

AR

818

THE
Aryan Origin of Tamil



Edited & Published

By

K. M.



PRICE Re. 1

THE
Aryan Origin of Tamil



*Edited & Published
By*

K. M.



PRICE Re. 1



PRINTED AT THE
VANI VILAS PRESS,
SHEVAPET, SALEM.

1947
T. N. JAYAVELU,
ANTIQUARIAN BOOKSELLER,
49, VENKATACHALA MUDALI ST.,
CHOOLAI, MADRAS-7, S. INDIA

3384

3384

CONTENTS.

	Page
Preface	1
I. Introduction	5
II. The Ethnology of India	11
III. The Aryan Origin of Tamil	22
IV. A Few Interesting Words Studied	42
V. Aboriginal Languages	64
VI. The Tamil Alphabet	70
VII. Some Grammatical and Phonetic points	73
VIII. Scientific Terms	78
IX. The Ancient Civilization of South India	81
Appendix	102

ERRATA.

Page.	Line.	Error.	Correction.
1	11	Sankrit	Sanskrit
5	1	artificical	artificial
6	24	certain	certain
11	4	Caucasion	Caucasian
12	25	observes	observers
16	27	pre ent	present
17	18	diffrences	differences
18	17	Ar an	Aryan
20	16	it	its
25	21	begins	begin
30	10	gg:u	ga:u
32	10	muchakai	mochai
35	1	அவிழ்	அவிழ்
36	12	utna, kitna	kitna, utna
36	29	குத்து	கூத்து
36	30	ku:ttu	ku:du
38	16	sa:hmila	sha:mila
40	6	பிரம்	பிரம்பு
53	3	Lexican	Lexicon
55	16	theroy	theory
70	7	Phoenecian	Phoenician
75	25	posses	possess
80	6	sensee	senses
87	9	exagerations	exaggerations
89	16	referes	refers
89	24	missionaries	missionaries.
90	29	east	least
94	14	Munchausan's	Munchausen's
100	29	Tamil	Tamil's
100	29	intransic	intrinsic
101	2	formerly. The	formerly that the

PREFACE.

A pamphlet of this kind is peculiarly liable to misrepresentation by the mischievous, and by those who cannot meet reason with reason. Any language in the world can be criticised, even immoderately, without much heat. But in the hyper-sensitive South India even a whisper against Tamil is likely to be regarded as a crime.

The author of this desires to commit no such crime. He has no intention of criticising Tamil, or lowering it in the estimation of the world. On the other hand, he understands, honours, and loves Tamil most. He also strongly believes that Tamil is superior to Sanskrit in most respects, because Tamil has benefited from the merits and errors of Sanskrit and many other languages. It has a glorious literature equal to any other in the world. A few stanzas from Kamban alone will be sufficient to prove this statement.

To call a man a German or a Nazi or a Quisling may be defamatory, but I hold that it is not at all defamatory to call Tamil an Aryan language. Sycophancy is much too common in the world. In our land religious and literary sycophancy is regarded as a virtue. But in the interests of historical truth, I have been compelled to state that Tamil is an Aryan tongue, and that no civilization other than the Aryan existed any

where in India before Alexander's invasion. That there existed in South India a Dravidian civilization earlier and better than the Aryan civilization is only an assertion without proof. Many apparent differences between Tamil and Sanskrit have led Europeans to believe that Tamil is a non-Aryan tongue. Further, the study of Indian philology has been confined to a few foreign scholars not having much acquaintance with more than one Indian language. Indians have either neglected philology, or have remained content with playing second fiddle to European scholars. This also is a reason for the wrong belief.

The author of this pamphlet is not well equipped for the task he has undertaken. He knows Tamil fairly well. He has a smattering of a few other languages, but most of his poor knowledge has been gathered by him from dictionaries. Because this pamphlet is written in English, let not the reader think that his claim to know Tamil is an empty boast. I am compelled to write in English, because all my knowledge of philology is through English books. For the sake of precision and clarity in a controversial subject I have adopted English.

My pamphlet is only a suggestion for further and fuller studies, and not a complete work in itself. A satisfactory philology of Tamil can be written only after a list has been prepared showing all the words common to two or more South Indian languages.

Scholars should form philological societies for studying the history of the words. There must also be born a genius who knows the South Indian languages well in addition to his Sanskrit scholarship, and he should also be philologically minded. Until the emergence of such a person we should be content with scraps of philology like mine.

I am only an amateur linguist. I crave the indulgence of the reader for errors I might have made in the spelling and derivation of words.

My thanks are due to Sri T. P. Ranganathan, M. A., (Head of the Sanskrit Department, Salem College), for reading through the MSS. and making valuable suggestions. For the views expressed herein, and the mistakes that may be found in transliteration or derivation of words, the responsibility is entirely mine.

I INTRODUCTION.

The Tamil land is now under an artificial communal and political cloud created by a few people. But I believe that the vast majority of the people of South India are sufficiently fair minded to see through the cloud, and recognise the correctness of the conclusions arrived at here.

Dr. Caldwell has the merit of having started the study of the comparative philology of the South Indian languages. But his work contains very little philology and less comparison of words of the four chief languages of the South. In his days the science of philology was in its infancy. He was a foreigner, and was not well equipped for the work he had undertaken. In those days missionary gentlemen generally took the help of Indian pundits. As they could not spend much money, they hired cheap pundits, or took counsel with Indian Christians who had some knowledge of the South Indian languages. Further, he does not appear to have been acquainted with Sanskrit or Hindi. Therefore he was easily led into errors.

But Dr. Caldwell was clearly to blame for starting the Aryan-Dravidian controversy. He allowed his missionary zeal to obliterate his zeal for truth. A few

missionary gentlemen of the last century found that it was Sanskrit and Brahmin influence which prevented the easy conversion to Christianity of the South Indians of the higher castes. They thought that, if the non-Brahmin Hindus could be convinced that they belonged to the Dravidian race quite different from the Aryan Brahmin race, that the Dravidian civilization was more ancient than and superior to the Aryan civilization, that Tamil was quite independent of Sanskrit, and that the Dravidians were losing their individuality and greatness by merging with their Aryan conquerors, their work of conversion would be very easy. By creating a Dravidian race, and freely admitting into it all South Indians except Brahmins, and by flattery they thought they could wean the non-Brahmins from the influence of Sanskrit tradition, and bring them under the influence of Christian missionaries to whom the South Indians would be grateful for having resurrected the Dravidian race and civilization.

Certain facts helped the birth and growth of this Dravidian theory. To superficial observers there would seem to be no connection between old Tamil and Sanskrit. Though Brahmins have been the spiritual leaders of South India, they have observed a certain measure of social and religious aloofness from the non-Brahmins. This aloofness was attributed by mischievous people to racial difference. Lastly, when Europeans compared Brahmins with non-Brahmins, they took for this purpose the cultured Brahmins on the one hand,

and the butler, syce, peon and gardener on the other. They found the difference between the two sets remarkable, and so they concluded that racial difference must be the cause of this. The error was due to the fact that in those days the Europeans rarely came in contact with cultured non-Brahmins. These were the causes of the false Dravidian theory which has been exploited by some for religious and political purposes.

Here it is but just to state that the present day missionaries are quite free from such faults. Some of them may be mistaken in their views, but few of them deliberately twist facts or adopt questionable methods. They have ceased to address Hindus as 'sinners'. They do not throw mud on other religions. They are ready to acknowledge merit wherever it is found.

To my knowledge there are only two missionaries now who believe in the Dravidian theory. The first is Father Heras. He has been thinking and dreaming so much about the Chalcolithic civilization of Sindh, and its connection with the South Indian civilization that he has coued himself into the belief that these are connected with each other. Though he is himself very diffident about his opinions, and has expressed views in public lectures which are quite opposed to his theory, yet some people in South India do not hesitate to regard his tentative theories as well established facts, because they wish to make political and communal capital out of them.

The other missionary belongs to Ceylon, and his theories are so fantastic that they do not merit notice. It is enough to mention the most fantastic of his views, viz. that the Tamil language has developed out of half a dozen roots standing for sex organs and sexual acts.

The Dravidian theory started by foreigners has found fertile soil in the inferiority complex developed in some Tamil scholars and politicians who never tire of harping on the vanished glories of the Tamil civilization, and who deplore their present day degradation. They have been wrongly induced to believe that the Aryans were responsible for their downfall, while really these Aryans were agents of civilization in South India. It is true that Tamil literature has not made progress in the last few centuries. The cause of this is not Aryan influence, but the obstinacy of Tamil scholars in clinging to out-worn modes and classical Tamil, which is as much a dead language as Sanskrit. They dislike the living language of the people, they condemn the use of expressive foreign words, and above all they hate like poison words of the Sanskrit language, which is really the parent of Tamil.

Some like Mr. Sivaraja Pillai handsomely acknowledge the deep debt which Tamil owes to Sanskrit, and the common Aryan civilization. He has written a small volume to smash the Agastya myth. He has brought out the salient improbabilities in the details of the story. But he has not proved beyond doubt that a

person named Agastya who did some good to Tamil never existed. He has also not recognised that though there might not be truth of fact in the myth, still there may be truth of impression in it. The truth of impression in the story is that North Indians have done much for the development of Tamil.

Many facts of the Agastya myth might have been invented later on to check the growth of inferiority complex among the Tamils. It is said that Agastya made Tamil the equal of Sanskrit, and for centuries Tamil was not felt to be inferior to Sanskrit. But now the inferiority complex is growing apace. This growth is due to unscientific and wrong lines of thinking on the part of many Tamil scholars. They think that a civilization or language which claims to be earlier than others gains special honour thereby. They forget that if idiot A is born five years earlier than intelligent B, idiot A's earlier birth does not confer on him any special merit. Tamil scholars also apparently believe that a language which is independent of other languages, and which does not borrow from others has special claims to honour. This belief is proved completely wrong by the fact that English, one of the greatest languages of the world, freely borrows from other languages. It even borrows 'Blitz', 'Straf' etc. from German, while a bitter war is going on with the Germans, because Englishmen are sensible enough to prefer these more expressive words to the tame native words.

It must be admitted that there were some English cranks in the last century who thought that Anglo-Saxon words possessed special virtues denied to Latin and Greek words, and that therefore dead Anglo-Saxon words should replace the live Latin and Greek words already current in the English language. Their generation has disappeared. One may look into any modern English book and find that it contains seventy five per cent or more words of Latin, Greek or French origin. India is generally some centuries behind other countries in thought and action. It is therefore not surprising that we have in our midst a number of people with 19th century mentality. They say that dead Tamil words should replace live Sanskrit words which have already become part and parcel of the Tamil language. This attempt is not likely to be more successful than that of the English faddists.

II

THE ETHNOLOGY OF INDIA

Ethnology like all other social sciences is inexact. It concerns itself with the classification of the human beings. The usual division of them is into four races viz. the white or Caucasian, the yellow or Mongolian, the black or Negro, and the hook nosed Semitic or Arab. There has been a good deal of mingling of races all over the world. So these four divisions are only theoretical. No such races in purity exist anywhere in the world. More races have come to India, and more mingling has taken place here than anywhere else in the world. So it would be difficult, or even impossible to say with certainty to what race a certain Indian belongs.

The mingling of races and local conditions have led to the formation of new types, and so the four races have been subdivided into Nordic, Alpine, Mediterranean, Australoid etc. And these again have been subdivided to show minor variations in type. But the most important point to be borne in mind in this connection is the fact that Ethnology is an inexact science, and only certain broad principles of classification arrived at, and a few conclusions reached by it can be accepted as fairly reliable.

India has been called the melting pot of many races. It has been frankly admitted by modern Ethnologists that the classification of the Indian people is well-nigh impossible on account of the confusion of the races in the land. The general opinion is that the Caucasian or Aryan type predominates in North West India, the Mongolian in North East India, and the Australoid in South India. But the actual difference between the average North Indian and South Indian is so slight that almost all people in India are said to be of the Mediterranean type, which is a subdivision of the Caucasian race.

In truth there is very little real difference between the North Indian and South Indian types. The theory that the South Indians are Dravidians and that the North Indians are Aryans is not based on fact. The average Punjabee is taller, stronger and fairer than the South Indian. He has also a more prominent nose. But these differences are due to differences in diet and climate. The Punjabee eats his rich meal of wheat, dhall and ghee with much flesh, while the South Indian eats his beggarly meal of rice or millets with a little vegetables and practically no animal food. The prominence of nose is usually associated with the Aryan type. But modern observers have found that the big nose is usually the result of a high standard of living. For instance, the richer classes in England have more prominent noses than the poorer classes, though both belong to the Aryan race.

The Vedas refer to the non-Aryans of India as noseless and black. Such a description is applicable only to the Negritoes of the Andamans—even these are not regarded by some as Negritoes. No such people are found on the mainland of India. One often sees very dark people both in South India and North India, but their prominent noses and tall stature clearly show that they do not belong to the negrito race. So we must conclude that the Negritoes, or similar people with whom the Vedic people came in contact were either wiped out, or became completely merged in the general population of India without visibly influencing its racial character, because they were so few in number.

Another type which must have inhabited large portions of India is the Australoid. The aborigines of Australia and the people of Java, Philippines and Ceylon belong to this type. This type is also not found in India separately, or in purity. It is completely merged in the present population of the land from the Punjab to Cape Comorin, though some say the Australoid characteristics are more prominent in South India than in North India. But this is due to the stunted growth of the South Indians, and their low standard of life. It should be noted that the Australoid type is itself the result of a mixture of various races.

Peoples speaking languages belonging to the Aryan group appear to have entered India in several

waves. One of the earliest groups which must have entered India many centuries before the Vedic people got mixed up with the Australoid people of India. Subsequent waves of the Aryan language group with very primitive culture merged with the previous invaders, who were already merged with the Australoid people. The result was that a people speaking a language of the Aryan group, but with very primitive culture spread over India. Those that reached South India came under the influence of Vedic culture last of all. A very small section of those in the extreme south was unfortunately named Dravida in Sanskrit literature. And this Dravida, the name of a small area or group, has been converted in recent years as the appellation of a non-existent race and culture.

Of the present population of South India, the untouchables were most probably the earliest inhabitants. In the so called Sangam literature they are called *pa:(n)ar*, *patter*, *pariar* etc., Many of the stanzas of *Purana:nu:ru* speak of *pa:(n)ars* as poets and musicians. At the present time *pa:(n)ars* are found in Malabar. They are untouchables who specialize in making leaf umbrellas. There is nothing to show that they were ever poets or musicians. [Therefore the *Purana:nu:ru* account of them is only a fiction to sustain the theory of a great Tamil civilization in which poets and musicians were treated by the kings with special honour, affection and munificence.]

While the *pa:(n)ars* have disappeared from the Tamil area, the *pariahs* still form a considerable part of the cultivators. The rude, ear-splitting South Indian drum is called '*parai*', and because these people played the drum during marriages and funerals and festivals, they were called *pariars*. These untouchables were most probably the descendants of the earliest Aryan invaders who got mixed up with the Australoid and Negrito inhabitants. It must be clearly understood that these people do not ethnically differ from the rest of the inhabitants of the present-day India.

