CHAPTER I

1. Views of scholars of the question of the affinity of the Dravidian languages and the classification of languages in general. (The group of languages designated the Dravidian, comprises the most important literary languages, Tamil, Malayalam, Kannada, and Telugu and the lesser uncultivated dialects Kurukh, Malta, Kui, Gondi and Brahui.)

Let us note first how the classification of languages has been considered.

Mahānātikāya Rāvabhadra R. Narasinhacharyo

"The principle of the classification of languages now adopted by philologists is the morphological, i.e., the one based on their dramatical structure. According to the morphological classification, languages differ from one another in the structure of the sentence and the grammatical relation of its parts. The form of grammar are the expression of the mental life and history of a people, so the formative part of a language must ever be the surest differentia of linguistic kinship. The life and soul of a language, which constitutes its substantial individuality, and distinguishes it from all others, is its grammar. It is the only decisive evidence of the relationship between languages. Morphologically then languages have been divided into five groups, namely, isolating, agglutinative, inflectional, polysynthetic and incorporating ......... In the agglutinative group like the Finish and the Dravidian languages, two roots coalesce to form a word, one retaining its radical indoo..."
These languages show grammatical relations by prefixing, suffixing or infusing sounds and syllables which are no longer independent ones, and yet are clearly distinguishable from the full words or they belong and yet inextricably linked with them. In the inflectional language, like Sanskrit, one roots consider so that neither the one nor the other retains its substantive independence. The root and the suffix occur so inseparably bound so as to make the history of the word quite obscure.

Dr. F. Lucas

This morphological classification is to be distinguished from the genealogical classification of languages. Here four classes are put forwards:

1. The agglutinative languages……. The forms of words are made up by suffixes and the two appear to be glued together to some extent. Moreover the stem and suffix always keep their individuality and are filled as individual parts with the word form. If there is a prefix the change while the suffix is added, it is not as in the Indo-European languages, a necessary condition. The suffixes could then be correctly separated from the stem and may be looked upon as independent words.

2. The agglutinative-inflectional languages have both suffixes and inflection like the Indo-European languages, for the formation of words. The difference of this class from the former one is that here the words must have inflection before the suffixes and the similarity to the addition of the suffixes.

3. Root or isolating languages.

4. The inflectional languages, e.g., the Indo-European and the Uralic groups. These are distinguished from the others by their purely inflectional character. From the ‘finnish' type one distinguishes by the absence of the inserted syllable which serves for inflection, by a lesser number of cases, (and we have seen, there is a tendency to lesser, there still more, e.g., English, French, etc.) by not creating compound words which the agglutinative languages do not, and so not
The most familiar classification of languages is into three groups known as isolating, agglutinating, and inflecting respectively. The agglutinative languages are those like Turkish or Finnish that have relatively long words built up in much the fashion of the Chinese sentence. The fundamental difference between Chinese structure and the Turkish structure is that in the former language the tacking together of relatively short invariable elements extends from beginning to end of every sentence while the Turkish sentence is normally composed of several words of varying length, some of which consist of short elements.

Inflecting languages are typified by the older Indo-European and Semitic languages, and inflecting structure is still common in the modern Indo-European languages, including English.

If other clues are not available, the fact that languages are classified in this way does not necessarily point to common origin, because languages which are related may have lost outstanding grammatical similarities, and languages which belong to different families may have evolved similar grammatical traits along different paths. From this point of view we can divide languages into the following types: isolating, flexional, root-inflected and classificatory.

Agglutination and amalgamation.

The flexional type includes languages which mainly indicate modification of meaning and grammatical relations by affixes attached to the word-root. According to the decree of fusion between core and accretion, we can distinguish two sorts of external fleotion, agglutination and amalgamation. The two most characteristic features which distinguish languages of the amalgamating from languages of the agglutinating type may therefore
be summed up in this way. Amalgamating languages have many derivations arbitrarily chosen by custom in situations connected by no common thread of meaning, and many different ways of forming the derivative appropriate to a single context in accordance with meaning or conventional usage.

