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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 आषध्यायिणी 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 Maniḥpravāḷam, the mediaeval literary language of Kerala, which is defined as a mixture of the Keralabhāṣa and Sanskrit (hence the name Maniḥpravāḷam: mani ‘rubies’ [Malayāḷam] and pravāḷam ‘coral’ [Sanskrit]).

The grammatical section of the Lilātilakam,

*I warmly thank Jean-Luc Chevillard for his useful comments and suggestions.

1The term maniḥpravāḷam—or rather maniḥpippiravāḷam—is defined in kārikai 182 of the Viracoyeram (a grammar of Tamil of the 11th century):

\[
\text{ṣṭaiyē vata chutta egret viraviyal […] manippiravāḷam nal teyvac collin [...]
\]

“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: bhāṣāsanskṛtyogō maniḥpravāḷam “maniḥpravāḷam [is] a mixture of bhāṣā and Sanskrit.” Maniḥpravāḷam compositions are mainly hymns to Gods, royal panegyrics and poems. By the time of the Lilātilakam, most of Maniḥpravāḷam 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 śilpa ends with the following mention: *iti lilātilake maṇipravāla-lakṣaṇam prathama-śilpaṃ* and some scholars consider *maṇipravāla-lakṣaṇam* (‘definition of Maṇipravālam’) to be the original title of the whole work.

The *Lilātilakam* does not actually constitute a grammar of Maṇipravāla; it is a poetical manual intended for those composing in Maṇipravāla. 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—it 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 *lilātilakē*; 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 (śūpa):

1) maniṣpravāla-lakṣaṇam (‘definition/description of Mahipravālam’): definition and division into nine types
   = eleven sūtras

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

3) sandhi-vivāraṇam (‘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-ālocanam (‘survey of faults’): faults of poetical composition
   = twenty-seven sūtras

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

6) śabdālāṅkāra-vivekaṇam (‘discussion of figures of speech’): figures of speech relative to the form of words
   = nine sūtras

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

8) rasa-prakāraṇam (‘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 śiṅpa

L 2.9 arthaviśēṣē 'syāḥ parabhāgaviśēṣaḥ.

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

Vṛtti: sampṛati bhāṣayā vibhaktyādyantarṣo nirāpyatē. arthaviśēṣaḥ prātipadikamātrādiḥ liṅgavacanē ca. asyāḥ bhāṣayāḥ.

“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] bhāṣayāḥ.”

L 2.10 sō śṭadāḥ tridhā dvīdhā ca.

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

Vṛtti: saḥ parabhāgaviśēṣaḥ. aṣṭadāḥ vibhaktayaḥ. tridāḥ liṅgaṇ. dvīdāḥ vacanāṃ.

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

---

10 The 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-ūtē (3rd sing. pers. base, masc., gen.) ‘his’, ava-l-ūtē (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’.

11 The use of the expression prātipadikamātra seems to echo a passage of the Collatikāram of the Tolkāppiyam. The commented sūtra is avaṭṭal // eluvāy vēṟṟumai pēyar tōṟṟu nilai ē (sūtra 65 according to Čenavaraiaiyar); 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 pêr, e, oṭu, kkû,12 ninrû, nnû, îl viḻîy aṣṭakam.13

“The group of eight [nominal endings is]: pêr, e, oṭu, kkû, ninrû, nnû, îl, viḻî.”14

Vyrtti: atra prathamāṭamā arthau. anyē śabdāh. tatra prathamaḥ parabhāgaviśeṣo yathā—kaṇṭan, āna, maraṇ. atra prati-padikamātram evāṛthāḥ. tad ēva pêr ity ucayāt. tasya nāma-śabdavācyatvā.

“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 pêr and ‘call’ for viḻî). 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’), maraṇ (‘tree’).15 Here, the meaning [consists] precisely [in the one of] the nominal base only. This [first nominal ending] is called pêr (‘name’) because it has the property of being the meaning of the word ‘name’. […]”

L 2.12 saṣṭhaṁ samāsē vā lapyatē.

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

Vyrtti: yathā—pulivāl, māntōl.

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

L 2.13 saṣṭamaś ca.