The next wave of invaders were most probably the huge class of peasants known in South India as '*pallies*', but now sometimes called '*padaia:chies*' and more often '*goundars*'. *Palli* is a Sanskrit word meaning a native, or a village where the natives live. This name was given to them about the fifth century B. C. by the first Jain settlers and missionaries in South India. A Jain temple was called a '*pullichandam*'. The term 'native' is generally disliked, and sometimes resented by the people to whom it is applied. So other names have been adopted. *Goundar* is derived from a Mahrati word meaning village headman. The aborigines such as the *Todas*, *Gonds* and *Santals* were only little groups or islets left in the hills and forests by the *goundar* class of invaders. Almost all the other present day inhabitants of South India are the descendants of later (5th century B. C.) settlers from the north, or descended from irregular marriages.

But all the people of South India, Brahmans as well as Harijans and aborgines, approximate to the same racial type, viz. the Mediterranean.

Mr. Julian Huxley's "Race in Europe" is a very useful pamphlet which should be read by all those who are interested in racial theories, and especially those who pride themselves on their race. He has conclusively shown that the Aryan race is a myth. He is of the opinion that the term Aryan can only be used to indicate a language or culture group. It is absurd to apply it to any people as there is no such Aryan race anywhere in the world. Such a race in its purity might have existed fifty or a hundred thousand years ago. The term Dravidian Race is a greater myth than the Aryan, for there are at least an Aryan group of languages and the Aryan culture of the Vedic people of India. The aim of this work is to prove that the 'Dravidian' group of languages is descended from the Aryan. It is unnecessary to prove that the present day South Indian culture is completely Aryan. No Ethnologist has been able to prove the existence in South India of a Dravidian race with definite racial characteristics different from those of the people of Northern India. North Indians and South Indians, Punjabees and Bengalees, and Tamils, and Todas, Gonds and Santals all approximate to what is known as the Mediterranean type—this is the present day view of the most competent Anthropologists.

The last wave of the Aryan language group was that of the Vedic people who were fairly high in the scale of civilization. They found their kinsmen, the pre-Vedic Aryan groups in a primitive state with but a few hundred words in their language. Though many of these words belonged to the Aryan group, they had undergone changes which made them look different from their Sanskrit originals. So also their complexion, customs and manners differed from those of the Vedic people. A similar thing happened in England. The Danes and the English originally lived in the same country and belonged to the same group. Three hundred years of separation was sufficient to make them differ a good deal in speech, looks, customs and manners. When the Danes invaded England, they could not recognise their kinsmen. So the Danes regarded the English as alien enemies, and treated them most cruelly. Similar differences arose between the Vedic group and the pre-Vedic groups which had already entered India. But so far as South India is concerned there is absolutely no evidence that the people of the Vedic culture ill-treated the pre-Vedic people, though they looked upon each other as belonging to two different races. On the other hand, the new comers to South India treated the natives with missionary kindness, and worked hard to Aryanize them. They succeeded in this to a remarkable extent.

A great error that prevails in South India is that only Brahmans came to South India and that no non-

Brahmans of the Vedic culture set foot on its soil. The truth, on the other hand, is very different. Probably ninety nine per cent of the North Indians who came South were non-Brahman Hindu fighters and adventurers, or Jain and Buddhist missionaries, and colonists. Very few Brahmans came to South India, and most of these according to tradition were imported by the Pallava kings. The statement that most South Indian non-Brahmans must have descended from North Indian non-Brahmans is borne out by the fact that there is less difference in type between South Indian Brahmans and non-Brahmans than there is between a Punjabee and a South Indian Brahman.

The people who chiefly Aryanised S. India were the Jains and Buddhists. It is they who civilized the land, and gave to the people the Aryan system of laws, government, ethics etc. All this is called in short Aryan culture. The most important contribution they made was towards the development of the Tamil language. We may say with some certainty that it was only after their arrival in South India that Tamil literature came into existence. They brought with them the Brahmi alphabet. The Tamil alphabet was devised by them on Brahmi model.

The Brahmans continued the good work begun by the Jains and the Buddhists. There is not a shred of evidence to show that there was ever any antagonism in South India between Aryan and Dravidian till a few years ago. All classes have treated the Brahman with

great respect and kindness. Dr. Ambethkar was probably ignorant of the Asokan edict which ordains the people to respect the Brahmans. Otherwise he would not have repeated Merindale's mistake of calling Buddhism an anti-Brahman movement. It may be surprising to many to hear that the Buddha called his truths "The Four ARYAN Truths."

Much capital has been made of the theory of the Lost Continent of Lemuria which spread between India and Africa, and connected them. This theory is now discredited by recent scientists, yet in South India, the last refuge of exploded theories, it holds sway in schools and colleges. In some recent books on the History of India, and in almost all books of the history of Tamil literature this theory is stated as a geological truth. In the latter variety of books Lemuria becomes Dravidistan, and much tears shed over its loss. It is now geologically certain that no such continent was ever lost, because it never existed.

That the Sumerian civilization of the Indus valley was Dravidian is another exploded theory, but as it has been exploded by Dr. Wheeler's report on new excavations on the site only very recently, it will take at least a century more to disappear from books. That the Brahui language of Baluchistan is a Dravidian tongue, and that it indicated an overflow of the Tamils beyond India are also discredited theories, but still they are accepted in South India as historical and linguistic

truths. It has recently been established that there is absolutely no connection between Brahui & Tamil.

The conclusion is that there is no race now which is found in purity anywhere in the world. The races might have existed in purity fifty to a hundred thousand years ago. The so called Aryans who entered India were a mixed race. Only the Vedic culture and the Sanskrit group of languages can correctly be termed as Aryan. Dravida indicates only a province, and Dravidians are only the people of that province as Punjabees and Biharis are. There is no Dravidian race, no Dravidian culture, and no Dravidian language independent of the Aryan group. All Hindus belong to the Aryan culture, and speak languages belonging to the Aryan group. Tamil literature is soaked in Aryan culture, and there is absolutely no indication of it having ever come under the influence of any other culture. Therefore it is beyond doubt that all Hindus, especially the Tamils, are Aryans by culture and speech. The so called Dravidian elements in the Aryan culture are either sham or absurd theories based on no evidence. Linga worship was a late comer to South India. The latest report of Dr. Wheeler on the new discoveries in the Mohenja-Daro, and Harappa sites proves the Indus Valley civilization to be Sumerian, and hence the Dravidian origin of Linga worship has no leg to stand on. The "namam" mark could not have been older than Srivaishnavism (8th Century A. D.) whose distinctive mark it is. By no stretch of the imagination can

Srivaishnavism be called non-Aryan. The existence of the octaval system at any time in South India has not been proved. It is only a supposition based on the fact of the names of the first eight numbers in Tamil appearing to have no connection with Sanskrit. The strange thing about the other duo-decimal system is that the names of the numbers in it are Hindi, and not Tamil. Therefore the term Dravidian can be used only as a provincial name, but since it has been wrongly invested with a racial significance, it is better to discard its use.

Transliteration Table.

a: = अ, आ

e: = ए, ऐ

i: = इ, ई

o: = ओ, औ

u: = उ, ऊ

c = च

(t) = ट, ठ

(d) = ड, ढ

(n) = न, ण

(l) = ल

zh = झ

sh = श (both sh's in Skt.)

List of Abbreviations.

Skt. = Sanskrit.

Tl. = Tamil.

T. = Telugu.

K. = Kanarese.

Tu = Tulu.

E. = English.

Heb. = Hebrew.

Eg. = Egyptian.

III. THE ARYAN ORIGIN OF TAMIL.

Dr. Waddell started the theory that most Tamil words are derived from Sanskrit roots. But he did not develop the subject. It was Dr. Waddell's theory that put me on the track. My studies have left me in no doubt of the fact that Tamil is an Aryan tongue. The Tamils must have separated from the main Aryan group before the Vedic period. Their long stay in South India without contact with the main group led to such great changes in the Tamil language that it is difficult to recognise it as an Aryan tongue. In Sanskrit k, p, t, etc., group of sounds have four different sounds each. In Tamil there is only one sound each in the alphabet. This striking contrast between the two languages alone would be sufficient to lead astray the unthinking scholars, and make them believe in a separate Dravidian group of languages. All this difference is due to the fact that the Tamils left the main Aryan group long before the elaborate Vedic civilization developed among them. Hence some of the Tamil words for very common things are pre-Vedic Sanskrit words which had undergone changes in their new environment.

The Tamil vocabulary may be divided into the following groups:- (1) Pre-Vedic Aryan words such as pronouns, names of parts of the human body, of common objects and actions or verbs, making up the essential vocabulary of Tamil. (2) Prakrit and Pali words introduced by Jain and Buddhist missionaries. (3) Tamilised Sanskrit words introduced mostly by Jains and Buddhists. A frequent device is the substitution of μ in Tamil for Ksh, sh, etc. (4) Direct borrowings from Sanskrit in recent centuries without much pother about Tamilising. (5) Borrowings from other languages. It is noteworthy in this connection that Tamil has imported no word from either Rome or Greece in the west, or from either Siam or Java in the east. This makes it improbable that the ancient Tamils had intimate intercourse with these countries. (6) Local or dialectical words and slang.

This pamphlet is chiefly concerned with the words of the first three groups. The words of the first group, as also many of those of the second and third groups are common to two or more of the South Indian languages. The first group indicates that more than 2500 years ago, when the post-Vedic Aryans were coming to settle in South India, the pre-Vedic Aryans of South India lived together, and spoke a single language containing about three hundred words. After contact with the Vedic Aryans they grew in numbers and civilization. They spread

over the whole of South India. Geographical factors such as hills and forests divided South India into five distinct areas between which intercourse was difficult. The result of this was the growth of five languages of close affinity—made very close indeed by Sanskrit influence — viz. Tulu, Kanarese, Telugu, Tamil and Malayalam, not to speak of Singhalese, because it is spoken outside South India.

Pronouns are some of the earliest words in any language. If we compare Tamil pronouns with Sanskrit pronouns we can see that the former is derived from the latter. Sanskrit 'aham', English 'I', German 'ich', Hindi 'ham' (both singular and plural in meaning), and Tamil யான் (sing.), and யாம் (pl.). Tamil யான் is the earlier form of நான். யான் is derived from 'aham' by the palatalization of 'ah' and the reduction of m into a mere nasal sound, and in course of time this became m and n to indicate number. In the plural form யாம் the m sound of the Sanskrit word is retained. In English 'aham' became 'I', in Tamil it became யான், and later நான். யா becoming நா is not an unusual process in Tamil, as seen in யமன், நமன், and the colloquial ஒங்கி. நோங்கி. This is due to the assimilation of யா with the nasal n of the word. That நான் is derived from 'aham' is clearly seen from the fact that the Telugu first person possessive is மா which is certainly derived from Sanskrit मम. In எனது and எமது (H. hamare) (1st person sing. and pl.) ன and ம sounds indicate

number, and the essential sound ன is from Sanskrit ah in 'aham'.

The Sanskrit second person pronoun is 'yushmad', from which English you is derived. There must have been in Tamil and Telugu a second person nominative form with the initial u sound, but there is no trace of it now. That form must have changed to நீ in Tamil, and நீய in Telugu by a process of assimilation with நான் of the first person, because first and second person pronouns often come together as in நானும் நீயும். This process of assimilation is also found in Telugu, and confirms what has been stated about நான் and நீ. The Telugu first person possessive singular is மா, and this is clearly derived from Skt. मम. The Second person possessive in Telugu is మీ, and this మీ is certainly due to the influence of மா. That நீ is evolved from 'yushmad' is also established by the fact that the second person possessive in Tamil is still உன் (sing.) and உம் (pl.). As a matter of fact, all other cases except the nominative begins with உ. Also the first person nominative alone begins with ந in Tamil, and so the second person nominative alone changes from உ or whatever sound it might have been long ago to நீ. The other cases of the second person do not change.

Sanskrit second person singular is 'thvam' from which English thou is derived. Hindi singular is

'thu' and plural 'thum'. In Telugu the plural honorific form is தமரு, and in Tamil தாங்கள், and both these are derived from 'thvam'.

The third person masculine in Sanskrit is 'asah' from which the English he is derived. But Hindi 'voh' does not appear to have been derived from it. Sri. T. S. Ramakrishnan, B. O. L., Hindi Pandit of the National College, Trichy, says that according to Chatterjee the derivation of 'voh' is as follows:—

Skt.	Prakrit	Dialect	Hindi.
अव (av) supposition. }	ओ (o:)	ओ (o:)	वह (voh)

It is said that the forms अव and ओ are found in Persian also. So they are Aryan forms.

Tamil அவன் is derived from av the oldest form of the third person singular in the Aryan group. அது is from Skt. 'adas' and இது from Skt. 'idam'. யாது, எது are from Skt. relative pronoun 'ya' or 'yad'. Skt. 'ka' is the stem of the interrogative pronoun. In Hindi the k is followed by the palatal ya:, and the word becomes kya. In Tamil ka is completely palatized, and the interrogative stem is யா and எ as in யார், எது, ஏன் etc. The table below may help the reader to understand better the Sanskrit origin of the Tamil pronouns:—

Sanskrit.	Hindi.	Tamil.	Telugu.
aham=I	ham.	{ யான், யாம் English I.	
mama=my	me:re: hamare: }	{ எனது, எமது	ma:
Yushmad, tvam =you	tu:,tum	நீ, தாங்கள்	tamaru:
yushmat, yushma:ka=yours }	tuma:re:	உன், உம்	mi:
o: (dialect) av (Persian)=he }	voh	அவன்	va:du
adas=it or that		அது	adi
idam=it or this		இது	idi
ya, yad=who, which		{ யாதோ, எதுவோ	
ka	kia	{ யார், யாது, ஏன், என்ன	e:mi, evaru

The pronouns form part of the basic or essential vocabulary of a language. Let us now take some more Tamil words of the same class used by us everyday. They must have been in use long before the Vedic age. The familiar Tamil names for the various parts of the body are certainly derived from Sanskrit roots. The list below will prove this statement:—

Sanskrit.	Tamil.
Mukha	... முகம் (No other word in Tamil)
Va:k or Va:ch	... வாய்

aksha(n)	...	கண்
o:sh(t)a	...	உதடு
bhru	...	புருவம்
karna (H. ka:n)	...	காது
shru (root)	...	செவி
gala (H. galla)	...	கழுத்து
kapola	...	கன்னம், கதுப்பு
karam	...	கை
shmashtu	...	மயிர்
tunda	...	தொந்தி
tvash	...	தோல்
kaksha	...	கக்கம்
prish(t)a (H. pit)	...	பிடறி
vrish	...	விரல்
nime:sha	...	நிமை, இமை
ni(d)a:la	...	நெற்றி
khe:le (H. khe:l)	...	கால் (ஆல் வினையாடு)
jihva	...	நாக்கு

மூக்கு is not derived from Sanskrit 'na:si', but from 'mukha' (face). The most prominent feature of the face or mukha is மூக்கு.

