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Pāṇinian Features of the Oldest Known Malayāḷam Description∗

ÉMILIE AUSSANT

Introduction

The work presented here represents one of the first steps in a research program called “Grammaire sanskrite étendue/Extended Sanskrit Grammar” led by Jean-Luc Chevillard (CNRS, Paris), Vincenzo Vergiani (Cambridge University) and me. The aim is to study the way in which descriptive models elaborated for Sanskrit (the Asṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini, as well as works of other grammatical schools) have been used to describe other languages, as for instance Tamil, Telugu, Malayāḷam, etc.

The oldest known grammatical observations from Kerala are found in a poetical treatise of the 14th century: the Lilātilakam. This text, composed of Sanskrit sūtras, describes—among other things—morphological and phonological characteristics of Manīpravālam,1 the mediaeval literary language of Kerala, which is defined as a mixture of the Keralabhāṣa and Sanskrit (hence the name Manīpravālam: mani ‘rubies’ [Malayāḷam] and pravālam ‘coral’ [Sanskrit]).2 The grammatical section of the Lilātilakam,

∗I warmly thank Jean-Luc Chevillard for his useful comments and suggestions.
1The term manīpravālam—or rather manīppiravālam—is defined in kārikai 182 of the Viracōtyam (a grammar of Tamil of the 11th century):

ṣṭaiyē vaṭa chutta eṭtil viraviyal […] manippiravālam nal teyvac collin […]

“When Sanskrit letters are interspersed with Tamil, the style is known as a ‘mixture’ (viraviyal); when Sanskrit words are mixed with Tamil, the style is known as rubies and coral.” [trans. Monius (2001: 119)]

2The very first sūtra reads: bhāgaṇaṃskṛtyogō manīpravālam “manīpravālam [is] a mixture of bhāṣā and Sanskrit.” Manīpravālam compositions are mainly hymns to Gods, royal panegyrics and poems. By the time of the Lilātilakam, most of Manīpravālam works were devoted to description and praise of heroines (this is, at least, what the examples quoted in the Lilātilakam tend to show).
because it reveals a Pāṇinian influence, merits special attention within the context of this research program.

1. Overview of the Lilātilakam

Nothing is known of the author of the Lilātilakam, nor of his life or the conditions under which he composed the treatise, except that he was a pandit versed in both the Sanskrit and Tamil traditions. It was in 1916 that the first complete edition of the Sanskrit sūtras with Malayālam translation of the Sanskrit commentary was produced by Attur Krishna Pisharoti. John Brough was to publish an edition of the Sanskrit text, as well as a part of the translation in 1947. His edition/translation is based on Pisharoti’s. Four manuscripts should be accessible in India, probably copied from the same original.

We do not know if the name Lilātilakam, which literally signifies ‘Ornament of leisure’, is the original title of the treatise and/or of the Vṛtti—it sounds more like the title of a commentary than anything else. The first sīlpa ends with the following mention: iti lilātilake maṇipravaḷa-lakṣaṇam pratham-a-sīlpaṁ and some scholars consider maṇipravaḷa-lakṣaṇam (‘definition of Maṇipravālam’) to be the original title of the whole work.

The Lilātilakam does not actually constitute a grammar of Maṇipravālam; it is a poetical manual intended for those composing in Maṇipravālam. But, insofar as a good composition necessarily requires correct morphology and syntax, the text provides some considerations concerning the functioning of the language.

The text and its Vṛtti—of the same authorship, according to some, both entirely in Sanskrit, take the form of a śāstra in aphoristic sūtras. The resort to this form of composition may probably be explained by the attempt to confer śāstric status on the work and the authority which proceeds from such status. It is well known that, by this time, Sanskrit still represents a descriptive apparatus or a discursive model of compositions for the most part (technical as well as literary).