“The seventh [ending] also.”

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

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

14Ezhuthachan (1975: 91) writes: “The first, i.e. pêr (noun), denotes the primary word with no suffix. The last word viḻî (call) […] denotes the vocative.” This way of naming cases follows a Tamil method. The sūtra 64 of the Kolatikāram of the Tokkappiyam: avai-tām peyar ai oṭu ku iṅ atu kaṅ viḻî ensem ḳra states: “These [cases are]: the nominative (peyar), ai, oṭu, ku, iṅ, atu, kaṅ and they have the vocative (viḻî) 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, malayinīci.

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

L 2.14 dvitiyam asamāsē vá.

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

Vṛtti: yathā—māla kaṇḍu, mālayekkaṇḍu. puli konru, puliyek-konru. acčātanē tiraści cāyaṃ víkalpaḥ. anyatra na lupyatē. amātyeekkaṇḍu.

“For example: māla kaṇḍu [and] mālaye-kkaṇḍu (‘he saw the garland’), puli konru [and] puliyek-konru (‘he killed the tiger’).

This is an option which concerns inanimate beings and animals. Elsewhere, there is no elision: amātyeek-kkaṇḍu (‘he saw the minister’).”

L 2.15 stripunnapumsakaṇṃ trikaṇṭ.

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

L 2.21 ēkānekam dvikaṇṭ.

“The two [numbers are] singular [and] plural.”16

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 Aṣṭādhyaśī, 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 pāls: aṇpāl (word denoting a male), penpāl (word denoting a female) and palarpāl (word denoting more than one male or female). The category of words denoting objects other than human beings is divided into two pāls: ongpāl (word denoting one object other than a human being) and palavinpāl (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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sUBanta—tiNanta ‘term ending in a nominal ending’—‘term ending in a verbal ending’</td>
<td>V ad 2.7</td>
<td>M$^{17}$</td>
<td>NI$^{18}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 7.1.1 yuvōr anākāv iti$^{19}$</td>
<td>V ad 2.7</td>
<td>L$^{20}$</td>
<td>NI (iti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prātipadika ‘nominal base’</td>
<td>V ad 2.9 and 2.11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karman ‘object’</td>
<td>V ad 2.11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2.3.5 kālādhvātyantasamyogādikam$^{21}$</td>
<td>V ad 2.11</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>NI (-ādikam)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{17}$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 Kērālabhaṣā, the distinction between alveolar and dental nasals is relevant (though not represented in the writing system), in contrast to the Pāṇḍyabhaṣā (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 kālādhvānuḥ atyantasamyoge “[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 nirvarttyavikāryapṛṇyātmakaṁ karmārthah, na tu kālādhvātyantasamyogādikāṁ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vṛttī Reference</th>
<th>VAd</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Ni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>kändanōkkinōtu utsukam ści</td>
<td>V ad 2.11</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>kändannu kopikkinniritu kända ityādi</td>
<td>V ad 2.11</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>avanōgalninrī payāṭī (ityādi)</td>
<td>V ad 2.11</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>puliyōgalninrī peṭicc uyādi</td>
<td>V ad 2.11</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

23 The context of the quotation is the following: the Vṛttī deals with the fourth ending (-kkū/-nnū). Several examples are given, as well as a counterexample kändannu kōpikkinniritu kānda (‘the lady is angry with the lover’), which would be generated if the rule A 1.4.37 krūbdhrubṛṛṣgyāṛthānāṃ yaṃ prati kopah 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’ (dṛuh-), ‘not tolerate’ (īṛṣy-), ‘find fault with’ (asūy-). But kändannu kōpikkinniritu kānda is not considered as correct in the Kērālābhāṣā.

