

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF
ĀNDHRAŚABDACINTĀMAṆI AND BĀLAVYĀKARAṆAM**

**A Dissertation submitted to the University of Hyderabad
in partial fulfillment for the degree of**

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

APPLIED LINGUISTICS

BY

GOPAVARAM PADMAPRIYA



**CENTRE FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TRANSLATION STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF HYDERABAD
HYDERABAD – 500 046**

1999

Dedicated to
My Grand Father
ATE G. KODANDA RAMI REDDY

D E C L A R A T I O N

I hereby declare that I have carried out this dissertation, entitled "A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ĀNDHRAŚABDACINTĀMAṆI AND BĀLAVYĀKARAṆAM" (samj̄na, sandhi and kriya only) in partial fulfillment for the award of M.Phil. I also declare that this dissertation, partly or fully, was not submitted earlier for any degree at any University.

Date: 29.5.99

Place: Hyderabad

G. Padmapriya
(GOPAVARAM PADMAPRIYA)

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that Ms. G. Padmapriya has worked under my supervision for her M.Phil. dissertation entitled A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ĀNDHRAŚABDACINTĀMAṆI AND BĀLAVYĀKARANAM (samjña, sandhi and kriya only) at the Centre for Applied Linguistics & Translation Studies (CALTS), University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad - 500 046. This is her bonafide work and does not constitute part of any material submitted for a degree here or elsewhere.

Date: 29/5/99



(KORADA SUBRAHMANYAM)
Research Supervisor

LECTURER Lecturer
Centre for A. L. T. S. Centre for ALTS
University of Hyderabad University of Hyderabad
HYDERABAD-500 046. HYDERABAD - 500 046.



HEAD
Centre for ALTS
University of Hyderabad
Hyderabad - 500 046.

Date: 29/5/99

HEAD
Centre for Applied Linguistics &
Translation Studies
University of Hyderabad
Hyderabad - 500 134



DEAN
School of Humanities
University of Hyderabad
Hyderabad - 500 046.

Date: 31/5/99

DEAN
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES
University of Hyderabad
Hyderabad - 500 134

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I express my deep felt gratitude and indebtedness to my supervisor KORADA SUBRAHMANYAM who encouraged me throughout and has taken a keen interest in this work not only as a supervisor but as 'Guru' by giving extensive guidance in other fields concerned. The care and affection he showed to me his patience and help while listening to me are the main factors that may my stay and studies in this University very smooth and pleasant. My sincere thanks for him for his encouragement and guidance without which the completion of this work would have been impossible.

Especially I express my gratefulness and profound sense of gratitude to my parents, who allowed me to do this work and their immense encouragement and support.

I owe alot to my cousins, Mr. Srinivasula Reddy, Sumitra, who have been a great source of encouragement and affection throughout my life.

With great pleasure I express my affection and gratitude to my supervisor's family and friends and brother - Pradeep, Gautam, Sridhar Reddy, Maheswara Raj, Subba Rao and Phanidhar, who made my stay at Hyderabad a joyous and memorable one. I strongly feel

that their support and affection are one of the main reasons of my success.

I am obliged to Mr. Radha Reddy for his care and support to me during the course of my research.

My deep and sincere gratitude also goes to Mr. Murthy for his help in typing this dissertation neatly with utmost patience.

I would like to thank Kadambini, Prasad, Laxmi, Subha, Nagalakshmi, Bhaskar and Kamesh for their moral support. I would also like to thanks Madam Sasikala for her encouragement.

Last but not least, I thank the Head and Faculty and the non-teaching staff of Centre for ALTS.

C O N T E N T S

ABBREVIATIONS		i
TRANSLITERATION		ii
CHAPTER I	INTRODUCTION	1 - 5
CHAPTER II	SAMJÑĀPARICCHEDA	6 - 21
CHAPTER III	SANDHIPARICCHEDA	22 - 63
CHAPTER IV	KRIYĀPARICCHEDA	64 - 78
CHAPTER V	CONCLUSION	79 - 84
BIBLIOGRAPHY		85 - 87

Abbreviations

1. Ā. Gī - Āryāgīti
2. Aho - Ahobalapāṇḍitīyam
3. Ān. Ma. Bha. - Āndhramahābhāratam
4. Ān. Śa. Ci - Āndhraśabdacintāmaṇi
5. Ān. vyā. san. sa - Āndhravyākaraṇasamhitāsarvasvam.
6. Ān. vyā. vi - Āndhravyākaraṇavikāsamu
7. Bā. sa - Bālasarasvati
8. Bā. vyā - Bālavvyākaraṇamu
9. Bā. vyā. k - Bālavvyākaraṇakalpadrūmamū
10. Kā. kha - Kāśīkhaṇḍamu
11. P. - Pāṇini
12. Sṛ Nai - Sṛṅgāranaiṣadam
13. Sū - Sūtramū
14. Te. vyā. vi - Teluguvvyākaraṇavikāsamū
15. Vai. ca - Vaikṛtacandrika
16. vi.vi - Vikṛtivivēkamū

TRANSLITERATION

అ - a	క - ka	న - na
ఆ - ā	ఖ - kha	ప - pa
ఇ - i	గ - ga	ఫ - pha
ఈ - ī	ఘ - gha	బ - ba
ఉ - u	ఙ - ṅa	భ - bha
ఊ - ū	చ - ca	మ - ma
ఋ - ṛ	ఛ - cha	య - ya
ౠ - ṝ	జ - ja	ర - ra
ౡ - ṝ̄	ఝ - jha	ల - la
ఌ - ī	ఞ - ṅa	ళ - ḷa
఍ - ē	ట - ṭa	వ - va
ఐ - āi	ఠ - ṭha	శ - ś'a
ఒ - o	డ - ḍa	ష - ṣa
ఓ - ō	ఢ - ḍha	స - sa
ఔ - au	ణ - ṇa	హ - ha
అఁ - c	త - ta	క్ష - kṣa
అః - ṃ	థ - tha	
అః - ḥ	ద - da	
	ధ - dha	

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Āndhraśabdacintāmaṇi is the first treatise on Telugu grammar written in Sanskrit in A.D.11th century by Nannaya, who was also considered to be the first poet and translator in Telugu. Cintāmaṇi was written in 'Ārya' meter. Each verse consists of a few sūtras. Nannaya is called by another name, vāganuśāsana, literally one who analyzed the (Telugu) speech. Atharvaṇa wrote Kārikāvali, which consists of Sanskrit verses useful in elaborating and amending Cintāmaṇisūtras. Ahobalapati built a vast bhāṣya, called Kaviśirobhūṣaṇam in Sanskrit based on Nannaya and Atharvaṇa.

A careful study of Cintāmaṇi would give the following view - vāganuśāsana closely followed the pattern that is there in the grammatical treatises like Aṣṭādhyāyī and Vālmīkivyākaraṇam. But unlike Pāṇini, Nannaya divided his work into five chapters, covering samjñā, sandhi, ajanta, halanta and kriya.

A conspicuous feature of Cintāmaṇi is that it is written in prosody and we come across a few vyākaraṇa treatise written in verse in Sanskrit - Vyādi's 'Samgraha', Bhartr̥hari's 'Vākyapadīyam' and the occasional varthikas of Kātyāyana and Patañjali are written in poetry. In Telugu there was no grammatical work earlier to Nannaya.

Apart from freely utilizing the nomenclature of Pāṇini (like samāsa and kāraṇa), Nannaya coined a number of terms that are required for the analysis of Telugu language (like paruṣa, sarala, kaḷa, drutaprakṛtika etc.). Needless to say, without the background of various Pāṇiniyan concepts it is difficult to understand Cintāmaṇi. Probably Nannaya might have been of the view that since most of the people during that period were studying Pāṇini it will not be difficult, if he freely uses the Pāṇiniyan terminology without offering definitions.

It was in 19th century that a teacher of Madras Christian College, Cinnayasūri authored a beautiful and lucid work, Bālavākaraṇam for Telugu in Telugu. He, no doubt borrowed ideas and concepts from Nannaya and some of his sūtras are translated versions of Cintāmaṇi. Cinnaya not only effected additions and omissions but also preferred his own path to that of Nannaya in certain aspects.

During the course of period between Nannaya and Cinnaya the Telugu language had undergone considerable changes and there were quite a few grammarians, who attended the task of analyzing and updating of Telugu paradigms.

It is also a fact that by the time Bālavākaraṇam adorned the hands of Telugu people almost all the earlier works have gone into oblivion. And this can best be compared with the Sanskrit grammatical tradition wherein the Vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakau-

mudi of Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita became popular across the sub-continent and had thrown, all similar works on Pāṇini, into obscurity.

In fact, the structure of Bālavvyākaraṇam closely resembles that of Kaumudi in all aspects, i.e. organisation of chapters and their order etc.

Unlike Nannaya, Cinnaya had had vast literature before him besides a number of treatises dealing with Telugu grammar. It is noteworthy that Cinnaya had attempted and composed a couple of works on Telugu grammar (Śabdakṣhaṇasangrah, Śabdānuśāsana etc.) before finally coming out with the present work. Frankly speaking, Bālavvyākaraṇam with its infrastructure looks to have utilized the Pāṇiniyan concepts, 'paribhāṣās etc. (and a couple of ideas from Tarka as well) to the maximum extent possible and one need not hesitate to assert that a person with considerable knowledge of Pāṇinīyavyākaraṇa only can interact with Bālavvyākaraṇam.

It is in the light of the above situation that I would like to take up the task of conducting a comparative study and analysis of Cintāmaṇi and Bālavvyākaraṇam in order to enrich the already existing literature in this field. Earlier there were some scholars, who partly or fully discussed certain aspects in this regard. It is my wish to attempt such instances that are not exhaustively dealt with and those which attract further probing due to various reasons.

For practical reasons the study is being confined to samjña, sandhi and kriyāparicchedās only.

At the outset Nannaya discusses the definition and the purpose of kāvya and the need of a grammar, which may not apparently fit into the infrastructure of a grammatical work. But Nannaya with the then circumstances behind him had his reasons to follow such a pattern. On the other hand, the author of Bālavvyākaraṇa completely ignored such matters as he did not feel it necessary keeping in view the changed times.

So far as the kaḷa and drutaprakṛtika categorization is concerned, Nannaya and Cinnaya have followed quite opposite ways. Regarding the definition of 'dēśya' Sūri's explanation seems to be clearer and more explanatory. While discussing the use of certain śabdās which are out of the purview of vyākaraṇa, called apaśabdās or grāmya both are of the view that they are acceptable in case they are used by elders and are popular. In this context Cinnaya borrowed the term 'Ārya' and tried to uplift the Telugu vyākaraṇam to the level of Pāṇinīyavyākaraṇa.

The ēmyādisandhi is said to be bahula by Nannaya whereas Cinnaya makes it vaikalpika and naturally it makes a lot of difference. Cinnaya, taking into consideration the examples available until his period, elaborated / extended the āmreḍita-sandhi. The ga sa ḍa davādēśa sandhi, according to Nannaya, is 'nitya' while Cinnaya wants it to be bahula. In case of rugāgama

Nannaya composed a single sūtra and left it to 'vyākhyānato viśēṣapratipattiḥ', whereas Cinnaya attempted the same in two sūtras i.e. one for 'tatsamas' and the other for 'ācchikas', besides clearly stating that 'rugāgama' is subject to karmadhāraya.

So far as the verbal paradigms are concerned, there is a gulf of difference between the two popular grammarians - the former categorized the verbs into three groups, mostly dealt with 'tatsama' verbs, whereas the latter closely followed the Pāṇiniyan code, 'lakāras' and 'puruṣās' and thus asserting the behaviour of all types of verbs, offered a clear and vivid panorama of the chapter.

The structure of Cintāmaṇi gives the idea that Nannaya preferred to follow the paribhāṣa-'yathoddhēśam samjñāparibhāṣam' whereas in Bālavvyākaraṇa Cinnaya followed the paribhāṣa - 'kāryakālam samjñāparibhāṣam', occasionally resorting to the 'yathoddhēśapakṣa'.

The above mentioned are some of the points which merit a comparative study of Cintāmaṇi and Bālavvyākaraṇam and as is evident from the analysis made in the following chapters, there are many other things, which prompt a researcher to make further study.

CHAPTER II
Samjñāpariccheda

Nannaya in his Grammatical work, viz. Āndhrśabdacintāmaṇi, written in Āryāgītis, initially discusses definition and the purpose of a kāvya and the need of a grammar. On the other hand, Cinnaya, the author of Bālavvyākaraṇam, did not discuss any of these things.

1. viśvaśrēyaḥ kāvyam tadadōṣan parikṛtau ca vāgarthau¹
sā vāgyā rasavṛttiḥ sādhyo hi rasō yathāyatham kavibhiḥ
2. svasthāna vēṣabhāṣābhimatā ssantō rasapralubdhadhiyaḥ²
lōkē bahumanyantē vaikṛtakāvyaṇi cānyadapahāya
3. siddhirlokāddṛśyā lokō' nanyāddṛśaśca nityaśca
samskāārthō niyamō' niyamādgrāmyam hi yattvapabhramśaḥ³

The commentators have touched the point as to why Nannaya speaks of a kāvya in a work related to vyākaraṇa. It may look odd as nowhere did any grammarian, especially in Sanskrit, defined a kāvya or any other details. The following can be a justification-

In paspaśāhnika of Mahābhāṣya, Patanjali⁴ says that a combination of lakṣya (examples) and lakṣaṇa (sūtras) is called vyākaraṇam.

1,2,3. Ān. Śa. Ci. -- Samjñā (Ā.Gī 1,2,3)

4. Lakṣyalakṣaṇe vyākaraṇam, lakṣyam ca lkaṣaṇam caitatsamuditam
vyākaraṇam bhavati

However, since there is a lot of literature both v̄edic and classical, besides the spoken language of Āryāvarta, one need not search for Lakṣya, whereas in Telugu the same was not the situation by the time Nannaya penned the first organized grammatical work of Telugu language (like Pāṇini, Nannaya too had some predecessors). There was also some literature related to prāṇnannaya-yuga. Therefore, in order to streamline both the lakṣya and lakṣaṇa in respect of Telugu language, Nannaya not only wants to give a perfect lakṣaṇa but also prescribe the lakṣya.

Rather, earlier to Nannaya there was probably no kāvya worth the name nor was any definition offered for a Telugu kāvya. And therefore, Nannaya was prompted to offer the definition of a kāvya and he did it closely following Mammaṭacārya ⁵. and Viśvanātha ⁶. the famous Sanskrit rhetoricians.