It must be admitted that தலை, பல் etc., cannot be traced to Sanskrit roots. But the list I have given is long enough to prove that Tamil belongs to the Aryan group. For instance the English word 'head' (old English-'heofed') cannot be traced to any sanskrit root. There are, in fact, hundreds of such

Kanchi (4th century A. D.) that Hindu or Brahmanical influence became stronger in the Tamil country.

Tamil words borrowed from Prakrit:—

Prakrit.	Tamil.	Prakrit.	Tamil.
ajjan-அச்சன், ஐயன்		chokka-சொக்கம்	
appa-அப்பன்		tamba-தம்பம்	
atta:-அத்தன் (தகப்பன்)		dha:ti-தாதி	
ido-Skt. itah-இதோ		na(t)(t)a-நட்டம் (dance)	
ra:ni-இராணி		nichcha-நிச்சயம்	
e:laka-ஏழகம் (ஆடு)		nimmala-நிம்மலம்	
kasa(d)a-கசடு		ni:l-நீலம்	
ka(t)(t)ha-Skt. }	கட்டை	ne:yam-நேயம்	
ka:shta }		pa(d)ima-படிமம்	
ka(n)ha-கண்ணன்		pati(t)(t)a-பதிட்டை	
kantha-கந்தை		paya(n)a-பயணம்	
khappara-கப்பரை		pariva(t)(t)a-பரிவட்டம்	
karma:ra-கம்மாளன்		palanka-பலகை	
kara(n)(d)haka-கரண்டி		pa:kata-பாகதம்	
gha:u-காவு		phudavi-புதவி (பூமி)	
krtaka-கிருதக்கு		bomma-பொம்மை	
kokkai-கொக்கு		pe:(t)a-பேட்டை	
sari-Skt. }	சரி பார்த்தல்	be:ram-பேரம்	
sadrisha }		ma(n)(d)ava-மண்டவம்	
sa:mi-சாமி		ma:tu-மாது	
sungar-சுங்கம்		bangar-வங்காரம் (பொன்)	
su(n)(n)a,sunna-சுண்ணாம்பு		vara(1)(1)a-வார் (தோல் வார்)	
se(t)(t)i-செட்டி		vichcha-விச்சா	

se:(n)i-Skt. sre:(n)i-சேணி vijja-விச்சை (வித்தை)
vi(n)(n)appa-விண்ணப்பம்

The list below contains examples of Sanskrit words Tamilized by the use of μ . I well remember that, when I was a little boy, one of my teachers said that μ was peculiar to Tamil, and that if μ was found in a word that word must be undoubtedly Tamil. My list not only disproves this, but also tells us that the presence of μ in a word should put us on the alert to discover a camouflaged Sanskrit word. No doubt μ is peculiar to Tamil, but people find it difficult to pronounce it. The Cockney is noted for dropping his h's where he should use them, and revelling in their use where he should not use them. But the illiterate South Indians dislike μ , and use some other sound instead of it. We are led to guess that a Jain practical joker introduced it in the Tamil alphabet for the discomfiture of non-Tamilians.

The truth appears to be that μ was a sound confined to a small area probably on the Malabar coast. The Jains introduced it in the Tamil alphabet to confer on Tamil a dignity equal to that conferred on Sanskrit by ksh, sh, etc. It should be remembered that Agastya wished to make Tamil the equal of Sanskrit. In Tamil μ generally takes the place of ksh, sh, d, t, of Sanskrit.

Sanskrit words Tamilized with μ :—

Sanskrit.	Tamil.
amirtha-அமிர்து	da(1)a-தமை

havis-அவிழ	dramila } (திரமிளன்)
hata, ha:ri-அழி	drami(d)a } தமிழன்
ro:dana-அழுகை	dra:vi(d)a }
a:hve:-அழைப்பு	tulasi-துழால்
anala-அழல் (அனல்)	to:yam-தேழம் (sea)
de:hali-இரேழி	nakshatra நாம் (நான்)
hi:na-இழிவு (கினம்)	na:(d)i-நாழி
lipi, likitha, } எழுத்து,	na:(d)ika-நாழிகை
lakshana } (இலக்கணம்)	nuda-நுழை
e:(d)aka } ஏழகம் (ஆடு,	parichaya-பழக்கம்
Pkt. e:laka } இடையன்?)	phala-பழம்
garu(d)a-கலுழன்	pu:rva }
kalusha-கலுழ் (கலங்கு)	pura:tana } பழய
skhalitha-கழிகை	H pura:na }
gha(t)ika-கழகம்	T. pa:ta }
grdhra-கழுக்கு	(vi) bhu:ti-புழுதி (பொடி)
gardaba }	pi:(d)-பீழித்தல், பழுது,
H. gadde }	(பிணி)
T. ga:(d)ide } கழுதை	mukula-முகிழ் (மொக்கு,
K. katte }	முகை)
gala-கழுத்து	makula }
ki:la-கிழி, கீறு	H. bakul } மகிழ் (மரம்)
kulaka-குழம்பு	mada }
kurula-குழல் (hair)	mo:da } மகிழ்
ku:ra-கூழ்	mugda }
kuda-குழ. (குழந்தை)	varsha-மழை
kula-குழால், குழாம், குழவு,	me:sha-மேழகம்
குழுஉ	va:rta }
kapha-கோழை	H. ba:t }
sta:li-தகழி, தாழி	T. ma:(t)a } மொழி
	K. ma:tu } (மாற்றம்)

yuga-யூழி
va:ch-(வாய், வாசல்) வழி
a:yush-வாழ்வு
vibhav-விழா

Tamil words borrowed from Sanskrit and Tamilized in various ways:—

Sanskrit.	Tamil.
aksha-அச்சு	gha:(t)i-காடி
ha:syam } அசித்தல், இசித்தல்	ka:ma-காதல்
H. hass } தல், சிரித்தல்	ga:tha-காதை (பாட்டு)
kiath, iath } அத்தனை,	ka:la-கார், கருமை
H. utna, kitna } எத்தனை	kshara:-காரம், கார்த்தல்,
apu:pya-அப்பம்	காய், காயம்
shamana-அமைதி	ka:la (god of } காற்று
vrikshara:ja-அரசமரம்	wind) T. ga:li }
sarana-அரண்,	ka:ra:-காரன் (வண்டிக்
(அரண்மனை)	காரன்)
vrihi }	ki:ra-கினி
T. vari } வரகு (அரிசி),	ga:tri-கீரி
Tu ari } அரிசி	guchcha-குச்சம், கொத்து
ullola-அலை	uchcha (Pkt.)-குச்சி
sabha-அவை	ku(t)il, ku(t)i:ra-குச்சில்
a:cha:da-ஆடை	kubja-குஞ்சம், குறள், கூன்,
a:bda, a:ya(n)a-ஆண்டு	குஞ்சு
a:(n)i-ஆணி	ku(t)umba-குடி, குடி
diva:nda-ஆந்தை	யானவன்
a:ra-ஆரை	ku(t)angaka-குடிசை
ra:tri-இரவு	ku(n)(d)a-குண்டம்
shyamala (யாமளம்)	ku:rd
இளமை	H. khu:d } குதி, குத்து
yasti-சட்டி	K. ku:ttu }

sva:sa-உசர், உயிர்	gho:(t)a }
ulu:kala-உரல்	H go:da } குதிரை
ru:pa-உரு, உருபு	T. gurram }
varan(d)aka-உருண்டை	kudda:la-குந்தாலி
upama-உவமை	gumpha-கும்பல், கூட்டம்,
ulukalika-உலக்கை (and	குப்பம், குவியல்
உரல்)	ko:kila, H. ko:el-குயில்
arka-எருக்கு	guluccha-குலை
he:ramba-எருமை	ku:la-குளம்
lichuka or }	guravah-குறவன்
lakucha } எலுமிச்சை	gunja-குன்றமணி
nisre:ni-ஏணி	gu:(d)ha-கூடம்
samshaya-ஐயம்	kshu:r-கூர்
u:shtra-ஒட்டகம்	kaitaka-கைதை (தாழை)
ho:tr-ஓதல்	kutsa-கொச்சை
o:jas-ஓசை	kinchit-கொஞ்சம்
karka(t)i }	go:sh(t)aka-கொட்டகம்
H. kak(d)i } கக்கிரி	ko(t)(t)haka-கொத்தளம்
kakshi-கட்சி	kostumbari-கொத்தமல்லி
ka:nana-கானகம்	go:man, go:mat-கோ, கோன்,
ka:sh(t)a-காடு	கோனான்
kha(t)va-கட்டில்	ko:(t)i-கோடம், கடை,
ka(t)a-கடாம்	கோடி
gha(t)i-கடிது (விநைவு)	ku(t)he:ra-கோடாலி
ce:(t)aki-கடுக்காய்	gho:sh(t)ha } கோட்டம்,
ka(t)u(ka)-கடுகு, கார்ப்பு	gu(t)ika } கோவில்,
ga(n)aka-கணக்கன்	T. gu(t)i } குடிகை
kapa:(t)a-கதவு (காவல்)	go:(n)a-கோணி (ப்பை)

kramuka-கழுகு	go:dhuma-கோதுமை
sankalana-கலப்பு	sahakalatram-சக்களத்தி
kalya-கள்	jarjara-சச்சுரவு
khale-களம்	tadru:pa-சச்சுருபம்
kavalika-கவளி	shrinkhala } சங்கலி
kamsaka:ra-கன்னான்	E. chain } சதங்கை
	(waist band) } சலங்கை
khan, khani-கனி (சுரங்கம்)	cha:tra (scholar)-சட்டன்
கன்னம் (ஓட்டை)	(பிள்ளை)
sanda:-சந்தை	sa:(n)a-சணல்
shambala-சம்பளம்	shtiv (H. tu:k)-துப்பு
samprata:ya-சமயம்	tu(n)(d)a-தும்பிக்கை,
jara:-சரை, நரை	தூம்பு (tube)
chal-சலித்தல்	tutha-துரிசு
chal-சனைத்தல்	druti-துருத்தி
chaga(n)a-சாணி, சகணம்	tri(n)a-துரும்பு
sa:hmila-சாம்பல்	tuvara-துவர்
se:vati-சாமந்தி	stu: (to curdle)-துவை
cha:ya-சாயம்	dva:ra-துளை
chid, sithila } சிதைவு, சிதை	tu:ni-தூணி (quiver)
kshata } சீவு	dhu:li-தூள், தூசி, துகள்
chira-சீலை	dro:(n)i-தோணி
si:ha (Pkt.)-சீயம் (சிங்கம்)	na:(n)aka-நாணயம்
chukra-சங்கங்கிரை	nana:ndri-நாத்தனார்
sun(t)hi-சுக்கு	jambu-நாம்பு, நாவல்
sun(d)i (mu:shika)-சுண்	na:ya (lord)-நாயினார்
டெலி	na:randa-நார்த்தை
sun(d)a-சுண்டை	nivartna:-நீக்கம்

sudha. svad-சுதை, சுவை	na:ra, ni:ram-நீர்
sru (K. osar)-சுரத்தல்,	yugam (yoke)-யுகம்
ஊருதல்	na:la (fibre)-நூல்
sushka-சுருக்கம்	niyati-நேதி, நீதி, நெறி
kshulla-சுள் (சிறுமை)	ne:ma-நேமம், நேரம்
குள்ளன்	paksha-பக்கம்
dyu:ta-சூதம், சூதாட்டம்	bubhuksha-பசி
sampu(t)-செப்பு, செம்பு	panji-பஞ்சி, பஞ்சு
kar, (K. key)-செய்	pha(t)a-படம், (பாம்புப்)
chala:-செல்வி (லக்ஷ்மி)	படம்
செல்வம்	pa(t)ala-படல், படை
subhiksha-செழிப்பு	bha:n(d)a-பண்டம் (store)
che:ta-சேடன், சேத்தாளி	pa(n)ya-பண்டம் (wares)
sre:(n)ika-சேணியன்	பணியாரம்
(weaver)	bha:(n)(d)ari-பண்டாரம்
che:da (T. cedu)-சேதம்,	pa(n)a-பணம்
கேடு, கெடு	pankti-பத்தி, புத்து
jval-சொலி	bandha-(பத்து) பற்று
so:sha-சோடை	padya-பதிகம்
so:ham-சோம்பல்	prat(ata)-பரத்து, பரப்பு
sunaka-சோணங்கி	parusa-பரு
trapu-தகரம்	spa(t)ika-பளிங்கு
taksha-தச்சன்	phala: (piyaba)-பலா, பழம்
tvash(t)r-தட்டான்	po:trin-பன்றி
ta:(d)ana-தட்டு	pu:ga, (guva:ka) } பாக்கு
da(n)(d)a-தண்டு, தடி	T. vakka)
ta:ta-தந்தை	pa:tha (H. ba:(t)-பாட்டை,
tanu:ta-தமியம், தணிவு,	பூதை
தாழ்வு	pa:(t)ha, pa:(t)haka-பாடம்,
dadhi-தயிர்	பாட்டு, பாடகன்

tara-தரம்	pa:(t)ali-பாதரி
dhari-தாங்கு	pa:lyam-பானையம்
ta:marasa-தாமரை	pin d)aya (pasi)-பிடி
dha:tri-தாய்	pinya:ka-பிண்ணாக்கு
sta:lam-தாலம்	preta-பிணம்
tunga, tungisa-திங்கள்,	be:tra (T. bettam)-பிரம்ட
துங்கள்	pi:ra-பீர்க்கு
stira-திரம்	pu:yalasa-(கண்)பினை
taranga-திரை (அலை)	pa(t)a:m-புடவை
di:p-தீ, தீ (விளக்கு)	pa:ra:vata-புரா
ti:r-தீரப்பு, தீர்வு	sphur-புரிதல்
di:pana-திவனம், தினி	pushpa (H. phu:l)-பூ
ti:vra-திவிரம்	bu:sh-பூசு
duku:la-துகில்	vand-வணங்கு
tr(t)i-துடி	varti-வத்தி
thun(d)a-துண்டு, துணி	vardhana-வரவு
pe:(t)a, pe:(t)aka-பெட்டி,	vali-வரி (tax)
பெட்டிக்கூடை	vali-வரி(கோடு)
bangar	vr(t)(t)a-வருட்டம்
ja:mbu:nada	கம்,பூதனம் (முட்டை) விராட்டி
bo:j-பொதி	vala, bala-வல் (strength)
po:ta-போத்து (young	vala-வன
shoot)	valaya-வளை
bandh-பைந்து	va:shi-வாச்சி
makshika-மக்கி (சு)	bha:j-வாசி
mrd-மண்	bha:(t)akam-வாடகை
mathna-மத்து	va:ra-வாரம், வரப்பு, வரம்பு
ma:ya-மயக்கம், மாயோன்,	hikka-விக்கல்
(திரு)மால்	vikriti-விசுதி
	vi:jana-விசிறி

mayu:ra-மயில்	va:la-வால்
malaya-மலை	va:tuli-வாவல், வெளவால்
mash-மழு	vish-விடு
ma:(kanda)-மா(மரம்)	bi:ja
mat-மான் (புத்திமான்)	T. biya- } வித்து, விரை,
mahima-மாட்சிமை	அரிசி } விதை
ma:tulunga-மா தலங்காய்	vismita-வியத்தல்
mari:cha	vri:sh-விரல்
H. mirich	} மிளகு, மிளகாய்
T. mirapa, miri	
musali-முதலை	bilva H. bel-வில்வம், விரா
mu:laka-முள்ளங்கி	vikri:(d)-வினையாடு
mrd-மெது	vistar-விறிப்பு
maddhyam-மையம்	vrtha-வின்
mukha-மோப்பம் (மூக்கால்	vinitam-வீதம்
நுகர்வது)	vijaya-வெற்றி
mo:r(n)a-மோர்	vaikratha
varga-வரிசை	vaira:ghya } வெறுப்பு
vashika-வசம்பு	vya:ghra-வேங்கை
va:sh, va:chya-வசை, வசவு	vasu:ra-வேசை
vartula-வட்டம்	vyadha-வேடன்
vridhi-வட்டி	de:ve:ndra-வேந்தன்
va(t)a-வடம்	vikalpa
va(t)aka-வடகம் (வற்றல்)	vibhakti } வேற்றுமை
va(t)ika-வடை (of rice)	hi:ra-வைரம்
	vya:la-யாளி(புலி)

IV

A FEW INTERESTING WORDS STUDIED.