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

25 The context is the same as in the previous case. The Vṛttī deals with the fifth ending and gives another counterexample puliyōgalninrī peṭicc (‘got afraid of the tiger’), which would be generated if the rule A 1.4.25 bhṛtrathānāṃ bhayaḥetuh, which provides that the technical term apādāna denotes a cause of fear in relation with [verbal roots] having the meaning of ‘fear’ or ‘protection’, were applied. But puliyōgalninrī peṭicc is not considered as correct in the Kērālābhāṣā.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>kānkekku pōyi (ITYAD) (form which would be generated by A 2.3.38)</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>V ad</td>
<td>L, NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>maraninālute māvuninṛITYAD</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>V ad</td>
<td>L, NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>udikkīnra adityanil pirannānITYAD (form which would be generated by A 2.3.37)</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>V ad</td>
<td>L, NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>vā ‘or rather, preferably’</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>et passim</td>
<td>L, NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>maṇḍukapāluti process</td>
<td>2.16–18–19–23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>aT</td>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>M, NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>aC</td>
<td>‘vowels’</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>M, NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>hāL</td>
<td>‘consonants’</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>M, NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

27 The context is the same as in the previous case. The Vṛtti deals with the sixth ending and gives another counterexample maraninālute māvuninṛ (‘a mango tree is the best among trees’), which would be generated if the rule A 2.3.41 yataś ca nīrdhāranam 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 maraninālute māvuninṛ is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

28 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 udikkīnra adityanil pirannān (‘he was born when the sun was rising’), which would be generated if the rule A 2.3.37 yasya ca bhāvena bhūvalaśānam 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 udikkīnra adityanil pirannān is not considered as correct in the Kēralabhāṣā.

29 na 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 “Pāṇini- 
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 samjñā (‘technical term’).

Secondly, one typical Pāṇini 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

---

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 ityādisamjñāvyavahārah ‘tasminn  
itī nirddisti pūrvasya, tasmād ity uttarasya iityādi’ ‘tasminn  
itī nirddisti pūrvasya, tasmād ity uttarasya’ { ‘as in the Pāṇinian  
grammar, is observed here.”

33The Vṛtti often gives the element(s) to be supplied (x ity adhikārāt, x ity  
anusāyate/anusamghoh, x iti prastavat sidhyati, x ati varttate, etc.).

34The rule is: yasy tasya tah “After y, t is substituted for t.”

35The author of the Viracölyam 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 Līlātīlakam  
is more Vyākaranic than strictly Pāṇinian (e.g. aksara, apratibda, udāharaṇa,  
oshyatva, karmadarśana, kriya, deśi, nāman, prakrta, rūdhā, linga, vacana, x- 
āra, etc.), though this does not appear in the table above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>samjñā</th>
<th>V ad 3.1</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>samjñā</td>
<td>V ad 3.1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A 1.1.66</td>
<td>V ad 3.1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A 1.1.67</td>
<td>V ad 3.1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>anuvṛtti</td>
<td>3.4–5 et passim</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>substitution process</td>
<td>3.14 et passim</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

"The use of technical terms such as aC and haL, [as well as] the use  
of conventions such as tasminn iti nirddisti pūrvasya [and] tasmād ity uttarasya,  
as in the Pāṇinian grammar, is observed here."
works of other grammatical schools such as, for instance, some Śīkṣās and Prātiśākhyaśas, the Kātantra, the Maṇḍhabodha, the Tolkāppiyam, the Śabdamaṇḍiarpayaṇa, the Kalāpasūtra, the grammar of Kaccāyana, etc.; these works, according to some scholars,37 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 Vṛttī) 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”38 in contexts where Sanskrit is clearly in the mind of the author. I will come back to the relation between Sanskrit and Maṇipravāḷam 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 maṇḍikapāti 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 Vṛttī 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 Vṛttī describes each of them successively at the formal and semantic levels. Let us look at the description of the third ending:

\[
\text{Vṛttī ad L 2.11: \text{tyāti yathā—avaṇoṭu, avaṝoṭu, nampiyoṭu, maratṭoṭu, atrāpi kāṇḍanōkkinoṭu utsukam ityādi na bhavati.}}
\]

“The third [ending], for example: \text{avaṇoṭu} (‘with him’), \text{avaṝoṭu} (‘with them’), \text{nampiyoṭu} (‘with [a Nampi’), \text{maratṭoṭu} (‘with [a tree’). Here also, there is no [expression] like \text{kāṇḍanōkkinoṭu utsukam} (‘one is eager for the glance of his beloved’).”

