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INTRODUCTION.

The Sanskritic element in the vocabularies of the Dravidian languages is so large that it has often been urged with much show of reason by orthodox pandits that Dravidian languages can claim no originality independent of Sanskrit, that, in other words, Sanskrit is the mother of the South Indian languages. This is only the popular view shared by illiterate people along with the orthodox pandits whose learning knows no analysis nor comparison. Grammarians of the Dravidian languages have clearly pointed out that the languages they deal with are different from Sanskrit. The grammarian of each language has indicated in a way that there is the Dravidian language pure to be differentiated from Sanskrit. Thus, the Tamil grammarian (the author of the Naṉṉul) frames certain rules to govern the words imported from Sanskrit. The Telugu grammarian (Ketana, the author of the Āndhra-bhāsa-bhūṣanamu) differentiates the pure Telugu words from Sanskrit words. The Kanarese grammarian (Keśiraja, the author of the Šabdamaṇidarpaṇam) devotes a whole chapter (Ch. VII) to the tadbhavas. Malayālam grammar is recent, and the author of the Kerala-Pāṇinīyam (published in 1896) makes such a distinction (p. 335).

But none of these, except the last, who had the benefit of western learning and of the researches made by orientalists like Dr. Gundert and Dr. Caldwell in the nineteenth century recognized the relation of the Dravidian languages to each other. Tamil grammarians, for instance, regarded Telugu words and even Malayālam words as ticaiccol, 'words from other quarters.' They divided words into three classes: (1) pure Tamil words, (2) Sanskrit words, and (3) ticaiccol. This classification would group all foreign words, together, Arabic, Persian, Telugu, Malayālam, Tulu, Kanarese, etc. This classification was of course unscientific. When a certain word that was not found in Tamil literature or used by the Tamil-speaking people, happened to be employed by
an author perhaps owing to his contact with, say, the Telugu people, it was set down as a Telugu word and a tīciccol. One cannot deny that there were people at various times conversant with more than one of the Dravidian languages. Still it was not before Dr. Gundert, Dr. Caldwell, and other European scholars pointed it out that it was recognized that Tamil, Telugu, Kanarese and Malayālam were sister-languages and that they all belonged to the same stock that may be termed Dravidian.

In olden times Sanskrit was looked upon with such great respect that it led to the popular belief that it was a divine language, the language of the gods (compare the Tamil name for Sanskrit, girvānam). Even scholars looked up to it for solution of all intricate problems in all departments of knowledge. Kētana or Abhinavadāndin, the author of perhaps the earliest Telugu grammar Āndhra-bhāṣā-bhūṣānamu, a work unquestionably of the thirteenth century, accepts that Sanskrit is the mother of all languages (verse 13). Another Telugu grammar, the Nannaya-bhaṭṭiyamu, for which is claimed an earlier date but which has been proved to be a spurious work by Mr. Veeresalingam Pantulu in his Lives of Telugu Poets, is written in Sanskrit. It was wrongly ascribed to the great Nannaya Bhaṭṭa, the author of the Telugu Bhārata. The earliest Kanarese grammar, the Kāṇṭakaka-bhāṣā-bhūṣānam, was written in Sanskrit by Nāga Varma whose date according to B. L. Rice is 1070–1120. (Introduction to the Kāṇṭakaka-śabdānuśāsanam.) He wrote a vṛtti for it also in Sanskrit. Bhaṭṭākalaṅka Dēva completed in 1604 his exhaustive grammar of Kanarese in Sanskrit sūtras, the Kāṇṭakaka-śabdānuśāsanam by name, with a commentary, also in Sanskrit, called Bhāṣā-maṅjari, and a further voluminous commentary on the latter, in the same language, called Maṅjari-makarandah. Even in modern times, Rājarāja Varma, the author of the Kēraḷa-Paṅṇiniyam, named his work after the great Sanskrit grammarian. In Tamil, Svāminātha Deśikar, who wrote his Ilakkaṇakkottu to explain, as a grammar of grammars, the intricacies of Tamil grammar, goes out of the way in his introduction to the work to praise Sanskrit and cry down Tamil. Says he:

"To Tamil works there is no limit. But is there one among them that is written in pure Tamil? Besides, wise men will hesitate to even mention that there is a language formed of five letters. So do I, understand. Grammar is the same for Sanskrit and Tamil." By the five letters the author means e, o, l, r, n, not found in the Sanskrit alphabet. Another author, Subrahmanyā Dikṣitar, a contemporary and fellow-scholar of Svāminātha Deśikar, derives the name of the language t밀, from a Sanskrit word drāvida. His work, the Prayōga-vivēkam, was written to explain the application of Sanskrit grammar to Tamil literature. These authors flourished in the seventeenth century.
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The earlier Tamil grammarians, however, did not hold this extreme view. They, no doubt, ascribed sanctity to Sanskrit, but this did not make them lose their regard for their own language. It is remarkable that there is no Tamil grammar written in Sanskrit as in the case of Telugu or Kanarese. People may be found even to-day who hold that Tamil is in no way inferior to Sanskrit, that the God Śiva was the author of Tamil as well as of Sanskrit, that while he taught the Sanskrit grammar to Paṇini, he taught the Tamil grammar to Agastya, by no means a less renowned sage. Paraṅcōti Munivar's Tiruvilaiyaṭarpurāṇam, and Śivajñāna Yogi's Kāṇcippurāṇam have verses endorsing this view.

In spite of their high regard for Sanskrit or their false view in respect of the relation of Sanskrit to the Dravidian languages, the grammarians of the Dravidian languages have differentiated Sanskrit words from the Dravidian, and some of them have reduced the changes which Sanskrit words undergo in the Dravidian languages to certain rules. The Tolkāppiyam, the earliest Tamil grammar extant, which cannot be assigned to any period later than the first century B.C. even by the severest critic of Tamil literature, is silent on the question of the Sanskrit origin of the Tamil language and even on its relation to the other Dravidian languages, but speaks of two classes of loan-words borrowed from Sanskrit, one the tatsamas so-called, and the other tadbhavas (Tolkāppiyam, Collatikāram, sūtram 401 and sūtram 402). All words found in Tamil Tolkāppiyar divided into (1) iyacol, 'plain words employed in ordinary speech', (2) tiricol, 'words employed only in literary works', (3) ticaiccol, 'words borrowed from languages spoken all around', and (4) vatacol, 'the speech of the North, or Sanskrit words.' In dealing with vatacol, the grammarian speaks first of the borrowings in which the letters peculiar to Sanskrit do not appear, and then of corrupted 'words. The first class I named tatsamas and the other tadbhavas following the terminology of later times. A commentator of the Naṟṟul employs these words. Tatsamas he explains as words formed of letters common to Sanskrit and Tamil. This definition, of course, must be modified in the case of Telugu or Kanarese or even Malayāḷam in consideration of the fact that these languages have a fuller alphabet, and 'common' is meaningless with them. They can bodily adopt the Sanskrit words without any change whatever except perhaps in the case of terminations peculiar to Sanskrit. Tadbhavas he explains as words formed of letters peculiar to Sanskrit as well as those common to Sanskrit and Tamil, and corrupted to a greater or less extent from the original Sanskrit. This definition will apply to the tadbhavas in the other Dravidian languages above-named, only the question of letters is meaningless. Tadbhavas are corrupted Sanskrit words. Dr. Pope translates tatsamas as unmodified words and tadbhavas
as modified words (A larger Grammar of the Tamil Language in both its dialects, 1859).

The Kanarese grammars come next in point of antiquity. Dr. Kittel in his Kannada Grammar (p. 432) has given a classification of words accepted by Kesava, the author of the Šabdamaṇidarpanam, and his learned predecessors. He says: "The Kannada language consists (1) of words that are peculiar to the country (deśiyas) or are pure Kannada (accaganna); (2) of words that have been borrowed from Samskṛta without any alteration (samasamskṛtas); (3) of words that have been more or less corrupted from Samskṛta (apabhramšas or tadbhavas), regarding which it is to be remarked that they may also (in speaking or writing) be used in their original form; (4) of some words (about 21) that exist in Kannada as well as in Samskṛta (tatsamas and compounds with them), or are, as it were, Kannada and Samskṛta." The Kanarese grammarians seem to have employed tatsama in a peculiar sense: some tatsamas mentioned are aṅgana, gōṇi, tala, bala, maṅca, maṇi, male. The tatsamas of Telugu and Malayalam would correspond to the sama-samskṛtas of Kanarese. Tamil tatsamas also would come under the same category with the limitations already pointed out. The Kanarese grammarians do not seem to have recognized what in Tamil are called ticaiccel unless they regarded them as deśiyas.

The Telugu grammarians have classified words in a similar way. The Andhra-bhāṣa-bhūṣaṇamu, for instance, divides them into (1) tatsama, e.g., vanamu, purusudu; (2) tadbhava, e.g., lacci (S. laksni-), vivvaccuddhi (S. bibhatsu); (3) accurtenugu, e.g., tala, gudi; (4) deśya, e.g., inti, makkvua; and (5) grāmya, e.g., yidu, yinuti (verses 18 - 25). Tatsama and tadbhava apply to Sanskrit. Of the other three divisions, accurtenugu corresponds to accaganna, deśya corresponds to the deśiyas of Kanarese in the sense of provincialisms; and the third grāmya is included in either of the above in Kanarese and denotes the vocabulary of the illiterate.

Cinnavya Suri, in his Balavyakaraṇamamu (edition of 1910, page 6), gives two kinds of tatsamas, (1) tatsamas borrowed direct from Sanskrit: S. rāma-, Te. rāmu; S. bhū-, Te. bhuvī; and (2) tatsamas derived through Prakrit: S. agni-, Pr. aggi, Te. aggi; S. rājni-, Pr. rāṇi, Te. rāṇi. He gives also two kinds of tadbhavas, (1) tadbhavas borrowed direct from Sanskrit: S. aśa-, Te. ašamu; S. sūci-, Te. sūdi, and (2) tadbhavas derived through Prakrit: S. pṛthi-, Pr. pudhavi, Te. pudami; S. lakṣmi-, Pr. lacci, Te. lacci. The remaining three appear in another form in his classification (1) deśya, probably denoting all Dravidian words in general, (2) grāmya, ungrammatical language, and (3) grāhyā, elegant usage.

The author of the Kerala-Paṇintyaṁ, in his Šabda-śodhini (fourth edition, 1910, page 131) gives an exhaustive classification of Malayalam words,
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(1) ābhyantaram (indigenous)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>svantam (own)</th>
<th>sadharaṇaṁ</th>
<th>dēṣyaṁ (provincial)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g., andi, pörri</td>
<td>e.g., maḷa (Ta., Ka.)</td>
<td>e.g., appa, palutura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cippi (Ta., Ka., Te.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) bāhyam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tatsamam</th>
<th>tadbhavam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.g., sukham, daya, manassu</td>
<td>prakṛti, vikṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from Sanskrit)</td>
<td>S. rājan- , aracan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaldi (from Persian), and klāśu, 'class' (from English)</td>
<td>S. piśaca- , pē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. śāstar-, cūtian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng. hearing , iraiiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng. hospital , āspatri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eng. France , paraiki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The authors of the Vyākaraṇa-mitram (second edition, 1908, p. 184) divide the words in almost a similar way:

Malayālam ...

1. svantam, e.g., ālca, eta.

2. ābhyantaram, e.g., eli, katu.

Vaidēśikam ...

1. tatsamas.

2. tadbhavas.

Vaidēśikas denote words derived from Sanskrit, Arabic, Hindustani, Persian, Syrian, Portuguese, and English. Tadbhavas are words that have been altered to suit the genius of Malayālam, and tatsamas are those that have not been thus altered, but are pronounced as they are found in the original language. Thus the Malayālam grammarians classed Sanskrit words with words from foreign languages, and did not accord them the dignity that the Tamil grammarians or the grammarians of Telugu and Kannarese accorded them. That is but natural in this age of western culture.

In thus reviewing the classifications of words by the indigenous grammarians, we have seen that only the Kannarese grammarian ventured to suggest that certain words found in Kannaḍa as well as in Sanskrit were common to both, that in other words, the Kannaḍa words far from being derived from Sanskrit, have been borrowed by Sanskrit. For the other grammarians the criterion must have been, as it is even to-day for the learned pandits, that the fact of a certain word being found in the Sanskrit lexicon sets it down as Sanskrit. It is sacrilege to think that the divine Sanskrit has to borrow words from any human language.

The author of the Prayōga-vivēkam admits, however, that manalūrpuram in the Sanskrit Vyāsa-bhārata is a dēśika word. By the way it may be mentioned that he regards as pure Tamil words the names of two months Āṭi and Tai which correspond, as
tadbhavas, to the Sanskrit months Āṣāḍha and Taiṣa respectively. Naccinārkkiniyar, the great commentator, in his commentary on the Tolkāppiyam. (Collatikāram, p. 45) contends though with little reason that ulakam and kālam are pure Tamil words. For he says, "the author would not exemplify a rule by citing Sanskrit words." Yet, as a matter of fact, there are following these tevyam (S. daiva-), and pūtam (S. bhūta-), which are clearly Sanskrit words. It is interesting to see that minam did not strike this Naccinārkkiniyar as a Sanskritized Tamil word min (Tolkāppiyam, collatikāram, p. 233). Even Sanskrit writers regarded it as a Drāvida word, i.e., a Tamil word (Kumārika Bhaṭṭa's Tantravārttika).

Again, we have in Tamil so many as ten lexicons (nighantaḥ) or dictionaries in verse, e.g., the popular Cuḍāmani-nighanta (a work of the ninth century A.D.) or the older Pingala-nighanta. But none of these can help us to determine whether a particular word is Sanskrit or Tamil. They are at best a collection of synonyms under various heads classified according to subjects. The eleventh book of these nighantaḥ is devoted to the description of words with different meanings. An ancestor of the present writer elaborated this division into a separate work and named it Nanártha-dipikai. This work has not yet, however, seen the light of day. But it may be mentioned that it is by far the most exhaustive work extant containing, as it does, a large number of Sanskrit words which the author corrupted himself so as to be useful for any future translation of Sanskrit works. Again, that was the first work in Tamil to contain a section corresponding to the Sanskrit Ēkākṣara-nighanta. As regards the scope of the nighantaḥ, the other Dravidian languages do not seem to have fared better. Kanares has the Kāṇṭāṭaka-sabda-mañjarī by Tōṇṭadārya whose date, according to B. L. Rice, is A.D. 1480. It is said to be a vocabulary of tadbhava and Kannada words in 120 saṭpadī verses. An earlier work, the Maṅga-raja-nighantu or Kavi-maṅgaḥbhidhāna by Abhinava Maṅga Raṇa (A.D. 1398–1433) is described by the same authority to be a valuable dictionary in Kannada verse on the plan of the Amara-kōṣa giving the Kannada meanings of Sanskrit words commonly used in the language. The Telugu Āndhra-nāma-saṅgrahamu, and its supplement, the Āndhra-nāma-sēṣamu, like the Kanarese Kāṇṭāṭaka-sabda-mañjarī, are vocabularies of tadbhava and Telugu words. But no attempt has been made to distinguish tadbhavas from pure Telugu words. Modern commentaries, it must be mentioned, do give the original Sanskrit words in the case of tadbhavas. These are a little better than the Tamil nighantaḥ, which do not exclude the tatsamas. And tatsama in Kanarese and Telugu means a good deal.

Coming to the regular dictionaries, the first for Tamil was the Caturakarāti written by Father Beschi (printed for the first time in 1819). That was, however, only a re-arrangement of the matter
contained in the nighantus so as to facilitate reference. It was a small work. Native writers improved upon it in course of time and put forth larger and larger dictionaries. The largest is considered to be the best by the ordinary people, and writers have been vying with one another to give a greater number of synonyms with the result that often in the case of Sanskrit words meanings unknown to Tamil literature are found bodily transferred from Sanskrit dictionaries. The most exhaustive dictionary yet published, the Tamilcollakarati of the Madura Tamil Sangham, is no better. Moreover it is inaccurate and unscientific. It derives Ta. caïkai, "measure" from S. jangha- (p. 987) while the original word would seem to be S. saïkhyâ-. Again, it connects Ta. caïkù, "conch," with S. saïgu (ibid.), which word I am not able to find in the Sanskrit dictionaries. The proper word would be S. saïkha-. No Sanskrit connexion is shown for kalakam, "dispute" (p. 776), kôlam "a globe" (p. 972). The Sanskrit words are clearly kalaha- and göla- respectively. The Tamil words kattai, "fuel" (p. 718), kammadâr, "smiths" (p. 755), cêtî, "a Vaiśya" (p. 1150), lattam, "a fang" (p. 1204), are all given as pure Tamil words. They are surely Sanskrit words borrowed through Prakrit or Pali. Ta. cuṇṇam, "powder" is given as a tadbhava of S. cûryâ-. Right, but if Prakrit connexion were shown, it would be clearer. Ta. cûtâ "gambling" is guessed to be connected with S. dyûta-. A knowledge of Prakrit would make it certain. Mañikkâvâcâkar, in his Tiruvâcâkam, has used an expression atetu which has been puzzling many a pañḍit. This authority makes it a Telugu expression (p. 134). Those who have a smattering of knowledge of Telugu will tell us that they cannot understand the expression. Some scholars regarded it as Kanarese. But the expression is Malayâlam and means "what is that?" From the context, of course, it may mean 'here I am' and so on.

There are, however, Tamil-English dictionaries by Rottler and Winslow. They are old, but it must be acknowledged they served their purpose well in their own days. Why, Winslow has not been superseded yet. It is hoped that the Tamil dictionary, by some called the New Tamil Dictionary, which name was perhaps suggested by the New English Dictionary, to be published by the University of Madras, will be a standard dictionary.

The Telugu-English Dictionary by C. P. Brown is on a par with Winslow's. Sûtrarâmacâryulu's Šabdaratnakaramu is a valuable dictionary of Telugu viewed from the standpoint of orthodox pañḍits.

Dr. Gundert's Malayâlam Dictionary is a really good dictionary for Malayâlam and was written from a philologist's standpoint. It is full of philological matter and of suggestions for the student of the Dravidian languages. Dr. Gundert divides with Dr. Caldwell the honour of being the father of Dravidian philology.
Dr. Kittel’s Kannada Dictionary did for Kanarese what Dr. Gundert’s did for Malayalam, and more. Appearing much later it is fuller and much more helpful to the student of Dravidian philology. Further it is more systematic. The New Tamil Dictionary to justify its appearance must have at least the merits of Dr. Kittel’s work: An improvement on Dr. Kittel’s system will be certainly welcome.

Thus it is a good dictionary that can enable us to distinguish pure Dravidian words from Sanskrit or other foreign words. Dr. Kittel’s, for instance, differentiates the pure Dravidian words by printing them in bolder type. But no finality has yet been reached as regards the determination of the origins of words. Sanskrit words are the most puzzling. They are divided into tātsamas and tadbhavas as has been already pointed out. Tadbhavas are not easily discernible: A knowledge of the Prakritic languages and of Pali seems to be an essential for one who has to deal with Sanskritic tadbhavas in the Dravidian languages. For Sanskrit words have entered them not only directly but also through the Prakritic languages and Pali. Ignorance of these languages or at any rate of the phonetic laws that govern the importation of Sanskrit words in these has led, as in the case of the author of the Tamilcollakarati, to mistaking tadbhavas for pure Dravidian words.

Another error that besets the workers in this department of philology is to regard as Sanskrit whatever word is found in the Sanskrit lexicons. Sanskrit, like other languages, has borrowed from time to time words from languages with which it came in contact. Dravidian languages have certainly been among such. The author of the Prayoga-vivekam must have thought that he was doing a great service to Tamil when he conceded that manalur, a deśya word, was found in the Vyasa-Bharata. It needed a Dr. Gundert to proclaim to the world that Sanskrit was indebted in some measure to the Dravidian tongues so far as its vocabulary at least was concerned. For it was Dr. Gundert that contributed to the Journal of the German Oriental Society for 1869 an article on the Dravidian Elements in Sanskrit. Dr. Kittel contributed his on the Dravidian Element in Sanskrit Dictionaries to the Indian Antiquary for August 1872. Dr. Caldwell, in his Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian languages (second edition, 1875), has dwelt at some length on the same subject in part VII dealing with glossarial affinities (p. 452). He has fully utilized the materials contained in the articles above mentioned. One cannot, however, argue that Dr. Caldwell was inspired by Dr. Gundert or Dr. Kittel, for there is evidence in his work to prove that he has been himself thinking in the same groove. The labours of these orientalists enabled him to give a fuller treatment to the subject. More recently Dr. Kittel, in his Kannada Dictionary (1894), made a list:
of all the words he regarded as probably borrowed by Sanskrit from Dravida (Preface, p. XVII). They are 420 in number.

