

**THE GRAMMATICAL TRADITIONS
AND LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS IN ANCIENT INDIA
(WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PĀṆINI AND *TOLKĀPPIYAM*)**

SINIRUDDHA DASH, UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS, INDIA

This paper deals with the comparative and contrastive features of the morphology and syntax of Tamil and Sanskrit. The open interpretation of texts by commentators has added a different dimension to the original and there is a pressing need to separate the wheat from the chaff. This paper, by way of clarification, seeks to shed light on some similarities and on the dissimilarity between the two long-standing traditions of Tamil and Sanskrit. Illustrations culled from modern and ancient sources we hope will illuminate the contrastive features of the two languages. In particular, we have given a brief overview of the *kāra* system in Sanskrit and its plausible equivalent in Tamil. Where the differences are so severe that there is no common ground we have mentioned this.

0. INTRODUCTION

Indology is at a crossroads today due to the open interpretation of texts made by commentators down the centuries. This is especially true of the linguistic and grammatical tradition of India, be it Sanskrit or Tamil. In both languages, there exists a long-standing tradition of commentaries and sub commentaries and commentators who either emended or suggested changes to the principal texts *Aṣṭādhyāyī* or *Tolkāppiyam* respectively.¹ It would be interesting to evaluate to what extent the commentarial tradition has succeeded in managing the corpus of grammar in the respective systems. Modern linguistic analysis as well has thrown up some inconsistencies in the great grammars; the commentarial tradition especially being vulnerable to a variety of examinations by modern linguists. Yet the commentaries are our only source of approaching the texts, which are almost impossible to read independently.

This paper will discuss some of the interesting aspects of the Sanskrit and Tamil tradition. However, the topic is very broad and in this short presentation we can point out only some of the main points. And though it has been dealt with by several scholars (see below), it certainly deserves our further attention.

¹ The following abbreviations are occasionally used:

A – *Aṣṭādhyāyī*

TE – *Tolkāppiyam eḷuttatikāram*

TC – *Tolkāppiyam collatikāram*

Y.N. – *Yāska Niruktam*

The descriptive adequacy of a grammatical system of a language can be said to be complete if and only if it provides for the following descriptions – designations, categories, relations of categories described and the process by which these relations are made possible. Such a complete descriptive adequacy in a language will not only be a source of inquiry and rationalisation but will also allow for extension to other systems of grammar or languages as well. Hence the effectual universality of an adequate grammar can be established.

This is precisely what the Indian grammarians meant by *lakṣya-lakṣaṇe vyākaraṇam* (grammar is constituted of rules and the instances thereof). The rules set out by Pāṇini (P) form a rule-bound grammar which gives the instances thereof. But it is to be borne in mind that each language is very particular and unique and this can be attributed to the very nature of the language considered. However, general principles can be used to understand various languages. One can indeed come to appreciate the nature of each language by such comparative study.

A comparison of the grammatical categories of a language should cover the areas of phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax. In this paper phonology and morphology are addressed in the main. The primary sources for the illustration of grammatical categories in noun morphology are taken from K. Meenakshi and P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri. While the overall approach is grammatical, a linguistic angle in the line of universality has been adopted while addressing syntax. Hence the three main topics addressed in eight sections of this paper can be classified as

- 1) Phonology,
- 2) Morphology,
- 3) *kāraka* (the syntactico-semantic relation between verb and noun in a sentence often translated as ‘case’).

The grammatical tradition in Sanskrit as well as Tamil is characterised by the presence of a series of commentaries and sub-commentaries on the main grammatical texts, namely the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Tolkāppiyam*, making for a long-standing, rich and erudite commentarial tradition. The need for the writing or exposition of so many commentaries is due to the esoteric content of the original primal grammar so to speak. Pāṇini wrote his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in an aphoristic style making the meaning open to interpretation even up to this day. What Kātyāyana did by emending the *sūtra* literature is continued to this day in the form of linguistic study which points to inconsistencies in even such a great work as the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. The implication and application of these insights at every century or period of enlightenment constitutes the grammatical tradition in Sanskrit.

This is true of the *Tolkāppiyam* tradition as well. The *Tolkāppiyam* attracted much attention from commentators down the centuries and present in Tamil is a treasure rich in interpretations, implications and applications. The meeting point of this interpretation is the head of the commentator where new ideas arise which suggest a new meaning to an existing fact in the grammar.

A comparative study shows the fact that the nature of the languages in question also required a different approach to be taken. While an aphoristic *sūtra* style suits

an inflectional language like Sanskrit, Tolkāppiyar attempted a descriptive manner for Tamil, which is agglutinative. Pāṇini's language is highly artificial (*kr̥trima*) as he adopts technical terms to convey his ideas; the *saṃjñā* (technical name) being critical in defining the nature of the interpretation of the entire *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Besides it is felt that Pāṇini's grammar was meant for a language dealing with the mind; therefore mental activity as addressed by language is dealt by him in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Tolkāppiyar addressed a broad and living audience as Tamil was a widely spoken language in the Sangam era. Hence he had the natural and first option of writing in a natural style; he wrote therefore in an open natural style as befitting a language spoken in various dialects but by one and all.

1. PHONOLOGY

1.0 Types of Rules

One can come across similar types of rules in both the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Tolkāppiyam*: the *adhikāra* (governing rule or section heading rule), *niyama* (obligatory rules), *pratiśedha* (negation rules), *apavāda* (exception rules), *atideśa* (over-ruling rules). These types of rules used in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* find a place in the *Tolkāppiyam* as well, though neither Pāṇini's text nor the *Tolkāppiyam* use these terms.

1.1 Method of Interpretation of Rules

It is the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* that follows rule ordering and facilitates the derivation of words. The grammatical rules in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* are generally arranged on the basis of certain themes such as feminine suffixes, *kr̥t*, *taddhita*, retroflexes, vocalisation, *kāraka*, compounds and so on. The arrangement does not generate a finished word in the order of the rule. Indeed Pāṇini prescribes the application of the rule in an ordered manner to get the correct form.

The rules of the types *utsarga/apavāda* (quitting/exception rules) and *antaraṅga/bahiraṅga* (being essential to base of word / relating to exterior or unessential) are invoked here. The *tripādī* section enjoins the principle of *asiddhatva* or ineffectiveness in relation to rules preceding them. Tolkāppiyar, on the other hand, does not require any such guidelines as the *sūtra*-s are neatly arranged and it hardly contains any rule for the derivation of a word as such.

1.2 Phonology in Tamil and Sanskrit

The *Tolkāppiyam* presents a detailed description of phonology which includes phonemic inventory, distribution of speech sounds and production of sounds, i.e. articulatory aspects of phonological units. The first three sections of the TE are devoted to phonology.

Pāṇini has not paid much attention to phonology and the kind of phonological rules found in the *Tolkāppiyam* are absent in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. However, Pāṇini has formulated phonological rules necessary for grammatical understanding in other sections of the text, which need phonological clarification for derivation of a word.