By the time Cinnaya entered the scene, i.e. 19th century, there were a number of works available in Telugu literature supported by spoken Telugu. Moreover, between Nannaya and Cinnaya there were some grammarians like Atharvaṇa and Ahobalapati, who augmented Cintāmaṇi with their works and commentaries. Therefore, I presume that Cinnaya did not feel that a definition of a

5. Tadadoṣau śbdārthau saḡuṇāvanalankṛtī punḡ kvāpi,
kāvyapṛakāśa, 1-1

6. Vākyam rasātmakam kāvyam, Sāhityadarpaṇam 2-1

kāvya was necessary especially in a grammatical work like Bālavākaraṇa.

In the second verse, Nannaya indirectly explains that people with love of their place, dress and traditions, started tilting towards Telugu kāvyas, leaving behind the Sanskrit kāvyas. This can be taken as a justification for venturing upon the task of writing a grammar for Telugu. It is a different matter that his writing a grammar of Telugu in Sanskrit suggests the domination of Sanskrit over Telugu. For his part, Cinnaya keeping in mind the popularity of Telugu works among Telugu people did not touch this point.

The third verse can best be described as a replica of the first vārtika of Kātyāyana ⁷ quoted in Mahābhāṣya. Of course, there is slight difference between the two - the śabdās are to be taken from the common usage, which is constant (Pravāhanitya); the niyama (vyākaraṇa) is for samaskāra (refinement/authoritative analysis); without niyama the language is called grāmya/apabhramśa (i.e. not fit for usage). Obviously, the difference between Kātyāyana and Nannaya is that the former associates Dharma with the usage of perfect śabdās whereas the latter does not speak about that aspect as is not possible with the usage of Telugu śabdās. This and another aspect, grāmyam will be elaborated later in this chapter.

7. śiddhe śabdārthasambandhe, lokato'rthaprayukte
śāstreṇa dharmaniyamaḥ kriyate - paspaśāhnikam

The following verse explains the universal problem of not having the knowledge of vyākaraṇa and therefore employing imperfect śabdās, which mean otherwise :

yadyapi bahu nādhīṣē
tathāpi paṭha putra vyākaraṇam !
svajānaḥ śvajano mā bhūt
sakalam śakalam sakṛt śakṛt !!

[O! my son! anyhow you did not study much, nevertheless, at least study vyākaraṇa - 'svajāna' (our people) should not become 'śvajana' (dogs), 'sakalam' (all) should not become 'śakalam' (piece) and sakṛt (once) should not become śakṛt (dung)]

Varnas in Telugu:

Nannaya: Te'nyē cānupraviśanti śabdayogavaśāt 8.

Sūri: ṛ ṛ ī ī visarga, kha, cha, ṭha, tha, pha, gha, jha, ḍha, dha, bha, na, ña, śa, ṣa, lu samskṛtapadambulanu gūḍi teluguna vyavaharimpambadu. 9.

So far as the number of varṇas in Sanskrit and Telugu is concerned, there is no difference between Nannaya and Cinnaya. Rather, Nannaya says that certain varṇas, which do not belong to -----

8. Ān. śa. ci - samjña. Ā.Gī(5). sū 15

9. Bā. vyā - samjña. 4

Telugu, enter through śabdās of Sanskrit origin. For his part, Cinnaya enumerates such varṇas and other examples too.

Dantyas and Tālavyas:

Nannaya: Adantyaśtālavyaścurvakrassyānmithassvarṇaśca ¹⁰.

Sūri: i, ī, e, ē lanu gūḍina ca, ja lu tālavyamulu ¹¹.
a, ā, u, ū, o, ō, au langūḍina ca, ja lu dantyamulu ¹².

So far as the sāvarṇya ¹³ between dantya ḥa - ja and tālavya ca - jas is concerned, there is no any difference of opinion between Nannaya and Cinnaya. Rather, Nannaya says that those ending in 'a' are dantyas and those ending in 'e' are tālavyas. Ahobalapati supports this view. On the other hand, Cinnaya added those (ca - ja) ending in 'u, ū, o, ō & au' also to dantyas, besides adding those ending in 'i' and 'ī' to tālavyas - mentioned by Nannaya.

Appakavi, the author of Appakavīyam, supported the view of Nannaya.

10. Ān. śa.ci - samjñā Ā. Gī (10) sū (23)

11. Bā. vyā sanjñā - 8

12. Bā. vyā samjñā - 9

13. Ān. śa. ci - samjñā Ā Gī (10) sū (23)
Bā. vyā - samjñā (7 vṛtti)

As far as the usage of dantyas and tālavyas is concerned, it seems that people do not strictly follow the right pronunciation, i.e. use one in another's place. Often it is also found that a sound between 'a' and 'e" (?), which is not there in Telugu (prevalent in English) is used for a tālavya ending in 'e'. Commentators on Telugu grammatical works opine that the author of Cintāmaṇi took only 'a' and 'e' as mostly it is in the case of both these varṇas that people abuse the language.

It is believed that earlier to Sūri, Vēdam Vēṅkaṭarāya-śāstri, ¹⁴. a scholar of Telugu and Sanskrit, for the first time envisaged the sets of dantyas and tālavyas and Sūri simply followed the same. The additional information provided by Cinnaya is interesting - 'ca' and 'ja' ending in 'ai' are not there is śabdās other than tatsama, etc. Sītārāmaśāstri ¹⁵. in his udyotana, however, differs from Cinnaya in this regard following Vaikṛtacandrika ¹⁶. of Vāsudevakavi

curdantyo tālavyāt

vaikṛtakāryē tālavyajvirahitaśca vargān

dantyoḥcāraḥ syāt himaruci - himaruculu

14. Te. vyā. vi - page 66-67

15. Ba. vyā. u - page 11

16. Vai. ca. - page 21 (Te. vyā. vi Page 76)

Antasthālu:

Nannaya: nānyēṣām Vaidharmyam laghvalaghūnām 17.

Sūri: ya, ra, la, va lu laghuvalani yalaghuvulani
dvividambulagu 18.

According to Nannaya, both the sets of laghu and alaghu - ya, la, va-s are not dissimilar but laghu and alaghu repha, i.e. ra, ra, are dissimilar with each other. This condition is more useful in prosody in deciding the compatibility in respect of yati and prasa. Probably keeping in mind this situation, the author of Bālavāyākaraṇa did not go beyond mentioning that there are two kinds of Antasthas called laghu and alaghu. Nor the commentators of different grammatical works contributed anything more in this regard.

Bālasarsvati, Appakavi and Ahobalapandita have quoted Pāṇinisūtras 19. and Prākṛtavāyākaraṇasūtra 20. in order to explain the categorization.

17. Añ. śa. ci - Ā. Gi (*) sū (*)

18. Bā. vyā - samjña (18)

19. hali sarvēṣam p.8-3-22

20. lōlah (lōlah paiśācyām), vai. pā.
page 246 (Te.vya.vi page 31)

Drutaprakṛtika and kaḷa:

Nannaya: Tiñmadhyaśeṣaṣaṣṭī suskarmappravacaniyajavibhaktiḥ
kincitprasamsanādbhutasantāpayadātadā ki mē vāmsca
ktvākilatūṣṇimādyānabhidadhati kalādruto na
yēśām syāt ²¹.

Sūri: drutāntamulayina padamulu drutaprakṛtikamulu ^{22 & 23}.
drutaprakṛtikamulu gāni śabdambulu kaḷalanambadu

Nannaya initially enumerated kaḷas and stated that the remaining fall under the heading drutaprakṛtika. On the other hand, Cinnaya did quite the opposite defined drutas first and said that the remaining are kaḷas. Appakavi, who lived during the period between Nannaya and Cinnaya, was probably the guide to Cinnaya in this regard.

There is a striking difference between Appakavi and Cinnaya which is significant - the former claims that words like 'tannu', 'ninnu', 'nannu' etc. are kaḷas except when followed by the hal-'n', i.e. tannun, nannun, ninnun. According to Bālavvyākarta both the above groups fall under the category drutaprakṛtika.

21. Ā. sa. ci - Ā. Gī. 14.15

22 & 23. Bā. vyā. - samjñā - 12 & 13

Atharvaṇācārya ²⁴. hardly discusses the druta/kaḷa categorisation. He employed the term druta but in opposite cases he preferred 'adruta' to kaḷa'.

Coming back to Nannaya perhaps it was due to the reason that kaḷas are less in number when compared with drutaparakṛtikas and therefore from the point of view of brevity ²⁵. (as was discussed by Patañjali in paspaśā of Mahābhāṣya regarding enumeration of śabdas and/or apaśabdas) it is wise to enumerate kaḷas. So far as Cinnaya's pattern is concerned the simple logic that it is the drutaparakṛtikas which are useful in many grammatical applications when compared with kaḷas, which are, however, less in number and therefore it will be useful to the students if the drutaparakṛtikas are listed out. ²⁶.

Dēśyamu:

Nannaya: Pravāhinī dēśyā ²⁷.

Sūri: Trilingadēśavyavahārasiddhambagu bhāṣa dēśyambu ²⁸.

24. sarale paruse caiva samāse mamuto bhavet
adṛtātsarasādandu ... vi. vi. sandhi - 23

25. Te. vyā. vi - page 359

26. Bā. vyā. ka. dṛ - page 32

27. Ā. śa. Ci-samjña Ā. Gī (16)

28. Bā. vyā. samjña - 21

Nannaya defined *dēśya* as the language in currency, whereas Cinnaya termed it as the one that is prevailing across the so called 'Trilingadēśa'. Interestingly, it was Appakavi who elaborated the idea put forth by Nannaya. Rather he suggested that the language spoken by the people has to be identified and be used in *kāvyas*.

ē dēśamu mānavulaku
 nā dēśamu bhāṣa dēśyamayye garutma-
 tyādi janavyavahāramu
 cē dāni neṅgi kṛtula jeppaga noppun

On the other hand, Ahobalapati ²⁹. took the derivative meaning of the term 'pravāhinī' and explained that the language flowing like a current is *dēśya*. Vāsudēva ³⁰. took a similar view. The common language spoken by the people is '*dēśya*' - this is the essence. It is known that language is available in '*lōka-vyavahāra*' only. Then why come the grammarians define '*dēśya*' only, leaving behind '*tatsama*' and '*tadbhava*'? It is so because the origin of *tatsamas* and *tadbhavas* is there in Sanskrit whereas the term '*dēśya*' is popular in '*lōkavyavahāra*'.

In fact, the definition offered by Nannaya is applicable to

29. Aho. page 172 pravāhinī dēśyā bhavati -
 cali, mudda, padari

30. nityo'nanyādrśo lokah pravāhah so'syāstīti

language in general. It is according to the context that the same is applied to Telugu here.

Nannaya somehow did not specify the boundaries for 'dēśya' while Sūri clearly stated the same. It may not be out of context as to where Sūri took the term 'Trilinga' from. It is discussed by several scholars -

The following is the first reference from 'Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa'

srīsaila bhīma kaḷēśa mahēndragiri samyutam
prākāram tu mahat kṛtvā trīṇi dvārāṇi cākarōt
trilōcana mahēśassa trisūlam ca karē vahan
trilinga rūpam syvasat tridvārēṣu gaṇairvṛtaḥ

Visvanātha too touched the point in 'Pratāparudrīyam'.
Vinnakoṭa Peddana in his 'Kāvyalankāracūḍāmaṇi' said thus -

dhara srīparvata kālē
svara dākṣārām samjña varālu trilingā
kāra maguṭa āndhradēśam
barudāra trilinga dēśamana janu kṛtulan

Following is the definition offered by Appakavi:

srī kṣitidhara kālēśa
drākṣārāmambu lanaga danarārēḍu nī
trikṣētrambula lingamu
līkṣimpa trilinga samjña nennika kēkkun

tattrilinga nivāsamai tanaruka tana
nāndhradēśambu dā trilingākhyamayye

It was probably keeping all the definitions in mind and the somewhat unclear statement of Nannaya, Sūri thought of giving a clear explanation for 'dēśya', for which he was writing a vyākaraṇa in Telugu.

Grāmya:

There is not much difference between Vāganuśāsana and Sūri so far as the definition of 'Grāmya' is concerned.

Nannaya: aniyamād grāmyam hi, yattvapabhramśaḥ 31.

Cinnaya: lakṣaṇaviruddhambagu bhāṣa grāmyambu 32.

Nannaya says that the language without 'Niyama', i.e. the one which is not analyzed by 'vyākaraṇa', is 'Grāmya' and the same is also called 'Apabhramśa'. One may have doubt that Nannaya while prescribing śabdās through his vyākaraṇa, indirectly suggests that those which are against the vyākaraṇa are 'Apaśabdās' or 'Grāmya' and hence unfit for usage and therefore

31. Ān. Śa. Ci-samjñā Ā- GĪ (3) sū (9, 10)

32. Ba. vyā - samjñā (22)

there is no need to define 'Grāmya'. Ahobalapati ³³. clarifies that there are people attempting kāvyas in Telugu and Nannaya wants to demarcate a clear line between so called 'Grāmya' and 'Agrāmya', in his firstever vyākaraṇa of Telugu language. This was perhaps became necessary in light of the definition of a kāvya offered by the author at the outset of the work 'Tadadoṣau parikṛtau ca vāgarthau' ³⁴.

It is certain that Nannaya was following the path of Sanskrit Ālankārikas like Daṇḍi in this regard. The latter vehemently opposes any kind of defect/doṣa in a kāvya. The following is the verse of Daṇḍi in Kāvyaḍarśa which says that although it is small, blemish like a spot of leprosy, would make the entire body of kāvya impure -

tadalpamapi nopēkṣyam kāvyē duṣṭam kathancana
syādvapuḥ sundaramapi śvitreṇaikēna durbhagam

(kāvyadarśa prakā - 7)

Use of certain 'Grāmya' śabdās:

In spite of the restrictions set by grammarians certain poets have employed Apaśabdās in their kāvyas - [Nirankuśāḥ Kavayaḥ]. Following the dictum - "prayogaśaraṇam vyākaraṇam". The

33. Aaho - page (158)

34. Ān. Śa. Ci - samjñā. Ā. Gī (1) sū (2)

grammarians try to somehow accommodate such words and the following are sūtras by Nannaya and Cinnaya in this regard -

Nannaya: viralān pēcōṣādika śabdān
pravyāharantu śabdajñāḥ
ihatu pravyāhāryam
sankētita suprasiddhamēva padam 35.

Cinnaya: āryavyavahārambula dr̥ṣṭambu grāhyambu 36.