Much, however, remains yet to be done for Sanskrit itself in this field. Indo-Germanic words in Sanskrit in the first place must be differentiated from loan words, and the latter must be traced to their source as far as practicable. In Part II of August Fick’s Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Germanic Languages (1890) the word-stock of Sanskrit and other Indo-Iranian languages is dealt with etymologically. Dr. C. C. Uhlenbeck has written an Etymological Dictionary of Sanskrit. There is, of course, the grand Petersburg Sanskrit Wörterbuch (1855—1875). All these are in foreign languages, and on that account sealed books to many an earnest Indian student of Dravidian languages. Besides such works become old soon and have to be revised from time to time so as to embody the results of researches made by scholars.

If Sanskrit has borrowed from the Dravidian languages, it has flooded them with its own words. The relation of Sanskrit to these languages is often compared to the relation of Latin to English. The dictionaries of the Dravidian languages are full, too full of Sanskrit words. In modern literary composition they have become a necessity. But times there were when Sanskrit words were rarely used. People can be found among educated men who will challenge us to show a single Sanskrit word in the Tolkāppiyam or the Tirukkural or the Pattuppāṭṭu. Some time ago I heard a good Telugu scholar say that the Andhra-nāma-saṅgrahamu contains only pure Dravidian words. Tadbhavas, I suppose, he did not regard as Sanskrit. No doubt the Dravidian languages have words wherewith to express simple ideas; Sanskrit words are, however, necessary to carry on any complex process of thought. They are false patriots who would underrate the importance of Sanskrit words for modern needs and plead for purism in vernacular literature.

Sanskrit words have not entered the Dravidian languages all of a sudden or by design. To trace the connexion of Sanskrit with the Dravidian languages one will have to go far back to the early centuries of the Christian era. Taking Tamil, for instance, one is led to think that Sanskrit influenced it even in the centuries that preceded the birth of Christ. The earliest Tamil work extant, the Tolkāppiyam, already referred to, contains several Sanskrit words. Omitting words whose origin may be regarded as doubtful, the following may be given: teyam (S. dāiva-), kāraṇam, kālam, ulakam (S. lōka-), pūtam (S. bhūta-), varuṇam (S. varuṇa-), paruvam (S. parvan-), tātu (S. dūta-), nimittam, ēmam (S. kṣema-), mānam, uvamam (S. upamā-), kāmam, nātakam, mārdyam (S. mahārāja-), pinžam (S. piṇḍa-), aranam (S. śaraṇa-), tēm and tēyam (S. dēsa-), maṅkalam (S. maṅgala-), tāyai (S. sēna-), arac̣car (S. rājan-), tapatar (S. tāpasa-), avi (S. haviś-), pali (S. bali-), avaiyam (S. sābhā-), pakkam (S. pakṣa-), pēy (S. piśāca-), amarar (S. amara-), vannam
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(S. varna-), niccam (S. nitya-), karumam (S. karman-), karanam, amuta-
man (S. anta-), antaram, etu (S. hetu-), vatuva (S. vadhū-), kunam
(S. guṇa-), (peru-)mitam, uru (S. rūpa-), cuṇṇam (S. cūna-), mātirai
(S. mātra-), āyiram (S. sahasra-), cinnam (S. cīna-), cūtiram (S. sūtra-
patālam, mantiram (S. mantra-), kuṇcaram (S. kuṇjara-), manam
(S. manas-), vaicikan (S. vaiśya-), utthi (S. yuktī-), atikāram (S. adhi-
kāra-), āṇai (S. ājī-), ṇāpaka (S. jñāpaka-). Some of these
words, however, would go into Dr. Kittel’s list already referred to,
e.g., kālam, nātakam, pīntam, pali, pakkam, pēy, uru. The list of
Sanskritic words in the Tolkāppiyam given herein, is well nigh
exhaustive. Four of the words show distinctly Prakrit influence:
vaṇṇam, niccam, cuṇṇam and āṇai.

The Tirukkuṟaḷ has a larger proportion of Sanskrit words. The
very first distich contains āṭi (S. ādi-), pākavaṇ (S. bhagavant-), and
ulakku (S. lōka-). The Pattuppatṭu does not contain such a propor-
tion of Sanskrit words, true; but no one contends that it is an
earlier work on that account. It is the subject-matter often that
determines the proportion of the Sanskrit element in the diction
of a Tamil work of this kind.

If we regard this period as the first when Sanskrit words were
imported into Tamil, the next is the period of the Jain ascendency
when there was a large output of really good Tamil works. The
Jains, however, when they introduced Sanskritic words in their
works, introduced the Prakrit forms freely. The Maṇimēkalai,
the Cintāmaṇi, the Cūlāmaṇi afford us a number of examples of this
type of words: tammam (S. dharma-), accaṇandi (S. āryanandin-),
vatam (S. vrata-), kappam (S. kalpa-), uyyānā (S. udyāna-). The Jain
scholars not only wrote original kāvyas in Tamil, they translated
Sanskrit works; they wrote good grammars, of which the Naṇṇūl,
that remains to this day the most popular, was written by Pava-
ṇanti (Bhavanandin) in the twelfth century A.D.; they commented
on old Tamil works; they were perhaps the first to introduce the
manipravāla style of writing in Tamil. Āvakačarittiram, extracted
from the Śri-puraṇam in the second edition of the Tamil Jivaka-
cintāmaṇi, is an example of their activity in this direction. Possi-
bly the Vaišṇava writers who commented on the Nalāyira
Prabandhas were influenced largely by the Jain writers who
must have either preceded them or been their contemporaries.
The Śaiva literature has not many manipravāla works to boast of,
the Śaiva Tirumurais (the sacred literature) have not been favoured
with any exegesis similar to that for the Prabandhas. Sanskrit
scholars, Śivāgra Yōgin and Jāna Prakāśa wrote their commenta-
tories on the Śivajñāna-siddhiyar, a Śaiva Śāstra, in a Sanskrit-ridden
style that reads somewhat like manipravāla. During this period,
then, of the manipravāla style, Sanskrit words were borrowed
again directly from Sanskrit, because they were borrowed by
Sanskrit scholars from Sanskrit literature. In the period when the
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Tolkæppiyam was written, the Āryan Brāhmans had already come to South India and had even introduced their ceremonies and institutions. The Tolkæppiyam shows a medley of the Dravidian and the Āryan institutions. It shows distinct traces of the influence of the Āryan immigrants. During that period, therefore, the Āryans naturally introduced their vocabulary into the Tamil language. In the period of the Jain ascendancy, the Prakrit-speaking people must have come in contact with the Dravidians and given them the Prakrit forms of Sanskrit words. Early in this period, i.e., in the early centuries of the Christian era, Pali must have exerted considerable influence on the vocabulary of Tamil. Oldenberg, in his Buddha, thinks that Pali was once the popular language of Southern India (Uhlenbeck's Manual of Sanskrit Phonetics, Introduction, paragraph 5). The free intercourse between India and Ceylon in the early times must have indeed brought some Pali-knowing Buddhist priests to India and must have led in an appreciable measure to the enrichment of the Tamil vocabulary with Pali words. When Pali and Prakrit compete for consideration in tracing a Tamil tadbhava, it would be only fair to give the palm to Pali. Towards the close of the Jain period, however, the Tamil grammarians had systematised the borrowings from Sanskrit. The Naṟṟū, for instance, gives rules that should regulate the formation of tadbhavas. They do not, however, apply to Pali or Prakritic words. The rules nevertheless were adopted, and in later times, when Sanskrit words were borrowed, they were corrupted according to these rules only. That takes us then to the third period. Still later, in recent times, the Tamil alphabet was improved to admit Sanskrit words being transliterated as far as practicable by the addition of j, s, s, and h. Some have even added s. All these were borrowed from the Grantha alphabet. These letters were borrowed to represent such words as jayam, kaṭṭam, vastu, and hari, the tadbhavas ceyam, kaṭṭam, vastu, and āri having become classical. Some scholars would not stop here. They would push this principle of transliteration to an absurd length. If they had adopted the Grantha alphabet in toto, one would not have anything to say against them. They would transliterate Sanskrit words in Tamil with the defective alphabet they have, e.g., they would write kṛāṇam for S. grama-, iṣvayaṇ for S. iṣvara-, krusi for S. kṛṣi-, and sometimes would startle us with a hyper-Sanskritized false form like palāstikaṇ for S. balādhya-. There is, however, no need for such transformations.

Whatever might be the period when particular Sanskrit words entered Dravidian literature, they are all either tatsamas or tadbhavas as has been already pointed out: and tatsamas, according to Tamil grammarians, are formed of letters common to both Sanskrit and Tamil, e.g., vāri, mēru. One would like to make their scope a little wider and include in them Sanskrit words which undergo change in Tamil just to suit its special grammatical
peculiarities as for instance _parai_ for _S. parā_. Malayālam regards _sabha_ and _manassu_ as tâtsamas only, and Telugu regards such a word as _râmuḍu_ as a tâtsama. Kanarese, too, follows the same principle. The tâtsamas present little difficulty as a comparison of the vocabularies settles the matter at once. Only the question to which language a particular word belongs must remain open until we are able to make use of good Sanskrit and Tamil dictionaries paying special attention to the etymological side of these languages. The tadbhavas, however, present some difficulty. In the first place, the words should be identified with the Sanskrit originals, for often one finds sound-laws have been very active and corrupted words beyond easy recognition. Then the relation between the Dravidian form and the Sanskrit original should be established by an enunciation of the laws that have operated.

The aim of this paper is to take some tadbhavas more or less at random and to illustrate with them the sound-laws that have operated in the passage of words from Sanskrit to the Dravidian languages. It needs no apology that many terms have been taken from the spoken language. Philology is not concerned with literary dialects only. Again, more prominence will be found to have been given to tadbhavas in Tamil than in any other Dravidian language for the simple reason that the writer's acquaintance with those languages is not long enough to warrant him to speak of words in them with confidence. He has had to rely for the most part on the dictionaries in those languages, except in the case of Malayālam. His stay in Cochin and Travancore for a little time and his acquaintance, though short, with Malayālam literature has enabled him often to dispense with the use of the Malayālam dictionary. It is unnecessary to point out, perhaps, that the term tadbhava denotes, in this thesis, only the corrupted forms from Sanskrit. It is not used in that broad sense which the modern grammarians of Malayālam, for instance, give it.
SANSKRIT VOWELS.

Their treatment in Tamil and Malayalam Tadbhavas.

\[ a > i. \]

S. ācārya-, ‘a teacher’; Pa. ācariya; Ta. āciriyan.
S. pātala-, ‘name of a tree’; Ta. pātiri; Ma. pātiri; Ka. pādari; Te. pādiri.
S. ācārya- is ācariya in Pali (Andersen, p. 36). The Tamil tadbhava is surely from the Pali form. The change of \( a \) to \( i \) is noteworthy. It seems to be due to the long vowel of the first syllable, which is accented, and the influence of the ānaptyctic vowel \( i \) between \( r \) and \( y \). Ta. āciriyan, ‘name of a metre,’ may perhaps be connected with āciriyan, denoting, as it does, an old metre held in considerable esteem. The same remark applies to Ta. pātiri. The Prakrit form is pādala (Kumārapālacarita, III, 31). The decerebralization is due to Dravidian influence. S. pātala- is probably not a Sanskrit word.

This vowel-change is noticeable among Dravidian languages themselves.

Ta. kaṭā, ‘male of cattle’; Ma. kitāvū.
Ta. kaṭā, ‘dream’; Ma. kināvū.

\[ a > e. \]

S. gati-, ‘motion’; Ta. keti.
S. jaya-, ‘victory’; Ta. ceyam.
S. bala-, ‘strength’; Ta. pelam.
S. darśana-, ‘seeing’; Ta. tericanam.
S. gandha-, ‘smell’; Ta. kentam; Ma. kentuka, ‘to stink.’
S. jagat-, ‘world’; Ta. cekam; Ma. cekam.
S. dāsāratha-, ‘name of a king’; Ma. tēratan.

This change from \( a \) to \( e \) is found in the case of words borrowed from Sanskrit, which begin with a non-aspirated voiced stop. Compare S. ghata-, ‘a pitcher’, S. bhakti- ‘devotion’, S. jhaṭiti, ‘quickly’, and S. dhana- ‘wealth’ which become only Ta. kaṭam, Ta. patti, Ta. caṭiti, and Ta. tanam respectively. S. ghana- ‘hard’ and S. ghāṭikā-, ‘a measure of time equal to 24 minutes,’ must have been borrowed and pronounced for a long time as words without aspiration. So we hear [genəm] and [gediːɾəm]. The old Tamil word pēm is perhaps a tadbhava of S. bhaya-, ‘fear’, pronounced without aspiration, which sometimes occurs as beyam. Or it is only a case of onomatopoeia as pē or bē is just the sound produced by a person in dread. The same sound may be the origin also of Ta. pēyi, ‘a devil,’ as a person in dread only is known to be able to see devils or phantoms. It is worth noting that when \( b \) changes into \( v \) as in valam, the \( a \) remains unchanged. Malayalam, however, can
show velam. Compare palam, a tadbhava of S. phala-, ‘fruit.’ In Tamil itself kal, ‘stone or to dig,’ is pronounced by some people [kellū]. Ta. kāṭu, ‘a tie,’ is also kēṭtu and in Malayaṭam is kēṭtu. Ta. kalakku, ‘to stir up,’ is in Telugu kelaku.

S. campaka-, ‘name of a flower’; Ta. cempakam; Ma. cembakam.
S. carman-, ‘skin’; Ta. cemmāu, a shoemaker’; Ka. samma; Ma. cemmāu.
S. sāyyā-, ‘a bed’; Te. sejja; Ka. sejja.
S. sābbata-, ‘sound’; Ma. cettam.

The tadbhavas of S. sāyyā- are through the Prakrit sejja (Pischel, p. 86). The word cēccaï in the Tamil ‘Tirumalainayakkan cēccaï’ is perhaps only a Tamil form of the Prakrit sejja.

S. arka-, ‘name of a plant’; Ta. erukku; Ma. erikku; K. erke.
This is perhaps the only instance of an initial a changing into e. In Sanskrit words beginning with y followed by a is often observed this change, e.g., S. yantra-, ‘a machine’, Ta. entiram; S. yama, ‘death’, Ta. eman. Is it possible that a was pronounced with a y added on to it before this change happened? The anaptyctic vowel u is just what one would expect to have after r. But Dr. Kittel regards this as a Dravidian word borrowed by Sanskrit (Kannada Dictionary, Preface, XXII). It may be noted in this connexion that the Tamils in certain provinces show a tendency to pronounce e as a in some words, e.g., elā [allā], embi [ambi].

\[ a > ai. \]

S. masūri-, ‘small-pox’; Ta. vacūri, vaicūri.
S. āśvayuja-, ‘belonging to the month Aśvina’; Ka. āśvija; Ta. arpici-, appici, aippici, aippaci.
The Tamil arpici is derived from Ka. āśvija. There is a tendency in Tamil to change a into ai. Taking Tamil words themselves we observe the change in the beginning of words in maiyal (moyal), ‘delusion’, aintu (aṅcu), ‘five’, paiyal (payal), ‘boy’; compare Ma. paital. In the middle of words, in araci (aracu), ‘king’; ilaṅci (ilaṅci), ‘fort-wall’; palaimai (palaimai), ‘oldness’; ilaṅmai (ilaṅmai), ‘youth’.

We observe this latter change in the following so-called Sanskrit words too:

S. laya-, ‘dissolution’; Ta. ilaiyam.
S. valaya-, ‘a bracelet’; Ta. valaiyam.
S. malaya-, ‘name of a mountain’; Ta. malaiyam.
S. kalaṣa- ‘a pitcher.’; Ta. kalaśyam.

These forms, however, are not regarded as elegant. Although malaiyam is a tadbhava of S. malaya-, the Sanskrit word itself is derived from Ta. malai, ‘a mountain.’ S. valaya- again is derived from Ta. valai, ‘to surround,’ the Dravidian root being val. S. nilaya- is a Sanskritized Tamil nilai from the Dravidian root nil.
Compare *maitta*, the colloquial form for Ta. *marrā*, 'other,' and *paittu*, another colloquial word which stands for Ta. *payru* in the sense of payments.

\[ a > ai. \]

S. *ārya*-, 'worthy'; K. *ajja*; Ta. *aiyan*.

The Tamil form must be derived through the Pali *ațya* (Andersen, p. 32). *ai* is only another mode of writing *uy*. The more recent tadbhava is *āriyān*. The Kanarese form is through Prakrit *ațja* (Pischel, p. 195) and perhaps is the original of the Tamil-Malayālam *acayā*.

S. *amātya*-, 'a minister'; Ta. *amaiccau*.

The Tamil tadbhava would be *amāṭiyān* according to the rules of Tamil grammar. Here again we see the Pali influence. The Pali form is *amacca* (Andersen, p. 31). As in words written above *ai* is written although only *a* is pronounced. Among Tamil words we find the diphthong in *uṭaimai* and *uṭaimāṇam* pronounced as simple *a*

\[ i > a \]

S. *puṣkariṇi*-, 'a piece of water'; Ta. *puṭkariṇi*.

S. *prthivi*-, 'the earth'; Ta. *puṭavi*; Te. *puḍami*.

The Tamil *puṭkariṇi* must have been got by comparison with Pali *pokkharāni* (Andersen, p. 183). Prakrits have only *pokkharini* (Pischel, p. 100). If, as Oldenberg thinks, Pali was once the popular language of Southern India, it is probable that Pali has influenced Tamil more than any of the Prakrits spoken in the north or communicated through books. A fact in favour of this is that the Tamil *puṭkariṇi* is a popular word. And *puṭavi*, which is found in literature only, is no doubt derived through the Prakrit *puṭhavi* (Pischel, p. 50). In the absence of any evidence to prove that S. *rohini*,'name of a lunar mansion', is changed into Ta. *urōkāni* through the influence of Pali or Prakrit, one has to assume that the change is due to analogy of forms like the preceding.

S. *dikṣila*-, 'a priest engaged in a dikṣa'; Ta. *tīṭcatāṅ*.

This form also must have come into use by analogy with such forms as *rāṭcatāṅ*. It is remarkable that such changes occur only in words that are constantly used by the people.

\[ i > e \]

S. *vināyaka*-, 'name of a god'; Te. *venakayya*.

The change of *i* to *e* in the first syllable is quite common in the Dravidian languages, e.g., *itai* (*etai*), *cila* (*cela*), *nirai* (*neyai*), *cīru* (*ceyu*, also Malayālam) *pirai* (Ka. *pere*). Tamil grammarians following Sanskrit grammarians hold that *e* and *o* are compound letters composed of *a*, *i* and *a*, *u* respectively. But that is against facts. *e* and *i*, *o* and *u* are related in this way: while *e* and *o* are open sounds, *i* and *u* are closed ones produced under similar conditions.
In the case of words mentioned here, the *i* is broadened into *e* under the influence of the broad vowel of the following syllable.

\[ u > i \]

S. manusya-, ‘man’; Ta. maṇiṭṭaṇ, maṇuṭaṇ, maṇuṭaṇaḥ.  
S. ayaś(ya)-, ‘life, long life’; Ka. ayiṣa; Ta. ayicu.

In both these cases, the *u* seems to have dropped before *i* came in. Even now one hears these words pronounced as *mansan* and *āysu*. The Tamil *āyam*, the name of a Tamil letter, is considered to be a tadbhava of S. *āydha-*, ‘a weapon’. It should also be pointed out that the tadbhava *āyutam* is rarely pronounced as such. One hears rather *i* than *u* in the second syllable.

S. anuja-, ‘a younger brother’; Ma. aniyan.

As in the case of the above words, one has to imagine an intermediate form *anijan*.