1.3 Sandhi Rules (Morphophonemic rules)

Puṇarcci, the corresponding Tamil name for *sandhi*, is described elaborately in the last six sections of the TE. The majority of *sandhi* rules are the description of external *sandhi* and the only place where internal *sandhi* is found in Tamil is the declension of nouns. The finished word is formed by the addition of case markers to the nouns and some noun take *cāriyai* or inflectional increments before the case maker is added. Compared with the number of rules he devotes to the description of external *sandhi*, the rules of internal *sandhi* are minimal.

The *Tolkāppiyam* divides *sandhi* into *vēṟṟumai-p-puṇarcci* or case relation *sandhi*, and *alvali-p-puṇarcci* or non-case relation *sandhi*, which is specific to Tamil. Therefore *sandhi* rules in the *Tolkāppiyam* reflect a syntactico-semantic relationship. Unless one knows the words in question one cannot predict the *sandhi*. The descriptions are elaborate at the cost of being repetitive.

Pāṇini deals both with internal and external *sandhi*. As the majority of Pāṇini's rules are concerned with the formation of correct words, a large number of sūtras in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* concern internal *sandhi*. Almost all the *sandhi* processes are shared in common by all languages. *Tolkāppiyar* includes each and every minor detail in his description of *sandhi*, whereas Pāṇini simply describes the *sandhi* processes without going into such minor details.

In *Tolkāppiyam* there is special mention made of the fact that the addition of case markers brings about *sandhi* (*puṇarcci*). A series of examples are provided in the *Naṇṇūl*:

nilaṅ kaṭantāṅ - ai – nilattai-k kaṭantāṅ (He crossed the land.)
malaiyil aruvi - iṅ – malaiyiṅil aruvi (river in the mountain)

2. MORPHOLOGY

Morphology is the process of word formation and the study of categories of the word. The morphology of Tamil nouns is different from that of Sanskrit nouns.

2.1 Sanskrit Nouns

Nouns in Sanskrit are generally analyzed into root (*prātipadika*), gender forming affix, number-case forming affix.

Pāṇini treats nouns and verbs as *pada* ('finite word') when used in sentences. The suffixes are technically known as *subanta* and *tiṅanta* respectively. *Subanta* refers to

the nominal-endings and *tiñanta* refers to the verbal-endings. His sūtra A 1.4.14 is *sup-tiñ-antam padam* (a *pada* or a finite word is that which takes *sup*, i.e. nominal endings, or *tiñ*, i.e. verbal endings). More specifically, *sup* (nominal endings) and *tiñ* (verbal endings) constitute a 'finite' word or *pada* when formed with a nominal base or verbal root respectively. This is because at the heart of Pāṇini's definition is the assumption in Sanskrit grammar that a word (W) is

$W = R + S$ (where R is the Root and S is the suffix).

This is treated by Pāṇini as

pada = *prakṛti* + *pratyaya*

It is to be noted that *prakṛti* includes both the *dhātu* (verbal root) and *prātipadika* (nominal stem). On the other hand, most of the nouns in Tamil which are capable of being derived from roots (verbal/pronominal) are analyzed into root, gender number forming affix and case forming affix.

In the Sanskrit word *devam* (God), the *-a-* denotes masculine gender and the *-am* (*-a-* being elided) denotes the accusative singular. In Tamil *tēvaṇai*, *-aṇ* at the end of *tēva* denotes masculine gender and singular and *-ai* the accusative case. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri (1947, p. 21) argues that the plural accusative form *tēvarkkaḷai* is a development of later Tamil.

Nouns in Tamil which denote their gender and number through their meaning have only the nominative case singular form for their stem. But in Sanskrit nouns which do not end in a consonant or *a* generally denote their grammatical gender only through the suffix.

E.g. *alavaṇ* (a crab) and *makkaḷ* (human beings) do not denote their gender and number through the suffixes *-ṇ* and *-aḷ*. Their gender and number are determined only through their meaning and the cases are formed by adding case suffixes to the forms *alavaṇ* and *makkaḷ* (P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, 1947, p. 22). E.g. Old Tamil has the same Accusative suffix *-ai* with nouns both in singular and plural. The 'non-rational' or 'neutre' (*akṛiṇai*) nouns need not have the plural suffix, for instance the word *māṭu* may mean both 'cow' and 'cows'. Note also that *māṭu* is a common name referring to both male and female. In the sentence *māṭu vantatu* 'cow came', it is singular because of the singular form of the verb, and in the sentence *māṭu vantaṇa* 'cows came', it means plural, because the verb is in plural.

2.2 Noun morphology

Nouns in Tamil are classified into

- (1) nouns denoting objects
- (2) verbal nouns or *tolīr-peyar* denoting action
- (3) abstract nouns, *peyar*, denoting quality, colour etc.
- (4) participial nouns or *viṇaiyāl-aṇaiyum-peyar* according to later grammarians (Meenakshi refers to these as participial nouns, 1997, p. 95)
- (5) personal pronouns

- (6) demonstrative pronouns
- (7) interrogative pronouns
- (8) numeral pronouns
- (9) indefinite pronouns
- (10) collective pronouns

Both pronouns and nouns are referred to by the name *peyar* in the *Tolkāppiyam*.

Tolkāppiyar observes that primarily there are only two classes of words, *peyar* (noun) and *viṇai* (verb), and in a secondary sense there are two more:

iṭaiṅcol (particle which cannot be used by itself in any sense but which when occurring in combination with nouns and verbs functions as inflectional and conjugational suffixes adverb, preposition, expletive, conjunction interjection; one of the four parts of speech in Tamil grammar);

uriccol (one of the few indeclinables which have the force of adjective or adverb, one of the four parts of speech in Tamil) which are always found in conjunction with the previous two. According to P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri (1979, p. 149) *uriccol* is nothing but nominal root and verbal root.

He adds that in ancient India there were two schools of thought, one holding that all words can be derived from verbal roots and the other that all words need not be derived from verbal roots, i.e. some may be derived from them and some may not. Tolkāppiyar seems to hold the latter view. *iṭaiṅcol* are the case suffixes, particles like *-um*, and certain words are reduced to the position of particles.

A striking resemblance or parallelism is seen between Tolkāppiyar and Yāska who defines nouns, verbs, prefixes and particles in his *Nirukta* (*nāma-ākhyāta-upasarga-nipātaśca*; Y.N. 8.8). Primary importance is given both to noun and verb and subordinate position to *upasarga* and *nipāta*, the particles. All case suffixes may be dropped in Tamil nouns when they stand before the verbs they qualify and the second case suffix (Accusative) and the seventh case suffixes (Locative) are dropped even before verbs. This is not permissible in classical Sanskrit. The use of inflexional increments between the stem and case suffix found in Tamil is not found in Sanskrit.

In Old Tamil the pronouns of the first person were considered to be 'rational'. This is not so in Sanskrit.