We will now consider the affinity of the Dravidian languages. Let us hear what the scholars have to say.

Dr. Caldwell,

"The Dravidian languages occupy a position of their own, between the languages of the Indo-European family and those of the Turanian or Sythian group -- not quite a midway position, but one considerably near the latter than the former. The particulars in which they accord with the Indo-Indo-European languages are numerous and remarkable, and some of them are of such a nature that it is impossible to suppose that they have been accidental; but the relationship to which they testify -- in so far as they do testify to any relationship -- appears to me very indefinite as well as very remote. On the other hand, the particulars in which they seem to accord with most of the so-called Sythian languages are not only so numerous but are so distinctive and of so essential a nature that they appear to me to amount to what is called a family likeness and therefore naturally to suggest the idea of a common descent.

R Narasimhacharya.

" It will thus be seen that scholars are generally agreed that the Dravidian languages are agglutinative. The harmonic sequence of vowels, of which, according to Whitney, the Dravidian languages show no trace, is, however, found to exist to an appreciable extent in Telugu.

Ibid p 201. Read also P.S. Subrahmanya Shastri's (M.A.Ph.D) view expressed at the A.I.O. conference of 1949.
though not to the same extent in the other Dravidian tongues also. Agglutination and vocalic harmony are two characteristics common to the Dravidian group and some of the languages of the so-called Scythian family. Added to these, there are a few coincidences in grammar. These similarities, are, according to some scholars, quite inadequate to warrant the affiliation advocated by Caldwell.

"Sir George Grierson and Dr. Sten Konow think that the name Scythian is very unsatisfactory and that the Dravidian languages are related neither to the so-called Scythian family nor to the Indo-European family.

"Dr. Pope has expressed the opinion that the more the Dravidian languages are studied, the closer they affinity to Sanskrit will appear. Cover, Seshagirihastri and R. Svarinatha Iver have also advocated the Indo-European relationships.

"Cust says that the Dravidian family may be considered to represent the agglutinative method, notwithstanding that Pope, up to this day, maintains that the dravidian family belongs to the same morphological order as the Aryan---

"We are thus led to the conclusion that the Dravidian languages form an isolated family."

Dr. Chilakuru Narasimha (of the Madras University) seems to agree with Dr. Pope's view.

K. Ramakrishnasastry Ramakrishnaiah (of the Madras University)

"It seems to me, anyhow, a matter of common agreement among the linguists, that a language is said to belong to one family or another, or to have been derived from this language or that only when there is perfect agreement between the languages compared in the matter of root-material and grammatical forms, and that no amount of word-material borrowed by one...

"Studies in Dravidian Philology" by K. Ramakrishnaiah, M.A. also page 90 of this book.
language from another can convert the former to the family of the latter. If the Dravidian and the Aryan can be recognized as two distinct families of languages, we can understand Telugu or Kannada as originally belonging to one family and enriching itself by borrowing a lot of word-material from a language of another family like the Sanskrit. If on the other hand it is to be maintained that there is nothing like a distinct Dravidian family of languages and that all the languages spoken in Southern India are nothing but corrupt and disintegrated forms of Sanskrit or Prakrit, then most of the grammatical forms common to all these languages and not merely the transformations found in one particular language of that group, should be shown to have been derived from Sanskrit or from some form of the Prakrit. Indian grammarians, who declare that Telugu is a 'vrikshita' of Sanskrit, must be said to have only skipped on the surface, because they dealt only with the word material of the language and tried to derive a portion of it from Sanskrit or Prakrit, leaving the root-material and the Comparison of the fundamental grammatical forms and methods quite unnoticed.

Grierson.

"With regard to the Drn. languages the attempt to connect them with other linguistic families outside India is now generally recognized as a failure, and we must still consider them as an isolated family. The attempts made to show a closer connection with the Indo-European family have proved just as futile.