The Tamil purai, ‘a roofed building’ is colloquially *pirai* as in Ta. kuttuppirai, and is *pirai* in Malayāḷam as well. Ta. min, ‘before, anterior’, is *miṅ* colloquially and in Malayāḷam *min* as in *minṉānu*, ‘the day before yesterday’; compare also Ta. munti > minti.

\[ u > o \]

S. uṣṭra-, ‘a camel’; Ta. ottai; Ma. oṭṭe; Te. oṭṭe; Ka. oṭṭe, oṭte. *u* in the first syllable has a tendency to become *o* in the Dravidian languages. This was noticed when *i > e* was considered. Many words in Tamil with *u* in the first syllable are pronounced as if they had *o*, e.g., kulam, ‘a tank’; tutai, ‘the thigh’; nurai, ‘foam’; putai, ‘a hole’. Some regard *ottai* as a Dravidian word, and in support of this view take *ottiakam*, also in use for *ottai*, and derive it from two Tamil words *ottu* and *akam*. This is a very improbable derivation as the word is found in Persian and some other languages too. And the word *ottiakam* itself is very likely a corruption of *ottakai*, a tadbhava of S. *uṣṭrikā-. oṭte* in Kanarese and Telugu is a nasalized form of *otte*. Compare Hindustani *ūnt*.

S. kuṭhāra-, ‘an axe’; Ka. kodali, kodli; Ta. kōṭali, kōṭari.  
The Tamil *kōṭari* again is popularly derived from two simple words *kōṭu*, ‘branch’ and *ari*, ‘chop off’.

S. tuṇḍa-, ‘mouth, beak’; Te. tonḍamu; Ta. tuṇṭai.  
S. guṇa-, ‘a quality’; Te. goṇamu.  
S. bhuvamga-, ‘a serpent’; Ka. bojanga.  
Ta. pustakam is colloquially pronounced *postakam*. Again Ta. *ural* is Ka. oralu and Ta. ulakkai is Ka. onake.

\[ ē > a \]

S. rēvati-, ‘name of a lunar mansion’; Ma. iravati.

The change seems to be due to the prothetic vowel in the tadbhava, which is accented.
S. र > i, iver (iru)

S. इ, ‘a bull’; Ta. itapam; Ma. atapam, itavam.
S. ह्रदया, ‘the heart’; Ta. ithayam; Ka. hidaya, hedaya.
S. व्र, ‘a bull’; Ta. vitai.
S. त्र, ‘a sage’; Ta. iver; Ma. irisi.
S. बक्शा, ‘a tree’; Ta. virukkam.
S. त्र, ‘grass’; Ta. tiruam.
S. ग्र, ‘a house’; Ta. kirukam; Ma. kiriyam.

The Pali form of त्र is isi (Andersen, p. 46). Tamil perhaps avoided that kind of change lest it should yield iver which is already a Tamil word meaning thunder. We have in Tamil more recent tadbhavas riṣapam, iverayam, riṣi as well as ṛṣi, viruṭam. These indicate that the pronunciation of त्र was not correctly understood, and the change is the result of an attempt on the part of the Dravidians to represent a sound which was not familiar to them. Again, that the prothetic vowel before र is i is evident from the tadbhavas. The Tamil words indicate only the change of त्र into i and iver. Pali shows a as in S. prākta-, pākata (Andersen, p. 173) which the Dravidian tongues have adopted. Other examples are hadaya (hrdaya-, ‘the heart’—Andersen, p. 280), pathavi, (gṛthivi-, ‘the earth’—Andersen, p. 158). Tamil has also variant forms for त्र and ग्र, to wit tiruam and giraham. These are considered to be wrong, but their existence cannot be denied. And giraham is apt to be confounded with the tadbhava of S. graha-, a Sanskrit word meaning planet. The Malayālam tadbhavas ṛsī and kiriyam show the change iver for iver of Tamil.

S. ḍṣ, ‘an incarnation of Viṣṇu’; Ta. kāṇṇa; Ma. kāṇṇa.

The Prakrit form is kaṇha (Pischel, p. 51), and the Tamil-Malayālam form seems to be derived through it. There are more recent tadbhavas kiruṣṭhaṇṇ, kṛṣṭṭaṇ which are also current in somewhat changed form in Kanares and Telugu.

S. ṣṭ, ‘a circle’; Ta. vaṭṭam.
S. ṣṭṭa- or natya-, ‘dance’; Ta. naṭṭam.

The Tamil vaṭṭam is surely derived from the Pali form (Andersen, p. 226). It is also found in Prakrit (Pischel, p. 49). The more recent tadbhava is viruṭam. The author of the Prayōga-vivēkam while regarding vaṭṭam as a tadbhava, is not inclined to derive it through Prakrit. ṣṇai, naṭṭam, viṇṇaṃ he puts under the same category. But Naccinārkkiniyār and a still earlier commentator Cēṇāvaraiyar have taken ṣṇai, vaṭṭam, naṭṭam, and kāṇṇa to be Prakrit forms borrowed by Tamil. (Tolkāppiyam, Collatikāram, Naccinārkkiniyām, p. 234; Cēṇāvaraiyam, p. 212.)

Again, Pali has nacca from S. nṭyyu- (Andersen, p. 132). Dr. Gundert derives Ma. nattuwan from S. natya-, perhaps a misprint for nṭyya- from which the Prakrit form naṭṭa can be derived: nattuwan is also a Tamil word and it must have come from naṭṭam with the termination changed as naṭṭu, and the masculine affix ay
added on. Similarly we have *vaṭṭu* from *vaṭṭam*. Both these words are often derived also from the Dravidian root *vaḷ*, which seems improbable.

S. *prthu*—'numerous'; Ta. *potu*; Ma. *potu*.
This *potu* looks like a pure Tamil word, but it cannot be connected with any Tamil root. It is likely that the Pali *puthu* (Andersen, p. 180), has given this form to Tamil. *Puthuʃjana* in Pali is used exactly in the sense in which *potunjana* is used in Tamil, 'the masses, vulgar people.' We have in colloquial Tamil *putu* also in the sense of common as in *putuniram*, 'complexion that can be said to be neither fair nor dark.' The ordinary meaning the word *putu* is 'new.'

S. *prakṛti*—'material cause'; Ta. *pakutit*.
S. *vikṛti*—'change'; Ta. *vikuti*, 'suffix.'
These are distinctly Tamil forms. Pali has *pakati* (Andersen, p. 146). But we have in Tamil *pakati*, *vikati* which show Prakrit influence.

S. *sadṛśa*—'like'; Ta. *cari*; Te. *sari*; Ma. *sari*, *sari*; Ka. *sari*
*sari* is an old Tamil word but nevertheless it cannot be derived from any indigenous root. The form *sarisa* for *sadṛśa* is found in all Prakrit dialects (Pischel, p. 172). So it must have come to the Dravidian languages through Prakrit only. Dr. Gundert derives it from *cariyu* and *cār*: 'to be near.' But he did so evidently at a time when the influence of Prakrits on Dravidian languages was not so well realized.

S. *anṛta*—'ambrosia, nectar'; Ta. *amutam*, *amīḷam*; Ka. *amardu*, *avardu*.
S. *anṛta*—first becomes *amīrtam* and the *r* then changes into cerebral *r* (i.e., *ṛ*). The form *amutam* is analogous to *pakuti* for *prakṛti*. *amutam* is found in the Tolkappiyam and *amīḷam* in the Kural.

\[ ai > a. \]

S. *paśaça*—'a kind of demon'; Ta. *pacācam*.

The Tamils do not appear to treat *ai* as very different from *a*. Compare *maiyal—mayal*; *ilaṅci—ilaṅci*; *vaṭcir—vaṭcir*; *vacciram—vaṭciram*. The alternate forms like *akācam* and *akāyam* lead us to assume *paiyācam*, and then the change becomes quite intelligible. The influence of *y* in many of these cases is to be noted.

\[ ai > ayi. \]

S. *kaḷasa*—'name of a mountain'; Ta. *kayilācam*.
S. *vaṟa*—'enmity'; Ta. *vayiram*.

The diphthongal *ai* must have been pronounced as *a* and *i* separately before this change took place. Pr. *kaḷasa* (Pischel, p. 56) and Pr. *vaṟa* (Pischel, p. 56) show this stage in pronunciation. Then the *y* glide naturally comes in. Similarly the *u* glide with regard to *au* which will be noticed later.
SANSKRIT VOWELS

ai > e or è
S. saîndhava-, 'a horse'; Ka. sendava.
S. tailikat-, 'an oilman'; Ka. telliga.
S. vaiśākha-, 'name of the second lunar month'; Ka. hēsage.
In these cases the change is just what happens in Prakrit.
Pischel gives tella from S. taila (p. 56).

ai > ey.
S. daîva-, 'fate'; Ta. teyyam; Ma. teyyam; Te. dayyamu, 'a devil'; K. devva; Pr. devva (Pischel, p. 56).
ai although historically long was pronounced short even in olden times. It had become short even in the time of Pāṇini as is shown by the word mairéya from Prakrit maira from S. madira-. The a is short a and the peculiarity about it is that it is pronounced as e.
This peculiarity is observed also in pure Dravidian words. Compare kai and key, mai and mey.

ö > ū.
S. kāṭhōra, 'hard'; Ta. kāṭūram; Ka. kāṭuram.
This form seems to be due to analogy of such words as katu, kāṭumai.

au > ū.
S. sārvabhauma-, 'an emperor'; Ta. cāruvapūman.
S. āśauca-, 'impurity'; Ta. ācūcam.
Here the change seems to be due to the recollection of the original words bhūmi and śuci while these are pronounced. āsuci suggests ācucam, ācūcam. Sometimes it is also acūcam.

au > ó, ö.
S. krauṇca-, 'name of a bird'; Te. koṇca, kroṇca; Ka. koṇce.
S. kaupina-, 'a piece of cloth to cover nakedness'; Ta. kōvaṇam; Ka. kōvaṇam.
S. kauṣika-, 'name of a sage'; Ta. kōvīkay; Pr. kōsika (Pischel, p. 57).
S. gautama-, 'name of a sage'; Ta. kōtamaṇ.
S. mauḷi-, 'a crown'; Ta. mōli; Pr. mōli (Pischel, p. 58).
S. kauṣalā-, 'name of a province'; Ta. kōcalam.
This is decidedly a change peculiar to Prakrit and Pali.
Tamil ordinarily inserts a v between a and u, which is known as 'the connecting v' or rather the v- glide, as in kiravuṇcam, kavupiṇam, etc. Compare Pr. kāsisala (Pischel, p. 58) which is similar to Ta. kavucalam, and Pr. maṁna from S. maṁna-,'silence' (Pischel, p. 58) which is similar to Ta. mavunam.
SANSKRIT DENTAL STOPS.

Their treatment in Tamil and Malayalam Tadbhavas.

Sanskrit dental stops are *t, th, d, and dh*. Tamil has only the letter *t* to represent all these sounds. But this letter has different sound-values determined by its position in words. Taking for instance the *t* combined with vowels, initially it is a voiceless stop like the Sanskrit *t*. Whatever may be the Sanskrit sound, it becomes only *t* at the beginning of a Tamil tadbhava. Medially, it has two values (i) that of the Sanskrit *d*, after the dental nasal, (ii) that of *th* in English *then* (the voiced interdental spirant ō). And whatever may be the Sanskrit sound, it is either of these only according as it is preceded by the dental nasal or not preceded by it.

Malayalam, however, has adopted the Sanskrit alphabet and can represent all the Sanskrit sounds by different letters. But it is remarkable that it follows Tamil sometimes in respect of the representation of these sounds. This bears testimony to the close relationship between Tamil and Malayalam, and indicates that the tendency to Sanskritize Malayalam is quite modern. As Dr. Gundert points out in his Malayalam Dictionary, *th, d* and *dh* occur only in Sanskrit and foreign words. But even in the case of Sanskrit words, these letters are not employed unless they are recent borrowings. And the sound-values of the medial *t* are just as they are in Tamil. Dr. Gundert, however, represents both by the Greek ō, e.g., S. *atula*: *ōdulam*, 'unequalled'; S. *antara*: *andaram*, 'interior'.

S. *takṣan*, 'a carpenter'; Ta. *taccav*; Ma. *taccan*.
S. *dāna*, 'a gift'; Ta. *tānām*; Ma. *tānām*, 'penance'.
S. *dūli*, 'dust'; Ta. *tūli*; Ma. *tūli*.
S. *anta*, 'end'; Ta. *antam*; Ma. *antam*.
S. *sindhu*, 'name of a river'; Ta. *intu*; Ma. *intu*.
S. *patākā*, 'a flag'; Ta. *patākai*; Ma. *patāka*.

The Tamil *antam, intu, patākai, and patam* are transliterated without any reference to the special sound-value of the medial *t*. If a new system can be adopted, *t* medial between vowels should be represented by ō, and *t* after the nasal by *d*. Dr. Gundert transcribes the Malayalam tadbhavas as *anḍam*, *inḍu*, *padāya* and *paḍam*.

When *t* is doubled, it has its normal sound; *dd*, and *ddh* also are equivalent to ō in Tamil, although some who know may pronounce them as *dd* or *ddh*.

S. *pittā*, 'bile'; Ta. *pittam*; Ma. *pittam*.
S. *uddēśa*, 'intention'; Ta. *uttēcam*; Ma. *uddeśam*.
Sanskrit Dental Stops

S. vrddhi-, 'prosperity'; Ta. virutti; Ma. vdthi.
Sometimes one hears such mispronunciations as viddyasam; this is supposed to represent vitiyac, a tadbhava of S. vyatyasa-. Forms like vittai, a tadbhava of S. vidya-, correctly pronounced viddai, might have affected the pronunciation of T. vitiyac.

When t and d occur in combination with other consonants, i.e., when they form the initial letters of the conjunct consonants, they change in Tamil in all cases, while in Malayalam, t or d followed by n, y, r, v, do not change. In Tamil the dental is doubled as tt and an anaptyctic vowel appears after the double consonant.

S. patni-, 'a wife'; Ta. pattini; Ma. patni.
S. satya-, 'truth'; Ta. cattiyam; Ma. satyam.
S. udganga-, 'effort'; Ta. uttiyokam; Ma. udgogam.
S. sattraya-, 'asylum'; Ta. cattiram, 'choultry'; Ma. satram.
S. kudrama-, 'mean'; Ta. kuttiram, 'cheating'; Ma. kudram.
S. sattva-, 'strength'; Ta. cattuvam; Ma. satvam.
S. udvaga-, 'fear, sorrow'; Ta. uttiwakam; Ma. udvagam, 'care.'

In Malayalam tadbhavas into l.

S. utkarsa-, 'excellence'; Ma. ukkarsam.
S. sadguna-, 'virtue'; Ma. salgyna.

In Malayalam there is no separate letter to represent the consonantal l. The symbol @ is made to represent the consonantal l as well as the consonantal t. ta = w; la = w.
The same words would, in Tamil, become
S. utkarsa-; Ta. urkarsam.
S. sadguna-; Ta. sarkunam.
t in combination with p, and d in combination with b or bh also change in Malayalam tadbhavas into l.

S. taparya-, 'object'; Ma. telparyam.
S. budhuda-, 'a bubble'; Ma. bulbudam.
S. adbhuta-, 'surprise'; Ma. abhutam.

Sanskrit tapara-, 'occupied with' becomes in Malayalam tapparam as well as talparam. The former form, of course, shows Prakritic influence.
The same words would, in Tamil, become
S. taparya-; Ta. tarpriyam.
S. budhuda-; Ta. purputam.
S. adbhuta-; Ta. prputam.
t or d in combination with m change into l.
S. almam-, 'the soul'; Ma. almavu.
S. padma-, 'a lotus'; Ma. palmam (written patmam).

Orientalists like Dr. Gundert prefer to transcribe these in English as alm and palma. No doubt some sound like t is often heard between l and m, but that is not defined, and far from being an equivalent of the dental voiceless stop in Malayalam, it approaches the English t. Compare also the pronunciation of t in
S. ratna- by Malayālis. The presence of t can be explained by the circumstance that people as they pronounce the t get the l but at once think of the t, and in attempting to bring it up again pronounce a slight t after l by way of compromise. In the case of k, p, s, etc., the slight t is assimilated by these consonants, and hence perhaps has been ignored by the orientalists. A more satisfactory explanation would appear to be a reference to the change the same sound undergoes in Tamil, viz., into the alveolar r [r].

The same words would, in Tamil, become
S. ātman-; Ta. ārmā.
S. padma-; Ta. pattumam.
In ārmā, the n is alveolar; the dental n is found only before a dental t or a dental n, and before consonants like m in tātsamas. In pattumam, the n is anaptyctic.

But, besides ārmā, there is āłumā and sometimes āṛumā. In compounds like S. ātmanēpada-, we observe the change āṛpanēp-patam. This is noticeable again in the tadbhavas of S. padma-. We have parpam, parpam (a hypothetical form) which latter is difficult to pronounce. The change may be indicated thus:

S. ātmanē > ārmāne > āṛpanē.
S. padma- > parpam > parpam.

Compare Prakrit appā (Pischel, p. 82) from S. ātman-. From S. bhasman- also Tamil has a tadbhava parpam.

Again, t in combination with s changes in Malayalam tadbhavas into l.

S. utsāha-, ‘energy’; Ma. utsāham.
S. matsya-, ‘a fish’; Ma. mātyam, also māccham; Pr. māccam.
S. vālsalya-, ‘affection’; Ma. vālsalyam.
The same words would, in Tamil, become
S. utsāha-; Ta. ucca̯kam, ucca̯kam.
S. matsya-; Ta. māccham, māccham; Te. māccham.
S. vālsalya-; Ta. vācccalliyam, vācccalliyam.
The forms ucca̯kam, māccham, and vācccalliyam show Prakritic influence. (uccāha—Pischel, p. 225; macccha—Pischel, p. 228.)

When t or d is final, it changes into l in Malayalam. The t is, however, retained when it is followed by another t in composition. Final dh also becomes l.

S. īṣat-, ‘a little’; Ma. īṣal.
S. pariṣad-, ‘an assembly’; Ma. pariṣal, pariṣa.
S. samidh-, ‘sacrificial sticks’; Ma. samil, camata.
The t is retained in sentences like samitthunu vēṇṭi kāṭṭil pōyī. camata and pariṣa are tadbhavas. The Ma. upaniṣattu from S. upaniṣad- shows influence of Tamil.
The same words would, in Tamil, become
S. īṣat-; Ta. īṣattu.
S. pariṣad-; Ta. pariṣattu.
S. samidh-; Ta. camittu.
Now *t* and *d*, when they change, in Malayalam, change into *l*, and in Tamil usually into *r* and occasionally into *y*, which is the nasal of *r*.

The change in Malayalam differs from the change in Tamil only in appearance. For in reality it is the same change and Malayalam shows only an intermediate stage in the passage of *t* or *d* into *r*.

If we analyse the Tamil words *sarkuṇam* and *tarparam*, for example, we find they are

- *sal + kuṇam.*
- *tal + paraṃ.*

and *l* becomes *r* according to the rules of Tamil grammar:

- *kal + ka = kurka.*
- *nāl + ka = nūrka.*

The vulgar pronounce *kalkka* and *nūlkka* with the consonant *k* doubled as it is in Malayalam. *r* obviates the need for a second *k*.

Compare also

- S. *vālkala-* 'bark-garment'; Ta. *varkalai.*

Again, in compounds also, the same change is noticed:


It is noteworthy that Malayalam does not double the consonant *p* after *l* except in *malppiti*, as it does in the case of *k*. Dr. Gundert transliterates this word with a single *p* only. And the doubling in these cases seems to be to represent the voiceless sound, rather than the double sound. Compare *pākkatal* with *akkatal*.

The *m* changes the preceding *l* into *y* in Tamil, e.g.—

- Ta. *naṃmai*  
  (nal + mai), 'good.'
- Ta. *mēṃmel*  
  (mēl + mēl), 'more and more.'

* S. *sālmalai-* 'the silk-cotton tree'; Ta. *cāymai.*
- S. *gulma-* 'chronic stomach-ache'; Ta. *kuṃmam.*

In some other cases, too, *l* changes into *y*, e.g.—

- Ta. *nāyku*  
  (nāl + ku), 'four'.
- Ta. *nayku*  
  (nal + ku), 'well'.

