INTRODUCTION

1. MALAYALAM

Malayalam is a South Dravidian language with a literary history of over eight centuries. In terms of spelling and vocabulary, Malayalam is nearer to Tamil than to Telugu and Kannada. However, Malayalam is more akin to Telugu and Kannada than to Tamil with respect to the impact of Sanskrit on these Dravidian languages. Malayalam has some direct borrowings of Sanskrit vocabulary in the form of 'kalam', and 'vedha'. 'Endo-dayar Loan words in Malayalam'

by E. Gomperan, gives a list of Sanskrit words and names from other Dravidian languages in Malayalam. M. Jayakrishna Pillai (1977) describes Malayalam as a 'Dravidian Language'

entwined with Sanskrit. He suggests that Sanskrit is evident in the grammar, phonology and vocabulary and in a lesser extent in the lexicon.

1.1. Malayalam

Although the literary dialect throughout Kerala is almost uniform, there are differences in the spoken forms of teerananta, sambha, South Malayalam, and North Malayalam. Regularization are approved in the use of romanization of several digraphs like 'and', 'manik', 'paya, delives (daya), thatian, and Malayalam.'
1. LANGUAGES IN CONTRAST: MALAYALAM AND TELUGU:

1.1. MALAYALAM:

Malayalam is a South Dravidian Language with a literary history of over eight centuries. In grammar and vocabulary Malayalam is nearer to Tamil than to Telugu and Kannada. However Malayalam is more akin to Telugu, and Kannada than to Tamil with respect to the impact of Sanskrit on these Dravidian languages. Malayalam has freely borrowed sanskrit vocabulary in the form of 'tatsama' and 'tadbhava'. 'Indo-Aryan Loan words in Malayalam' by K. Godavarma gives a list of sanskrit loans and loans from other Dravidian languages in Malayalam. Kunjan Pillai (1977) describes Malayalam as a 'Dravidian Language saturated with Sanskrit'. Influence of Sanskrit is evident in the alphabet, phonology and vocabulary and to a lesser extent in morphology.

1.1.1. Dialects:

Although the literary dialect throughout Kerala is almost uniform, there are differences in the spoken forms of Travancore, Cochin, South Malabar and North Malabar. Peculiarities are observed in the conversational idioms of several communities - the Nambudiris, Nayars, Ezhavas (Tiyas), Harijans, Christians and Muslims.
The several tribes inhabiting the mountainous areas on the eastern region of the state have their dialects which may be dialects of Malayalam or one or the other South Dravidian languages. At the southern end and in some places near the eastern border Malayalam mingles with Tamil and in the north it mixes with Tulu and Kannada. The mappila dialect is believed to be the most divergent among the Malayalam dialects spoken in the plains (Panikkar, 1976). A notable dialect of Malayalam is the one spoken in the Laccadive Islands in the Arabian sea of the Kerala coast, the inhabitants of this island are immigrants from North Malabar.

The first systematic study of the regional dialects of Malayalam was that based on the speech of the pulaya caste in Kerala (Subramoniam, V.I - 1962). This pilot survey was conducted towards the end of the sixties with the intention of providing a preliminary idea of the dialect areas of Malayalam. The first major Dialect Survey of Malayalam started in the second half of 1965, was completed in 1968. The report of this survey (Subramoniam, V.I, 1974) points out twelve major dialect areas on the basis of the speech of the ezhavas. The dialect areas listed are: (1) South Travancore, (2) Central Travancore, (3) West Vembanad,