2.3 Formation of words

Nouns are formed by the addition of case suffixes to nominal stems when sometimes inflexional increments are added between them. It seems there was no suffix to denote the nominative case. This is true of pronouns too. *Peyar-vērrumai* is the term given to the nominative case and no suffix belongs to the nominative case.

2.4 Origin of case suffixes

According to Caldwell all case relations are shown by means of post positions or post positional suffixes. In fact the suffixes were originally in separate words retaining

properties of auxiliary nouns. Without doubt they were all post-positional nouns originally.

Even in the case of inflectional languages like IE languages there is reason to suspect/believe that derivative affixes or flexional suffixes were originally independent words. This is confirmed by Jespersen's Theory of Coalescence (cf. Jespersen 1968, p. 376).

As for Tamil, according to P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri (1979, p. 77), a few different meanings have been assigned e.g. to the suffix *-ku* (TC 110). He proceeds to illustrate the functions of the *-ku* suffix.

The suffixes mentioned in the *Tolkāppiyam* are: *-ai*, *-oṭu*, *-ku*, *-iṅ* *-ai* and *-āi*.

2.5 Theory of case in the *Tolkāppiyam*

Generally cases can be treated from two aspects – morphological or syntactic. Although both aspects deal with the same grammatical category, the functional and generative aspects of the two said methodologies differ in their scope of examination. The morphological aspect of case theory involves an emphasis on inflection. These inflectional increments (*cāriyai*) and morphophonemic influences (*sandhi*) are as in declensional processes. On the other hand, syntactic representations of case theory involve a studied approach of *kāra* relations (syntactico-semantic relation between verb and noun in a sentence – loosely co-extensive with case)

Below an examination of each case is taken up under the respective *sūtra* of the *Tolkāppiyam*.

2.5.1 *VĒRRUMAI-Y-IYAL*

It is said that the cases are eight in number. There are many opinions on the choice of the term *vērrumai* (basic meaning 'difference', 'dissimilarity' < *vēru* 'other, that which is different'; TL s.vv.) for case affixes or relations. 'It is felt that case is called *vērrumai* since it brings the object denoted by the noun into some relation to the action denoted by the verb' (P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri 1979, p. 61). Some feel that just as *vibhakti* (case-affix) is derived from the root *vibhaj-* – to divide, to distinguish, so too the term *vērrumai* conveys the ability to distinguish, to vary (K. Meenakshi 1997).

2.5.2 THE LIST OF *VĒRRUMAI-Y-URUPU*

The list of case-affixes under each kind of *vērrumai* is provided first. The aim of the paper is to go beyond secondary sources and examine primary literature on the topic of *vērrumai-y-iyal*. The major kinds of *vērrumai* (casal relations) listed in the TC are the following (eight cases including the vocative):

peyar vērrumai (nominative)

-ai-vērrumai (accusative)

-oṭu-vērrumai (instrumental)

-*ku-vērrumai* (dative)
-*iṅ-vērrumai* (ablative)
-*atu-vērrumai* (genitive)
-*kaṅ-vērrumai* (locative)
viji vērrumai (vocative)

2.5.3 PEYAR VĒRRUMAI

This *peyar vērrumai* is used to denote the doer or the subject of the active verb. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri (1979, p. 66) argues that the nominative case is used to denote the *eḷuvāy* (subject; literally 'source'/'creation'/'beginning') and that the fact that there is no suffix for the nominative case is easily inferred from the two rules in TC 6 and TC 11 which deal with the names of cases and case suffixes.

2.5.4 AI-VĒRRUMAI

am-malai kākkum naḷli-y avan

(He is Nalli protecting that mountain) (P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri 1979, p. 79)²

The second case called *-ai* denotes the direct object of a verb or an appellative verb. It is felt that the *Tolkāppiyam* speaks about the *toljil-mutal-nilai* (or *kāraka-s*): "That which is the cause for action is known as *toljil-mutal-nilai*. As it precedes the action (*kāriyam*) it is *mutal-nilai*. *kāraṇam* and *kārakam* are synonyms" (Meenakshi, 1997, p. 129), which includes the direct object (*ceya-p-paṭu-poru*). The commentaries diverge on the interpretation of the terms *viṅai* (verb) and *viṅai-k-kurippu* (lit. 'verbal sign', also known as appellative verbs) in the *sūtra*. This author proceeds to point out that though the *Tolkāppiyam* has stated *viṅai* and *viṅai-k-kurippu* can occur as predicates, the text has not given an example of even a single *kurippu-viṅai* or appellative verb. In TC 72, the *Tolkāppiyam* lists 28 verbs which can occur with the 2nd case as a direct object.

2.5.5 OṬU-VĒRRUMAI

nīroṭu nīrainta kaṅ

(Eyes filled with tears, an illustration of the Agent) (P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri 1979, p. 86)

The third case called *-oṭu* denotes the agent or instrument of an action. Although the *Tolkāppiyam* mentions only *-oṭu* in the *sūtra* TE 114, it mentions *-āi* as a suffix as well. A subtle note to be observed is that the suffix *-oṭu* is used rarely in modern literature and when used, it denotes 'association'. *-oṭu* is an older version of *-āi* and does not *in toto* convey the instrumental sense. Caldwell was of the opinion that

² Note that in this phrase the second case (Accusative) suffix *-ai* has a zero-form after *malai*. A zero-form Accusative suffix can occur with the *akriṅai* ('non-rational' or 'neutre') nouns under some conditions.

in Sanskrit the conjunctive need not always stand separate from the instrumental. He points out that in Dravidian this case has many case signs of its own, while in Sanskrit that is not the case. However some scholars feel that both *-oṭu* and *-āi* were used to denote all the three – agent, instrument and association. In his treatment of contemporary Tamil, Pon Kothandaraman (1997, p. 234) separates the associative as a distinct category from the instrumental.

2.5.6 KU-VĒRRUMAI

The fourth case denotes recipient:

nelli-k-kaṇi emakku-t tantaṇai yē

(You gave me the sweet nelli fruit) (P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri 1979, p. 95)

The next sūtra enumerates ten places of occurrence of *-ku-vērrumai* (cf. Sastri 1979, pp. 97–8; K. Meenakshi 1997, p. 111–2). K. Meenakshi (1997, p. 112) arranges these ten occurrences into three functional groups.

However K. Meenakshi (1997, p. 112) points out that the list does not contain even a single word having the sense 'to give'. The *Tolkāppiyam* also points out that the 4th case may be used in the sense of 2nd, 5th, 3rd, 6th and 7th (TC 110). K. Meenakshi (1997, p. 112) demonstrates that the *-ku*-case is used to denote several meanings besides its main semantic relation of recipient (*koṭai-p-poruḷ*).