The form *nalku* is actually found in the Porunarruppatai (l. 165) and in the Perumpānarruppatai (l. 489); and the alternative form for *nayku*, *naṟku*, found in the Malaiṭuṭukaṭam (l. 392), is perhaps the regular form.

In Malayalam we find *l* takes the place of the Tamil *y* in certain words, e.g., *mul* is often found for Ta. *mūn*.


Possibly *r*, *y* and *l* (found in these words) belong to the same class. They must all be alveolar. As there is no separate symbol in the Tamil alphabet to represent the alveolar *l* as distinguished
from the dental or cerebral \( l \), one will have to be content with merely pointing out this peculiarity.

It has been found that, in Tamil, \( l \) interchanges with \( r \) or \( y \). It depends on the succeeding letter. As a rule \( l \) changes into \( r \) before voiceless stops.

The change of \( l \) into \( y \) is found also in Malayālam. In compounds we are told \textit{van} = \textit{val} (Gundert’s Dictionary, p. 906), \textit{e.g.—}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{vankopam}, ‘wrath.’
  \item \textit{vanikkaru}, ‘strong wind.’
\end{itemize}

The Malayālam alphabet in vogue at present does not make any difference between the dental \( n \) and the alveolar \( n \). In pronunciation, however, such a difference is made as, for example, in words like \textit{onnu} and \textit{nau} which correspond to Ta. \textit{onru}, \textit{naru}. \( l \), too, is distinctly alveolar when it is found doubled in words, \textit{e.g.} — \textit{illa}, \textit{nalla}.

In Madras, Ta. \textit{poon} is pronounced with a distinct medial alveolar \( y \). Compare also \textit{unnai}, \textit{anpu}. That \( r \) is alveolar can be seen from the pronunciation of Ta. \textit{marr} which is almost \textit{maier}, and that accounts for the colloquial form \textit{maitta}. Similarly \textit{paittu} from \textit{parru}. Subtle observation will reveal the alveolar nature of \( l \) in words like \textit{illa} and \textit{nalla} as they are pronounced in Madras.

Such expressions as Ma. \textit{vankopam} are employed in Tamil too, but often the following velar influences the alveolar \( y \) and converts it into its own nasal, \textit{e.g.}, \textit{vankilatu} is pronounced as \textit{vankilatu}.

The change in Tamil of \( r \) into \( r + a \) consonant similar to the one succeeding is sometimes noticeable:

\begin{itemize}
  \item S. \textit{tātparya}, ‘object’; Ta. \textit{tārppariyam} for Ta. \textit{tārppariyam}.
  \item S. \textit{udbhava}, ‘birth’; Ta. \textit{urppavam} “ Ta. \textit{urppavam}.
  \item S. \textit{utsava}, ‘festival’; Ta. \textit{urccavam} “ Ta. \textit{urccavam}.
\end{itemize}

That is, however, wrong spelling and misleads one in respect of the derivation of words.

The reverse of this is sometimes noticed:

\begin{itemize}
  \item S. \textit{durguna}, ‘vice’; Ta \textit{tukku} for Ta. \textit{turkku}.
  \item S. \textit{arcanā}, ‘worship’; Ta. \textit{arccnai} “ Ta. \textit{arccnai}.
  \item S. \textit{karpūra}, ‘camphor’; Ta. \textit{karppu} “ Ta. \textit{karppu}.
\end{itemize}

In these and similar cases, there is nothing to justify the introduction of the alveolar \( r \). The Sanskrit words transliterated in Tamil would become

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{turkku}
  \item \textit{arccnai}
  \item \textit{karppu}
\end{itemize}

But \( k, c, p \) are not voiceless stops medially. Although in the case of the first word a soft sound only is required, there is a feeling in the Tamil mind that in all these cases the proper enunciation is not obtained unless the consonant is doubled. Thus to
insert the alveolar $r$ and keep the consonant single is an orthographic expedient.

Again, in Tamil, in the vulgar dialect, there is practically no difference between $t$ and $r$ when these are doubled:

- Ta. *parru*, 'hold' $\rightarrow$ *pattu*
- Ta. *karru*, 'air' $\rightarrow$ *kattu*
- Ta. *irru*, 'decaying' $\rightarrow$ *ittu*
- Ta. *krru*, 'a line' $\rightarrow$ *kittu*
- Ta. *rrru*, 'go round' $\rightarrow$ *cuttu*
- Ta. *rrru*, 'a spring' $\rightarrow$ *rrtu*
- Ta. *rrru*, 'dried fruit, specially of the coconut palm' $\rightarrow$ *
- Ta. *nrrru*, 'yesterday' $\rightarrow$ *nrrtu*
- Ta. *rrru*, 'a consonant' $\rightarrow$ *ottu*
- Ta. *ddrru*, 'take care of' $\rightarrow$ *ddrrtu*

The above examples indicate the change of *rr* to *tt*. *tt* does not become *rr*. The people are prone to choose always the easiest way of pronouncing a word, and do it regardless of any other considerations. It is certainly easier to pronounce the dental *t* than the alveolar *r*. Take again the peculiar Tamil *l*. By very few people is it pronounced properly. In the so-called Shen-Tamil districts, Tinnevelly and Madura, they do not make any difference in speech between *l* and *l*, although particular attention is paid to it in literary writing. When they are in doubt, they ask if it is *ulayā* or *alayā*, in other words if it is the *l* that occurs in the Tamil word *ula* or the *l* that occurs in the Tamil word *ala*. In northern districts and about Madras, they make it equivalent to *y*. Thus *kiliyā*, 'an old woman', becomes *kiyavi* first, and then *kēvi*; *palam*, 'fruit', is invariably *payam*.

Some Sanskrit words have entered Tamil and Malayalam through Prakrit.

- S. *praticchanda-, 'likeness'; Ta. *paṭiccantam*.
- S. *kadamba-, 'a tree'; Ta. *kaṭampu*; Ma. *kaṭampu*. 


The normal tadbhavas according to the rules of Tamil grammar would be *airāvatam, piratimai, pirakiruti, tampam, pattanam, viruttam, piraticcantam, katampam*, and in fact all these forms are found in Tamil and they should be regarded as doublets, forms directly borrowed from Sanskrit in later times. Ta. *patimai* is found in the Kampa Ramāyaṇam; Ta. *pakaṭi* is popularly almost a synonym of S. *vikata*- which is doubtless a Prakrit form from S. *vikṛta*- (Pischel, p. 157) and both are used in the sense of mockery, jest, etc. It is a curious transformation of meaning and ought to be of interest to a student of Semantics. But *pakaṭi* as an approved tadbhava of S. *prakṛti*- is found in a Jaina work, the Tirunāṟṟṟṟantāti, wherein it is, according to the commentator, employed in the sense of *karma, 'action.'* Paṭiccantam is found in the Tirukkōvaiyār. It is doubtful, however, if S. *pattana*- is not a Dravidian word borrowed by Sanskrit, as words like Ta. *paṭṭi* would indicate. There is also a Tamil word *pattiyam* employed, in older works, in the sense of a sea-side village or town. *kudamba*- is a puzzling word. One is not able to find the tadbhava *katampa* either in Prakrit or in Pali. Perhaps analogy accounts for it. There is in Sanskrit itself a variant *kalamba*- which, if it was pronounced with a cerebral *l* instead of the dental as is often done (for instance, *mangalal*), could account for *ḍ* (in Tamil of course *l*), which change cannot be abnormal.
SANSKRIT SIBILANTS.

Their treatment in Tamil and Malayalam Tadbhavas.

The Palatal Sibilant.

The palatal ś is not altogether foreign to modern Tamil, although there is no distinct symbol to represent the sound even in the enlarged alphabet that is in use in school-books as well as in popular literature. The enlarged alphabet contains j, ś, s, h, and the compound letter ks too. ś is represented by the Tamil letter c which is pronounced s except when it is doubled, in which case it has its normal value, the value that it has in Sanskrit of the palatal affricate. It must be admitted that in recent times some editors have found it desirable to adopt the Grantha ś (ṃ) in printing manipravāla literature.

The Malayalam alphabet, however, is not defective in this respect.

S. śara-, 'an arrow'; Ta. caram; Ma. caram.
S. śāna-, 'a whetstone'; Ta. cānai; Ma. cāṇa.
S. śilā-, 'stone'; Ta. cīlai; Ma. cīlā.
S. śāla-, 'colic'; Ta. cūlai; Ma. cūlā.
S. śava-, 'a corpse'; Ta. cavam; Ma. cavam; Pa. chava
(Andersen, p. 99).

This is how the initial ś changes in Tamil and Malayalam. There is a difference of opinion about the pronunciation of the initial c, be it in a tadbhava or a pure Tamil word. Some contend that c is always voiceless. But one who has observed the pronunciation of c by various classes is inclined to hold that the pronunciation of it as a voiceless palatal affricate is vulgar and unrefined in the present age.

There is also another pronunciation of it as dental s, observable among certain classes of people all over the Tamil country. They hold it to be a more refined mode of pronouncing c. But this change itself is perhaps due to the same influences that are at work in Telugu and Kanarese. For in these languages the Sanskrit ś becomes s.

S. śuddha-, 'clean'; Te. suddamu; Ka. sudda.
S. śālā-, 'a hall'; Te. sālā; Ka. sāle.
S. śāna-, 'a whetstone'; Te. sāna; Ka. sāne.
Even the Tamil c they transform into s.
Ta. cavu, 'death'; Te. sāvu; Ka. sāvu.
Ta. cutti, 'a hammer'; Te. sutti; Ka. suttige.

It must, however, be remarked here that in Malayalam the initial c is pronounced distinctly as a voiceless stop. That circumstance may be taken to indicate that Malayalam, as well as
the Tamil vulgar dialect so-called referred to above, retains the older pronunciation of c.

That there is absolutely no difference between the pronunciation of the Tamil c, except when it is doubled, and that of the Sanskrit ś may be proved in another way.

S. cakra-, 'disc,' is in Tamil cakkiram or cakkaram (pronounced [śakkirəm], [śakkərəm]).

S. ācāra-, 'conduct,' is in Tamil ācāram (pronounced [a:sa:ɾəm]). Some people, feeling that when it is a single c they do not get the proper Sanskrit pronunciation, write the word as ācāram. That indicates that one c can give only the ś sound. Compare S. samācāra-.

In Malayālam, however, curiously enough, one hears ājāram and ājamanam, although the words are written acāram and acamanam, 'sipping water before religious ceremonies.' This peculiarity is found only in the case of words which have a medial c. When c begins a word, as already pointed out, it is voiceless, unlike the initial c in Tamil. This clearly indicates that the medial c in Tamil as well as in Malayālam must have been originally pronounced as j. That the initial c must have been originally pronounced as a voiceless stop, has, with the help of Malayālam, already been shown. Once the original pronunciation of the medial c is taken as established, the change of ś to y in tadbhavas is easily explained. A transition change of ś to c and then a change again of c to j have to be inferred. j to y is of course a change quite common.

S. bhuj-, 'arm'; Ta. puyam.
S. gaja-, 'an elephant'; Ta. kayam.
S. rājan-, 'a king'; Ta. rāyan.

Malayālam shows vāyakam from S. vācaka-, 'a reader.' It may not be possible to assert that the peculiar pronunciations as indicated by Malayālam are the oldest or the original Dravidian pronunciations, but it would be quite safe to say that they are pretty old.

The medial ś remains so in Malayālam, which has adopted the Sanskrit alphabet, but, in Tamil, is changed into c, as when it is initial.

S. āśā-, 'desire'; Ta. ācai; Ma. āśn.
S. dēśa-, 'region'; Ta. tēcam; Ma. dēṣam.
S. pāśa-, 'a noose'; Ta. pācam; Ma. pāsam.

The sound does not change, however, in Tamil. It is ś, as it is in Sanskrit and Malayālam.

But there is another kind of change noticeable in regard to the medial ś. It is replaced by y in Tamil, and in Malayālam too. In view of what was mentioned already, one has to suppose an intermediate form with c which must have been pronounced as j.
S. ākāśa-, ‘the sky’; Ta. ākāyam.
S. dēśa-, ‘region’; Ta. tēyam, tēm.
S. vāsa-, ‘influence’; Ta. vayam; Ma. vayam.
S. śmaśāna-, ‘cemetery’; Ta. mayānam; Te. maśānamu, maśnamu.
S. śmaśru-, ‘beard’; Ta. mayir, ‘hair’; Ma. mayir.
This kind of change is certainly old, for alongside of these are found in Tamil later forms which indicate only transliteration (i.e., c for ś). Again, this change is not confined to borrowed words. That is another proof in support of my statement that the medial c was pronounced formerly as a voiced stop.
Ta. paci, ‘hunger’; Ma. payi.
Ta. pāci, ‘moss’; Ma. pāyal.
Ta. pācai, ‘glue’; Ma. pāya.
It must be noted here that y sometimes interchanges with ś, or the Tamil medial c, as in
Ta. ayaḷ, ‘neighbourhood’; acul (phonetically [aśul]).
Ta. iyai, ‘agree’; icai (phonetically [iśel]).
Ta. kayam, ‘a spring’; kacam (phonetically [kaśam]).
Ta. kuyavai, ‘a potter’; kucavai (phonetically [kuśavai]).
Ta. payalai; paṭcilai (phonetically [paśile]).
Ta. puyal, ‘a storm’; puṭal (phonetically [puśal]).
Ta. mual, ‘a hare’; mucal (phonetically [muśal]).
Ta. uyir, ‘life’; ucil (phonetically [ušir]).
The forms with ś are all colloquial. Tamil ucil is found in Telugu and Kanarese also: Te. usuru; Ka. usir.
Initial ś is sometimes dropped although this is a common enough phenomenon with s.
S. śāla-, ‘an abode’; Ta. ălai; M. āla.
S. śmaṇa-, ‘cemetery’; Ta. mayānam; Pr. masana (Pischel, p. 215).
Dr. Gundert suggests S. aranýa-, ‘forest’ as a possible source of aran. Again he gives S. śāla- only as an alternative by the side of S. ālaya-. The authors of the Malayālam Vyākaraṇa-mitram connect āla with S. śāla-.
When ś occurs, at the beginning of words, in combination with r, either śr is dropped, or an anaptyctic vowel is inserted between these letters, or the r alone is dropped.
S. śramaṇa-, ‘an ascetic’; Ta. camana; Pa. samana
(Victor Henry, p. 35).
S. śraviṣṭha-, ‘name of an asterism’; Ta. avittam; Ma. avittam.
S. śrāvaṇa- (śrōna), ‘name of an asterism’; Ta. (tiru-)vōṇam; Ma. ōṇam.
S. śrāvanika, 'name of a month'; Ta. āvani; Ma. āvani.
S. śrāddha, 'a funeral rite'; Ta. cāttam, cirāttam; Ma. cāttam
S. śruti, 'the Veda, etc.'; Ta. curuti, 'the Veda'; cuti, 'harmony in music'; Ma. curuti
Te. suli.
S. śrēni, 'a row'; T. ēni, 'a ladder'; cirēni, 'a row'; Ma. ēni; cēni; Pa. sēni
(Andersen, p. 277).
S. śrēṣṭhir, 'the head of a mercantile guild'; Ta. cētti, 'a merchant'; Ma. cētti.
S. śrōtra, 'the ear'; Ta. cōttiram.
The Sanskrit word śri, 'wealth' follows a distinct law:
S. śri; Ta. tiru, ci, ciri; Ma, tiru, tiri, tṛ; ci, ciri (acciri < aṣrī); ciru (ciruta < sṛi tē or sṛidēvi); Te. sī.
Tiru is a very old Tamil word but nevertheless admitted to be a tadbhava of śri. The author of the Telugu dictionary Śabdaratnakaram regards tiru as a dēśya, i.e., a Dravidian word. It is usual for the dental s to get transformed into t in Tamil as is shown elsewhere, here s has become t. Another instance pointed out by Dr. Gundert is the Malayālam-Tamil tuyya, 'pure' which he derives from tuyi, tadbhava of S. suci. Judging from the solitary instances available one is inclined to think that s must have been pronounced s before it became t thus: ś > s > t. śri > sri > tiru. That these ś and s are often confused with c is amply borne out by facts. Again, some Sanskrit words have been borrowed through Prakrit, and Prakritic languages have only one s to represent all the sibilants. Telugu and Kanarese have the intermediate forms with s.
S. śri; Te. tiru, siri; Ka. tira, tiri, tiru, siri.

Bishop Caldwell, however, says: "ś, the soft sibilant of Sanskrit, sometimes passes through similar changes. Generally it is represented by the corresponding ś or ch of the Dravidian languages, but sometimes it is converted, like the harder s, into t, as in the very ancient derivative tiru, sacred, for śri." (A comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, 1913, p. 164).

To revert to tuyya, Dr. Gundert's derivation of the word from S. suci is not tenable. He is himself not positive about it, having put a mark of interrogation after the word. He connects it rightly with tū, which word is found in forms like Ta. tūya, tūymai. tūyya can be directly derived from tūya. Compare Ma. tiyya from liya (a caste in Malabar).

When ś is followed by c, ś is assimilated to c, as it is in Prakrit.
S. aṣcurya, 'wonder'; Ta. acciriyam.
S. duṣcārin, 'an ill-behaved man'; Ta. tuccāri.
Sanskrit Sibilants

S. niścaya-, 'certainty'; Ta. niccaya; Pr. nicchaya (Pischel, p. 206).

S. niścita-, 'certainty'; Ta. niccitam; Pr. nicchaya (Pischel, p. 206).

S. paścima-, 'western'; Ta. paccimam; Ma. puccima; Pr. pacchima (Pischel, p. 206).

S. āścarya- becomes in Prakrit accariya. Tamil follows Prakrit only as far as assimilation is concerned. It keeps the long ā. Ta. tuccāri is found in the Nālatīyār. Pischel gives duccara corresponding to duścara- (p. 206). Nikṣaya appears to be an unnatural tadbhava. It is not really a Tamil form but the result of a re-Sanskritization. Pischel gives a similar form derived from S. paścima-, paksima (p. 206). One often meets with nicciyam in Tamil colloquial speech. But it is doubtful if it is the Prakrit form of S. niścita. It is probably a corruption of Ta. niccayam. Ma. paccima is found in the Rāmacaritam.

ś followed by y takes an anaptyctic vowel or drops the y.

S. śyāmala-, 'black'; Ta. ciyāmalam.

S. śyāmalā-, 'name of a goddess'; Ta. yāmalai; Pr. sāmalā cāmalai (Pischel, p. 85).

S. śyāmaka-, 'a grain'; Ta. cāmai; Ma. cāma.

S. kāśyapa, 'name of a sage'; Ta. kācipay. Pali has sāma from S. śyāma. (Andersen, p. 268.) In Ta. kācipay, there has not been the mere dropping of y. The y has influenced the succeeding vowel before it dropped off.

The authors of the Malayālam Vyakarana-mitram give an instance of the dropping off of l after ś.

S. ślaghya-; Ma. cākkiyur.

Dr. Gundert thinks that the Malayālam word may be a tadbhava of S. sākṣin- or sākya-. It may be noted that Tamil has cākki from S. sākṣin-

When ś is followed by v, v is assimilated to ś.

S. iśvara-, 'lord'; Ta. iccuran.

When iśvara- is used in the name of a place, there is no change of the vowel, e.g., patticçaram. The vowel change is due to the presence of v in the word as in kācipay above; v has suggested u as y suggested i.

But S. aśva- becomes in Tamil accuvam or acuvam. The former is the older form. Words like accuvam and iccuran would seem to suggest that ś medial was once written as c and pronounced not as a sibilant but as a voiceless palatal. As according to the rules of Tamil grammar the consonant c could not combine with v, the anaptyctic vowel u appeared when the word had to be used in literary writing. The consonant was doubled with a view to get the proper enunciation, one of them was dropped when the pronunciation of c definitely changed into what it is now.
It is also worthy of note that ś changes into । as in
S. mārgaśira-, 'name of a month'; Ta. mārkaḷi; Ma. mārkkaḷi.
As it is common to find ś changing into । in these languages, it
may perhaps be inferred that the r's gave the ś a s sound, and then
the change is easily explained. Again, careless pronunciation
gives ś or even s sometimes the sound of ś.
S. anśa-, 'part'; Ta. anśiṣam.
S. vamśa-, 'family'; Ta. vaṁkiṣam.
S. māṃsa-, 'meat'; Ta. māṃkiṣam.
The name of a king vaṁkiṣa-cēkaraṇa would suggest that S. vamśa-
became also Ta. vaṁkiṣam (compare Te. vaṅgasamnu) for such a form
only can yield vaṁkiya (compare Bengali and Oriya vaṁṣa).
The name in Sanskrit is vamśa-śekhara. But what led to the change of
m to n? The Tamil change perhaps indicates that m was regard-
ed as an anunāsika. These forms are, however, considered to be
not quite literary. The forms amīcam, vamīcīm and māmicam are
more commonly found in literature.