---

3Gopala Pillai (1985: 23–31) reviews the different theses supported (and provides a summary of them [26]). According to him, the author of the Lilātilakam would have been a Nambutiri brahmin (29). See also Freeman 1998.
4See Gopala Pillai 1985: 5.
7Not all the editions seem to have the word lilātilake; Brough’s edition does.
9Gopala Pillai (1985: 32–38) reviews some contradictions between the sūtras and the Vṛtti.
The Lilātilakam consists of 151 sūtras—most of them followed by a Vṛtti—organized in eight chapters (śilpa):

1) manipravāla-laksanaṃ (‘definition/description of Manipravālam’): definition and division into nine types
   = eleven sūtras

2) śarīra-nirūpaṇam (‘examination of constituent elements’): nominal and verbal morphology
   = twenty-five sūtras (2.1–2.5: words composing the bhāsā (deśi, sanskritabhāva, sanskritarūpa); 2.6: two varieties of bhāsā (apakṛṣṭā, utkṛṣṭā); 2.7–2.8: sanskritized bhāsā; 2.9–2.23: nominal endings (cases, genders, numbers); 2.24–2.25: expression of gender and number in verbs)

3) sandhi-vivaraṇam (‘description of junctions’): phonetics/phonology
   = twenty-nine sūtras (3.1–3.6: vocalic junctions; 3.7–3.12: vocalic-consonantic junctions; 3.13–3.19: nasal junctions; 3.20–3.28: glide junctions; 3.29: list of phonetical operations which are to be known from usage)

4) dōṣa-ālōcanam (‘survey of faults’): faults of poetical composition
   = twenty-seven sūtras

5) guṇa-nirūpaṇam (‘examination of qualities’): qualities of poetic composition
   = five sūtras

6) śabda-laṅkāra-vivecanam (‘discussion of figures of speech’): figures of speech relative to the form of words
   = nine sūtras

7) artha-laṅkāra-vivaraṇam (‘description of figures on meaning’): figures of speech relative to the meaning of words
   = thirty sūtras

8) rasa-prakaraṇam (‘explanation of rasa’): discussion of rasa
   = fifteen sūtras

What we may call the “grammatical section” is then restricted to the second and third chapters.
2. An example from the second śilpa

L 2.9 arthaviśeṣe 'syah parabhāgaviśeṣah.

“When there is a difference in meaning, there is a difference in the last part [of words] of the [bhāṣā].”

Vṛttī: sampṛatī bhāṣāyā vibhaktyādyaṃśo nirāpyatē, arthaviśeṣah prātipadikamātraṇaiḥ liṅgavacanai ca. asyāḥ bhāṣāyāḥ.

“Now, the part [of the word] of the bhāṣā which is the ending, etc.¹⁰ is considered. The difference in meaning consists in the group [of eight items] beginning with prātipadikamātra (i.e. the use of the mere nominal base, which characterizes the nominative case),¹¹ as well as in gender and number. asyāḥ [stands for] bhāṣāyāḥ.”

L 2.10 sāḥ śādāḥ tridāḥ dvidāḥ ca.

“The [difference in the last part of words] is of eight kinds, of three kinds and of two kinds.”

Vṛttī: saḥ parabhāgaviśeṣah. aśādāḥ vibhaktayāḥ. tridāḥ liṅgaḥ. dvidāḥ vacanaḥ.

“sāḥ [stands for] parabhāgaviśeṣah. Endings are of eight kinds. Gender is of three kinds. Number is of two kinds.”

¹⁰The word ‘etc.’ (-ādi) means ‘liṅga and vacana’; the parabhāga (‘suffixes’) category is then divided into three sub-types of units: nominal endings (vibhakti), gender suffixes (liṅga) and number suffixes (vacana). Malayālam nominal morphology is mainly of the agglutinating type: one marker is used for the case, another marker is used for gender and another one is used for number. Examples: ava-n-ute (3rd sing. pers. base, masc., gen.) ‘his’, ava-l-ute (3rd sing. pers. base, fem., gen.) ‘her’, ava-n-il (3rd sing. pers. base, masc., loc.) ‘on/in him’, ava-l-il (3rd sing. pers. base, fem., loc.) ‘on/in her’.

¹¹The use of the expression prātipadikamātra seems to echo a passage of the Collatikāram of the Tolkāppiyam. The commented śātra is avattu // eluvayı vēṟṟumai peyar tōṟṟu nilai e (śātra 65 according to Cēṉāvaraiyar); the commentary reads: ‘What [we call] ‘situation where appears the name only’ is the situation where, without any association with case endings or the vocative mark, the name is not combined with something else.” [based on the French translation by Chevillard (1996: 144)]
L 2.11 pér, e, oṭu, kkū,

ninrū, nnū, il viṃty aṣṭakam.¹²

“The group of eight [nominal endings is]: pér, e, oṭu, kkū, ninrū, nnū, il, viṃ.”¹³