Nannaya in his verse obviously referred to Patanjali's Mahābhāṣya and ruled that the śabdās which are 'sankētita' [prescribed in a particular meaning like jāti etc - sankētitaḥ caturbhedo jātyādiḥ jatireva vā - says Mammaṭācārya 37. in kāvya prakāṣa] and 'Prasiddha' [popular] should be used. He wants to convey that in case words that are against the vyākaraṇa are used the vyavastha [arrangement/establishment] would fail and as a consequence the intended meaning is not expressed/received and it will naturally have a chain reaction.

Bālasarvasvati was of the view that since the usages of great poets are to be taken authoritatively even 'Grāmyaśabdās', if used by such people, have to be taken to be fit for usage. And, in fact, this is what Nannaya had in mind as also his usages like -----

35. Ān. śa. Ci - samjñā. Ā. Gī (18)

36. Ba. vyā. samjñā (24)

37. Kāvya prakāṣa 2-8

'kanen', 'canen', etc. prove to be.

On the other hand, Atharvaṇa went a step ahead and commented that since 'Grāmya' is included in tatsama etc. the implication can be that depending on context and propriety such śabdas can be used -

"Grāmyam tattadvidhau sādhu karakaṇṭhāmukhā hi tē" 38.
closely following the path of Atharvaṇa, Cinnayasūri ruled that although 'Grāmya', if used by 'Āryas', it would become fit for usage. Here the term 'Ārya' needs to be discussed in detail:

The term Ārya can be traced back to Mahābhāṣya of Patanjali - having analysed thousands of 'śabdas', Pāṇini resorted to the usage of 'Āryas' regarding the fitness of some śabdas which were not covered by Aṣṭādhyāyī, but are there in common usage -

"Pṛṣodarādīni yathopadiṣṭam" 39.

(pṛṣodara etc śabdas are to be taken (acceptable)
as pronounced)

While commenting on the above sūtra, Patanjali held a very detailed and useful discussion regarding 'upadeśa'. In this

38. Atha. vi. vi - samjñā (29)

39. P. (6-3-109)

context he spelt out the qualifications of 'Āryas', whose
'upadeśa' (pronouncement) has to be taken authoritatively.

kaḥ punarāyāvartaḥ?

prāgādarśāt - pratyakkālakavanāt - dakṣiṇēna
himavantam - uttarēna pāriyātram, ētasmin āryāvarte
āryanivāse yē brāhmaṇāḥ kumbhīdhānyā alolupāḥ
agrhyamānakāraṇāḥ kincidantarēna kasyāścidvidyāyāḥ pāramgatāḥ
tatrabhavantaḥ śiṣṭāḥ

The gist of the above paragraph is this - which one is Āryāvarta? East of Kurukṣētra, West of Prayāga, South of Himalaya and North of Vindhya - is the place called Āryāvarta. The Brāhmaṇās - who are - living in Āryāvarta, store grains sufficient for ten days, without lust, performing the rites, expecting nothing in return, and more or less, scholars in at least one 'vidyā' - are called 'śiṣṭas' (Āryas).

In contrast, in Telugu we do not have such a specific demarcation of boundaries as well as other details to identify Āryas. Nevertheless, Cinnaya tried to hint the general qualifications of people who can be called Āryas in Telugu. He explains that the śabdās, used by 'peddalu' (elderly people, i.e. poets, scholars etc.) who are generally treated as an authority in the use of language, are authoritative). The boundaries for Telugu language are Trilingas i.e. Srīsailam, Srīkālahasti and Drākṣārāmam.

CHAPTER III

Sandhipariccheda

Uttvasandhi:

Nannaya: sandhirnaco'canyutah - 1.

Suri: uttunakaccu parambagunapaḍu sandhiyagu 2.

Although the purport is the same there is some difference in the construction of sūtras between Nannaya and Cinnaya. The former prefers the rule to be 'niṣēdhamukha', i.e. the meaning is expressed through censure, whereas the latter preferred the rule to be 'vidhimukha', i.e. the meaning is expressed through injunction.

In order to show that except in the case of 'uttva', in Telugu there is no nityasandhi, Nannaya started the chapter with a censure. This is elaborated by Srirāmachandramūrti 3. - in Telugu attvasandhi is bahula, ittvasandhi is vaikalpika and uttvasandhi is nitya. That's why Vāganuśāsana started sandhipariccheda in Cintāmaṇi with a niṣēdhasūtra.

On the other hand, Bālavvyākarta perhaps did not like to start sandhipariccheda with a niṣēdhasūtra and another reason

1. Ān. śa. ci - sandhi.A.Gī (19) sū (1)

2. Bā. vyā - sandhi (1)

3. Bā. vyā. ka - samhita page 90

might as well be that the order of nitya-vaikalpika - bahula sandhis would be more appropriate.

Furthur, Sūri felt it necessary to define 'sandhi' whereas commentators felt differently regarding the sense in which Nannaya used the term 'sandhi'.

One of the commentators of 'Āndhraśabdacintāmaṇi', Balasarasvati did not explain the term sandhi.

Appakavi ⁴. while commenting on Nannaya's sūtra, 'sandhirnāco' cyanutaḥ, says the following:

pollayagu pūrvaśabdānta hallumī c da
bara padādyayaccu nilicedu c brāṇa sandhi
kommu pai c dakka nityarasvarammu c mīda
naccugadisina nacaṭa lē dāndhramunanu

Rajēśvaraśarma ⁵. opined that 'prāṇasandhi' here in the above verse means that 'hal' at the end of the first word mixing with 'ach' in the beginning of the second word. In fact the origin of the statement is there in another verse of Appakavi⁶.

4. A. k. - 4.52

5. Ān. vyā. vi page 353

6. A. k - 4-37

ecaṭa sandhi galugu nacaṭa b̄urvapadānta
hallutōḍa gūḍinaṭṭi svaramu
lopamuga nonarciya pollato mīdi
yakṣarambu gūrpanayye sandhi

Following kātyāyana's vārtika - "śakandhvādiṣu pararūpaḥ
vācyam", Appakavi ⁷ interpreted sandhi as pararūpa -

araya śakandhvādiṣutēḥ
pararūpaḥ vācyamanucu brakriyalonan
vararuci vākyamu kalimini
pararūpame vikṛti c gāna c baḍu svarasandhin

Rajēśvaraśarma discussed the concept of sandhi in the following words - the term 'sandhi' is not used in Pāṇinīya in the present context. The commentator of older generation, Appakavi feels that the term 'sandhi' in Cintāmaṇi should be interpreted as pararūpa in paṇinīya. "ekaḥ pūrva parayoḥ" ⁸ is an Adhikārasūtra of Pāṇini, which runs into all the sandhisūtras and it means that one would replace both the 'pūrva' and 'para' vowels.

The term sandhi in Vālmīkivyākaraṇa is also used in the sense of "samhita" of Pāṇini. Therefore Rajēśvaraśarma thinks

7. A.K. - 4-38

8. Ān. vyā. vi - page 374-75

that the author of Cintāmaṇi also used the term in the same sense.

Atharvaṇa in the following verse says that the combination of last and first varṇas is called 'sandhi' and in Telugu it can be asserted that the pūrvavarṇa will get pararūpa (and it is sandhi) -

"ādyanta varṇayoraikyam sandhurityucyate budhaiḥ
pūrvasya pararūpatva matraiva niyatam bhavet"

Kalpadruma ¹⁰ clearly states that in Telugu there are no svara-sandhis like guṇa and vṛddhi. Also there are only parasandhis and pūrvasandhis in Telugu.

Therefore it can be concluded that Cinnaya clarified the meaning of the term 'sandhi' which was not clear in Cintāmaṇi.

Attvasandhi:

Nannaya: va' taḥ ¹¹.

Sūri: attunaku sandhi bahulambugānagu ¹²

10. Bā. vyā. ka - page 88

11. Ān. śa. ci - sandhi Ā. Gi (19). sū (2)

12. Bā. vyā - sandhi sū (4)

It is interesting to note that attvasandhi, according to Cintāmaṇi, is 'vikalpa' whereas Bālavāyākaraṇam says that the same is 'bahula'.

Initially, Ahobalapati had offered examples like 'lessagu - lessayagu'; 'mēnatta - mēnayatta'; 'ellappuḍu - ellayappuḍu' etc. and claimed that it is 'aprāptavibhāṣa'. But later termed it 'vyvasthitavibhāṣa' in light of the observation by Atharvaṇa that in case of certain examples, like pannāku, candamāmalluḍu, āvanta, taginaṭlu etc. it will be good with nityasandhi. Therefore we are given to understand that by the time of Atharvaṇa itself the vikalpa of Nannaya was at stake.

Cinnayasūri ruled that attvasandhi is bahula. The following verse explains the concept of bahula ¹³.

kvacitpravṛtṭiḥ kvacidapravṛtṭiḥ kvacidvibhāṣā kvacidanyadēva
vidhērvīdhānam bahudhā samīkṣya caturvidham bāhulakam vadanti

[Application, non-application, optional and different form - a conglomeration of these four items is called bāhulakam].

Bālavāyākarta gave examples for apravṛtṭi, vibhāṣa and anyatva only. Pravṛtṭi was left behind. The reason for this may be explained thus - Sūri was closely following the terminology of

13. vi. vi - sandhi 3

Paṇinīyavyākaraṇa. But there is no any specific term to cover apravṛtti, vibhaṣa and anyatva, which may be a strange phenomenon in the case of `attvasandhi'. Therefore, most probably Cinnaya preferred bahulaṃ, although there is an example for pravṛtti, rather than coining a new term in this regard.

In order to show apravṛtti, Sūri further said that there is no sandhi in case of `strivācaka, tatsama and sambōdhanānta', but he ammended by saying that in ādhunikakṛtis there are instances for strivācaka and tatsamas. Atharvaṇa by his kārika - kutracsitsamskṛtiyōpi - employed that sandhi is seen in the case of tatsamas. Commentators have registered examples like `ganganukāse', `nelaticcenu', `īranga-bhartancu' etc. It is interesting to note that Sūri observed that sandhi is seen in the case of strivācakas and tatsamas in modern kāvyas only while usages like bāhappalince by Tikkana, mahattanigi (Basava 6.246), appa + ala ---> appala (U. Harivamsam) etc. vouch for the fact that in ancient kāvyas also there were instances for pravṛtti. Although Pālkuriki Sōmana and Nācana Sōmana are considered to be modern poets, one cannot ignore Tikkana who is an ancient poet by any stretch of imagination.

Although Nannaya claims attvasandhi to be vaikalpika there are usages of nityasandhi in Telugu literature. That's why Proudḥavyākarta and Udyōtanakarta have offered examples like rāmayya, sītamma etc. Therefore, it can be concluded that "attvasandhi is bahula" is more appropriate.

Ikārasandhi:

Nannaya: nityamanuttama puruṣa kriyāsvitaḥ 14.

Sūri: kriyāpadambulandittunaku sandhi

vaikalpikarbugānagu 15.

madhyama puruṣakṛiyalayandittunaku sandhi yagunu 16.

Nannaya's sūtra rules that the 'it' in verbal words of non-uttamapuruṣa (i.e. Prathama and Madhyamapuruṣa) would get sandhi. Cinnaya by his two sūtras ruled that sandhi in the case of madhyamapuruṣakriyas is nitya whereas it will be vaikalpika in case of prathama and uttama.

Resorting to 'Pariśēṣanyāya', it can be inferred that so far as Nannaya is concerned sandhi in the case of uttamapuruṣa is vaikalpika. Ahobalapati says that in the case of uttamapuruṣa sandhi will be vaikalpika and the same is achieved by Nannaya through a sūtra - "prāyastu syat kimādikasyētaḥ 17. On the otherhand the author of 'Vikṛtivivēka' clearly stated that ittvasandhi in the case of prathama and uttamapuruṣa is vikalpa,

14. Ān. śa. ci - sandhi Ā. Gi (19) Sū (4)

15. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (6.7)

16. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (6.7)

17. Ān. śa. ci - sandhi Sū. Gi (2) . Sū (9)

in madhyamapurusa, it will be nitya and ktvārthēkāra never gets sandhi, following these rules usages like "balabhidvahniparē-tarājavaruṇul paryutsukatvambu sandhila gūrcundiri" 18. and "siddhigānciri yavimukta sīmayandu" 19. etc. are acceptable inspite of the adverse comment by Kākunūri Appakavi, who could not acquire a copy of 'Vikṛtivivēka'.

In such a situation it seems to be legitimate to conclude that since vyākaraṇa is built on the basis of prayoga, each one of the above have stipulated rules as far as the prayogas they have come across. And finally the rules of the latest vaiyākaraṇa have to be taken authoritatively.

Emyādi:

Nannaya: prāyastusyāt ki mādikasyētaḥ 20.

Sūri: ēmyādula yittunaku sandhi vaikalpikamuḡānagu 21.

The 'it' in ēmi etc. will get sandhi and this is seen often in usages - is the literal meaning of the above Nannayasūtra. Following this Cinnaya said that ēmyādi is vaikalpika.

18. sr. Nai (3-78)

19. kāsū 3-232

20. Ān. śu. ci - sandhi Ā. Gi (20) Sū (9)

21. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (5)

Ahobalapati ^{22.}, the commentator on Cintāmaṇi (and Atharvaṇa kārīkas) said that ēmyādi sandhi is 'bahula'. For pravṛtti he offered kancantakāpuramu, maganālu, for appravṛtti arugudenciya-taḍu, kaṇṭinambujākṣuni and for vibhāṣā puriṭālu/puriṭiyālu. The author of 'Āndhrakaumudi' also ruled - 'kimādērbahulam'. The bahulasandhi is supported by Vēdaḥ Paṭṭābhiramaśāstri by referend to usages like tinṭinannamu, and kaṇṭinacyutuni. On the other hand, Gurumurti mixed tadādis, kimādis and kiṣaṣṭhi as a group and ruled vaikalpikasandhi. The author of Laghuvyākaraṇam took the said group and called it 'ēmyādi'.

Cinnaya took the entire ēmyādigaṇa as it is from Laghuvyākaraṇa but dropped 'edi', 'evi'. Boḍḍupalli Puruṣottamarao is of the view that the above words are dropped by Cinnaya as there are other forms of ēdi and ēvi.

Malladi Sūryanārāyaṇaśāstri while supporting bahula explained reasons for the preference of Cinnaya for vaikalpikatva.