1.1.2. Malayalam as the official languages of the state:

Consequent to the linguistic reorganisation of states, the state of Kerala was formed on November 1, 1956. Efforts are being made since 1968 for the adoption of Malayalam as the official language of the state. The establishment of the State Institute of Language in 1968 was intended in this direction. The Institute was mainly interested in the preparation of glossaries and University level textbooks in Malayalam which would enable the changing over of the medium of instruction into mother tongue. The publications of 'Malayalam Lexicon' by the Kerala University, 'Malayalam Encyclopedia' by the Kerala Government and the 'Encyclopedia' by the National Book Stall are notable in this context. In Kerala the University gives its students the option to write their examination in Malayalam, though none of the colleges provides for instruction in Malayalam. An official languages commission was set up by the government in 1968 mainly to translate all Acts and Rules applicable in Kerala into Malayalam and to
prepare a glossary. The Constitution of India was the first to be translated and published by the commission. The Kerala Official Language Act was passed in 1969 facilitating legislation in Malayalam. Steps have been taken by the Government to issue Malayalam typewriters to the Government offices and to train the typists with the new keyboard. In the light of the governmental decisions, it was presumed that, by the end of 1978-1979, Malayalam was to be the official language in all government offices, government undertakings and the courts up to the Taluk level. Inspite of all the efforts, adoption of Malayalam as the official language of Kerala remains a very slow process.

1.1.3. Earlier works in Grammar:

The first account of Malayalam grammar appeared in the fourteenth century treatise on literary theory, Liilaatilakam. Its authorship is anonymous. It is written in Sanskrit about 'manipravala' (mixture of Sanskrit and Malayalam). Liilätilakam describes certain aspects of Malayalam in a fragmentary manner, which are useful for the history of the language. Two of the important traditional grammars published in Malayalam are Gundert's Malayālabhāsha vyākaranam and Raja Raja varma's KeralaPaniniyam. Gundert's grammar was published, first a shortened version in 1851 and later the full text in 1868.
Kērala Pāniniyam was first published in 1896 and the revised and enlarged edition in 1917. During this period a few other native scholars also prepared grammars for Malayalam. Though the author of Kērala Pāniniyam claims that it is written on historical principles as opposed to the traditional prescriptive method it is really a mixture of both. It deals mainly with the literary language, seldom taking care of the colloquial speech. Kērala Pāniniyam has four chapters viz., Kerala and its language, division of language according to stages, Alphabet and sound change. The book also deals with Sandhi, Morphology, Syntax and Etymology, the latter two not in detail. Raja Raja Varma was familiar with and benefited by the works of Caldwell and Gundert, though he was largely following the Indian tradition. In Gundert's grammar the analysis does not present an orderly picture because the data, though large, is diverse and unrelated. Under phonology, Gundert does not describe the articulations of Malayalam sounds. Instead, he deals elaborately with the variations of sounds in different phonological and morphological environments. Sandhi is dealt with in brief. Morphology is broadly divided into three sections—Nouns, verbs and Indeclinables. The section of syntax is the largest with six major divisions viz.,
(1) Subject, Predicate and agreement, (2) Syntax of nouns, (3) Syntax of verbs, (4) Syntax of particles, (5) Syntax of figures of speech and (6) Syntax of compounds.

The advancement of modern structural linguistics has led to a systematic, scientific and methodological study of comparative Dravidian in general, especially with reference to Phonology. A series of articles by Burrow was published in BSOAS during 1937-1947, dealing with a number of phonological problems raised in Caldwell's time. During this period Emeneau also had his studies on Dravidian especially the non-literary languages of South Dravidian. His works were mainly descriptive and were about the cultural aspects of these tribal tongues. L.V. Ramaswamy Aiyar's contribution to Dravidian Linguistics especially Malayalam and Tulu, during this period, is noteworthy. From 1925 till independence he wrote on all aspects of Malayalam linguistics - comparative phonology, morphology and etymology. Grammar of Lilatilakam and Evolution of Malayalam morphology written by L.V.R. should be mentioned. Yet another work on comparative Dravidian is Dravidian Cognates by K. Ramakrishna Ayya. In the history of Malayalam linguistics K.Godavarma's
Kērala Bhāsha Vijnāniyam, first published in 1951, is an important contribution. 'Evolution of Malayalam' by A.C. Sekhar (1953) deals with a descriptive grammar of the language of early inscriptions of Malayalam from 10th to 13th Centuries. The last two decades have brought out a number of comparative Dravidian studies in phonology and morphology while no serious work on syntax was produced. The current trend of historical and comparative linguistic studies in Malayalam is more leaned towards the exploration of dialects.

