

**Nominal Cases in Danzandagva's Ogtorguin mani –
The Commentary of Jirukhen tolta Compared with
Sanskrit and Dravidian Languages**

**Oyun Erdenebat, Research Scholar
University of Kerala**

Abstract

R. Caldwell published his “Comparative grammar of Dravidian or South Indian family of languages” in 1856. He noted 2 hypotheses “... Dravidian languages occupy a position of their own between the languages of the Indo-European family and those of the Turanian or **Scythian group**”. Caldwell's study has been taken by a number of linguists such as Schrader, Von Hevesy, Burrow, Stephen R Tyler, Jaroslav Vacek, Menges, Uma Maheshwar, etc.

The second hypothesis establishes the relationship between both languages in their infinity. According to Caldwell “the relationship seems to me to be not merely morphological, but in some shape or another, and however it may be accounted for – genealogical”.

This paper introduces the genetic relationship between Dravidian and Mongolic languages with morphological evidence by nominal cases in Danzandagva's “Ogtorguin mani- The commentary of Jirukhen tolta”.

Introduction

The possibility of the genetic relationship between Mongolian and Dravidian was expressed right from Bishop Caldwell (1856). However, serious and consistent efforts of investigation have not come forth except for Vacek (1978, 83, 87, 93, 96, 2004), who has been conducting his work in a cross-linguistic study of formal similarities within the shared semantic fields.¹ The two language families have been considerably well described and have sufficiently good material resources available. However, there are certain discrepancies between the two language families when compared. Mongolic languages are younger in the sense, that the available material does not go back beyond 12th c. A.D. and the reconstructed Proto-Mongolic takes us at the most to another 500 years back while the Dravidian languages have a history of 2000 years and the reconstructed Proto-Dravidian based on the diversity of the Dravidian.

¹ G. Uma Maheshwar Rao Dravidian and Mongolian genetic affinity: The provisional evidence

Therefore, for the research material for further Dravidian and Mongolian genetic affinity, we introduce Ogtorguin mani- the commentary of Jirukhen tolta, one of the literary traditions among Mongolian Traditional Grammarians, which was written in XVI century by the Mongolian monk Danzandagva. The book consists of 3 chapters, 1. Spread of Buddhism in Mongolia, 2. Grammar rules for words and the last one the 5 Elements theory of Sino-Indian way. In the second chapter the main grammar rules including nominal cases are written. In this article we focus on the nominal cases of Ogtorguin mani and compare it with Sanskrit and Malayalam language.

Many scholars in Mongolian linguistics follow the Traditional Indian Grammar, not because the Buddhism has its root in India, or Sanskrit sources brought the knowledge, but apparently they knew the root language of Mongolian language could be in Indus-valley or vice versa in South Asia.

The South Indian languages are grouped under one family called Dravidian by Robert Caldwell² and the major cultivated dialects of this family are Tamil, Malayalam, Telugu, Canarese, Thulu and Kodagu. Malayalam in its spoken form has a very ancient history though its literature is only a "thousand years old" and its grammatical literature is only a century old. The first gleanings of Malayalam grammatical principles are found in the famous Sanskrit work 'Lilatilakam ' of fourteenth century. There has been large-scale importation of Sanskrit vocabulary that testifies to the sophisticated taste of a superior class.

Languages are classified under different types, taking morphology into account. A.R. Raja Raja Varma gives the following classification³

(i) Isolative: In an isolative language, words stand independent and they have no means to show mutual relationship. For example, Chinese.

(ii) Agglutinating: In agglutinating languages, words denoting relationship are juxtaposed, but they can also stand independently. Mongolian, Tamil and Malayalam are said to be agglutinating languages.

(iii) Inflectional: In these languages words showing relationship have lost their independent status and have become pure suffixes attached to content words. Sanskrit is an inflectional language.

(iv) Analytic: In analytic languages, words showing relationship stand independently. English is an example of an analytic language.

Although this classification is useful to describe the morphological system of languages, no language is typical of a class in the sense that the characteristics of different types appear in the same language. According to A.R. Raja Raja Varma, in the process of linguistic change, Malayalam has entered the inflectional phase from being agglutinating type. In other words, Malayalam and Mongolian⁴ exhibit the characteristics of both agglutinating and inflectional types.

² Robert Caldwell A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South Indian Family of Languages (Madras: University of Madras, 1961), p.6.

³ A.R. Raja Raja Varma, op.cit., p.50.

⁴ Ts.Unurbayan. Mongolian Language and historical research. P.38

Nominal Cases in Ogtorguin mani, Sanskrit and Malayalam

According to Danzandagva, there are in Mongolian language 7 nominal cases including vocative case like Sanskrit, Malayalam and Tamil languages. The case names are following, ankh, hoyardugaar, gutgaar, dutguur, tabudugaar, jirugadugaar, doldugaar, duudagch etc. The naming and the main sequences are the same, particularly the explanations of each case remind the Sanskrit, Malayalam or Tamil case definitions. Strictly following the Sanskrit tradition, Malayalam grammarians adopt seven vibhaktis including the suffix less nominative and excluding the vocative case.