Dūsi Rāmamurti advanced the following argument regarding vaikalpikatva of ēmyādisandhi as discussed by Mallādi - "Mallādi says that since sandhi to ikāras of ācchikanāmas is not mentioned in Bālavvyākaraṇa and therefore 'maganiyāṇḍru' it is not comfort-

able to the ears (aśrāvya)" 23. . But the fact is that generally nityasandhi affect the comfort of the ear (śrutisukha) during the course of time it will get vaikalpikatva. Therefore in order to see that the śrutisukha is not affected one has to create pravṛtti and apravṛtti to the sandhi.

Puruṣottamarao opines that the narrow path followed by Cinnayasūri in this context made it look like lacking integrity. Rather he should have preferred vyavasthita - vibhāṣa to vaikalpikatva.

One more interesting aspect is that he included two other sūtras - "tadvat tadādiḥjasya and apiśabdārthaśyetaḥ" 24. in his sūtra, i.e. the words that are there in the above sūtras are included in ēmyādigaṇa. There are two reasons for this - both the above sūtras are vaikalpika in nature, following "sandhiraṇaco' cyanutaḥ" it can be inferred that there is no nityasandhi except for 'ut'. Thus Cinnaya could achieve brevity.

ktvārthekāra:

Sūri: ktvārthambaina yittunaku sandhi lēdu 25.

23. Te. vyā. vi - Page 413

24. Ān. Śa. Ci - sandhi Ā.Gī - (20, 21), Sū (8, 10)

25. Bā. vyā - sandhi. Sū 8

It is conspicuous that the above sūtra of Sūri does not have any origin in Cintāmaṇi.

Rather it is the translated version of Atharvaṇakārika - "ktvarthētu na bhavātsadā".²⁶ The author of udyotana supported Sūri by saying that no sandhi is available for ktvārthēkāra in Mahābhārata. The implication is that since there were no usages in front of Nannaya he did not touch this aspect. And since there were usages after Nannayas period which prompted Atharvaṇācārya to declare that ktvārthēkāra doesn't get sandhi. Appakavi, who is also a commentator on Cintāmaṇi followed Atharvaṇācārya.

Ktvārtha needs the following elaboration "samānakarṭṛkayōḥ pūrvakāle"²⁷. is the Pāṇinisūtra institutes the suffix 'ktvā' in the sense of 'incomplete past' the pratyaya has to be applied to the first verb when two activities are taken up by the same person - 'bhuktvā vrajati' (having taken food he is going). In samāsas, except nañ-samāsa, ktvā is replaced by 'lyap' (samāsē anaṅpūrve ktvo (lyap-Pāṇini). In Telugu 'i' is added to two verbs of the same kind to denote ktvārtha (vacci, velli, etc.). vacciyundenu is an example of the above sūtra.

26. vi. vi - sandhi (Te. vya. vi. - Page 534)

27. P. 3.4.21

Āmrēḍitasandhi:

Nannaya: ādyasyā mreḍitē' ntyalopaśca 28.

- Sūri: 1. accunakāmrēḍitambu parambagunapuḍu sandhi
taracugānagu²⁹
2. āmrēḍitambu parambagunapuḍu kaḍādula doliyaccu
mīdi varṇambulakella dviruktaṭakārambagu
3. āmrēḍitambu parambagunapuḍu vibhakti lopambu
bahulambugānagu
4. andadukuprabhṛtulu yathāprayogambuga
grāhyambulu
5. āmrēḍitamabu parambagunapuḍu madhyama
mudun̄jn̄ulaku lopambu vibhasanagu.

According to Amarakōśa first or second repeated word is called āmrēḍita (āmrēḍitam dvistriruktam). Rather, since the second repeated word is not seen in usages (where sandhi is effected) only first repeated word is taken as āmrēḍita.

28. Ān. śa. ci - sandhi Ā. Gī. Sū (18)

29,30,31,32,33. Bā. vyā - sandhi. Sū (10,40,41,42,49)

The following is the literal meaning of the sūtra of Nannaya - when followed by āmreḍita the last letter of the first word will get 'lōpa' also. Cinnaya, on the other hand, says that sandhi will often take place if the 'ac' is followed by āmrēḍita.

It seems most of the commentators (except the author of Kavijanamaṇḍana), if not all, did not go deep into the interpretation of Nannaya's sūtra in light of Cinnaya's wording. One can certainly state that both Nannaya and Cinnaya mean the same, but for the wording. Nannaya preferred 'antya-lōpa' to 'sandhi', although the result is the same (sandhi). The interesting point is that Nannaya added the word 'ca' which means 'in addition'. The purport is that the sandhi in case of āmreḍita is vaikalpika. It won't be amiss to conclude that, more or less, Cinnaya ruled the same, i.e. āmreḍitasandhi is vaikalpika. In fact, Sūri clearly mentioned that the term 'taracuga' implies that the sandhi is vaikalpika.

Extension of āmreḍitasandhi by Cinnaya:

The vast Telugu literature, that was available by the time Sūri penned his Bālavvyākaraṇam, compelled to write more sūtras in order to cover the gamut of examples related to āmreḍita. Most probably, Atharvaṇa and Sīta Ramakavi must have influenced him to extend the aspect beyond what Nannaya had said.

Atharvaṇācārya, apart from mentioning the lōpa already ruled by Nannaya, added lōpa and āgama in respect of āmreḍita -

adrutānā majādīnām dviruktā dantyalōpatā
anyēśām ca dviruktau syurbahulōpāgamā matāḥ

(except dṛtaprakṛtikas, when followed by āmreḍita ajādiśabdas would get antyavarṇalōpa. Other śabdas also would get many kinds of lōpa and āgama).

The author of Kavijanamaṇḍana applied the kārīka of Atharvaṇa - "aḥ ' kutracillōpa bahulam syat prayōgataḥ, to āmreḍitasandhi and illustrated the same to prove that is bahulaōhōho, auraura, annanna - Pravṛtti, ēgiyēgi for apravṛtti, ēmēmi/ ēmiyēmi for vikalpa. Boḍḍupalli also argued on the same lines". 35.

In fact, Cinnaya's treatment of āmreḍitasandhi was vivid - he assembled all the examples of dviruktaṭakāra in terms of āmreḍita and allotted a separate sūtra. Listing out some irregular usages like andaduku, illinkulu, irrinkulu etc. and put them under the heading 'nipāta' (to be received as they are pronounced). These observations do not have origin in Cintāmaṇi. Rather, the Atharvaṇakārīka-kvacidarthaviśēśēsyuḥ kēcidadau dvivarnakāḥ - might be the guideline to the dviruktaṭakāra. Similarly the kārīka -

35. Te. vyā. vi - Page 418

`adṛtānām ajādīnām dviruktāvāntyalopitā
anyēṣām ca dviruktausyurbahulopāgamā matāḥ 36.

- might be the origin of vibhaktīlōpa that is bahula. The fifth sūtra of Sūri is also originated from the second line of the above kārika.

It is rather surprising to note that such an aspect like āmreḍitasandhi with so many ramifications was not discussed thoroughly by grammarians earlier to Sūri. The author of Sarvalakṣaṇasārasaṅgraha 37. mentioned antyalōpa in respect of āmreḍita and had given the following two examples only - annayan-na / annanna, ēmēmi.

Bālasarasvati offered three examples - annanna, ēmēmi, ōhōhō - and the last one suggests that the sandhi on long vowels which is unusual in Telugu is also there. He somehow failed to recognize the other form, i.e. ēmiyēmi which insinuates that according to him āmreḍitasandhi is nitya. Appakavi offered examples like accaṭaccaṭa, ādādi, ōhōhō, which are termed by Boḍḍupalli Puruṣōttama Rao as examples for kaḷa and ktvārtha. In fact, the first example might have been given as an example for āmreḍita in respect of drutaṭprākṛtika as usages like accaṭaccaṭa,

36. vi. vi. Ajanta (vn) (Bā. vyā. 1e. Page 108)

37. Rendu māṛuluccarincu śabdāmunaku, nantyaṭpadamy medali
yaccāḍangu nannayanaka kṛtula nagani vēśa

accaṭanacaṭa are seen. Ahobalapati said that the last varṇa of the first dviruktaśabda expressing surprise will get lōpa. And Cinnaya's treatment of āmredita sandhi reflects the different propositions of the said grammarians.

Apadādisvarasandhi:

Nannaya: parimitau samastānām 38.

Sūri: andvavagāgamabulandappa napadādisvarambu
parambagunapuḍu accunaku sandhi yagu. 39.

All the vowels will get sandhi when followed by a śabda in the sense of measurement - is the meaning of the above Nannaya sūtra. Atharvaṇa 40. and Ahobalapati 41. clarified that the word 'parimitau' in Nannaya's sūtra refers to the suffix 'eḍu'. In his two-fold strategy, Cinnaya covered 'andu' and 'avagāgama' on one side and 'eḍu' etc. on the other. He did not prefer the term 'parimiti' but saw to it that 'eḍu' is also covered by saying 'apadādisvara'. He put instances like Ramulandu / Ramulayandu, Hariyandu, enimidavadi / enimidiyavadi etc. under 'nipata' while stating that the 'ac' when followed by apadādisvara will get nityasandhi. And this deviation from Nannaya helped him in cover-

38. Ān. śa. Ci - sandhi Ā. Gī. (19) Sū (5)

39. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (11)

40. mānārthā nityamēkatvē eḍusyā tparimāṇanē

41. parimānārthakē varṇakē parē tatsambandhi pranyē saḥa
sarvapṛāṇānām nityam sandhis syāt

ing pratyayas other than 'edu' - ex: mūreḍu, vēseḍu, nirjin-
cu, arthincu - therefore one can aptly say that when compared
with Nannaya sūtra, Cinnaya's sūtra is broad based and confirming
to the conditions - 'sāravat and visvatōmukham'. 42.

Dvirukta-ṭakārādēsa-sandhi:

Sūri: kuru - ciru - kaḍu - naḍu - niḍu śabdambula
ra, ḍala kaccu parambagunapuḍu ḍviruktataḍakārambagu 43.

It is difficult to explain as to why the author of Cintāmaṇi failed to write a sūtra for examples of dviruktataḍakāra, some of which are actually available in that part of Āṅhramahābhārata authored by Nannaya himself - 'kaṭṭeduru, niṭṭūrpu'. 44. In fact, none of the Telugu grammarians had touched this aspect inspite of the fact that usages like 'kaṭṭaluka', koṭṭānimutyālu', 'koṭṭayitambu', 'naṭṭaḍavi', 'naṭṭinta', 'naṭṭindlan', 'ciṭṭeluka' - are available in the works of poets of high standard. Rather, a hint is available in the work of Vedam Venkata Ramaṇa Sastri, which might have become a guideline to Sūri in framing his sūtra, which is very clear. In light of the above guideline it is not correct to say that it was Cinnayasūri,

42. Sūtralakṣaṇam: alpāksaram asandigdham, sāravadvīsvatomukham
astobhāmanavadyam ca sūtram sūtravido viduḥ
(parāsaropapurāṇam and viṣṇudharmottara)

43. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (12)

44. Ān. ma. bhā Nannaya 2.II 97, 3.II - 133

who first touched this aspect. Nor is the statement of the author of Pēṭika that - there are no examples for dviruktataḥkāra in Nannaya's Bhārata and Sūri created such dvita following some Tamil paradigms like 'kaṭṭāṇi- - is correct. Vajjhala Cinasītārāma Śastri had in fact refuted the statement of the author of Pēṭika.

It may be noted that Cinnaya in his earlier grammatical works, viz. 'Śabdalaḥṣaṅgasaṅgraha' ⁴⁵. and 'Āndhraśabdānu-śa-sanam' ⁴⁶., also wrote sūtras, which are slightly different.

Having analysed pada-sandhi and apada-sandhi, Cinnaya wanted to write a sūtra for a sandhi that is common to padas as well as apadas. In Cinnaya's sūtra 'kaḍu' is a pada and the rest are apadas. That's why Cinnaya preferred the term śabda ⁴⁷., which has got many meanings including varṇa, prakṛti, pratyaya, pada and vākya. Generally, the term 'apada' is used in the sense of a prakṛti / pratyaya.

45. kuru, ciru, kaḍu, naḍu, niḍu laku dviruktataḥkāraṁbagu

46. kuru, ciru, kaḍu, niḍu la yupadhaku dviruktataḥkāraṁdi nityamba

47. root, suffix, phoneme, morpheme, word, sentence, discourse, parā, praśyanti, madhyamā, and vaik... - vākya.
pa. Bra. Page 109.

ga. sa. ḍa. ḍa. vādēśa-sandhi:

Nannaya: ga, sa, ḍa, ḍa, vāssyuh prathamā mātrādātmāśma -
dorvinaivaite 48.

Sūri: prathamamīdi parūṣamulaku ga sa ḍa ḍa valu
bahulamigānagu 49.

This ādēśa is nitya according to Nannaya whereas Cinnaya wants it to be bahula.

In the inscriptions of prānnannaya period ga sa ḍa ḍa vādēśa used to be in vogue. Today the kakāra of 'kān', a tumunnanta form, is used as gakāra, i.e. a nitya sandhi. In the inscriptions of Cālukyas it is observed that often 'ga' does not replace 'ka'.

Moreover, in many inscriptions it is seen that in places, where the ādēśa should have taken place, it did not happen. Keeping all this background in mind Vāganuśāsana made a vyavasthā that except 'tānu' and 'nēnu', the parūṣas on prathamāvibhakti would get ga, sa, ḍa, ḍa, vādēśa. During the course of time, it is believed that the sandhi lost its nityatva. It was probably due to this reason that Atharvaṇa mentioned this sandhi as vaikalpika.

48. An. śa. Ci - sandhi, A. Gī (25) Sū (23)

49. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (13)

For his part, Cinnaya mentioned ga sa ḍa da vādēśa on prathama in both Āndhraśabdānuśāsana as well as Śabdalaṅkārasamgraha. But in Sūtrāndhravyākaraṇa, he ruled -

prathamāmātrāt paruṣāṇām bahulam ga sa ḍa da vāḥ.

The same is taken in Bālavvyākaraṇa.

By the time of Nannaya the ādēśa was nitya and as the time went on it became vaikalpika. Commentators expressed different views on this aspect. The reason is the change in janavyavahāra. Cinnaya observed the situation and termed it to be bahulam.

Following Ahobalapati, Sūri said that this ādēśa is seen in the case of kriyāpadas, which are kaḷas and this supports his contention of the ādēśa being bahula.

Ex: nīvuḍakkari-nīvuṭakkari, rārugaḍā - rārugaḍā

Saralādēśasandhi:

Nannaya: taddrutanca bindussyat, avikāragatē tasminnapi
saralā ēvaṣṣanti tē parataḥ 50.