In Lexicography, the Malayalam-English dictionaries of Rev. Baily (1846) and Dr. Gundert (1872) and the Malayalam dictionaries of Collins, Sreekanteswaram Padmanabha Pillai (1923), R. Narayana Panicker, T. Ramalingom Pillai and C. Madhavan Pillai are commendable works, though not upto date. Reference may also be made to bilingual dictionaries like Malayalam-Russian Dictionary by M. Andronov, German-Malayalam Dictionary by Chacko, Malayalam-Hindi and Arabic-Malayalam dictionaries.

1.1.4. Recent works – Malayalam:

A few descriptive grammars of literary texts in Malayalam with indexes have already been prepared as Ph. D dissertations and some are under preparation.
Descriptive grammars of some dialects and certain tribal dialects have been done. A few works on Malayalam Syntax are also available. In contrastive linguistics, one or two works on phonology has been prepared.

1.1.5. Treatment of Syntax.

In speaking, however, the basic minimal unit is not the phoneme, nor even a sequence of phonemes, but rather the sentence. For an understanding of a language one must start from the sentences of the language and determine their structure. A sentence is a sequence of selected syntactic items combined into a unit in accordance with certain patterns of arrangement and intonation. Syntax received less attention than morphology in Indian grammatical tradition. In most of these grammars listed above there is no chapter on syntax.

Malayalam:

In Malayalam, Gundert's grammar (1851) is the one which gives so many examples and details connected with the actual structure of the language. In the vacaakandam subject, predicate and their agreement is discussed. It also deals with coordination, attribution, combination, definite numeral attributives etc. Cases are discussed in detail. A detailed description of the verbs also is
given. Vyākaranamitram (Sēshagiri Prabhu, 1904, 1919) also deals with syntax. The nature, division and construction of sentences are discussed. Syntax is studied from two angles – one purely grammatical and the other literary. Hence he deals with loose and tight constructions of sentences, unity, intimate relationship of words, clause, structure etc. Spring's grammar (Outline of a grammar of Malayalam language, 1839) Part VI deals with syntax. A portion on syntax is available in Peet's grammar (A grammar of the Malayalam language, 1841). Usage of words in sentences and their different constructions are explained. In the syntax of nouns, cases and their governing verbs are given. Under verbs, tense, participles, moods, verbal nouns, negatives and causals are described. The portion on syntax elaborately explains the rules laid down in the first grammatical portion and is quite useful.

In Kērala Paninīyam syntax is briefly discussed under 'ākāmkeśādhikāra'. It discusses word order, concord, compounds and case in brief.

1.2. TELUGU:

Regarding the position of Telugu in the Dravidian family, there are differences of opinion. It is considered as having some common phonological features with South Dravidian and others with Central Dravidian. L.V. Ramaswamy Aiyar considered Telugu as a member of
the South Dravidian. Bh. Krishnamurthy (1961) groups Telugu under Central Dravidian, based on morphological evidences. Warrior (1982) also classifies Telugu under Central Dravidian. Telugu, like Malayalam, has freely borrowed from Sanskrit vocabulary. In some cases the Sanskrit forms have lost their original meaning in spoken forms. Sarma (1972) gives a list of such forms. According to G.V.S.R. Krishnamurthy (1972) Telugu borrowed about forty thousand words from Sanskrit and Prakrit (tatsamas and tadbhavas).

1.2.1. Dialects:

Four major regional dialect areas are attested for Telugu. The dialects are:

1) The coastal variety which is the dominant one is spoken in the six districts along the coast - East Godavari, West Godavari, Krishna, Guntur, Prakasam and Nellore.

2) The Telangana dialect spoken in the ten districts which were formerly part of the Nizam's dominions - viz. Adilabad, Nizamabad, Medak, Karimnagar, Warangal, Mahaboobnagar, Rangareddy, Hyderabad, Nalgonda and Khammam.

3) The Rayalasima dialect of the four districts - Kurnool, Anantapur, Cuddapah and Chittoor districts.

4) The Kalingandhra dialect is spoken in three districts viz., Srikakulam, Vijayanagaram and Visakhapatnam.