2.5.7 IN-VĒRRUMAI

The fifth case is called *in-vērrumai* and denotes the nature of an object in its relation to another comparison (*porūu-p-poruḷ*, coming from *porūu-* to compare), separation (*nīkkam*), limit (*ellai*), cause (*ētu*).

kuḷavi kolpavariṇ ompumati

(Protect like those who tend children) (P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri 1979, p. 99)

It is argued that the (*oṭu*) is said to be of two kinds *ñāpaka ētu* and *kāraka ētu* and that this sūtra refers to *kāraka ētu* which is denoted by the words *accam* (exactly), *ākkam* (arrangement). The author proceeds to demonstrate the usage of this 5th case sign and argues that the 5th case had not yet been developed into an ablative at the time of the *Tolkāppiyam*.

2.5.8 ATU-VĒRRUMAI

The 6th case called *atu-vērrumai* denotes the relation between an object and its inseparable elements or, between one object and another.

aḷitō tāṇē pāriyatu paṛampē

(The *Paṛampu* [name of a hill] of Pāri deserves our pity) (P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri 1979, p. 104)

This *vērrumai* denotes a relationship (*kiḷamai*), which can be *taṛ kiḷamai* (inalienable possessions) or *piṛitiṅ kiḷamai* (alienable possessions; refer K. Meenakshi 1997, p. 116). The former one exists between an object and its part (*cāttāṇatu vaḷi*). Commentators differ concerning the further classification of this case. All however agree that ‘a’ should be taken as the 6th case marker if the noun governed is plural (e.g. *cāttāṇatu yāṇaikai*, Cattan’s elephants). TC 80 lists sixteen categories as the semantic relations of the sixth case.

2.5.9 KAṆ-VĒRRUMAI

The seventh case called the *kaṇ-vērrumai* denotes place and time of act.

mulaviṅ kaṇ aṭittāṅ

(He struck at the centre of the *muḷa*, a type of drum/instrument) (P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri 1979, p. 110)

The case suffix *-kaṇ* meaning ‘place’ might have been considered the seventh case suffix. Hence Caldwell’s statement that case suffixes were originally post-positions is correct with respect to the seventh case suffixes *-kaṇ*, *-kāḷ*, etc. in Tamil. Here we can see an example of grammaticalisation.

The majority of commentators agree that the 7th case denotes three semantic relationships, viz. *viṇai ceyyum iṭam* (the place of action of the verb), *nilam* (location) and *kālam* (time). Shanmugam (1972, pp. 306–307) points out that the first two have to be one category, rebutting Tolkāppiyar’s opinion that they can be included under *nilam* and *kālam* (location and time).

Tolkāppiyam provides a list of 19 post positions in the next sūtra. K. Meenakshi points out that many of these are fully-fledged nouns. However, they are also capable of taking *-oṭu* and *-ai* under certain conditions (e.g. *akattai*, *akattoṭu*, house/mind as direct object, with the house/mind). For a detailed exposition of the postpositions one can refer to K. Meenakshi (1997, p. 120) and P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri (1979, p. 110).

2.6 Use of case affixes

According to P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri (1979, p. 115), in TC 83.

‘Tolkāppiyam insists that to expatiate the meanings of the cases mentioned above all the words which are synonymous with the words found in the collection at the end (in *sūtra*-s 72, 74, 76, 78, 80, 82) have to be added to the list of words found in each of them.’

The summary of *vērrumai* in the Tamil tradition shows some similarity to the Sanskrit tradition. At the same time it retains its own unique method of presenting the list of respective case affixes. Tolkāppiyar has demonstrated a systematic classification of case affix in the *Tolkāppiyam*. Pāṇini also formulated a systematic *kāraka* theory in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Although one expects to find similarity of structure in the *kāraka* theory in any language, there are also many considerable points of difference between the

Tamil and Sanskrit traditions. While Pāṇini gives the terms *kārake* (A 1.4.23) *anabhihite* (unexpressed; A 2.3.1) and syntactic rules in the *kāra* section, the strength of *Tolkāppiyam* lies in its systematic classification and demonstration of the number of case suffixes actually in use in a vital living language.

3. COMPOUNDS

Definition: A compound is a group of words connected in a syntactical relation and fused into a single form.

The name *tokai* which is given by Tamil grammarians to compounds suggests both the unitary nature of compounds and elision in general of something between their component parts.

In Sanskrit, the term *samāsa* covers the full range of types of compounds available in the literature.

3.1 Classification of Tamil Compounds

Tolkāppiyar classifies Compounds into six kinds:

- (i) *vērrumai-t-tokai* (case compound)
- (ii) *uvamai-t-tokai* (simile compound)
- (iii) *viṇai-t-tokai* (verbal compound)
- (iv) *paṇpu-t-tokai* (quality compound)
- (v) *ummai-t-tokai* (co-ordinative compound)
- (vi) *aṇmoḷi-t-tokai* (exocentric compound)

3.1.1 VĒRRUMAI-T-TOKAI (CASE COMPOUND)

Here case relationship determines the relationship between the two members of the compound.

e.g. *por-kuṭam* (pot made of gold)
cāttan-kai (Sattan's hand)

3.1.2 UVAMAI-T-TOKAI (SIMILE COMPOUND)

When the former member suggests similarity or *upamāna*, the compound is called *uvamai-t-tokai*.

e.g. *tuṭi-y-iṭai* (waist like *tuṭi*, a small drum)

3.1.3 VIṆAI-T-TOKAI (VERBAL COMPOUND)

This is a compound made up of a relative participle and a noun qualified by it,

e.g. *kol-yāṇai* (*koṇra yāṇai*) (an elephant that has killed, threatens to kill or will kill)

3.1.4 PAṆPU-T-TOKAI (QUALITY COMPOUND)

This is a compound made up of two words, which stand in apposition with each other; the former word may denote quality, state, colour of the individual member of a genus, e.g. *karuṅ-kutirai* (black horse)

3.1.5 UMMAI-T-TOKAI (CO-ORDINATE COMPOUND)

This compound is formed by words connected by the combination of two words/nouns, each denoting measurements, or words denoting objects that are counted or words denoting weight and words denoting numbers.

e.g. *uvāppatiṅṅku* (*uvā* + *patiṅṅku*) (fourteen *uvā* trees; Sand-paper Tree or *Dillenia indica*)

3.1.6 AṆMOLI-T-TOKAI (EXOCENTRIC COMPOUND)

This is called a possessive compound by philologists:

e.g. as in *poṅ-mēl-vantāṅ* (lit. 'the one who came on gold', meaning 'the one who came on a golden horse or lotus' or 'the one who wore clothes of gold' depending on the context. The meaning is exocentric giving an extra meaning to that which is contained in the compound)

3.2 Sanskrit Compounds

Pāṇini formulated the rule *samarthaḥ pada vidhiḥ* (a grammatical operation requires a certain fitness between finite words; A 2.1.1). To explain characteristics and classification of compounds S. C. Vasu (1997) translates the passage as follows:

'A rule which relates to complete words (and not to the roots and affixes out of which the words are constructed) is to be understood to apply only to those words the senses of which are connected.'

A grammatical operation on *pada*-s ('finite' words) takes place on syntactically and semantically connected words where *pada* is a word terminating in *sup* (nominal endings) triplets or *tin* (verbal endings) triplets. By A 2.1.4. only an item ending in a *sup* triplet combines with another to generate a compound.