R.M. Sreekampaiah. (translated from the Kannada)

"The Drn. languages in North India made room for Sanskrit and Prakrit, by a language can adopt and create as many words as it pleases without changing its character, but it cannot alter its grammar, its syntax, without becoming another for grammar represents the innate mode of thought over which the individual person or nation has no real control.

--- 'on the classification of languages' by Gustave Oppert p 17.
Vide S.D.P. p 5, lines 4 to 10

Dravidian philology by Dr. C. Narayan Rao.

linguistic survey of India-- by Grierson Vol. 4, p. 282.
and were wiped out. They may even constitute a reason as to why Sanksrit was transformed into Prakrit. Until the script of the Mohenjo-daro and the Harappa finds is deciphered and the character of the language definitely established we are not in a position to state how far back Dravidian speech goes.

"In South India in the Marathi regions, the Aryan language swallowed up the Drav. But farther to the south Andhra, Kannada and Tamil were never completely wiped out although subjected to considerable Sanskrit influence. For a long time the truth lay hidden; the belief was current that these languages were derived from Sanskrit. But it has now been established that they belong to a Drav. group different from Sanskrit after a comparative study of indigenous words, grammatical structure, and syntax and from researches of linguistic science and a study of the history of languages."

R.V. Jagirdar: (Wid P. 40 seq.)

"... the genius of the two languages (Kannada and Marathi) differs. What is meant by genius is not only a series of broad facts, but the cumulative characteristic of details. (1) The 'Verbal' image -- in the case of these two speakers essentially differs. (2) ... the every-day vocabulary of the average speaker in the case of both these languages shows points of essential variation. Words common and most frequent, are, in form and origin, peculiar to each language. Such words, for example, are the pronouns and the numerals. (3) -- in Sanksrit the gender belongs to the words and words alone, irrespective of their meaning, and times the gender determines the meaning. This peculiarity of the gender, important as it thus is, does not obtain at all in Kannada or other Drav. languages. (4) ... in none of the Drav. languages are there any relative pronouns. ... Though the Indo-European feature is, now and then, imitated and participlar forms are used as conjunctive adjectives; though sometimes, as in Kannada, the interrogative pronoun is used relatively with the personal pronoun, the practice is
not at all to be found in the spoken language.

12. "Some eminent Drvn. scholars, like Dr. Pope, while agreeing in
the main with Dr. Caldwell, think that the remarkable analogies
between the Celtic and the Drvn. languages merit a more thorough
investigation, and thus seem to consider the latter to be, for the most
part Indo-European (foot-note to 1 in last page)

from the Presidential speech in the Kannada section of the All
India Oriental Conference at Tirupati in 1940.

13. An Introduction to the comparative philology of Indo-Aryan language

1. An introduction to linguistic science (Sturtevant) 4th edn. 1950
25. The loom of language (Hodder) 4th impression 1946 P. 195, 196.

"Languages are related, if the many features of vocabulary
structure and phonetics which they share are due to gradual differ-
entiation of what was once a single tongue."
Scholars have proved beyond controversy that Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Celtic, French, German, Russian and some other languages share characters of similar word-roots, similar grammatical structures of declension and conjugation in an astonishing degree and over similar basic word-lists to some extent. Some scholars have arrived at the conclusion that they must all have descended from some common parent which must from its remote antiquity remain a rare hypothesis, and give some idea of what it must look like has been formulated and one which has actually gone to the extent of narrating a story in this reconstructed Indo-European language, as the parent language was so far designated (Indo-Germanic being an alternative name). (Recent excavations have however established the affinity of another ancient language -- the Hittite, to this family group so that we now speak of the Indo-Hittite family of languages.)

From an examination of the internal linguistic structure of each family group of any one period language-types have also been designated as predominantly agglutinative, inflectional and isolating types.