Vṛtti: atra prathamāṣṭamē arthau. anyē śabdēh. tatra prathamāḥ parabhāgaśiśaḥ yathā—kaṇṭan, āna, maran. atra prāti-padikamātram evārthāḥ. tād ēva pér ētī ucētā. tasya nāma-śabdavacētvāl. [ … ]

“Here, the first and the eighth [elements of the list] are meanings (i.e. they express the meaning of the first and the eighth endings, that is: ‘name’ for pér and ‘call’ for vilī). The other [elements of the list] are forms (i.e. they are the endings themselves). The first difference in the last part of words (i.e. the first nominal ending) [is], for example: kaṇṭan (name of a man), āna (‘elephant’), maran (‘tree’).¹⁵ Here, the meaning [consists] precisely [in the one of] the nominal base only. This [first nominal ending] is called pér (‘name’) because it has the property of being the meaning of the word ‘name’. [ … ]”

L 2.12 saṣṭhām samāsē vā lapyatē.

“The sixth [ending] is optionally elided in a compound.”

Vṛtti: yathā—pulivāl, māntōl.

“For example: puli-vāl (‘tiger’s tail’), mān-tōl (‘deer’s skin’).”

L 2.13 saptaṃaś ca.

“The seventh [ending] also.”

¹²The letter ā is used to indicate a half-vowel—the shortest vocalic sound in Malayāḷam—which stays at the end of many words.

¹³In the edition by Iḷāṅkuḷaṁ Kuṅṇan Pillā (1985), this is not a sūtra but part of the Vṛtti. I would like to take the opportunity to warmly thank Rich Freeman for having indicated to me some of the variants adopted in I. Kuṅṇan Pillā’s edition, to which I had no access.

¹⁴Ezhuthachan (1975: 91) writes: “The first, i.e. pér (noun), denotes the primary word with no suffix. The last word vilī (call) […] denotes the vocative.” This way of naming cases follows a Tamil method. The sūtra 64 of the Col-lattikāram of the Tolkāpyam: avai-tām peyar ai oṭu ku īnu ātu kaṇ vilī engum īṭra states: “These [cases are]: the nominative (peyar), ai, oṭu, ku, īnu, ātu, kaṇ and they have the vocative (vilī) as the end of their enumeration.” [based on the French translation by Chevillard (1996: 143)]

¹⁵There are two suffixes for the nominative case: -m and zero. The -m suffix is found in di- and poly-syllabic non-human nouns with bases in -a. Other nouns are used with a zero suffix.
Vṛtti: yathā—kaṭalāna, malayiñci.

“For example: kaṭal-āna (litt. ‘elephant of the sea’, ‘whale’), malay-iñci (‘mountain ginger’).”

L 2.14 dvitiyam asamäsé vá.

“The second [ending] is optionally [elided] when it is not in a compound.”

Vṛtti: yathā—māla kaṇḍu, mālaye-kaṇḍu. puli konru, puliye-koṇru. acētānē tiraścī cāyaṁ vikalpāḥ. anyatra na lupyatē. amātyanekkāṇḍu.

“For example: māla kaṇḍu [and] mālaye-kaṇḍu (‘he saw the garland’), puli konru [and] puliye-koṇru (‘he killed the tiger’). This is an option which concerns inanimate beings and animals. Elsewhere, there is no elision: amātyane-kaṇḍu (‘he saw the minister’).”

L 2.15 strīpunnapuṁsaṁ trikaṁ.

“The three [genders are] feminine, masculine, neuter.”

L 2.21 ēkāṇekam dvikam.

“The two [numbers are] singular [and] plural.”

3. Pāṇinian features of the Līlātilakam

The influence of Vyākaraṇa, and more precisely, of Pāṇini, on the Līlātilakam, is evident at two levels: 1) at the metalinguistic level, that is to say, at the level of the organization of rules and of the technical terminology; 2) at the linguistic level, that is to say, at the level of the described facts of language.