These four major dialect areas consists of various sub-dialect areas under them. Besides these are social dialects based on education profession, caste and community. The speech of the educated people of the coastal area is considered to be the standard variety of Telugu.

A few of the many dialectal studies in Telugu Madrasu Telugu by C. Radhakrishna Sarma (1969), Mándalikpadakōṣam composed by M. Kothandarama Reddi (1970), Nāyalasīma Mándalikam-Ananthapuram prāntīyata by V.C. Balakrishna Sarma (1975) are noteworthy for their contribution to dialectology. The reports of the survey of Telugu dialect vocabulary started in 1958 under the general supervision of Bh. Krishnamurthy are published under the title Mändalika vṛthipadakōṣam in several volumes by the Andhra Pradesh Sahitya Akademi. Telugu Akademi is now publishing books on dialects of Telugu such as 'Karimnagar dialect of Telugu'.

12.2. Telugu as the official language of Andhra:

English is being slowly replaced by Telugu at all levels with the ultimate object of using Telugu as the sole language of administration and education throughout the state.
In connection the Andhra Pradesh Government has formed an Official Language Committee in 1965 and the Telugu Academy was started in 1968 to translate books in English to Telugu and for preparing glossaries and textbooks in Telugu. The authorities have agreed in principle to introduce Telugu as the medium of instruction at the University level in the three Universities - Andhra, Osmania and Sri Venkateswara and their Post-graduate centres.

Unlike that of Malayalam, there is a wide gulf between literary dialect and the colloquial variety in Telugu. This has led to the 'vyavahārika movement' of the 20th century when the demand was for the colloquial variety (B. Radhakrishna, 1977). In 1968 it was decided that the publication of university level literature in Telugu should employ the colloquial variety. Sri Venkateswara University accepted vyavahārika style (Modern standard Telugu) for writing Ph. D thesis in 1969. The government of Andhra Pradesh passed a Bill in 1973 to introduce vyavahārika style for teaching Telugu as second language at the graduate level.

1.2.3. Earlier works in grammar:

Nannayabhatta (IIth century) is supposed to have compiled the first grammar of Telugu written in Sanskrit
named Andhrasabdacintamani. Nannaya also translated 'Mahabharata' into Telugu which is the first available written literary work. The next called, vikṛti vivēkamu, supplementary to the former one, was also written in Sanskrit. It was believed to have been written by Adharvanāchārya of 13th century. There was no reference to these grammars earlier than 17th century. Abōbalapati wrote a commentary on both these grammars with the title - Kavīśirobhūshanam in sanskrit. Since then a good number of commentaries appeared in Telugu also. These two grammars including the commentary were the first detailed, available descriptive accounts of literary Telugu. However, they were mainly concerned about the derivation of Sanskrit borrowings, sandhi and a few morphological processes.

Pattabhirama Sastrī (1760-1820 A.D) wrote a Telugu grammar in verse, with a list of Telugu verbal roots. (2) Puduru sitarama sastrī (1834 A.D) published his prasnothara vyākarana, literally a question-answer grammar. (3) Rāvipāti Gurumurti Sastrī in 1836 published his Telugu grammar (Telugu vyakaranamu) and dedicated it to A. D. Campbell, who wrote a grammar in 1816. He listed the classical and the colloquial forms of words together, and coined a few technical terms. (4) Vedam Venkatarama Sastrī published his
Laghuvyakarana in 1856. (5) Udayagiri Seshayya Sastri wrote a grammar supposed to have been published in 1856, reprinted in 1875. The first edition contained a number of colloquial forms which had been later revised into the classical ones. More detailed grammars in Telugu are Balavyakaranamu written by Cinnayasuri (1809 - 1862) and Prapudha vyakaranamu by Sitarama-charyalu (1829 - 1891). These grammars are popular among scholars and are used in graduate and postgraduate courses. They are more prescriptive in nature and are descriptive in technique. These works were intended to guide the amateur writers in the literary tradition. At the same time they are helpful in understanding the structure of classical Telugu.

