the same *n* performing the same function in all the Dravidian languages. We see from the example shown above that the so-called case signs are the same in both singular and the plural and that in the singular they are added to the base and in the plural to the sign of plurality, just like in the Dravidian languages. We find also that the case signs are *ke"* in the dative and the genitive and sometimes in the accusative also, *se"* in the instrumental and ablative and *me"* in the locative. In the genitive *kai*, *kar* and *kare"* are also used. *Se"*, the case sign of the ablative - instrumental is found as *si"* in Marathi, *se"* in High

Hindi, so" in Braj, and su" in Marwari and is connected with the Prak. ablative - instrumental termination *sunto*". Me', the locative case sign is found as me" in High Hindi, Sindhi and Braj, ma" in Marwari and Gujarati, and ma" in Naipali and is a corruption of the Sanskrit word *madhye*" through the Prakrit *ma'e*". Similarly the acc-gen.-dat. *kai* or *ke*" is widely used in the Gaudian languages and found as *ke* in Bengali, *ku* or *ki* in Oriya, *ko'* or *ka'* in High Hindi, *kau* or *kau* in Braj and *khe*" in Sindhi and is connected with the Sanskrit *kr'ite*' through the Prakrit *ka'e*". It will be observed that these so-called case signs thus bear no connection with the Sanskrit case endings and they were necessitated by the general confusion brought about by the unrestricted levelling to which the Sanskrit case endings were subjected in the Prakrits. The same levelling process in the Dravidian

languages also has necessitated the use of post-positional auxiliaries for the same purposes as they are used in the Gaudian languages, the only difference being that whereas in the Gaudian even the separate words used are reduced to the position of suffixes, in the Dravidian they are still presenting some connection with the original words. There is no doubt that, in course of time, even these separable auxiliaries will undergo the same changes as in the Gaudian.

(3) Dravidian neuter nouns are rarely pluralized ; neuter plurals are still more rare in the inflexion of the verb

Against this remark, we have to say that the same state prevails in the Gaudian languages also. In Eastern Hindi, for instance, lo"ng is added to form the plural of words denoting the rational beings, and the plural form of any other word is the same as in the singular. The same

remark applies also to the plural of neuter verbs.

(5) In those connections in which prepositions are used in the Indo-European languages, the Dravidian languages, with those of the Scythian group, use post-positions instead—which post-positions do not constitute a separate part of speech but are simply nouns of relation or quality, adopted as auxiliaries. All adverbs are either nouns, or the gerunds or infinitives of verbs and invariably precede the verbs they qualify.

It will have to be observed that even in the old Prakrits the distinction between the prefix and the roots had become obliterated and the prefixes were fused by phonetic changes with the roots themselves, thus giving rise to new roots altogether with their old connections completely forgotten. Hence it is that we do not find the use of prefixes in the Gaudian languages also. Post-positions

alone generally supply in the Gaudian languages the place of what in Sanskrit are prepositions. In Eastern Hindi we have tare" (beneath) Tel. krin"da; va'hi' or kane'(near) Tel. daggara, vad-da; ma', ma'hi', ma'k (in, within). Tel. madhya, mayamuna, lo"; le" or tak (till), Tel. var"aku; san"ge", san"g (with), Tel. to"; ka"hi" (towards), Tel. van"kaku etc. Sometimes as in Hindi these post-positions are also added to the case signs as in the Dravidian. Cp. Tel. antavar"aku, anta-t"ivar"aku; na"to". na"to"ku"d"a etc.

(6) Sanskrit adjectives have to be declined in accordance with the nouns which they qualify, but Dravidian adjectives are not so declined.

This is a fine point in favour of Caldwell in as much as the Gaudian languages fail us in giving any light, for the adjective in those languages is regularly declined along with the substantive which it qualifies. But even here there is divergence of usage

and some confusion. While in Sanskrit, the adjective agrees with the noun in number also, in all Gaudian languages the oblique form of the adjective is the same in both plural and singular, except in Sindhi where the oblique feminine plural may be optionally like that of the substantive. Even with regard to the case signs to be added to adjectives, there is some difference. While the termination of the oblique singular of substantives is *a'* in Eastern Hindi and Braj and *ya'* in Mara'thi, that of the oblique form of the adjective is *a'* in all three. There are also some other minor discrepancies. But all the same, we see the operation of the Sanskrit declension of adjectives still at work in the Gaudian languages. We have to account for this by the fact that they still preserve the long vowels at the end of words which gives them an air of gender, and the adjectives in them will continue to be declined so

long as there is the consciousness of gender in them. But in the Dravidian languages, all traces of grammatical gender are lost in the adjectives, the distinction of number in adjectives is already lost in the Prakrits and the case signs of adjectives are dissolving. We have therefore to account for the non-declensional nature of the Dravidian adjective as due to this process of dissolution which has been completely brought about in them.

