STUDIES
IN
DRAVIDIAN PHILOLOGY.

STUDIES
IN
DRAVIDIAN PHILOLOGY

BY

KORADA RAMAKRISHNAIAH, M. A.,

Senior Lecturer in Telugu, Oriental Research Institute,

University of Madras.

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS.

1935

PRINTED AT THE ANANDA PRESS, MADRAS.

PREFACE.

Unlike the Indo-European Philology, Dravidian Philology is yet a field very little cultivated. Though Rev. Dr. Caldwell by his epoch-making Comparative Dravidian Grammar has laid the foundations of Dravidian Philology, about the middle of the 19th century, very few attempts have since been made to raise the superstructure. His work supplies us with a comparative estimate of the grammatical facts of the South Indian languages, with a special application to Tamil, but the history of the growth and individual development of these languages from their common mother tongue, the primitive Dravidian, has yet to be traced and worked out.

This work proposes to carry on the comparative study of the Dravidian Languages from where Dr. Caldwell has left it. With the help of his findings, and other facts of linguistic phenomena supplied by the descriptive grammars in these languages, an investigation into the nature and development of the Dravidian inflexion has been attempted here. This, supplemented by a study of the common root material, has led to the formulation of the theory of root-agglutination by applying which one can trace the line of development of the individual languages of this group, from the primitive root stage, to their present semi-inflexional condition.

In this connection I have to express my grateful thanks to Mr. K. N. Sivaraja Pillai, B. A., Senior Lecturer in Tamil, O. R. Institute, and Mr. U. Subbaraya Bhat, M. A., Principal, Maharajah's College, Vizianagram, for the valuable suggestions they have

offered me. I acknowledge also with thanks the assistance rendered by Mr. N. Kuppuswamy Iyengar, B.A., Clerk, O. R. Institute, in preparing the Index. I thank the University authorities for having sanctioned the publication of this work.

O. R. INSTITUTE,
LIMBDI GARDENS, ROYAPETTAH,
Madras, 24th January 1935.

K. RAMAKRISHNAIAH

CONTENTS.

	Pages.
Part I	
The Dravidian Problem	1— 50
Part II	
The Verbal Inflexion	51— 80
Part III	
The Nominal Inflexion	81—106
Part IV	
Derivatives	107—131
Appendix	133—179
Index	181—185

CONTENTS.

I. The Dravidian Problem.

		Page.
1.	Language and its history	1
2.	Theories about the Dravidian Languages ...	2
3.	Grammar as the true test of relationship ...	4
4.	Origin of the Prākrits	8
5.	Non-Aryan element grows as we go East and South	13
6.	Nature of the Aryan migration to the South	15
7.	Telugu more exposed to the Aryan influence than other languages of the South ...	19
8.	Andhras and their migration to the South...	20
9.	Condition of the Telugu in the early centuries of the Christian era	21
10.	The Non-Aryan element in the North Indian Vernaculars	23
11.	The Non-Aryan element identified with the Dravidian	29
12.	Indian grammarians' opinion of these Vernaculars as 'Vikritis.'	36
13.	Basic root-material of the Dravidian languages and its characteristics	43
14.	Nature of the Primitive Dravidian speech ...	48

CONTENTS

II. The Verbal Inflexion.

		Page
15.	Origin of the stem-forming suffixes ...	51
16.	Grammarians' treatment of the forms in *gu*	54
17.	The sign of past tense	57
18.	Dr. Caldwell's treatment of the past forms.	59
19.	The past relative participle	64
20.	Future forms and their formation ...	67
21.	Formation of the present	71
22.	Kanarese present in *dapa*	72
23.	The principle of root agglutination applied to other forms of verbal expression ...	76

III. The Nominal Inflexion.

24.	Declensional terminations are independent words	81
25.	Attributive nature of the Dravidian sentence	82
26.	*in* the sign of the locative, genitive, possessive as an inflexional increment ...	84
27.	The Dative and the accusative—the origin of their case signs	85
28.	The Accusative sign *nu*	87
29.	Nominative is no case in these languages ...	88
30.	Tamil grammarians view of the Nominative case	91
31.	*mu, vu,* of the Telugu	92
32.	The origin of the Telugu Nominative *ḍu* ...	95
33.	*lu,* a sign of plurality	99

PAGE

34. Various means adopted to express the attributive relation of words in a sentence ... 101

35. The Principle of root-agglutination applicable to all Dravidian Languages ... 104

IV. DERIVATIVES.

36. Roots as nouns 107

37. Nouns with a slight change in the root ... 109

38. The final vowel of the Derivatives ... 111

39. Derivative nouns from secondary bases ... 115

40. Abstract nouns in *pu* 120

41. Abstract nouns in *mi*, *paḍi*, *ka*, *vi*, *gaḍa*, *tana* 123

42. Common Dravidian Noun-forming suffixes... 128

43. Conclusion 130

STUDIES IN DRAVIDIAN PHILOLOGY.

I

THE DRAVIDIAN PROBLEM.

Language and its History.

1. A study of the antiquities and origin of things carries with it as much interest as a study of current affairs, since the human mind always looks back into the past for inspiration and guidance in its onward march of expansion and development in the future. To find unity in diversity being the object of Science it always tries to connect the past with the present and by observation and classification of the facts of Nature traces the process of evolution of things present from things past. The Science of Language applies the same principle of evolution to all linguistic phenomena and by collecting, comparing, and scrutinising their facts tries to trace their origin and lines of development. "The distinctive feature of the Science of Language, as conceived nowadays", says Otto Jespersen in the preface to his work *Language, its Nature and Development*, "is its historical character; a language or a word is no longer taken as something given once for all, but as a result of previous development, and at the same time as a starting point for subsequent development." The Science of Language is always faced by and has to find an answer to, a very prominent question "Why do we speak as we now do?" To answer this question it has to take into consideration all the facts supplied by each and every language spoken on the face of the earth, and with their help try to trace the development

of these languages through the different periods of their growth and if possible also to find out their common original source or sources. We, the people of South India, too have to face and answer the question 'Why do we speak such a variety of languages as we now do?' This question naturally prompts us to make an investigation into the origin and development of the Dravidian group of languages spoken in Southern India. An attempt is herein made to trace the history of this group of languages with special reference to Telugu and to find out the lines of its growth in its relation to other prominent languages of Southern India, and gain thereby a better knowledge of its primitive structure and distinctive character.

Theories about the Dravidian Languages.

2. Several theories have been brought forward regarding the origin and development of Telugu as also of other South Indian Languages. Dr. Caldwell, in his *Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages* claimed for these languages independence from Sanskrit and other tongues belonging to the Indo-European family, and affinity with those belonging to the Scythian Group. But he seemed to think that people speaking these two groups of languages might have come into close contact with each other at a very remote period in the history of mankind.* "The theory I advocate," says Dr. Caldwell "takes account of both sets of

* It is probable that the wide grass-lands of Eurasia were shared by primitive tribes, both Indo-European and Ural-Altaic (Altaic and Finno-Ugrian) in speech, and that there was some amount of intermingling among them. The connection between the Indo-European and Finno-Ugrian Languages, as advocated by Henry Sweet (*History of Language*, London, 1900, Chap. VII) might be a genetic one, and it may yet be proved that the Indo-European and Finno-Ugrian speeches have a common origin in the language of the pre-historic dwellers of the Eurasian plains. *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language* by Suniti Kumar Chatterjee p. 23.

relationships—the Scythian and Indo-European—though it regards the former, on the whole, closer and more essential. With regard to Celtic affinities in particular, it is to be remembered that of all members of the Indo-European family the Celtic is that which appears to have most in common with the Scythian group, and especially with the languages of the Finnish family—languages which may possibly have been widely spoken in Europe previous to the arrival of the Celts. It will be necessary, therefore, in each case to inquire whether the Celtic affinity may not also be a Scythian affinity. If, therefore, the Dravidian Languages may be classified as essentially and in the main Scythian, I must add that I consider them as, of all Scythian tongues, those which present the most numerous, ancient, and interesting analogies to the Indo-European Languages. The position which this family occupies seems to me to lie on that side of the Scythian group in which the Indo-European appears to have been severed from it, and on which the most distinct traces of the original identity of the families still remain. If this view be correct, the Indo-Europeanisms discoverable in the Dravidian Languages carry us back to a period beyond all history, beyond all mythology, not only prior to the separation of the western branches of the Indo-European race from the eastern, but prior also to the separation of the yet undivided Indo-European race from that portion of the common stock which was afterwards styled Scythian."