In the field of Lexicography Bahujana Palli Sitaramacharyulu's Sabdaratnakaramu is a very useful handy reference book. It is a dictionary of Telugu words both native and Sanskrit loans, picked up from literary compositions of Telugu, words in current use etc, along with citations wherever necessary and available. Campbell's dictionary (1821 A.D), C.P.Brown's dictionary (1852 A.D) are well known. The dictionary by Mamidi Venkayya (1849) and the Andhra Nighantu by Suryaraya are available.
Later works - Telugu:

Till 1900 grammars were prepared only for the written dialect and the colloquial prose was ignored. The twentieth century has necessitated the study of Telugu, especially the spoken dialect by foreigners. In this age the following scholars wrote Telugu grammars as earlier contemporaries of Chinnayasuri: Vajjalacina Sitaramaswamy sastri (Balavyakaranoddhatamu), Kalluri Venkatarama Sastry (Ramaniyamu), Vadlamudi Gopalakrishnaya (Vyavaharikabhasha vyakaranamu) have left good works. The later works by Boddupalli Purshotham in his two volumes of 'vyavaharika Bhāsha vikāsam' (the Evolution of Telugu grammar) is noteworthy. 'Andhra vyākarna vikāsam' by A. Rajeswara Sarma records Telugu grammatical works in a chronological and comparative manner. Mahadeva Sastri has made very useful contributions in his study of the 'Historical grammar of Telugu with special reference to old Telugu' (1969). Among other works, B.J. Suryanarayana (1966) provides information regarding the nominal compounds in the work of Tikkana (13th century) and a critique of the traditional Sanskrit-based system of classification as applied to noun-compounds in Telugu. A study of Telugu semantics (G.N. Reddy, 1966) is also to be noted. "Telugu Grammar - A descriptive study of the Modern literary
language" by N. Sivarama Murthy (1968), (Ph.D. Thesis unpublished) and "Localist Studies in Telugu Syntax" by B. Ramakrishna Reddy (Ph.D. Thesis, 1976, unpublished) are a few of the more recent works in Telugu grammar.

**Treatment of Syntax:**

In Telugu, *Proudhavyākarana* is the earliest traditional grammar which has a chapter on syntax. *Bālavyākarana* has some statements pertaining to syntax. It gives a chapter on cases where cases are assigned to different semantic relations. In this chapter Chinnaya Suri deals with in detail the Karakas in Telugu. Chinnaya Suri's treatment of syntax had some interesting parallels with current ideas in linguistics (Rama Rao, 1981). 'Dative subject' is treated under 'Karta'. Chinnaya Suri had also dealt with certain other syntactic process like agreement and word order. *Proudhavyākarana* gives more details on syntax. The grammarian gives certain traditional notions of sentences and its constituents in general. *Proudhavyākarana* also has case replacement rules, rules that cover agreement of various sorts, the subjecthood of sentences with conjunct noun phrases, deletion and stylistic devices.

1.3. **MALAYALAM - TELUGU CONTACTS**

Telugus are the second largest speech community in India and the largest among the speakers of the Dravidian family of languages. The contact between the speakers of Telugu and Malayalam were not intimate as those of Telugus and Tamils or Telugus and Kannadigas.
In South India, comparatively smaller number of Telugus are found in Kerala. 1971 census shows that 0.21% of the population of Kerala speak Telugu. A sizeable number of Telugu Reddiars, Chettys and Adi Andhara are found in Trivandrum, the capital of Kerala State. They speak an altogether different dialect of Telugu, since their ancestors migrated to the region long back. The earliest migration of the Reddiar community dates back to 1886 (Mathur, 1977). Reddiars are found mainly in the cities and towns of Kerala and are engaged chiefly in textile business. There are also printing presses, jewellery shops and provisional shops run by them. Reddiars are the oldest printers and publishers in Kerala. S.T. Reddiar and sons one of the reputed 'printers and publishers', have branches in important cities and towns of Kerala. It is interesting to note that the well known malayalam weeklies - 'Kerala Sabdam', 'Kunkumam' and 'Nāna' are owned by a Reddiar family (the late Krishnaswamy Reddiar of Quilon). More than 50% of the Reddiar's are literates (Mathur, 1977). There are also doctors, engineers and Ph.Ds from this community. In Trivandrum, Telugu chettys are more in number than the Reddiars. About 400 families of Telugu chettys live in Karamana, the eastern part of the city (the place is known as 'chetty street'). Chettys are not financially sound
like the Reddiars. Many of them are vegetable vendors, rice sellers and fruit merchants. Regional dialects of Telugu are spoken in the Palghat district of Kerala.*