3.1. Typology of borrowings

I have tried to establish a typology of borrowings by the Līlātilakam from the Aṣṭādhyāyī, which are observed in the second and third chapters of the former. This includes the given borrowing, its localization in the Līlātilakam,

16In the Tolkappiyam, the category of words denoting human beings is divided into three pāḷs: āyapāḷ (word denoting a male), penpāḷ (word denoting a female) and palarpāḷ (word denoting more than one male or female). The category of words denoting objects other than human beings is divided into two pāḷs: onṟapāḷ (word denoting one object other than a human being) and palavipāḷ (word denoting more than one object other than a human being). See Subrahmanya Sastri 1997: 107–108.
its level (metalinguistic or linguistic) and its modality, that is to say, whether it is indicated as a borrowing or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>borrowing</th>
<th>localization</th>
<th>level</th>
<th>modality of the borrowing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| sUBanta—tiNanta  
‘term ending in a nominal ending’—‘term ending in a verbal ending’ | V ad 2.7 | M$^{17}$ | NI$^{18}$ |
| A 7.1.1  
yuvōr anākav iti$^{19}$  
‘nominal base’ | V ad 2.7 | L$^{20}$ | NI |
| prātipadika  
‘nominal base’ | V ad 2.9 and 2.11 | M | NI |
| karman  
‘object’ | V ad 2.11 | M | NI |
| A 2.3.5  
kālādhvātyantasamyogādikam$^{21}$ | V ad 2.11 | L | NI | (-ādikam) |

$^{17}$M stands for ‘metalinguistic level’.  
$^{18}$NI stands for ‘not indicated’.  
$^{19}$Close to the canonical form of the rule. The context of the quotation is the following: in the Kēraḷabhāṣā, the distinction between alveolar and dental nasals is relevant (though not represented in the writing system), in contrast to the Pāṇḍyabhāṣā (where it is represented in the writing system but no longer pronounced by this time) and Sanskrit (where it is not represented in the writing system and of course not pronounced since it is irrelevant). To show that alveolar and dental nasals are mere allophones in Sanskrit, the author quotes the rule A 7.1.1. According to him, the n in anākau is alveolar; if this alveolar nasal were really different from the dental one, these two phonemes would not have a similar allophone n as in karana, karaṇa, etc. Therefore, alveolar and dental nasals in Sanskrit are mere allophones and not phonemes.  
$^{20}$L stands for ‘linguistic level’.  
$^{21}$The canonical form of the rule is A 2.3.5 kālādhvānyantasamyogādikam “[The second ending is used with words denoting] time or distance to express total connection.” The context of the borrowing is the following: in the edition presently used, the rule L 2.11 provides the list of the nominal endings. The Vṛtti describes them successively, on the formal and the semantic levels. It is when the semantic value of the second ending (-e) is under consideration that the Vṛtti quotes the rule A 2.3.5. Vṛtti ad L 2.11: atra punar ‘e’ ity asya nirvarttyavyākārya-prāpyātmakaṁ karmārthāḥ na tu kālādhvātyantasamyogādikāṃ.
The context of the quotation is the following: the Vṛtti deals with the third ending (-oṭu/-ṭu). Several examples are given, as well as a counterexample kāndanokkinōtu utsukam (‘one is eager for the glance of his beloved’), which would be generated if the rule A 2.3.44 prasitotsukābhāyām trātīya ca, which states that the third ending is also used after a nominal base co-occurring with prasita and utsuka, were applied. But kāndanokkinōtu utsukam is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

The context of the quotation is the following: the Vṛtti deals with the fourth ending (-kkū/-ṇū). Several examples are given, as well as a counterexample kāndannu kōpikkinритu kānda (‘the lady is angry with the lover’), which would be generated if the rule A 1.4.37 krūdhabhersūžāvārthānām yāṃ prāti kopāḥ were applied. This rule provides that the technical term saṃpradāna denotes the person towards whom anger is felt in relation with verbal roots having the meaning of ‘feel anger’ (krūdh-), ‘injure’ (druh-), ‘not tolerate’ (īrsy-), ‘find fault with’ (asūy-). But kāndannu kōpikkinритu kānda is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

The context is the same as in the previous case. The Vṛtti deals with the fifth ending (-ninrū). Several examples are given, as well as another counterexample avergilinnīnīnī pēṭiccu (‘studied from him’), which would be generated if the rule A 1.4.29 akhyatopayorge, which states that the technical term apādāṇa denotes a reciter when instruction is intended, were applied. But avergilinnīnī payattī is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