Some eminent Dravidian scholars, like Dr. Pope, while agreeing in the main with Dr. Caldwell, think that the remarkable analogies between the Celtic and the Dravidian Languages merit a more thorough investigation, and thus seem to consider the latter to be, for the most part, Indo-European. Others, there are, who

seem to be of opinion that the Languages of South India form a group by themselves, and follow an altogether independent line of development. * But the Indian grammarians, (especially of Telugu), while maintaining that this language is a 'Vikriti' † *i. e.*, one derived either from Sanskrit or Prakrit or both, admit that there is a large amount of indigenous element in it, and frame special rules or even add a chapter in their grammars to explain the formation of these indigenous forms of grammatical expression. Again, while some modern scholars maintain that these languages (especially Telugu) are not derived directly from Sanskrit or Vedic, but only from some popular form of language coeval with either of these, others hold that Telugu is Dravidian in its origin and Sanskritic in its present form. ‡

Grammar as the true test of relationship.

3. It seems to be, anyhow, a matter of common agreement among the linguists, that a language is said to belong to one family or another, or to have been derived from this language or that, only when there is perfect agreement between the

* With regard to the Dravidian Languages the attempt to connect them with other linguistic families outside India is now generally recognised as a failure, and we must still consider them as an isolated family. The attempts made to show a closer connection with the Indo-European family have proved just as futile. *Linguistic Survey of India* by Grierson Vol. IV p. 282.

† "Ādyahprakrith Prakritihs chādyē
ēshā tayōr bhavēth *vikritih*
tajjā samā cha *dēsyā*
grāmyā chēyam chatur vidhā bhavati." (*Āndhrasabdachintāmaṇi.*)

Talli Samskritambe yella bhāshalakunu
dāna nuṇḍi konta gānabaḍiye. (*Āndhrabhāshābhūshaṇamu.*)

Āndhra bhāsha Vikriti
Tatsama Tadbhava vyatiriktam bagu bhāsha acchayanambadu.
(*Bālavyākaraṇamu.*)

‡ *History of Telugu Literature,* Heritage of India Series by Chenchaiah and Bhujanga Rao.

languages compared in the matter of root-material and grammatical forms, and that no amount of word-material borrowed by one language from another can convert the former to the family of the latter. * So, there can be no meaning in saying that a language belongs to one family by its origin, and to a distinctly different one by its growth, unless it is shown that the former also is an offshoot of the latter, in which case again, we can talk of both as belonging to only one family. We talk of different families of languages on account of the difference in distinctive characteristics, and in the forms and methods of thought and expression displayed by a certain group of languages, as against others, just as we divide humanity, out of convention and for the sake of convenience, and talk of races and families, according to their geographical position and special characteristics of life exhibited by them. Yet at the same time we cannot be unmindful of the original unity of the whole human race, as also of the ultimate unity of all the forms of expression used by the various divisions of mankind to communicate their thoughts to one another. † If the Dravidian and the Aryan can be recognised as two distinct families of languages, we can understand Telugu or Kanarese as originally belonging to one family and enriching itself by borrowing a lot of word-material from a language of another family like the Sanskrit. If, on the other hand, it is to be maintained that there is nothing like a distinct Dravidian family of

* A language can adopt and create as many words as it pleases without changing its character, but it cannot alter its grammar, its syntax, without becoming another ; for grammar represents the innate mode of thought over which the individual person or nation has no real control. *On the Classification of Languages* by Gustave Oppert p. 17.

† Linguistics is a subject of absorbing interest. The Science of Linguistics has taught me the essential unity of humanity.——Dr. Tareporevala in his presidential address to the Linguistic Society of India, 1931.

languages and that all the languages spoken in Southern India are nothing but corrupt and disintegrated forms of Sanskrit or Prakrit, * then most of the grammatical forms common to all these languages and not merely the transformations found in one particular language of that group, should be shown to have been derived from Sanskrit or from some form of the Prakrit. Indian grammarians, who declare that Telugu is a 'Vikriti' of Sanskrit, must be said to have only skipped on the surface, because they dealt only with the word-material of the language and tried to derive a portion of it from Sanskrit or Prakrit, leaving the root-material and the comparison of the fundamental grammatical forms and methods quite unnoticed. They had to admit that even in the limited portion of the word-material they handled, there is a fairly large residue which cannot be derived either from Sanskrit or Prakrit. They called it 'Desya,' *i. e.*, belonging to the country in which Telugu is spoken.

Not only this, even the grammarians † of the North Indian Prakrits dividing the words into Tatsama Tadbhava and Desya had to admit that there is some indigenous element in that group of languages ‡ also—

* cf. *Dravidian Philology* by Dr. C. Narayana Rao.

† cf. *Desinamamala* by Hemachandra.

‡ There are, in all Indo-Aryan languages, a considerable number of words which cannot apparently be identified in other Indo-European languages. This is especially the case in modern vernaculars, and the old opinion was that such words had, generally speaking, been borrowed from the language of the tribes which inhabited India before the Aryan invasion. The steady progress of philological studies in later years has enabled us to retrace an ever-increasing portion of such words to Sanskrit, and many scholars now hold that there have hardly been any loans at all. It has however been overlooked that it is not sufficient to show that a word is found in Sanskrit, or even in the Vedic dialects, in order to prove that it belonged to the original language of the Aryans. The foreign element must reach back into the oldest times, and it would be necessary to trace the dubious words not only in Sanskrit, but also in other languages of the Indo-European family. That is exactly what modern Philology has, in many cases, failed to do. There are *e.g.*, a number of verbal roots in Sanskrit which

languages whose relationship with the Aryan is not at all questioned. Attempts have also been made to identify this indigenous element in the North Indian languages with the Dravidian element of the South. The very fact that the old Indian grammarians who were sound scholars of Sanskrit, and as such followed the model of Sanskrit grammar in their analysis of the vernacular languages of India, could not trace everything that they found in these vernaculars to Sanskrit or Aryan sources, but had to set apart a portion as indigenous element in them, goes to prove that even those Aryan languages which were in a way super-imposed on the native tongues of India, were not left unaffected by them. These latter also in themselves seem to have undergone different kinds of development according to their geographical distribution and the nature of the contact they had with the Aryan language of superior culture. To deny the existence of any kind of foreign element in the North Indian vernaculars is tantamount to saying that either there were no people inhabiting the country when the Aryans entered India and consequently no language was spoken in the land at that time, or that there were only a few uncivilised hill tribes inhabiting the country who ran away at the sight of the incoming Aryans without coming into any kind of contact with them. Such a position does not deserve any serious consideration. It goes against all the available evidence, literary, historical, ethnological, etc., and specially runs counter to the archaeological evidence furnished by the recent excavations of the

do not appear to occur in other Indo-European forms of speech. The same is the case with a considerable portion of vocabulary. There is, however, every probability for the supposition that at least a considerable portion of such words and bases has been borrowed from the Dravidians. *Linguistic Survey of India* by Grierson Vol. IV p. 278-279. cf. *The Chronology of the Early Tamils* by K. N. Sivaraja Pillai p. 123.

Sindh valley at Mohenjo-daro and Harappā. These go to prove not only the existence of a highly civilised people inhabiting the land some thousands of years before the advent of the Aryans into India, but also the identity of their civilisation with that of the Dravidians. *

Origin of the Prakrits.

4. If the theory of Aryan migration into India and of Aryan conquest is accepted, we have to take it as quite likely that the Aryan tribes on their onward march came into contact, even on the borders of the Iranian land, with some non-Aryan tribes, not excluding the Dravidians who differed from them in race, speech, and culture, unless it is presumed that the country was a very thinly populated one, and that the few people that inhabited the country gave an easy way to the incoming Aryans—a presumption which seems to be quite against the evidence furnished by even the Vedic

* The Aryans began to pour into India about the middle of the third millennium B. C. The recent finds of the Archaeological Department at Mohenjo-daro and Harappā prove the existence of a civilization in the Punjab and Sindh, which was not Aryan in its characteristics, but allied to the Sumerian of about 3,000 B. C. It has been suggested from a comparison of their physical types, burial customs, and matriarchal systems that the Sumerians belonged to the Dravidian stock, and it is quite reasonable to believe that in the early part of the third millennium B. C. the Aryans had not come and driven away the Dravidians from the Punjab. *Aryanisation of India* by N. K. Dutt, Calcutta, 1925.