The establishment of educational institutions, research centres and other business establishments under the control of the Central Government and the increasing industrialisation have promoted inter-state migration. In Kerala the Vikram Sarabai Space Centre (VSSC) has a good number of Telugu people. There are a few Telugu Associations in existence in the State. The Andhra Cultural Association formed in 1971 by the students and faculty members of the Regional Engineering College, Calicut; Aryavysya Samajam, also in Calicut, started in the last decade, The Andhra Cultural Association in Cochin formed in 1973. The Telugu Samskritika Sangham in Trivandrum (1971) is also notable for its interest in conducting cultural activities.

As far as the Malayalees in Andhra are concerned, there is no migrant community from Kerala similar to the Telugu Reddiars or Chettys. But there are others who joined recently on employment with several Central and State Government concerns. Malayalee Associations are there in Andhra Pradesh also 0.1% (1971 census) of the

* Gopala Krūhanayya, Vavilala (1981) ibid. P.10
total population of Andhra Pradesh speak Malayalam. Malayalam does not find a place in the curriculum of Andhra Pradesh whereas the Department of Linguistics of the University of Kerala offers Telugu as a subject for Post Graduate students in Linguistics. The Department had also conducted short term courses in Telugu for the employees of the FACT, who had to go to Andhra Pradesh, on official duty.

1.3.1. Language contact:

Unlike Telugu, Malayalam is not rich in early literary documentation. Malayalam as well as Telugu has borrowed a lot from Sanskrit – themes for literary composition and vocabulary. Malayalam and Telugu have not influenced each other, though they belong to the same family. In grammatical structure Telugu is different from Tamil, Malayalam and Kannada (Bh. Krishnamurthy, 1981). According to him Telugu is genetically closer to its northern neighbours (viz. gondi, konda, kui, kuvi, pengo and manda) than to its southern ones. Krishnamurthy gives a list of linguistic features which Telugu shares with its northern neighbours as distinct from its Southern neighbours.

A few translations from Malayalam to Telugu are available. (1) 'Rendu Serlu' by G. Subramaniaiah is a
translation of the Malayalam novel 'Rentitangazhi' by Thakazhi Sivasankara Pillai. (2) Another Malayalam novel by Thakazhi - 'Chemmeen' - is also translated into Telugu, by Subramaiah named 'Rooyalu' (1964). Other translations are:

'Ma Tatayakoka Enugundedi' by C.R. Sarma (M-Entuppuppakkoru Aanentarunnu' by Vaikam Mohammed Basheer). (4) 'Manavatvam' by J.Venkateswara Sastri (M-'Odayilninnu' by Kesava Dev), (5) 'Addam' by P. Viswanatha Rao (translation of M- 'Kannadi' written by Kesava Dev). (6) puttaparti Naranacharyulu's 'Tirani Baksi' is a translation of Malayalam one act plays. J.Venkateswara Sastri's 'Malayala Bhasha Sahityalu' (1968) is a notable work on the history of Malayalam language and literature.
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Mariamma Chacko (1980) 'Contrastive study of Malayalam and Russian (A phonological statement)
Contrastive Linguistics as a systematic branch of linguistic science is of fairly recent date, though the idea itself is not new. This is especially true for the area of syntax. The publication of Robert Lado's 'Linguistics Across Cultures' in 1957 marks the real beginning of modern applied contrastive linguistics. The hypothesis applied in Contrastive Linguistics is that learning is facilitated whenever there are similarities between the source language and the target language. Learning may be interfered with wherever there are marked contrasts. The structure of a language may be regarded as the set of rules which specify what the optional choice are, what their obligatory consequences are, and what the restrictions are that each choice imposes on all the subsequent choices. In a strict sense, these optional and obligatory choices and the restrictions which govern them are unique to each language, but probably no two languages are so completely different that some choices and restrictions are not alike, or at least similar. The fact that there is substitutional similarity in the choice and restrictions of related languages makes Telugu easier for a speaker of Malayalam to learn.
than, say, for a speaker of English. The points of difference between two languages are a major source of difficulty. In no area of language is it more obvious than in syntax (Robert L Politzer). The points of similarities can be used to our advantage. The differences between optional choices and obligatory ones extend throughout the structure of a language.