(7) The Dravidian languages use relative participles of verbs as adjectives, in preference to nouns of quality or adjectives properly so called. In consequence of this tendency, the formative termination of the relative participle is generally suffixed to them, through which suffix they partake the nature both of nouns and of verbs.

It is noteworthy that the same kind of usage with regard to the relative participles occurs in the Gaudian languages, especially in the West and

Southern Gaudian, where they are always used in the passive sense, and in consequence, when they are employed to express the preterite indicative and present subjunctive tenses active, they take the subject in the active case and the object in the nominative. This is what is called the passive construction or Karman'i-Prayo'ga in Sanskrit. In Telugu, 'na' ce'sina pani' means na'ce' ce'ya-bad'ina pani', the work which is done by me. It is also to be noted that the past passive or past relative participle in Telugu is formed by adding ina to the root and closely resembles the Eastern Hindi il, as in kha'il, Telugu tinina (eaten.)

(8) There are two plural forms of the first person in the Dravidian languages, one inclusive and the other exclusive, but in Sanskrit and the Indo-European languages no such distinction is made.

This contention has been answer-

ed by Mr. Swaminatha Iyer in his paper on 'The Aryan affinities of Dravidian pronouns', wherein he says that the Rigveda uses nau in the dual six times, always in the inclusive sense. He thinks that na'm, the inclusive plural in the Dravidian languages, is a nasalized form of na'v from nau, changed into na'm in the same way as -au the dual sign in Sanskrit is found nasalized in Sindhi as a uc.

(9) The Drav. languages have no passive voice. The passive is expressed by auxiliary verbs signifying 'to suffer' etc.

It may be pointed out that in the Gaudian languages also the passive is generally expressed exactly as in the Dravidian, except in Sindhi and optionally Marwari, Nepali and Panjabi. In all of them 'ja'ib = to go, is added to the past participle of the active verb; e. g., kha'ib = to eat, kha'yal ja'ib = to be eaten. This compound passive is very rarely used

in Eastern Hindi, or indeed in any of the Gaudian languages, in the same way as *pad'u*, to suffer, is rarely used in Telugu. It is generally paraphrased by means of compound verbs: *ma'r*, to beat; *ma'r kha'ib*, to eat a beating (Tel. *tannulu tinu*), not *ma'ra' ja'ib* (*tannulu po'vu*), to go a beating. Hoernle considers that the *ya*, the passive sign in Sanskrit, might itself be a contraction of the root *ya'*, to go, and the *-jjai* of the Prakrit passive as in *pad'hijja i* from Skt. *pat'hyate'*, has been disconnected from the verbal forms and wrongly connected with *jai* from Skt. *ya'ti*. He thinks that this circumstance alone can explain why auxiliaries like *kha'ib*, to eat, had come to be used to express the passive meaning.

(10) The Dravidian languages prefer the use of continuative participles to conjunctions unlike Sanskrit and the Indo-European languages.

This is the case in the Gaudian

languages also. It is remarkable that *i* or *iy*, the sign of the continuative participle in the Dravidian languages has its counterparts in the Gaudian: Bengali *iya'*, E. H. *ai* or *i*, Oriya, W. H. and Panjabi *i*, Gujarati and Nepali *i'*, and Sindhi *i'* or *e'*, all derived from the Sauraseni Prakrit *i a* from Sanskrit *ya*. The *-du* corresponds to *-du'n'a* of the Maharashtri Prakrit. The Magadhi *-u'n'a* is retained only in the Telugu *ka'vuna* from Prak. *ka'u'n'a*, Skt. *kr'itva'*.

(11) There is a negative and an affirmative voice in the Dravidian languages, while Sanskrit has no negative voice but expresses negation by a separate negative particle *na*, and *ma'* in the imperative.

