The Gnaanam-Daaviid Canlram's

Criticism and Appreciation of Dr. J. T. Xavier's Work

The Sound of Letters

Whence came Sinhala Here?

Rev. Fr. H. S. Daaviid,

B.A.Hons. First Class (History),
M.A.London (Sanskrit, Paali, Praakrit),
Ph.D. London (Tamil)

To -

Prof. T.V. Mahalingam.
University of Madras
Tamil Nadu.
S. India

from

(DR. J.T. Xavier)

The Gnaanam-Daaviid Cankam's Criticism and Appreciation of

Dr. J.T.Xavier's Work

Introduction to this booklet

(1) This Criticism and Appreciation of Dr.Xavier's **"Land of Letters"** has been written out by a group of linguistic research students and scholars whose former patron was the famous Nallur Swami Gnana Prakacar. His mantle has now fallen, as that of the Prophet Elija on Eliseus, on Rev. Dr.H.S.Daaviid, the author of the Etymological and Comparative Lexicon and Grammar of the Taamiilzha (= Dravidian) Languages, including Elu (ඒඒ) the mother of Sinhala. This work has now reached its sixth part out of twelve contemplated by its author.

(2) This booklet examines Dr.Xavier's work mainly from the linguistic point of view, but Dr.Daaviid is quite capable of extracting more valid history from the deep study of words than other historians can draw out of the pious legends of the Mahavamsa.

(3) It also provides additional evidence in support of Dr.Xavier's main views on the Sinhala language and on its original kinship with Tamilzh, these two being the only two indigenous tongues of this **Iilzham** (= beautiful) or Srii (= Ciiriya = illustrious) Lankaa or Ilankai (= Resplendent) Island. Both "**Tamilzh**" and "Sinh-**elza**" have this "**iilzh**" (beauty) both in their **make-up** and in their **utterance.**

(4) Above all, it supplies an alternate explanation (to the Vijaya legend) as to origin of the **Siy-elza** (from Ciiriya Elzha or Iilzha) or **Sinhelza tongue** from the infusion into the **original Taamiilzham** (from 2,000 B.C. in this Island) of a host of Aarya words, brought in by the Praakrit speaking Buddhist missionaries, between 260 and 200 B.C. from several regions of North and Central India round about the time of the famous Buddhist Emperor, **Asokavardhana** (="the increaser of non-grief" or happiness). It is the presence of these Praakrit words in Sinhala which led Doctors Geiger and Julius de La Nerolle to come to the wrong theory that ancient Sinhala or **El²u** was Aarya, whereas she cries out with a myriad tongues that **she is of the Taamiilzha progeny,** made resplendent in the Harappa-Mohenjodaro Empire of 3,000 B.C., when the Indo-European or Aarya speakers were **still** in their original "**Heimat**" (Home-land) of the Volga Valley, north of the Black Sea.

H2926

(5) When these Indo-Europeans arrived in their new home-lands, these **higly intelligent** but **still uncultured** nomadic horsemen and shepherds found ancient cultures: the Romans or Latin speakers absorbed the **non-Aryan** Etruscan and Basque Cultures; the Greeks absorbed the **non-Aryan** Minoan (of Crete) and Mycenean (of main-land Hellas); the Sanskrit speakers developed their tongue with the importation thereinto of **a host of Taamilizha words, already in the Rigvedic epoch** of 1,800 B.C.. Within two millenia both the classical

Sauskrit of the learned and the popular Praakrits of the **"hoi polloi"** (=the many) became **almost half Taamiilzha** in their **makeup** and **grammar.**

(6) Finally, Dr.Daaviid who shuns the lime-light and prefers to stand in the background and direct others to act on the stage-but this **beautifully** and **correctly** - gives some sound advice to people like Dr.Xavier and others who like him wish to write on linguistic, historical or archaeological themes. Especially valid is his advice, if one has to break through long established intellectual fashions and prejudices. But all these "idols of the tribe, cave, market, theatre," (Bacon, Nov.Org. I, 39) will fall down before the truth, like Dagon before the Ark of Yahweh or the walls of Jericho before the trumpl.ets of Joshuah, if the truth is presented with a multitude of wise saws and happy instances This may be reinforced by a prayer to that Being in whose fingers are all mankind's hearts and minds. May He direct us all Sri-Lankians into the paths of **truth, peace** and happiness.

"WHENCE CAME SINHALA HERE"?

Nearly forty years have elapsed between the appearance of Rev. S.Gnana Prakacar's revolutionary article, "The Dravidian Element in Sinhalese" in the foremost International Revue of Ethnology and Linguistics, "**Anthropos**", Tome 32, 1937, and this work by Dr.J.T Xavier, F.R.C.S. (England). Why had Fr.Gnanam to go as far as a press at St.Gabriel-Modeling bei **Wien**, Osterreich (=near **Vienna**, Austria) to get it published? That was because "**intellectual**" **fashions** change very slowly. Piyatumaa David is now demonstrating in his Lexicon Books, especially in his "අපි කෑගයි" series, that the predominant part of Sinhal²a, or rather Siihel²a, which we call **El²u** or **Hel²a**, "ඵළු, ඉළු", is basically a Dravidian tongue. The intellectual fashion has now changed so greatly that not one Aaryanist has barked against him, perhaps for the simple reason that all these Aaryanists suspect that they may be Dravidian themselves. But four decades ago things were quite different. To pass off as complete "**Aryans**" was the ambition of the Sinhalese elite, which dominated the Royal Asiatic Society, Ceylon Branch No wonder that it threw out this article for the nonce and was ready to accept it only if he defended his own contentions in person before them in Colombo. This was in 1946-7, when our Guru was near his death. He soon passed on to a higher judge. Looking over this article now, we find that he did not put the full force of all the knowledge that he had amassed within that **limited** compass, although it was limited by circumstances beyond his control, nor did he sugar-coat his wording, as Piyatumaa David does,

thereby gaining acceptance for this revolutionary view so much opposed to the still dominant views, which the Sinhalese have to be enticed, step by step, sweetly but strongly, to discard. This can only be effected by wise saws and manifold instances of **Sii-El²u** (later Sinhel²a or Sinhal²a) having obtained her words and grammatical structures from that original **Taamiilzham** (தமிழம்) from which Tamilzh, Malayaal²am, Kannad²am, Tul²u and 15 other Dravidian tongues have derived them. Piyatumaa David (to be pronounced "**Daaviid**", as in the Hebrew original of 1,000 B C. where this name first occurs in the sense of "**beloved**") has already given hundreds of instances where the Tamilzh and Sinhel²a words are so close to each other, either now or in their original state, that their difference can be mentioned, proverbially, as "between **Tweedledum** and **Tweedledee**". These instances are by no means over Thousands more are coming from his pen and his judicious mind in his (and our) "**Api naa(i)yoo**" series Thereby do we establish our contention that the only two indigenous tongues of **Iilzham** (ஈழம்), the original name for "சீ (= ciiriya=illustrious) ஈழம்" or "Ceylon", are in fact separated slightly but derived from the same original **Taamilzham.** Note that both our land and our original language are "ஈழம்" = "things of beauty"; வடி-வான, அழகிய, எழில்-ஆன: they are "யாழ்" in the ancient Taamilzham, still found in the Tamilzh Canka classics of Christ's time, but in the sense of "fine fellow" or "sweet girl" in the conversations between two lovers, as maid and young man respectively called each other, as they walked hand in hand or still closer, through the Ceylonese or Indian parks of that time. Note that Sinh. (having lost ழ்) registers this word as "yaal²-uvaa, යාළුවා", earlier "யாழுவா(ள்)"="beautiful person" > "friend". Note finally that our two languages still keep in their names the same "யாழ்" or "ஈழ்" (=beauty) but contracted into 'இழ்" in "தமிழ்" and into "எள், එළ, el²" in "El²u, එළු" or "Hel²a, හෙළ", with the intrusive "h" that occurs in 450 Sinhal²a words.

Dr. J.T.Xavier is not exactly a member of our Cankam or Kulzhu (குழு, poetically குழூஉ, originally கூழு, as Kuut^2 t^2-am, கூட்டம், is derived therefrom, since many "ன்,ட், ண்" sounds register an earlier "ழ்" sound). But for the last six years he has been on its outer fringe. The nature of his medical service at a station very far from our two centres prevented him from becoming a prominent member thereof. Had he been one, he would have heard at our Vivekananda Hall (Colombo 13) meetings, the principles of sound etymology as enunciated by our present patron. These are:

(A) **A step by step approach** There should be neither a gallop at top speed, not even a short jump across, as this may turn out to be a leap into the darkness and thence prove to be a fall down a philological precipice We have gone through 192 pages of his remarkable book which is a compendium of archaeology, pre-history, history, ethnology and linguistics on a wide scale. This shows that he has read widely and well. Even our earlier patron, Rev.Fr.Gnana Prakacar, at times jumped across several steps in some of his manifold books. We warn his spiritual grandchild. Dr.Xavier, against such leaps in his remaining pages. If he has time. we would advise him to go over these (already printed) nine chapters, detect the several jumps therein and, in an Appendix, place the steps between the two termini in each case. Thereby his present work will gain in its acceptance by scholars, especially of the West.

(B) **Several** instances, not merely one or two, must be advanced for any phonological or phonemic change in the very language concerned or in similar and related tongues so as to establish "**a law**". Thereafter we may speak of this change as a real linguistic phenomenon; but it is **safer** to assert this **tentatively** : "From all these instances we are inclined to conclude that .. . ", or "It is very probable that ...". Any revolutionary view, stated **tentatively** in this way, is less likely to jolt or shock the

reader; and thereby the writer is more likely to gain acceptance. It is in this way that Piyatumaa Daaviid **insinuates, suggests** and **cajoles** the readers of his Lexicon to accept the fact that both linguistic communities in "Srii Lankaa" or "**Ciiriya Ilankai**" (this is the earlier form) are speaking **the same original tongue**, "*தமிழும்*", the Old Dravidian of 4,000 to 2,000 B.C, when this had not branched off into her twenty daughters, **with a heavy admixture** of Indo-European words in both Tamilzh and Sanskritic Sinhal²a from the Aarya sources of N.W.India ever since 2,000 B C.