In a compound the main member is termed *pradhāna* and the secondary member *upasarjana*.

A compound demonstrates *ekārthībhāva-sāmarthya* (the capacity to denote only one notion). Pāṇini describes compounds by their sentence form; that is to say the analytical sentence, *vākya* (sentence) or *vigraha-vākya* (analytical sentence).

Each compound as a whole in turn is a *prātipadika* or nominal stem and thus undergoes declension like any other nominal stem.

3.2.1 TYPES OF COMPOUNDS

- (i) *avyayībhāva* or indeclinable compound,
- (ii) *taṭpuruṣa* or determinative compound. This includes *dvigu* or numeral and *karmadhāraya* or appositional compounds,
- (iii) *bahuvrīhi* or attributive compound,
- (iv) *dvandva* or co-ordinative compound.

3.2.1.1 *avyayībhāva* or indeclinable

Either the first member or the second member of the *avyayībhāva* may be an indeclinable. In that case the constituent members may have the sequence – an indeclinable + nominal *pada* or nominal *pada* + indeclinable.

Thus the compound may be an alternating *avyayībhāva* or an obligatory one.

3.2.1.1.1 Alternating *avyayībhāva*

e.g. *prāg-grāmam* (east of village)

3.2.1.1.2 Obligatory *avyayībhāva*

e.g. *śalākā-pari* – (unlucky throw of ivory pieces) < *śalākā* (ivory pieces) + *pari* (away from)

3.2.1.2 Determinative compounds – *taṭpuruṣa* (A 2.1.22 – 2.2.22)

3.2.1.2.1 vibhakti-*taṭpuruṣa*

The first member of the case compounds may occur in any *sup* triplet except the first. Thus 6 types of case compounds are possible. Pāṇini's description of cases include both *kāraka* and non-*kāraka* relations.

- (i) *dvitīyā taṭpuruṣa* (accusative determinative)
e.g. *sukhaṃ prāptaḥ* > *sukha-prāptaḥ* (one who attained happiness)
- (ii) *trītiyā taṭpuruṣa* (Instrumental)
e.g. *guḍena miśraḥ* > *guḍa-miśraḥ* (mixed with molasses)
- (iii) *catuṛthī taṭpuruṣa* (dative)
e.g. *yūpāya dāruḥ* > *yūpa-dāruḥ* (post for sacrifice > sacrificial post)
- (iv) *pañcamī taṭpuruṣa* (ablative)
e.g. *stokān muktaḥ* > *stoka-muktaḥ* (barely released)
- (v) *ṣaṣṭhī taṭpuruṣa* (genitive)
e.g. *rājñah puruṣaḥ* > *rāja-puruṣaḥ* (king's servant)
- (vi) *saptamī taṭpuruṣa* (locative)
e.g. *akṣau śauṇḍaḥ* > *akṣa-śauṇḍaḥ* (expert in dice)

3.2.1.2.2 *karmadhāraya* or appositional compounds

When the first member of the compound is co-referential to the second member the compound is *karmadhāraya*. The rule for generating this compound comes under *viśeṣaṇam viśeṣyena bahulam* (many or various are the instances of qualifier and qualificand; A 2.1.57). It is translated by S. C. Vasu (1997) as follows: 'A case inflected word denoting the qualifier is compounded diversely with a case inflected word denoting the thing thereby qualified (the substantive) the latter being in agreement with the former and the compound is determinative.' These compounds are said to be *sāmānādhikaraṇa* or co-referential to one another:

e.g. *ghana iva śyāmaḥ* > *ghana-śyāmaḥ* (dark as cloud)

Generally the qualifier is placed first. However, in certain instances, the second member qualifies the first. These instances are treated separately by Pāṇini.

3.2.1.3 *bahuvrīhi* or attributive compound

Bahuvrīhi denotes a meaning distinct from its constituent members and can be composed of two or more members. *Sūtra* A 2.2.24 (*anekam anya padārthe*; which gives another meaning than that of its own finite word) defines the nature of *bahuvrīhi*. It is interpreted by S. C. Vasu (1997) as follows:

'Two or more words, ending in any case-affix, form a compound, denoting another new thing, not connoted by those words individually; and the compound is called *bahuvrīhi*.'

E.g. *citra gavā yasya sa citraguḥ* (He who is the possessor of mottled cows).

The man who possesses mottled cows is said to be owner of those cows. This is the *bahuvrīhi* compound, also sometimes called the exocentric compound.

3.1.2.4 *dvandva* or co-ordinate compound

E.g. *plakṣa-nyagrodha* (*plakṣa*, *Ficus infectoria*, and *nyagrodha*, *Ficus indica*, trees)

3.2.1.5

Other types of compounds formed with indeclinables in Sanskrit include:

- (i) *ku-puruṣaḥ* – a bad man
- (ii) *duṣ-puruṣaḥ* – a wicked man

3.2.1.6 *upapada* compounds

When a constituent of the compound is used in the sense of *karman* (object), it is called an *upapada* (lit. 'word placed near', 'an adjoining word'; cf. Abhyankar, Shukla 1986): e.g. *kumbha-kāraḥ* potter

3.3 Properties of compounds in Sanskrit

- i) They are *prātipadika*-s (Nominal stems) and hence can undergo **declension**.
- ii) They are marked by **accent**. Accentuation is determined by the semantics of a compound. Thus *taṭpuruṣa* (and *samāsa*-s in general) accent the last syllable (*antodātta*), while the first member carries the original accent in a *bahuvrīhi* (*pūrvapada-prakṛti-svara*, the original accent of the first member of the compound). Pāṇini defines accentuation in A 6.1.223 and A 6.2.1 and provides for the exceptions in later *sūtra*-s.
- iii) *aluk samāsa* (a compound in which case suffixes are not dropped)
Generally the case suffix (*luk*) is elided during the compound formation. In certain instances of *aluk samāsa*, this does not happen and the case suffix is retained in the first member.
- iv) *dvigu* (a subdivision of the *taṭpuruṣa* with a numeral as the first member), *dvandva* and *avyayībhāva* are neuter in gender. In *sūtra*-s 2. 4. 1925, Pāṇini states the gender of the *taṭpuruṣa* compounds. Exceptions are clearly stated.
- v) *dvigu* is treated as if it were a single entity. A *dvandva* is defined by Pāṇini to be a single entity under certain specific conditions.

3.4 A comparison of Tamil and Sanskrit compounds

Tolkāppiyar recognises the classification of compounds into co-ordinating, sub-ordinating, epithetised and non-epithetised. *ummai-t-tokai* and *aṇmoḷi-t-tokai* correspond directly to *dvandva* and *bahuvrīhi*, but a *bahuvrīhi* may be determined from its form, which is not the case with Tamil. *Vēṛrumai-t-tokai* corresponds to *vibhakti-taṭpuruṣa* but not to *prathama* which may correspond to *karmadhāraya* in Sanskrit. The *avyayībhāva* does not find any direct correlates in Tamil. *uvamai-t-tokai* corresponds to *upamāna-pūrvapada-karmadhāraya* (*upamāna* or standard of comparison is the first member of the *karmadhāraya*) and *paṇṇu-t-tokai* to *viśeṣaṇa-pūrvapada-karmadhāraya* (qualifier or adjective is the first member of the *karmadhāraya*).