A few interesting words may now be studied. It is curious to note that only two out of the first ten numbers are really from Sanskrit, viz. ஒன்பது and பத்து. The second is from Skt. pankti, and the first means one less than ten, though it has a separate numeral viz. கூ to represent it. The Romans had a separate word for nine (nove), but wrote the figure as ten minus one (IX). Three other numbers in Tamil have sounds resembling the Sanskrit names, but it is very doubtful whether there is any real connection between them. They are:— (1) Skt. e:kam, H. e:k, T. okati, E. one, Tl. ஒண்ணு, ஒன்று. (2) Skt. pancha, H. pa:nch, Tl. அஞ்சு, ஐந்து. (3) Skt. ashta, H. a:t, Tl. எட்டு. The fact that the names of the first eight numbers in Tamil are independent of Sanskrit can be explained only on the supposition that the Aryans had not developed numbers when the first wave of them moved towards South India. After their separation from the main group they learnt to count upto eight with names of their own coinage.

The theory, that the South Indians had originally the octaval system of reckoning because the names of the first eight numbers are distinctly Tamil, and that later they adopted the decimal system of the North Indians is wrong. The correct assumption is

that the very ancient South Indians could count only upto eight, and that later on, after coming in contact with post-Vedic civilization, they adopted the Sanskrit names for all the higher numbers except hundred (நூறு). ஆயிரம் (Skt. sahasram), லக்ஷம் and கோடி are from Sanskrit, and there are no Tamil words for them. There is absolutely no evidence that the South Indians had their own names for thousand, lakh and crore. The very name for mathematics in Tamil is கணிதம் which is Sanskrit. There is no other Tamil term for it. It is sometimes said that எண் is a pure Tamil word, and that it means mathematics. But really எண் is a word coined on the model of Skt ga(n), H. gin (count). To avoid confusion with கண் (eye) the form எண் was adopted. எண் also means think. The Sanskrit word gan also means consider or think. The Tamil word for accountant is கணக்கன், (Skt. ga(n)aka), and there is no other word for it. There is no such formation from எண் to indicate an accountant or mathematician. As both எண் and கணக்கன் are from the same Sanskrit word gan, there was no need to form another word meaning கணக்கன் from எண்.

Mr. Mark Collins in his 'Octaval System of Reckoning in India' says, that the prominence given to 8, 16, 32 and 64 in Hindu mythology and religion is due to the influence of the Dravidian mathematical system. He derives Skt. Kala: from Tl. கால் foot ($\frac{1}{4}$), though he knows that 'kala:' does not mean $\frac{1}{4}$. He

also conveniently forgets that the names of many other fractions in Tamil are undoubtedly Sanskrit, viz. ardha ($\frac{1}{2}$) அரை; Skt vimsa, Pali-visam வீசம்; ka:kini, காணி; maha-ka:kini, மாகாணி. Fractions like $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{3}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{16}$ form an easy and attractive geometrical progression, and it is usual in all religious systems to invest striking numbers like 8, 16 and 32 with magical and religious virtues. 3, 7 and 9 are a few other numbers of religious or magical significance. Hence 8, 16, 32 etc., obtained their prominence in religion not on account of any octaval system, but because they form an easy and striking geometrical progression.

Of the names of colours கருப்பு, கார், கரி etc., are from the Sanskrit root 'krish'. The Telugu word for black is nalupu and this comes from the Sanskrit ni:la which means not only blue but also black. சிகப்பு is from Skt. asrig or asrik. H. surukh, T. eruppu. Sanskrit root 'bhr' means outside; H. ba:hir, T. baita, K. be(1)ika, Tl. வெகிர் (outside of a house) and வெளி, from which வெளிச்சம், வெள்ளை (bright or white colour), வெள்ளி and வீடியல் (dawn) K. be(1)ika, are derived.

The Tamil names of the 28 nakshatras (constellations), of all the months, of six of the planets, of the year, (ஆண்டு from Skt. abda). of the week (வாரம்), and of all the astrological terms are from Sanskrit. One or two writers have given it as their opinion that

the Tamils borrowed the astrological terms from the Romans. A comparison between the Tamil names of the months, and the days of the week, and the Sanskrit names will show beyond doubt that the Tamil names have been taken from Sanskrit with certain modifications to suit Tamil modes. Of the names of the days of the week புதன், வியாழன் (விருகஸ்பதி), and சனி are clearly from Sanskrit. செவ்வாய் (red-faced planet-here வாய் means face as in Sanskrit) is a Sanskrit compound derivative. திங்கள் may be from Skt. tunga which means moon. வெள்ளி is from Skt. root bhr. குயிறு alone appears to have no connection with any Sanskrit word.

மாடு and மான் are from Skt. root mrig. சிங்கம் வேங்கை (Skt. vya:gra, H. ba:ig, Mhr. uva:k) ஓட்டகம் (u:sh(t)ra) குரங்கு, பன்றி, கருடன், கழுகு, பருந்து, and மீன் are all from Sanskrit. If the Indus Civilization had been Dravidian, there would have been a Dravidian word for at least 'simha' and 'u:shtra'.

கர் has been the chief liquor drunk in South India from time immemorial. It might be expected that at least this word would be pure Dravidian. However it is from Skt. Kalya (joy). கலியாணம் is also from the same root. Almost all people fall into the trap of marriage, but Dravidian philologists have fallen into a double trap by fondly thinking that மணம் is a pure Tamil word. மணம் comes from Skt. root mad or mo:d which means joy like 'kalya'. That this derivation is the correct one is proved by the

Kanarese form madume. மணம், meaning sweet smell, is also from the same root, for மணம் is a joy as long as it lasts.

திரு has been the centre of some party strife. Though the contest appears to be subsiding, it may flare up at any moment. 'Stri' (woman) becomes in Tamil திரி. In the same manner the Skt. 'sri' has been Tamilized into திரு, because Tamilizing it into சிரி would cause confusion with சிரி (laugh). Further, திரு means, as sri also does, Lakshmi. If திரு had been a pure Dravidian word, it passes one's comprehension how it came to bear all the meanings of sri including that of Lakshmi, an Aryan Goddess. That is to say, திரு is an exact synonym of sri. Such exact synonyms are possible only when one of the terms is coined after the other. The analogy of திரி proves that திரு has been coined on the pattern of sri.

The word திரு must have been coined about the 9th century A. D. About 700 A. D. திருநெல்வேலி was called only நெல்வேலி. Onam which is now invariably preceded by the prefix திரு, is even now only ஒணம் in Malabar. Sri Vallaba, the name of a king who ruled towards the end of the 12th century A. D. is called in Tamil inscriptions Sri-valluvar and Si-valluvar and not Tiruvalluvar. The word appears to have come into popularity only from the end of the 13th century, when Saivite and Vaishnavite sects

used it before all sacred names - generally the idiom is to use திரு before Tamil holy names, and Sri before Sanskrit holy names.

On account of the presence of மு the word கழகம் is regarded as pure Tamil. It is trying to displace 'sangam' now. But கழகம் is only the Sanskrit word 'ghatika' in disguise. In Pallava times Ka.ncchi had a 'ghatika' or a centre of Brahmanical learning. The word means an association of learned men. Therefore திராவிட கழகம் should mean a literary association of Tamil scholars, and not of party politicians.

A similar word is நாழ் or நாள். It is the Tamilized form of 'nakshatra' as in Sva:ti Tiruna:l. Now நாள் usually means day. Long ago the Aryans followed the system of measuring days and months by the waxing and the waning of the moon. The month had 28 days, and each day had a chief star or nakshatra. So நாள் or நாழ் meant not only day but also star.

'குதிப்பது குதிரை' This funny derivation of குதிரை given by Dr Caldwell is an illustration of his lack of equipment and help for the task he undertook. Skt gho:taka. H. Go:da, T Gurram and Tl. குதிரை: This derivation is straight forward and correct. Even if we accept Dr. Calowell's opinion that குதிரை is from குதி (leap or dance) குதிரை is still of Sanskrit origin, for

குதி is from Skt. Kuṛd (jump, leap, dance). It is regrettable that there is no better book of South Indian philology than Dr. Caldwell's for use as text-book in schools.

If குதிப்பது is குதிரை, then it is reasonable to expect that உதைப்பது would be உதிரை, but it is really கழுதை from Skt. gardhaba, H. gadde, T. ga:(d)ide, and K. katte.

Another comic error made by Dr. Caldwell is about the derivation of நாய் (dog). Some Tamil Pandit must have primed him with the old philological superstition that most Tamil words are formed from verbal bases. Therefore he said, “நக்குவது; நாய்.” As undoubtedly நாய் must have been one of the earliest words in the Tamil language, this derivation implies that thousands of years ago, when the Tamil language was just sprouting, the Tamils studied zoology before naming animals! But the correct derivation of நாய் is from Skt. shva:na which became செந்நாய், the name of the wild dog, and later on, the first syllable (செந்) was dropped under the mistaken impression that it meant red, and நாய் came to be used as the name of the domestic dog. The wild dog of India is no doubt rusty brown or reddish brown in colour. That is why, pandits say, it is called செந்நாய் (red dog). Many of the domestic dogs of South India (called pariah dogs in English) are reddish in colour. The ‘Kombai’ dog is almost red in colour, but they are not given the epithet செந். So the name செந்நாய் could not have been given to the wild dog on

account of its colour, but because it is derived from Skt. shva:na (root-shvan). Skt. shunaga also means dog, and from this the pleonism சோணங்கி நாய் is derived.

Yet another mistake of the same class made by the Doctor is பாய்வது பாம்பு. பாம்பு is from Skt. sarp (E. snake). In Hindi sarp becomes sa:nmp-the ‘nm’ is only a nasal sound which is neither n nor m—and so it is certain that பாம்பு is derived from a very similar word in Pali or Magadhi.

‘வெட்டப்பட்டது வேட்டி.’ This derivation is born of perversity and ignorance. வேட்டி is only the Tamilized form of Skt. ve:sh(t)ana; that is why some people pronounce it வேஷ்டி. In Tamil வெட்டப்பட்டது is named வெட்டல் as in பாக்கு வெட்டல், and not பாக்கு வேட்டல் which would mean ‘marrying betel-nut.’

மலர் is said to be a pure Tamil word, from Toda ‘malo:j’. But it is really derived from Skt. ma:lya which means not only garland but also flower. The Toda ‘malo:j’ may be a derivative of Tamil ‘malar,’ or it may be a case of chance coincidence.

All the Tamil names for cloth are from Sanskrit:- ஆடை (a:cha:da), வேட்டி (ve:shtana), சேலை, சேலை, (cellika), துண்டு (thunda), கந்தை (kantha) துகில் (duku:la), and புடவை (pata:m). Even the Tamil name of cotton is from Sanskrit:- பஞ்சு or பருத்தி (panji). நூல் is from Skt. na:la. Therefore this gives the quietus

to the theory that the art of weaving flourished in South India many centuries before it was known in the North.

The Tamil names of almost all the artisans are from Sanskrit:— தச்சன் (dvacha), தட்டான் (tvash(t)a), ஆசாரி (a:cha:ri), கம்மாளன் (karma:ra), கன்னான் (kamsaka:ra) குயவன் (kula:la), வெண்ணான் (from Skt. root bhr); நாவிதன் or நாசுவன் (na:piṭa).

சந்தை, a word of some importance from its implication, comes from Skt. sanda. It is a popular word and it has no substitute in the language of daily use. The only other possible words in Tamil for சந்தை are கடை and அங்காடி (T ang(d)i), and both these are derived from Skt. root gha(t), from which ghata and ghatika are also formed. Ghata means a multitude, an assembly, especially of elephants or other animals. In the Tanjore district the assemblage of cattle on fields for manuring purposes is called கடை. If Tamil has to use a Sanskrit word to denote such a common thing as a fair, the implication is that fairs were unknown in the Tamil country before men of Aryan culture settled there.

Such a common word as நிரம்ப (நொம்ப) is from Skt. nirbhara. In Hindi it becomes bhar and in Tamil நிரம்ப, நிறைய, நிறை and நிரப்பு. •

The Tamil names for such simple things as உலக்கை are from Sanskrit. உரல் and உலக்கை (ulukhala and ulukhalika) ஏந்திரம் (yantra), ஆணி (a:ni), பலகை (palanka), ஆரை (a:ra), ஊசி (su:ci), அச்சு (aksha).

All the Tamil names for coins are from Sanskrit காசபணம் (karsha:pana) துக்காணி (do:ka:kini).

All this shows that Tamil has drawn its life's breath from Sanskrit.

தொல்காப்பியம் means ancient literary work. தொல் is from Skt. du:ra (T. toli) which means distance in time or space. காப்பியம் is from Skt. ka:viam (poetical work). This is the traditional and universally accepted meaning of ka:viam. But modern Dravidian Philology says that தொல்காப்பியம் is pure Tamil, and means பழமையைக் காப்பது (காப்பியம்-காப்பது). This meaning of காப்பியம் was a political discovery made some time after Sir Alexander Cardew began his reign in Madras.