The context is the same as in the previous case. The Vṛtti deals with the fifth ending and gives another counterexample puliyinīnīnī pēṭiccu (‘got afraid of the tiger’), which would be generated if the rule A 1.4.25 bhūtrārthānām bhayākhetuḥ, which provides that the technical term apādāṇa denotes a cause of fear in relation with [verbal roots] having the meaning of ‘fear’ or ‘protection’, were applied. But puliyinīnīnī pēṭiccu is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>kāndanokkinōtu utsukam stī (form which would be generated by A 2.3.44)22</td>
<td>V ad 2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>kāndannu kōpikkinritu kānda ityādi (form which would be generated by A 1.4.37)23</td>
<td>V ad 2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>avangalinīnī payattī (ityādi) (form which would be generated by A 1.4.29)24</td>
<td>V ad 2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>puliyinīnīnī pēṭiccu ityādi (form which would be generated by A 1.4.25)25</td>
<td>V ad 2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22The context of the quotation is the following: the Vṛtti deals with the third ending (-oṭu/-ṭu). Several examples are given, as well as a counterexample kāndanokkinōtu utsukam (‘one is eager for the glance of his beloved’), which would be generated if the rule A 2.3.44 prasitotsukābhāyām trātīya ca, which states that the third ending is also used after a nominal base co-occurring with prasita and utsuka, were applied. But kāndanokkinōtu utsukam is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

23The context of the quotation is the following: the Vṛtti deals with the fourth ending (-kkū/-ṇū). Several examples are given, as well as a counterexample kāndannu kōpikkinritu kānda (‘the lady is angry with the lover’), which would be generated if the rule A 1.4.37 krūdhabhersūžāvārthānām yāṃ prāti kopāḥ were applied. This rule provides that the technical term saṃpradāna denotes the person towards whom anger is felt in relation with verbal roots having the meaning of ‘feel anger’ (krūdh-), ‘injure’ (druh-), ‘not tolerate’ (īrsy-), ‘find fault with’ (asūy-). But kāndannu kōpikkinritu kānda is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

24The context of the quotation is the following: the Vṛtti deals with the fifth ending (-ninrū). Several examples are given, as well as a counterexample avergilinnīnī pēṭiccu (‘studied from him’), which would be generated if the rule A 1.4.29 akhyatopayorge, which states that the technical term apādāṇa denotes a reciter when instruction is intended, were applied. But avergilinnīnī payattī is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

25The context is the same as in the previous case. The Vṛtti deals with the fifth ending and gives another counterexample puliyinīnīnī pēṭiccu (‘got afraid of the tiger’), which would be generated if the rule A 1.4.25 bhūtrārthānām bhayākhetuḥ, which provides that the technical term apādāṇa denotes a cause of fear in relation with [verbal roots] having the meaning of ‘fear’ or ‘protection’, were applied. But puliyinīnīnī pēṭiccu is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.
The context of the quotation is the following: the Vṛtti deals with the sixth ending (\-nnu/-kkū, -ṭe/-ṭe). Several examples are given, as well as a counterexample kānkekkū pūyi (‘he went away without caring for the onlookers’), which would be generated if the rule A 2.3.38 ṣaṭṭhi cānḍare were applied. This rule provides that the sixth ending is also used after a nominal base to express the meaning of ‘notwithstanding’. But kānkekkū pūyi is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

The context is the same as in the previous case. The Vṛtti deals with the sixth ending and gives another counterexample marāniṅaḷuṭe māvū ninṛu ityādi (‘a mango tree is the best among trees’), which would be generated if the rule A 2.3.41 yataś ca nirdhāranam were applied. The rule provides that the seventh as well as the sixth endings are used after a nominal base denoting something from which something else is set apart. But marāniṅaḷuṭe māvū ninṛu is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

The context of the quotation is the following: the Vṛtti deals with the seventh ending (\-il). Several examples are given, as well as a counterexample udikkinṛ ādiyaniṅi pirannān (‘he was born when the sun was rising’), which would be generated if the rule A 2.3.37 ṣasya ca bhāvena bhāvalākṣayam were applied. This rule states that the seventh ending is used after a nominal base denoting an action which serves to characterize another action. But udikkinṛ ādiyaniṅi pirannān is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

26The context of the quotation is the following: the Vṛtti deals with the sixth ending (\-nnu/-kkū, -ṭe/-ṭe). Several examples are given, as well as a counterexample kānkekkū pūyi (‘he went away without caring for the onlookers’), which would be generated if the rule A 2.3.38 ṣaṭṭhi cānḍare were applied. This rule provides that the sixth ending is also used after a nominal base to express the meaning of ‘notwithstanding’. But kānkekkū pūyi is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