4. COMPARISON OF VERBS IN SANSKRIT AND TAMIL

On the whole the *Tolkāppiyam* has not devoted much space to verbal conjugation. Pāṇini's description of verb includes the formation of derivative verbs, the markers of *lakāra*-s (the name in general given to personal endings applied to roots in the ten tenses and moods which take different substitutes and have various modifications and augments in the different tenses and moods), *vikaraṇa*-s (affixes placed between a root and a personal ending for showing the specific tense or mood or voice, to convey which the personal ending is added), *parasmaipada* (active voice; the term used in grammar with reference to the personal affixes *-ti*, *-taḥ* etc. applied to roots.) and *ātmenapada* (or 'medium', a technical term for the affixes called *tañ* and the affix *-āna* called so possibly because, the result/benefit of the activity is

such as generally goes to the agent when these affixes are used; this also occurs in the passive voice) verbs. The verbal system in Sanskrit is complete.

5. SYNTAX OF CASES (KĀRAKA AND VIBHAKTI)

Both *kāra* (syntactico-semantic relation between noun and verb in a sentence) and *vibhakti* (case-affix) taken together represent the syntactico-semantic relation present in a sentence. *kāra* is defined as the relation between a noun and a verb. This eternal relation is expressed in Pāṇini's system by six *kāra*-s:

apādāna (taking away/removal)

sampradāna (handing over)

karaṇa (means)

karman (that which is done)

adhikaraṇa (substratum)

and *karṭṛ* (agent)

How are these relations or *kāra*-s related to *vibhakti*? The underlying semantic structure is the *kāra*, which through the respective *vibhakti*-s, are highlighted in sentence. Thus, the *apādāna* is expressed through *pañcamī* (ablative), *sampradāna* through *caturthī* (dative), *karaṇa* through *trīyā* (instrumental), *karman* through *dvitīyā* (accusative), *adhikaraṇa* through *saptamī* (locative). One of the strengths of the Sanskrit grammatical tradition is the descriptive adequacy of Pāṇini's system. It will be worthwhile to consider a few examples from this viewpoint.

1a) *apādāna kāra* expressed through *pañcamī* as in:

grāmād āgacchati (He comes from the village)

The *Mahābhāṣya* discusses the problem of accepting *apādāna* status in the following example:

1b) *grāmasya samīpād āgacchati* (He comes from near the village / the vicinity of the village.)

In 1b the *apādāna* designation cannot apply to *grāma*.

Similarly, the post-positional 'suffix' *iruntu* expresses a *kāra* relation in Tamil:

2a) *ūril-iruntu vantāṅ* (He came from the town.)

2b) *pakkattu ūril-iruntu vantāṅ* (He came from the neighbouring town.)

The two sentences show the difference between the categories that expresses the sense of the ablative conveyed by the marker *iruntu*. One is a true *apādāna* relation with respect to the town while the other is not. The meanings of 1a and 2a are clearly due to the operation of *vibhakti* in these sentences. Both sentences reflect the Ablative, only sentence 2b has an additional attribute 'neighbouring'.

Such use of *vibhakti*, which thereby reflects the underlying *kāraka* relation, can be extended to other *vibhakti*-s as well.

6. UNIVERSALITY AND SOME PROBLEMS IN UNIVERSALITY

Although *kāraka* and *vibhakti* treated together as a case of syntax are universal to all languages, there are exceptions in some instances in certain languages.

6.1

For example, firstly *ṣaṣṭhī* (genitive), which is a noun to noun relation, is not differentiated from other noun to verb relations in Tamil. The 6th *vērrumai* is afforded the same status as other *vērrumai*-s. In Sanskrit, though, the Pāṇinīya tradition does not treat *ṣaṣṭhī* as a *kāraka* at all. Appropriately enough, there is no reference to *ṣaṣṭhī* in the *kāraka* section in the Bhāṣya. Yet, the *vibhakti* is used only to refer to *sva-svāmī-bhāva* (relation of possession and possessor) and such relations.

6.2

Among other problems there is the problem of the instrumental in Tamil. Although the 3rd *vērrumai* is said to be *oṭu* there is no complete explanation for the *-āi* suffix in a true passive form. Is there a *kartari tṛtīyā* (the instrumental in *kartari prayoga* or active sense) or not? Caldwell points out that the passive form is alien to the Dravidian group of languages and its use is really a result of foreigners (to Tamil); it is due to such concepts from other languages that there exists a clear passive form for every nominal sentence. He points out that in Tamil this (a clear passive form, i.e. a synthetic grammatical form of the passive) is not the case at all and that the use of the (analytical) formations with *paṭu-* is highly artificial in the Tamil language. We wish to present here examples from modern Tamil that support the presence of passive formations in the use of the language.

Pon Kothandaraman (1997, p. 233) shows the conditions to be allowed for passivisation. Cognate objects cannot be passivised.

1a) *nāṅ kaṅṅai viḷittēṅ* (I opened my eyes.)

1b) *kaṅ eṅṅāi viḷikka-p paṭṭatu* (Eyes were opened by me.)

Pon Kothandaraman (1997, p. 233) also shows the absence of passivisation in certain sentences:

2a) *nāṅ tūkkam tūṅkiṅēṅ* (I slept sleep.)

2b) *nāṅ avaṅ varuvatai-p pārttēṅ* (I saw him coming.)

Contrast this with the Sanskrit examples:

2a) *ahaṃ taṃ paśyāmi* (I see him.)

2b) *sa mayā dṛśyate* (He is seen by me.)

Pon Kothandaraman (1997, p. 133) also shows that the instrumental suffix *-āḷ* in Tamil is homonymous with the causal affix. The instrumental *-āḷ* can be replaced by *-ōṭu* (the instrumental suffix).

3a) *avaṅ vāḷāḷ veṭṭināṅ = vāḷ koṇṭu veṭṭināṅ*

He cut with a sickle = He cut with the help of a sickle.

He points out that:

vāḷāḷ veṭṭināṅ can be nominalised as *avaṅ veṭṭina vāḷ* (lit. 'the sickle with which he cut').

On the other hand the sentence:

avaṅ kaṇṇaṅāḷ vantaṅ (he came because of Kannan) cannot be nominalised as: **avaṅ vanta kaṇṇaṅ*.

The one is instrumental, the other causal.