The Dravidian influence on the development of the Sanskrit language, and Dr.Xavier's rules of de-Sanskritisation

Now we cite Dr.Xavier's work. We fully agree with him in this statement of his at the end of page 67. "Sanskrit, a language which developed only in the (post) Aryan era could not have been the language of the Indus inscriptions". Professors Burrow and Emeneau in the West, Rev.Gnana Prakacar and Piyatumaa Daaviid in the East have shown in their Comparative Lexicons that though Sanskrit is the eldest son of "Indo-European", having Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, German and Old Slavic (whence arose Czech, Slovak, Polish, Russian, Yugo-Slav and Bulgarian) as his younger brothers, still this language changed from Indo-European into Sanskrit only in North West India, where it soon absorbed more than one-third of her vocabulary from the earlier Dravidian tongues, in the second millenium B.C. This fact should not surprise any scholar or even student of languages and cultures For, next in age to Sanskrit, Greek and Latin both grew up

under the tutelage of Minoan-Mycenean and Etruscan, reinforced in the latter case by Oscan, Umbrian and other tongues of Latium, the region south of Rome. In the same way did Sanskrit grow up under the tutelage of Old Dravidian, which scholars both in India and Srii Lankaa are now calling "தமிழம் Taamiilzham", ever since Piyatumaa Daaviid edited his Lexicon, Part II, as that term alone could have been her own name in her own tongue and could have become "Draavid²a" in Sanskritic lips. He has called her "the Queen Mother of several Languages, Mankaiyarkku Araci" in the title of his Lexicon, Part IV. Under the impact of this tremendous culture and remarkable language, which already in the forth and third millenia B.C. had given several of her own words as loans to her close neighbours, Old Semitic to her West and Indo-European to her North, Sanskrit developed rapidly from a tongue coming out of nomadic lips to the status of the most refined of the Indo-European languages, as any one who chants or studies the Rigvedic hymns can see for himself. Sanskrit then became classical in the next millenium, with a multiplicity of Conjugations (10), Moods (5), Tenses more numerous than in Greek or Latin, having such refinements as a Desideratlve, a Benedictive Mood and fully **seven** forms of the Aorist. Read Sir Ramakrishna Gopal Bhandarkar's Grammar, in two parts, if you don't believe us. It is to this work that both our patrons are profoundly indebted for their thorough grasp of this complex language

Having flowered out into so many moods and tenses, in Vedic and early Classical times, Sanskrit in the Mediaeval Epoch, when Dun²d²in and Baan²a, with their tell-tale Dravidian names-தண்டின், வாழ்நன்7 வாணன், ruled the roost in the sixth and seventh centuries A D., got a mood, different from the grammatical ones. Readers of the Tamilzh Ten Idylls (பத்துப்-பாட்டு) and later prose works get impatient with the

series of வினையெச்சம், verbal participles and absolutives, and long to see the main verb (முற்றுவினை) which may come after a hundred வினையெச்சம், just as the Nizam of Haiderabad, Dekhan, came in the last train-carriage after a series of carriages conveying his screened seraglio or harem, during his journeys in British times. Now read Baan²a's Kaadambarii, a poetical romance in prose. What has happened to Sanskrit? (We make this language masculine on set purpose). He has passed absolutely under the control of his foster-mother, Taamiilzham, since those who employed Sanskrit from Kaalidasa's time were mostly Dravidians like these two. Hence the manifold moods and tenses of Sanskrit are thrown overboard and வினையெச்சம் and பெயரெச்சம் rule the roost. This is the culmination of a historical process of guiding and fostering which Taamilzham started on Sanskrit in the earliest Vedic age, circa 1,800 B.C. Turn now to the Daaviid Lexicon, Part II, Chapter V, Section II, "Aariyam". Six different etymologies are there given for "Aarya", some from the Taamilzham source Now read over the end of page 67 of Dr. Xavier's work and shake hands with him for that statement, which we endorse upto the hilt We come very near to doing so with regard to his statements about this same Sanskrit throughout his page 87. "**Sam-s-krita**" his own name for himself, has been split up into "**sam**" = "**sun**" in Greek, or "**cum, com**" in Latin = "together with", and "**kar-, kri-, kre**" = to **create** The Latin and Greek words are similar to the English "Creator, create", which Sanskrit renders "karooti" as verb, "kaarya, karma, kartaa" as nouns; the last is "kartaa" in the Nominative singular alone. In its vocative it becomes "kartar". Both forms are found in Tamilzh. Cf. M.W Sk.Dict. "Kartar" = "a doer, maker". at its page 257

Now we cite Dr.Xavier at his page 87:-

(a) : "Sanskrit, the mixed language.. which developed in the post-Aryan era....." Better omit the word

"post" - both here and and at the end of his page 67, unless the reference is to **Classical Sanskrit** alone, as some take this word. In that case "**post**" -may safely stand. But **we** take Sanskrit to mean the "**Aarya**" literary language in all its three stages, Vedic, Brahmanic and Classical, through more than two millenia As Professors T Burrow and H.S Daaviid have shown. even **Vedic** "has words and roots of (both Aryan and) Dravidian origin". The former listed 27 such words, the latter has added 45 more in Parts I to IV of his Comparative Lexicon. One is man²-tuunka" (மண்-தூங்க) = sleep in the mud / a frog. This becomes in M. Monier Williams; Sk. Dict.p 776 "man2d²uuka masc, man²d²uukii fem. or man²d²-uukii fem. =a frog, R V. You will note the Vedic accent marked in this Dictionary over "-kii" in the first and "d2uu" in the second feminine form. If one were to take these three separate formations in Vedic Sanskrit from early Dravidian as 3 words, then the list so far made would **exceed** the 72 above mentioned.

(b) "Dravidian loan words in Sanskrit have been phonologically Aryanised to so great an extent as to make their real origin almost unrecognisable" This was stated more than a century ago by Dr H.Gundert, the great scholar of both **Malaya-al2am** and Sanskrit, in 1869, in the 23rd. volume of the German Oriental Society; then by Rev. F.Kittel, the author of the best **Kannada-English** Dictionary, in 1872, in its August issue of the Pombay Indian Antiquary; and then again by Rev.Dr R.Caldwell in his Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian languages, 2nd. edition, 1875. The succession of these statements is "**3 years-spaced**": they are made by the **three** most eminent scholars of the **three** most important Dravidian tongues-Malayaal²am, Kannad²a, Tamilzh.

(c) It may be good to cite Dr.Gundert to bear out Dr.Xavier's contention, although the latter may never have read the former's statements:-
"It might be anticipated, therefore, that as the Aryans penetrated further and further to the south, and became acquainted with new objects bearing Dravidian names, they would, as a matter of course, adopt the names of those things together with the things themselves."

From Gundert we pass on to Professor Thomas Benfey. In his Complete Sanskrit Grammar, on page 73, he examines the exotic elements in Samskrita and states: "Words which were originally quite foreign to Sanskrit have been included in its vocabulary". Both Rev.Gnana Prakacar and Rev. Dr. Daaviid have estimated that atleast 36% of the Sanskrit vocabulary is of Taamiilzha (=Dravidian) origin.

We are lucky in catching the rogues in their preparations for their plunder, if not in the actual stealing. About 800 A.D. Kumaarila-bhat²t²a (who has himself the Taamiilzha names குழு மாஸிலபட்ட), in his "Tantravaarttika" suggests ways of converting Dravidian words into Sanskritic ones, e.g.

1. சோறு into "coor" (=boiled rice) oo is ஓ, ூ), in Sk.
2. நடை, நடை (K.M.) (=walking/way) into Sk. 'nad²ee" or "nadeer", preferably the latter, as Sk. relishes "r", "sh", "s" sounds. Sk has no short "e" or short "o". The presence of both in Sinhal²a is additional reason for us to assert her Tammiilzha origin fundamentally
3. வயிறு; K. basiru (=belly) into "vair" in Sk.

4. பாம்பு; K. **paavu** (=cobra, as **spreading** its hood) > "paamb"

5. ஆள் (verb=to rule, noun = a ruler, person) 7 Sk. "aal²"

6. He adds 21 words to be taken into Sk. without any alteration.

Now Kittel adds this statement, which is in the same vein as Dr.Xavier's here:- "**As a rule,** the Aaryas, in adopting a Draavid²a word, changed it considerably in order to suit it to their tongue; and whenever such a word was imperfectly understood or negligently reproduced, the change naturally became still greater. It is more than probable that Samskrita borrowed a number of words also from Draavid²a tribes, the dialects of which are unknown to us, so that in such a case it becomes very difficult and even impossible to trace their origin."

Compare the above with Dr.Xavier's words here: "The Sanskrit names..... have undergone changes caused by mispronunciation, or by false translations of Dravidian roots ..." True indeed!