Never for a moment was it imagined that five thousand years ago, before ever the Aryans were heard of, the Punjab and Sindh, if not other parts of India as well, were enjoying an advanced, and singularly uniform civilization of their own. Yet this is what the discoveries at Harappā, and Mohenjo-daro have now placed beyond question. They exhibit the Indus peoples of the fourth and third mellenia B.C. in possession of a highly developed culture in which no vestige of Indo-Aryan influence is to be found. . . . Their society is organised in cities; their wealth derived mainly from agriculture and trade, which appears to have extended far and wide in all directions. Their religion is so characteristically Indian as hardly to be distinguishable from still living Hinduism or at least from that aspect of it which is bound up with animism, and the cults of Siva and Mother Goddess still the two most potent forces in popular worship. Preface to *Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization* by Sir John Marshall.

Hymns.* Here we find that the occupation of the country had not been an easy task for them, and we see clear indications as to how those Aryans had to gain their way inch by inch from the original inhabitants, who offered a strong resistance at every step. At the beginning they drove these away from their original homes by their own superior physical strength and later on took them into their fold imposing their language and culture on them. Thus, in North India, the original inhabitants, including the Dravidian tribes, which at one time "seem to have spread over the whole of Northern India from Beluchistan to Bengal", † had succumbed to the irresistible power of the Aryans, but not without leaving their marks on the language and culture of the conquering race. It is to the close

* The theory of Aryan migration is borne out by the general outlook upon life as presented by the Vedic poems, which is that of a warlike and conquering people establishing themselves in a country previously inhabited by another people, by the character of the Vedic speech which in its habits differentiates itself from later forms of Indo-Aryan, and associates itself with Greek and others in preserving a Indo-European structure, and by totally different forms of culture and ideas presented by Rig Veda on the one hand, and the oldest Tamil poems on the other—poems which represent the Dravidian spirit in its purest and most ancient form. *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*, p. 29.

Hitherto it has commonly been supposed that the pre-Aryan peoples of India were on an altogether lower plane of civilization than their Aryan conquerors. The picture of them gleaned from the Hymns of the Rig Veda was that of black-skinned, flat-nosed barbarians, though at the same time it was evident that they must have been rich in cattle, good fighters and possessed of many forts in which they defended themselves against the invaders. Preface to *Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization.*

† cf. *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*, p. 28.

The Indus language or languages must have been pre-Aryan also. This, for three reasons, seems a most likely conjecture—first, because Dravidic-speaking people were precursors of the Aryans over most of Northern India, and were the only people likely to have been in possession of a culture as advanced as the Indus culture; secondly, because on the other side of the Kirthar Range and at no great distance from the Indus Valley the Brahuis of Beluchistan have preserved among themselves an island of Dravidic speech, which may well be a relic from pre-Aryan times, when Dravidic was perhaps the common language of these parts; thirdly, because the Dravidian language being agglutinative, it is not unreasonable to look for a possible connection between them and the

intermingling * of these Aryan and non-Aryan tribes in Northern India, speaking different languages and having different cultures of their own, that we have to trace the origin of the Prakrits as well as the civilization of ancient India.

When the original inhabitants of Northern India entered the Aryan fold and got mixed up with them they had naturally to adopt the language of the conquering race, and in so doing they subjected the sounds of the Aryan tongue to various kinds of modifications suited to their own vocal tendencies and habits of speech. † Such adaptation of the Aryan speech by the non-Aryan population of the country greatly tended to corrupt that speech in such a way as to give rise to what are called the popular languages or Prakrits, as opposed to the language of the cultured, represented by the Vedic dialect and Sanskrit.

Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar accounts for the characteristic features of the Prakrits in the following manner. "Elision seems to be a distinguishing characteristic which strikes one very forcibly on reading a Prakrit passage. It is too regular, systematic, and far-reaching to have been the product of a long course of softening. If this general mutilation of words was brought about by a natural decay, we must suppose the process to

agglutinative language of Sumer in the Indus valley. *Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization* Vol. I, p. 42.

* The Aryan population of Northern India is not, therefore, a pure race, but contains, among others, a strong Dravidian element. *Linguistic Survey of India*, by Grierson Vol. IV, p. 278.

† As for the causes of the changes that may be styled Prakritic, Prof. Woolner says, 'Economy of effort, progressive refinement, especially in courts and cities, softening influence of a semi-tropical climate, *influence of the speech habits of non-Aryan peoples who adopted the Aryan speech*, all these may have been at work.' *Introduction to Prakrit*, p. 10.

have gone on for a great many centuries. The Prakrit vocables that have descended to the modern vernaculars have not, since the period when the Prakrits arose about fourteen centuries ago, suffered so much as the Sanskrit words in passing into Prakrits. The elision of consonants on a large scale in the Prakrits is, therefore, to be accounted for in another way than by attributing it to a natural process of decay. The Prakrit words must be taken to represent the pronunciation of the corresponding Sanskrit words by an alien race. The vocal organs of the people of that race were unused to the utterance of Sanskrit sounds, and in this respect, they were in the condition of children, making their first attempt at articulate speech, and elided uninitial consonantal sounds and assimilated conjunct consonants as these do. When a child or a barbarous foreigner listens to an elderly or more civilized person he has not the patience to attend to all the sounds composing a word and to reproduce them carefully. The first letter alone makes a strong impression on the ear, and this he faithfully reproduces, and as to the rest, he realizes their quantity by pronouncing the vowels, but his tongue being untrained, the peculiar movements necessary for uttering the consonantal sounds he cannot go through and avoids. The assimilation of conjuncts and other peculiarities in the Pali dialect, and the elision in the Prakrits, must be accounted for in that way." *

"If this supposition is correct, we must find other traces of the peculiarities of this alien race. And such we do find. The existence of the short e and o in the Pali, and the predilection the people showed for them as well as the change of dentals to cerebrals without any

* Wilson's Philological Lectures, by Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar, *Collected Works*. Vol. IV, pp. 336-37.

influencing cause are to be attributed to the natural vocal tendencies of the people. These sounds must have existed and played an important part in the original language of the people, so that they were unable to shake them off entirely, even when they left their own tongue and learned that of the more civilized Aryans with whom they came to be closely incorporated. If the original Pali speakers belonged to the same race as the Dravidians of Southern India of the present day, we have a reason to believe that their native tongue contained them; for they exist in the Dravidian languages and are very characteristic of them." *

The contact of the Aryans with the non-Aryan population of India not only affected their language and gave rise to a new set of popular languages called Prakrits, but had even left a lasting effect on their religion and culture bringing these nearer to what we call 'Hinduism' of the present day as distinguished from the Vedic religion and culture. "The result of the contact between the speakers of the highly inflectional and complicated Aryan and those of the comparatively regular agglutinative Kol and Dravidian, when the latter took to speaking the languages of the former, we see in the later history of the Aryan speech in India, in the process of its formation to the N. I. A. Languages. The whole system of the Vedic, with its highly inflexional character, has been simplified to that of the modern vernaculars, and this simplification has been carried out to a great extent along the lines of the Dravidian. Even as early as the Vedic period, when the thoughts and notions, the social institutions and mental outlook of the Aryans in India, in fact, their culture as a whole, had

* *ibid.* p. 293.

many more things in common with the primitive Hellenes, Italians, Germans, and Slavs, than with their descendants, the later Hindus of Northern India—at a time when characteristic Hindu ideas did not develop among them, the Dravidian cults and Dravidian language had begun to influence their religion and their speech. No trace of the doctrine of Transmigration is found in the Rig Veda, and yet no other doctrine is so peculiarly Indian. It may have had its origin in non-Aryan animism, but became established among the Aryans quite early. Some of the cosmic notions seem to be Dravidian; Dravidian Gods were being added to the Aryan pantheon, thus a new and composite creation resulted gradually from this sort of union. The language of the Rig Veda is, as yet, purely Aryan or Indo-European in its form, structure and spirit, but its phonetics is already affected by the Dravidian, and it has already begun to borrow words from Dravidian and Kol." *

Non-Aryan element grows as we go East and South.