Thus the (analytical) passive formation (in Tamil) seen in certain instances points to the presence of *kartari ṭṭiyā* (Agent/Instrumental in *kartari prayoga* or passive sense) and *hetau ṭṭiyā* (causal Instrumental) in certain instances, even in a Dravidian language that is widely acknowledged to lack true passive forms. One would like to point out here that Pāṇini's system is one of a high degree of adequacy. Hence, almost all grammatical transformations are found to exist within Pāṇini's system for Sanskrit. In respect to this particular instance of passivisation the universality of a true transformation is seen to be missing due to the nature of the language itself. However, it will be appropriate to point out that almost all technical literature in Tamil employs the passive, although it is considered a highly inelegant way of expressing oneself both in the spoken and written styles.

6.3

Despite certain differences in the case of syntax in Tamil and Sanskrit, it would be no exaggeration to state that Pāṇini and his commentators provide for a complete universal system of grammar in the *kāraṅka* theory. Points of difference are natural and one that we should not resist as it adds to the depth and uniqueness of a particular language.

With respect even to the problem of the passive, K. Meenakshi brings out clearly the presence of the passive in Tamil. We cannot adduce from our data whether these passive formations are true representatives of the native language in the light of Caldwell's comment. Yet, we take here the exemplification of the passive by K. Meenakshi. The author makes some pertinent points:

6.4

oṭu-vērrumai (the 3rd case) denotes *viṇaimutal* (agent) and *karuvi* (instrument).

6.4.1 AGENT

e.g. 1. *koṭiyōṭu toṭakkunṭāṅ*

He got entangled with the creeper.

6.4.2 INSTRUMENT

e.g. 2. *ūciyōṭu kuytiṅra tūcum paṭṭum*

Cotton and silk stitched together with a needle.

The suffix *-āṅ* is also mentioned as a suffix in TE 113 and TC 108.

According to K. Meenakshi (1997, p. 100), *viṅaimutal* 'agent' refers to a passive construction in the surface structure. The 3rd case form occurs as the subject of the sentence at the deep level as in the following examples:

6.4.3

e.g. 3a. *akattiyaṅ tamil̄ uraittāṅ* (Akattiyan codified Tamil [grammar].)

corresponds to Sanskrit

agastyah vyākaraṇam proktavān (Agastya expounded grammar.)

6.4.3.1

e.g. 3b. *akattiyaṅāḷ tamil̄ uraikkaṭṭaṭṭatu* (Tamil was described by Agastya.)

Agastyena vyākaraṇam proktam. (Grammar/Language was expounded by Agastya.)

Note: *akattiyaṅāḷ* (3rd case or Instrumental) in the passive sentence occurs as *akattiyaṅ* (1st case, or Nominative), i.e. the subject of the sentence, in the active construction. *oṭu-* case occurring as instrument remains the same in both the surface structure and the deep structure. Thus Tolkāppiyar covers both case relations – agent and instrument, by mentioning them as *viṅaimutal* and *karuvi* respectively. Here, he points out the *kāraka* relation.

This example from K. Meenakshi's work proves that the passive formation is very much in use in the Tamil language. Although Caldwell points to a lack of the passive in Tamil and the rarity of finding formations with *paṭu-* in the literature and usage of his times, current usage in the mass media and technical literature supports the evidence that passivisation has very much come into use in modern Tamil.

From the illustrations provided by K. Meenakshi and Pon Kothandaraman it is clear that *kartari ṭṭiyā* (Agent/Instrumental in *kartari prayoga* or the passive sense), *kaṇa ṭṭiyā* (the instrumental as a pure means) and *hetau ṭṭiyā* (causal instrumental) are found in use in Tamil. Such categories as *karman* (the relation of action) and *kāraka* (the syntactico-semantic relation between noun and verb) were also present in Tamil. This can be extended to other *kāraka* relations as well. However, Tolkāppiyar's concept of agent as presented by K. Meenakshi has to be tested through the history of Tamil Language. Passivisation is a debatable point. So it needs more convincing examples and arguments. This is an aspect open for further research.

7. NOTION OF SUBJECT

The problem of the subject in Sanskrit has been dealt with in detail by Cardona who distinguishes between the role of agent and that of subject (cf. Cardona 1976 for detailed study). As the theory of the subject has already been dealt with in detail in the Sanskrit tradition, only the aspects of agency concerning Tamil are addressed in the main here. Rangan (2001, pp. 59–72) mentions in passing the relation of animacy to the role of subject in Tamil.

The term *eḷuvāy* (subject; literally 'source'/'creation'/'beginning') corresponds to the term subject (as well as Nominative) as used in the traditional grammars of English and modern linguistics. It is used to denote case forms and their meaning. *eḷuvāy* is described as the subject case when a noun is uninflected for the case in a sentence. The noun is uninflected for number or gender and it is not inflected for case functions as a subject in a sentence. The term nominative is also used to refer to this case. *eḷuvāy* may be a single or a compound word. Rangan (2001, p. 61) provides the following examples:

- 1) *paīyan vantān* (The boy came.)
- 2) *centāmarai malarntatu* (The lotus bloomed.)

The *Tolkāppiyam* assigns six kinds of meanings to the nominative case. This was discussed previously under the section on *peyar-vērrumai*.

Two kinds of subjects have been identified by both the modern linguists and traditional grammarians. This is the grammatical subject and the logical subject. The logical subject is closer to the semantic interpretation of sentences. The subject in an active sentence is said to be logical and the one in the passive sentence grammatical. e.g.

- 1) *rāmaṅ oru pāmpai-k koṅṅāṅ* (Raman killed a snake.)
 - 2) *oru pāmpu rāmaṅāḷ kolla-p paṭṭatu* (A snake was killed by Raman.)
- rāmaṅ* is the subject of the first sentence and *oru pāmpu* is the subject of the second passive sentence. This brings one closer to the notion of agent or *kartā*.

In most instances the notion of agent and subject coincide. However, the subject need not always express the notion of agent:
e.g.: *pārai uruṅatu* (The rock rolled.)

Thus the subject may express the meaning of object, goal and place without expressing the notion of agent. According to Rangan the semantic criterion that the subject expresses the meaning 'agent' is not a working hypothesis completely. The concordance of the concept of the subject and the agent is not a clear cut hypothesis in Tamil according to Rangan.

8. CONCLUSION

8.1 Formal aspects

Thus the *kāraka* system appears to be a complete grammatical system in Sanskrit and its major categories can be extended to other languages as well. However, one must bear in mind the very unique and original nature of each language as caution against the dangers of extreme extensionalism.

In conclusion we wish to say that the report demonstrates

- 1) The use of *vibhakti* which highlights the underlying *kāraka* relation
- 2) The *kāraka*-s are common to both languages seen here, although the treatment of *ṣaṣṭhī* varies between Sanskrit and Tamil.