Sūri: ādēśasaralamulaku mundunna drutamunaku bindu-
samślēṣamulu vibhāṣanagu 51.

50. Ān. śa. Ci - sandhi A. Gī (24). Sū (21, 22)

51. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (17)

Nannaya while ruling that the druta before ādēśasarala would change into bindu, also said that although the change does not take place, the original ādēśasarala does not undergo any alteration. Sūri, on the other hand said that bindu and samslēṣa will take place by turn, i.e. bindu is optional. In other words this vibhāṣa is implied by Nannaya's sūtra - since Nannaya says that although bindu is not effected, the ādēśasarala would remain as it is, i.e. it would be a samslēṣa. In fact in a forthcoming sūtra Nannaya clearly mentions this tendency by the term 'samslēṣa'.

Therefore, it can be concluded that except in the formation of sūtras, there is no difference between Nannaya and Cinnaya, so far as the saralādēśa-sandhi is concerned.

Ex: pūcemgaluvalu - pūce c galuvalu - pūcengaluvalu

Nannaya: lugvā druta prakṛtikāt parataḥ
 saralē sthirē ca nasya syāt
 aluki ca samslēṣa ssyā dbindum
 pravadanti tam kvaci tkēcit 52.

Sūri: 1. drutambunaku saralasthirambulu parambulagu -
 napuḍu lōpa samslēṣambulu vibhāṣaṇagu 53.

52. An. śa. Ci - sandhi Ā. Gī. (26)

53. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (18, 19)

2. vargayuksaralamulu paramagunapudokānokacō
drutamunaku c būrṇa binduvunu gānambadiyedi 54.

There is slight difference between vāganuśāsana and Sūri regarding pūrṇabindu replacing drutaprakṛtika. The former says that the 'nakāra' on a drutaprakṛtika will get lōpa optionally is followed by sarala and sthira; in case the 'luk' does not take place, according to some people, samslēṣa or bindu would replace druta in some places.

Sūri split it into two sūtras - the first one says that lōpa and samslēṣa are optional, whereas the second sūtra says that pūrṇabindu also is seen when druta is followed by 'vargayuk' or 'saralas' in some places.

Apparently, Sūri differs from Nannaya in so far as pūrṇabindu replacing druta is concerned, i.e. sarala or sthira may cause pūrṇabindu - according to Nannaya, whereas it can be either sarala or vargayuk (second, fourth varṇas of each varga) and not all sthiravarṇas (other than paruṣas and saralas). The reason for such a difference might be the keen observation of various usages across Telugu literature, both ancient and modern, by Cinnaya.

54. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (18, 19)

Bodḍupalli Puruṣottam⁵⁵. feels that since vargayuks' are part and parcel of sthiras it is not necessary to write a separate sūtra. The relevant kārīkas of Atharvaṇa⁵⁶. in this regard are not clear.

Drutalopa:

Nannaya: vākyāntagatapadānām ca⁵⁷.

Sūri: avasānambuna drutasvarambunakēni, drutambunakēni
lōpambu bahulambugānagu⁵⁸.

Nannaya said that the drutalōpa at the end of a vākya is vaikalpika, whereas Cinnaya made it bahula. It was Ahobalapati, who stressed that the word vākyam in the sūtra as well as in the Atharvaṇakārīka, means the line of a poem. He also said that this lōpa has to be effected, whereas there is no any problem to the metrical rules of the poem, i.e. in case there is any violation of the rules of prosody this lōpa should be taken as vyasthita-vibhāṣa. On the other hand, Sūri while accepting the above contention of Ahobalapati, stated that it is bahula - ex:

vāḍuvaccen/ vāḍuvacce / vāḍuvaccenu. He felt that in case of last

55. Te. vyā. vi - Page 432

56. ādyē trtīyēca kapāstrtīyāssyuh kapētarē ādyē trtīyē
turyēcā prāpnuvanti nimittatām (v. vi. Te. vya - vi Page 432)

57. Ān. śa. Ci - sandhi Ā. Gī (31) Sū (41)

58. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (20)

varṇa of the padyapāda is 'guru', there will be drutalōpa. And if it is 'laghu' then the lōpa does not apply. He avoided the controversy arisen out of the use of the term 'vākya'.

Druta on Druta:

Sūri: konniyedāla drutamū mī c da nakārambu
gānambadiyedi 59.

There is no origin for this sūtra in Nannaya's work. But Atharvaṇacārya composed the following verse in this regard -

nō vā dvitvam kvacit śliṣṭaḥ paraprāṇēna sangatēḥ
durtā ddrutaḥ kvaciccātra dṛsyatē kavibhāṣitē

Kavijanamaṇḍanavyakhya 60. also says that in some places druta on a druta is seen. It is perhaps, following both the above grammarians that Sūri constructed his sūtra.

Tānu, Nēnu:

Nannaya: vātmāsmadō rdrutasya sṣyā lluk 61.

Sūri: tānu nēnu padambula drutambunaku samślēṣambu lēdu 62.

There is difference between Nannaya and Cinnaya so far as

59. Bā. vyā - sandhi. Sū (21)

60. drutamunakante c baramandu druta mokānoka
cō c gāna vāccucunnadi

61. Ān. śa. ci - sandhi Ā. Gī (31) Sū (40)

62. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (23)

the 'bindu' with regard to 'tānu', 'nēnu' is concerned. Lugvā etc. sūtra says that lōpa is vikalpa to druta if followed by saraḷa and sthira. Other two sūtra (sandhi 26, 27) institute 'bindu' and 'samślēṣa' to druta when the lōpa is not effected. The present sūtra is meant to prevent both 'bindu' and 'samślēṣa' in the case of tānu, nēnu therefore tā c jadive and tānujadive are the forms according to Nannaya.

Sūri, on the other hand, restricted samślēṣa only i.e. bindu is acceptable to Sūri. But since there cannot be a pūrṇabindu on dīrgha (samjña 15) it will be a khaṇḍabindu. And as a result, in addition to above forms there will be another form (tā c jadive), with a khaṇḍabindu between 'ta' and 'ja'.

Atharvanacārya ⁶³. in this verse, i.e., "vinā dvitīyam syāt asmodātmanoḥ svantayorapi, noranyasyāpi sarvam syāt bahulam satpryōgataḥ", says that samślēṣa will not be there to druta of 'tānu' and 'nēnu' but the rest will take place as bahula.

Korāḍa Rāmakṛṣṇayya ⁶⁴. has the following to say -- this samślēṣaniṣēdha is inclusive of all similar instances, i.e. all the drutas upon dīrgha, since it is said (samjña 15) that there won't be pūrṇabindu to druta upon dīrgha and because similar sound (sṛtis) will happen to samślēṣa upon dīrgha also, samślēṣa

63. vi. vi - sandhi 32

64. sandhi - 1956. Korāḍa Rāmakṛṣṇayya

too is restricted. The author of 'Āndhravyākaraṇasamhitāsarvasva'⁶⁵. did not agree with the above opinion and he was supported by puruṣōttama Rao.

Nugāgama:

Nannaya: numcōtaḥ⁶⁶.

Sūri: samāsambula nudantambulagu strīsamambulaku
nugāgamambagu⁶⁷.

It is numāgama according to Cintāmaṇi whereas it is nugāgama in Bālvāyākaraṇa. Although the purpose in making an agent 'mit' or 'kit' is different as per Pāṇini⁶⁸, here the result is the same. In fact Sūri in his first work mentioned it as 'num', rather it is significant that he never used any agent as 'mit' across Bālvāyākaraṇa. This is the only technical difference between Nannaya and Cinnaya.

In his sūtra Nannaya referred to samāsas only whereas Sūri extended the purview by adding udantās, strīsamas and pumpus.

65. Ān. vyā. sam.sa - page 328

66. Ān. śa. Ci - sandhi Ā. Gī (28) Sū (31)

67. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (25)

68. Midaco'ntyātparaḥ P.1-1-46
Ādyantau ṭakitau P. 1-1-47

This clearly shows that Cinnayasūri had had a vast literature of Telugu, which had undergone changes since Nannaya, before him.

Druta in samāsas:

- Sūri: 1. samāsambulandu drutamunaku svatvamu lēdu ⁶⁹.
2. tala c brālu modalagu samāsambula drutamunaku lōpamu lēdu ⁷⁰.

Vāganuśāsana imposed lōpa to druta in samāsas. Apart from nugāgama (which also had its origin in Cintāmaṇi), Cinnaya composed three sūtras with regard to the position of druta in samāsas. He rendered Nannaya's sūtra as it is that there will be lōpa to druta in samāsas. Svātva to druta in samāsas is not mentioned by Vāganuśāsana.

The svatvaniṣēdha to druta in samāsas is directly mentioned by Atharvaṇācārya in the following kārīka -

"svatvam . praśleṣatā bindussamāse tu prayogataḥ ⁷¹. as a result samāsas like 'sarasampunu baluka' where svatva of 'druta' is seen are not acceptable.

Druta should get lōpa in a samāsa and when no lōpa takes place there should be either bindu or samślēṣa or svatva would happen. Since usages with svatva are not seen Cinnaya composed a -----

69. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (26, 27)

70. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (26, 27)

71. vi. vi - sandhi

sūtra saying that there is no svatva to druta in a samāsa.

According to Cintāmaṇi, no other application, except 'num' will take place with regard to druta in samāsas, whereas other forms of druta, in case when there is no lōpa, in usages like 'tala c brālu', sēsa c brālu' are seen (there is khaṇḍabindu betwen 'la' and 'bra'.) Atharvaṇācārya observed this phenomenon as the following verse says -

svatvam praslēṣatā bindussamāsē-tu-prayogataḥ
kvacitsamāsē'pi bhavēt prānimātrasya susthitaḥ

aparāntē samāse ca śabde no bindu riṣyate 72.

Here, since bindu means pūrṇabindu as well as a khaṇḍabindu, both forms, i.e. tala brālu and 'talambrālu' will be there.

Ṭugāgama:

Nannaya: sāmānādhikarāṇyaṣūḍantānām
ṭugāgamo'ci syāt 73.

Sūri: 1. karmadhārayambulam dutthanakaccu parambagunapuḍu
ṭugāgamarbagu. 74.

72. vi. vi. sandhi (Bā. vyā. ka. dr. Page 137)

73. Ān. śa. Ci - sandhi Ā. Gī. (28). Sū (33)

74. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (29, 30)

2. karmadhārayambunandu c bērvādi śabdamula

kaccu parambagunapuḍu ṭugāgamambu vibhāṣanagu ⁷⁵.

Vāganuśāsana said that udantas will get ṭugāgama in sāmānādhikarṇya whereas Cinnaya said that udantas will get ṭugāgama in karmadhāraya. According to Pāṇini, tatpuruṣasamāsa with sāmānādhikarṇya is called karmadhāraya. ⁷⁶. If the visēṣya and visēṣaṇa denote the same thing then it is called sāmānādhikarṇya (nīlam utppalam - nīlotpalam). Except for nomenclature, there is no difference in the meaning.

Vāganuśāsana instituted ṭugāgama as nitya and common to all instances. Sūri, taking different examples into consideration, composed two sūtras - the first one is a clear translation of Nannaya's sūtra while the other one deals with the examples under 'pērvādigaṇa', where 'ṭugāgama' is seen optionally.

Bālasarasvati, a commentator on Cintāmaṇi offered an example, 'alaruṭākulu', which falls under pērvādigaṇa. Ahobalapati took a different view - the bahuvacana in Cintāmaṇi sūtra, i.e. sāmānādhikarṇyēṣu, suggests that it happens in places other than karmadhāraya also - 'cekuṭaddamulu', vēlpuṭāvu etc. By clearly mentioning 'ṭugāgama' is anitya (as per vyadiparib-

75. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (29, 30)

76. tatpuruṣah samānādhikaranah karmadhārayah (P.1-2-42)
ādhāro'dhikaraṇam (p. 1-4-45), samānam adhikaraṇam, tasya
bhāvah

haṣa - āgamaśāstramanityam) 77. - Cigurāku - Ciguruṭāku, vaikṛtacandrika of Vāsudevakavi also registered this phenomenon -

Ciguruṭāku/Cigurāku; pēruṭeda/pēreda.

The author of Teluguvyākaraṇavikasaṃu opines that the proto forms of pērvādi are halamtas and hence the āgama is optional.

Cinnaya in his earliest work accommodated Cintāmaṇi while composing an independent sūtra 78.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the Cintāmaṇisūtra, which is terse due to technicalities, is made easier for students of Telugu, by Cinnayasūri. Ahobalapatis' 79. remarks invariably apply to Sūri's sūtra also.

Rugāgama:

Nannaya: dārārthē ' ta edapi vaḥ 80.

77. āgamaśāstramanityam (Pari 95)

78. tuḡāgamambaccurā sāmānādhikaranyambulandagu -
śa. la. sa. Page 33 (Te. vya. vi. Page 996)

tuḡāgamambutvambuna kaccurā bāmānyāthi karnyambunn-
śamāsamulandu ciguru prabrtulakam bāksikambu, pumpulaku
nityambu - ān. śā. śā. (Te. vya. vi. Page 496)

79. samānādhi karanyeyēkārthakatam viṣeṣanaḥ viṣeṣyayāḥ

80. An. śa. Ci - sandhi A. Gī. Sū (34)

Cinnaya: 1. pēdādi śabdāmula kālu śabdāmu parambagunapuḍu
karmadhārayamunandu rugāgamambagu 81.

2. Karmadhārayamunandatsamambula kālu śabdāmu
parambagunapuḍatvambuna kutvambunu rugāgamambu
nagu 82.

Nannaya composed a sūtra that is generally applicable to both tatsamas and ācchikās, where the difference is clearly seen. Everywhere in such cases one has to apply the 'Paribhaṣa - vyākhyānato viśeṣapratipattiḥ na hi sandēhādalakṣaṇam' 83., which means that one has to depend upon the commentary in order to elicit the cryptic meaning that is there in the sūtras and a lakṣaṇa (sūtra) cannot be judged as unfit to be called a lakṣaṇa simply because the student has got some doubt about its meaning interpretation. This is clearly stated in paspaśānhika and elsewhere in Mahābhāṣya by Patañjali. 84. Ahobalapati in his commentary on the present sūtra of Nannaya quoted another sūtra of Nannaya from halanta, i.e. vyatiriktabhūyamsaḥ and a kārika of Atharvaṇa i.e. 'varṇalopagamānaike sarvasmintatbhavēpade', and covered examples of both tatsama and ācchita with different forms (including 'na' lōpa) -

81. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (30, 31)

82. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (30, 31)

83. Paribhāṣēndusēkharam - Paribhāṣa - 7

84. Paspaśānhika - mahābhāṣyam

dhīrurālu, sūrurālu, javarālu, javvanuralu,
godrālu etc. Anuktamanyaśabdānuśāsanavat' - is the
guideline in applying norms of a different vyākaraṇa.