Then let us examine the first three of the six rules he enunciates on this very page, namely 87:-

1. Remove the sound "s" or "**sh**" as a prefix or infix.

2. Remove the sound "**r**" (trill) which follows a consonant.

This calls for comment. This "**r**" or "**sh**" was the **dhoby mark,** according to Fr.Gnana Prakacar in 1936, when he taught Sanskrit to Fr.Daaviid. "Kalulzh"

(கலுழ்). a pure Dravidian word, with a score of collaterals like "kalakku, kalanku, kalacu, kalappu, kalampakam, kalaval, kalavai, kalaavu, kaliyaan²am, or kalyaan²am, kalilzh (கலிழ்), கலிழிநீர் (=கலங்கல் நீர்) (kalankal niir) கலுழ்ச்சி, கலுழ்வு, கலுழம், கலுழி," and connoting "turbidity, disturbance, confusion, mixture, trouble, medley", became Sanskrit "**kalusha**". The Madras Lexicon has the cheek to tell us that all this Taamilzha wealth, with "ழ்" as the central or prominent figure in many of the words listed above, was from Sk. "kalusha". Not a bit! It was just the other way about. The "r" is not very different from the "sh". In his Lexicon Fr.Daaviid has conclusively shown that it was the old word "தாமிழம்" that Sanskrit changed into Draavid₂a. Here we see the "r" creeping in, as Dr.Xavier has already warned us it would. Sanskrit seems to have been at his wit's end what to make of this mysterious "ழ்". a very ancient letter, as it was taken (a) into the Semitic Arabic, as its 17th. letter, "z²aa (=zhaa)", (b) into Russian as "zh", written)+(, as a cross between two Cs, the first in reverse, as its 7th. letter out of the 32 in its alphabet. In "Teach Yourself Russian", Maximilian Fourman, L.L.B. of the University of Kiev tells us on his page 2, that this letter should be sounded as "**s**" in "pleasure". This is very near its proper sound in the தமிழ் (Taamilzha) tongues, where it is pronounced best as a **simultaneous** l² (=ன், ல்) and y (=ய், ω) In Russian this letter is philologically connected with the Russian equivalents of "**d**" (and "z"), as we cau see by a glance at page 88 of this work. Here Fourman lists the degrees of comparison of 29 Russian adjectives:-

4. molod-oy, molozhye, mladshiy
   =young, younger, youngest

Evidently the "**zh**" in the comparative degree word is phonemically connected with the "d" in the

other 2. Now we go into **a philological tangent**. In the beginning of language there was Taamiilza "மெல்(=**mel**)" =soft tender; then came "**mel-ku**" =to become soft; "mell-**aa** (=to be) 7 **mella**, adverb =softly, gently, slowly; mell-**il** (=she in the இல் or இல்லிடம்) 7 melli=soft one, 7 gentle-woman; mell-ikk-**ai** (=having become="**aay**") 7**mellikai** =softness, thinness; **mell-itu, mell-icu** = this which is soft 7 slenderness fineness; mell-iy-**ar** they who **are** of delicate build=woman. See the rest of this remarkable study of "**Mel**" in Tam. Mal Ko. To. Kan. Kod². Tul²u, Telugu and Kui, at No.4167, on page 346 of "A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary", by Professors T.Burrow andM.B Emeneau, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1961, 2nd. Edition, 1966.

Now there is a philological law that postulates a a vowel alternance between "**e**" and "**o**" in the root words of "**Indo-European**". The same word will be found as "**mel**", for instance, in some Indo-European tongues, and as "**mol**" in others. This law has long been established. But it has never been extended to cover the Taamilzha tongues when connected with I.E. ones. as evidently in this case of "**mel/mol**". Either as a loan-word from Taamilzham, as Rev.H.S.Daaviid maintains or as from a common ancestry, as Rev Gnana Prakacar contended against Geiger of Germany and Julius de la Nerolle (of Huguenot ancestry) in Srii Lanka, this "**mel**" crept into Indo-European. In Latin, from "softness", its meaning changed into "sweetness" and then "honey". The "De Mels" in Ceylon should be **soft, sweet and gentle**, like honey, to their Taamilzha kinsmen, even if the **Mel** is from **Deiv-endra Tud²uva**. in the extreme south of "**Ciiriya Ilankai**". But this is by no means the end of "மெல்,". For, Latin has several mansions. In one she had seated "**mel**", as we have just seen. In the next, she enthroned "**moll-is**" = "soft, gentle". Look at your English Dictionary now:- I. mollify=to soften, from French "mollifier", from Latin **molli**-ficare; 2. mollities = softness, Latin,

but employed in English. 3. mollitious = soft, luxurious, 4. mollusc, mollusk, molluscan, molluscoid, molluscous. Mollscoidea, all from Latin "**molluscus**" = softish, i.e. somewhat "mel", மெல். We are told that old Latin had "molier" = மெல்லி (above mentioned). But just as the "**e**" in மொழ்-இ7மொழி (- thundering sound, speech, as "**Taam-iilzham**" was in 3,600 B.C on the Caspian shores) became in "முழங்கு". 'முழக்கம்" an "**u**" sound, so this "**molier**" changed into "mulier". But note that one daughter of Latin still keeps the "o", in "**mole**"—soft, mild: this is Spanish. See Cassell's Sp.Dict p.567; while the **soft one** is (mulier7) **mujer**=woman, ibidem, page 574. Another daughter is Italian, the nearest to Latin, as தமிழ் is to தாமீழம். She has "molcere" = to soften, Cassell's It Dict p 325, very near to Latin "**mulcere**", now "**mulgere**". From Vergil's time this means 'to milk", just as from Cicero's time "mel, mellis"=honey and from Horaces time, Latin 'mel" means' 'sweetness": Thus "mil-(k), mel, mol-, mul-" are all brought into this set of I.E. words from Taamiilzha "mel" = soft; for **milk** is the **softest** food for children. That is why the Russian word for milk is "**moloko**", just an inch from "**molod**" = soft7young. This semantic change from "softness' to "youth" is found too in the score of words first in Taamiilzham as "கூழ்" = soft, குழ்-அந்த்-ஐ = soft child, young one. "குழ்"+உம் (= being) +அர் (= person)> குழ்-மர்> "**kumar**". sometimes expanded into "kumaran, kumaar-அன், kum r இல்"> "kumari". All boys and girls are both physically and emotionally **soft** in their teens. Finally, note the superlative form in Russian, "**mlaadshiy**", with an aceent on "a", which is pronounced "ஆ, ஏ" Here we get the final form "ml-" without any vowel at all, in between. Either the "**d**" or the "**dsh**", in the positive or the superlative degree becomes "zh" (=ழ்) in the comparative degree: "molo**zh**ye". See above. The original Slavic "**d**" must have been more like "d^2" =ட் than like "d^1" (=த், ஜ்), for then alone could it have been connected with Slavic "**zh**" =ழ்). In Arabic the

sequence and connexion are quite similar to this. The 16th letter is "t²aa", written almost like ழ, but without the dip below; while the 17th is our "z²aa", with just a dot over the 16th. The 16th is "ட்", in Tamilzh and "ට" in Sinhal²a, while the 17th, the Arabic "ழ்", is pronounced variously as "ழ், ள், or ட்", according to Arabic dialects in the very common name for the month of fasts, Ramazhaan, Ramal²aan or Ramad²aan, all ending in a long syllable- "ஆன், ஏன்". In the "Meaning of the Glorious Koran", by M.Pickthall, London, 1930, at Surah (pronounced Suurah) II, 185 onwards, this word occurs as **"Ramad²aan"**

The change in the vowels between "m" and "l" above illustrates Dr.Xavier's Rule 4; while "இளம்" > "Lamm" (Germ.) or "lamb", explained at lenght on page 48 of our Daaviid Lexicon III, or "இலங்கை" (ilankai) becoming "Lankaa" in Sinh., or "இளமையன்" becoming "Lankaa" in Sinh , or "இளமையன்" becoming Sinh. "l²amayaa" illustrates Dr.Xavier's Rule 3, as applying to languages connected with Sanskrit. But in all such matters one must go **cautiously**. Otherwise he might come under the ridicule, which Fr B.A John at times mischievously bestowed on his cousin's, Rev. Fr. Gnana Prakacar's, etymology thus: "cat 7 dog". Rule I: c 7 d. Rule 2: a 7 o. Rule 3: t 7 g Ofcourse, he knew that this was arrant nonsense. But it is very souud advice to keep our etymology **as far as possible** from such ridicule; and it was to warn the great etymologist against this danger that the great scientist, called the "Father of Lights", indulged in this banter with another cousin, Rev. Fr Charles Navaratnam. There is a distinct tendency in this scholar, Dr.Xavier, to step out of his crease and try to hit boundries and "six sirs". But we would advise him. as the St. Patrick's College Rector, Rev.T.M F.Long O M.I exhorted Walter Ayadurai, fresh from Trinity College on the Patrician cricket pitch, to go steadily up by ones and twos, batting his way up to victory over St.John's. Slow

and steady wins the race. That the great etymologist, Rev.Gnana Prakacar at times scored very fast with recurrent boundaries should not tempt lesser mortals to indulge in such wide hitting, especially as Geiger and De la Nerolle went so far as to accuse him of knowing no philology and advised him to follow a course of linguistics in some European University. all because he went too far and too fast for their own comprehension. This controversy went on for years from the start of his Lexicon in 1936, even before it was edited by the Tirumakal[2] Press, in 1938, as some of its most controversial features figured very prominently in the most famous International Review of Ethnology and Linguistics, "**Anthropos**" at Vienna, in Austria in 1935 and 1937, above the heads of those members (and Committee) of the Royal Asiatic Society, Ceylon Branch, who had rejected the two articles of his. They were accordingly surprised and indignant, when they were presented with a printed copy each, of Revue Internationale D'Ethnologie et de Linguistique, Tirage A Part, "**Anthropos**", Tome XXX, 1935, "Root-words of the Dravidian group of languages", by Rev.S.Gnana Prakacar, O M.I. covering pages 135 to 150. They were stunned when, two years later, the same scholar posted to each of them at his own expense one copy each of "**Anthropos**", Internationale Zeitschrift fu(e)r Vo(e)lkerund Sprachenkunde, Sonderabdruck, Band XXXII, 1937, "The Dravidian Element in Sinhalese", by the same scholar, covering pages 155 to 170. We congratulate Dr.J.T.Xavier on basing his assumptions throughout his own work on the truths which this scholar and his pupil, Rev.Daaviid, have taught both in these learned articles by the former and in his Lexicon volumes by the latter.

Mudaliyar W.F. Gunawardhana's views on the Sinhala language

Even before these, at Ananda College Colombo, another scholar delivered a lecture before the Director of Education and a gathering of learned men, on 28-9-1918. Therein W.F.Gunawardhana, Mudaliyar, argued thus:-

1. "Language is the medium for the communication of our thoughts, and thoughts are communicated not by isolated words but by means of sentences."
2. "Accordingly, taken essentially, **language is the sentence**; and grammar is that science which analyses and explains the construction of the sentence."
3. "Therefore scientifically, the determining factor of a language is **not its vocabulary,** but its structure, viz., that aspect of it which is concerned with the arrangement and mutual adjustment of words in the expression of thought."
4. "In this respect Sinhalese is essentially Dravidian, a "Taamiilzha" language. This is not all."
5. "Its evolution seems to have been on a Tamil basis. With regard to her physical features and her own physical structure, she is essentially the daughter of **Tamil.**" We alter this word into "**Taamiilzham**".