Thus, the *kāraka*-s are expressed through their *vibhakti*. The underlying semantic basis is reflected by the case marker by the process of inflectional declension. In fact, the 'sup' triplets, which convey *vibhakti* due to inflectional morphology are almost transfigured in the declensional process. Pāṇini's system very clearly provides for:

- 1) designations (*saṃjñā*)
- 2) categories such as *kāraka*, *vibhakti*
- 3) relations such as *kāraka*, between noun and verb, relations between *kāraka* and *vibhakti* to form a case of syntax
- 4) devices such as *abhihite/anabhihite* (expressed/unexpressed) which allow or permit expression and function of certain categories
- 5) the declensional morphology which connects the *sup* triplets, to *vibhakti* and to *kāraka*

Thus one can observe that Pāṇini's system provides for a completely adequate grammar. This descriptive adequacy of a grammar is also seen in Tolkāppiyar's treatment of grammatical categories. However, where Pāṇini's grammar is highly analytical, Tolkāppiyar's treatment of grammatical categories is synthetic in the main. The treatment of nouns and noun morphology is highly complex in Tamil while the morphology of nouns is generative in Sanskrit. While both grammars deal with verbs, Pāṇini's classification of the verbal system is complete.

8.2 Semantics

Tolkāppiyar has included a section of aesthetics and poetics as one section in his *Tolkāppiyam*, viz. the *Poruḷatikāram*. It may be interesting to observe the fact there are very few grammars in the world that devote space to rhetoric, yet Tamil has the pride of place in possessing a work which includes grammar as well as poetics. This was probably necessitated by the vast literature of poetry in the Sangam era, which required guidelines to be set down for the writing of poetry. It also points to a highly literate society, cognisant of the metrics and higher points of poetry.

Poruḷatikāram not merely deals with the laying down of the landscape for the appreciation of poetry but also deals with suggestion or *vyaṅgya*. We find no such

attention to poetics in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Pāṇini deals only with the primary meaning of the word, or *abhidhā*. There is little attention paid to *lakṣaṇa* (secondary meaning) or *vyarṅgya*, the tertiary or suggested meaning in his work. This is because Pāṇini was primarily concerned with grammatical forms of the language, the definitions and derivations thereof. This is not to say that the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is devoid of semantic content. Pāṇini deals appropriately with semantics in its proper context according to the grammatical context required. Thus even the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is not devoid of semantic content. For example, under his rules for accentuation he prescribes certain meanings, particular meanings that are required for the derivation of the proper understanding of accent.

Thus we see that the comparative study of the grammars of Tamil and Sanskrit points more to the uncertainty of definitions and descriptions. As mentioned in the introduction, Indology appears to be at crossroad as there remains much to be explained, comprehended and understood. Hence the importance of studying the manuscripts and printed editions of the texts and commentaries becomes essential. Unless the primary text/source is studied or taken up for academic work there will be little clarity concerning the topics surveyed. The clarity obtained by shedding light on the primary sources from the manuscripts or critical editions will enrich the future aspirations of Indological research.

REFERENCES

- Agesthalingom, S.; Shanmugam, S. V., 1972, *Proceedings of the Third Seminar in Dravidian Linguistics*. Annamalai University, Annamalaiagar.
- Agesthalingom S.; Kumaraswami Raja, N., 1978, *Studies in Early Dravidian Grammars*. Annamalai University, Annamalaiagar.
- Agesthalingom, S.; Rajasekhara Nair, N., 1981, *Dravidian Syntax*. Annamalai University, Annamalaiagar.
- Cardona, George, 1976, Subject in Panini. In: *The Notion of Subject in South Asian Languages*. Edited by M. K. Verma, University of Wisconsin, Madison, pp. 1–38.
- Caldwell, Robert, 2000, *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South Indian Family of Languages*. University of Madras, Madras (reprint of the 3rd edition, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., London 1913).
- Israel, M., 1959, *The Treatment of Morphology in Tolkāppiyam*. Madurai University, Madurai.
- Jespersen, Otto, 1968, *Language, Its Nature, Development and Origin*. George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 13th Impression 1968 (originally 1922).
- Joshi, S. D.; Roodbergen, J. A. F., 1969, *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya, Avyayībhāva-tatpuruṣāhnikā*. CASS, Poona.
- Joshi, S. D.; Roodbergen, J. A. F., 1973, *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya, Bahuvrīthi-dvandvāhnikā*. CASS, Poona.
- Joshi, S. D.; Roodbergen, J. A. F., 1975, *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya, Anabhihitāhnikā*. CASS, Poona.
- Joshi, S. D.; Roodbergen, J. A. F., 1980, *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa Mahābhāṣya, Vibhaktāhnikā*. CASS, Poona.
- Kothandaraman, Pon., 1997, *A Grammar of Contemporary Literary Tamil*. International Institute of Tamil Studies, Madras.
- Meenakshi, K., 1997, *Tolkāppiyam and Astādhyāyī*. International Institute of Tamil Studies, Madras.

- Nannūl, Kāṅṭikaiyurai (collatikāram)*, Kaḷagam, Madras. Reprinted 1992.
- Nannūl, Kāṅṭikaiyurai (eḷuttatikāram)*, Kaḷagam, Madras. Reprinted, 2003.
- Pope, G. U., 1985, *Tamil Grammar*. Kaḷagam, Madras. Reprinted.
- Rangan, K., et al., 2001, Exploring the notion of subject in Tamil. *Indian Linguistics*, 62, pp. 59–72.
- Shanmugam, S. V., 1967, *Naccinārkiṇiyar's Conception of Phonology*. Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar.
- Shanmugam, S. V., 1983, *Aspects of Language Development in Tamil*. All India Tamil Linguistics Association, Annamalainagar.
- Subrahmanya Sastri, P. S., 1999, *Tolkāppiyam, eḷuttatikāram*. KSRI, Chennai.
- Subrahmanya Sastri, P. S., 1979, *Tolkāppiyam, collatikāram*. Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar.
- Subrahmanya Sastri, P. S., 1967, *Historical Tamil Reader*. Arjee Printers, Tiruvaiyaru.
- Subrahmanya Sastri, P. S., 1997, *History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil*. KSRI, Chennai, Reprinted.
- Subrahmanya Sastri, P. S., 1947, *Comparative Grammar of the Tamil Language*. Tiruvadi – Tanjore. Printed at Trichinopoly United Printers Ltd., Trichinopoly.
- Tolkāppiyam eḷuttatikāram. Iḷampūraṇar's commentary*. Kaḷagam, Madras, 2000.
- Tolkāppiyam, collatikāram. Iḷampūraṇar's commentary*. Kaḷagam, Madras, 2000.
- Tolkāppiyam, collatikāram. Cēṇāvāraiṇiyurai*. Kaḷagam, Madras. Reprinted 2001.
- Vasu, S. C., 1997, *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. Motilal Banarsidass Publishing Private Limited, Delhi, Reprint.
- Vijayavenugopal, G., 1968, *A Modern Evaluation of Nannul*. Annamalai University, Annamalainagar.

Dictionaries & Lexicons

- Abhyankar, K. V.; Shukla, J. M. (eds.), 1986, *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*. Ed. by, Gaekwad's Oriental Series No.134, Oriental Institute, Baroda.
- Tamil Lexicon*, 1982, University of Madras, Reprinted.
- Williams, Monier, 2002, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited, Delhi (Corrected Edition).