The Cerebral Sibilant.
The cerebral ś, unlike ś, has been given a separate symbol
adopted from the Grantha alphabet. Still, the sound is recognized
to be distinctly foreign to Tamil. And as ś and s are usually
represented by c, it being a difficult matter for an ordinary Tamilian
to pronounce the sounds properly, ś also for the same reason is
represented by c whose value in Tamil either initially or between
vowels is always that of ś, e.g.,
S. saṁmukha-, 'the six faced'; Ta. caṇmukan,
cammukan.
S. saṣṭi-, 'sixty'; Ta. caṭṭi, as in caṭṭipūrtti.
S. bhaṣā, 'language'; pācai.
Initial ś is represented in Malayalam as well by c.
S. saṇḍaṅga-, 'six auspicious things'; Ta. caṭṭaṅku, 'ceremony';
Ma. caṭṭaṅku.
Ś in the middle of a word and between vowels changes into t (d)
or l. d changes into l also in the passage of words from Sanskrit
into Tamil, e.g.,
S. piddā-, 'pain'; Ta. pilai. d is put in as an alternative of t as
that is the sound-value of the medial t in Tamil where it is not
doubled. Strictly speaking, the medial t has a spirantal sound
like the medial k, t and ṁ in Tamil. Where t is doubled it has its
normal value. And t cannot begin a word or end one.
S. anuṣa-(?) 'name of an asterism'; Ta. anuṭam; Ma. anuḷam.
anīḷam.
S. bhaṣā, 'language'; Ta. pāṭai.
S. rsabhā-, 'a bull'; Ta. itāpan; Ma. itāpan.
itavam.
S. uṣa-, (uṣas-), 'dawn'; Ta. uṭai.
uṭai.
S. kaṣaya-, 'a decoction'; Ta. kiyālam; Ma. kaḷiyam.
S. kaluṣita-, 'dirty, muddy'; Ta. kalūṭi, 'a flood'.
S. ausadha-, 'medicine'; Ta. avītam
\{ avuṭatam
     \}
               \{ Ma. avī[atam.
               autatam
               \}
               avisadham.
S. jyōtiṣa-, 'astronomy'; Ta. cōṭītam.
\{ jōsyam,
     cōṭiyam.
\}
S. kṣaya-, 'consumption'; Ma. kilayam.
S. mahīṣa-, 'a buffalo'; Ta. makiṭam
\{ mayītam
\}; Ma. makiḷam.
S. maśi-, 'ink'; Ma. maḷi.
S. māṣa-, 'a particular weight of gold'; Ta. māḷai
\{ māḷai
\}, 'gold.'
S. méṣa-, 'a ram'; Ta. mētam.
\{ mēlakam
\}; Ma. mētam.
S. viṣa-, 'poison'; Ta. viṭam; Ma. viṭam.
S. susīra-, 'hollow' (Vedic); Ma. tuḷiram, 'a hole.'
S. susūpti-, 'sleep'; Ta. cuḷuttī.
S. susumna-, 'an artery'; Ta. cuḷimunai.
\{ cuḷinai.
\}
S. sēṣa-, 'remaining'; Ta. cētam.
\{ cētam.
\}
S. santōsa-, 'joy'; Ta. cantōtam; Ma. tantōtam.

It would appear from these examples that the change $s > l$ is older than $s > i$. As a rule all the forms with $l$ are older in Tamil literature. Ma. iṣuvaṁ is found in the Rāmacarītām. Ma. makiḷam is found in the same work in the phrase makiḷanāśini.

S. anuṣa- as the name of the 17th lunar mansion is not found in Apte's Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary or the Vācaspatyām. The Vaijayanti of Yādavaprakāśa gives anuṣi in the sense of demon. The word given is anurādhā. But Dr. Gundert has given in his Malayāḷam Dictionary anīṭam as a tadbhava, and suggests that it is from S. anuṣa- and is a medical term. He gives below that word anīṭam, 'the 17th constellation.' The Tamilcollakarāṭi published by the Madura Tamil Sangham gives Ta. auṭam as a tadbhava of S. anuṣa-, which word is not found in Sanskrit dictionaries, as already pointed out.

Besides pāḷai, there is another tadbhava from S. bhāṣā-, viz., pācāi,
'a curse.' Ta. uḷai is found used in Villiputtūrār's Bhāratam and uḷai in Aracakēcāri's Rakuviṃicam. Ta. kiyālam is used only in Madras and the adjacent districts. The Tamil Sangham Dictionary does not recognize it. There has been also metathesis in the word, $y$ and $s$ have changed places. And $i$ in place of $a$ is justified by the popular pronunciation of the Sanskrit word even in the south as kṣāyam. Once the word is hyper-Sanskritized that way, the anaptyctic vowel comes in all right. Compare Ta. sundūram from S. sundūra- through *sundram. Ta. kalūṭi is found in the
Kūrinciippattu (l. 178). Ma. avilataṁ is straight enough, only ṹ has been substituted for u. Ta. avilām is a little puzzling. Did Ta. amīlām, a tadbhava of S. amṛta- suggest this word? Possibly: for learned men have always regarded avilām as amīlām. Compare the common word Ta. maruntu, ‘a medicine,’ which is considered to have been employed in the sense of nectar in the Kōṇalavēntaṁ (maruntāṇum viruntōtun = Be it nectar, share it with guests). Ta. jōsyam or jōsiyam, and čōsiyam are found in colloquial speech, the former in the speech of the higher castes, and the latter in vulgar speech. In the case of Ta. jōsiyam, the s of S. jyōtiṣa- must have been pronounced as a palatal ē, and ē indicates the reverse of the usual change s > t. In Ta. čōsiyam, the dental ē has been cerebralized.

S. susīra means a hollow in the Rg-veda (Grassman: Wörterbuch zum Rig-veda, p. 1556).

Ta. culuttī is a word used only in philosophical works. Ta. culimunai also belongs to that category and is used to denote the place of union for the breath of both nostrils.

Ta. cēlam is colloquial in Tinnevelly.

Ma. tantōlām is found in the Rāmacaritam.

In form the Tamil letter l (ḷ) so much resembles the Tamil grantha ś (ṣ) that often some people mistake the one for the other. S. bhāṣā- which becomes in Tamil pāsai is often found written by schoolboys pālai. Sometimes in laying stress on the l in a word, people are heard to pronounce it as ś, e.g. mālai, valukku. This kind of pronunciation is perhaps peculiar to Tanjore and the neighbouring districts, as M. Julien Vinson points out (Manuel de La Langue Tamoule, Grammaire, p. 18). He would equate it with the French j. This probably explains the old system of transliterating l by sh, followed even today by people trained in old methods. Such a pronunciation, however, can be regarded only as a dialectal variety and cannot be allowed to have any better title for consideration than the pronunciation of l as l current in the far south, or as y current in Madras and some western districts.

As has been already noted, the medial s changes also into c. The change, however, is comparatively modern. In Telugu it changes into s dental.

S. mōsa-, ‘theft,’ ‘stealing’; Ta. mōcam; Ma. mōsam; Te. mōsamu.

S. dōsa-, ‘a fault,’ ‘sin’; Ta. tōtam ; Te. dōsamu.

S. manussya-, ‘a man’; Ta. manucan.

S. maśī-, ‘ink’; Ta. maci.

S. māṣa-, ‘a particular weight of gold’; T. mācai.

The word mōsa is found in Kanarese too. It is perhaps a Dravidian word. Dr. Kittel regards it as such. Dr. Gundert,
however, regards it as a tadbhava and even gives a variant form _NONE_ in Malayalam. The difficulty lies in connecting it with any other word in Tamil. One has to note a peculiarity with regard to the sound-value of the medial _c_ in these borrowed words. The value is usually that of _s_ palatal or _s_ dental. But sometimes the characteristic value of the medial _c_, i.e., that of _j_, has affected some of these, e.g., _maci_ has an alternative form _mai_ (through _mayi_). Ta. _taciam_ occurs in the Jivakacintamaṇi and _maci_ in the Cūḍamaṇi. A class of people are heard to say _maniyam_, which is no doubt derived from _manucay_, the intermediate form being _manicay_. And _manicay_ could yield _manitay_ if the medial _c_ was pronounced as a dental _s_. Bishop Caldwell, however, says: "_manusya_, Sans. _man_, becomes in classical Tamil _mānida-n_; and this by a further change becomes _mānida-n_." (Dravidian Comparative Grammar, p. 163.) Against this it may be urged that _mānida-n_ is a comparatively recent word and is not found in the earlier works. As regards the change of _u_ to _i_, it has been pointed out elsewhere that the pronunciation of _u_ in such words is not distinct and borders on that of _i_.

S. _viṣama_- , 'unevenness'; Ta. _viyamam_.
S. _vasṣava_- , 'a Viṣṇu-worshipper'; Ta. _vaiṇava_.

The first example is from the Kalittokai, a Tamil classic. That, of course, indicates that there must have been an intermediate stage when _viṣama_ remained _vicama_ and the medial _c_ then became _y_. Similarly _vasṣava_ must have first become _vaicīnavav_, _vaicīnavav_ which forms do not exist (cp. S. _vāsya_, Ta. _vaciyan_; also S. _paīṣaka_, Ta. _pacācam_ and even _pācam_ in the Patirrupattu, a Tamil classic), and then passed on to _vaiṇavav_ which is only another mode of writing _vaiṇavav_.

When _s_ occurs at the beginning or in the middle of words in combination with voiceless stops, particularly the velar _k_, it is either assimilated or undergoes some other change.

S. _kṣaya_- , 'a disease in general'; Ta. _kayam_, 'consumption'; Ma. _kiḷayam_; Pa. _khaya_ (Andersen, p. 82).
S. _kṣāma_- , 'destruction'; Ta. _cāmam_, 'famine'; Ma. _cāmam_.
S. _kṣema_- , 'well-being'; Ta. _cēmaṇi_; Ma. _kēmaṇi_; Pr. _khēmaṇi_ (Andersen, p. 84).
S. _aksara_- , 'an axle'; Ta. _accu_; Ma. _accu_.
S. _aksara_- , 'a letter'; Ta. _akkīram_; Ma. _akkaram_; Pa. _akkharam_ (Andersen, p. 10); Pr. _akkharam_ (Pischel. p. 236),
S. kakṣa-, ‘the arm-pit’; Ta. kakkam; Pr. kakkha (Pischel, p. 219).
S. kuḵṣi-, ‘the belly’; Ta. kukki; Pr. kukkhi (Pischel, p. 221);
Pa. kucchhi (Andersen, p. 78).
S. takṣa-, ‘a carpenter’; Ta. taccay; Ma. taccan.
S. pakaṣa-, ‘a side’; Ta. pakkam; Ma. pakkan; Te. pakkamu;
Pa. pakkha (Andersen, p. 147).
S. bhikṣa-, ‘alms’; Ta. piccai; Ma. picca; Te. biccamu.
S. yakṣa-, ‘a demi-god’; Ta. (i-)yakkay; Pa. yakka (Andersen, p. 212).
S. dakṣina-, ‘the south’; Ta. takkanam; Te. dukkinamu.

These changes, although usually found in Prakrit or Pali, may not altogether be due to the influence of either of these. The same laws that operated in the case of Prakrit and Pali might have operated in the Dravidian languages as well. Still the change of ks to k or kk seems to be foreign to Tamil if one is to judge by the popular pronunciation of today. S. kṣaṇa- = canam;
S. kṣaya- = cayam. cāman and cēmaṁ are words in every day use. Again S. aṇḍara- = acara. The words taccay and piccai indicate the characteristic Dravidian change.

The change of S. kṣaya- into kilayam in Malayālaṁ is peculiar. Bishop Caldwell says: “s is sometimes, though rarely, converted in Tamil into l. Dr. Gundert supplies me with some instances of this in old Malayālaṁ, e.g., kṣaya, Sans. ‘less,’ is in old Mal. written kilayam, and the name lakṣmaṇan in an old copy of the Rāmāyaṇa is written ilakkkaynan. Here l stands for ks” (Dravidian Comparative Grammar, p. 163). In this change, kṣaya must have first got the anaptyctic i for facility of pronunciation and then s became l as in several similar cases. The presence of l in ilakkanaṁ is unintelligible. In the Ms. of the Ramacaritam I examined I remember to have seen only ilakşanaṁ without the l, if I may rely on my notes. The Tamil form is ilakkuvaṁ. If there is an l in any Ms., that has to be accounted for by the anxiety of the scribe or even the reader to see that s was represented by the usual substitute l.

Ta. cēmaṁ is possibly an old tadbhava. It is used in the sense of protection, prison, etc. If it is a tadbhava, the initial sibilant must have dropped off.

S. kakṣa- also appears as kaskam in colloquial Tamil. This must be a re-Sanskritized false form from Ta. kakkam. Pischel gives instances of ks changing in Prakrit into šk, pakṣa = paška (p. 222).

The Tamil takkay is a recent tadbhava from S. dakṣa-, ‘name of a Prājāpati’; taccay is a very old word. The trade itself is known as taccu.

cāman in Tamil, as well as Malayālaṁ, is also a tadbhava of S. yāma-, ‘a period of three hours’ through the Prakrit jama.

Again,
S. pakṣin-, ‘a bird’; Ta. patci; Ma. pakki; Te. pakki; Ka. pakki
pakki; Pa. pakkhiṇi. (Andersen, p. 147).
S. sākṣin-, ‘a witness’; Ta. cātic̄; Te. sākiri.
cākki
In the case of patci and cātic̄ it should be observed that ūc̄ is but a mode of transcribing kṣ in Tamil. Any word with kṣ may be written with ūc̄ instead, e.g., S. nakṣatra-, ‘a star’; Ta. naṭcattiram. It must be mentioned, however, that elegant pronunciation of words transcribed thus would make ū sound like ś. And in vulgar pronunciation ś is assimilated to the succeeding ū and both together are sounded like a doubled palatal cc. There are two exceptions to this mode of transcription among the words given above, viz., accu and laccam. They are completely Tamilized.
When ś follows r, an anaptyctic vowel seems to be a necessity. ś of course, in accordance with the general law, is changed into ū (d).
S. ākārṣava-, ‘attracting’; Ta. ākaruṭanaṃ.
S. āṛṣa-, ‘relating to the āsī’; Ta. āṛitam.
S. varṣa-, ‘a year’; Ta. varuṭam; Ma. varisam.
The same phenomenon is noticeable in cases where ś follows the vowel ū.
S. ṣi-, ‘a sage’; Ta. īruṭi.
The popular form is, of course, rici (phonetically [riśi].) Compare S. ṣabha-, ‘a bull’; Ta. īṭapam; Ma, ēṭavam. In this case also the popular form in Tamil is ricapam (phonetically [riśavam]). ś followed by k is assimilated. It is so in Pali.
S. catusk̄a-, ‘a crossway’; Ta. catukk̄am
cavukk̄am, ‘a square’
cukku and catukk̄am are good old words. catukk̄am is a classical word (Tirumurukarruppatai, l. 225), but people who know the origin sometimes write it catukkam. That is pedantry. Compare S. catuskika = cadukkī (Pischel, p. 206). cavukkam is distinctly borrowed through Prakrit (Pischel, p. 206, catuska = caukka).
But there are instances where ś is changed into ū unaffected by the succeeding k.
S. śuṣkala-, ‘abundant’; Ta. puṭkalam.
S. puṭkarini-, ‘a piece of water’; Ta. puṭkarini
puṭkarnaṇī
The change of i to a in puṭkaraṇī is perhaps due to Pali influence. (Pa. pokkaraṇi. Andersen, p. 183). The Prakrit forms are only pokkarini and puṭkharini. (Pischel, p. 100.) ś followed by ū is assimilated. That is also the natural change in other combinations.
S. īṣṭa-, ‘wish’; Ta. īṣṭam; Ma. īṭam; Pr. īṭha (Pischel, p. 207).
S. jyēṣṭhā-, ‘eldest sister’; Ta. cēṭtai; Ma. cēṭṭa.
S. jyēsthā-, 'name of an asterism'; Ta. kēṭṭai; Ma. kēṭṭa.
S. diśta-, 'assignment'; Ta. tiṭṭam; Ma. tiṭṭam.
S. nasta-, 'loss'; Ta. nattam; Ma. nattam; Pa. nāṭṭha (Andersen, p. 132).
S. vēṣṭ-, 'to dress'; Ta. vēṭṭi, 'a cloth'; Ma. vēṭṭi.
S. viṣṭi-, 'unpaid labour'; Ta. vēṭṭi; Te. vēṭṭi; Pr. viṭṭhi, viṭṭhi (Pischel, p. 207).
S. sṛēṣṭhin-, 'the head of a mercantile guild'; Ta. cetṭi, 'a merchant'; Ma. cetṭi; Te. setṭi, setṭi; Pr. setṭhi (Pischel, p. 217); Pa. setṭhi (Andersen, p. 276).

Some dialects of Tamil and Telugu have forms like vēṣṭi, and nastam where s becomes a kind of alveolar s in spite of the presence of t, changing the t also into an alveolar t. Compare Prakrit kasta = S. kāṣṭha- (Pischel, p. 207). Strictly speaking separate symbols are required to represent these alveolar s and t. They may perhaps be indicated by a dash underneath as the other alveolar symbols l, r, and u of Tamil.

The change of S. sṛēṣṭhin- to Ta. cetṭi does not follow the rules of Tamil grammar like another word kuttai, a tadbhava of S. kāṣṭha-. These forms must be ascribed to Prakrit or Pali influence. Only that can account for the long e becoming short e before the double tt. There is, again, a word in Tamil cetṭu meaning frugality, and this word might possibly have given the personal noun cetṭi. But the difficulty in deriving cetṭu and the Telugu tadbhavas would induce one to conclude that it was formed from cetṭi as taccu was formed from taccan.

jyēsthā- becomes cetṭai when it means 'eldest sister,' also when it means 'the goddess of misfortune,' and kēṭṭai when it means 'the eighteenth lunar mansion.'

It is curious that s before u, too, changes into f, although the words undergo further changes before they are incorporated in the Tamil vocabulary.

S. kṛṣṇa-, 'an avatar of Viṣṇu'; Ta. kirtinānu {kittay, kuttay, kamay}; Ma. kuttan.
Pa. kanha (Andersen, p. 66); Pr. kanha (Pischel, p. 215).
S. viṣṇu-, 'the god of protection'; Ta. viṭṭu {vitṭu}; Ma. viṇṇu

Ka. viṭṭu; Pr. viṇhu (Pischel, p. 215).
kittan and vitṭu are easily derived by the dropping of the succeeding n with a view to shorten the words. It may be interesting to see that in colloquial Telugu we find kista which cannot be explained by saying that n changed into f, but rather that n dropped off while the t inherent between s and u (though unrepresented in writing) remained. viṇṭu is perhaps a nasalized form of viṭṭu. It may also be regarded as a case of metathesis viṇṇu > viṇṭu.
The Malayalam \textit{vinnu} is given here on the authority of Dr. Gundert, who writes under the word: "T.M. Te. (Te. also \textit{min} from \textit{min}?: rather Tdbh. of \textit{visnu})" and gives as meanings 'the sky, heaven'. The Prakrit \textit{vinhu} seems to lend support to Dr. Gundert's derivation. But one would expect \textit{vinnu}, 'the sky' to be connected with the Tamil word \textit{vin} which is again derivable from \textit{vil}, 'to open'. Compare the de-cerebralized Te. \textit{vinnu}. Bishop Caldwell has a remark on this very word. He says: "Sometimes \textit{s} is assimilated to a succeeding \textit{r}—e.g., the name \textit{Viṣṇu} becomes sometimes, both in poetical Tamil and in Malayalam, \textit{Vinnu}. This name appears also in poetical Tamil as \textit{vinu}, a word which denotes the wind as well as \textit{visnu}. Dr. Gundert identifies the \textit{vin} of \textit{vinnu}, 'Viṣṇu', with the Tam.-Mal. word \textit{vin}, 'sky', a true Tamil word connected with the root \textit{vīl}, 'to be bright'. The derivation of \textit{Viṣṇu} from \textit{vīl} and \textit{vin} looks very tempting, but I fear Sanskrit lexicographers will refuse to yield to the temptation." (Dravidian Comparative Grammar, page 163.) Judged by the dictionary from which I have quoted, published in 1872, three years before the date of the publication of Bishop Caldwell's Grammar, second edition, Dr. Gundert would rather derive \textit{vinnu} from S. \textit{viṣṇu}.—And \textit{vinnu} in the sense of \textit{Viṣṇu} is unknown to Tamil literature. \textit{kūṭṭam} may be ascribed to the peculiar pronunciation of \textit{r} which yields \textit{ru} as in \textit{iru} > \textit{ți}. The Telugu people of some districts pronounce \textit{gṛha}-as \textit{gruha}, and \textit{kṛṣṇa}—as \textit{kṛṣṇa}. Some Tamil scholars in the vicinity of Madras have been heard to refer to Sanskrit as \textit{sanskṛutam}. The old Tamil word \textit{amūtuv} indicates this pronunciation, being derived from S. \textit{amṛta}.—Dr. Gundert does not give the Malayalam \textit{kūṭṭam} as a tadbhava of S. \textit{kṛṣṇa}.—Evidently he connects it with \textit{kūṭti} which is ultimately derived from \textit{kul}. But the word as a personal name is common in Malayālam, and is held to be a corruption of S. \textit{kṛṣṇa}.