Atharvaṇācārya achieved the same result in a different
manner. The following verse says that both ajantas and halantas
when followed by 'ālu' śabda will receive rugāgama is kar-
madhāraya and sometimes only repha will take place -

ajjhalo rālu śabdena samānārthakatā yadi
samāsastatra codrassyāt rēpha eva kvaci dbhavet. 85.

Therefore it can be rightly be presumed that Cinnayasūri
composed the above two sūtras, one for tatsamas where utva and
rugāgama are applicable and the other exclusively for ācchika
śabdās - codenamed pēdādi, where only rutva is applicable and
thus tried to give a vivid picture of the examples to benefit the
students.

As per the available information Sūri revised the sūtras in
his earlier works - 'Pēdādulaku ālu ra rukku nityambugānagu' 86..
He also put some examples like podarillu, bommarillu under
nipāta. But somehow missed this in Bālavvyākaraṇa.

85. vi. vi - sandhi

86. vi. vi - sandhi

In order to satisfy, Ahobalapati, Sūri in his vṛtti stated that 'javvani' is replaced by 'java'.

Pumpulu:

Nannaya: mostu vibhaktēkavacanē pumpū 88.

Sūri: karmadhārayambuna muvarṇakambunakumbumpulagu 89.

According to Cintāmaṇi sūtra the ādēśa 'pu' and 'mpu' will take place in vibhaktyēkavacana only. This confirms with the usages in Nannaya's Bhārata but in the works of Tikkana etc. there are usages where the said ādēśas are seen in bahuvacana also - neyyapumbalukulu, amulyapugōvulu.

The author of Vikṛtivivēka composed the following verse in this regard -

sāmānādhikarṇye tu bahutvārthe parepi ca
mubvorbhavetam pumpvākhyā vādeśā vatra sarvadā

88. An. Śa. Ci - A. Gī. (29) Sū (35)

89. Bā. vyā - sandhi. Sū (32)

It is clear that Atharvaṇa meant both ēkavacana and bahuvacana by saying bahutvārthe parepi ca - sarasapupalkulu - sarasam-
pu c balkulu - sarasampu c balkulu, kundanaṇapuchāyālu etc.

It is probably against this background that Sūri composed the sūtra without mentioning the vacana and as a result it can be applied in both ēkavacana and bahuvacana.

Nugāgama:

Nannaya: ṣaṣṭyā utō ' ci numṣē 90.

Sūri: ṣaṣṭhīsamāsamunandukāra ṛkāramula
kaccuparamaḡunapuḡu nugāgamambagu 91.

Vāḡanusāsana instituted numāgama to udantas only. Rather there is at least one example in that part of Mahābhārata which was translated by Nannaya, i.e. 'savitrṇaku' 92., for 'ṛkāṛānta'. And Cinnaya mentioned nugāgama for udantas as well as ṛkāṛāntas. Moreover, earlier to Cinnaya both Laghu vyākaraṇa and Guruvyākaraṇa said nugāgama in both the cases. Sūri in his first work composed two sūtras for udantas and ṛkāṛāntas.

90. Ān. Śa. Ci - sandhi Ā. Gī (23) Sū (17)

91. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (34)

92. Ān. Ma. bha - 2.1.160

Saṅgrahavyākaraṇa and Venkayyavyākaraṇa omitted the itsamjña whereas Sūri preferred nuk to num.

tana and nugāgama:

udanta strī samambulakunu bumpulakunadamtaguṇa
vācakambulaku danambu parambagunapuḍu nugāgamambagu 93.

Sūri said this nugāgama following Atharvaṇa, i.e. Nannaya did not touch this aspect. The following are the kārikās of Atharvaṇa -

sarale puruṣe caiva samāse numuto bhavet
adrutat svarasādandu paṭṭi kūr̥ci vibhaktiṣu
tane ca kutracidado vikārāscāpi kecana

[num will take place, on udanta in samāsa if followed by paruṣa or sarala; in places where drutalopa occurred; If followed by andu, paṭṭi, kūr̥ci and in some places if followed by tana pratyaya]

Cinnaya, taking the lead from Atharvaṇa, i.e. in some places, clearly stated the places where nugāgama occurs -

sogasumdanamu - sogasu c danamu - sogasunundanamu

93. Bā. vyā - sandhi. Sū (35)

Prā c tādī:

- Sūri: 1. samāsambunam brā c tādula toliyaccu mī c di
varṇambulakella lopambu bahuḷambugānagu⁹⁴
2. krottaśabdamuna kādyakṣara śeṣambunakum gonniyeḍala
nugāgamambunu gonniyeḍala mī c di
hallunaku dvitvambagu
3. anyambulaku sahitamikkāryambulu koṇḍokaco i
gānambaḍi yeḍi

Vāganuśāsana did not say anything regarding usages such as
prā c jaduvu, prā illu, kroṇjāya, pandommidi etc.

Rather the following verses of Atharvaṇācārya were probably
taken as a guide-line by Cinnaya in constrcuting the above four
sūtras -

śabdānāmādibhāgeṣu nūtanavādibodhakāḥ
ekadvi varṇakā śabda artha bhēdo ' pi ca kvacit ⁹⁷.

(In the beginning of śabdās, śabdās with one or two phonemes in
the sense of novelty etc. remain and in some places, difference

94, 95, 96. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (36, 38, 39)

97. vi. vi - ajanja (69)

of meaning is also seen).

The author of 'Kalpadruma' ⁹⁸. says that Atharvaṅcārya meant numāgama also if followed by paruṣa and sarala. According to Boḍḍupalli Puruṣottam, Ahobalapati gave examples like kronana, kronjivurulu, cengalva etc. under this kārīka.

Cinnayasūri tried to cover the gamut of things in four stages - firstly he composed prātādigana subject to samāsa and imposed, bahula-lopa to the varṇas beyond the first vowel - prāillu / prāta illu, lēdūda / lētadūda etc.

At the second stage Sūri instituted nugāgama ⁹⁹. when the luptaśeṣa is followed by paruṣās (saralas also says Atharvaṅa) - lē c gomma, mī c gaḍa etc. He also asserted that due to bahulaagrahaṇa the lōpa in mīdu etc. is nitya and due to vyavasthitavibhaṣa this druta does not have samślēṣa.

At the third stage Sūri took krotta śabda and instituted ādyakṣaraśeṣa, nugāgama at some places and dvitva to the next hal (consonant) at some places - kromjāya, kromkāru, etc. he also registered examples like kroggandī, kemdhūli, kemjaḍa etc.

At the fourth stage, Sūri, following Pāṇinisūtra, i.e.

98. Bā. vyā. ka. dr - samhita Page 150

99. luptaśeṣambunakum baruṣamulu paramulagunapuḍu nugāgamambagu

'anyeṣvapi druśyate' 100. composed a sūtra that is common to different usages having one or some of the above said applications - pandommidi, samgōru, nennaḍumu etc.

Muvarṇakalōpa:

vyatirēka madhyama muvarṇakambula kelayeḍala lopambu vibhāṣanagu 102.

We can assert without any hesitation that this sūtra is the original contribution of Cinnayasūri to Telugu grammar. Neither Nannaya nor Atharvaṇa, nor any other commentator had touched this aspect. Following the dictum - 'prayogaśaraṇam vyākaraṇam' Sūri keenly surveyed the vast Telugu literature available till his time and then composed this sūtra - vānini nammakumu.

Anukaraṇa:

Nannaya: 1. napadānyavyayasuptiṅktvātumunām, anukṛtē sti vākyantu 103.

2. lopō nama ādikē visargasya 104.

Sūri: 1. visargambuna kanukaraṇambuna lōpambagu 105.

100. P. 3-2-101

102. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (48)

103. Bā. vyā. ka - samhita, Cintāmaṇi sūtram Page 171

104. Ān. śa. Ci - sandhi Ā. Gī. (23) Sū (20)

105. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (50, 51)

2. anukṛtini namaśśbdamu tudiyattunakōtvamu
vibhāsanagu 106.

Vāganuśāsana clearly stated that there will be no usage of Sanskrit avyayas, subantas, tumunnantas etc. in Telugu, rather a complete vākya can be taken in Anukaraṇa (only). On the other hand, Atharvaṇa 107. stated that Sanskrit words and sentences can be used in anukaraṇa, in Telugu. Rarely is it seen that poets have carried out such usages without anukaraṇa (especially the authors of Telugu Bhārata did not carry out such usages).

Sūri did not say anything about the usage of Sanskrit words or sentences in Telugu. Rather he indirectly suggested that the tendency is prevalent in Telugu literature. It can be said that Cinnaya mostly followed Atharvaṇa in this regard. The lopa of visarga in the case of 'namaḥ' etc. is generally mentioned (omitting nama etc.) by Sūri following Nannaya. Oṭva at the end of the word namas (visargalopa by earlier sūtra) in anukṛti is imposed following Atharvaṇa -

'namaśśabdavisargasya lopa otvamapīṣyate'

ex: vardhatām sriyaniye, 'tubhyamnamoyane - tubhyamnamayane'

106. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (50, 51)

107. 'prabandhē kēvalādyasya prayogastu na dōsakrt
sankīrnatvam vikṛtyādyāsukrtvā manjulam bhavēt
vinānukarnam kēci dārya śabdāṃ prayujjate
pratyārḥāvayasyāpi prayogaḥ kutraci dhavēt.

Dvitva in anukaraṇa:

Nannaya: ahamādīnām dvitvam 108.

Sūri: anukaraṇambuna dudihallunaku dvirvacanambagu 109.

anukaraṇambunam dahamādula makārambunaku
dvirukti vibhāṣanagu 110.

Cinnaya composed two sūtras with regard to dvitva to the last consonant in imitation (anukaraṇa) - one for the ahamādigāṇa which is optional, the other a general rule which is nitya

Nannaya made only one rule saying ahamādis will get dvitva and the same is rendered by Sūri as vibhāṣa. He also clearly stated that this happens only in anukaraṇa. The Atharvanakārika - 'antyaḡasya halo dvitvam bhavet anukṛtau pare' was the guideline for the other sūtra of Cinnaya. The result is that examples like 'kintattaniye, kastvammaniye', which are not covered by Nannaya are also taken care of. In case of ahamādi also, instead of saying it as nitya, as was done by Nannaya, Sūri made it vibhāṣa so that both usages, i.e. 'dāsohamane / dāsohamane' are registered as correct ones.

108. An. śa. Ci - sandhi A. Gī (23) Sū (19)

109. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (52)

110. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (53)

In fact Atharvaṇa clearly stated regarding dvitva of 'makāra' (anusvāra), and that of the last consonant of words ending in tavyat etc. which is vikalpa. Therefore, it can be concluded that Cinnaya satisfied both Nannaya and Atharvaṇa by his two sūtras.

Sandhi at the end of pāda:

Sūri: vākyaavasānambuna sandhi lēmi dōṣambugādani
yāryulandru 111.

This sūtra does not have an origin in Āndhraśabdacintāmaṇi. 'Nasyādvākya virāme tu sandhyabhāvopi dōṣakṛt' - an Atharvaṇa-kārika might have prompted to write this sūtra. Ahobalapati, while commenting on this sūtra put at rest the doubts regarding the interpretation of the term 'vākya' in the above kārika - here vākya means pāda (each leg/line of the poem) only; in sīsa etc. each line is a vākya. Further, Ahobalapati ruled that the following norm, that is applicable in Sanskrit is not applicable in Telugu.

samhitaikapade nityā, nityā dhātūpasargayoḥ
nityā samāse vākya tu sā vivakṣāmapekṣate

111. Bā. vyā - sandhi Sū (55)

(sandhi is nitya (is compulsory) in a single word - parīkṣa; between dhātu and upasarga also sandhi is nitya - parīkṣyate; in compound words also sandhi is nitya - nyāyaḥ, vyākaraṇam; but in a sentence sandhi has to be effected depending on vivakṣa - dadhi atra / dadhyatra).

Rather, the example for this sūtra offered by Cinnaya does not confirm to the norm put forth by Ahobalapati. And it is difficult to support Cinnaya in this regard for obvious reasons.

CHAPTER IV
Kriyapariccheda

Types of kriyas:

Nannaya: upakṛti pariṇati samvṛti bhēdāt
trividhā kriya puṣaṇvādi
nupakṛti ratha bhujyādiḥ
pariṇati ranyā tu ranjivasyādiḥ ¹.

syādupakṛtiḥ kṛdantā sāpariṇati
ravayava ranvitaiva ssyāt
samvṛti rahatākārā jñēyam
trividhāsu ca kriyāsvēvam ².

There is gulf of difference between Nannaya and Cinnaya so far as the treatment of kriyas is concerned. No doubt, both of them tried to closely follow the Pāṇiniyan pattern in the analysis of verbal paradigms. (Also there is striking difference between the two authors - Sūri besides borrowing certain terms and concepts from Pāṇinīyavyākaraṇa, preferred to adopt certain ideas and definitions from Nyāya works as well. This will be discussed later in this chapter). Rather Nannaya wanted to put the verbs under three headings viz; upakṛti, pariṇati and samvṛti in line with Pāṇini's bhvādi, juhotyādi etc. And defined each one of them. Sūri ignored this categorization.

1. Ān. Śa. Ci - Ā. Gī (72, 73)

2. Ān. Śa. Ci - Ā. Gī (72, 73)

Puruṣōttama Rao ³ was of the opinion that in order to make it convenient that all the verbs originated in Sanskrit are covered, Nannaya preferred the categorization. Vāraṇāsi, the author of 'Andhravyākaraṇavivēka' had the following to say - 'there is a popular opinion that tatsama verbs were paid more attention to Cintāmaṇi. Some believe that it marks the beginning of vyākaraṇa of Telugu. It also does not seem that Cintāmaṇi was written keeping only tatsama verbs in mind. Rather it won't be amiss to say that when compared with other works tatsama verbs paid more attention than others. The pattern that was followed by later Telugu grammarians is a mark of development of the Telugu grammatical arena.