The same Mudaliyar in his Siddhaanta Parii-kshan²aya, Introduction, pages 14-15, states:-

6. "I have found that the Sinhalese are **entirely a Dravidian race** with just a slight Aryan wash. I have since had the great satisfaction of seeing that the best advanced scientific opinion in Europe has arrived at identically the same conclusion. Witness the Cambridge History of India, edited by a circle of the most eminent scholars of the day, Volume I, Chapter on Ceylon."

7. "With regard to the language of the Sinhalese, my conclusions have not only received confirmation, but have been a great deal amplified as to details. It now appears to me that the original contribution to the evolution of this tongue, viz. the Yaksas and Nagas (the aborigines), Vijaya and his party and the contingent from Madura, were all **Dravidian.**"

We are therefore surprised that Rev.Charles Carter's Sinh.-Engl.Dict. (1924) at its page 304, explains "දෙමළ" (=Dravid²a) as "**outcast**" or candaal²a", in addition to "දෙමළ", "demal²a". Like Dr.Johnson, we have to remark on this self-assumed "**A**arya" pride and prejudice. "Ignorance, my brethren! Colossal ignorance!" It is this that prompted a certain Sapramadu of Gampola to equate the Demal²aa (=a Tamilian) with "beravaayaa, paraiyah", and the Member of the N.S.A. for Walapane to state openly the **new tiers** in Ceylonese power-structure whereby one community is bound to dominate the others.

All this pride, rancour and venom are **misplaced.** The glory of "Ciiyel²u" (later "Sinhal²a") is in her "Tamiil³a" nature (l³ = lzh = ழ், while l² = ள். ள்); and it is far more profitable to investigate the original home of **the Dravidians** than to try to fit the unhistorical legends embedded in the Paal²i "**Mahavamsa**" into any historical narrative about the original home of **the Sinhalese,** despite the valiant efforts made by Dr.J.T.Xavier in this superhuman task.

The original home of the Dravidians

23 years ago in the Journal called "Tamil Culture,, started by Dr.(Rev') Xavier S.Thani Nayagam in that year, appeared his first article out of hls 18 **and** the, first article out of his 12 (the next in numbers of such article in its 15 years' life) by the life-long associate of Dr.Thani Nayagam, namely Piyatumaa Daaviid. The latter bears this title:- **"The Original Home of the Dravidians :** their Wanderings in **Prehistoric Times**, B.C 4,500 to 1,500"

"The evidence for the statements in this small article has been carefully pieced together from a comparative study of philology, ethnology and archa ology. It is impossible within this small compass to detail all the pieces of evidence : to do so would entail a large volume. I would refer any person who is keenly interested in this snbject to Stuart Piggot's **"Prehistoric India"**, 1952, a Pelican Book." "Between 4,500 and 3,000 B.C. the Dravidians lived to the South of the Caspian Sea. in close proximity to the Elamites and Sumerians. Then nomadic herdsmen (till 4,000 B C) they roamed from the frontiers of Sumer and Elam to the valleys of the Oxus (Amu Daria) and the Jaxartes (syr Daria) in modern Russian Turkistan. In the 3rd. millenium B.C. the Dravidians, then a "white" race, lived on a footing of complete equality with both the Aryans to the west, mainly in the Volga Valley, just north of the Caspian and Black Seas, and **"the Dravidian like"** section of the so-called Mongolians to their east. It would be better to call them **"Turanian"**, **"Scythian"** (like Dr.Caldwell) or **"Ural-Altai"**. It was then that the Dravidians started their first settlements in the Indus Valley, which soon turned out to be the vast Harappan Empire, with mighty walled cities, which are now the ruins called Harappa, Mohenjo-daro, Chanhu-

daro etc. While making their tremendous advances in civilization, they also developed their ancient language so well and so rapidly that they were able to bestow scores of loan words on their Aryan neighbours. To some linguistic scholars, like the late Swami Gnana Prakacar of Nallur, these words seem to have have been so abundant that they have postulated **a common origin** to the Indo-European and Dravidian tongues. On the other hand, a section of the Dravidians migrated northwestwards into **Finland,** Lapland and Esthonia, while another section went northeast into North Siberia, from the mouths of the of the Yenisei, Khatanga and Anabara, on **the Arctic Ocean,** in the region northermost and **coldest** in Eurasia, where the "**Samoyed(e)s**" speak a tongue quite close to Tamil[3] and Sinhal[2]a of the **torrid** Srii Lankaa plains beside the Indian Ocean. Professor T.Burrow of Oxford and other "**Ural-Altai**" and "**Finnish**" scholars have conclusively proved the common ancestry of the Dravidian with the above-mentioned languages.

Now read Dr.J.T.Xavier's "**Land of Letters**", especially his citation of the four **Finnish** scholars, associated with the University of Helsinki The Indus inscriptions, definitely pre-Aryan, are in that Proto-Indian language which the latest research has shown to be neither Indo-European (=Aarya), nor Hittite, nor Elamite, nor Hurrian, nor even Sumerian, but Dravidian i.e. "**Taamiilzham**".

This is our contention from the 1935-6 days of our first patron, which we term the "**Gnanam epoch**"; and we are glad that, like that of the famous Spanish Research Scholar, Rev.H.Heras S.J. of Bombay, Dr.Xavier's view is **identical**, as also **his view on the Sinhal[2]a tongue. In our research** we do not live near 2,000 A.D. but nearer to 2,000 **B.C.** At that stage there were not any of the 20 Dravidian languages, including our own "Sinh-el[2]a", but only 20 dialects of "*தமிழ்-லெவ்*"

(**Taamilzha-El²uva**). Of these what eventually became Sinhal²a was the **purest Dravidian** and **closest to the Proto-Dravidian I of 4,000 B.C.** One simple proof, among **thousands** in our mental possession, will establish this **basic view and contention** of ours. The Dravidians were perhaps the most intelligent people in the world, and they built up their **beautiful** "*தாம்-ஈழம்*", where "*ஈழம்*" means **beauty, on scientific lines;** for, "*ஈழம், எழில், யாழ்*" or "*அழகு*", like "*வடிவு, வண்ணம்*", consists in **the perfection of form.**

The plural suffix, and the roots 'al²' and 'nal²'

One of the **crucial forms** of any tongue is **the plural suffix.** It is a baffling problem to find the origin of the "**er**" or "**en**" which figures in this role in German and English, as in "child-er en" 7 "child**ren**". But in Sinh. "**al²**", '**අළ**", "*අල්*", the origin of the Tamil³" **ku+al²**" 7 "*கள்*", or of Telugu"**l²u**", "*లు, ళు*", we are at the dawn of linguistics and closest to the knowledge of **how the plural suffix arose.** It did so as **an association of similar objects** A child associates his **home**, "**ge-ya**", with those of the **neighbouring** ("*அண்மையான*", from *அள்-ஈம்-ஐ* (=*ஆய்*) + *ஆன*=අළ්-ආ-පු, now "allaapu") **house-mates** or friendly children he plays with. Thus from "අළ්" meaning "near" he passes on to "අළ්" connoting **several neighbouring** objects, like "**ge-v-al²,** ගෙවල්". This "**v, ව, வ்**" again is the **pure Dravidian** euphonic consonant, which like Sinh. and Tam. "**y, ය, ய்**", links the two vowels, the one final and the other initial, of two consecutive words.

Blissiully ignorant of the Dravidian tongues, except Sinhel²a, never having even heard of "*தாமீழம்*" or the real "ළළව", Sinh. scholars like Geiger beat about the bush, when confronted with such words as this "අළ්-" or its development: "අ-, අල්- words. Their basic meaning is "**nearness**". You never get closer to any

other person than in "kissing" or "embracing" him or her. Hence "අලඟ", rather "අළඟ" (as it should always appear) is clearly a development of this "අළ්". But this evident truth has not yet dawned on the Sinhal²a "Aryanists". Thus Prof.W.Geiger, in his 1941 R.A.S. publication, "An Etymologican Glossary of the Sinhalese Language" manifests his colossal ignorance of real etymology and of the real "**El²u**" the predominant portion and base of **Sinhal²a.**

(a) Thus his No.168 "**alanga**" = "embracing" has no mention whatever of this "**al²**, අළ්, அள்".

(b) His No 170 "**alana**" mentions "**tying**" elephants to a post, a semantic development from getting the post and the elephant **nearest** each other; but still there is not even a whisper of this "**al²**"

(c) His No. 182 "**allanavaa**" = "to lay hold of, to catch, **seize**" and its causative "**allavanavaa**" = to cause to seize – hesitates between two etymologies, neither of which is really correct. see below.