S. \textit{kṛṣṇa}, 'sharp, warm'; Ta. \textit{tīṭcanam} / \textit{tikṣanyam}

In \textit{tīṭcanam}, the anaptyctic vowel is the only peculiarity. \textit{ks} > \textit{ṭc} is quite common, as already pointed out. \textit{tikṣanyam} is a false Sanskrit form evidently derived by analogy with such words as \textit{tākṣanyam, vikṣanyam, etc.}

S. \textit{uṣṇa}, 'heat, warmth'; Ta. \textit{uṭṭanam} / \textit{uṭṭinam}

The inherent \textit{ṭ} referred to above is distinctly visible here, \textit{uṣṇam} by pronunciation is \textit{uṭṭam}, then \textit{uṭṭanam} or \textit{uṭṭinam}. Compare the English \textit{Kistna}, 'name of a district in the Madras Presidency' which is only \textit{kṛṣṇa} in the vernacular.

\textit{s} followed by \textit{ṭ} is assimilated, or changed into \textit{ṭ}.


S. pusparāga-, 'a topaz'; Ta. putparakam; Ma. puṣyarāgam.

The Tamil putpam is often pronounced as if it were written pūppam. It is also noteworthy that some people pronounce it as puṣyippam. That is regarding s as ś, for ś is interchangeable with y, e.g., kāśā, kāyā; ışal, iyal. Of course ś became first c and the medial c is found to have been pronounced as j, then from this arose y. Ta. putparakam is plain enough. How puṟuṭarākam is obtained either from puṣparāga-, common in Sanskrit, or even from the Ma.- Ka. alternative form puṣyarāgam, it is difficult to see Ta. puṟuṭarākam is found in the Cūṭāmaṇī-nikanṭū (XII, 104).

ś followed by m.

S. duṣmanta-, 'Duṣyanta, a king'; Ta. tuṭṭantaya.

S. bhīṣma-, 'a Bharata hero'; Ta. viṭṭumany.

bhīṣma- is simply explained, changing as viṣnu, and bh first becoming b, then v. In the case of duṣmanta-, the disappearance of m is inexplicable except by the usual change of m to v, and the final assimilation of v as in S. khaṭvāṅga-, 'a club with a skull at the top'; Ta. kaṭṭaṅkam.

S. sūkṣma-, 'subtle'; Ta. cūkkumam; cūkkam

The word first became cūkṣumam with an anaptyctic vowel between ś and m, and then cūkkumam. The other form was obtained by a kind of assimilation which may be termed Haplogogy. There is another form which may perhaps be called a re-Sanskritized form, cūkṣam or cūṭcam, 'a trick'. Malayālam also has sūkṣam and Dr. Gundert gives the meanings 'minute, subtle,' and 'care'. It has also formed a verb from the word, sūkṣikka, 'to watch'.

S. grīṣma-, 'the summer'; Ta. kiriṭṭumam; kiriṭam

kiriṭṭumam is like viṭṭumany explained above, only the anaptyctic vowel came in to make gri kiri.

S. lakṣmana-, 'a brother of Rāma'; Ta. ilakkumany; ilakkuvany

Ma. ilakkanāṇ.

S. lakṣmi-, 'the goddess of fortune'; Ta. ilakkumi; lekṣumi; lecci; Te. lecci

Pr. lacchi (Pischel, p. 216).

Ta. ilakkuvany is clearly derived from ilakkumany, m changing into v and na being assimilated. There are also popular forms like lekṣumāṇay and lekṣumāny corresponding to the tadbhavas of S. lakṣmi-. This vowel-change a > ē is peculiar to Tamil and is common in words beginning with unaspirated voiced stops and liquids, e.g., kēncay [gene:çon] ceyam [dżejom], terittiram [deridrom], pelam [belam], yemañ, reįkay [reɔgən]. Except ceyam
and pelam, these examples are only heard in popular speech. People write the words all right although they pronounce them with an e. The explanation would appear to be that people who pronounce so pronounce ā as a diphthong a and hence we hear an e. Really it is not a clear e. Compare also the pronunciation of the Malayālam speaking people in regard to words with a medial r followed by ā, which I observed as peculiar, e.g. kurainu, 'a monkey,' pūram, 'name of a lunar mansion.'

In the case of lecī, m has been lost by assimilation, and in (y-)ceci the loss of the initial consonant may be noticed. Ma. ilak-kaṇan has been dealt with in another connexion.

S. ślēśman-, 'phlegmatic humour'; Ta. cilēttumam;

cēttumam;
cēttumam, cērrumam;
cilēppanam;
cilēppanam, cērpanam;
cērpanam, cērpanam.

Ma. culēṇṇam; Pr. sēpha (Pischel, p. 185).
It looks curious that this Sanskrit word of all should have so many tadbhavas in Tamil. But this is a word that cannot escape being used oftener than any other, indicating as it does the humour that kills. When the śēśma-dhātu makes its presence felt, then it is a sure sign that death is knocking at the gate. Considering the circumstances in which the word is employed, one cannot be surprised at the changes the original Sanskrit word has undergone. cilēttumam is formed after the model of vittumay, or kiriṭtumam. In cēttumam, we have assimilation. Cērrumam is a case in which the cerebral ī becomes an alveolar t. There is absolutely no difference in pronunciation between a double tt and a double rr. The double rr often, we may say almost invariably, becomes tt, e.g., kāṟru> kattu. S. śēśman- must have been pronounced with a dental medial s before it became cilēppanam. Compare S. bhasman-, Ta. pāṟpan. cēṟpanam, cēpānan and cēṟpan point to assimilation. Compare the Prakrit form sēpha. cilēppanam also got pp by assimilation of r to p.

S. bhāṣya- 'a commentary'; Ta. pāṭiyam.
S. pūṣya- 'name of an asterism'; Ta. pūcam; Ma. pūyan.
S. lākṣya- 'an aim'; Ta. (i-)lakkiyam, 'poetical literature.' (i-)lakku, 'aim.'

Ta. pāṭiyam is plain enough. Ta. pūcam may perhaps be regarded as a case of compensatory lengthening. The vowel ū is lengthened to compensate for the loss of y. Ma. pūyan must have been derived from Tamil when the medial ē was pronounced as ā. The i in the Tamil forms of S. lākṣya- is prothetic. Ta. ilakku may be derived from ilakkiyam, but the process is not plain. It seems likely that there was another tadbhava ilakkaṁ from S. lākṣa-,'aim,' which led in course of time to the formation of ilakku by the dropping of
the final -am. There is, of course, a Ta. īlakkam which means 'number.' Brown’s Telugu Dictionary (second edition) gives the corresponding Telugu word lekka and suggests that it is a pure Telugu word when it means 'number' and makes it a tadbhava of S. lakṣya- when it means 'esteem.' I am inclined to think that 'number' and 'esteem' are closely related and that both are denoted by the tadbhava of S. lakṣya-. Compare also Ta. en which means 'to count' as well as 'to regard, to think,' etc., and again Ta. māti which means 'to estimate or appraise' as well as 'to regard.' The noun matippu means 'estimate' as well as 'esteem.' Ta. īlakkam, 'a lakh' is also a tadbhava of S. lakṣa-.

The Dental Sibilant.

The dental s, like the cerebral ṣ, has been given in the Tamil alphabet a separate symbol adopted from the Grantha alphabet. This symbol, however, did not exist as a letter of the Tamil alphabet in the earlier language. Even today the dental s is popular only in the case of words where it occurs as part of conjunct consonants, e.g., pustakam, stiri.

Ordinarily the dental s is represented in Tamil or Malayālam by the palatal ṣ which letter is in fact made to answer, as has been shown already, for ṣ and ṣ as well, being the nearest phonetic representative.

S. simha-, 'a lion'; Ta. ciṅkam; Ma. ciṅnām.
S. siṅḍu-, 'red lead'; Ta. cinturam; Ma. cintûram.
S. sanghata-, 'association'; Ta. caṅkattam; Ma. caṅnātām
S. sēvaka-, 'a servant'; Ta. cēvakān { cekuvān }; Ma. cēvakan.
S. svāti-, 'name of an asterism'; Ta. cōtī; Ma. cōtī.

Such words as sāvu, 'death,' sōra, 'a shark,' sōna, 'rain' in Telugu corresponding to ca νu, curā and cōnai of Tamil, and again such words as sāvu, 'death,' sōne, 'incessant drizzle,' suttu, 'surround' in Kannarese corresponding to ca νu, cōnai, and cur ī of Tamil, prove that the sound of c is related to that of s, and Telugu and Kannarese with their enlarged alphabets have preferred to represent it by the latter symbol in the words shown. That the sound of s is adopted for c by some classes even among Tamils has been shown already.

Ta. cōtī is also the tadbhava form of S. jyōtis-.

One would expect the dental s to change into the dental t judging from the close relationship to each other and the difficulty of pronouncing the spirant for children and untrained people. And so it does. In Tamil the change is not common at the beginning of a word whereas Malayālam can supply a number of instances. They are mostly from the Rāmacaritam, the oldest Malayālam work extant.

S. sutkāru-, 'hospitalable reception'; Ma. takkāram.
S. santati-, 'progeny'; Ma. tantati.
S. sāntēsā-, 'delight'; Ma. tantōlam.
S. sambandha-, 'relation'; Ma. tammantam.
S. sāyaka-, 'an arrow'; Ma. tāyakam.
S. sārathi-, 'a charioteer'; Ma. tārati.
S. suranga-, 'a mine'; Ma. turaṅkam.
S. sōdara-, 'a uterine brother'; Ma. tōtaran.
S. sēnā-, 'an army'; Ta. tāyai; Ma. tēnā.

The change of ū to ū in Ta. tāyai is somewhat difficult to explain. Compare Te. ēnugu and Ta. ānai. There is another instance in Tamil illustrating this change of s to t which is of doubtful validity. In Tamil one meets with the word tattiyam which may be taken as a tadbhava of S. sālya-. But there is in Sanskrit tathya- which means 'truth, reality'. That obviates the need for formulating any change of s to t with regard to that word.

Proper names also seem to have been affected by this change.
S. sampāti-, 'name of a fabulous bird in the Ramāyaṇa'; Ma. tampāti.
S. samirāṇa-, 'air'; Ma. tamirānan.
S. sumitrā-, 'one of the wives of Daśaratha'; Ma. tumittirai.

It may be noted in this connexion that Prakrit shows this change in regard to c. Pr. tigichhā < S. cikitsā- (Pischel, p. 224).

When s occurs in the middle of a word between vowels, the change is found as often in Tamil as in Malayālam.
S. asi-, 'a sword'; Ma. ati.
S. asura-, 'a demon'; Ma. atūran.
S. āyasa-, 'fatigue'; Ma. āyātam.
S. āsuna-, 'seat'; Ta. āṭaṇam.
S. kusuma-, 'flower'; Ma. kutumam.
S. dāsa-, 'a servant'; Ta. tāṭay; Ma. tātan.
S. nāsikā-, 'the nose'; Ma. nātiku.
S. nivāsa-, 'a house'; Ma. nīvālam.
S. māsa-, 'a month'; Ta. mūtam.
S. musala-, 'a club'; Ma. mutulam.
S. vasīṣṭha-, 'name of a sage'; Ta. vatiṭṭay.
S. vilāsa-, 'sport'; Ma. vilātam.
S. vyāsa-, 'name of a sage'; Ta. viyāṭan; Ma. viyātan.
S. rasa-, 'juice'; Ta. irātam; Ma. irātam.
S. śvāsa-, 'breath'; Ta. cuvātam.
S. sāsana-, 'a deed'; Ta. cāṭaṇam.

Most of the Malayālam forms are taken from the Ramacaritam. Ta. irātam is also a tadbhava of S. ratha-, 'a car.' Ta. cuvātam occurs in Villiputtūrar's Bhāratam. Ta. cāṭaṇam is also a tadbhava of S. sādhana-, 'a means.' This change of s to t is sometimes found among Dravidian words themselves; thus Ta. ọcāi is also written as ọtai. s of course becomes c by transliteration. Malayālam has
the forms ôśa, ôca, and occa. Again Ta. kocu, kocuku has another form kotuku, while Malayālam has kotu and kotuki only. In the latter case it is hard to determine which is the earlier form. The Tamil word culai, 'pulp' is telē in Kanarese. The Tamil caratū, 'a cord' is Te. trādu. Accepting that the forms with c are the earlier, one has to theorise, with reference to the early pronunciation of the initial and medial c already discussed, on the probable date of this change. The pronunciation of c at this stage in the language must have been that of the dental s. Perhaps this is comparatively later.

Medial s sometimes changes into y, like ś.

S. vasanta-, 'the spring'; Ta. vayantam; Ma. vayanta.
The Tamil form presupposes a form vacantam in which c was pronounced as j. Ta. vayantam is a pretty old word. The modern form is vacantam in which c is pronounced as ś. The tendency of the Tamil-speaking people in Trichinopoly and the neighbouring places to substitute y for c (ś) even in Tamil words, as e.g., pēcāṭe > pēyāṭe, as they pronounce them, would lead one to doubt if the intermediate change of c > j has to be taken for granted.

The initial s followed by stop consonants and nasals generally drops off. Such a combination is not native to Tamil, and s in such cases cannot change into c.

S. skanda-, 'the war-god'; Ta. kantay; Te. kanduḍu.
S. stambhana-, 'restraining'; Ta. lampaṇam.
S. stuti-, 'praise'; Ta. tūi.
S. stōtra-, 'praise'; Ta. tōttiram.
   cōttam.
S. sthūnā-, 'a pillar'; Ta. tūṇ; Ma. tūṇ; Pr. thūṇā (Pischel, p. 101).
S. sthūla-, 'bulky'; Ta. tūlam; Pr. thūla (Pischel, p. 101); Pa. thūlu (Andersen, p. 116).
S. snāna-, 'bathing'; Ta. nāṇam; Te. tānamu.
S. sparśa-, 'touch'; Ta. paricam; Ma. pariṣam {i}
   pariymam}
S. sphatika-, 'crystal'; Ta. paṭikam; Ma. paṭikam.
S. smṛti-, 'a law-book '; Ta. miruti.

Words recently borrowed keep the s on, e.g., S. stri, 'a woman,' becomes stiri. And most of the above words have been borrowed for a second time with s retained. This is true of all tadbhavas. Sanskrit-knowing people in modern times have imported many Sanskrit words with very few changes, e.g., psaṭa-, 'clear,' smārtā-, 'name of a sect,' smāraka, 'reminding,' stava-, 'panegyric.'

The tadbhava cōttam which occurs in the Tiruvācaṇam does not belong to this class of words. Assimilation has been at work in it. There is also in popular speech a re-Sanskritized false form cōstrāma. Compare the colloquial Ta. cūstra, a corruption of Ta. cūttiram, a tadbhava of S. sūtra. These forms are evidently
formed from analogy with S. śāstra-. Te. tānamu is a curious tadbhava. Tamil too has stāna a dialectal variant corresponding to it. Frequent occurrence of words with st must have led by contamination to the formation of this tadbhava.

Dr. Gundert derives Ma. pariṣam and pariyaṃ from S. sparsa-. But they do not mean 'touch.' They mean (1) the back part of a house (compare Mar. parasā, 'backyard, enclosure of a house'), and (2) a token given by the bridegroom to the bride. Tamil has both the forms, which, however, it uses in the latter sense only. Again, in Tamil classics we have paricil, paricu which mean 'gift, present,' and it is probable that paricam was derived from these by contamination.

Again Tamil has, besides paṭikam, paliṅku derived through Prakrit or Pali. Pischel (p. 148) gives phaliha, and Andersen (p. 184) phaliha. Tamil has nasalized the Pali form. Malayālam has paliṅku. Telugu has paliugu with an ardhanusvāra before -gu which makes the form almost identical with the Malayālam form.

In some words s preceding a vowel also has shown a tendency to drop off.

S. subha-, 'an assembly'; Ta. avai.
S. sundhya-, 'twilight'; Ta. anti, 'evening'; Ma. anti.
S. samaya-, 'opportunity'; Ta. amayam.
S. sindhu-, 'the Indus'; Ta. intu; Ma. intu.
S. simhala-, 'Ceylon'; Ta. ilda; Ma. ilda.
S. sisa-, 'lead'; Ta. iyam; Ma. iyam.
S. sahusra-, 'a thousand'; Ta. āyiram; Ma. āyiram.
S. suci-, 'a needle'; Ta. āci; Te. südi; Ka. süji.

Many of these have other forms with s retained, of course changed into the Tamil c, as capai, canti, camayam, cintu, ciṅkalam, cakkiciram, and cuci. In the expression anticanti, if anti is taken to mean 'evening,' canti may be taken to mean morning. S. sundhya- means 'twilight hour,' and anti has come to mean 'evening' in Tamil and Malayalam. There is another anti in Tamil met with in expressions like antikkālam. There, of course, it is a tadbhava of S. antya-, 'last.' S. simhala- has undergone many changes. There is the modern tadbhava ciṅkalam (Te. singalāmu) which is employed to denote the language Singhalese, and the country inhabited by the people that speak it. But ilda is derived in a different way: Pali has siha corresponding to S. simha- (Prakrit also has that form. Pischel, p. 68). The Tamil tadbhava of S. simhala-, through Pali, would be siyālam. And the stress on the first syllable has led to the dropping of ya after it. We thus get siyālam from which by the dropping of the initial s, the word ilam or ilda is obtained. One is not inclined to attach much value to the change of l to l, as often the Tamils in the so-called pure-Tamil districts, Tinnevelly and Madura, make no difference between them.
Sanskrit Sibilants

s followed by m, it was pointed out before, drops off. Sometimes m drops off and the following vowel is changed, naturally into u or o.

S. smarana-, ‘recollection’; Ta. corañai1 ‘consciousness’, cunai2 ‘keen sensibility’.

s followed by y assimilates the y.
S. syandana- ‘a car’; Ta. cantanam.

There is another cantanum, ‘sandal’, a tadbhava of S. cundana-.

s followed by r takes an anaptyctic vowel.
S. srwva-, ‘a sacrificial ladle’; Ta. curwam.

s followed by v takes an anaptyctic vowel.
S. svāmin-, ‘a lord’; Ta. cuvāmi.
S. svara-, ‘gold’; Ta. cuvāram.
S. svarga-, ‘heaven’; Ta. cuvarkkam.
S. svahā-, ‘an oblation’; T. cuvākā.