The famous scholar Vajjhala floated an interesting discussion regarding upakṛtikriyas - the name 'kṛt' is instituted in Pāṇinīya by the sūtra - 'kṛdantiṅ' ⁴ which means a suffix on a verbal root, other than 'tin' is called 'kṛt'. Kṛdantas are those which have 'kṛt' at the end. Kṛdantas are 'prātipadikas' ⁵ and prātipadikas cannot become dhātus and therefore the original version should have been 'upakṛtiḥ kṛdantā z bhā', which means that upakṛti is that which is similar to kṛdanta', or else how can prātipadikas become 'dhātus'? 'sups' will stand on prātipadikas but 'tins' cannot stand. On the otherhand, this is not ac-

3. Te. vyā. vi - Page 704

4. Ān. vyā. vi - Page 449

5. P. 3-1-93

ceptable to other commentators - it is beyond doubt that kṛdantas are given the name prātipadika in Pāṇini. It is also correct to say that 'tins' are not directly added to them (except nāmadhātus⁶ - kṛṣṇati etc.). For that matter on any dhātu taken from any one of the three groups, no kriyavibhakti is directly added, i.e. incuk is added first and then the kriya vibhakti, seen from this angle, since incuk is added even on certain subantas (naṭincu, ghaṭincu etc.) and thus they are changed as kriyas the, entire prakriya can be certified as one akin to nāmadhātuprakriya of Pāṇini. And, in light of this fact, it seems that the available Cintāmaṇi version is perfect.

So far as Bālavyaṅkaraṇam is concerned, Sūri, while ignoring the categorization of verbs initiated by Nannaya, started the chapter with an Adhikarasūtra, that is an exact replica of Pāṇinīyasūtra - 'dhātuvunaku' (dhātoḥ)⁸. An Adhikāra sūtra is one which does not render a complete meaning but will get associated with later Vidhisūtras in order to render a complete meaning⁹. Later, he adapted terms like vartamāna and lakāras like 'laṭ' as they are in Pāṇinīya. In certain cases, where he felt inconvenient, Sūri coined terms like 'lāṭ and lūṭ'.

6. kṛttaddhitasamāsāśca (P.1-2-46)

8. P. 3-1-91

9. śvasthale vākyārthabodhājanakatve sati svottaravartividhi-
śāstraikatāpannatvam adhikāratvam

By and large, it seems that Sūri analysed the verbal paradigms in more detail, when compared with Nannaya.

Tenses:

Nannaya: taddharma vartamānātītāgāmyarthakāḥ
kriyā jñeyāḥ 10.

Cinnaya: 1. vartamānambuna laṭṭagu 11

2. bhūtambuna liṭṭagu¹²

3. bhāvini lṛṭṭagu¹³

4. taddharmādulandu lāṭṭagu¹⁴

5. aśiśśāpasamprārthanāvidhulandu lūṭṭagu¹⁵

6. vyatirēkambuna laṅi yagu¹⁶

All the kriyas are put under four headings by Nannaya. While following the same four categories Cinnaya separately mentioned a group, that is actually part and parcel of taddharmādi for operational purposes - 'aśiśśāpasamprārthanavidhi...'

Another major difference that is conspicuous is the absence of lakāraavidhi in Cintāmaṇi and the presence of the same in Bālavvyākaraṇa -

10. Ān. Śa. Ci - Ā. Gī (74) Sū (9)

11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. Bā. vyā - kriya Sū (2, 3 4, 5, 6, 7)

Nannaya did not institute ^{17.} any lakāra like laṭ, lṛṭ etc. on kriyas. On the other hand, Cinnaya instituted six lakāras (varṇakās) viz. laṭ, liṭ, lṛṭ, lāṭ, lūṭ, lani and replaced them with pratyayas. ('lakārambunaku ḍuṅ-ṛ-vu-ru-nu-munnagu')

While Nannaya did not explain the concepts of vartamāna etc. ^{18.}, Cinnaya in his vṛtti had given the definitions that are there in Helaraja's ^{19.} commentary (on Vākyapadīya), Tarkāmṛta ^{20.} etc. (In fact these definitions are more popular in Tarkaśāstra) and had given a single line definition in simple Telugu. This posture of Sūri prompted some commentators ^{21.} to remark that Sūri closely followed Tarkaśāstra with regard to the definitions - vartamāna etc.

Following Pāṇini's plan of lakāraprakriya, Nannaya used the terms vartamāna, atīta, āgāmi without kālādhikāra. However, in Halantapariccheda he said 'vartamānakāle' ^{22.}. The reason behind

17. Nannaya used the term laḍartha and lṛḍartha in kriya 75

18. vartamānambunā c brārabdhāparisamāptambu
(Bā. vyā kriya Sū(2) vṛtti)
bhūtambana vidyamānadhvamsa bratīyogi
(Bā. vyā. kriya Sū (3) vṛtti)
bhāvināvidyamāna prāgabhāvapratiyogi
(Bā. vyā. kriya Sū (4) vṛtti)

19. Prārabdhāparisamāptikriyopādhiṣṭu vartamānasamjñah

20. vidyamānadhvamsapratiyōgutpattikatvam bhūtatvam
prāgbhāva pratiyogyutpatti kagamanānukūla kṛtimān ityarthah

21. Te. vyā. vi - Page 703

22. Ān. śa. Ci - Halanta Ā. Gī (63) Sū (30)

not taking up kālādhikāra by Pāṇini himself can be explained thus - among the lakāras instituted by Pāṇini some express the kāla i.e. vartamāna /bhūtā/ bhaviṣyat (laṭ, liṭ, lṛṭ, etc.), whereas others express 'artha', i.e. 'āśīḥ', 'vidhi', 'nimantraṇa', 'adhīṣṭa' etc. (āśīrlin, vidhilin, loṭ). Rather both these things, kāla and artha are expressed by verbal paradigms only. Therefore it would not be wise to enforce kālādhikāra in the analysis of that verbal paradigms. On the otherhand, kriya is nothing but vyāpāra (associated with phalam-Manjūṣā) ²³. and was explained by Bhartr̥hari ²⁴. 'kāla' itself is called by another name 'vyāpāra'. In Pāṇinīyavyākaraṇa it was 'vārtikakāra' and 'bhāṣyakāra' ²⁵. who initiated the discussion related to kāla (the same is elaborated by Bhartr̥hari whereas in Telugu it was neither Nannaya nor Atharvaṇa but Ahobalapati, who discussed the aspect 'kāla'.

(i) Taddharmārthakam:

Taddharma in Telugu is akin to āśīḥ, vidhi etc. in Pāṇinīya, i.e. it does not express any kāla (no lakāra is instituted in Taddharma by Pāṇini) rather, simply the dhātvartha - 'tasya dhātoḥ dharmāḥ taddharmāḥ'. In other words the sense expressed by

23. tinagartha nirūpanam

24. pratyavasthantu kālasya vyāpārotra vyavashtitāḥ
kālasyēva hi viśvātmā vyāpāra iti kathyate
vākyapadiyam, padakāṇḍa - kālasamuddeśa sloka 12

25. bhūvādayo dhātavaḥ (P. 1-3-1)

both the Pāṇinisūtras, bhāve ²⁶. and tasyabhavastvatalau ²⁷., is meant by the term 'taddharma'. Although the term is used in Pāṇini ²⁸. but in no other grammar of the draviḍiyan languages is it seen. Nannaya used this term in sandhipariccheda, called the same 'dharma' in halanta, and there is usage of the term taddharma in kriyapariccheda as well. Atharvaṇa also said taddharmasamjñā but commentators feel that there is difference between Nannaya and Atharvaṇa so far as the meaning of the term is concerned.

On the other hand, Vāsudēva said that the sole dhātvartha is taddharma, whereas Ahobalapati defined it as the one different from all the three thing viz., bhūta, vartamāna and bhavisyat.

The author of Kavijanamaṇḍana as well as some modern grammarians are of the view that the taddharmārthakakriyas expressed future tense only. Sūri took all these opinions into consideration and instituted a lakāra for taddharmādi. Rather, the fact is that there is no difference in meaning ²⁹. of the term 'taddharma' used by both Nannaya and Cinnaya. The contribution of Sūri in

26. P. 3-3-18

27. P. 5-1-119

28. ākveḥ tachīlataddharmatatsādhu (P.3-2-134)
anuktamanyasabdānusāsanavat (vālmīki 1-1-2)
(Aho page (679))

29. prathamāścōttamaścaiva tānu taddharmasamjñikau
bhūtādyavisayastatra caikatvārthābhidhāyakau
udantau ca sadā nāntau na sandhistatra kalpyatē

this regard was that - according to him the paradigms in taddhar-
mārtha said by Nannaya do express not only taddharma but also
tacchīla, sambhāvana, samprasna etc.

Bhūtārtha:

ktvārtha

Nannaya: ktvā bhūtayōḥ kriyāntyasyēt³⁰.

Sūri: bhūtambunandigāgāmambagu³¹.

samānāśrayambulambūrvakālambunandivarṅkambagu³².

Vāganuśāsana instituted 'itva' in ktvārtha and bhūtārtha by
a single sūtra whereas Sūri composed two Sūtras - one for
bhūtārtha and the other for ktvārtha.

Sūri's second sūtra says that when two kriyas, which have
samānāśraya, the verb that expresses the earlier time will get
'itva'.

This sūtra seems to be a translation of the Pāṇinisūtra -
"samānakarṭṛkayōḥ pūrvakāle"³³. But the fact is that Sūri while

30. Ān. Śa. Ci - kriya Ā. Gī (77) Sū (17)

31. Bā. vyā - kriya Sū (17, 38)

32. Bā. vyā - kriya Sū (17, 38)

33. P. 3-4-21

keeping in mind the Pāṇiniyan concept of samānakartṛkatva, did not fail to observe the behaviour of Telugu verbal paradigms in this regard - 'caitronicēta maitrunḍu koṭṭambaḍi madise' (maitra was beaten by caitra and died) - in the sentence both the verbs are not samānakartṛka but have samānāśrya. By saying samānāśrya examples like 'caitruḍu tini vellāḍu' (caitra had eaten and gone) etc. where that verbs are both samānakartṛka as well as samānāśrya - are also taken care of. That's why Sūri in his vṛtti said - the same is called 'ktvārtha'.

enu in bhūtārtha:

Nannaya: prathamaikasyaidbhavēcca bhūtārthē 34.

Sūri: liḍlāṭṭula ḍuṅṅuna kenunuvarṇambulagu 35.

Nannaya says that ēt will be added to the kriyāpada in prathamapurusaikavacana in bhūtārtha.

Sūri, on the other hand, instituted 'enu' in such cases. In fact, it is hrasva 'e' rather than dīrgha 'e' that is being added in this regard. But Nannaya, it seems, was constrained to use 'ēt' instead of 'et' as hrasva e does not exist in Sanskrit alphabet and one has to judge that it is 'e' and not 'ē', taking recourse to examples (ex. vanḍenu etc.)

34. Ān. Śa. Ci - kriya. Ā. Gī (81) Sū (30)

35. Bā. vyā - kriya Sū (16)

The other aspect is whether it is 'e' or 'enu' - it is clearly stated earlier in samjñāpariccheda of this dissertation that Nannaya and Cinnaya took opposite directions while defining drutaprakṛtikas and kaḷas. The former gave the list of kaḷas and it is implied that the rest are drutaprakṛtikas whereas the latter followed a way that is quite opposite to that of the former.

Vakāralōpa:

Sūri: liḍlāṭṭula vakārambunaku lōpambu vibhāṣanagu ³⁶.

Nannaya did not touch this aspect. Atharvaṇa composed the following anuṣṭup, which was perhaps a guideline to Sūri in composing the above sūtra -

bhūtē tayorvikalpatva miti kēcidbabhāṣirē
kvaciddvuvarṇakē cāpi kēcittasyāsti tām jaguḥ||

(some grammarians said that 'nī' and 'vi' varṇakās would come in an optional fashion in bhūtārtha. Some others said that in certain cases 'u' varṇaka follows, 'a' will also come etc.)

Here the expression 'kēcittu', according to 'Kavijana maṇḍana' refers to 'u' varṇalōpa - ghaṭincedavu / ghaṭincedu.

36. Bā. vyā - kriya Sū (24)

Vartamānārtha:

(i) unnānubandha:

Nannaya: vasati ranubandhaka ssyā dyatralaḍarthō -
vivaḡṡita statra 37.

Sūri: udantambunaku laṡṡu parmbagunapuḍunnānu-
bandhambagu 38.

Nannaya said that when laḍartha is to be expressed then the dhātu will get 'unna' as an addition. The implication is that all the verbs expressing vartamāna will get 'unna'. On the other hand, Sūri said that 'unna' will be added to udantakriyas only. So much so that other kriyas like 'kala' will not get 'unna'. Here Nannaya's contention can be explained thus - mostly the verbs, in Telugu, are udantas. Therefore Nannaya might have felt that it is needless to say that only udantas will get 'unna' and as usual it will be understood depending on the usages in Telugu. Sūri might have felt the need to offer a clearer picture and hence specified as 'udantas'. ex. vanḍucunnāḍu (vanḍu + cu + unnā + ḍu)

bhaviṡyadartha:

Nannaya: asti ranubandhaka ssyā dyatra lḍartho vivaḡṡito
dhātōḡ 39.

37. Ān. śa. ci - kriya Ā. Gī (75). sū (1)

38. Bā. vyā - kriya sū (13)

39. Ān. śa. ci - kriya Ā. Gī (75) sū (12)

Cinnaya: kalānyanubandhamu lṛṭṭu parambagunapuḍagu 40.

The difference between vāganuśāsana and Sūri is that the former does not institute 'lṛṭ' but says that 'kala' will be added to the verbal root if the sense of lṛṭ is desired to be expressed whereas the latter said, 'kala' will come between dhātu and lṛṭ. Rather both of them composed their sūtras keeping in mind the Pāṇiniyan sūtra 'lṛṭ śeṣe ca' 41. It is simply amazing to note that the commentators who came later to Nannaya, like Kētana and Peddana, did not say the 'kala-anubandha'. Even the author of Gurumūrtivyākaraṇa, who lived between Nannaya and Cinnaya also did not favour Kalānubandha. On the other hand, a predecessor to Sūri, Rāvipāṭi Gurumūrti preferred to impose 'Kalānubandha'. The conclusion is that following the dictum - prayogaśaraṇam vyākaraṇam (vyākaraṇa has to be built following usages), since there are usages with Kalānubandha in lṛḍartha in Telugu literature, both Nannaya and Cinnaya are vindicated in their stand.