As regards this point, it may be said that the particle *na* tended in the Praks. to be combined with the roots and formed part of the negative verb instead of remaining separate. This negative particle is always found

combined with the verb in the modern Gaudian languages also. Sometimes, as in Sindhi, this particle is found added after the root as e. g., 'chuna', it is not. This is perhaps how the Dravidian languages also have come to possess a negative voice.

(12) In the Dravidian languages relative participles are used instead of the relative pronouns. There is no trace of the existence of the relative pronoun in any of the Drav. langs.

This statement is only partially true, for we do find relative constructions in the Dravidian languages. For example, in Telugu 'evad'u ce'su-konnadi va'd'e anubhavist'ad'u',, that which one does he himself experiences, is as perfectly idiomatic as 'ce'su-konna va'd'e' anubhavista'd'u', he alone who does, experiences. In the two cases, there is a slight difference in meaning, emphasis being laid on the action in the first, and on the doer in the second. Both the kinds

of expression occur in the Gaudian languages also. Again, it is not true to say that there is no relative pronoun in the Dravidian languages, for *ya'vanu*, *evan*, *evad'u* etc., are the direct representatives of the Sanskrit *yah'*. It would have been more correct to say that the interrogative pronoun is absent in the Dravidian, the relative pronoun doing duty for both.

(13) The syntactical arrangement of words in the sentence is different in the Dravidian languages from Sanskrit.

It is true that in Sanskrit, there is no definite order of words in the sentence. It was unnecessary because the forms in it were fully inflected and there was no danger of the meaning getting obscured or of words signifying something other than was intended. But with the general levelling of declensional and conjugational forms and the revolutionary phonetic decay that had taken place in the

Prakrits, it became necessary that the different words forming part of the sentence should keep to their places to avoid misunderstanding. It is immaterial whether we say in Sanskrit *bid'a'lo' mu's'hikam abhakshayat*; or *abakshayat bid'a'lo' mu's'hikam*; or *mu's'hikam bid'a'lo' abakshayat*, for in any case the meaning is not obscured; but if in the Drav. we interchange *pilli* and *eluka* in the sentence '*pilli eluka dinenu*' we arrive at the improbable notion of the mouse eating the cat. A similar necessity is found in all the languages whose inflections are levelled like the Prakrits or the Gaudian languages.

I hope I have satisfactorily met the arguments of Caldwell to disprove the connection of the Drav. languages with Sanskrit. Of course, his main contention was correct that Sanskrit as Sanskrit does not lead us far in fixing the affinities. As I said before, Caldwell was handicapped by the three

initial mistakes which he has committed—firstly, of looking at the wrong end of the telescope by taking Tamil as the basis of his investigation, and secondly of confining himself to Skt. alone in his comparisons, and thirdly of hoping for light from the Scythian languages, instead of looking to languages nearer home in his investigation. The result was that he was caught in the quagmire of unprofitable speculation and had to content himself with the conclusion that the best light for the solution of the Dravidian problem is to be found in them alone. We do not, of course, belittle the work which he has so lovingly turned out, but all the more honour him for the splendid lead he has given to Dravidian philological studies

I have done. I have given you an idea of the extent and nature of the Prakrit languages. I have traced their origin to the Indo-Iranian times and shown how their history runs

through the Vedic and the Primary, Secondary and Tertiary. Prakritic stages down to the modern Aryan vernaculars. I have given an account of the Paisaci and Apabhramsa dialects which, I said, afford us the best clue to the history of the Dravidian languages and met the main arguments of Caldwell disproving a Sanskrit affiliation by referring to affinities in the modern Gaudian languages. I hope I have made you sufficiently perceive how, in very many details, there is such a close resemblance in the general features of the Prak. and the Drav languages, and realise that a minuter investigation in this direction will bear fruitful results. Indeed, it seems to me impossible to conceive that, possessing as they do, so many, common features with the Prakrit languages, the Dravidian idioms could be considered as other than Prakrits, for, otherwise, we have to postulate that the Prakrits have been com-

pletely overrun by, and owe their very existence to, the Drav. tongues! All the greater glory to the Dravidian idioms if they did possess such great power, but as matters stand, I fear we have to rest content with attributing a Prakritic origin to them along with the North Indian vernaculars and turn our efforts towards working out the details of this very promising conception.