Contrastive study mainly aims at presenting the common and divergent features at various levels, between two or more languages. The grammars used for contrastive analysis should be based on the same general theory and methodology. Contrasting the syntactic structure of one language with that of another language, anticipates the problems which are to be emphasised. Generally, in a contrastive analysis the target language will be given greater importance in which case the similar and dissimilar features of the language are sufficient for the preparation of the teaching materials. It is a study which aims at presenting a generalised or regularised phenomena as far as possible which gives a better learning device. Contrastive study explains the nature of errors that a second language learner may commit.
2.1. **Contrastive linguistics and Comparative philology:**

Comparing individual languages is not new, on the one hand we have the well established discipline of comparative philology, a branch of learning which may be said to have reached its zenith in 19th century Germany. However the aims and methods of comparative philology differ from those of contrastive linguistics. In comparative philology, languages are compared in order to trace their pylogenetic relationships. The comparativist attempts to reconstruct the putative parent language from which the kindred are thought to have descended. In comparative philology mainly the individual sounds and words are compared. Contrastive analysis on the other hand, mainly compares languages with the aim of improving the methods and results of language teaching. Its comparison ranges over a wider area of language structure than those of traditional comparative philology and its merits differ accordingly.

2.2. **Contrastive analysis and Error analysis:**

Although one can discover by long observation what errors are likely to occur, a contrastive analysis goes beyond such mere listing because it may provide an explanation of why such mistakes are made, how great their degree of difficulty is
and which steps must be taken to avoid them. Though an error analysis would be more objective and its results more reliable, there is no guarantee that our error analysis would corner the whole spectrum of errors a second language speaking community is bound to make. On the other hand a predictive contrastive analysis is more comprehensive in that it lays bare all the apparent similarities and differences between the languages described and compared. This vastness of the area covered and the number of errors predicted outweighs what little is lost by way of a small number of unrealised predictions. Contrastive analysis lays equal emphasis on description as well as comparison, which an error analysis does not. However, Error Analysis and Contrastive Analysis do not exclude, but complement each other. The former covers more than only contrastive relations, the latter tries not only to describe errors, but also analyses one particular source in detail. Whether one starts with error analysis, or vice versa is a question of method and objective.

2.3. Methodology: It has been felt that Contrastive Linguistics is not dependent upon any specific linguistic model provided the two languages in question are described within the same theoretical framework. Various theoretical frameworks have been utilised in comparing the languages for the purpose of application in teaching or translating. Thus there exist contrastive
2.4. **Equivalence** : One of the problems connected with Contrastive Linguistics is that of 'equivalence'. Whereas formal equivalence can be established relatively easily, it is rather difficult to set up functional-semantic equivalents. While making syntactic comparisons, it is necessary to find out which constructions in the two languages are comparable. It is also necessary to see to what extent the compared constructions are formally similar. It has been assumed that only those constructions which exhibit contextual equivalences are comparable (Halliday 1964, 15; Krezeszowski 1962). Equivalent constructions are those constructions which at least sometimes are mutually translatable, the relation which holds between such equivalents is called textual equivalence (Catford 1965, 27). In order to discover textual equivalents in a given context or situation, one has to rely on the authority of a competent bilingual informant or translator (Halliday 1964, 11), (Catford 1965: 27). The informant's judgements are based on his intuitions, which underlies his linguistic competence in the two languages. Equivalence is a
notion connected with the meaning of the compared constructions and that an approach to CA through equivalence is necessarily meaning based. Yet when particular structures are compared it is also necessary to give an account of their forms, some of the equivalent constructions may be formally similar. Such constructions are termed as 'congruent' and their relationship as 'congruence' (Krzeszowski 1967, Marton 1968). On the basis of equivalence and formal correspondences various constructions in any two languages can be classified as (a) equivalent, formally different (b) equivalent, formally similar (congruent) (c) non-equivalent, formally similar (d) non-equivalent, formally different, where areas of conceptual systems underlying the Source language and Target language are isomorphous, meanings can probably be thought effectively by pointing to the semological equivalences between SL and TL. Semological comparison is the keystone of contrastive analysis (Snook 1971 p.35). Then another function of CA is to facilitate the teaching of meaning by displaying equivalences in the semologies of the SL and TL.