5. The Prakritic nature of these popular languages differed in different localities of the country in proportion to the closeness of contact and the strength of the intermingling of the people of these two races. "Among the various old Indo-Aryan dialects, those of the tribes of the West, contiguous to Iranian, might show points of agreement with the latter; and those of the East might reasonably be expected to have come more and more under the influence of the non-Aryan languages, as they

* Among words of probable Dravidian origin in the Rig Veda, the following may be noted:—aṇu—particle; araṇi—rubbing wood for fire; kapi—monkey; karmāra—smith; kāla—time; kuṭa—hut; kuṇḍa—hole; gaṇa—band; nānā—several; nīla—blue; pushpa—flower; pūjana—worship; phala—fruit; bīja—seed; mayūra—peafowl; rātri—night; rūpa—form. *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*, p. 42.

penetrated deeper and deeper into the heart of India. As an increasingly large non-Aryan population adopted the Aryan speech, we may expect changes creeping into it, and its words and forms to be modified, to suit the ways of the people that adopted it. Thus as we go further and further towards the East from Gandhara, which was the original stronghold of the Vedic Aryans, we find the differences in dialect growing greater and greater through the Prakritic tendencies developing in the eastern dialects.

"As the language of the people began to deviate more and more from that of literature, the language of the Sis̱tās or the cultured people came to be systematised, and after a time attained the sanctity of being called 'Dēvabhāsha' or the speech of the Gods. But this again is not free from the influence of the vernaculars. Prakrit roots and forms were ever on the increase in Sanskrit, and occasionally words from Dravidian and Kol which were first adopted in the vernaculars crept into it. Its syntax gradually came to be based on the Prakrit vernaculars, and like the latter, it began to disregard gradually the old Indo-Aryan inflected past forms of the verb, ultimately relying almost entirely on participles." *

Thus it is clear that the Aryan tribes as well as their language began to be affected by the native tribes and their language from the time of the Vedic period, or perhaps even from the Iranian period, for it is here that we first notice the beginnings of a change in the development of these languages, a change not found in any other tongues of that family and that, as they gradually pushed their way into the interior from the Gandhara or the North-Western country

* *ibid* p. 42.

towards the East and South, their contact with the original inhabitants became closer, and the effect on their languages grew deeper and stronger. As a result of this, we find more and more of non-Aryan element appearing in the North Indian Vernaculars as we go towards the East and South—Bengali on the eastern side and Maharashtra in the South showing more points of resemblance with the languages of South India than the Prakritic dialects or vernaculars spoken further North and north-west.

Nature of the Aryan Migration to the South.

6. In the North it was a case of conquest and occupation of the country by the Aryans who came and settled in large numbers subjugating the original inhabitants of the land. In the South it happened to be a case of peaceful migration and settlement among the natives of the soil. The conquest of the country south of the Vindhyas by the Aryans was more a cultural than a military one. These ranges of mountains and the impenetrable forest of Dandaka proving to be a strong barrier to their onward march, they were contented to make Aryavarta their home for the time being and began to effect a peaceful and gradual migration to the South which remained practically independent under its own Dravidian rulers. The population of the soil was not disturbed, for they came and settled here in smaller numbers and chose to live peacefully among the original inhabitants whom they won over by propagating their Aryan religion. This is the reason why the languages of South India stand on an altogether different footing from those of the North. Here, neither the people nor the languages of the soil were subjected to powerful influence as in the North. The Southerners held their own and allowed

the Aryans to settle peacefully amongst them. Since these settlers, who came only in smaller numbers, could not think of imposing their language or culture on a large population speaking their own tongue, and having a culture of their own, they thought it best to meet these people more agreeably. Accordingly, they began to study the language of the country in which they came to settle and interpret the Aryan religion and culture in the language of the people. As they were faced with a foreign language, which they had to master before they could interpret anything of their religion and culture to the people of the country, the first thing they had to do was, to analyse the language and frame rules of grammar according to the grammatical principles of their own language the Sanskrit, just like the early Christian missionaries, who adopted the same plan of preparing grammars of vernacular languages in English and also of simple readers in vernaculars, for the use of their own countrymen who came in their wake and worked here as the propagators of Christian religion among the masses. This had a very great appeal. Those early Aryans were hailed as the first grammarians, first poets and first writers in the language, and the earlier indigenous poets and writers were all overshadowed by them and altogether forgotten in course of time. Thus we can now understand why the first grammarians of the vernaculars in South India happened to be Aryan sages like Agastya and Kanva or other propagandists of Jaina or Brahmana faiths like Tolkappiyanar or Nannaya Bhatta, and also why some of the earliest grammars of these vernaculars came to be written not in the vernacular itself but in Sanskrit, the language of the religious propagandists. Though the earliest grammars in Tamil were written in the language of the country, those of Kanarese and

Telugu, like the *Karnātabhāshābhūshaṇa*, the *Āndhra-sabdachintāmaṇi* and Karikas of Adharvana, were written in Sanskrit—a clear indication of the strong influence which Sanskrit and Sanskritists came to wield already on these languages. When once these languages were subjected to a grammatical analysis made in accordance with the principles of Sanskrit grammar, the line of their natural development came to be deflected, and gradually each language as well as its literature began to move in a line of independent development according to the strength of the influence exerted by Sanskrit.

Of course this influence varied with the different languages of the South, according to their geographical position in the country and the nature of the contact, those in the southernmost corner having been comparatively less affected than those on the North. * That is why the Aryan element appears in these languages in

* In the Deccan there are three shades of Aryan permeation. In the first place are the Maharashtra country and Berar. They were conquered, and Indo-Aryan ruling families, chiefly of the Yadu tribe, settled there, imposing their tongue and creed upon the mass of Dravidian population, who had been already conquered by Brachycephalic tribes probably from Iran. In the second place comes the Telugu speaking or the Andhra country. This land did not long remain under the Aryan rule, but being exposed to Aryan influences from two sides, Berar and Kalinga, became aryanised not only in creed, but also to a certain extent in language. The bulk of the population is almost pure Dravidian but the language has about a third of its vocabulary derived from Aryan roots. Most of the borrowed words relate to abstract or scientific and religious terms, which supports the tradition of missionary work of the Brahmin sages. That the contact was slight is proved by the fact that the words relating to common-place things and ideas are mostly Dravidian, and that the grammatical rules are entirely different from those of Sanskrit, and this in spite of the fact that "when an Aryan tongue comes into contact with an uncivilized aboriginal one, it is invariably the latter which goes to the wall," (Grierson), a fact which is amply corroborated by the cases of imperfectly aryanised Bengal, Assam, and Maharashtra. Still more free from Aryan influence is the Tamil country. Even as late as the times of the Mauryas the ordinary religion of the Tamilians was a form of demon-worship, and Brahmanism had not made much headway among them. The first great Aryan influence came with the spread of Buddhism and Jainism, together with their literature from Northern India, and by the time these two religions gave way to Hinduism the creed of the Tamil land had been

different degrees, so that those which were nearer and subjected more largely to its influence seem to differ from other members of the family to such an extent as to delude some scholars into thinking that they are direct descendants of Sanskrit or Prakrit and belong to the Aryan stock. Tamil and Malayalam occupying the southernmost corner are comparatively less affected by the Aryan influence than their sisters immediately north of them, viz., Kanarese and Telugu. Of these again, Tulu and Kanarese, occupying a position south of the Telugu country, and north of the Tamil-Malayalam country, seem to be less affected than Telugu in the northernmost border; at least they show more points of resemblance with languages further south than Telugu does.

Of the languages which belong to the Dravidian group it is Telugu and to some extent Kanarese, that appear to be much allied to Sanskrit or the Aryan languages of the north and the reason why it is so will be explained later on. If we go a little further north, i. e., north of the Telugu country, we find not a Dravidian Language, but Marathi on one side and Uriya on the other, languages of the Aryan stock, which have become established in those parts of the country after supplanting the Dravidian Language of the soil, though in the intervening portions of Central India still inhabited by the forest tribes we find traces of the Dravidian persisting in Gond, Khond, Oraon, and other dialects of the hill tribes.

practically aryanised. The language, however, has not been influenced. It contains a very small number of Sanskrit words, and a Tamil composition is regarded as refined and classical not in proportion to the amount of Sanskrit it contains, but in proportion to the absence of Sanskrit. While in other parts of India the authors were mostly Brahmins, most of the compositions in classical Tamil Literature were the works of Sudras. While the Telugu speaking peoples might have received a sprinkling of Aryan blood, the Tamil non-Brahmins are almost of pure Dravidian origin." *Aryanisation of India* by N. K. Dutt, Calcutta.