Comparative phylology sheds an interesting light on the range of affixes in a language. (In the course of long research it has been discovered that all affixes were once independent words having a meaning of their own, like other words. Of course we have not been able nor shall we perhaps ever hope to be able to restore all the affixes in any language to the full status which they once bore and shared.) Some of these restorations do however seem to justify the presumption that all affixes are thus theoretically comparable. Consider the forms 'yāti.', 'yēs' and 'yēm' of the present indicative forms of the Sanskrit root yā-, 'yā' 'yē' 'yēm' are to recall endings corresponding to the personal pronouns 'hi', 'hu' 'ha' 'hu' 'i' 'ai' 'au' and 'us' are alternative bases for the pronominal bases 'hi', 'hu' 'ha' 'hu' 'i' 'ai' 'au'.

See note following Form of Language
In the English language the suffixes -hood, -don and -ly for instance, are contractions of the fuller words kid (old English meaning 'State'), and -don standing for 'doon' (also meaning condition) and -ly standing for 'like'. De-core is to "come by" (Prefix).

A dip into any good book on the science of language or comparative philology will open out a wonderful vista to the curious searcher's eye.

When separate words or affixes showing a great variety of syntactical relations to words before or after them are glued together into a meaning-ful unit of expression, the resulting phrase or sentence is said to have an agglutinative or amalgamating structure. The best example of such a formation is at present the Turkish language or the Finnish language. Three categories of words are nearly always required in any language which has passed the earliest stage of mere root agglutination—words denoting things or objects, words denoting actions, and words denoting relations. When those relationalizing words were cut into mere affixes we got what we describe as flexional languages. So are most modern languages now to a greater or less extent. There are some languages however which do not even show any distinction of objects and actions or qualities nor do they possess any stock of relational words except a rare few. The one prominent example now of such a language is the Chinese. It is therefore styled as an isolating language.

We shall look at a few examples of these various types.

The distinction between these types does not amount to a clear cut definition. Suffixes or post-positions are fastened on to noun bases or verb bases. These post-positions are
particles of relational words and being numerals they express an indefinite number of relations than is done by inflectional endings. For instance, possessive pronouns, interrogative, or negation particles are suffixed. These particles, with the exception of a very few ones, exist independently in the language. Study the following Turkish sentences:

\[\text{Sanskrit} \quad \text{English} \quad \text{Turkish}\]

Ha jàna \quad I do not know \quad bilmezsin

'tol' is the verb root meaning 'to know'

'na' is the negative particle corresponding to Sanskrit 'nā'

'yor' is the suffix for the present tense,

'san' is the personal suffix for 'I'.

All these elements are glued together somewhat like

'know -not-de-I.'

It will be noticed that in Skt. too there is some degree of agglutination as in

jäna, meaning 'know-I'

Hence there is no need to say 'when no jäna'.

\[\sqrt{3.2}\]

\[\text{Sanskrit} \quad \text{English} \quad \text{Turkish}\]

Arcad \\n
Did you see my wife? \quad (Eng)

Arcad gârdhi sâ \quad (Turkish)

'Arcad' means 'went' 'Arcad' was Mood: disjunctive

'sà' is the verb root meaning 'to see' /\text{\(\text{subject} \quad 3^{rd}\) acc. acc. acc.}

'î- is the sign of the past tense.

'tumar' is the 3rd person singular suffix.

'sà' is the interrogative particle.

So the sentence is unic up like:

'life-sà-(hâr)- sà- did-you- on'
Notice the possessive pron. 'my' glued to, 'Zenoa'

Teva petukayah talakan apavren (Skt)
undo the lock of your box (Eng)
sandiginis kilidini açiniz (Sanskrit)

Sandiginis = box
Sandiginis = your box

Unidin = of your box; Kilidini = trilakun (t): case

'taç' = open, açiniz = open (Imp. 3 sec. d. 3NL.)