The commoner change is the dropping of the v and the changing of the vowel.
S. svāmin-, ‘a lord’; Ta. cāmi; Ma. sāmi; Te. sāmi; Ka. sāmi;
Pr. sāmi (Pischel, p. 286); Pa. sāmin (Andersen, p. 268).
S. svāmini-, ‘a lady’; Ta. cāyi; Te. sāni.
S. svapnu-, ‘a dream’; Ta. coppaṇam

S. svāti-, ‘name of an asterism’; Ta. cōti.
S. svayā-, ‘oneself’; Ta. cuyām1; Te. sayām1 coyam \[sayānu\]
S. svara-, ‘a note of the musical scale’; Ta. curam; Te. soram.
S. svarga-, ‘heaven’; Ta. cokkam.
S. svayambhū-, ‘name of Śiva’; Ta. cuyampu
cayampu

S. svayamvara-, ‘choice-marriage’; Ta. cayamaram.
S. svabhāva-, ‘nature’; Te. sabāmu.
S. svara-, ‘gold’; Ta. conyam.
S. svapla-, ‘insignificant’; Ta. corpam.
S. svadēśa-, ‘one’s own country’; Ta. cutēcam.
S. svantra-, ‘self-dependent’; Ta. cutantaram.

Ta. cāni is not used alone. It is only an affix as in turai-cāni. In many of the Tamil words u after the initial consonant is pronounced as o, and in course of time is bound to be written so. cuyampu is a classical word (the Nilakēci, quoted in the Manimēkalai, commentary, p. 254). Evidently it is a form borrowed through Prakrit. Prakrit has sayam for S. svayam (Pischel, p 237). Pali also has that form (Andersen, p. 265).

There is in Tamil a word contam, ‘one’s own.’ Sanskrit-knowing people pronounce it as soutam and svantam. Dr. Gundert gives in his dictionary svantam and transcribes it in English as soundam and indicates that it is connected with sva of Sanskrit. Dr. Kittel
gives in his Kannada Dictionary *svanta* and says it is equivalent to *sonta*, and makes both tadbhayas of *S. sva*-.* In Brown’s Telugu-English Dictionary (second edition) *svanta* and *sonta* are regarded as the same word and both are connected with *S. svatantra*.- If *contam* must be connected with Sanskrit, no other derivation seems to be possible. *S. svatantra*- might have been corrupted into *svantam*, rather than *S. sva*.-

*S. svatantra*-, one would expect to become *cutantiram*. Indeed the scholars are very particular about the vowel *i* before *r*, that being the natural anaptyctic vowel. But people would not have it so: *cutantaram* is a common word and perhaps looks neater to them than the word with *i*.

*S. snēha*, ‘oil, love’; Ta. *ney*; ‘ghee’ *nēya*; *nēshā*; ‘love’; *Ma. neyi*; ‘ghee’ *nai*; ‘a friend’

This word could have been put along with others of the same kind, the words that drop the initial *s*, with a further change as happens in *siha* of Pali. But it has undergone some curious changes, and deserves separate handling. Besides the loss of the initial *s*, the vowel is shortened when we get *ney* in Tamil and *neyi* in Malayālam. Malayālam would make it *nai* as well, the reverse case of what happens in *S. daiva* > *Ma. teyyam*. Telugu has *neyyi* and *neyi*; both mean ‘ghee.’ Kanarese has *ney*; Dr. Kittel is, however, not sure of its being a tadbhava of *S. snēha*. In Tamil, *ney* when used independently means ‘ghee,’ and in composition, ‘any oily thing’ as in *venney*, ‘butter’ (lit. ‘white ghee’), *enney*, ‘gingelly oil.’ It is a pretty old word and one has to think well before he sets it down as a tadbhava. The chances are more with regard to *nēya*. Even in that case one has to take into consideration words like *nē*, ‘affection,’ found in Tamil classics like the *Purāṇāṇūru*. Assuming that *nēyam* is a tadbhava, one has to explain another form of the word *nēcam* by analogical instances, like *nyir*, *ncir*, or by metathesis. And Kanarese has *nēṣta*, *nēha*, meaning ‘love’. Telugu has *nēṣtamu*, *nēyamu*. While *nēha* and *nēyamu* can be easily explained to be tadbhayas of *S. snēha*-, *Kā. nēṣta* and *Tē. nēṣtam* are harder to account for. *S. snēhita* is possibly the source of these forms thus: *snēhita* > *nēṣita* > *nēṣta*. Ta. *cinēkita* with an anaptyctic vowel may also be noted. Compare Pali *sinēhita* (Andersen, p. 270).

*S. stambha*-, ‘a pillar’; Ta. *kampam*; *Ma. kampam*.

This equation is accepted by almost all Dravidian grammarians and lexicographers. Dr. Gundert doubts the derivation. Dr. Kittel regards *Kā. kamba* or *kambha* as a tadbhava of *S. skambha* or *stambha*-. The Telugu form is *kambamu*. That Prakrit has *kambha* and that the Prakrit word has been borrowed by all these languages is the only possible explanation. But Dr. Kittel’s alternative derivation from *skhambha* seems to be nearer the truth. Pischel
(p. 4) equates khambha with the Vedic skambha-. Grassman in his Wörterbuch zum Rig-veda (p. 1585) has given skambha- as meaning 'prop, support.' And the omission of the initial s is more natural than a change of st to k. The Tamil kampu meaning 'a stick,' used only in the southernmost districts of the Madras Presidency— in Madras the word is kompu—is possibly a corruption of kampam.

The medial s followed by dental stop consonants is assimilated.
S. astra-, 'an arrow'; Ta. attiram.
S. astamana-, 'setting of the sun'; Ta. attamayam; Pr. attamayam (Hemacandra's Kumārapāla-carita, V. 88).
S. avasthā-, 'state'; Ta. avatīai; Pr. avatthā (Pischel, p. 211).
S. pustaka-, 'a book'; Ta. puttukam; Pa. potthaka (Andersen, p. 183).
S. māsakara-, 'skull'; Ta. makkam; Pa. matthaka (Andersen, p. 201).
S. hasta-, 'the hand'; Ta. attam; Pr. hattha (Pischel, p. 211); Pa. hattha (Andersen, p. 279).
S. hastin-, 'an elephant'; Ta. attī; Pr. hatthi (Pischel, p. 213); Pa. hatthin (Andersen, p. 280).

But the medial s followed by a guttural or a labial is changed into r, the alveolar r.
S. bhāskara-, 'the sun'; Ta. pārkaran.
S. āspada-, 'a place'; Ta. āpam.
S. bhāsapati-, 'Jupiter'; Ta. pirukarpati.

The medial s followed by m, the labial nasal, is transformed into r changing the succeeding nasal into a stop.
S. bhasmam-, 'ashes'; Ta. parpam.

The intermediate form paspam is also used by people in the sense of 'a medicinal powder.' In another connexion it has been pointed out that parpam is also a tadbhava of S. padma-, 'the lotus.'

The medial s followed by y takes an anaptyctic vowel.
S. nasya-, 'a sternutatory'; Ta. naciyam.

The final -as is replaced by -am in Tamil tadbhavas. Perhaps the Prakrit languages in which -as also becomes -am have exerted some influence on Tamil words.
S. tamaś-, 'darkness'; Ta. tamam; Ma. tamam.
S. śīras-, 'the head'; Ta. ciram; Ma. cīram.
S. manas-, 'the mind'; Ta. manām; Ma. manam.
S. tapas-, 'penance'; Ta. tavam; Ma. tavam.

There are, however, later tadbhavas with u affixed to the Sanskrit bases: cirauc, manauc, tavauuc and tapaucu. manauc also appears as manitu. These words are popular; tamam is only classical. These later tadbhavas are the result of a second borrowing.
THE Sanskrit Spirant ḥ.

Its treatment in Tamil and Malayalam tadbhavas.

The spirant ḥ is a sound not altogether foreign to Tamil. For Tamil has the āṣṭam ḥ ('). which is almost an equivalent of it. But the āṣṭam differs from ḥ in some ways. The āṣṭam is found in a very few words in Tamil and is peculiar to Tamil of all the Dravidian tongues. It is, however, not a recent introduction, being referred to in the Tolkāppiyam, the oldest Tamil grammar extant (Ejuttatikāram, 2). Tolkāppiyar refers to it as 'the three dots known as āṣṭam,' thus indicating its shape when committed to writing. And it is mere dots not a linear symbol like those for all other sounds. Again he says: "The consonant āṣṭam comes in only after a short vowel and before the six vowel-consonants k, c, t, t, p, and ṛ" (Ejuttatikāram, 38). Thus it is only medial, and its use is much restricted.

Dr. Caldwell says: "Tamil makes no use whatever of aspirates, and has not borrowed any of the aspirated consonants of Sanskrit, nor even the isolated aspirate ḥ. It professes to possess a letter, half vowel, half consonant, corresponding in some respects to the Sanskrit visarga and called āṣṭam (that which is subtle, minute). It is pronounced like a guttural ḥ, but is only found in the poets, and is generally considered a pedantical invention of the grammarians" (Dravidian Comparative Grammar, third edition, p. 130). Dr. Caldwell's statement regarding the Tamil āṣṭam is, I am afraid, not based on a knowledge of facts. The āṣṭam is not considered by any one, so far as I know, a pedantical invention of the grammarians. What could have been their purpose in inventing such a letter? This calls in question the very fundamental principle of Tamil grammar-writing. Tamil grammarians have always held that literature should precede grammar, and the fact that reference is made to the āṣṭam in the Tolkāppiyam would put it beyond dispute that it is no idle invention of the grammarians.

- The words in common use where the āṣṭam occurs are Ta. aḥtu, 'that,' and Ta. iḥtu, 'this.' These ought to be pronounced with the aspiration, but the popular pronunciations are [aɡūdū] and [iɡūdū] where ḥ is represented by [ɡū]. There are some words found only in books where ḥ occurs: Ta. ḥku, 'steel' is one. This is popularly pronounced as [egū] as if there were no ḥ at all, and it is worth noting that elu is only another form of ḥku, corrupted from it. Compare S. mulḥurta-, 'a period of 48 minutes, auspicious hour' > Ta. mukurttām > muluttam. In the case of ḥku, ḥ cannot be pronounced as [ɡū] as it is itself followed by ku. Ta. koheu, 'a weight, ⅛ oz.', is another word, and is pronounced as [kaɡūs]. Some other words are Ta. akkam, 'food-grain' and Ta. vehku, 'desire ardently.'
The āyām sometimes comes in when words combine as in the case of paḷ + tuḷi = pahreṇi, ‘many drops’, which is pronounced [pəgherul]. There is also another compound, parruli. Ta. mutītu, ‘the thorn is bad’, is another example. This is pronounced [mugudīdū]. There is mutītu as well.

The tendency of modern speech, however, it must be admitted, is to discard the āyām altogether. The words ahu and ihu referred to above are about the only ones commonly met with, but only in books and in pedantic speech. They are also acknowledged to be variants of atu and itu, and considered to be necessary when these words are in sandhi followed by words beginning with a vowel or y, e.g., ahaṭṭuppu, ‘that is the oven’, iḥtūr, ‘this is a village’. But to argue from that circumstance that the āyām is only an invention of the grammarians is like arguing that the letter ṛ is an invention of the Telugu or Kannada grammarians because modern speech makes no distinction between ṛ and ṭ, or rather knows only ṛ.

Sanskrit words where ḥ occurs, when they enter Tamil, invariably have it changed. It must be noted, however, that in recent times, the Grantha symbol has been adopted in the Tamil alphabet, and is often found used in books, especially school books. When it does change, it follows certain laws. When ḥ is initial, it disappears in the tadbhavas.

S. hari-, ‘Viṣṇu’; Ta. ari; Ma. ari.
S. hashin-, ‘an elephant’; Ta. atti; Ma. atti.
S. hiti-, ‘wholesome’; Ta. itam, ‘good’; Te. itawu.
S. hima-, ‘snow’; Ta. imam; Ma. imam.
S. hṛdaya-, ‘the heart’; Ta. itayam.
S. hingu-, ‘asafetida’; Te. inguva.
S. hēman-, ‘gold’; Ta. ēmam.
S. haiyangavina- ‘butter’; Ta. aiyaṅkaviyam.
S. hōra-, ‘an hour’; Ta. orai.

When it is medial, it is replaced by k, of course with the sound it usually has when medial, or is assimilated to a previous anusvāra.

S. āhuti-, ‘an oblation offered to a deity’; Ta. ākutī.
S. mōha-, ‘illusion of attachment or love’; Ta. mōkam; Ma. mōkam.
S. simha-, ‘a lion’; Ta. ciṅkam; Ma. ciṅkam; Te. singamu.
S. samhāra-, ‘destruction’; Ta. cāṅkāram; cammāram.

The change of ḥ into v cannot be regarded as an apparent change. The change of k into v is common in pure Tamil words, e.g., aṅkum → avum; maku → manvam; pakkal → paval. S. naraḥari-, ‘man-lion’, Ta. naraṇārī cannot come under this category as v comes
in as a glide thus: *nara + hari = nara + ari = nara(v)ari*. Ta.—Ma.
cinkam* is not anything peculiar to these languages. Prakrit can
show singh. Pischel gives singha from S. sinha-, and samghāra from
S. samhāra- (p. 184).
Again the medial *h* is changed into *y* in some cases.
S. parihāsa-, ‘joking, jesting’; Ta. pariyācam.
S. mahaśa-, ‘a buffalo’; Ta. mayītam.
S. mahendra-, ‘name of a mountain range’; Ta. mayēntīram.
In all these cases, there is the alternative tadbhava with *k
glides to have crept in as a glide, as in narahari, when *h* was dislodged,
e.g., *mahiṣa > maīda > mayīda* or Ta. mayītam. The *y*-glide has
evidently been suggested by the *i* that precedes or follows. Ta.
dakikka (S. dah) and Ta. vikikka (S. vah) are pronounced as if they
were written dayikka and vayikka. Malayālam has the colloquial
vayā for vahiya, ‘intolerable, impossible’. Telugu has bayilu,
‘the open’, obviously from S. bahis-. The Hindustani nahi is collo-
quially nayī or nai. Compare also Ta. mailāppur supposed to be
connected with S. mahiṣārūpya-, and maisūr (Mysore) with S.
mahiṣāṭurra-.

The following compounds follow the rule mentioned above
regarding words that have a medial *h*. Although *h* is initial in the
second words of these compounds, the compounds have to be
regarded as single words.
S. paramahamsa-, ‘an ascetic of the highest order’; Ta. parama-
kaṇcaṇ.
S. śīṣvhatyā-, ‘child-murder, infanticide’; Ta. cicukatti.
Strictly viewed, these compounds should be *parama + aṇcay =
parama (v) aṇcaṇ, cicu + atti = cicu (v) atti*. But these have not been
treated as compounds. Thus there is no initial *h* in these, it is
only medial. And the medial *h* has, following the usual rule,
become *k*. But the medial *k* is hardly *k*, and is often interchange-
able with *v*, as has been shown above. Compare also nōum, nōkum; nāval, nākal (in nākappālam). The medial *k* has a peculiar
sound-value in Tamil. Of course it is that of *g* when it follows its
nasal. Some people would pronounce it as *g* in other places as
well. Others would make it an equivalent of *h* and pronounce it
as an aspirate. This appears to be due to Sanskrit influence.
Others again would pronounce it as *k*, unvoiced velar pure and
simple. The correct pronunciation of the *k* between vowels,
however, seems to be none of these but that very nearly akin to
the modern Greek *γ*. Dr. Gundert adopted this symbol in tran-
scribing the Malayālam words with the medial *k* in his Malayālam
Dictionary. It may be noted in this connexion that Tamil shows
a need for such symbols in the case of the medial *t*, and the medial
*p*, and also in the case of the medial *t*, e.g., Ta., atu, ‘that’, is
neither [atū] nor [adū], it is [adū]; Ta. urupu, ‘particle’, is neither
[urupū] nor [urubū], it is [uruvū]; Ta. katal, ‘the sea’ is neither [kAṭṉ]
nor [kaːd̪al], it is [kaːd̪al]. The International Phonetic Association seems to have felt no need for this last symbol. But there is the spirantal sound in the case of the lingual also. It is not the voiceless nor the voiced sound that is heard but a spirantal sound which will pair off with ɡ, ɐ, and ʋ.

Dr. Gundert wrote his Dictionary half a century ago. It has become a fashion with the Malayalam-speaking educated men to contend that their alphabet is perfect, and that each sound has its proper value in Malayalam words. Thus they would not admit with Dr. Gundert that Ma. katu and Ma. patir should be pronounced as [kaːd̪uː] and [pəd̪ir] but would pronounce them giving the t and ɬ their normal value. Ordinary people, however, keep to the feature that Malayalam shares with Tamil, and do not appear to make any effort to pronounce them otherwise. It may perhaps be confidently asserted that these very men who want to give these symbols their normal value, taken unawares, may betray the popular tendency.

Elsewhere the peculiar sound-value of the medial c between vowels has been noticed. In this connexion it may be well to point out that the value of the medial c between vowels in Tamil is neither that of the palatal ʃ nor that of the dental s, but is a thing by itself. To one who observes the sound subtly, the medial c appears to be something midway between ʃ and s. It might have had the value of the Sanskrit j or an approach to it sometime in the history of the language. Malayalam to this day preserves this peculiarity. And Dr. Gundert rightly indicates it by a symbol related to j, i.e., j. S. acaram = Ma. ajaram. When the Sanskrit word itself has j, Dr. Gundert adopts a slightly different symbol, e.g., S. ajayam = Ma. ajayam. If this pronunciation were current in Tamil, it would enable one to pair this off along with the other spirantal sounds indicated already. As all other symbols are but modifications of the symbols for voiced consonants, this would complete the symmetry. But Tamil perhaps owing to Sanskrit influence has altered the pronunciation of the medial c, and there it remains, a sound between ʃ and s as already pointed out. The same is the value of the initial c also in modern Tamil. c preceded by its nasal is j; and preceded by another c, it regains its palatal sound.

When the medial h is found in Sanskrit words before a consonant, it is either assimilated to that consonant or elided.

S. vahni-, 'fire'; Ta. vanni.
S. brahman-, 'the creator'; Ta. piramay; Te. bomma.
S. madhyaña-, 'noon'; Ta. mattiyāṇam.

In some words when h happens to be between vowels (a's) it is neither merely lost nor assimilated as already pointed out, but lengthens the vowel that precedes it before disappearing.

S. kalaha-, 'quarrel'; Ta. kalam.
S. grahaṇa-, 'an eclipse'; Ta. kirāṇam.
S. mahāl-, 'greatness'; Ta. māṭṭu.
S. rahasya-, 'secret'; Ta. rāciyam.
S. gahana-, 'the sky'; Ta. kāṇam.
S. sahavāsa-, 'dwelling together'; Ta. cāvācam.
S. sahasra-, 'a thousand'; Ka. sāviram; Ta. āyiram.

This kind of change is met with in pure Tamil words too. Ta. akam, 'a house,' of course pronounced as if it were aham by the Brāhman people, has an alternative form ām. Ta. āttāl, āmuṭaiyān, etc., are all compounds of ām or akam. The Sanskrit word aham, 'I,' never takes this form except in the compound āṅkāram for S. ahaikāra-. Compare Ta. pakal, pāl; S. sakaṭa-, Ta. cakaṭu and cāṭu.

S. mahān-, 'the active agency of nature, a great man'; Ta. mān.

In this as well as in the Hindustani mahāl which becomes mal, e.g., the Tirumalaināyakkān Māl at Madura, ah is assimilated to the long vowel ā that follows.
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REMARKS.

Mr. Anavaratavinayakam Pillai has dealt, in my opinion, in a highly praiseworthy way with an important section of the data bearing upon the relation of Sanskrit and the Prakrit dialects to the Dravidian languages, more especially to Tamil and Malayalam. The material that has been collected and arranged cannot but be of great value to future investigators. I venture to add the following remarks, more by way of accompaniment than by way of comment.

It is a well-known law that, when one speech-community borrows from another, the imported words are inevitably modified in accordance with the speech-habits of the importing community. Old Irish possessed no $p$, and when it imported the Latin word purpura, 'purple', it changed it into corcor. In French there are numerous words of Teutonic origin which show an initial guttural in place of an original $w$-sound. Some of these, as is well-known, were brought to England by the Normans and now form part of the Anglo-Norman element in English, such as guard by the side of ward, guise by the side of wise. Similarly the Hindustani khaki, 'like dust, dust-coloured,' is regularly pronounced, as a borrowed word, with an initial $k$ instead of the sound heard in the Scotch loch. It is with such changes as these in the case of Sanskrit or Sanskritic words borrowed by Dravidian peoples that Mr. Anavaratavinayakam Pillai is mainly concerned.