7. Of all the languages of Southern India, it is Telugu that has borrowed immensely from Sanskrit and Prakrit, and on that account it has come to be looked upon as a derivative of Sanskrit by its grammarians and by some modern scholars. Kanarese also has borrowed largely enough, but as it has not been perhaps subjected to so much Sanskritic influence as Telugu, rather as it exhibits the characteristic features of the Dravidian family even more prominently than Telugu, it is not claimed as a derivative of Sanskrit. The geographical position of the Telugu country which is certainly nearer to Aryavartha, the home of the Aryans, than other portions of the South, has exposed the language of the Telugu country to a greater and longer impact of Aryan influence than any other of the South Indian languages. It was a few Buddhist or Brahman settlers that were responsible for the introduction of Aryan language and culture in the Tamil and Kanarese countries. If the story of Chandragupta's conversion to Jainism and his advent into Mysore is to be believed, we can take it for granted that by about the third century B. C., the Kanarese country came into touch with North India and began to feel the Aryan impact. It is perhaps about the same time that the Tamil country also began to receive Jain and Buddhist missionaries, and the Hindu Aryans must have followed these in their wake. A few references to the performance of yagas by kings, found in the earliest Tamil literature, bear sufficient testimony to the fact that the Aryans by that time had already gained the confidence of the rulers of the country and begun to spread the Aryan religion in the Tamil land. The Jains and the Buddhists also must have been propagating their own

Telugu more exposed to the Aryan influence than other languages of the South.

religions in the land, which gained ground in course of time, and of which clear references are found in subsequent literature. These Jains and Buddhists who always took to the vernacular for the effective propagation of their religious cults cultivated the languages of the Tamil and Kanarese lands and became the authors of several works in those vernaculars. It is perhaps after the revival of Aryanism in the Tamil country that Agastya was hailed as 'Tamiṛmuni' (Tamil Sage) or the first grammarian and poet in the language. It is anyhow clear that it was religious propaganda that first brought a few Aryan Hindus or Buddhists into touch with Tamil and Kanarese countries of the South in the pre-Christian era. But the contact, which the Andhra country had with the people of the North, was far earlier and far more intimate than that of the southernmost part of the peninsula.

Andhras and their migration to the South.

8. Even as early as the 6th or 7th century B.C., or about the time of the composition of Aitereya Brāhmaṇa, * some tribes of the non-Vedic Aryans, who, perhaps on account of their intermingling with the non-Aryan population of the country and non-performance of Vedic rites, were kept out of the pale of the Aryan society by their kinsmen, the more orthodox section of the community, seem to have crossed the Vindhyas and formed their abodes on the other side of the ranges, and lived there for a time along with the forest tribes like Pulindas and Mutibas. Gradually, some of the more adventurous and warlike tribes like the Andhras who penetrated the Dandaka forest in search of new homes found their way to the south, and established themselves on the extensive fertile basins of

* cf. *Vedic India* by Ragozin pp. 318-19.

the Godavary and the Krishna. These Andhra tribes who had already formed connections with the natives of the soil while they were in the North, easily cultivated sympathy of the people of the new land wherein they had come to stay and began to live peacefully amongst them, and after a time felt no difficulty in raising armies from the native population and in carving a kingdom of their own in the new land. They gradually began to extend their territory, so that by the second century B.C., they had grown so powerful as to carry on their conquests to the North and establish their kingdom at Magadha. The southern country did not attract their attention; somehow they did not care to extend their dominions towards the south. The Tamil kingdoms were therefore left to themselves, without having been subjected to any disturbing influence from the North, and the language of the country was allowed to preserve its purity and develop in its own way without any dominating help or hindrance from outside.

Condition of Telugu in the early centuries of the Christian Era.

9. Since the Telugu country or the 'Vaḍugu' 'the northern country,' as the early Tamilian writers called it, had become the seat of a dominating political power of a Prakrit speaking tribe from the North, the language of the country was also subjected to the powerful influence of the language of the ruling race. Prakrit, the language of the rulers, was also the language of the State. All affairs were carried on in the State language and all the inscriptions of the period were in Prakrit. Poets composed their poems in Prakrit and prose writers wrote in the same. The '*Saptasati*' of Sālivahana and the "*Brihatkatha*" of Guṇādhya, two important works of the period known to us, whose memory is highly cherished even to-day

bear testimony to the Prakritic character of the literature of the period. The language of the country was thrown into the background, but not supplanted by the Aryan tongue as in the case of Northern India. We do not hear of any Telugu works of the period, nor have we any other means of knowing the condition of the language of the country in those days. Still it did not die out, giving place to Prakrit. It held its own against the language of the rulers, and persisted as a home language among the masses, waiting for better times to show itself out again. The Andhra rulers, though they were using their own language for state purposes, did not perhaps interfere with the language of the masses, with whom they came to live in peace, and with whose help they were able to establish themselves in power; and before they ceased to exist as a political force in the land, they managed to lend their name to the country in which they had come to dwell, to the people living in it with whom they had got mixed up, as well as to the language they spoke which must have absorbed by that time a lot of word-material from the language of the rulers. This sufficiently accounts for the existence of a large number of old Prakritic Tadbhava words in the Telugu language. Thus did the Dravidian language of the original inhabitants of the country acquire the name 'Andhra,' and it was on account of this preponderating Prakritic influence that the indigenous language took almost a new turn and entered upon an altogether new line of development, which made her quite a stranger to the other members of that family. From this impact of the Prakrit which came along with the advent of the Andhra tribes into the country, the Dravidian language of the Telugu country, after a few centuries, passed under the dominating influence of Sanskrit, which in

its turn overflooded it with new word-material and gave it a Sanskritic turn. In spite of these powerful influences of Prakrit and Sanskrit exerted on Telugu for many centuries, the Telugu language is still able to preserve its basic integrity, as the original population was not wiped off the country by the North Indian incomers, but was allowed to live peacefully under their sway, speaking its own language in its own way. Thus in such parts of the country as were converted by the Aryans into lands of occupation by the displacement of their native population we find the Aryan languages prevailing, but not without a good deal of non-Aryan element appearing in them, whereas, in the South, where the Aryans came and lived among the native population propagating their religion and culture without causing any disturbance amongst them we find the Dravidian languages persisting in full vigour in spite of the preponderating Aryan vocabulary they have been absorbing all the while.

The non-Aryan element in the North-Indian Vernaculars.

10. Some scholars are of opinion that the non-Aryan element found in the North-Indian languages can be identified with the Dravidian, while others think that there is a Kol or Austric element also in them besides Dravidian. But to deny the existence of any non-Aryan element in the Prakrits or modern Indian vernaculars, or to explain it away as being due to nothing but natural disintegration of the Indo-Iranian language or Sanskrit, will amount to nothing less than denying the existence of any kind of people in India at the time of the Aryan migration. Even though what is called the non-Aryan element in Aryan vernaculars can be traced to the popular languages of the Indo-Iranian period, the non-Aryan nature of that element cannot turn to be

Aryan, unless it is proved to be Indo-European also; nor can it go to prove that the Dravidian languages are merely disintegrated forms of the Aryan language or Prakrit. On the other hand, it only goes to show that the Aryans came into contact with the non-Aryan or Dravidian races even while they were in the Iranian country, a supposition which is strengthened by the existence of a colony of the Brahuis in the borderland of that country, whose language shows many points in common with the Dravidian languages of the South and with the languages of the so called Scythian * group to which these Dravidian languages are said to be allied. But as this non-Aryan element makes its appearance in the Aryan languages from the Iranian period or more prominently in the Indian period only, and not traceable in the other languages of the 'Satem' or Eastern group of the Indo-European family, and as it appears to grow in proportion to the intimacy of contact which the Aryans had with the non-Aryans residing in India, in their march from the north-western country towards the east and south, we cannot help identifying it with the indigenous element of India of which the Dravidian forms no mean part. †

Dr. Caldwell, while agreeing that the corruption of Sanskrit out of which the vernaculars of Northern India have arisen has been brought about by the operation of non-Aryan influences, is inclined to think that this non-Aryan influence is more Scythian than

* The denomination Scythian is a very unhappy one. The Scythian words which have been handed down by Greek writers are distinctly Eranian, i,e., they belong to the Indo-European family. But nevertheless the word has been used as a common designation of all those languages of Asia and Europe which do not belong to the Indo-European or Semitic families. Moreover those languages cannot, by any means, be brought together into one linguistic family. *Linguistic Survey of India* by Grierson Vol. IV. p. 282.