27The context is the same as in the previous case. The Vṛtti deals with the sixth ending and gives another counterexample marāniṅaḷuṭe māvū ninṛu (‘a mango tree is the best among trees’), which would be generated if the rule A 2.3.41 yataś ca nirdhāranam were applied. The rule provides that the seventh as well as the sixth endings are used after a nominal base denoting something from which something else is set apart. But marāniṅaḷuṭe māvū ninṛu is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

28The context of the quotation is the following: the Vṛtti deals with the seventh ending (\-il). Several examples are given, as well as a counterexample udikkinṛ ādiyaniṅi pirannān (‘he was born when the sun was rising’), which would be generated if the rule A 2.3.37 ṣasya ca bhāvena bhāvalākṣayam were applied. This rule states that the seventh ending is used after a nominal base denoting an action which serves to characterize another action. But udikkinṛ ādiyaniṅi pirannān is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

29na vā ‘or rather not’ is used in the Vṛtti ad L 3.7.
### 3.2. Comments

Concerning the metalinguistic level, we may say the following.

First, the technical terminology includes a significative number of “Pāṇinian basics” like sUBanta ‘term ending in a nominal ending’ and tiNanta ‘term ending in a verbal ending’,35 karman (‘object’), aC (‘vowels’) and haL (‘consonants’) and the notion of samjNā ‘(technical term)’.

Secondly, one typical Pāṇinian way of describing linguistic facts is also used: substitution (in the phonetic/phonology section).36

I call these elements “Pāṇinian basics” because they are not used in

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>samjNā ‘technical term’</td>
<td>V ad.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>tasminn iti nirdīśte pūrvasya (ityādi)30</td>
<td>V ad.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>tasmād ity uttarasya ityādi</td>
<td>V ad.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>anuvṛtti process</td>
<td>3.4–5 et passim33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>substitution process x (gen. case)—y (nom. case)34</td>
<td>3.14 et passim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

30The context of the quotation is the following: the third chapter is devoted to sandhis. Sūtras start in media res and it is the Vṛtti which explains the conventions and organization of the chapter.

31I stands for ‘indicated’.

32The full sentence is as follows: acam, halam ityādisamjNāvyavahāraḥ ‘tasminn iti nirdīśte pūrvasya, tasmād ity uttarasya’ ityādisarikētavyavahāraḥ pāniniyavad ita draṣṭavyah “The use of technical terms such as aC and haL, [as well as] the use of conventions such as tasminn iti nirdīśte pūrvasya [and] tasmād ity uttarasya, as in the Pāṇini grammar, is observed here.”

33The Vṛtti often gives the element(s) to be supplied (x ity adhikārā, x ity anusāyatē/anusāmgah, x iti prastāvat sidhyāt, x iti varttate, etc.).

34The rule is: yas tasāya tah “After n, t is substituted for t.”

35The author of the Viracōliyaṃ also used these two terms. Later grammairians (from the 13th century onwards) sometimes use nāman in place of Tamil pēyar. See Subrahmanya Sastri 1997: 104–106

36It is important to note that the technical terminology in the Līlātlakam is more Vākaranic than strictly Pāṇinian (e.g. aksara, apāśaba, udāhānā, osēhyatva, karmasaṅhāra, kriyā, deśī, nāman, prakṛti, rūdhā, linga, vacana, x-kāra, etc.), though this does not appear in the table above.
works of other grammatical schools such as, for instance, some Śīksās and Prātiśākhya-s, the Kātantra, the Mrgdhabodha, the Tolkāppiyam, the Saṃgītaraṇya, the Kālāpasūtra, the grammar of Kaccāyana, etc.; these works, according to some scholars, would pertain to an “Aindra school”—but I know that the question is controversial and I do not intend to discuss it here. The use of these “Pāṇinian basics” in the Lilātilakam (sūtras and Vṛtti) seems to imply a strong affinity for the Pāṇinian treatise and—maybe even more—for the language it describes and normalizes. We find indeed most of these “Pāṇinian basics” in contexts where Sanskrit is clearly in the mind of the author. I will come back to the relation between Sanskrit and Manipravālam in a moment.