The case suffixes and postpositions of Mongolian languages in Ogtorguin mani are taking same positions like the languages aforementioned, even though Sanskrit is inflectional and the other Dravidian main languages are agglutinative.

Now we see the 7 noun cases from Danzandagva's Ogtorguin mani with Sanskrit and Malayalam below.

(i) Ankh/ Prathama/ Nirdhesika: Prathama or nirdhesika is the form of the subject noun and it is the most important element in a sentence. It has no suffix in every 3 languages. The nominal stem itself is used as Ankh, Prathama and Nirdhesika. In Sanskrit and Malayalam, the karta appear in the active voice, the karma in the passive voice, the attribute in the noun and the complement of an intransitive verb in Prathama. In Ogtorguin mani, the first case of other seven cases is the upright case⁵ that marks naming, for example, *burkhang* and *bodisung*, *sireveg* and *bradic*, *mür* and *ür*, *tingri* and *khümün*, *asuria* and *adguus*, *birid* and *tamu*, *ger* and *bagana*. Thus it specifies the *quality* called the first case.

(ii) Khoyardugaar/Dvitlya/ Pratigrahika: Dvitlya or 'Pratigrahika' vibhakti has the suffix ~e and it has the Tamil counterpart 'ai'. Dvitlya is the vibhakti of karma karaka. Karma is the noun to which the result of/action reaches. The object of a transitive verb in the active voice appears in the dvitlya vibhakti: When the object is inanimate, it is not marked by the -e suffix. This is called the unmarked dvitlya. According to A.R.Raja Raja Varma, karmatva is inherent in inanimate and so even without the suffix, the objectivity is evident. In Ogtorguin mani, khoyardugaar/ the second case⁶ expresses the *object's action*.

(iii.) Gutgaar/Tritiya: Tritiya is the instrumental case. A.R.Raja Raja Varma calls tritiya the social vibhakti or samyojika. The 'karana' /instrument and 'karaka'/the agent in the passive voice appear in tritiya vibhakti. Its suffix is '-al'. According to Dr K.Sukumara Pillai, the suffix '-an' is a variant of '-al' .³⁸ The instrumental suffix '-al' is used to express both the 'karana' karaka and the 'karana I karaka. The 'karana' karaka is that which helps the agent as an instrument or tool, and 'karana' karaka is the logical cause. But the suffix '-al' mostly expresses the cause (karana). And the instrumental meaning (karana) is conveyed by the postposition.

⁵The first case- *nominative* case

⁶ The second case- *accusative* case

Mongolian gutgaar case⁷ “...thus is called as the third case, in terms of expressing the *agency*. For the declension of the third case are used in words ending with consonants *-bar*, in words ending with vowels *-yiar* .”

(iv) Dutguur/Caturthi:'caturthi' expresses the sampradana karaka in Sanskrit which is called swami karaka by A.R. Raja Raja Varma. The caturthi case endings are -ul and -kku and they denote the recipient or the beneficiary of the object of the action. A.R. Raja Raja Varma names this case as 'uddhesika' and means the person or thing to whom benefit of the action goes. The fourth case⁸ of Ogtorguin mani, is *burhan-dur mürgümü, guilagchin-dur idegæn üg* etc. Thus is called as the fourth case, that indicates the *act*. The suffixes of this case are –*dur/tur*.

(v) Tabudugaar/Pancami: Pancami is known as sociative vibhakti. Gundart calls pancami as the 'sahitya vibhakti' and it is followed by the postpositions *iasi(as)/-bhyām /-bhyas*. The fifth case⁹ is for instance *nigülesehüi-eche ülemji sedhil törühü, dorun-a-acha naran urgahu, šiltagan-acha ür-e törühü* etc. Thus is called as the fifth case that indicates the *reasons* from where it comes.

(vi) Jirgugadugaar/Sasti: Sasti vibhakti or the genitive is not associated with verbs and therefore, it does not imply a karaka relationship. The dependence of sasti is to a noun and so the meaning is adjectival. Sasti expresses hosts of relationships. The following are some of the important relationships expressed by sasti. The sixth case is for instance *burhan-u guchin hoyar lagšin, nayan sayin nayirag hüigeed, ayiladhu-yin orun ba yabahu-yin odulga hüigeed* etc. Thus is called as the sixth case, that it expresses the *linking of meaning*.

(vii) Doldugaar/ Saptami: Saptami vibhakti expresses the adhikarana karaka and it denotes the location where the action takes place. The suffix is '-iI' or '-kal'. The suffix '-iI' is derived from the word 'illam' which means a place or house in Tamil. The seventh case goes like *burhan-a ayiladhu örüşiyehü bui, burhan dur nöhör bui*. Thus is called as the seventh case which defines the *location*.