† cf. Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar's Philological Lectures: *Collected Works* Vol. IV. p. 293.

Dravidian. Quoting the opinion of some Orientalists like Rev. Dr. Stevenson of Bombay and Mr. Hodgson of Nepal, (1) that the North Indian vernaculars had been derived from Sanskrit not so much by the natural process of corruption and disintegration as through the overmastering, remoulding power of the non-Sanskritic element contained in them ; and (2) that this non-Sanskritic element was identical with the Dravidian speech, which they supposed to have been the speech of the ancient Nishādas and other aborigines of India, he says that the first part of this hypothesis appears to rest upon a better foundation than the second. "The modifications, which the grammar of the North Indian languages has received, being generally of one and the same character, and in one and the same direction, it may be concluded that there must have been a common modifying cause; and as the non-Sanskritic portion of those languages, which Professor Wilson styles a portion of a primitive, unpolished, and scanty speech the relics of a period prior to civilization," has been calculated to amount to one-tenth of the whole, and in Marāṭhī to a fifth, it seems reasonable to infer that it was, in part at least, from that extraneous element that the modifying influences proceeded." We have to note here that the non-Sanskritic element is recognised as growing in the languages as we go to the south. And he proceeds 'it is admitted that before the arrival of the Aryans, or Sanskrit-speaking colony of Brahmanas, Kshatriyas, and Vaiśyas, the greater part of Northern India was peopled by rude aboriginal tribes, * called by Sanskrit writers, Dasyus, Nishādas, Mlēchchas etc.; and it is the received opinion that those aboriginal tribes were of Scythian, or at

* Later evidence clearly shows that the population consisted not merely of rude aboriginal tribes but civilized people also.

least of non-Aryan, origin. On the irruption of the Aryans, it would naturally happen that the copious and expressive Sanskrit of the conquering race would almost overwhelm the vocabulary of the rude Scythian tongues spoken by the aboriginal tribes. Nevertheless, as the grammatical structure of the Scythian tongues possesses peculiar stability and persistency, and as the pre-Aryan tribes, who were probably more numerous than the Aryans, were not annihilated, but only reduced to a dependent position, and eventually, in most instances, incorporated in the Aryan community, it would seem almost necessarily to follow that they would modify, whilst they adopted, the language of their conquerors, and that *this modification would consist, partly in the addition of new words, and partly also in the introduction of a new spirit and tendency.*" Better than any other hypothesis this seems to have the merit of being in accord with the existing phenomena.

It is to be noted that the North Indian vernaculars are not directly derived from Sanskrit, but from a popular language or an early Prakrit coeval with their literary forms, the Vedic or Sanskrit. This early popular language spoken by the masses had an admixture of native element in it, and gave rise to different Prakrits which were named according to the locality in which they came to be spoken in course of time. It is in this popular language spoken by the lower strata of the Aryan society having an admixture of native element in it, that we can find non-Aryan spirit and tendency prevailing in different degrees according to the nature and intensity of contact of these two races. Since the Vedic language and Sanskrit have become fixed as literary dialects once for all, and ceased to be the popular languages, the scope

for their being affected by the non-Aryan element was very much restricted. Still in Sanskrit we find traces of the new spirit and tendency; in Sanskrit as well as even in Vedic we find the addition of a good number of words of non-Aryan origin. But, since the northern vernaculars are derived from the popular languages and not directly from Sanskrit, they can safely be expected to contain this spirit and tendency in a far greater degree than Sanskrit. And that is exactly what we find here. Dr. Caldwell himself observes: "Seeing that the northern vernaculars possess, with the words of the Sanskrit, a grammatical structure which in the main appears to be Scythian, it seems more correct to represent those languages as having a Scythian basis with a large and almost overwhelming Sanskrit addition, than as having a Sanskrit basis with a small admixture of a Scythian element."

But the identity of this non-Sanskritic or Scythian element contained in those languages with the Dravidian element appeared somehow to Dr. Caldwell to be less defensible. "According to the supposition in question," he says, "the Scythian or Dravidian element is substantially one and the same in all the vernacular languages of India, whether northern or southern, but is smallest in amount in those districts of Northern India which were first conquered by the Aryans, greater in remoter districts of Dekhan, Telingana and Mysore, and greatest of all in the Tamil country, at the southern extremity of the peninsula, to which the aggressions of the Brahman race had scarcely extended in the Age of Manu and Ramayana." Whatever relationship in point of blood and race may originally have subsisted between the northern aborigines and the southern—whatever ethnological evidences of their identity may be supposed to exist—when the question

is viewed *philologically* and with reference to the evidence furnished by their languages alone, the hypothesis of their identity does not appear to him to have been established. It amounts in his opinion only to a general relationship to the entire group of Scythian languages, without any special relationship to the Dravidian languages, in contra-distinction to those of the Turkish, and Finnish or any other Scythian family.

The sole endeavour of Dr. Caldwell is to show that these Dravidian languages are in the main Scythian. There are many points in which even the Dravidian languages differ from those belonging to the Scythian group, like Turkish and Finnish, as they have been following an altogether independent line of development and subjected to various kinds of influences for thousands of years. Yet Dr. Caldwell tries to affiliate the Dravidian languages to the Scythian family because of the common basic grammatical principles that these two groups of languages exhibit, as against the Indo-European. It was some thousands of years ago that the Aryans first came into contact with the original inhabitants of India of whom the Dravidians formed an important portion. The language of the latter at the time, must have had very many elements in common with those of the Scythian family, and it is this common element that should have affected the Aryan language at such a remote time. Further it could not then have exhibited all those distinguishing characteristics which it had developed in the course of its independent growth in Southern India during all these thousands of years. That must be the reason why none of those particular differentia marking off the Dravidian languages from the Turkish or the Mongolian, has been discovered in early North

Indian idioms. We might discover some Kol or Austric element in Northern India. It can certainly be said that such differentia are smallest in amount in those districts of Northern India which were first conquered by the Aryans, greater in the remoter districts of the Dekhan, Telingana and Mysore, and greatest of all in the Tamil country, where, the Dravidian language, being comparatively free from the aggressions of Sanskrit and the intermixture of Kol and Austric element, could very well have free scope for independent development.

The Non-Aryan element identified with the Dravidian.

11. I shall extract from Suniti Kumar Chaterjee's "*Origin and Development of the Bengali language*" the following points of similarity between the Indo-Aryan and the Dravidian showing probable influence of the latter in order to make clear that the non-Aryan element is more Dravidian than anything else.

Phonetic :—

(*a*) Paucity of diphthongs.—The insertion of y, w, between *udvṛtta* vowels, after the dropping of intervocal stops in spoken middle Indo-Aryan down to new Indo-Aryan times, although Middle Indo-Aryan spelling does not ordinarily represent it. This euphonic insertion of the palatal and labial semi-vowels, in connection with front and back vowels respectively and of 'n' is characteristic of Dravidian.

(*b*) The occurrence of cerebrals.—ṭ, ḍ, ṇ, ḷ, ḻ, are peculiarly Dravidian sounds, and are not found in any other ancient Indo-European speech than Vedic and Sanskrit.

(*c*) Insertion of short vowels by anaptyxis (Swarabhakti, viprakarsha) in consonant groups, which

is a characteristic feature of Middle Indo-Aryan and New Indo-Aryan (*e. g.* in words like kilesa, sineha, harisa, ratana, parāna, barāmhana) is parallelled out in Dravidian; (*e. g.* Kn. barāmaṇa, Tam—pirāmmaṇan = *a Brahman;* Tam. Sinēgam = Snēha, Kiruṭṭiṇan = Krishna, etc).

In other points of phonetics *e. g.*, change of c, j, to ts, tz, of s into h, the voicing of the intervocal unvoiced stops, the retention of a final vowel etc., Dravidian influence has been postulated.

Morphological:—

(*a*) The gradual disuse of prepositions. All other Indo-European Languages developed the prepositions as aids to declensional system. Prefixes or prepositions as modifiers of the meanings of roots still continue in those languages. In primitive Indo-European, the preposition, in origin an adverb, came before or after the noun; but it is remarkable that the development of it in India should be post-positional (as in Sanskrit), that in late Middle Indo-Aryan and New Indo-Aryan a series of help-words of a different kind, the post-positions of nominal and verbal origin, should come in.