குறள் means short verses, and comes from the Skt. root ku (little). அக and புற in அகநானூறு and புறநானூறு are also from Skt. roots. அகம் is from Skt. o:kus (house), and புறம் from Skt. param (outside). அப்புறம் is from Skt. atah-param.

How the name Dravida Desa for South India arose cannot be easily decided. Some say that it is only the Sanskrit form of the word தமிழ். In old Sanskrit literature Dravida meant a small area in the extreme south inhabited by a very backward people. In Macdonald's Sanskrit Dictionary, Dravida is said to be on the West Coast. According to Purana:nu:ru the fishermen of the southern coast were called துமிலர்.

Most probably திமிலர் (K. Tigris - தமிழர்) became Skt. Dramila, Dravila Dramida and Dra:vida, (Latin Dimirice or Limirice, c=k), and Dramila was again Tamilized into தமிழர். This is very like the doubtful philological curiosity of Hamilton's Bridge becoming அம்பட்டன் வராவதி, and this being again translated into Barber's Bridge, the present name. Another explanation is that Dravida is composed of drava and ida (water and place), and means the country of rain-fed rivers as opposed to the ice-fed rivers of the North (Sankarananda). Va:tsa:yana refers to Dravidas as a people inhabiting the extreme south of the country, and his description, not a very flattering one of the people, seems to refer to the South Indian Brahmans. But the மு in தமிழர் looks like a definite pointer to its Sanskrit derivation.

It is some times asserted that it is Sanskrit that has borrowed the words from Tamil, and not vice-versa. This position is untenable. Dead languages seldom grow or change. Sanskrit became a dead language or a language that ceased to be spoken by the common people some 3000 years ago. But it was the chief medium of literary expression till about the 10th century A. D. though Pali and Magadhi were for some time rivals in the religious literature of the Buddhists and the Jains. Borrowing words from other languages is very repugnant to its genius. Its rules are very rigorous. That such a language has borrowed from Tamil is highly improbable. Tamil on the other hand is a living language. It has borrowed, and it is borrowing from other languages

The presence of thousands of indubitably Sanskrit words in Tamil, as shown by the numerous star marks in the first 506 pages of the Tamil Lexicon, and discontinued afterwards for some unknown reason, is a sufficient indication of the way the wind has been blowing.

It may be conceded for argument's sake that Sanskrit has borrowed many of the Tamil words like 'gopuram'. Then there will be as much difference between Sanskrit and Tamil as there is between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee. That is to say, Aryan is the same as Dravidian. Again it is also but right that what we have lent should be taken back with interest. That is to say, Tamil should appropriate as many words as possible from Sanskrit by way of interest.

When the first wave of the Aryans entered India they got mixed with the Australoid and Negroid peoples already living there. The newcomers were likely to have annexed many of the words of the natives, if they had any speech. History has many instances of conquerors, or peaceful settlers adopting the language of the new country, or at least extensively borrowing from it. Such a thing might have happened in India as well. But it is now quite impossible to say what words the Aryans borrowed from the natives, because we have not the foggiest notion of the language or languages spoken by them. The fact that the essential vocabulary of most Indian languages, including Tamil, is derived from Sanskrit roots makes it highly doubtful whether the

pre-Aryans of India had any language worth borrowing from. So far as Tamil is concerned all available evidences show that it began its literary existence in the 7th century A. D., when Sanskrit literature had already passed its heyday, and was fast declining towards its virtual end in the 10th century. Tamil literary forms and expressions follow closely those of Sanskrit. Within historical times it is Tamil that has borrowed extensively from Sanskrit. Even Mr. Sivaraja Pillai, who has a veiled dislike for Sanskrit, handsomely acknowledges Tamil's indebtedness to it. Therefore it is impossible to accept the view that Sanskrit borrowed from Tamil, unless there is clear evidence to the contrary. Another fact confirms the view that Tamil has borrowed from Sanskrit and not Sanskrit from Tamil. In all Tamil grammars there are rules for Tamilizing Sanskrit words. But there are no rules in Sanskrit for Sanskritizing Tamil.

Some people, like the Ceylon missionary already referred to, claim in their ignorance such patently Sanskrit words as 'gopuram' to be Tamil. They should be ignored. But others like Mr. Mark Collins, who ought to know better, in their eagerness for originality, have turned philology inside out to prove that Sanskrit words are of Dravidian (Tamil) origin. Mr. Collins begins by saying that 'kala:' is probably from Tamil Ka:l (leg, foot, $\frac{1}{4}$). But soon after he gives away his case by admitting that kala: is found in the Rig Veda. The generally accepted view is

that the Rig Veda verses were mostly composed when the Aryans were outside India. Therefore it is certain that they could not have borrowed 'kala:' from the Tamils of the extreme south of India.

Another argument he advances is that 'kala:' has no parallel in the other languages of the Indo-Aryan group, and therefore, it must have been borrowed from a non-Aryan language. He has forgotten that there is an alternative to borrowing - the word might have been coined by the Vedic Aryans long after they left their original home. There are thousands of Sanskrit words which have no parallel in Greek or Latin or German. It will be absurd to assert that all of them, or any of them have been borrowed from other languages unless there is clear evidence. But the most effective way to demolish his theory is to take a Sanskrit word which has a parallel in another Aryan language. Such a word is Skt. ardhā, English and German-half, (Latin-hemi). The Tamil word அரை is derived from it. So it seems that Sanskrit borrowed only கால் ($\frac{1}{4}$) from Tamil, but Tamil struck a better bargain by borrowing அரை ($\frac{1}{2}$) from it, and (the names of) many other fractions! According to Sri T. P. Ranganathan, (Head of the Sanskrit Department, Salem College), கால் is derived from Skt. khe:le: (காலால்) வீளையாடு. I think he is right. Khe:le: must have been derived from a Sanskrit root meaning கால், and this root must have been crushed out of existence by the frequent tread over it of the more popular pa:da (foot or $\frac{1}{4}$).

Another gentleman who arrives at sweeping conclusions without sufficient data and without sufficient knowledge, is Dr. Gilbert Slater. He is very fond of saying that Indian students are very much prone to this sort of weakness. This is a case of the pot calling the kettle black. He enters the hospital wards of Kumbakonam, and the Doctor there, with a wide sweep of his right arm tells him, "All these are Sourashtras down with venereal disease," and with another sweep of his left arm he tells him, "All these are Brahmans down with the same disease". This Doctor of Political Economy takes the word of the Doctor of Medicine as gospel truth, and jumps to the conclusion that most of the Sourashtras and the Brahmans of that town suffer that disease. It is strange that this statement is introduced in his book on the Dravidian Elements in the Aryan Culture.

His Economic works on India look like being partly based on imperfect data gathered by immature minds. Some one of his students appear to have told him that the Lingam and the Na:mam are representations of sex organs. People in India, who worship the Lingam or wear the Na:mam, never think of them in that way. Only people whose minds run on obscene lines can visualize these as such things. For the matter of that, such people see obscenity in many things which are really innocent. There is no authoratative religious work to support

Dr. Slater's view. It is likely that Saivite and Vaishnavite controversialists of a low order might have bandied such views.

The primary meaning of the word lingam is token or symbol. Its secondary meaning is symbol of sex or sex organ. It is this secondary meaning that has mislead foreign scholars into thinking that the lingam is a phallic symbol. But really the lingam is only a stone that represents the divine being. In primitive times, when man worshipped stocks and stones and trees, it is but very natural that men should have been attracted by the smooth oval stones found in river beds, and that he should use them as symbols of God. As a stone of this kind could not stand upright, a pedestal with a socket was devised, and the stone was set in it. This is called lingam or symbol of God and not symbol of sex. The Sakti cult of Bengal of the 13th century A D. might also have been another fact that mislead foreign scholars about the lingam.

Dr. Slater, who appears to know no Indian language except a few words of Tamil, not always very correctly learnt—he calls 'na:mam' nama:n—has written "The Dravidian Elements in the Aryan Culture". In this he says that in the Minicoy Island, situated some 500 miles to the west of Trivendrum, the people have the duo-decimal system of reckoning, which is a relic of the old Dravidian

Mr. Rawlinson says that the Tamil word ka:ruppu means cinnamon. It does not. It only means pungency, and is a derivative of Skt. kshara. He must have been misled by some Tamil scholar whose help he took. That Hebrew tuki-im is a derivative of Tamil தோகை (peacock) is only a mistake, first made by Dr. Caldwell, and repeated unthinkingly by others afterwards. The primary meaning of தோகை is the tail feathers of the peacock, or a leaf which looks like a collection of feathers as the young coconut frond at the top. It means peacock only figuratively, as synecdoche, or part put for the whole, and this figurative usage of the word is found in Tamil literature only after the 10th century A. D. It is preposterous to make a word about a thousand years old the parent of tuki-im which must be more than four thousand years old, and to build on the fortuitous resemblance of these two words the fiction of an enormous trade between South India and Palestine and other Middle East countries.

Tamil அரிசி became aruz in Arabic and oruz in Greek. But there is no evidence that this word was added to Arab or Greek vocabulary before the 4th century A. D., when Europe got acquainted with rice through Arab traders. It is noteworthy that there is no parallel word in either Hebrew or Egyptian. In the list of Tamil words from Skt. Tamilized in various ways (page 36), it is shown that அரிசி is derived from Skt. vri:hi (T. vari, Tu. ari). அரிசி

may also have been derived from Skt. akshata, unhusked rice or paddy, but the same word means in South India rice without husk. Canarese 'akki' is certainly from Skt. akshta. Tamil nursery word அச்சி closely resembles akki, and obeys also the rule of Canarese preferring guttural k to the sibilant s of Tamil, and it is only a variant of அரிசி.

Ginger is a derivative of Skt. shringavera. but Mr. Rawlinson says that it is from Tl. இஞ்சிவர், or இஞ்சிவேர், a word which has no existence in Tamil. It is called only இஞ்சி.

Another striking example of how foreigners go wrong in writing about Indian languages which they do not at all know, or know them only imperfectly is the equation established between the gibberish 'kothos' and the Canarese 'kodisu'. According to Mr Rawlinson a Greek drama of the Second century A. D. mentions the incident of a Greek lady being ship-wrecked in the Canarese coast — the locality being identified by the fact that the king of the country addresses his retinue as 'Indon promoi', which means only 'Indian chiefs'. How can 'Indian chiefs' who may belong to any part of the vast country refer to the very small area of the Canarese coast? In the same drama the word 'kothos' is used, and a Greek character explains this as 'piein dos' (meaning given to drink). Dr. Hultsch says that 'kothos' is from the Canarese word ko(d)isu. The learned Doctor

is entirely wrong. 'Given to drink' means 'addicted to drink', but kodisu means 'cause (something) to be given'. There is also another Canarese causative verb ku(d)isu which means cause (one) to drink, not necessarily liquor. The Canarese word for 'addicted to drink' is ku(d)iya-drunkard. Evidently Dr. Hultsch, who does not appear to have known the Canarese language, asked a Canarese pundit, who did not know much English, to give the Canarese word for 'given to drink', and the pundit not knowing the meaning of 'given to drink', gave him the word ko(d)isu which only means (cause to be) given, and so Dr. Hultsch blundered.

All this leads us to the conclusion that 'kothos' was a word invented by the Greek author to give versimilitude to the incident in the drama, and that it has nothing to do with any known Indian language. Further this gibberish does not warrant the inference that even before the 2nd century A. D. the Greeks had commercial intercourse with the Canarese country. It is on such false foundations many hasty theories on Indian history have been built.

Greek and Roman authors of the early centuries of the Christian era mention many Indian place names. Most of those connected with Northern India are near enough to the Indian names, and so they are easily identifiable; but most of those names connected with South India bear so remote a resemblance to the

Indian names that they cannot be identified with certainty. But European scholars, especially those who are ignorant of the South Indian languages, are cock-sure of the identifications which they establish. Muziris may be Muyiri-kotta or Cranganore. But Nelkynda supposed to be a corruption of Ni:lakan(t)a (this is quite unusual as a place name). Kamara supposed to be Kaveripatnam, Poduca supposed to be Puduchery, and Soptama supposed to stand for Su Pa(t)na or the 'fair city' of Madras are some of the other identifications. Mr. Rawlinson places Nelkynda, a port of the Tamil country, in the back-waters of of Cochin! Supa(t)na is a completely Sanskrit term, and not likely to have been the name of a Tamil port in the 1st century A. D. If Soptama is Supa(t)na, then Kaveripatinam would have been written as Kamaraptama, but it is only Kamara. Puduchery postulates a Pazhayachery. It is not likely that Puduchery existed in the 1st century A. D. The older town might have existed then. Further, there were no definite ports in South India then. Any coastal town was a port, and ships anchored near it.

V ABORIGINAL LANGUAGES.

It is often stated that the aborigines are the remnants of the original inhabitants of India, or, the Dravidians. But as already stated in II chapter of this pamphlet, they form stagnant groups left behind in hills and forests by one of the earliest waves of the so called Aryan invaders. Ethnologically they also belong to the prevailing Mediterranean type. Scholars of the last century thought that their languages contained the proto-Dravidian elements of the South Indian languages. But recent investigators have found that the aborigines have no distinctive languages of their own, and that their meagre vocabularies are made up of words from the well-developed languages spoken in the surrounding areas. For instance, the Santals of Bengal speak a language composed chiefly of Bengali and Hindi. The language of the Gonds of Central India is composed of words from Tamil, Telugu, Tulu, Marathi and Hindi. The Toda speech is mainly Canarese, and so it is closely allied to Tamil and Telugu. No doubt aboriginal languages contain some words that are not found in any of the cultivated languages of India. But they bear absolutely no evidence of proto-Dravidian elements in them.

Let us examine a few essential words from each of the Santali, Gondi and Toda languages representing respectively North India, Central India and South India. The words marked with the asterisk are from Dr. Grierson's 'Linguistic Survey of India'.

Santali:—

English	Santali	Sanskrit	Hindi
I	in* } indo }	aham	ham (we)
you	am* } amdo } apa (plural) }	tvam	tu, tum (pl)
he	ach* } uni* }	—	a:p voh
one	mit*	—	—
two	bara* } bar* }	—	—
three	po:nea* } po:n* }	—	—
tree	dare*	da:ru	—
fruit	jo*	—	—
earth	at } dharti* }	—	dharti
water	dak* •	odaka	—
fire	sengel	—	—
cow	gai*	go	ga:ye
dog	seta*	—	kutta
bird	che(d)e	—	chi(d)iya

Fourteen essential words have been given above. It will be seen that ten of them are from Hindi or Sanskrit. They appear to have coined their own names, like the South Indians, for the first few numbers. But the most striking thing about the words is that they have no connection with Tamil words except in the case of pronouns which have been derived from Sanskrit in both the languages.