The expression \text{kāṇḍanōkkinoṭu utsukam} would be generated if the Pāṇinian rule A 2.3.44 prasītotsukābhyaṃ \text{tyāti ca}, which provides that the third ending is also used after a nominal base co-occurring with prasīta and utsukam, were applied. What does this mean? It seems to imply that the Lilātilakam—or, at least, the Vṛttī on its grammatical section—was composed with the Aṣṭādhyāya 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 Sanskrit39 as well as of its grammatical and literary culture. I have already emphasized that Sanskrit was a descriptive apparatus or a discursive model for Maṇipravāḷam,

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 Aṣṭādhyāyī 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 Lilātilakam 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 Lilātilakam 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 Kērālabhāṣā, 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) Vṛtti ad L 2.7 reads: “Here, in the bhāṣā, there are four phonemes which do not exist in Sanskrit: nṛ, rr, r̥, l̥.”
2) Vṛtti ad L 3.1 reads: “This sandhi concerns the bhāṣā. It is not [a sandhi] of Sanskrit, etc. […]”
3) Vṛtti 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 Kērālabhāṣā. The first three chapters of the Lilātilakam provide a good overview of the characteristics of the Kērālabhāṣā, 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.42

40Freeman 1998: 45.
41Freeman adds (1998: 46): “Indeed, as the text progresses, this assertion for the distinctive autonomy of Kērāla-bhāṣā, directly against the Tamil spoken in the adjoining kingdoms, becomes increasingly marked.”
42L 2.7 reads: sandarbhē sanskritikti 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’

*koṇka* is taken as a Sanskrit base ending in the third ending -ā.\(^{43}\)

2) *ūṇ-urakkau* ‘food and sleep’

The Sanskrit dual ending -au is added to the compound though the dual does not exist in the Kēralabhāṣā.\(^{44}\)

3) *pōkkam cakri* ‘I have sent’

The Sanskrit form of the periphrastic perfect, which does not exist in the Kēralabhāṣā, 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 *Līlātilakam*:

\[\text{Vṛtti ad L 2.4: } \text{sanskṛtam anādi, anyad ādimat. tasya sanskṛtāt prabhavaḥ syāt.}\]

“Sanskrit is beginningless. Other [languages] have a beginning.
Their source is Sanskrit.”\(^{46}\)

### 3.2.4. For all these reasons, Pāṇinian features of the *Līlātilakam*—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 Maṇipravālam; 3) in Kēralite Maṇipravālam compositions, bhāṣā’s words are very frequently sanskritized; and 4) Sanskrit is considered as the source of all languages, including the Kēralabhāṣā.

For these specific 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: Kēralabhāṣā word + Kēralabhāṣā word = Kēralabhāṣā rules; Sanskrit word + Sanskrit word = Sanskrit rules; Kēralabhāṣā word + vernacularized Sanskrit word = Kēralabhāṣā rules; Kēralabhāṣā word + pure Sanskrit word = Sanskrit rules. See Ramaswami Aiyar 1944: 79.

\(^{43}\)Non-sanskritized form: *koṇkayāl*.

\(^{44}\)Non-sanskritized form: *ūṇrakkamār* (with the suffix of plural).

\(^{45}\)Non-sanskritized form: *pōṭṭen* (verbal base with the past tense suffix and the suffix of the first person of singular).

\(^{46}\)L 2.4 introduces *sanskṛtabhavas*, that is to say, *tadbhavas*, bhāṣā’s words which are derived from Sanskrit. The *Vṛtti* starts with the remark quoted.
4. *Lilātilakam* and Prakrit grammars

A final remark before concluding. Several characteristics of the *Lilātilakam* 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 *Aṣṭādhyāyi*: 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 *Lilātilakam* is, above all, a poetical manual, only two chapters out of eight deal with grammatical description; 2) rules of the grammatical section of the *Lilātilakam* 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 *Lilātilakam*, indeed, Sanskrit and *bhāṣā* are in a relationship of combination, not of derivation.

Concluding remarks

To conclude very briefly, I would say that Keralite Mani pravālam 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 Pāṇḍya literary tradition.
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