The declinational system of New Indo-Aryan with its agglutinated words gaṇa, guṭa, sab, lōg, etc., for the plural, and with new post-positional affixes derived from nouns like madhya> mē, Kaksa> Ko, pārsva> pās, etc., greatly resembles Dravidian. The use of verbal forms, participles and conjunctives as post-positions in declension (Bengali—haitē, lāgiyā, thākiyā, diyā) is a special point of agreement between New Indo-Aryan and Dravidian (e.g.,—Tam- "Katti-yaikkoṇḍu" = "with a knife"-literally having taken a

knife; avanōdu = with him; inru—having been, ninru—standing = Bengali—" thākiyā " as ablative post-position (Telugu = uṇḍi).

The above are cases where we can look for Dravidian influence in the inherent principles of formation only, quite legitimately.

(*b*) Absence of affixes in the comparison of the adjective in both New Indo-Aryan and Dravidian. The old Indo-Aryan affixes īyas, iṣṭha, etc., are lost, and comparison is denoted by employing the positive form of the adjective with the noun with which comparison is made, the latter being put in the dative or ablative or locative with some nominal or verbal post-position: *e. g.*, Bengali ēra cēye bhālō = *better than this* lit. *good having looked at this.* Sabāra mājhē bhālō *best of all*, lit. *good in the middle of all.* (cf. Tel. vāni kanṭe nidi goppadi; vāni yanniṭilō nidi goppadi.) This is also the Dravidian way to indicate comparison. Modern Indo-European Languages outside India have either retained the comparative and superlative affixes, e. g, Persian,-tar, tarīn, Modern Grek,-teros,-tatos, English,-er,-est, or employed words meaning *more* and *most* before the adjective in question.

(*c*) With the want of prepositions to modify meanings of verb-roots both New Indo-Aryan and Dravidian have developed the use, in a most curious and idiomatic way, of conjunctives, and participles with an adverbial function, giving rise to what is known as the " Compound Verb," *e.g.*, Skt. ni+sad = Eng. Sit down. Bengali Basiyā parā, lit. having sat down to fall; Hindi—baiṭh jānā = having sat down to go. (cf. Tel. kūrchuṇḍu, nilabaḍu). Eng. *rubbed off* = Bengali—muchiyā phēlā = *having rubbed off to throw* (cf. Tel.—" tuḍichivēyu.") Dravidian has this usage as well.

(*d*) An almost wholesale disuse of Old Indo-Aryan moods and tenses etc. The whole principle of phrase-building tended gradually to become nominal or adjectival from verbal, in Indo-Aryan; e.g., the normal Old Indo-Aryan (Vedic) for 'he went' would be, "sō gamat" or "sō gacchat," or "sa jagāma," but in Middle Indo-Aryan and New Indo-Aryan this verbal construction is changed to the adjectival. 'Sō gadō,' 'sē gaḍē' = Sanskrit—'sa gatah.' Whence New Indo-Aryan 'sō gayau,' 'gayā' (W. Hindi), "se gela" (Bengali); and herein there is a possible influence of Dravidian, for in Dravidian the verb has an adjectival force, *it being really a noun of agency with reference to the subject.* The Dravidian tenses developed out of participles; and in the development of Aryan, we find a gradually increasing employment of the participle forms, to the exclusion of the Indo-European finite verbal forms. The periphrastic future of Sanskrit, kartā = a doer, for "kariṣyati" = he will do, 'kartāsmi' = I am a doer, for "kariṣhyāmi" = I shall do, is Dravidian in principle. The compound affix 'tāvant' rare in the Vedic speech may be compared with the Dravidian (Tamil) -d-avan: Sanskrit 'krta' = done, 'kritavant' = one who has done. cf. Tamil—"seydu" = having done, 'seydavan' = *having done he = one who has done.*

The structure of the modern Magadhan (Bengali, Oriyā, Maithili, Magahi, Bhojpuriya) past and future verb, in showing the root + past or future (passive) participle affix + personal pronominal affix, affords a remarkable parallel to Dravidian. The importance attached to the conjunctive with the sense of *having performed or finished an act*, and its lavish use, *e.g.*, Tamil, 'kondu vā' (Tel. 'tīsikoni rā.'), New Indo-Aryan

Bengali 'laiyā āisa,' niē ēsō = *having taken come*, to mean simply 'bring,' is common to both Dravidian and New Indo-Aryan, and is undoubtedly an idiom borrowed by Aryan from Dravidian, very early in the history of Aryan.

The inflected passive of Old Indo-Aryan is lost to, or considerably restricted in New Indo-Aryan, which like Dravidian, forms passives by means of compound verb constructions, in which the roots meaning *to go*, *to fall*, *to suffer*, *to eat*, etc., are auxiliaries. Herein the idiom is probably Dravidian.

(*e*) Onomatopoetic formations on a lavish scale are a characteristic of both New Indo-Aryan and Dravidian.

(*f*) Presence of 'echo words.' A word is repeated partially, and in this way the idea of *et cetera, and things similar to, or associated with that*, is expressed. This is found in Modern Indo-Aryan and in Dravidian, *e.g.*, Bengali—ghōrā-ṭōrā; Maithili, ghōrā-tōrā; Marāṭhi, ghōrā-bīrā; Tamil—kudirei kidirei, Kanarese—kudire gidire, Telugu—gurramu girramu; Bengali—jala tala, water etc., Tamil—taṇṇīr kiṇṇīr, Kanarese—nīru gīru.

C. *Syntactical*:—

It is in Syntax that Indian Dravidiandom and Aryandom are one.. A sentence in a Dravidian language like Tamil or Kanarese becomes ordinarily good Bengali or Hindi by substituting Bengali or Hindi equivalents for the Dravidian words and forms, without modifying the word-order, but the same thing is not possible in rendering a Persian or English sentence into a New Indo-Aryan language. The most fundamental agreements are thus found between New Indo-Aryan

and Dravidian, and all this began from early Middle Indo-Aryan, as is seen from a comparison of the Syntax of Pāli and the Prakrits with that of the modern vernaculars.

(*a*) The omission of the copula is preferred by both Indo-Aryan and Dravidian. *e. g.*, Bengali "ē-tā āmādēra bāri"; Kanarese "idu namma mane", *This* (*is*) *our house*; Telugu 'idi mā yillu.'

(*b*) The most remarkable similarity in idioms is found in both: *e.g.*, use of a conjunctive, meaning '*having said*' (Bengali 'baliyā' Hindi "bōl kē," Tamil "enru," Kanarese 'endu,' Telugu 'ani') in the sense of '*as*' '*because*,' recapitulating and introducing a conditional clause.

(*c*) Employment of the infinitive for the polite imperative, *e.g.*, Hindi—yah kām karnā; Kanarese—ī kelasa māḍuvadu" = do this work.

(*d*) Use of the verb "*to give*" in forming the 'imperative' or permissive mood, *e.g.*, for Sanskrit—'vadāni' *let me say cf.* Bengali—āmākē balitē dēō; Telugu—nannu cheppan-iyy. Indo-Aryan does not possess the above points of similarity with Indo-European tongues outside India, but with Dravidian; and unquestionably herein we have the impress of the Dravidian mind on Indo-Aryan.

D. *Glossic*:—

The Aryan speech has been borrowing words from the Dravidian ever since the former came to India. The Brahuis are a Dravidian-speaking tribe outside India; it is just possible that there were other Dravidian speakers in Iran, with whom contact was possible for the Aryans even outside India.