Gondi:—

English	Gondi	Sanskrit	Hindi
I	nanna*	—	—
you	immat* immar* (plural) }	—	—
he	o:r*	—	—
tree	mara* maram }	—	—
flower	phul*, pungar	—	phul
fruit	fadka	phala	—
earth	dharti* to(d)i }	—	dharti
water	ye:r	—	—
fire	kis*	—	—
cow	tali* murra	—	—
dog	na:i	—	—
bird	pi(t)(t)e	pakshi T. pitta }	—

Four of the Gondi words are distinctly from Sanskrit or Hindi. The pronoun 'nanna' is from Telugu, and immat and or are derived from Hindi 'tun' (Skt. yushmad and tvam) and voh. Therefore seven of the twelve words given above are of Sanskrit origin. Mara is from Tulu, and if the derivation of this from Skt. Druma by inversion, and of na:i from Skt. shvama are accepted, then nine of the words are from Sanskrit. Kis (fire) is onomatopoeic or sound echoing sense; and yer (water), and tali (cow) appear to be words of local coinage. Evidently, their numbers have Hindi names, and so Dr. Grierson has not mentioned them.

If the Gondi language of the Central Provinces represents the ancient Dravidian tongue, the numerals in it should suit the octaval system of reckoning (according to Mr. Collins) or the duo-decimal system of reckoning (according to Dr. Slater); but they do not. Had these gentlemen known that the Gonds can count upto only seven in their own language, and that they use Hindi names for numbers above seven, they would have pinned their faith to the septenary system of reckoning of the Dravidians. Through the kindness of the Rev. V D. Sahayam of Patpara, Mandala C. P., I get the following Gondi numerals from one to ten: ontal, rendo, moondu, and na:lu, seiyam, sarun, and eru; and anna, thonma and padth. Rendu, moondu, and na:lu are clearly from Tamil; eru may be either from Tamil or Telugu; and anna, thonma and padth are clearly from Telugu. The

Rev. Sahayam says, "The books contain numerals upto ten in Gondi, but nowadays no one is able to count beyond seven in Gondi, and then they switch on to Hindi". From all this it seems that the Gonds were nomads of the Tamil country who wandered into the C. P. and settled there. That is why their language contains words from the languages of the districts through which they passed, in the same way as the language of the Sourashtras bears clear evidence of their long trek from Guzarat to South India.

Toda words as given by Dr. Grierson:—

English	Toda	Language from which adopted
I	a:n	Tamil or Tulu <i>யான்</i>
you	niv	Telugu
he	adum, avan	Tamil
tree	mae	do
flower	puf	do
fruit	—	—
earth	bu:mi	Sanskrit (Canarese)
water	ni:r	Tamil Skt (<i>Nirā</i>)
fire	nerp, dilo, etc.,	Tamil
cow	da:na:m	Probably from K. <i>danakara</i> (cattle)
dog	na:i	Tamil
bird	bitti, belt	Telugu

All the above words except *nerp* have already been shown in this pamphlet to be of Sanskrit origin. Therefore the definite conclusion from a study of some essential vocabulary of the three typical aboriginal languages is that they (aboriginals) had no languages of their own, that they have adopted the words of the cultivated languages around them, and that they (languages) do not disclose any proto-Dravidian language.

VI

THE TAMIL ALPHABET.

That the Tamil alphabet is derived from the Brahmi of North India has been established beyond doubt by Sri T. N. Subramania Iyer in his "பண்டைத் தமிழ் எழுத்துக்கள்". The opinion that Brahmi is derived from the ancient Phoenician alphabet, that the Tamil alphabet is directly derived from the same Phoenecian alphabet, and that it does not owe anything to Brahmi, is only an assertion without proof. A tabular presentation of the development of the Tamil alphabet at various stages is annexed, as such a thing is not found in the valuable work of Sri T. N. Subramania Iyer. Only letters that show striking resemblances to the Brahmi originals are taken for comparison. These resemblances are too close and too many to be due to chance coincidences. A glance at the table will carry conviction to the reader much more clearly than several pages of wordy argument.

Some are of the opinion that the va(t)(t)ezhuttu (வட்டெழுத்து) was the original Tamil alphabet. Va't)(t)a comes from Skt. vartula and ezhuttu from Skt. likita. This va(t)(t)ezhuttu is found only from the 8th century A. D. onwards for a few centuries. The table will show the close resemblance between

TABLE SHOWING THE EVOLUTION OF TAMIL ALPHABET FROM BRAHMI

MODERN TAMIL	அ	ஆ	ஈ	உ	எ	ஏ	க	ச	த	ந	ப	ம	ய	ர	ல	வ
BRAHMI	𑀅	𑀆	𑀇	𑀈	𑀉	𑀊	𑀋	𑀌	𑀍	𑀎	𑀏	𑀐	𑀑	𑀒	𑀓	𑀔
VENGI 4th C., A.D.	𑀅	𑀆		𑀈		𑀊	𑀋	𑀌	𑀍	𑀎	𑀏	𑀐	𑀑	𑀒	𑀓	𑀔
CHERA 467 A.D.	𑀅	𑀆		𑀈	𑀉		𑀋	𑀌	𑀍	𑀎	𑀏	𑀐	𑀑	𑀒	𑀓	𑀔
WESTERN CHALUKYA 578 A.D.	𑀅	𑀆		𑀈			𑀋	𑀌	𑀍	𑀎	𑀏	𑀐	𑀑	𑀒	𑀓	𑀔
EASTERN CHALUKYA 680 A.D.	𑀅	𑀆		𑀈			𑀋	𑀌	𑀍	𑀎	𑀏	𑀐	𑀑	𑀒	𑀓	𑀔
PALLAVA 700 A.D.	𑀅	𑀆					𑀋	𑀌	𑀍	𑀎	𑀏	𑀐	𑀑	𑀒	𑀓	𑀔
CHOLA GRANTA 11th C., A.D.	𑀅	𑀆			𑀉		𑀋	𑀌	𑀍	𑀎	𑀏	𑀐	𑀑	𑀒	𑀓	𑀔
GRANTA 1383 A.D.		𑀆		𑀈	𑀉	𑀊	𑀋	𑀌	𑀍	𑀎	𑀏	𑀐	𑀑	𑀒	𑀓	𑀔
BRAHMI	𑀅	𑀆	𑀇	𑀈	𑀉	𑀊	𑀋	𑀌	𑀍	𑀎	𑀏	𑀐	𑀑	𑀒	𑀓	𑀔
VATTELUTTU 8th C., A.D.	𑀅	𑀆	𑀇	𑀈	𑀉	𑀊	𑀋	𑀌	𑀍	𑀎	𑀏	𑀐	𑀑	𑀒	𑀓	𑀔
TAMIL 1080 A.D.	𑀅	𑀆	𑀇	𑀈	𑀉	𑀊	𑀋	𑀌	𑀍	𑀎	𑀏	𑀐	𑀑	𑀒	𑀓	𑀔
BRAHMI	𑀅	𑀆	𑀇	𑀈	𑀉	𑀊	𑀋	𑀌	𑀍	𑀎	𑀏	𑀐	𑀑	𑀒	𑀓	𑀔

the va(t)(t)ezhuttu and Brahmi, which is repeated in the table three times to make comparison easy. The Brahmi letter shapes are those in Sri T. N. Subramania Iyer's book and the other letters have been copied from Dr. Burnell's book on South Indian Palaeography. The letter i: (𑌕) has got two forms in Brahmi, and both are given one below the other. The Pallava, Chola-granta, and va(t)(t)ezhuttu 𑌕 and 𑌕, among others, show clearly the influence of Devanagari ३ and ३. The final shapes taken by Tamil letters generally bear indications of Nagari influence. As the 'Indian Antiquary' says, "Brahmi is the true national writing of India, because all late Indian alphabets are descended from it, however dissimilar they may appear at the present day".

It is sometimes argued that, if Tamil had copied or adapted the Brahmi script, the Tamil alphabet would have the letter b, as the sound is found in the Tamil language. But the Jains who created the Tamil language aimed at a system of simple sounds, and a simple grammar. That is why they adopted only the first letter of each of the complicated sounds of k, ch, (t), t, and p group of sounds, and dropped the rest, as in grammar they dropped the grammatical gender and the dual number, among the other complications of Sanskrit. They were then not aware of the linguistic law that under certain conditions a voiceless consonant may become a voiced consonant. For instance 𑌕 (t) becomes (d), when it comes after

a voiced consonant, and when it is not duplicated, as in வடகம் and கடு. All vowels are voiced. Those who do not understand this law of assimilation say that (t) becomes (d) in Tamil medially. The Jains meant that வடகம் and கடு should be pronounced only as va(t)aka and ka(t)u as in Sanskrit. But the law of assimilation operated against their design, and the sounds (d) and d and b came into being, and threw a double burden on (t), t and p. க becoming ஞ instead of 'ga' is due to the law of laziness—an aspirate glides off the tongue more easily after a vowel than a guttural g.

VII

SOME GRAMMATICAL AND PHONETIC POINTS.

It may be useful to emphasize here that the presence of a very large number of Tamil words not traceable to Sanskrit sources will not make Tamil a non-Aryan tongue. For instance, a very large number of words of Latin origin in English has not made it a Romance language. It is still a Teutonic language by reason of its essential vocabulary and grammatical structure being Teutonic. Many Muslims mistakenly think that Urdu is non-Aryan and non-Hindu, simply because a very large number of Arabic words not understood by 99 per cent of both Hindus and Muslims have been added to the Hindi frame work. By adding more Arabic words they can make Urdu look as un-Indian as they like, but they can never make it a non-Aryan tongue so long as it stands on Hindi foundation, and is contained within the frame-work of Hindi grammar. So also Tamil cannot become a non-Aryan tongue, so long as it stands on Sanskrit foundation, and is contained within the frame-work of Sanskrit grammar. There is a close connection between Sanskrit and Tamil grammars. 'Sandhi' rules are unknown to languages outside the Sanskrit group. Hindi, in spite of its patent parentage, has completely discarded 'sandhi'.

Probably Tamil is the only Indian language which follows 'Sandhi' rules more rigorously than even Sanskrit. This one fact is enough to show the affinity between Tamil and Sanskrit grammars.

The dative case ending in k is common to all the Sanskrit dialects of the North and the South Indian languages. For example, Hindi usko (to him) and Tamil அவனுக்கு. The genitive ending in n, though not found in Hindi, is found in Gujarati and Marathi of the north and also in Tamil. For example, Gujarati 'ja(d)nu', Marathi 'ja:(d)cha' or (ja:(d)cheni) and Tamil செடியின். The feminine ending i is found in Sanskrit as well as in all the other Indian languages, though the dative and genitive endings given above are not found in Sanskrit. Tamil syntax or sentence structure very closely resembles that of Hindi and Sanskrit. The above facts point to only one conclusion: if Hindi is admitted to be a language of the Aryan group, then Tamil is also a language of the same group.

Tolkappiam claims to be based on the non-existent Sanskrit grammar called Aindram, though modern scholars have stated that it follows Panini. This fiction was evidently created to give Tolkappiam the glory of having existed before Panini. The earliest Canarese grammar (10th Century A. D.) also claims to be based on Aindram. The earliest Telugu grammar (11th Century A. D.) is based on Panini,

and calls Telugu only a 'vikriti' (changed form or derivative) of Sanskrit. Nannaya, its author, who lived nearly a thousand years ago, and who was in a better position than we are to judge correctly, has told the real truth about the origin of Telugu. For that matter, all South Indian languages are only 'vikritis' of Sanskrit.

If the earliest Canarese and Telugu grammars were written about the 10th century A. D., it is highly probable that the earliest Tamil grammar Tolkappiam must have been written about the same time. All these sister languages adopted similar alphabets about the same time, and kept abreast of each other in their progress, and the people talking them lived in contiguous areas. Therefore, it does not stand to reason to say that the earliest known Tamil grammar was written or composed (for Tamil had no written form then) more than 15 centuries before either the Canarese, or the Telugu grammar came into existence. Tolkappiam is undoubtedly one of the greatest grammars of the world, and its greatness does not depend on its age.

Here are a few interesting points in comparative philology:— v and b are interchangeable sounds in most Indian languages. As Tamil does not possess b, it uses v for Sanskrit b. If the Sanskrit word has v, Tamil retains it, while Canarese prefers b to v, e. g. Skt. varuṭa, Tl. வாவல் (bat), and K. baval.

Tamil prefers ச to க, and Canarase vice versa—
 Tl. சிறு விரல் and K. kirubiral. Telugu, on the other
 hand, is most partial to the musical susurrous of
 ஸ, ஷ, and ஜ (the last is being now replaced by 'za',
 though there is no letter to represent it) — Tl. கை
 and T. chei. There is a strong tendency in Canarese
 to change pa or ba into ha. — Tl. பால், and K. ha:lu.
 In Tamil ம and வ are sometimes interchangeable. —
 மானம், வானம்; வீழி, முழி. I have already referred
 to யமன் changing into நமன், and யான் into நான்.

The Tamil alphabet must have been completely
 phonetic long ago, but now it has become slightly
 unphonetic. The ordinary, clearly enunciated ஁,
 and குற்றியலுகரம் (short ஁); k and g; t and d etc.
 are represented by one letter for each pair. குற்றிய
 லுகரம் is a misnomer, for it is not really a short ஁,
 but an obscure vowel like the final vowel in 'water'.
 மங்கிய உகரம், or தெளிவற்ற உகரம் would be
 better names.

Some time back Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar drew
 the attention of the makers of the Tamil Lexicon to
 the fact that it did not differentiate between the two
 sounds of க. One of the authors said that they did
 not do so, because க was pronounced by some as g,
 and by others as h wherever it was not pronounced k.
 This explanation is not satisfactory. Only Canarese
 and Telugu speaking people, and some Tamilians
 who live in their midst, or who have been warped
 a little by their English education pronounce the

word முருகா as 'muruga'. Almost all Tamilians in
 Tanjore, Trichy and Madura districts pronounce it
 either 'muruha' or 'murukha' (kh faintly resembling
 that in Urdu 'khan'). The Lexicon should have
 adopted 'muruha' as the standard pronunciation and
 'muruga' should have been condemned, or atleast, not
 recommended. The neutrality of the Lexicon in
 this matter is making 'muruga' increasingly popular
 especially in the music world. Think of காகம் being
 pronounced as 'ka:gam'!

Some years ago a gentleman, with more audacity
 than learning, was going about boasting of Tamil
 phonetics which prevailed in South India many
 centuries back, and which he gave himself the credit
 of having re-discovered. But really the system
 was his own crude invention. As he appears to have
 been ignorant of the first principles of the science of
 phonetics, he made his system only a caricature of
 true phonetics. He transgressed the very first
 principle of phonetics viz. 'one letter should represent
 only one sound'. But his one letter 'aydam' repre-
 sented three sounds. When this was pointed out to
 him, he said that his was Tamil phonetics and not
 English phonetics, as if there could be Tamil Physics
 different in principles from English Physics!

VIII

SCIENTIFIC TERMS.