(d) His No.181 "**alla**" = the palm of the hand may have developed from "at-la" or "attala", as he maintains; but more probably it is connected with the "**seizing**" in (c) The "**hand**" is viewed as the "**seizer**". This view comes very near certainty, when we examine words from the reinforced root "**n-al²**" 'நள், නළ්" in **both** our tongues. The words "அன்பு, அன்பர்" are wrong : they should be "அண்பு, அண்பர்", as in Kannad²a, as they are from "அண்மை", from "அள்-உம்-ஐ" = **being near.** But "நள், நண், நட்" are the same; only slightly reinforced by an initial consonant, **n.** Hence "அண்பர்" = "நண்பர்"; "நட்டாலும்" in மூதுரை 4:2 = சிநேகித்தாலும், Commentary; "நள்ளு" = **get near,** since, as Gnanam said, occasionally "அள்7 நள்"; or as T.Burrow says, likewise **M.L.** page 2182, "நள்ள்-உந்-அர்"; = adherents, friends; "நள்ளி²"

= relationship, intimacy, உறவு; "நள்ள்-அல்-அர்" = 'நள்ள-ஆது-ஆர்" =நள்ள்-ஆ (negative) + ர் (for ஆர்) = those not **nearing** us=foes, enemies:

"நளி 1" = to be close together, to resemble, Tol Por. 291; (P.2183)

"நளி 2" = closeness, Tolkaappiyam, Col.323;

"நளி 3" = "நள்ளி I" = **seizer** with its claw, thus either (අ) the **crab**, Cancer (on earth or in the Zodiac), or (ඇ) **the scorpion**, தேள். The (අ) meaning comes again in (ඈ) "நளிர் 3" lobster, நண்டு. This last word was originally "நள்-உந்-து" 7 "நள்ந்து", by the elision of the "u" as in 24 P.N. (புறநானூறு) words like "paay-un (= being) - tu" 7 the modern "paayntu". Hence (ඈ) M.L.page 2147. "நண்டு" = crab, lobster; Cancer in the zodiac. As usual, El²u (or Sinhel²u) has the earlier form of this group of words, based on "நள்". Carter's Sinh. Dict. page 318 has these words:—

(ඉ) "නළය, නළේ" (aya 7 ee) = crab's claw, as **seizer.**
(ඊ) = (ඊ) "නළයා, **nal²ayaa**, நளயா" crab.

Geiger, in his No.1247, mentions (ඉ) above, but gives other meanings than this crucial one, and thus avoids having to mention this தாமீழ root, "நள்". This is quite enough to show that, without a good grasp of "**Taamilzha-El²uva**", more than half of Sinhala, and her most intimate and basic possession, is almost unintelligible **etymologically. Corollary** on "අට, **at²a**, அ(ட்)ட". The mother or sister of a small child, just able to walk, fondly invites the infant to her fond embrace, saying repeatedly "என்-அட்டை-வா" = come thou **near to** me. In the elegant Tamilzh of cultured people this will be என்-அண்டை-வா, from the same "al², அள், අළ්" discussed above, as "எ, ட், ண்" are almost the same **etymologically.** This then is the origin of 'අට". Geiger shows his colossal ignorance of this at his No 48 b

and No. 865. Here in $6\frac{1}{2}$ lines he almost goes to the moon to search for a thing which is next door. Let us now retrace our steps to Geiger's No.1247, "nal²aya", "നലെയ" = "tube, reed" He cites Pk. P. Sk. ks²m. si **g.m.** or² ass **bg.h.** nep. pj. and l. (12 tongues , to demonstrate the Aryan origin of "நள" "നള", which appears also as "நட, நடா, நழ, நழா, நர, நரா, நாரி" in some of them. A moment's reflection should have convinced him that such wealth could only be "Old Dravidian", or "தமிழ", since **not one** of the hundred odd European languages and dialects has this word. If it were Indo-European, surely one or two of the European languages or dialects would have had this word. Geiger maintains that it is "**Aryan**". If so, "**Aryan**" obtains the connotation of "non-Indo-European," or **"daughter of Old Dravidian"**, as we proceed to show. Note "Pk" in this list of 12 tongues by Geiger: it heads the list It means "**Praakrita**", the **spoken form** of (Sk.=) Sanskrit, as A A.Macdonell states in his History of Sanskrit Literature, London, Edited by William Heinemann, 1917, pages 22 24. "Sanskrit: this name is meant to be opposed to that of the **popular dialects** called **Praakrita,** and is so opposed in the "Kaavyaadars²a,' or "Mirror of Poetry" a work of the sixth century A.D. etc"

Hence the Praakrits are all "Aryan": in the strict sense, there were no Pre-Aryan Praakrits. But both Sanskrit and the Praakrits are heavily indebted to Taamilzham, the former to about 40% and the latter to about 50% of their vocabulary. Geiger states that not only Sinhal²a but Paal²i (=P), Sanskrit and the Praakrits have this word. We are very happy to know this Whence did they and the 9 others, like (ks²m=) Kashmiiri and (nep.=) Nepaali, obtain this word? We tell you in a whisper, so that the Aryanists may not hear it and die of shock Like all good things. like the architectural skill of "**Maayan,**" the rebuilder of the "**Aryan-destroyed**" Dravidian cities, like Indian

culture itself, this word has a தமிழ் source : witness the tell-tale "ழ்" therein:-

(a) M.L. page 2231, "நாழி", "naalzhi" or "**naal³i**", in both Tam. and Kan. = tube, tubularity.
As usual, the "ழ்" can shake off its cushion like softness of utterance and become the rock-like "ட்",

(b) Hence M.L. (=Madras Tam. Lex.) page 2209, "நாடி. naat²i" =artery, vein, tendon, sinew, muscle, ligament; **tubular** organs of breath; **tubular** stalk as of a plant anything **tubular**, உள் தொளை உடையது.

(c) Also, on the same page, "நாடா, naat²aa = a small **hollow** bamboo; ribbon, tape; phylactery, **frontlet.**

As Sinh. is only another form of Tam. with a slightly different script, let us examine this word therein. Sinh. has no "ழ்" or "ழ", although her "ළ" is reminiscent thereof to some extent, while her "ළ", with two intertwined "ල"s, reminds us forcibly of "ள" with two "ல" s interlocked. Hence in Sinh, Tam. "ழ்" will always appear as "ළ්". Now turn to Carter's Sinh.-Engl. Dict. at its page 318:- (අ) "නළ, nal²a, நள" = tubes; **tubular.**

(ආ) "නළඇබය, nal²a-a(i) baya" = **tube**-plug
(ඇ) "නළ-දත, nal²a-data" = **hollow tooth** (cf. dental)
(ඇ) "නළය,නළේ" = tube, pipe, duct, reed, **flute.**

Now note the fantastic semantic change, where truth shows herself stranger than fiction. We have reached the musical instrument, the **flute**, played while **dancing**, as by Krishna himself. Hence an actress or dancing woman becomes associated with this "**nal²a**" as in "නළඟන, නළඹුව" = "nal²-a(n)gana, nal²-a(m)b-uva", where "**ammaa**" of தமிழ் origin has become "**ambaa**" in Sk. and "**amb-uva**" in Sinh., which delights in "**uv**", a variant of Tam. "**um, un**", as in "por-**un**-a" = battle-being > fighting, "por-**un**-ar" = warriors. At the end of (c) above, we saw the meaning "**frontlet**". Now note that this identical

meaning is given for (ඉ) "නළල්-පටිය"="**frontlet**", நளல்-ப(ட்)டிய = பட்டி.

(ඊ) "නළ-වරයා" = one who plays on a **pipe or flute,** piper; also a maker of mats, baskets etc from **tubular** reeds or bamboos.

(උ) "නළා-කාරයා" = "නළා-පිඹින්නා" = **piper.**

(ඌ) "නළා-පිඹිනවා" = **nal²aa** pimbinavaa = **to** play on a **flute.**

(ඍ) "නළු ගණය"=a company of stage-players' "**nal²u-ga:n²aya**"

(ඎ) "නළාව" = musical wind instrument as **tubular** flute, "**naal ava**"

(ඏ) "නළු-නාටකය" = **nal²u naatakaya = flute** playing and dancing.

We invite our readers to look closely at நாழ்", which has become "නළ්" in Sinhal²a, and at "நாடக-, නාටක-". You are about to suggest that the latter arose from the former Ofcourse, you are right. "ழ்>ட், ட" is according to the rules or norms of தமிழ linguistic development, while the progress from the **(tubular)** flute playing to dancing on the stage is a normal social change as well as a common semantic development. So you see now wherefrom Sanskrit obtained its words for '**dancing**", like "nyrtyati", "naat²-" or "nat²-". They all sprang from தமிழ "நாழ், நட்-", which, starting from designating a **hollow** flute, **tube** or pipe, soon flowered into these numerous meanings in so many languages.

(ඐ) නර්-ත්තකයා, නළුවා" = dancer, stage-player.

It is in this last word that one must look for the source of the peculiar "யாழ்நகர்" word : "நளவர்", unless we associate them with "නළයා" = one of the caste of (**bamboo**-legged) **palan**quin bearers, or (reed-) basket-makers.

(අ) "නළු-ලිය" = dancing woman The last word should rather be "ළිය", as it is from "இளம், இள" showing "tenderness, weakness, softness" pre-eminently feminine qualities. Look up Carter's Sinh Dict. pages 732–733.

Burrow and Emeneau have shown, in their Dravidian Etymological Dictionary, that a number of words have dropped their initial "c" or "n" in the தமிழ tongues. Thus in their No.3057, "**niir**"-**water** (from "neer" ="level" - this part is added by us, who are perfecting their work cf. the ii/ee alternance, mentioned very often in **our Lexicon**) 7 "**iiram**", "ஈரம்" = **wet.** Nothing can be **wetter** than water. Hence it is quite probable that "நழ், நாழ்7நள், நாள்" was the original "தமிழ" root-word from which both the "අළු" and the "නළු" words, which we have just examined and which have filled so many pages here developed in the course of centuries. B.E. connects its 69 (a) "அணை" (= approach) with 2962 "நண்ணு" =id.

Having dipped well into Taamiilzham, we are in a better position (than those who have not done so) to comprehend the mysterious way Sanskrit grew up.

(a) M.Monier Williams: Sk.Dict. page 525 "**nat²-**"(නට, நட்) "is the Praakrita" for "nṛ³it" = to dance. This we have just seen. Also = to hurt or injure. Cf. நட்டம் = injury, loss.

(b) "**Nad²a**" = Nal₂a (நட, நள; නඩ.නළ) = a species of reed. Arundo **Tibialis** (= **tubular, hollow**), RV. AV. with the Vedic accent on the second "-a". Hence தமிழ "நழ" had in the second millenium B.C. already become "நள" in Sanskrit.

(c) "**Nad²aka**" = the **hollow** of a bone; **seed**, Cf. Paan²ini, IV, 2, 91.