The Dravidians of Southern India have borrowed a great number of such words. To a large extent they are cultural terms, but there is also a considerable number of purely Āryan vocables expressive of ideas for which the language already possessed sound-symbols. This seems to be especially the case with Malayalam, and it is interesting to note the curious changes in meaning which such borrowings frequently show. I would instance the words Ma. samsāri, 'to converse' [S. samsāra-, 'the (constantly recurring) course of mundane existence'], Ma. tāmasi, 'ligner, loiter,' (S. tāmasa-, from tamas-, 'darkness, the guṇa or quality of ignorance etc.'), Ma. dāhi, Ta. tāki, 'be thirsty' (S. dāha-, 'burning, feverish heat'). Similarly Ta. mōram, in the sense of 'deceit, treachery', bears a meaning quite foreign to the S. moṣam, 'theft, with which it seems to be connected. Ta. coranaí or curanaí, 'sensation,' moreover, is fairly widely removed in meaning from the original S. smarana-, 'memory.' It need hardly be said that these changes in meaning need as careful investigation as the changes in form.

These borrowings, whatever modifications they may present, affect only the vocabulary. In structure the Dravidian languages of the south have remained true to the old type. With the race or races who occupied the greater portion of northern India in
primitive times the case is different. These came at a very early period into direct contact with the encroaching Ṭryans, and here we find a state of things quite analogous to that which obtained in those parts of Europe into which Roman soldiers and Roman settlers successfully penetrated. The Romance languages may well be called Prakrits of Latin, and there can be little doubt that the history of the rise of these new languages in Europe is closely akin to that of the rise of the Middle Indian languages of India. In each case a period of more or less complete bilingualism must have preceded the establishment of the supremacy of the invading speech; and in each case the victorious language emerged greatly modified by the speech-habits of the invaded areas. In the Prakrits and in the Roman languages the local sounds, the local idioms, the local sentence-structure made their influence felt upon the adopted speech. In French the word for ‘eighty’ is quatre-vingts, i.e., ‘four twenties.’ Latin has octoginta; but in Modern Irish the word is ceithre fchid and in Modern Welsh pedwar ugain, both showing the same idiom as French. This was evidently a Keltic, and therefore Gallic, way of reckoning, and the Latin was modified in accordance with it. The running on of a final consonant when the next word begins with a vowel (as in vous-avez ‘you have’) is characteristic of Keltic sandhi. And such Keltic peculiarities are frequently to be met with. Similarly, in India, the element of local colour is, I think, unmistakable.

This element presents an aspect which harmonizes well with the assumption that the northern parts of India were once occupied mainly by Dravidians. The Dravidian languages employ only post-positions: the Middle Indian dialects—the Prakrits, including Pali—, and the Modern Indian dialects, their lineal descendants, have completely abandoned prepositions and have substituted post-positions for them. The dative termination of nouns both in the vernaculars of the north of India and the Dravidian languages of the south consists of a k-sound (sometimes modified to a g-sound) followed by some vowel. The same grammatical psychology lies behind the Hindi naukar-log-k, ‘to the servants,’ and the Tamil vitu-kal-ukku, ‘to the houses’; both are distinctly agglutinative in type. The use of iruntu in the formation of the ablative in Tamil is quite parallel with the use of hōi, ‘having been,’ in the same case in Orīya. Similarly the generalization of kāraṇ in Tamil as a suffix denoting an agent, ‘one who has to do with something’, is answered in Hindi by a similar use of wāla (S. pāla-, ‘protector’); one often hears in Madras pani-wāla substituted for tanthir-kkāray, ‘water-man.’ Both in the north and the south the word for ‘foot,’ is used to denote ‘a quarter,’ and in both these areas are to be found single words expressing the notions ‘one-and-a-half’ and ‘two-and-a-half,’ respectively. Moreover, the comparative and superlative have ceased to be expressed morphologically in the Sanskritic
areas and have never been so expressed in the Dravidic areas: Malayalam itu ali nellatākunnu is comparable in structure with Hindi yih us-sē acchā hai; this is better than that; both languages employ a post-position (Ma. -i, locative; H. -sē, ablative) and a positive. Marathi agrees with Kanarese (and other Dravidian tongues) in its method of expressing indirect narration: the direct speech is made indirect by adding in Marathi hmanūn, a gerund from the root hman, in Kanarese endu, an adverbial participle from the root en, both roots meaning 'say.' Again the use of what may be called a gerundial construction is characteristic of both north and south. Hindi le-a, 'bring (thou),' le-jā, 'take (thou) away,' are very un-Indogermanic in type, but answer perfectly to the Dravidic idiom, e.g., to Tamil kantu-va, kantu-pace. These resemblances—and many more could be adduced—point unmistakably to the existence of a Dravidic substratum in the languages of northern India.

This Dravidian element makes its influence felt in the sounds employed, not only in the Sanskritic vernaculars, but to a certain extent, in Sanskrit itself. The cerebral stops, so characteristic of Dravidian, are found even in the earliest Sanskrit. Sanskrit झ (j) stands for an original z-sound, which is regularly preserved in Avestan: S. jantu-, 'creature,' is in Avestan santu; S. ajati, 'he drives,' is asati, and so on. In northern India to-day the words containing a z-sound that have been imported from Persian (or Arabic) are popularly pronounced with a j: zin, 'saddle,' is usually jin; huzur, lit. 'presence,' usually hujur. Just as the Dravidian languages of the south have no true z, so in the north no true z appears to have been known. In the Middle Indian dialects the three sibilants of Sanskrit, श (s) (palatal), ष (s) (cerebral) and ष (s) (dental), are, as a rule, reduced to one, and, similarly, the modern vernaculars only employ one s-sound; Hindi, for example, has s only, Bengali ̄ only. I am inclined to connect this treatment of the sibilants with the fact that in the Tamil alphabet, as in the Vaṭṭeluttu script upon which it is based, there is no symbol for s. In the Tamil-Malayalam country, at least, the pronunciation of the voiceless s, as well as the voiced z, evidently formed a difficulty, and it would appear that our (assumed) Dravidians of the north had no very good ear for sibilants of any sort. It seems to me that the evidence supplied by words borrowed from Sanskrit indicates that the pronunciation of ζ as a palatal s, which is heard over a very large portion of the Tamil-speaking area, is a comparatively recent development. Had this pronunciation existed in early times, Tamil would never have had recourse to s(l) to represent Sanskrit s between vowels but would surely have employed ζ(c) as it does in what appear to be modernized forms, మాచమ (mācam) 'month,' for instance, by the side of the older మాచమ (mātam). The sound of ζ between vowels (like the th of then) was a lisping approximation to the sibilant of the original, and
evidently seemed to the speakers to come nearer to this sibilant than the then pronunciation of \( \sigma \). I think there can be little doubt that the early pronunciation of \( \sigma \) was that which it has now when doubled, and which the corresponding letter still retains in Malayālam, viz., that of Sanskrit \( \varphi \). Between vowels, single consonants in Tamil, except when a Sanskritizing pronunciation is affected, are always (1) voiced and (2) spirantal, or fricative. It seems probable that the voicing preceded the spirantalization, that, for example, when the Sanskrit word \( \text{pītā} \) (nom.) was borrowed into Tamil, the original \( t \)-sound became first \( d \) and then the sound which the \( \sigma \) of the Tamil word (\( \text{pūjā} \)) now represents—a voiced spirant dental. Similarly the \( \sigma \) of the word \( \text{ākācam} \) was almost certainly in earliest times, as in Malayālam to-day, pronounced as the Sanskrit \( \varphi \), English \( j \), the voiced sound corresponding to Sanskrit \( \varphi \), English \( ch \) as in church, which would have been, I contend, the pronunciation of \( \sigma \) as an initial consonant. I consider it to be highly probable that the spelling \( \text{ākāyam} \) represents the further stage of spirantalization—the tongue remaining in approximately the same position, but the air-passage being less obstructed, the resulting sound, therefore, assuming a character verging upon that of the vowel.

With the above view of the original pronunciation of the sign \( \sigma \), initial and medial, in mind, I should like to offer a suggestion as to the possible source of the word \( \text{pūjā} \). I do so with some hesitation since it involves to a certain extent the assumption that what is true of Primitive Tamil is also true of Primitive Dravidian in general. The word \( \text{pūjā} \) is distinctly a Sanskrit word and as such appears in Kanarese as \( \text{pūje} \), in Telugu as \( \text{pūja} \), in Tamil as \( \text{pūcai} \), and in Malayālam as \( \text{pūja} \). The pronunciation \( j \) (and not \( dz \)) in the Telugu word, and the spelling with \( j \) (and not \( c \)) in the Malayālam word are indications that these words are considered to be of Sanskrit origin; and the final vowel in all the above four words can well be explained as resulting from a final long \( a \) in a borrowed Sanskrit word, when this word is feminine. In Tamil, when a masculine form in -\( \alpha \) was borrowed from Sanskrit, a slight \( u \)-sound seems to have been tacked on. This sound is no longer heard in nominative forms in Tamil (though it is still present in such forms in the kindred Malayālam, for example, in \( \text{pītā-vu, ātmā-vu} \), from the Sanskrit nominatives \( \text{pītā, ātmā} \)), but forms like the accusatives \( \text{pītā-v-ai, ātmā-v-ai} \) (Ma. \( \text{pītā-v-e, ātmā-v-e} \) seem clearly to show traces of such a sound. On the other hand, when the borrowed word in -\( \alpha \) was feminine, a slight \( i \)-sound seems to have been added, akin, apparently, to the short \( i \) that marks the feminine in such words as \( \text{āti} \), used in calling a female of a lower caste, \( \text{māmi, 'aunt,' āmappācci or āmappātti, 'a barber's wife,} \) and possibly in \( \text{māṇūsī, 'woman,' etc.} \) This -\( \text{-ā-i} \) in a final unaccented syllable would naturally become shortened to -\( \text{ai} \) just as, for instance,
tāy (i.e., tā-i) 'mother,' lit. 'yielder, producer, parent' (from the root tā) becomes in composition -tai, as in mun-tai, 'ancestor, forefather.' Hence in such Sanskrit feminines final -ai (an e-sound) in Tamil and in Malayalam final -a, with the i (or y) reasserting itself in sandhi (e.g., pūja-y-umtu 'there is worship'). The final e in such words in Kannarese appears to be of a similar origin, and therefore, probably, or at least possibly, the final -a in Telugu.*

In Sanskrit we find a root pūj, and at first sight it might seem that this was a development from the simpler radical pū, 'purify,' in the same way as the Sanskrit root yuj, 'join,' is a development from yu, 'unite.' But there are serious difficulties in the way of such an explanation. The Sanskrit root pū has its counterpart in other Indo-germanic languages, but one looks in vain for traces of a root pūj outside of India,—not even in Avestan, that has so much in common with Sanskrit, is such a radical to be found. And in Sanskrit itself formations from a root pūj are very rare before the sūtra-period. The form pūjana- occurs once in the Rg-veda in an epithet of Indra, sāci-pūjana voc. (viii, 17, v. 12) the translation of which is uncertain; the verbal forms apūjan (a doubtful reading), and pūpūjire occur once each in the Mahābhārata; pūja-'honour, worship' and the so-called causative verb pūjayati,-te, 'treat with respect or reverence,' are found in sūtra-literature, in the epics (along with a few other derivatives) and, of course, in classical Sanskrit. There can be little doubt that all this indicates that our so-called root pūj is an abstraction that arose in India, and that it is not of Indo-germanic origin. The word pūja is Sanskrit in the same sense that the word bishop is English. This is, of course, from the Latin episcopus, which is, again, from the Greek ἐπίσκοπος. The word bishop undoubtedly belongs to the English language, although of Greco-Latin origin, and the word pūja as undoubtedly belongs to the Sanskrit language, although almost certainly of Dravidic origin.

Gundert in his Malayalam dictionary suggests that pūja may be derived from the Primitive Dravidic base which in Tamil appears as pūcu with the meaning 'smear, anoint, wash, adorn.' This word would then seem to have had reference originally to the smearing (with saffron-paste, etc.)—possibly also to the washing and adorning—of an image or symbol of some deity as a mark of honour, or as part of the ritual of worship. I wish to suggest another etymology. I would connect the word with the Tamil pū,

* These are exceptions, due mainly to the influence of analogy. The final -a of mātā 'mother' appears to be due to association of this word with its correlative pītā 'father.' In composition such words seem regularly to retain the Sanskrit termination. The final -ai of mahānai, from S. mahiṇā, 'greatness' (a nom. from the mas. stem mahiṇan-), is clearly due to the influence of the numerous Tamil abstract nouns in -maī.

† 'Honouring or acknowledging zeal' (Grassmann), 'honoured by Śāci' (Ludwig), 'honouring the strong ones' (Wackernagel), 'worshipped well' (Griffith, following Sāyana).
'flower,'—I do not, of course, mean to say that the word is necessarily of Tamil origin. The Tamil verb puṭi (Ma. puji, etc.) would appear to be a secondary formation based upon the Sanskrit puṭā-. Such verbal formations are as a general rule formed from Sanskrit nominal stems—vāci, 'read,' from vac-, vādi, 'argue, discuss,' from vāda-, etc.—rather than from Sanskrit verbal stems. But in Winslow's dictionary the first meaning given to puṭi is 'offer flowers, etc., in worship.' The Sanskrit puṭā- would hardly warrant such a meaning in a verb-form derived from it. This leads me to suggest—at present very tentatively—that in this Tamil verb there is a reminiscence of the original meaning of the Sanskrit puṭā-; that this in fact, is from a Primitive Dravidic compound which in Tamil would have appeared as puṭ-cey. I repeat, this is a mere suggestion. But it may be pointed out that, granted a primitive puṭ-cey, used in the sense of 'flower-act, offering flowers' (cp. the Sanskrit paśukaran- 'an animal offering', karman, from the Sanskrit root kṛ, 'make'), it would be impossible for Sanskrit speaking people to distinguish between a final -ey (or -eti) and a final -ay (or -ai); for the short e was a sound unknown. This being so, during a stage of bilingualism such as I have spoken of above, it would not be unnatural, when so many Sanskrit words ending in -a were pronounced by Dravidians as ending in -ai, for the Aryan community to Sanskritize a Dravidian word ending in -ay or -ai by changing this into -a. The word puṭā would then be a Dravidian word that passed with slight modification into Sanskrit and then, again with slight modification, back into Dravidian. Such migrations of words are common enough. The old German word Beiwache, for instance, meaning 'watch,' as a military term, passed into French as bivouac, a word which we have borrowed from the French; it was then re-imported into German as Bivouac or Biwak. That a similar migration has taken place in the case of some early cognate of Tamil puṭcai, etc., admits of hardly any doubt. Whether my interpretation of the history of these words is correct must, however, remain an uncertainty. There is every need of further investigation.

The word śambhu-, as a vedic epithet, is well-known to be derived from Śam, 'blessing, welfare, prosperity,' plus the radical bhū, 'be, become,' and to mean 'being a blessing, beneficent.' As a name, in later times, of Śiva, I feel that it is likely to have been chosen because it suggested in the minds of the speakers some Dravidian word akin to the Tamil cem, 'redness' (cp. Tamil campu, 'copper'), the colour red being always associated with this deity. That is to say, the application of this epithet to Śiva—a euphemistic application—seems to me to become more intelligible under the above assumption of the existence in Northern India at an early period of a race or of races related to the Dravidians of the South. Śambhu as a name of Śiva, becomes in Tamil campu, which, if an early
importation, would, as I argue, have been originally pronounced with an initial sound like that of the English church. I venture the suggestion that this word has reverted to Sanskrit from some Dravidic dialect in the form jambu, as a name of Śiva bearing the connotation of 'redness, reddishness.' Both jambuka- and śiva- are used to denote a jackal, possibly because of the tawny colour of this animal (?). And, when it is considered that the area characterized pre-eminently by the worship of Śiva must have lain originally south of the zone into which Āryan civilization had advanced, it will not, I think, be felt to be impossible that it was to this unknown region that the expression jambu-dvīpa, 'the Śiva-country,' first had reference.

According to the mythic geography of Paurānic lore, Jambudvīpa derives its name from a gigantic rose-apple tree growing on mount Meru, which overlooked this continent, the name for a rose-apple tree being jambu- or jambū-. Is it too much to suggest that here again we have Dravidic intrusion and confusion? I know of no modern authority for a conceivable early *cem-pū-marum, in the sense of 'rose, or rose-like tree.' But it is curious that the Hindustani name for this tree is made up of the word for rose, gulab (lit. 'rose-water'), plus a derivative from the word jambu—gulāb-ja'aman. This would, of course, imply a very late date for the origin of this myth.

Sanskrit Śri (Ś) is so regularly represented in Tamil by that one hesitates to accept tiru, 'Lakṣmi, wealth, beauty,' as directly connected with the Sanskrit śri-. It might be from the Prakrit (Mahāraṣṭrī) siri, which is from the Sanskrit śri-. But the representation of an initial s- sound by a t, though fairly common in Malayalam, is extremely rare in Tamil. I surmise that since śri is frequently pronounced as stri, which is the Sanskrit word for 'woman,' some contamination has taken place between these two words. Sanskrit stri becomes tiri or tiri in Tamil, and Sanskrit śri is represented in Malayalam by tiru or at the end of a word by tirī. The final -u remains a difficulty. It may be due to a rapid, unaccented pronunciation of tiri, regarded as equivalent to śri, as ṭi; or it may be due to the influence of the radical element in tiru-ṭiu, 'set right,' some connexion being felt to exist between 'rightness, correctness' and 'beauty, prosperity.'

I will make but one other remark. In a form like Tamil kēṭkirēy, 'I hear,' the ṭ of the root kēṭ! passes before a stop consonant into the corresponding stop of its own series, viz. t. There takes place a species of assimilation unknown to students of Indogermanic philology. Just as, between vowels, an original stop consonant becomes spirantal, becomes, as it were, assimilated to the adjacent vowels taking on something of their nature, so when a spirantal sound like ṭ, for instance, is juxtaposed to a stop consonant like k, it takes on, by a similar kind of assimilation, something of the nature of the
following sound—it assumes, not the place of articulation of this sound, but the kind of articulation. So in the case of borrowings from Sanskrit. The Sanskrit puṣkula- 'plenteous,' is represented by puṭkalam, the Sanskrit ṛṣpada-, 'seat, site,' by ṛṭpatam; ṛ being the corresponding stop to the cerebral s, ṭ the corresponding stop to the dental s of the Sanskrit word. Now the latter word is also represented in Tamil by ṛṛpatam. It seems to me perfectly clear that the sound of ṛ (ᵣ) in such a position was not, at the time when this and similar words were imported; the 'rough, vibrating ṛ' that Pope in his Handbook sets down as the value of this symbol. It was clearly consonantal, like its alternative t (ᵣ). It was almost certainly an alveolar stop resembling our English t (probably with modifications which may, for the present, be overlooked). That is to say, its place of articulation lay between that of the dental ṭ (ᵣ) and that of the cerebral ṭ (ᵣ). It would seem, therefore, that when l (ᵣ) alternates with ṛ (ᵣ), as in niṅkirē, 'I stand,' it was alveolar in nature. In this connexion it may be pointed out that evidence seems clearly to indicate that the Tamil symbol ṛ, which, in consideration of a wide-spread pronunciation of this letter, has been transliterated in these articles as l, was certainly originally a cerebral ṛ. It seems, in the first place, unreasonable to suppose that one and the same sound was represented originally by two symbols: in Malayāḷam there is practically no distinction in pronunciation between the symbols corresponding to the Tamil ṥ and ṛ, and in Tamil these symbols are pronounced alike over a large area. And then the facts supplied by Kanarese point clearly to a primitive distinction between the sounds corresponding to these symbols in that language. In early Kanarese the symbol ṛ is the representative of Tamil ṛ. But this symbol cannot be dissociated in form from the symbol ṝ, the neighbouring alveolar sound, as I suggest, corresponding to Tamil ṁ. It was evidently emphatically an ṛ-sound and quite distinct from the sound represented by ṝ, the Tamil ṁ, as emphatically a cerebral l-sound.

M. COLLINS.