Sanskrit, Greek, Latin of the Indo-European or Indo-Iranian family are inflectional languages, not that there is no trace of agglutination at all in them. But the affixes are unrecognized as independent words and these are no doubt appended to the verbal or nominal bases. In agglutinative languages, the joining of the various affixes to the bases is highly regular so far as their correlation is concerned. Such is not the case with Indo-European. The bases also change internally, often there is a reanalysis of the words in order the words to express various meanings. This is true of Ind.-Tur.

It is also true of Arabic to a remarkable extent.

Arabic

Compare the following derivational nouns:

'darabu' has been ' in adhab, if A see him.
'durarab' one who boasts
'durarab' beating
'darabu' one blow.

Look at the following sentences:

'huma yaqabahah' means ' he goes or he will go'
'd'ahabur ila-l-Kanisa' means I went to the church
'idhab ahilan' means, go quickly.

Take Sanskrit
Take SANSKRIT.

"Nilay", he leads

"rayati", he leads

"Natra" or "mita", That which leads ["con on the right rath];

Notice the change of vowel in the root "ni" to lead or again in nominal fiction.

Gumbh, Cov (or Dv)

Udav, by the cow

Gavah, Kins

"Dvign" a part of cows or oxen

Gobhir, with kins

Dodier in his 'Index of language classifies languages morphologically as follows: (i) isolating; (ii) flexional; (iii) agglutinative; and (i) classificatory. (iv) root-inflected.

As has already been stated there are no sharp lines of demarkation between these classes. The distinction between agglutinating and agglutinating flexional is that in the former the grammar is simplicity itself; very regular whereas as in the latter the grammar has become very complicated owing to the appearance of numerous irregularities. Greek, Latin and Sanskrit may be said to belong to the second type 2(a), we shall not be very much concerned with the classificatory type of language which is to be associated with the speech of the Red Indians and of other similar backward tribes. We will therefore conclude this topic with an illustration of the isolating type of which Chinese is the example par excellence and the modern English language taking next precedence to it.

Look at the following Chinese sentences: (the factor accent left out of consideration)
(1) t'a-ti niang tso-tii'en ta liao t'a

= his mother yesterday thrashed him.

The form 'His' is expressed thus: t'a-ti = Ho- + relational suffix = belonging to him = his

'Thrashed' is expressed in this way:

ta liao = trash complete
= yu-thlaa-chan thrashed

't'e' is both he and him, as will be noticed above.

Nouns and verbs are not distinguished; there are no flexional affixes. 't'ion' means 'heaven' and so also 'day' Recall: 'thian-s'han' in Gorg.

(2) s'a (fund: 'tha') yao lai

means he wish come

i.e. he will come. The auxiliary word 'yao' is used to express the future tense.

(3) i nin u lin pai nin o ya yin

= "one bird enter wood, padded birds making sound" enter the wood

which means, when one bird[big!] all the other [smaller] birds become silent.

'iac' may be a noun or a verb as the similar English word 'sic.'

(4) t'a pu roi ni us't'ien wo tsa u ni

= he not give you money I then give you.

which means If he does not give you money I will give you.

(5) Since there are no distinct categories or parts of speech great use is made of word order thus

(t'a ni- K'u

he take-go = he takes away

(t'a pu ni - K'u

as not take-go = he does not take away

(t'a ni- pu - K'u

as take not-go = he cannot take away.
Modern English has nearly lost all its flexions and is fast becoming like Chinese. We will now briefly state the various phenomena of linguistic change and give illustrations.

§ 12 As Dr. Guo points out (P 53), yāsaka describes some of these changes in his nirukta.

(1) athāpy ṣator nivṛtti sthānoṣu ādāro po bhavati, sthā, santa iti.

(2) athāpy anta ādāro bhavati, ātavā gatar iti.

(3) athāpy upadādāro bhavati, jagatār jagat iti.

(4) athāpy avadīpryarṣya bhavati, jyotah, jnanaḥ.

(5) athāpy advayāt vipyayo bhavati, sthā, rajah, dhīte iti.

(6) athāpy vānapajanaḥ ādhatu, hrīṁja iti.