(viii) Duudagch/ Sambodhana (vocative): Although sambodhana appears in the list of traditional cases, it does not denote any intra-sentential relationship. This is a form of address. When the noun is addressed appears in the sambodhana vibhakti, the final vowel of the nouns is made long as a, e, obtain the sambodhana form. The third chapter is about 8 cases including *duudagch*¹⁰ which identifies a person being addressed like ay-a höbegün or *oo teyin bögesü* .

In the chart given below we show the nominal cases in Danzandagva`s Ogtorguin mani, Sanskrit and Malayalam with suffixes in each language. The naming of nominal cases in each language follows the tradition of Sanskrit grammar; there are some differences in Written Mongol that Danzandagva put Locative case to the Accusative case. According to the charts in Janhunens classification the accusative case was arranged to the genitive case. The accusative case is not available in Ogtorguin mani. By Danzandagva`s classification, the third and the sixth cases are interchanged.

⁷The third case- ablative case /instrumental case

⁸The fourth case- *dative*

⁹The fifth case- *genitive*

¹⁰ Duudagch- *vocative case*

The suffixes of Sanskrit are classified into 3 genders that decline into their genders like singular, dual and plural, that is not observed in Written Mongol. Basically the gender in Written Mongol has 3 types feminine or weak vowels, masculine or strong vowels and the neutral vowel. Also there is another rule in Written Mongol the words are classified into two parts according to their last consonant: weak consonant and strong consonant which are not available in Sanskrit.

Written Mongol	Postpositions/Suffixes- weak Cons/strong Cons/Vowel/Mask/Fem	Sanskrit	Suffixes- Sin/Dual/Pl	Malayalam	Suffixes
<i>Ankh/Nominative</i>		<i>prathamā,</i>	<i>-su(s)-au/-jas (as)</i>	nirdhesika	---
<i>Hoyardugaar/Locative</i>	<i>a,/e,</i>	<i>dviṭyā,</i>	<i>am/-auṭ/(au)/-śas(as)</i>	Pratigrahika	-e
<i>Gutgaar/Instrumental</i>	<i>-ber,-iyer</i>	<i>tṛṭyā</i>	<i>tā(ā)/-bhyām/-bhis</i>	samyojika	-out
<i>Dutguur/Dative</i>	<i>-tur,-dur</i>	<i>caturthī</i>	<i>-ṛe(e)/-bhyām/-bhyas</i>	uddhesika	-kku/-u
<i>Tabudugaar/Ablative</i>	<i>-ach,-eche</i>	<i>pañcamī</i>	<i>-ṛasi(as)/-bhyām/-bhyas</i>	prayojika	-al
<i>Jirugadugaar/Accusative/Genitive</i>	<i>un/ün, -u/ü</i>	<i>ṣaṣṭhī</i>	<i>-ṛias(as)/-os/-ām</i>	sambandhika	-ute
<i>Doldugaar/Comitative</i>	<i>luga/lüge</i>	<i>saptamī,-</i>	<i>-ṛi/-os/-sup</i>	adharika	-il/-kal
<i>Duudagch/Vocative</i>	<i>ai-a,-oo</i>	<i>sambodhanapramā</i>	<i>-su(s)/-au/-jas</i>		

Conclusion

The basic morphological system of Written Mongol is remarkably close to Proto-Mongolic. In the nominal sphere, relevant categories are number and case as well. The Written Mongol is first defined in Danzandagva's 'Ogtorguin mani- The Commentary of Jirukhen tolta' morphologically. In this paper we try to compare the first linguistic sources of nominal cases in Ogtorguin mani with Sanskrit and Malayalam.

References

1. Caldwell R. 1856, *Comparative grammar of Dravidian or South Indian family of languages*,
2. Vacek, Yaroslav, 1996, *Dravidian and Mongolian: Summary of results*, Praha
3. Uma Maheshwar Rao G., 2014, *Dravidian and Mongolian genetic affinity: The provisional evidence*, *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics*
4. Uma Maheshwar Rao G., *Critical Evidence for the Genetic Relationship of Mongolic and Dravidian Languages*
5. Raja Raja Varma. 1999, *Keralam Paaniniyam*, International School of Dravidian Linguistics, Trivandrum, Kerala
6. Ts. Unurbayan. 2003, *Mongolian Language and historical research*. Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia

Oyun Erdenebat
Research Scholars
University of Kerala
oyunubis@gmail.com

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 19:1 January 2019

Oyun Erdenebat, Research Scholar

Nominal Cases in Danzandagva's Ogtorguin mani – The Commentary of Jirukhen tolta Compared with Sanskrit and Dravidian Languages