Thirdly, the functioning of the rules is clearly based on the Pāṇinian model (except for the generative pattern, which is absent from the Lilātilakam): we find the anuvṛtti process, the maṇḍakapāli process and the metalinguistic use of cases (cf. A 1.1.66–67).

Concerning the linguistic level, we may observe the following: among the nine Pāṇinian rules—dealing with linguistic facts—to which the Vṛtti refers in the grammatical section, seven (cf. rows six to twelve) are indirectly quoted. Let us take just one example. The rule L 2.11 gives the eight nominal endings; the Vṛtti describes each of them successively at the formal and semantic levels. Let us look at the description of the third ending:

Vṛtti ad L 2.11: tṛtiyā yathā—avanoṭu, avaroṭu, nampiyoṭu, marattoṭu. aṭrapi kāndanōkkinōṭu utṣukam ityādi na bhavati.

“The third [ending], for example: avanoṭu (‘with him’), avaroṭu (‘with them’), nampiyoṭu (‘with [a] Nampi’), marattoṭu (‘with [a] tree’). Here also, there is no [expression] like kāndanōkkinōṭu utṣukam (‘one is eager for the glance of his beloved’).”

The expression kāndanōkkinōṭu utṣukam would be generated if the Pāṇinian rule A 2.3.44 prasitotsukābhyaḥ tṛtiyā ca, which provides that the third ending is also used after a nominal base co-occurring with prasita and utṣuka, were applied. What does this mean? It seems to imply that the Lilātilakam—or, at least, the Vṛtti on its grammatical section—was composed with the Aśṭādhyāyī in mind or before the eyes. When one reads again the first three chapters of the Lilātilakam with this in mind, one observes that the manual presupposes a perfect knowledge of Sanskrit as well as of its grammatical and literary culture. I have already emphasized that Sanskrit was a descriptive apparatus or a discursive model for Manipravālam,

---

37 See Burnell 1991.
38 Exceptions are: aC, aT, haL and vā. They are used in every kind of context.
39 More than that: knowledge of Sanskrit is a prerequisite insofar as the manual is composed in Sanskrit.
but its role does not stop here. Three other reasons explain its more or less manifest omnipresence.

3.2.1. First reason: Sanskrit is one of the two linguistic components of Manipravālam, the second being the bhāṣā. Insofar as Sanskrit is “substantively installed in the composition of the language itself,” the shadow of the Aṣṭādhyaśī is justified right away. However, it is not really as such, i.e. as one of the linguistic components, that Sanskrit is the most present in the Līlātilakām for, obviously, it does not need to be described—Pāṇini had already done this, magisterially. What is—partially—taught in the grammatical section of the Līlātilakām concerns exclusively the second linguistic component of Manipravālam, that is to say, the Keralite regional language. As Freeman relevantly remarks (1998: 45): “bhāṣā could refer generally to any spoken language.” Guidelines are therefore needed for the Kēralabhāṣā, not for Sanskrit. The latter is none the less present, but as the well-known component which is already in the mind of Manipravālam authors. I quote a few instances illustrating this constant though discreet presence:

1) Vṛttī ad L 2.7 reads: “Here, in the bhāṣā, there are four phonemes which do not exist in Sanskrit: ṇู, ṇū, ṇū et ṇū.”

2) Vṛttī ad L 3.1 reads: “This sandhi concerns the bhāṣā. It is not [a sandhi] of Sanskrit, etc. [. . .].”

3) Vṛttī ad L 3.2 reads: “It is said: only the a which has the meaning of the word tad and the i which has the meaning of idam.”

3.2.2. Second reason: Sanskrit often overwhelms the Kēralabhāṣā. The first three chapters of the Līlātilakām provide a good overview of the characteristics of the Kēralabhāṣā, which make this different not only from other Dravidian languages such as the Pāṇḍyabhāṣā, but also, I would say, above all, from Sanskrit. For the domain of the Sanskrit component and the domain of the bhāṣā component are not clearly delimited. Very frequently, indeed, in early texts of Manipravālam, bhāṣā words are used as if they were Sanskrit words, that is to say, with Sanskrit endings.