There has been a good deal of pother about scientific terms in Tamil. The greatest trouble comes from fanatical purists who want that every term should be pure Tamil, and that even those terms in current use should be dropped, if they had been adopted from other languages. They have tried their hand at coining pure Tamil scientific terms, and the result is rather a grotesque jargon. Their attitude is due to their ignorance of the fact that pure languages are as non-existent as pure races in the world. All languages are mixed up affairs. In most cases the mixing up took place in the remote past. So in most cases it is impossible now to pick out all the foreign words in a language. But in the case of Tamil the belief that it is a non-Aryan tongue has been fostered for such a long time by interested people, or by men who were unaware of its Aryan origin that it has gained the force of an axiomatic truth. Further, a fiction was created that a glorious age of Tamil literature existed two or three thousand years ago, and that it owed nothing to any other literature or language. Therefore the presence of thousands of Sanskrit words in Modern Tamil is regretted by the linguistic patriots, and regarded by the Brahman-baiting politician as a disgrace. These

people believe that Tamil can regain its past glory only by purging itself of all foreign elements, especially Sanskrit.

The story is told of a translator of a certain law court who achieved comic results in his renderings of Tamil into English on account of his lack of capacity. It is enough if three of his achievements are given. A witness in a case said in Tamil “அவன் அறுபது அடி கடப்பாறையால் கதவின்மேல் அடித்தான்.” This was translated by the clerk into “He beat the door with a sixty feet (foot) crowbar”. The European judge could not understand how it was possible for an ordinary man to lift a crowbar sixty feet long. But one of the lawyers set right the matter by informing the court that the witness meant only that the man struck sixty times at the door with a crowbar. On another occasion the same clerk is said to have translated ‘toll gate’ into ‘leather gate’, as toll-gate is generally pronounced தோல் கேட் in Tamil. The third example of his translation is that of “மொட்டை மாடு” into ‘widow-bull’! But the purists who coin scientific terms achieve tragic rather than comic results. Their renderings puzzle the teacher as well as the taught. For instance, the committee for Historical terms may consist of a Professor of History, who knows much History, but only a little Tamil, a Professor of English who knows a little History and may be a little Tamil, and a Tamil Pundit who probably knows neither English nor History. The

result is that the committee translates 'The Age of the Brahmanas' into பிராமணர்களின் காலம்! If unfortunately the committee contains a fanatical purist, very strange terms are coined. Even the authors forget the meaning of some terms of their own invention, and use them in different sense in different places!

For the sake of rapid progress in science it is desirable that the terms should be common to as many nations as possible. The European nations have used Latin and Greek for coining terms. If India also adopts the English scientific terms, Indian scientists will find it easier to follow scientific progress in Europe and America. This is the wisest, and at the same time the easiest course. But if for some reason Indians decide to coin their own scientific terms, it is highly desirable that the terms should be common to the whole of India. Sanskrit, the common heritage of all Indians (even Urdu belongs to the Sanskrit group), would be the best material for minting the Indian scientific terms.

IX

THE ANCIENT CIVILIZATION
OF SOUTH INDIA.

The opinion is almost universal that there existed in South India a better and earlier civilization than the Aryan. I should be the last person to disturb this pleasant notion, but the interests of historical truth impels me to say that I have not been able to discover the slightest evidence, except the highly doubtful and undeciphered one of Mohenjo Daro, that any civilization other than the Aryan existed anywhere in India before Alexander's invasion. Many other invasions took place, but the invaders got completely merged in the Hindu population. Even the Muslims have got merged in the common life of India, though they retain their separate religion. But now vigorous attempts are being made to keep them apart from the Hindus.

It is generally accepted that the Sangam Literature consisting of Purana:nu:ru, Pattupa:(t)(t)u etc form the earliest works in Tamil. Tamil scholars assign to it a date varying from 10,000 B. C. to the first century A. D. This one fact is enough to show that other factors than truth and logic have played a prominent part in Tamil chronology. Mr. Sivaraja Pillai who appears to have done much chronological

investigation thinks that Purana:nu:ru is earlier than even Tolka:ppiam and assigns to the former a date about the first century A. D. He has tried to be impartial, but failed as the Aryan bugbear has frightened him (though much less than it has done others). Almost all European investigators have been of the opinion that the beginning of Tamil literature is not earlier than the 7th century A. D. Some of them put it much later, as late as the 15th century.

Dr. Burnell says, "But though it is certain that the beginning of the Tamil literature may be safely put about the ninth century, there is nothing to show that there was any way a literature before that time. The legend of Agastya's settlement in the South is, of course, historically worthless; and though the three Dravidian kingdoms were undoubtedly ancient, we have nothing about their condition till Hiuen-Tsang's visit to the peninsula about 640 A. D. He says of the inhabitants of Mo-lo-kiu-tcha: (Malaku:(t)(a): 'Ils ne font aucun cas de la culture des lettres, et n'estiment que la poursuite du lucre.'" (Hiuen Tsang says that the South Indians had no literary culture). Dr. Burnell continues, "He (Hiuen Tsang) mentions the Nigranthas or Digambara Jains (ascetics) as the most prominent sect in the South, and this corresponds with the actual remains of the early Tamil literature which are in fact Jain, but he would have hardly said what he does if the grammars and the Kural had then existed."

Mr Sivaraja Pillai and some others say that the Purana:nu:ru gives us a picture of an ancient civilization earlier than the Aryan, and uncontaminated by it. Its very quaintness, he says, is a mark of its great age. He also takes pride in stating that it is a well of Dravidian language pure and undefiled, and that the presence of a few Sanskrit words in it has no appreciable effect on it. This shows in what estimation he holds Sanskrit. According to him Sanskrit is a foul thing whose presence in Tamil pollutes it. But really the civilization that is pictured in it is not strange. Only the artificial literary devices are queer. The verses in Purana:nu:ru describe people who are very similar to the lower classes living with us at present. Accounts given of them in it are not materially different from any account that may be given of the lower classes of today. I may not be far wrong, if I say that the lower classes in North India do not materially differ from the Purana:nu:ru people. Their way of living, their material civilization, their ignorance and poverty and superstitions are of the same type. The chief customs of the Purana:nu:ru people do not much differ from the customs still observed by the lower classes in South India. The higher classes in Purana:nu:ru are the same as in the Aryan system viz. Kings, Princes, Brahmins, Banias (வணிகர்), and Vellalars (K. Ballala-பலவாள்) answering to the Kshatriya caste, and the rest, viz. Maravars, Kallars, Kuravars etc. were the Sudras. It is true that there is not

found in South India the clearest fourfold division of the people. This is due to the fact that the Jains and the Buddhists, and not the Brahmans, were the earliest agents of civilization in the South.

I give below a tabular statement of the Purana:nu:ru customs compared with those of the Aryans, so that the reader can easily see the similarity between them. In many cases the customs are the same:—

Subject.	Purana:nu:ru.	Aryan.
1. Disposal of the dead.	Both burial and burning are mentioned. Sometimes the corpse is put under a pot called தாழி and buried. This word தாழி itself is from Skt. stali.	Burning, but the ashes are put in a pot, and buried in a river-bed.
2. Sati.	Sati is mentioned.	Satigamana was an important North Indian practice suppressed by Lord W. Bentinck.
3. Funeral rites.	Offering 'pinda' to the dead.	This is a peculiarly Aryan custom.
4. Widowhood.	Removing the jewels and shaving the head of the widow.	A characteristic Aryan (ill) usage.

5. Suicide. Starving oneself to death for salvation. for getting salvation, Jain penance called salleka:na by the Jains and ஸட்கிருத்தல் in Tamil, as the person must sit facing north. Facing north is tell-tale. Salleka:na is a Jain penance brought to South India by them.
6. Marriage. King Pari's two daughters are given to Brahmanas, when the South Indian princes refused to marry them. This is Aryan 'anuloma' marriage—a girl of a lower caste marrying a boy of a higher caste.
7. Messages. Sending a message through a swan. This is a Sanskrit literary device.
8. Religion. Animistic beliefs and rude village gods. Gods, Brahmanic beliefs, Yaga etc. are mentioned. In North India there is less of superstition and village gods owing to constant wars with the Muhammadans.
9. Mythology. Mythology and legends are almost completely Aryan.

Mr. Sivaraja Pillai who acknowledges freely the great Aryan contribution to South Indian religion, philosophy, literature, science and art, asserts that there are characteristically Dravidian elements in the South Indian civilization. He does not definitely

say what these are. He vaguely refers to the South Indian system of agriculture, industry etc. But I find no marked difference between South Indian and North Indian methods of agriculture, and pottery, brick and tile making, metal-ware manufacture etc.

I admit that there are minor differences between the North and the South. But such differences can be found between any two groups of people, whether in North India or South India. Punjabee customs differ from those of the United Provinces, and both these differ a good deal from those of the Marwadis. But on account of those differences we do not say that they belong to three different civilizations.

Mr. Sivaraja Pillai calls Purana:nu:ru "naturalistic poetry". By 'naturalistic' he means poetry which describes nature as Wordsworth's poems do. But Purana:nu:ru is neither 'naturalistic' nor poetical. It contains very little description of nature that is remarkable or poetic. Its verses are highly artificial and prosaic and confused. The division of poetic compositions into திணை and பால் is a valueless technicality of old Tamil prosody, a Jain ingenuity to make Tamil look quaint. In மலை படு கடாம் (பத்துப் பாட்டு) the way to a certain place is described with a wealth of useless details. If the directions given in it are followed, it will lead one nowhere. It is also impossible to say after reading it which hill, or which part of South India is described in it.

Another device in Tamil prosody is ஆற்றுப்படை. Many of the pieces in Purana:nu:ru belong to this type. In this kind of composition an aboriginal (now called Adi-Dravida) mendicant, poet, singer, or dancer, who has gained fabulous wealth (such as a thousand elephants or a 'ratha' or many lakhs of gold coins) from a prince, directs another mendicant to go to him, and be relieved of his poverty. The exaggerations and fulsome flattery contained in these verses bear a strong family likeness to the verses or words used by Brahman mendicants to tickle the vanity of their patrons. To regard such highly artificial literary devices as the distinctive mark of the Dravidian civilization is poor compliment to the great body of Tamil literature which is not inferior to any other.

Mr. Sivaraja Pillai has rightly characterised the three deluges and the three Sangams as legends, and not historical. He is likely to be also very right in thinking that these legends were created by the only historical Sangam which existed about the 11th century A. D. 'Sangam' itself is a tell-tale word. It is of pure Sanskrit origin. It was very popular among the Buddhists and the Jains, who invariably called their religious gatherings and associations 'Sangams'. If a real Tamil Sangam had existed ten or five or even two thousand years ago, it would have been called by a Tamil name, and not by a Sanskrit name.

I strongly believe that all the Sangam literature was created by Jain Sangams between the 11th century and the 13th century A. D. My reasons for this conclusion are the following:—

(1) 'Sangam' itself is a tell-tale word most popular among the Buddhists and the Jains. It is known that a Jain Sangam existed about the 11th century A. D. There is absolutely no reliable evidence of the existence of previous Sangams other than the evidence of the legends. It is curious to note that the Buddhists had three great Sangams, and Tamil literature talks also of three Tamil Sangams. The reference in them to Karikala, Senguttuvan and Gajabahu are not references to kings contemporaneous with the Sangam. The Jain Sangam authors used these names that had floated down the centuries to establish the claim that their works belonged to the hoary past. There were more than one Karikala and Gajabahu, and some of them lived only a few centuries before the Jain Sangam. The Gajabahu synchronism of which much has been made is really worth nothing, as we do not know which Gajabahu is meant.

(2) Tamil literature itself should have begun about the 7th century A. D. Most European scholars think so. "Anything written is literature". As we know for certain that Tamil inscriptions begin only from the 7th century A. D., Tamil literature, in the literal sense, could have come into existence

only after that time, though a period of popular songs and ballads must have preceded it. The use of the alphabet is a definite landmark in the history of any civilization. Brahmi as well as Canarese and Telugu inscriptions are found before the 7th century A. D. So writing and inscribing were not unknown to the South Indians. The fact that Tamil inscriptions are found only after the 7th century creates a strong presumption that the Tamils began to use the Tamil alphabet only a short time before the 7th century. Further, one of the pieces in Purananuru says that on the graves of heroes were planted stones with their names inscribed on them. This definitely dates Purananuru as a work produced after the 7th century A. D.

(3) One of the pieces in Purananuru refers to Kapilar taking Parri's daughters to a Hoysala prince of Dwarasamudra. According to competent historians the Hoysala dynasty ruled from the 10th to the 13th century A. D. This fact much more definitely dates the work between the 10th and the 13th century A. D.

(4) The earliest North Indians to come to South India were the Jain and the Buddhist missionaries, Kshatrya and Vysia adventurers, in search of kingdoms and wealth, must have come with their many followers, and settled here. The many Buddhist and Jain idols seen in South Indian villages bear

testimony to the Buddhist and Jain influence. Brahmanic influence was exerted strongly only after the Pallavas began to reign in Kanchi in the 4th century A. D. Before that a few fugitive Brahmans might have entered South India. Probably, they formed one in ten thousand, of the population. Brahman tradition is that the Pallavas established the first Brahman settlement at Kanchi under their liberal patronage in the 4th century A. D. Pattuppa:(t)u, one of the Sangam works closely resembling the style of Purana:nu:ru, refers to Brahman quarters, and says that fowls and dogs should not approach them. Therefore it is very correct to assume that Pattuppa:(t)u could not have come into existence before the Brahman settlements were made in South India in the 4th century A. D.

(5) Purana:nu:ru mentions the Onam festival. Onam is Tamil for Skt. sra:va(n)am. This is the most important annual religious rite of investing oneself with the 'holy thread'. Its Sanskrit name and Brahman character point only to one conclusion viz. that the Brahmans introduced the festival in South India. It is observed as a popular festival only in Malayalam. In the Tamil country it is observed only by the castes wearing the 'holy thread', and these form only a small minority of the population. As the first Brahman colony was at Kanchi in the 4th century A. D., they would have taken at least a century to settle a colony in Malayalam, and

it would have taken at least another century before O(n)am became a popular festival. This also enables us to conclude that Purana:nu:ru could have come into being only after the 6th century A. D.

(6) The statement, that in the so-called Sangam Age the people of the Tamil, Malayalam and Canarese districts spoke only Tamil, and that poets like Kapilar visited the courts of Chera, Chola, Pandya and Hoysala kings, and sang of them in the common language Tamil, is all legend, for if that had been so, then the characteristic words of the Sangam literature such as திணை, பால், யாழ், தடாரிப்பரை, குறிஞ்சி, முல்லை, and கொற்றவை must be found in those languages. But they are not. Dr. Burnell says, "The Chera inscriptions show that the Canarese language had the peculiarities which now characterise it, already, in the 5th century A. D.; and Tamil inscriptions of a date a few centuries later prove the same of that language. It is, therefore, almost certain that the three great Dravidian languages had, already, separated and assumed their characteristic forms some two thousand years ago". This fact also falsifies the statement that in the so called Sangam Age (1st to 3rd century A. D.) only Tamil prevailed in the three South Indian kingdoms.