2.5. Applications: Contrastive linguistics can be fruitfully used not only to language teaching but also for machine translation and linguistic typology. The groups of related languages could be more exactly
defined with the aid of contrastive analysis. Contrastive Linguistics can provide a clearer conception of common and divergent features of different languages provided it makes use of suitable model for description. Perhaps Contrastive Linguistics can also show a new and more systematic approach to the question of Universals (Nickel, 1971, p. 16). Features of language structure revealed in a Contrastive Linguistics may suggest modifications to the model. Lexicology is another field where CA finds its application.

2.6. Limitations: Contrastive Linguistics cannot predict all the errors that the students of a particular L₂ (second language) are likely to commit. It can predict only those mistakes which the students are likely to commit because of structural, systemic and transformational differences between L₁ and L₂. Mistakes due to the internal complexities of L₂ cannot be predicted by Contrastive Linguistics. It cannot be claimed that all the predictions of CA will prove true. It is also emphasised that the contribution of Contrastive Linguistics to the design of teaching programmes is only a partial one and that predicting errors is not its only task.
The standard spoken variety of the educated is analysed and described with emphasis on contrastive features. The descriptive approach has been adopted in general, and the contrastive features at various levels pointed out. It is assumed that the description of contrasts will enable one to predict the probable interference. The variety of Malayalam used for the study is the author's idiolect which can be considered a representative sample of the speech of the educated Malayalis. For Telugu the data were collected mainly from two informants (1) a 35 year old (graduate) lady belonging to the Vysya community, hailing from Hyderabad and settled down in Trivandrum for the last ten years. She can speak and understand Malayalam. (2) a 38 year old (graduate) lady from the Brahmin community belonging to the East Godavari district settled in Trivandrum for the last fifteen years. She can also speak and understand Malayalam. However the data is checked with other Telugu native speakers. Examples are also taken, whenever found necessary, from the Telugu works cited in the bibliography.
One of the difficulties, a contrastive linguist often faces especially on the syntactic level is the question of equivalences — conceptual equivalences vs. grammatical (language) equivalences. When the concept is similar language realisation may differ and vice versa.

For example, a personal letter can end in M with *ennu* 'So says...' (corresponding to yours faithfully, sincerely etc. in English) whereas in T the common usage is *itlu* 'in this way'. *ennu* (M) has an equivalent *ani* in T.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language equivalent</strong></td>
<td><em>ennu</em></td>
<td><em>ani</em> 'said, that'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>iprakaaram</em></td>
<td><em>itlu</em> 'in this way'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>innane</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**contextual/conceptual equivalent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ennu</em></td>
<td><em>itlu</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the present study preference is given to contextual equivalents.

Scope: To compare and contrast the major patterns in the syntax of Malayalam and Telugu. Emphasis is on teaching rather than on theoretical formulations.

The study is in no way exhaustive but found helpful in teaching and learning Telugu by Malayalee speakers. Areas of detailing are chosen based on the author's experience of learning Telugu. By a scrutiny of the 'Exercise books' of the M.A. students of the Department of Linguistics, learning Telugu, it is found that the contrastive features pointed out have one to one correlation with the errors they commit. It is also noted that the contrastive material presented can be of real help to the telugu teacher teaching the Malayali students. However the depth and extent of the application of the findings are to be tried and calculated.