(d) "**Nad²inii**" = a **reed** bed. The reed is "நட்", because it is "**tubular**". Now we pass on to its page 534, where we meet "Naa-":-

(e) "**Naat²a**" (நற(ட்)ட ನಾಟ) = dancing, **only in Sk. Lex.**

(f) "**Naat²aka** = dancing, a dancer, mime, Raamaayan²a.

g) **Naat²ya** = dancing, mimic representation. In the Taamilzha tongues the connection between "நறு" which became (b), (c), (d) = "**tnbe, flute, flute playing**" on the one hand and "நன்" which became (a), (e), (f), (g) on the other hand, (= dancing), is well-established, as we have seen above. In Sanskrit, it is **not so** Further, Sanskrit formed its own "t²" (= ತ) and "d²" (= ದ) separately, because normally there is no passage between the two, as between St John's (Boys') College and the Chundikkulzhi Girls' School The words in the two sections therefore are far apart in Sanskrit; it is Taamiilzham alone that can explain their close, intimate, connection. Now turn to the "d²" words:-

(h) "**Naad²i**" (நாடி. ನಾಡಿ) sometimes with "-ka" = any **tube** or pipe. especially a tubular organ, as a vein or artery of the boby; a measure of time=half a Muhuurta; a measure of length=half a Dan²d²a (=a rod. cf. தடி, தண்டம்). The நாழி or reed-bamboo was then half a long stick.

(i) "**Naad²ii**" (நாடீ, ನಾಡಿ) = the above (h), but employed already in Rigvedic times, with the **accent** on "**ii**". Note especially that this word denotes also the "நாழிகை" measure of time, the time taken for the sand to come down gradually from the top notch of **the reed** to its base, the தாமீழ hour-glass of the 4th. and 3rd. millenia B.C.

All this abundant wealth of vocabulary is centred around **just two** Sinhel²a words, "අළු-" and "ඇළ", both of Taamiilzha or El²uva origin Piyatumaa Daaviid has

repeatedly demonstrated in his Lexicon, Parts IV to the end, that the "ஈழ்/இழ்" in "தாம்-ஈழம்/தம்-இழ்" is identical with 'ள்' in "ளவி/ளவி", owing to the "i/e **alternance**, which no other scholar has **stressed** so vehemently as he, not even Professor T.Burrow, who exposed it first 30 years ago According to this scholar, as stated already, "அள்/அண்" and "நள்/நண்" are intimately connected, **perhaps one word** in the earliest stratum of தாமீழம் about 6,000 B C. In the first of the Tamil³ grammars of the present millenium. வீரசோழியம் composed by a **Buddhist Tamilian** (when many **Sinhalese** had become **Hindus** under Rajendra Cholzha in Srii Lanka), Buddhamitra. the "ந் (n)" is called **the wcakest** of தமிழ் consonants. That is why Burrow and Emeneau have detected this **"n" (as initial) dropping out** in a number of words, in their Dictionary, including this "நள், நண், நட்-", which then became "அள், அண், அட்-". So we are left with **one word alone**, "ள், நள்". Good lord! **One root-word** has given us **thousand words now**, in **both** languages, including the crabs, which we eat; **or** the scorpion that stings us. **or** the Cancer" and "Scorpio" that take their turns in the Zodiac to light up the night sky and to guide the Peedru Tud²uva (=Point Pedro), Mannaarama and Yaalzhnagara fishermen safe to habour supply the Sinhalese Corporation V I.Ps with their fish. As the prophet in the Bible said, 'Be astonished, ye heavens, at this!" No wonder, the Tamilians cling to this wonderful tongue so tenaciously as to irritate the two "lady-Prime Ministers" round about Madras-Delhi and Jaffna-Colombo, while some Sinhalese desire very vehemently to foist their form of Taamiilzham (or El²u) down the throats of those who already speak **another form of the same.** Will it not be much better to revive the old "Queen Mother of Languages", as Piyatumaa Daaviid calls her in his Lexicon IV Title, and to foist it down the minds of every linguistic scholar and of research students all over this **vast but tiny** world? Vast is the

Earth-surface for us, but before God and for the astronomer it is but a tiny speck in our own galaxy, which itself is one of the minor ones in the assembly of galaxies. Some persons may object to the term "**thousand words**" in our previous statement and ask us to correct it to "a hundred". That is because they have not read (A) "An Etymological and Comparative Lexicon of Sinhal²a and Tamilzh, Part IV, March I, 1974, edited by our living patron, for merely Rs.6/- per copy. Read especially the first three chapters thereof; for 28 pages, **only one rootword** is discussed in a "tour de force." Count the number of words that are mentioned there, as proceeding from "අළු, அள், "**al²**", especially in Sinh. Then turn to the same author's Part III, Chapter 2, pages 20 to 31. Count the number of Tam words from this same "**al²**, அள்", in **both** Tam. and Sinh. languages. On page 23, 16 words of this set are given in the Tam. script, but the words themselves are Sinhalese. It would be an ex ellent idea for the Government to print all the Sinh. **Readers** in the Tam. script and all the Tam. **Readers** in the Sinh script **gradually,** spacing out the process over a score of years, so that the **readers** may accustom themselves slowly but steadily to both our scripts and this come to the knowledge of the truth that only accidental differences in the suffixes employed and the laws of growth, whereby the same "cala/jala" of Taamiilzham from "**cancalam**" = **agitated** (water) became சலம் and "diya" in Sinhla²a, separate the speakers of both our tongues. (B) The above statements cover only 2 out of the 20 Taamiilzha tongues. To complete the list one must delve into H Gundert's "Malayalam and English Dictionary", Mangalore, 1872; M.B.Emeneau, "Kota Texts"; the same author's "Toda", T.P.S. 1957, 15-66; F.Kittel, "A Kannad²a-English Dictionary", Mangalore, 1894; R.A Cole's "An Elementary Grammar of the Coorg Language", Bangalore, 1867; A.Maenner, "Tul²u" English Dictionary, Mangalore, 1886; C.P.Brown, "A Telugu-English Dictionary,

2nd.ed. Madras, 1907; Emeneau: "Kolami", Berkeley, 1955; T.Burrow: "Parji", Hertford, 1953; S.Bhattacharya "Gadba, Ollari dialect", Delhi, 1957; C.J.C.Trench "Grammar of Gondi, Vocabulary, Folk-tales", Madras, 1919-21; S.Bhattacharya, "Kond²a", 1956; W.W.Winfield, "Kui-English" Calcutta, 1929: A.G.Fitzgerald, "Kuvinga Bassa", Calcutta, 1913; A.Grignard: "An Oraon-English Dictionary", Calcutta, 1924; E.Droese: "Introduction to the Malto Language", Agra, 1884; Sir Denys Bray, **"The Brahui Language,** Part I: "Introduction and Grammar", Calcutta, 1909; Part II, "the Language" and Part III, "The Brahui Problem and Etymological Vocabulary", Delhi, 1934 Thanks to the foresight of our first patron, Gnanam, most of these books are in the Library of our second and living patron, Daaviid but many of them are very old and must be used with great care A.M.'s 1886 Tulu-English Dictionary, rebound, by Gnanam in 1936, has lost one third of its first two pages owing to **six** transfers of his books in the last 30 years Some of these works are being studied by our crew. For instance, வெள்ளையர், who lives also at Nallur, within a mile from Fr.Gnanam's old residence for his last 20 years, scans "Kui", rather "Kuui". Our living patron had just completed Part I of Bray's work and was proceeding to Parts II and III of **Brahui,** when **Rev.** Dr.Edmund Peiris donated to him the best dictionary in a language much closer to Tamilzh than this tongue Brahui, spoken by 2 lakhs of Dravidians in a Baluchi milieu, where Pakistan meets **"Airan"** (= Persia) (not இரான்). That was the end of his Brahui; as Sinhal²a, as explained by Rev Carter, has absorbed his time and attention since 1971, when he came round to Fr.Gnanam's view that Sinhala and Tamilzh are **separated only** by a **hair's breadth,** when both are viewed not as they are now but as **they were two or three millenia ago.** Dr.J.T.Xavier is the **third** of this series of authors of books wherein Tam and Sinh. are uttered in the same breath. **The gifts of the Lord are without repentance.** He

has **given us two forms** of the same "சுழத்தமிழ்" or "ஈழ", which on close analysis embodies a vocabulary, which shows promise of flowering out into **every one of the 20 languages above-mentioned.** This shows us most convincingly that our ancestors first settled in சுழம் not as Sinhalese or Tamilians but as "தமிழர்-El²uvans" about 1,800 B.C. Dr.Xavier is one of those who will readily accept this view and soon discard the Vijaya myth, the source of the riots of May, 1958.

The Vijaya legend and its Roman Parallel

The ancient history of Ceylon defies analysis or scrutiny, if we were to base it on the Vijaya legend and the similar myths of the Mahavamsa, composed as an eulogy on Buddhist achievements almost a millenium after the supposed events. Not Vijiya nor his supposed followers, but the Buddhist Praakrit-speaking missionaries from several regions of North and Central India gave that Aryan twist to the purest Taamilzham that had been our heritage from 1.800 to roughly 300 B.C., perhaps to 260 B.C., when Asoka's missionaries first succeeded in importing some Buddhism into **Taamilzha-Iilzha religion.** This never died, as the pilgrimages of Sinhalese Buddhists to Murukan's shrine at Katirgaamam (or Kataraagama) testify to this day. Similarly **the Iilzha or El²u language** of the second millenium B.C. has continued into the second millenium A D , not as pure Taamiilzham but as "Ci-y-el²u" "Sinhel²u" or "Sinhal²a", after the progressive influx of thousands upon thousand Aryan words of Praakrit, Paal²i and Buddhist-Sanskrit origin into Taam-iilzha "**El²uva**" or **El²u**". What brought **"the lion"** into this was popular but false etymology. The story of Romulus and Remus being brought up by a she-wolf is now **discarded** by historians, but it arose from the "not-too bad" etymology which connected the name "**Rom**-ulus", the supposed founder of "Rome" in 743 B.C. with "ரோமம்" = the wooly hair (of the she-wolf) (M.L.