40Freeman 1998: 45.
41Freeman adds (1998: 46): “Indeed, as the text progresses, this assertion for the distinctive autonomy of Kērala-bhāṣā, directly against the Tamil spoken in the adjoining kingdoms, becomes increasingly marked.”
42L 2.7 reads: sandarbhē sanskritikṛtā ca “And, in compositions, it (i.e., the bhāṣā) is sanskritized.” On this point, Andronov (1996: 61) notes: “There are
Let us consider a few examples:

1) *koṇkayā* ‘by the breast’

2) *ūṇ-urakkau* ‘food and sleep’

The Sanskrit dual ending *-au* is added to the compound though the dual does not exist in the Kēralabhasa.

3) *pōkkam cakr* ‘I have sent’

The Sanskrit form of the periphrastic perfect, which does not exist in the Kēralabhasa, is added here to the root *pōkk-*.

The description of nominal endings—we saw the example of the third ending—perfectly illustrates this continuous intrusion of Sanskrit which has to be kept within limits.

### 3.2.3. Third reason: By this time, Sanskrit was very often considered as the source of all languages, and this is explicitly stated in the *Līlātīlakam*:

*Vṛtti ad L 2.4: saṃskṛtam anādi. anyad ādimat. tasya saṃskṛtāt prabhavāḥ syāt.*

“Sanskrit is beginningless. Other [languages] have a beginning. Their source is Sanskrit.”

### 3.2.4. For all these reasons, Pāṇinian features of the *Līlātīlakam*—features which represent the guarantee of the purest form of Sanskrit—are clear evidence. As shown above, 1) Sanskrit plays a model role at discursive, literary and grammatical description levels; 2) Sanskrit is one of the two linguistic components of Kēralite Manipravālam; 3) in Kēralite Manipravālam compositions, bhāṣā’s words are very frequently sanskritized; and 4) Sanskrit is considered as the source of all languages, including the Kēralabhasa.

Cases in early texts when nouns of the Dravidian stock take Sanskrit desinences [. . . ], and (131): “In early texts Ma. verbs of the Dravidian stock can also take the Sanskrit grammatical forms [. . . ].” Concerning compounding and sandhi, we find the following combinations: Kēralabhasa word + Kēralabhasa word = Kēralabhasa rules; Sanskrit word + Sanskrit word = Sanskrit rules; Kēralabhasa word + vernacularized Sanskrit word = Kēralabhasa rules; Kēralabhasa word + pure Sanskrit word = Sanskrit rules. See Ramaswami Aiyar 1944: 79.

43Non-sanskritized form: *koṇkayāl.*

44Non-sanskritized form: *ūṇurakkamār* (with the suffix of plural).

45Non-sanskritized form: *pōttēn* (verbal base with the past tense suffix and the suffix of the first person of singular).

46L 2.4 introduces *saṃskṛtabhavas*, that is to say, *tadbhavas*, bhāṣā’s words which are derived from Sanskrit. The *Vṛtti* starts with the remark quoted.
4. Lilätilakam and Prakrit grammars

A final remark before concluding. Several characteristics of the Lilätilakam remind us of Prakrit grammars: 1) the use of Sanskrit as a metalanguage, 2) the aim of the work: a manual intended for those who, knowing Sanskrit, want to compose in a linguistic variety different from it, 3) the grammatical description dealing exclusively with morphology and phonology/phonetics, 4) the omnipresent shadow of the Astādhyāyī: the same number of chapters, similarities in the technique of description, etc. But there are also two major differences: 1) Prakrit grammars are real grammars in the sense that they describe constituent elements and operations they are submitted to; the Lilätilakam is, above all, a poetical manual, only two chapters out of eight deal with grammatical description; 2) rules of the grammatical section of the Lilätilakam are not formulated on the model ‘instead of a, one says b’ which characterizes rules of Prakrit grammars, probably because the bhāṣā component is not considered to be derivable from Sanskrit—though it is said that Sanskrit is the source of all languages. In the Lilätilakam, indeed, Sanskrit and bhāṣā are in a relationship of combination, not of derivation.\(^{47}\)

**Concluding remarks**

To conclude very briefly, I would say that Keralite Manipravālam strongly incorporates Sanskrit influence. Because it is a hyper-sanskritized variety, and because of the reasons mentioned above, the appropriateness of the Sanskrit descriptive model was undoubtedly perceived in the Keralite grammatical tradition more strongly than in any other.

This high hybridization of the regional language with Sanskrit was probably authorized, regulated and claimed as part of the struggle against the hegemony of the Pândya literary tradition.\(^{48}\)
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