Argument (3) is clinching. That is to say, it establishes with certainty that Purana:nu:ru is a work of a date later than the 10th century A. D. The

assertion that it pictures an ancient Dravidian civilization is all bunkum. It must have been the work of the Jain Sangam. In some of the "Sangam works" there is a studied avoidance of using Sanskrit words, and to some extent Hindu legends, Hindu religion and Sanskrit literary models. The Jains and the Buddhists also coined a large number of Tamil words on Sanskrit models, but so camouflaged them that their Sanskrit origin could not easily be discovered. All this was by design. By these means they aimed to create the impression of there having been long ago a distinct civilization with a Tamil atmosphere.

The question may be asked why should they take such pains to create a fiction of this kind. It is the bitterness in their hearts—bitterness caused by a kind of persecution for which only the stories of the Spanish Inquisition can have a parallel. All this was done with the connivance, or with the open approval of the Brahman ministers. So the Jains who were the chief agents of the post-Vedic Aryan civilization in the South from the 4th century B. C. to the 8th century A. D., and who were chiefly responsible for developing the Tamil language on Sanskrit lines turned against their oppressors, and owing to their weakness they could only surreptitiously undermine Hinduism and Sanskrit by the 'Sangam literature'. Soon after they ceased their vain efforts, the flood gates of North Indian civilization opened wide, there was then born the truly glorious Tamil literature of Kambar, Puhazhe:ndi, Ottakuthar and others.

It is claimed that Tirukkural is another famous work that illustrates the pure Dravidian genius and civilization. I have already stated that திரு comes from Skt. sri, குறள் from the Skt. root ku (little), and வள்ளுவர் (the author's name) is from vallaba (lord or master). It appears that in the days of Jain persecution those of the Jains who submitted to the Hindus were granted their life, but degraded to the class of Panchamas. On account of their learning the Jains became the highest caste among the Panchamas. Even now the highest caste among them is called வள்ளுவர் who are the teachers, astrologers and priests of that class. But as soon as the period of cruel persecution ended many of them went back to Jainism. Tiruvalluvar must have been one of them, or a descendant of one of them. The existence of the Jain Sangam of the 11th century A. D., the fact that the Jains of South India praying to குறள் நாயுடார் even today, and the straight-laced uncompromising moral principles of his book point to the author having been a Jain scholar with much Sanskrit and Tamil learning.

குறள் is said to correspond to the Sanskrit su:tra metre. At least its political principles are very similar to those of Kautilya's Arthasha:stra. But its strict avoidance of questionable political methods advocated by Kautilya is another pointer to the author of குறள் having been a Jain. Except that it more studiously avoids the use of Sanskrit words than even Puranu:nu:ru, it does not bear any trace of anything

that is non-Aryan or un-Aryan or anti-Aryan. It gives absolutely no evidence of a separate Pravidian civilization. It may not be much out of place here to point out that Kural is not poetry in the same way as Nannu:l or Tholka:ppiam is not poetry. It is only a codified collection of moral aphorisms in verse, in many places closely following in the foot-steps of Kāṭilya. But as a book of moral aphorisms very neatly presented, it has no equal in the world, though it is a matter for regret that its style is abstruse.

Both Silappadika:ram and Ma(n)ime:kalai are fictions similar to Harichandra Na:takam. But the orthodox take them for true history. One may as well regard Baron Munchausen's Tales or Tena:li Raman stories as histories. A king named Sengu(tt)u-van might have reigned. But the rest of the story has been created out of the brain of the author. The word Adigal in I(l)ango: Adigal, the fictitious author of Silappadika:ram, comes from Skt. rishi (இருமிகர், அமிகர்). One of the incidents in the story is enough to cast serious doubt on the book's claim to historicity. Because the king was led into a grave error by a single goldsmith, he is said to have ordered that all goldsmiths in his realm should be put to death, and the order was carried out! Both these books must have been written between the 10th and the 13th centuries. The civilization that is pictured in these works is almost the same as the Hindu culture of the present day minus the modern features such as the railways.

Apart from legends and flat assertions of faddists, there is absolutely no evidence of there having existed any great civilization in South India before the Pallavas. No buried cities have been unearthed—not even a doubtful Mohenjo Daro. No archeological remains, no numismatic evidence except the Roman coins, no pottery or metal vessels or ornaments displaying skill, no definite statement by foreign writers or travellers, no inscriptions or magnificent ruins to remind us of a past and forgotten glory. Almost all inscriptions before the 7th century A. D. are in Sanskrit. All the archeological remains date from the 4th century A. D. The great South Indian temples were created from the 9th century A. D. Their very existence is due to Aryan influence and culture. Even the names of such ordinary and useful things as ஆணி, ஊசி, உலக்கை, and ஏந்திரம் are Sanskrit. Even the name of the home of the Tamils viz. தமிழ் அகம் is a gift from Sanskrit — அகம் is from Skt. o:kus (English house). It has already been stated that the Tamil alphabet is derived from the North Indian Brahmi script.

Much is made of the two facts that the three South Indian kingdoms are mentioned in one of Asoka's inscriptions, and that some Roman coins of about the first century A. D. have been found in South India. The first only means that the Jain and the Buddhist missionaries had so far succeeded as to organise three small kingdoms in the South, and

obtained for them from Asoka the honour of being mentioned in his inscription.

On the slender foundation of some Roman coins found in a few places is built the legend of the great Tamil navy which ploughed the ocean from the Mediterranean to the China Sea, and brought to our land the riches of many lands. This is often supported by the literary quotation “*திரை கடலோடியும் திரவியம் தேடு*” — the word *திரவியம்* gives it quite a modern ring, and betrays its false claim to ancient origin. If really Tamil ships had gone to Rome, and Tamil traders had seen its glory, which was not less than that of fictitious Sengu(tt)uvan's India, Tamil literature would have given at least an inkling of what the Tamil visitors had seen there. While Roman writers have much to say about India — no doubt, much that is vague, obscure and incorrect — Tamil literature has absolutely nothing to say about Rome or Italy, or the Romans or their ways of life. Even the Tamil name for Romans is Skt. Yavana. The truth is that in those far of days no Tamilian went to Rome and returned to tell a tale. No Tamil ships did so either. Foreign traders, most probably Arabs, brought the Roman coins to South India after the 7th century A. D., or it might have been that only North Indian traders who had settled in the wild south carried on the trade with Rome etc. The coin hoards are those left by them. Alexander's invasion brought to North India fine Greek

coins which were quickly imitated by Indian rulers. If the Roman coins had been known in South India in the first century A. D. there would have been Chola or Pandya imitation of them soon after. But actually they were imitated in South India only after the tenth century. Therefore the Roman coins could not have been known in the South before the 7th or 8th century.

It is also often stated that the Tamil kings conquered and spread the Tamil civilization over the East India Islands, Siam and Indo-china. We know nothing about these conquests. But we know for certain that it was the Aryan civilization and the Sanskrit language that have spread over those lands. In Bali Hinduism still prevails. In Java the most popular book among the Muslim population is said to be the Ramayana, and not Kural or Purana:nuru. The great Angkor Vat temple of Indo-China contains idols of Brahma, Vishnu and Rudra, and not of வீரன், முனியன் or பாவாடை if these village gods could be regarded as Dravidian by a stretch of the imagination. The Kings of Siam are called Prajadhikok and Ananda and not செங்குட்டுவன், இளங்கோ அடிகள், செஞ்சேட் சென்னி, நலங்கிள்ளி or பாரி or ஓரி. The languages of those countries have borrowed many Sanskrit terms, but no Tamil word, as far as I know. In Ceylon the Singhalese language has been highly Sanskritized, while in South India Sanskrit has been highly Tamilized and incorporated in the language.

This Tamilization of Sanskrit words has been carried to such an extent as to mislead and fool philological investigators. The persecuted Jain missionaries saw the advantage of dividing people into Aryan and Dravidian, as later missionaries, rulers and politicians found their strength only in the perpetuation of such divisions.

There is no evidence that there existed long ago in South India any musical instruments other than the various kinds of parais (தம்பட்டம்) mentioned in Puranu:nu:ru. The யாழ் of which much has been made appears to have been a primitive stringed instrument (the strings being made of guts) bearing no likeness at all to the veena. Unfounded, vague but highly boastful claims are made about பண் which is derived from Sanskrit bandh (compose verses or poems), H. bun and Tl. பண்ணு. இசை is another word often employed as potent specific for the inferiority complex. But this இசை is from Sanskrit root yuj (verb — yoke or combine, and noun — harmonious combination of sounds).

There has been a South Indian or Karnatic system of music. The basic principles of this and Hindustani music are the same. *The very sounds sa:, ga:, and da: indicate clearly the origin of the Saptaswaras. Singhalese music is now completely Hindustani. Popular Tamil music, as evidenced by the cinema, is fast becoming Hindustani. I believe that

in less than fifty years South Indian music will be completely replaced by Hindustani music in the Tamil language. It is untrue to say that there existed a Dravidian system of music; and the present day Tamil Isai is nothing but Sanskrit or Hindustani system of music with only the words in Tamil. The song “அத்திமுகவனை நித்தம் நித்தம் பணிவேன்”, so popular in my boyhood, was sung in an English tune. Though the song may be called Tamil, the music is English. Therefore the correct name for such music is “Tamil language music”, or தமிழில் இசை, and not தமிழ் இசை.

It is also wrongly believed that there is a separate system of Dravidian architecture. Buddhist viharas and chaityas, and Jain temples were the basic types on which South Indian architecture is modelled. The Pallavas and the later Cholas between the 4th and the 14th century modified and developed the Buddhist and Jain styles in the full blast of Brahmanic influence. To call the 10th and 11th century temples examples of Dravidian architecture is a misnomer. It is more correct to call them South Indian.

I have attempted to prove in this pamphlet that there are no such ethnological groups as Aryans and Dravidians in India, that Tamil is an Aryan tongue, that no great ancient civilization existed in South India, that the Tamil alphabet is descended from Brahmi—a little modified later by Na:gari — that

Tamil grammar closely follows the principles of Sanskrit grammar, except in a few cases where Tamil improves upon Sanskrit such as dropping grammatical gender, that Tamil syntax or arrangement of words in a sentence closely follows Hindi, that the 'Sangam literature' was the work of the Jains between the 11th and the 13th century A. D., that the contribution of Sanskrit to the literature religion, philosophy, art, science, law, system of government etc., of South India is very great, that it is a silly notion that a civilization or language which is prior to another gains greater respectability by the mere fact of priority and not by merit, and that it is an equally silly notion that language which borrows words from another loses respectability. Tamil has avoided many of the mistakes of Sanskrit, and has enriched her vocabulary by large borrowings from it. Kamban's poetry would have been impossible but for this borrowing. In this kind of borrowing there is no sorrowing, as the debt is not meant to be repaid. There is no language in the world which has not borrowed, and English, the greatest language of all times, has borrowed more than any other language.

The proper place of Tamil is in the noble group of Aryan languages spoken in both the hemispheres by the largest number of mankind. But I wish to emphasise that the Aryan origin of Tamil is stated here as a truth and not as the reason for its greatness. Tamil greatness depends on its intrinsic

merit and not on its descent. It is now better understood than formerly. The claim of superiority or special rights by birth is silly, though now in our land official preferment and admission to educational institutions go by birth, and not by merit. However, to be in a noble company is a matter for some pride. Wherever in India a language of the Aryan group is current, people speak in accordance with Sanskrit idioms and usage, think in its terms, are governed by the laws of its dharma shastras and take their religion, philosophy, science and art from that source.

Tamil is the greatest of the living languages of India. It is earnestly hoped that its future development will be guided in schools, colleges and journals by wise and tolerant people who know the elements of the Science of Language, and that faddists and fanatics will not be allowed to check its growth on natural and familiar lines, and strew the path of unborn generations with thorns.

APPENDIX.

While this pamphlet was in the press, I happened to see the Presidential Address of Mr. S. Vaiyapuri Pillai at the Dravidian Languages Section of the All India Oriental Conference, Nagpur (October, 1946). Some of his views agree with mine. He has noted the prevailing intolerance in the Tamil Country of the views that go against the traditional and accepted beliefs based on legends or fabricated literary history, which are too transparent to be believed by any one with a scientific attitude of mind. He says that even bringing down the date of a Tamil classic by a few centuries later than the accepted one, for very sound reasons, is bitterly opposed. I am afraid that my own thesis, which destroys the strongly held, and well-nigh universal belief that Tamil is non-Aryan, and that it had nothing to do with Sanskrit in very ancient days, will be regarded by the orthodox as a sacrilege, and by the educated Arya-phobe as an attempt to lower Tamil in the estimation of the people, though I have disclaimed any such motive, and though it is clear that the merit of a work does not depend on its date. Only fools, whose present is unenviable, draw satisfaction from their past. There are many

Indians who lay a flattering unction to their heart by proclaiming the fact that, when their forefathers were weaving the finest muslins. Englishmen were wandering unclothed in their forests. This kind of pride will certainly not clothe the millions of half-naked fakirs of India. Pride in the past is valueless unless it eggs one on to greater effort and progress.

Mr. Vaiyapuri Pillai has also stated that the presence of *μ* in a word is no guarantee to its being a pure Tamil word. On the other hand, I have gone further by stating that the presence of *μ* in a word should generally be regarded as a pointer to its Sanskrit origin. My list of words Tamilized with *μ* was compiled in 1942 with the help of a small Tamil dictionary which gave only one meaning viz. an assemblage of learned men for the word கழகம். I have derived கழகம் from Skt. gha(t)ika, by which name the Brahman centre of culture at Kanchi was known in the 4th century A. D. But Mr. Vaiyapuri Pillai has derived it from Skt. glh (gambling den or dice). My own opinion is that கழகம், meaning assembly, is derived from the Skt. root gha(t)a, while கழகம், meaning dice or gambling place, is derived from Skt. karanj, H. karanj or kalkaranj, T. gajjaka:i, Tl. கழஞ்சு, கழங்கு, and கழற்கொடி (bonduc nut) which were used as dice. The former meaning appears to be earlier and more widely known than the latter. In Malayalam it bears the first meaning alone. Seendan

(Skt. Jayantan) Divakaram, a Tamil dictionary which is claimed to be of the 8th century A. D. by the Tamil Lexicon, because it refers to the Chalukyas and Rashtrakutas, but which, for the same reason, I believe to be a work of a date later than the 10th century, does not give the second meaning கலித் கலிகை and குறள், which use the word in the second sense, must be later than Divakaram—most probably they are of the 13th century.

Copies can be had of:

KRISHNA PUBLISHING HOUSE,

No. 4, Mettu Street,
SALEM.

Vani Vilas Press, Shevapet, Salem.
Q. H. No. S 15-Copies 500-Date 15-5-47.