page 3433) This is a very ancient Indo-European word, dating from about 3,600 B.C. in the Volga Valley in South-Eastern Russia It is found first as "**rooman**" (here "oo" is not ஊ, but ஓ. as in the name "**Roosvelt**", which is Dutch and which the Dutch pronounce "ரோஸ்-வெல்த்" = "a **rose-field**", German "**Feld**") M.Monier Williams:Sk Dict. page 889, "**roman**" = the hair on the body of men and animals, probably from I. "**ruh**" = to grow up, ascend. Thus "**aaroohanam**" = "the Ascension" (of our Lord). In both Sanskrit and Tam. "panka" is "mud" or "mire". As the Nelumbium Speciosum lotus grows up in this mud. it is called '**pankeeruha**" in both tongues. Cf.M M.W.Sk Dict. p.574 and அரிச்சந்திர புராணம், மயான காண்டம் சந்திரமதி புலம்பல்:- "பங்கேருகத்து லர்போல் விளங்கும் வதனே" = தேவதாசன் This word "**Rooman**" has the old Vedic accent on its first syllable. Its later form is "looman", MMW Dict. p.908 in its own words:- "later form of ro m n" with the identical meaning. Despite this apparently good etymology, Roman historians treat this story of the **haired** she wolf mothering the **haired Romulus** with contempt, as also all the Roman legends depicting the supposed events down to the great law-giver Numa Pompilius. With his **inscriptions and other documents** real Roman history starts. Likewise should it be in our case too. The Vijaya legend arose from the confusion between two homonyms in the minds of the Praakrit speakers in Iilzham. In one of their Praakrits, "**Ciiriya**"- (சிரிய) .=splendid, illustrious) had been corrupted into "**Siya**" I. In the same Praakrit "**Sinha**" (=lion) had also become "Siya" 2. Unluckily they jumped from 'Siya" I to "Siya" 2 and concocted the story of Sinhabahu and **the lion**. This is well narrated by Dr.J.T.Xavier. but **unhistorical.** He also often alludes to the "l/r" alternance, which is borne out by the "**rooman looman**" alternance, accepted by Sanskritic etymologists here. In T.Hudson Williams: "A Short Introduction to the Study of Comparative Grammar

(Indo-European)". Cardiff, 1935, page 35, we find these statements about this "r/l" alternance:- "I.E. **r** remained in all Indo European languages: so too I.E. **l**, except in Iranian, where it became **r**, as in "rudhirah²". Cf. Greek "eruthros", Latin "ruber", Irish "ruad" Welsh "rhudd", Engl. "red". Tam. gets its "இரத்தம்" from this source.

But sometimes I E. "**l**" becomes Sk. "**r**", as in the following list. A. Words of I.E. (=Indo-European parent language, 3,600 B.C.) now appearing in slightly variant forms but with the "**l**" initial:- Greek "**leukos**" = "white"; Latin "**luuceo**" = "I shine"; Irish "**loche**" ="lightening, Welsh "**llug**" (earlier "lug"); English "**light**" Compare also Welsh "go-lug" or "am-lug". Hence we can support Dr.Xavier's "**r/l** alternance theory up to the hilt, but only in specific cases which can be brought under specific laws. Thus, "led" and "red" are quite different words in English. Dr Xavier accordingly must, in his concluding chapter, enunciate these laws.

42926

The words zimmer, zug முழங்கு, மொழி and பண்

Further, we were delighted when we saw him citing some little-known languages like "Old-Norse". But it would have been better still, if he gave us the names of the authors and of the books which he relies on. Moreover, we must use the best authors and pump out of their work **all** the relevant information which we are **legitimately** entitled to draw from them, but **not more than that, not one ounce more,** Let us take **two** German words as our examples and refer to the best work in German etymology: Dr.Ernst Wasserzieher's "Woher? Ableitendes Woerterbuch der deutschen Sprache", Bonn, 1950. This means: "Whence? Etymological Words-book (=Dictionary) of the Deutsche (=German) Speech". Our two words start both in "z",

pronounced in German as a rapid "ts", **not** like English "z". For, German "z" is the exact equivalent of English "t", as we shall soon see. Now turn to his page 414:-

1. "**Zimmer**": Old High German "**zimbar**", Middle High German "**zimber**"; Anglo-Saxon and English "**timber**"; Low German "**timmer**". All this is about the phoneme in its morphology. Now let us proceed to its semantics Karl Breul: German-English Dictionary, 1952, 10th. edition, page 753, "**Zimmer**"=room, chamber, apartment In 99% of its usage now this is its meaning. Only in old works of bygone times does it mean "**timber**", or 'plank". Hence we legitimately conclude that German house-builders ignored stones and bricks and concentrated on planks and **timber** for their walls, basement, attic, ceiling etc.

2. "**Zug**":- (Wasserzieher, page 416) Old High German "**zug**", but Low German "**Tog**", English "**tug**", from "ziehen". Cf. "tug of war" Cf. also the "**tug**" pulling bigger vessels safely into harbours.

Breul, page 812:- "ziehen", as present Indicative;
"zog" as imperfect Indicative;
'zoege" as imperfect Subjunctive;
"ge ziehen" as past participle.

Breul, page 751:- "ziehen" = to hull, haul, **tug**, draw out or up.

page 760:- "zug"=drawing, pulling; a pull, **tug**, draught; a strong current of air; train, retinue, procession.

There is an interesting story about this "Zug". When Piyatumaa Daaviid was spending his 9 months at Bremen in 1952 and perfecting his knowledge of German, he found a closed room somewhat suffocating on a summer afternoon and opened one of its windows opposed to the only open half window on the other

side of that room. Immediately he heard the sound '**Zug**", as a harsh "**Tsug**", from the lady of the house. He ran to the window on the other side to watch the train moving, since up to that time "Tsug" had always registered a train (or atleast its engine on the railway) in his experience. With a sweet smile, for which and for their kindness the Germans are famous (despite Hitler and Kaiser Wilhelm II in the two World Wars), that lady explained that there was **no train** involved but only a **draught** or passage or current of air through the room as soon as opposed windows are both opened. Immediately our Piyatumaa said to himself, "Quite right! In English too we have "draw" 7 "draught". If the air is **drawn in** violently, there is draught; then a cold or bronchitis." This is how one learns any language and pumps out therefrom ail its implications.

Let us now apply the same process to two more words, the one in Tamilzh and the other in Sinhala a, so as to be fair to **both our tongues.** Would to God that the Srii Lankaa Government too showed the same fairness to all the inhabitants of this **beautiful** Isle, "Iilzham"!

(அ) "முழ்ங்கு/மொழி" The "ழ்" in both words is characteristically Dravidian or "தாமீழ", and very old. We can date any Tam. poem according to the number of the "ழ்" sounds therein; the more of the "ழ்" s occur, the more ancient the poem. Take the opening lines of புறநானூறு P.N.) 152, for instance: lines 1-4 are

வேழம் வீழ்த்த விழுத்தொடைப் பகழி
பேழ்வாய் உழுவையைப் பெரும் பிறிது உறீஇப்
புழல்தலைப் புகர்க்கலை உருட்டி, உரல் தலைக்
கேழற் பன்றி லீழ..... i.e. ழ் 9" "sounds in 4 lines. The commentary, much later, ofcourse, in date has only 3 "ழ்" sounds: வீழ்த்த, கேழலாகிய. வீழச்செய்து. Likewise the "ழ்" in "முழங்கு/மொழி" is very ancient.

(ę) M.L 3283. "முழங்கு" = **"to roar, thunder"**. Compare நாலடி 392 "எழிலி முழங்குந் திசை எல்லாம்=whenever the lightening clouds thunder forth or roar loudly. (ஞ) M.L. 3378 "மொழி ··I" = to speak. say, as in குறள் 295 "மொழி 2"=word saying, **speech, language,** as at குறுந்தொகை 11:7, "மொழி பெயர் தேஎத்தராயினும".. .....

What does this mean? It means that the தமிழ **speech** was like thunder. Have you ever heard German speech on a loud speaker? The "Bewahrungen" or "Achtung" are **deafening** our ears, even in memory: **such was the** தமிழ **speech** when our ancestors, then **"white"** like the Indo-Europeans just a hundred miles more northwards, moved south from the shores of **the Caspian Sea and Bokhara-Samarkand** to the **Indus valley,** through "**Airan**". Long residence in the tropical heat has **browned** the skins of their modern descendants and **softened their speech,** so that now it has become nearly as soft as the Nyanja and Swahili of the hot African regions. Tamilzh speech is more "iyampal" than "molzhi" at the present time. Compare M L. page 300, **iyampu**" = to sound as a **musical instrument,** "vaacciyam olittal". The closely related Sumerian speech was more of this **softer** type than the thundering தமிழம் of that age, since the former was called "**emu**", or "**eemu**", where the "**iya**" initial had become "ee", just as in Sinh the final "iya" or "ai" or "aya" becomes "ee" as "kud²-**aya**"7 "**ee**".

(அ) "பாய், படி" ("paay, pa(i)n") The second word we are examining is intimately connected with "**spring**" in all its senses in English, "a **spring** (of water), **to spring**". Let us go and stand with Moses and his crowd of Israelites at Cadesh in the Desert just after his sister, Miriam, died. They complained that they had not a drop of water "Moses lifted up his hand and struck the rock twice with the rod. The hidden

spring burst forth and there came out **water** in great abundance, so that the people and their cattle drank their full" Numbers, Chapter XX, verse II. It behoves you to have this vision of the **waters** of that **spring**, gushing out. **leaping** and jumping on their way and then **spreading** over the adjacent desert. This vision helps us to knit together three numbers, 3361–3, in B.E's Dravidian Etym.Dict **3362** is the **crucial** one. Tamilzha "**paay**" = to spring, leap, gush out, like blood or a stream. Hence "**paayccal**", also "**paaccal** = torrent, jump; "**paavu**" = leap, jump over. Kan. "**paay**" = to jump; a course, whence "**paadi**" (later "**haadi**") = road. Although B.E. does not give us this, it is very probable that Tam. "**paatai**" pronounced "**paadai**" (=road) is from this source, twin-brother as it is of Kan. "**paadi**". Sinh often changes the "t" or "d" of Taamilzham into "r". Thus அ(ந்)த, pronounced "anda", becomes Sinh. "ara", "අර" = that (in view), Carter, p.59 Likewise Tam. Kan "**paad**" - becomes "**paar-a**"= road, Carter, page 377. But we are on surer ground, when we state that the following Sinh words are from "**paaynt-u**" (Tam)

(අ) Nearly every original "aa" (ஆ අා) of Taamiilzham has been shortened into "a" (අ, அ) in Sinh, or transformed into "a(i)" (අැ) or (more often) අෑ (=aa(i)). So Tam. "**paayn**" = Sinh. "පෑන්" = **a spring** of water; probably Hind. "**paani**" has this source. (අා) The verb "**pa(i)n-**" = **to spring.** It appears in a score of forms, like පෑනලා 2, past participle; පෑනිව, පෑනුම, පෑනෙනවා, පෑන්නවීම, පෑන්නා, පෑන්නුවා, පෑන්වීම. The noun "පෑන්" too is compounded with several words, as you can see for yourselves on page 381 of C.