I Change for notrical reasons end for preserving quantity:

āpo janayathā ca niḥ (lost vowel of janayathā; longa nucleus) niḥa > ni sa ṣa > ni sa ṣa > ni ṣa da > ni dha > ni ṣa dha > ni ṣa iti.

II Varnakoprayaḥ Uṣṣes kappā < Hunisc papla (orthography)

Kārada (Can) > kēdaga (Bellary dialect Can.)

harta (skt) a spindle > tarbi

grathana > gathamā > ghātana Sirṣa-ṣa) iti.

III Girirāddi > gurāddi (Kannada); Kūrava > gira

Easawasottī > casotti (do) (Haplography)

III (Haplography)

IV Syrsepo

paptiva, paphium (Perfect of pati 1/2, 1/3)

jagacau, jagauh (perfect of gar 3/2, 3/3)

V Anapoyīla

Varonya > varonāya (for 'chardas'.

VI Prothesis

nār (mr = man) becomes aṣṭp (Skt)

ṣaktul > istrakul. Nāma (s.t) : oṣumā (Skt)
VII Dissimilation lōngalā > nūngar (Marathī)
VIII Assimilation Chandragupta > Candracottos, pakva > pakra
'pinque is from 'quinque'

IX Commentary charges.

quid = cīt (skt)
quo = po (Greek)
quīnque (It) = pox (skt)

X Vocal Gradation (Ablaut)

ānapo > ā pr-vah
ēl = erzh

āndaraṣṭā: āndarṣṭītum

nināya (1/1, first pers. sing. perfect of 'nī' to load)
nināyāsthā (2/1) where 'nī' assumes weak forms
ninēsthā (2/1)
nināya (2/3)

and generally the strong vowel has the accent, the week loses it.

§ 3 Phonetics.

While most of the great languages of the world have many sounds of human speech in common it is to be noticed that each language has also a few sounds which are special to it. The Indian who really learns English will notice the special sounds f, v, and s and the sounds of a and o in 'cot' and 'cot' which he cannot form for instance in Marathi. In all Indian grammars the basic sounds of the language on hand are properly classified on the principle of their vocal production in the vocal organs.

The sounds are first grouped as (1) vowels (2) consonants. The consonants in all Indian languages are classified as (1) those of the throat (2) those of the palate (3) those of the cranium (4) those of the teeth (5) those of the lips. Then there are the semi-voals and the fricatives (belonging to either of the five sets) and the aspirates which may also be described as a sort of a throat sound. The vowels too may
be assigned each to one of these sets. These sounds are to be found in nearly all of the now spoken Indian languages. Each class of consonants has a five fold modification (a) hard (b) hard aspirate (c) soft (d) soft aspirate (e) nasal. All these elementary facts are familiar to students of grammar. The science of **Language** has one or more accurate studies of language sounds and their mode of production and devised special international signs to denote them, as the letters of the English alphabet which is neither phonetically arranged nor fulfills the primary conditions of phonetics that there shall be a distinct sign for each distinct sound that the human vocal cords are capable of uttering, are inadequate for the purpose. \(^1\)

The science of phonetics describes the mode of production of sounds -- the various organs which participate in the production, the lungs, the larynx, the vocal cords, the velum or the soft palate, the epiglottis or the ridge of the roots of the upper teeth, the tongue, the hard palate or the alveolus, the teeth, the lips and the nose. It tells us that consonants are produced by the blocking of the air passage at various places in the mouth; the passage of the air is stopped, (who for a minute fraction of a second) is exploded, as the language parts want to say, and then as quickly let loose, exploded as the linguists puts it; the storage and the opening out together being described by another inside; Latin derived word occlusion. For the semi-vowel the occlusion is only partial. The vowels are produced when the air passes through narrow channels formed some at the back of the mouth and some at the front and some through the lips. The hard consonants are described as unvoiced and the soft as voiced as a result of the lax and tense position of the chords. \(^2\)