Ex: veḷḷa c galaḍu & veḷḷa c galarau

Puruṣās:

Sūri: nāmayuṣmadasmadarthamulandu prathamamādhyaṃmottamambulagu 42.

40. Bā. vyā - kriya Sū (19)

41. P. 3-3-13

42. Bā. vyā - kriya Sū (11)

This sūtra does not have its origin in Cintāmaṇi etc. It is obvious that Cinnaya following Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī ⁴³, wanted to say as to which puruṣa is used in relation to 'karta'. Pāṇini said that - if yuṣmacchabda is upapada (whether the sthāni is used or not) madhyama is to be used, in case of asmat it will be uttama and for the rest it will be prathama. Sūri just changed the order of puruṣās and instead of using the term śēṣa, as Pāṇini did for prathama, preferred the term 'nāma' which means other than 'yuṣmadasmadartha'. Following Pāṇini, Sūri did not use the term puruṣa and this can be rated as the original contribution of Sūri to Telugu vyākaraṇa.

Incukāgama:

- Nannaya: 1. bhavati kriyāpadānām trividhānāmincugāgamaḥ ⁴⁴.
 2. anyasmācchādhātordhātutva vivakṣyaiva
 bhavatīm cuk ⁴⁵.

Vāganuśāsana clearly states that all the three types of kriyas will get 'incugāgama'. He added another sūtra which says to cover dēśyakriyas also. In all the cases 'incuk' is instituted

 43. P. 1-4-105
 1-4-107
 1-4-108

44. Ān. Śa. Ci - kriya Ā. Gī (76) Sū (13)

45. Ān. Śa. Ci - kriya Ā. Gī (78) Sū (21)

in 'svārtha' (i.e. the sense of prakṛti) and this is supported by Ahobalapati ⁴⁶. and Balasarsvati ⁴⁷.

Interestingly, Cinnaya streamlined this process - he created an ākṛtiganā - angalādi and instituted incukāgama on a par with 'samskr̥tadhātus'. Further he instituted 'gugāgama' as nitya on aḍḍādidhātus with regard to incuk (aḍḍagincu - maṭṭagincu) and as vibhāṣa on appādi in the same context. This 'gu' is remaining part of 'agu' - feels Boḍḍupalli Puruṣottam ⁴⁸. By and large, the credit for channelizing different kinds of verbs and instituting various applications in an easier and clearer manner goes to Cinnayasūri.

Iyudāgama:

Nannaya: laghvēkākṣarapūrvakriyanti masyanayō
bhavēdidvā ⁴⁹.

Cinnaya: guruvirahītambulayi yayāntambulayina yēkasvara
dvisvarambula yincugvakrambulaki yudāgamambu
vibhāṣanagu ⁵⁰.

46. Anō - Page 666

47. Ba Śa - Page 45

48. Te. vyā. vi - Page 710

49. Ān. Śa. Ci - kriya Ā. Gī (83) Sū (30)

50. Bā. vyā - kriya Sū (50)

The above sūtra of Nannaya was composed keeping the samskr̥tadhātus in mind. Atharvaṇācārya amended the sūtra by saying that the 'it' would apply even when the dhātus have got more than one 'ac' and/or connected with 'pra' etc. avyayās - vighaṭiyincu, sambhariyimcu. later Kētana also made an amendment to cover 'variyincu' / 'varincu' etc.

On the other hand, Cinnayasūri coined 'iyuṭ' in place of 'it' and made the same is applicable in case of dhātus belonging to both Sanskr̥t and Telugu. Thus he exhibited his erudition of vyākaraṇaśāstra. The author of 'Guptārthaprakāśika' remarked that both paribhaṣās, i.e. 'kṛtākṛtaprasangi nityam'⁵¹. and 'pūrvapar-anityāntarangāpavādānām uttarottaram baliyaḥ'⁵², are to be applied in this regard.

In addition Cinnaya had collected a lot of examples with regard to Telugu verbal paradigms which were not touched by Vāganuśāsana and gave a panorama of the verbal system in Telugu and made the path easily motorable.

And finally it can be concluded that the vyākaraṇa tradition of Telugu, which was initiated by Vāganuśāsana, in A.D.11th century had undergone some changes in the hands of various grammarians before finally taking an attractive shape in the skillful hands of Cinnayasūri in A.D.19th century.

51. Paribhaṣāendusekhara. Page 43

52. Paribhaṣāndusēkhara. Page 39

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The following conclusions can be arrived at following the conducted 'comparative study of Āndhraśabdacintāmaṇi and Bālavayākaraṇam' (limited to samjñā, sandhi and kriya only).

By the time Nannaya penned his first ever grammatical work of Telugu language the scenario was not the same as it was prevailing in front of Pāṇini, i.e. almost there was no considerable literature worth the name nor any work defining different literary theories. Therefore Nannaya was an author of both the lakṣya and lakṣaṇa of his grammatical treatise. Moreover, he was also compelled to offer definitions of a kāvya and also to explain the grave need for taking up the cause of Telugu kāvyas and the usage of Telugu śabdās. And Nannaya in his endeavour followed the path of Patañjali and Mammaṭa and Viśvanātha. Further he held that niyama for speech is needed, but stopped short of saying that perfect usage of śabdās would yield dharma, as was done by Kātyāyana in paspaśa.

In contrast, Cinnaya had had a vast Telugu literature supported by a number of grammatical and literary works before him. Therefore he might have not thought it necessary in the then prevailing circumstances to go into the details as Nannaya did.

So far as the enumeration of kaḷas and drutaprakṛtikas is concerned, Nannaya and Cinnaya travelled in opposite directions, i.e. the former enlisted kaḷas and left drutaprakṛtikas to implication while the latter defined drutaprakṛtika and left kaḷas to implication.

For Nannaya, Deśya was the language in currency whereas for Cinnaya it was a language that is in usage across Trilingadēśa. Unlike his predecessor the author of Bālavvyākaraṇa was particular about the fitness of certain 'grāmyaśabdās' employed by 'Āryas' and for this he borrowed the concept of 'Ārya' from Mahābhāṣya under the Pāṇinisūtra 'pṛṣṭōdarādīni yathopadiuṣtam'. This tendency reflects the strong feeling Cinnaya had in his mind to place Telugu grammatical tradition on a par with Pāṇiniya tradition. Probably keeping this concept in mind he specifically mentioned the boundaries for dēśya and these are akin to the ones stated by Patanjali for 'Āryāvarta'.

Vāganuśāsana probably wanted to see the sandhiparicchēda as 'niṣēdhamukha' as except 'uttvasandhi' all others are either 'vaikalpika' or 'bahula'. On the other hand, the author of Bālavvyākaraṇa either did not like very much the niṣedhasūtra to be at the outset of the chapter or wanted to follow the order nitya, vikalpa, bahula and said the uttvasandhi, that is nitya, at the beginning. The term 'sandhi' was not explained in Cintāmaṇi and it was Bālavvyākaraṇa took the responsibility of

offering a clear definition of the same that is applicable to Telugu rather than leaving it to readers to workout from the concepts of samhita etc. of Pāṇini, which is cumbersome.

It is generally accepted that due to many reasons language undergoes some changes and Telugu is no exception in this regard. As was already indicated there was limited literature before Nannaya, which can be considered as 'iakṣya' for which he attempted to prepare a lakṣaṇa. During the course of time, i.e. even by the time Atharvaṇa entered the scene, the Telugu language was demanding amendments. Similarly, by the time of Cinnaya, a vast vyākaraṇa treatise was needed for the analysis of Telugu paradigms. (The number of sūtras in Bālavvyākaraṇa is more than double of the number of sūtra in Cintāmaṇi). This kind of situation was clearly visible in the construction of different sūtras and vārtikas. Attvasandhi is vaikalpika according to Nannaya and it is bahula for Cinnaya. In such cases we do not have any other justification for either, except the above explanation. There are more such instances that are already discussed earlier in this work - it is so because one has to follow the dictum - 'prayogaśaranam vyākaraṇam'.

We are at loss in explaining the failure of Vāganuśāsana in making a rule for 'dviruktataḥkārādēśa' for which examples are available in that part of 'Āndhramahābhārata', which was translated by himself.

In the case of 'numāgama' Cinnaya made it 'nugāgama' without any specific reason or result, except for his love to Pāṇinīya. On the other hand actually there is significant contribution by Cinnaya in this regard - Nannaya referred to samāsas only whereas Sūri extended the phenomenon to udantas, strīsamās and pumpūs.

Apart from nugāgama, Sūri composed three sūtras with regard to the position of druta in samāsas.

As has been mentioned in the earlier chapters, Cinnayasūri while composing Bālavyaṅkaraṇa took into consideration the works of other grammarians of post-Nannaya period like Atharvaṇa, Ahobalapati, Appakavi etc. and in most of the cases incorporated their ideas in his sūtras and thus extended the purview of each grammatical application far and wide. The druta in samāsas is an example for such tendency.

Muvarṇakalōpa in cases like nammakīṭa / nammakumīṭa etc. was not touched by either Nannaya or any other grammarian/commentator, and this is an original contribution of Cinnaya.

Unlike Nannaya, Sūri did not say anything about the usage of Sanskrit words or sentences in Telugu, rather hinted that the tendency is prevalent in Telugu literature.

So far as the kriyāparicchēda is concerned, both the grammarians followed Pāṇinīya in different aspects the former catego-

rized the gamut of verbs into three groups and defined them. This roughly corresponds to Pāṇini's grouping of bhvādi, juhotyādi etc. Rather the subsequent grammarians have discovered the idea of continuing with the procedure as, perhaps, it does not in any specific manner benefit the infrastructure of Telugu grammatical system. On the other hand Cinnaya resorted to the pattern of Pāṇini's generation of verbal paradigms. He borrowed the Pāṇini's adhikārasūtra 'dhātoḥ' and instituted various grammatical applications on verbal roots. He also borrowed laṭ, liṭ and lṛṭ from Pāṇini and coined lāṭ, lūṭ and lanī to express kāla (tense) and mood (artha). It is noteworthy that Nannaya did not prefer the lakāras etc. but simply referred to 'laḍartha' and 'lṛḍartha'.

All the kriyas are put under four headings by both the grammarians whereas Cinnaya separately mentioned a group (āśīrādi) that is actually part and parcel of taddharmādi. While Nannaya did not explain concepts like vartamāna, bhūta and bhaviṣyat his counterpart offered explanation following the lines of tārkiḱās and vaiyākaraṇas. Both of them abstained as far as the usage of the term 'kāla' is concerned, except for Nannaya's wording - vartamānakāle in halantaparicchēda. This attitude was probably following Pāṇini where he was constrained to see that lakāras express both kāla as well as artha, as the case may be.

The term taddharma is borrowed from Pāṇini. No lakāra was instituted by Pāṇini in taddharma whereas Nannaya and Sūri stated

taddharma to be expressed by kriya, the only difference being Sūri's contention that it is taddharmādi (i.e. taddharma, āśīḥ, śāpa etc.) rather than taddharma only that is expressed by the verb. Literally the term, in terms of Pāṇinīyan terminology, means bhāva or dhātvartha and the same is applicable here also.

While instituting ikāra in ktvartha, Cinnaya slightly modified Pāṇini's terminology by saying 'samānāśrayambula' instead of 'samānakartṛkayoḥ' and this fact vouches for the keen observation of the behaviour of Telugu verbal paradigms of Sūri.

vāganuśāsana did not say anything about the puruṣas whereas Sūri taking the cue from Pāṇini imposed the puruṣās in different senses which slightly differ from Pāṇini.

By and large, Cinnaya tried to bring more verbs, especially dēśyās and ācchikās that were not covered by Nannaya, under the network he prepared besides offering a more precise and detailed analysis of verbs, while Nannaya stood as the pioneer.

Bibliography

1. Ahobalapanditīyam (kaviśirobhūṣaṇam), Ahobalapati, Āndhra racayitala samghamu, Hyderabad, 1973.
2. Āndhramahābhāratam, Nannaya, Vāviḷḷa Press, Cennapuri, 1964.
3. Āndhravyākaraṇasamhitāsarvasvam, (I, II), Vajjala, Cennapuri, 1951.
4. Āndhravyākaraṇavikāsamu, (I, II) Dr. Amareśam Rajēśvara Śarma, Prācyā Vidyā Pariṣattu, Kāmāreddy, 1973.
5. Āndhravyākaraṇavivēkamu, Dr. Vāraṇāsi Bālakṛṣṇa Ananta Padmanābha Śastri, Savitr̥ Printers, Ēlūru, 1985.
6. Appakaviyavivarāṇamu, vēdula Rāmaśāstri, yōgasādhana, Ālamuru, East Godavari, 1950.
7. Atharvaṇakārikāvaḷi (or) Vikṛtivivēkamu, Atharvaṇa, Vāviḷḷa Press, Cennapuri, 1951.
8. Bālasarasvati, Ēlakūci Bāla Sarasvati, Āndhra Sāhitya Pariṣatprabi, 1932.
9. Bālavvyākaraṇam, Paravastu Cinnaya Sūri, Technical Publishers, Guntur 1983.

10. Bālavvyākaraṇakalpadrumam, M.G.P. Ramachandramūrti, Mukundavanamāla, Khammam, Pingala, Ugādi.
11. Bālavvyākaraṇōdyotamu, Vajjhala Cina Sītārāmasvāmi Śāstri.
12. Bālavvyākaraṇasūktulu (I, II, III) Ambaḍipūḍi Nāga Bhūṣaṇam, Ambaḍipūḍi Lakshmīdēvi Publications, Guntur, 1988.
13. Bālavvyākaraṇavikāsavivēcanamu, Ambaḍipūḍi Nāga Bhūṣaṇam, A. Lakshmīdēvi Publications, Gunturu.
14. Kāśīkhaṇḍamu, Srīnātha, Vāviḷla, Cennapuri, 1969.
15. Kāvyaṇprakāśa, Mammatācārya, Choukhāmba, Vāranāsi, 1926.
16. Laghuvvyākaraṇam, Vedam Venkaṭa Ramana Śāstri, Vāviḷla, 1951.
17. Paribhāṣēndusēkaharaḥ, Nagēsabhaṭṭa, Rastriya Sanskrit Samsthan, New Delhi, 1987.
18. Sāhityadarpaṇam, Visvanātha, Motilāl, Delhi, 1970.
19. Siddhāntakaumudi, Bhaṭṭojidīkṣita, Bālamānorama Press, 1929.
20. Śṛṅgāranaiśadham, Śrīnādhudu, Sarvamkaṣavyākhyā, Vēdamvenkaṭarāyaśāstri, Madras - 1961.