In a number of words, especially from Taamiilzham, there is a rapid semantic spread based on the nature of things or events i.e. "ontology". Thus water seldom **springs** forth without **spreading** all over that area.

Often the same word is used for both these processes: this then is how we come upon (No.3363 in B.E.) Tam. "**paay**" = to spread *(as water)*; extend; as noun = spreading, **mat**, sail. Also "**paavu**" = to spread. Mal. "**paay**" = **mat**. At M.L.2613 the **two** "paay" words of B.E's 3362-3 are brought together as but one word; and the 2nd. one in B.E. is given an ancient date, as already employed in "**Taamiilzham**" and accordingly as needing to be **translated** into '**Tamilzh**'. Hence Tolkappiyam, the only fully extant "**Old Tamilzh**" or "**Taamiilzha**" work, had '**தெமிள்**" and "**பாய்**" within its ken. The "**Col**." section thereof is late, especially its "**uri-iyal**'. Herein, at No.361, these two older words are explained as "**para**" = to spread. If "to spring" were a completely different meaning, the author of this interpolation would have surely given that too. This is another reason for considering Nos.3362 and 3363 as **originally one** word. Now how does our Sinh. come into this picture? In **several** ways. Have you been to any **exhibition** and seen articles spread out? So

1. "පානවා, **paanavaa**"=**to spread out exhibit, show**
2. "පාඩිය", also "පාවඩය"=cloth or carpet **spread out** Here the Taamiilzha '**paa**" has **remained**; thank God! But often this '**paa**" is changed into "**pa(i)** or "**paa(i)**".
3. So, ("paay"7) "pa(i)"+"dura", "පැදුර"=mat; pl පැදුරු=mats.
4. "පැදුරු-ඇතය"=loft or shelf for **mats** (C.p 381) as spread later.
5. "පැ"=adj. pret. or "**peyareccam**" of '**paanavaa**" above.
6. "පැම"=verbal noun of the same "පානවා"=**spreading out** for a show or exhibition, (C.=) Carter, Sinh. **Dict.** p.383. Now we appeal to Sinh. scholars to let **Rev Dr.H.S.David**, St.Patrick's College, Jaffna, know as **soon** as they come across a word in Sinh. with "ප, පා, පැ" or "පැ" as the initial syllable for 'a **snake, serpent**

or **cobra**", since we find these in the sister tongues of Sinh. B.E 3361 "**paampu**" = snake in Tamil Mal ; "**paavu**" in Kan. In Tul²u this becomes "haavu"; in Tel. "**paamu**"; Naiki "**paam**": **Praakrit** "**paava**".

We have come across several etymologies for this word, "**paampu**". It is certainly from "paay", (in Sinh. throughout and in Tam. "paa-ccal", this becomes "paa"; in their sisters, "paav-", "haav-", "**paam**", from "**paay-um**", are also found). But from **which** meaning of the verb "paay"? M.L (at page 2613) gives it 18 meanings.
(a) Some have welcomed its **first** one:- "**to spring,** leap," = "**taavu**", as when a snake attacks a person.
(b) Others point to **meaning 8,** as connoting the actual attack: "**to spring** at, **pounce on,** = "**taakku**". (Incidently note how scientifically Tamilzh has been built up by our ancestors! Just a small change in the last consonant from "**-vu**" to "**kku**", and the meaning shifts profoundly from "leap" to ' pounce on".)
(c) Others take the meaning 14 = "**to flee, abscond**" as snakes do from their human pursuers. Compare the first two lines of "Muut-urai" (வாக்குண்டாம்):-
"நஞ்சுடைமை தான் அறிந்து நாகம் கரந்து உறையும்;
அஞ்சாப் புறங் கிடக்கும் நீர்ப்பாம்பு".
(d) Still others prefer its 16th meaning: "**to pierce, penetrate, plunge into**", as the snake's poisonous fangs do into their unfortunate victims, like Deevadaasan, the only child of Hariscandra and Candramati.
(e) But we prefer to take "**paampu**" as meaning not any snake, but the **cobra,** which we call **nalla** paampu" = (not "good", but) **the "real"** "paayumpu". cf. நல் எள்நெய் = the **real** oil. For the Italian or Spaniard, the **real oil** (from "oleum") is from the **olive** (in Latin "**oliva**") For us, the real எண்ணெய் is, of course, the "எள்-நெய்", the sesamum or gingili or sesame oil: so we call it "நள்எண்ணெய்". Likewise, "நல்ல பாம்பு" is **the cobra,** as it alone is the "**spreader**" of its hood. Hence we fix on the **sixth** connotation in M.L.'s list:

"to spread". This is also one of the two earliest connotations of **"paay"** as we have already explained just above. Thus we have knit together Nos.3361, 3362 and 3363 of B.E. and more importantly brought out **the ancient bond of union** between Tam. and Sinh. This is not a mere hypothesis but an established fact **both** for us and for Dr.Xavier. It is high time that he becomes a **full-fledged member** of our Cankam, club, crew or battalion, call it what you like.

We shall now conclude this pretty long criticism and appreciation of Dr.Xavier's work with an advice to all those who go extensively or intensively into **the field of linguistics.**

A. **Acceptance** is the key-note of **Success.** But against acceptance there is rampant a form of **idolatory,** not religious but scientific or rather **"unscientific".** In his "Novum Organon", 1, 39. Sir Francis Bacon has classified these fallacies or **idols** as "those of the tribe, cave, market and theatre". How shall we **destroy these idols** and gain **acceptance for our truths?**

B. 1. Try your best to establish the right milieu by a **suitable Introduction** to the subject. Piyatumaa Daaviid maintains that a large number of words were loaned by both Proto-Semitic and Proto-Indo-European (to roughly 6 to 9% of both tongues) from Proto-Dravidian or Taamiilzham I, already from the 5th. and 4th. millenia B C. But he prepares men's minds for this by showing that the Proto-Dravidians then stretched themselves out from near the Caspian Sea to the borders of Samarkand, while the ancient home of the Aryans was the Volga Valley near the Black Sea. The **close neighbourhood** of the speakers of both tongues lends probability to this loaning process in the distant past.

2. A **step by step approach,** like that of T.Burrow, Boden Professor of Sanskrit, in his Articles on Dravidian, and of Piyatumaa Daaviid in his Lexicon.

3 Both these gained too a lot for strength of their arguments by the **multitude of instances** that they marshalled out.

4. Even thereafter they made their first statements **tentative,** not categorical. We give one instance. Old Dravidian ழ், as in பழம், became often "l" (ல்) in Sanskrit "**phala**" etc. But we can assert only **tentatively** that the same "ழ்" became "l" in the other tongues of ancient Indo-European, like Greek or Latin. In the former "**palaeos**" resembles "பழைய" both in form and in meaning (old); in the latter "**alma**" (as in "**Alma Mater**", for ones own school) first meant "**deep**" (=ஆழமான) and then "high, lofty". "ஆழுமா" **may have become** "**alma**" and "ஆழ்து" **altus**". Thus Psalm 68:3 b "veni in altitudinem profundi"="ஆழ்ந்த பெருங்கடலின் பா தாளத்தின்கண் வந்தேன்". (Incidently is there any linguistic connexion between "**vant**"-in this last Tam. word and the Latin "**vent**" in "venturus" (= he that is to **come**), or "veni" (= I **came**), which have given us English words like "venture" or Italian and Spanish "venga" = **come**?)

But why this difference of treatment between Sk. "l" and Graeco–Latin "l", sir?" you may ask. That is because of the difference in the degree of the probability of acceptance. Professors T.Burrow and H S.David have a large number of words in which Old Dravibian "ழ்" became "l" in Sk. as well as "sh", "t^2" (=ட்) or "d^2" (also=ட்) therein Further, it is commonly accepted that (even Vedic) Sanskrit grew up in a Taamiilzha milieu in the 2nd. millenium B.C On the other hand, the supposed common basis for Old Dravidian and Indo-European, the famous hypothesis of Rev.Gnana Prakacar, has **not yet** received wide support. That is why Dr.Daaviid speaks

only of such resemblances as he detects between the words of both families as "**Loan-words**" from the earlier developed Proto-Dravidian I into the later developed Indo European I of about 4,000 to 3,000 B.C. Hence adjust your views and **your wording** thereof to the inherent probability of their acceptance by other scholars. We live in a largely hostile world, as Rev.Father Gnana Prakacar found to his cost between 1935 and 1946 in his bitter controversy with Dr.Wilhelm Geiger and and Julius de La Nerolle. His disciple (and our living patron) has avoided any controversy for a decade by **buttressing every one of his linguistic statements** with ramparts and palisades, which prop them up and have shielded him from attack. These have made his books more difficult but safer and more secure than otherwise. We advise Dr.Xavier and his imitators to follow his example. "**Hoc fac et vives**"="Do this and thou shalt live" free from attack

"Amen!" or "Aam!" or "ஓம், ಆಮೆ!"

SKYLINE PRINTERS
209, Ahamparam Road,
Trincomalee.