These points are enough to show the nature of the new spirit and tendency which the pre-Aryan tribes have introduced into the language of the Aryan conquerors when they came into contact with them and had to adopt their language after they were incorporated into the Aryan community. The position here is that of the original inhabitants of a country becoming merged into the community of the conquerors and adopting their language. As the conquering community was not only numerous, but held a dominating influence culturally as well as politically, they could impose not only their culture but even their language on the native population, which the latter had to adopt, giving up their own tongue. It was during this process of adoption that they could modify the language of the conquerors, and thus help the growth of what are called the Prakrit languages. As it is only a modification, and not complete replacing, all that we can hope to find there, is only an introduction of a new spirit and tendency in the growth and development of the language after the contact, and not as Dr. Caldwell expected to find "any primary Dravidian roots—such as words for 'head, foot, eye, ear,' etc., or analogy in pronominal forms. * Such a spirit and tendency affecting the language is to be seen

* If the non-Sanskritic element contained in the Northern Vernaculars had been Dravidian, we might also expect to find in their vocabularies a few primary Dravidian roots, such as words for head, foot, eye, ear, etc., but I have not been able to discover any reliable analogy in words belonging to this class. The only resemblances which have been pointed out are those which Dr. Stevenson traced in a few words remote from ordinary use, and on which, in the absence of analogy in primary roots, and especially in grammatical structure, it is impossible to place any dependence. Possibly further research may disclose the existence in the Northern Vernaculars of distinctively Dravidian forms and roots, but their existence does not appear to me as yet to have been proved. I conclude, therefore, that the non-Sanskritic portion of the Northern Languages cannot safely be placed in the same category with the Southern except perhaps in the sense of both being Scythian rather than Aryan. *Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages*, by Dr. Caldwell.

even in the old Indo-Aryan period which grows in the middle Indo-Aryan and becomes fully perceptible in New Indo-Aryan period. Not only the vocabulary, but even the grammatical structure came to be generally affected by this non-Aryan influence which found its way slowly but surely into the language of the conquerors. As the native or the Dravidian population adopted the language of the conquerors, we have no reason to expect to find in the vocabularies of the languages adopted, primary roots or words or pronominal forms belonging to their mother tongue, though we may meet with such forms but rarely. It is in the language South of the Vindhyas that we find such primary Dravidian roots and forms as well as Dravidian structure forming basic foundation of the languages though the superstructure is raised by material borrowed from Aryan sources. Thus it can reasonably be believed that the Dravidian formed an important portion of the non-Aryan element found in the North Indian Vernaculars, though, at the same time, it cannot be denied that there might have been other influences also at work.

Indian Grammarians' opinion of these Vernaculars as "Vikritis."

12. The Prakrit grammarians of the North who included 'Dravidi' a southern language, among the Prakrits must have done so, considering it either a popular * language, as most of the Prakrits are originally such, or a derivative from Sanskrit, on account of the Sanskritic element they found in it. It is anyhow

* It is probable that it was in the more general sense that 'Prakrita' was first applied to '*ordinary common speech*' as distinct from the highly polished perfected Samskritam. Grammarians and Rhetoricians of later days, however, explain Prakritam as derived from Prakriti-Samskritam. If in 'Samskritam' we include the Vedic language and all dialects of the old Indo-Aryan period, then

doubtful that they had any intimate knowledge of this 'Dravidi' or even of other Apabrahmsa * languages, when they classed them under the Prakrits, or that they had gone into the question of linguistic relationship with a scientific spirit. Simply because they chose to call them "Vikritis" it is not right that we should consider all of them to have been derived from Sanskrit. For, it is now the agreed opinion of scholars that these Prakrits are not direct descendants of Sanskrit, which is only one of the dialects of the Indo-Iranian language spoken by the higher classes of the Aryan Society. Moreover it is clear that those grammarians held Sanskrit Language in such a high respect, as to consider, that besides these Prakrits, all the languages spoken on the face of the earth, were derived from this Dēva Bhāsha. Kētana, one of the early grammarians in Telugu, actually gave expression to such a view when he said "*Talli Samskritambe yella bhāshalakunu*" in his work Āndhrabhāshābhūshaṇam. "*Janani samasta bhāshalaku Samskrita Bhāsha Dharātalambunam*" is the same idea expressed by another later poet. We need not hesitate to think that almost all the Indian grammarians assumed the same attitude when they came to deal with the Vikritic character of the Indian vernaculars. It is quite possible that the Prakrit grammarians called the South-Indian Languages also Vikritis or Vibhashas or Apabrahmsas, not knowing

it is correct to say that all the Prakrits are derived from Sanskrit. If on the other hand 'Sanskrit' is used more strictly of the Panini-Patanjali language or 'classical Sanskrit,' then it is incorrect to say that any Prakrit is derived from Sanskrit, except that Sauraseni, the midland Prakrit, is derived from the old Indo-Aryan dialect of the Madhyadēsa on which the classical Sanskrit was mainly based. "*Introduction to Prakrit*" by A. C. Woolner.

* 'Apabrahmsa' has been used in India (*a*) for anything diverging from Sanskrit, as the standard of correct speech, (*b*) for spoken languages as distinct from literary Prakrits, including Non-Aryan as well as Aryan languages, (*c*) a literary form of any such vernacular. *ibid.*

much about them, and they considered them to have been derived from Sanskrit, directly as in the case of the Prakrits; and the later grammarians of the South-Indian Languages being themselves pro-Sanskritists followed the footsteps of those Prakrit grammarians in calling these languages Vikritis. Vinnakota Peddana in his *Kāvyālankārachūdāmaṇi* has made it clear that the grammarians of Telugu followed the example of Prakrit grammarians in writing grammar (lakshana) for the languages of the South. * These were for a long time considered as Apabrahmsas and thus not worthy of being studied by Sanskrit scholars or of being subjected to lakshana or grammatical analysis by them. Even the Prakrit grammarians do not seem to have paid much attention to the Apabrahmsas of various Prakrits, as these were perhaps considered as their colloquial forms, and contained a large amount of non-Aryan element in them. The Paisachi † languages containing still larger amount of non-Aryan element naturally received still less attention at the hands of these grammarians. To say that what is considered as an alien element in the Aryan languages which makes its appearance just at the time of Indo-Iranian period, and in course of time introduces into those languages an altogether new spirit and tendency, is due to nothing but natural disintegration of the Indo-Iranian language, does not seem to be reasonable at all, since the same element appears almost simultaneously in the languages

* Visṛutulu Hēmachendra Trivikramādu
lonara jūpiri prākṛtambunaku trōvan
Āndhrabhāshayu prākritā hvayama kāna
valayu dallakshanambulu varusa deliya

† The term seems to have been used (*a*) of the language of the demon 'Bhūta bhāsha, (*b*) of a number of uncivilized languages, including some Apabrahmsas (*c*) the Paisachi dialect of the grammarians.

spoken even in the remote corner of the Southern Peninsula and forms their most important characteristic. To argue that these languages of the South, are also the result of the natural disintegration of the early Aryan speech, will be much more unreasonable, as it amounts to denying the existence of any kind of language in South India before the advent of the Aryans. Again, to prove the disintegrated nature of these languages, it is not enough if one takes a few forms of a particular language of this group, and traces them to some Prakritic or Sanskritic source. For, these languages spoken in South India are so clearly allied to one another, that they not only exhibit common features in all the essentials of grammatical expression, but also contain a common basic root-material. All this must be traced to the Aryan sources before any theory of the Aryan origin of the languages could be established, or before the 'Dravidi' * of the South, mentioned by the Prakrit grammarians could be placed in the same group of languages as the Prakrits of the North. Any attempt to establish the relationship of the Dravidian languages with the Aryan speech without first trying to find out the basic element which is common to all the languages spoken in South India, and trace the lines of development of the individual languages from that common primitive material, is bound to end in failure, especially when the most important information as to the nature and development of these languages that can be supplied by a study of the early Tamil, is left out of consideration altogether. Whatever may be the amount of Sanskrit or Prakrit elements (tadbhava or tatsama) that we find in Telugu or Kanarese, we can easily perceive that

* Mārkaṇḍeya mentions a list of twenty-seven *vibhāshās* including Dravida, Drāvida here seems to mean not a Dravidian language such as Tamil, but the corrupt form of late Indo-Aryan spoken in the Tamil country.

there is a purely non-Sanskritic, rather non-Aryan, basic element in these languages which is common to all South-Indian tongues, if we just care to compare the root element as well as the methods of grammatical formation and development in them. It is absurd to say that Telugu and Kanarese could never have stood as independent languages without the help of the Sanskrit element, for, as we go back in time, we find the Sanskrit element in those languages growing less and less. As the earliest literature extant in Telugu and Kanarese seems to have been produced under strong Sanskritic influences and by Sanskrit scholars themselves, and as we happen to know very little of the condition of these languages before that period, we are led to think that these languages had no independent existence of their own. But the case in Tamil seems to be different. Even now a Tamil composition or a poem is considered elegant or classical only if it is free from the intermixture of Sanskritic words or contains them in an infinitesimal proportion. Not only has it no tatsama forms in it, but even the tadbhava elements are fewer in Tamil than in any other South-Indian language, and these too approach almost the vanishing point as we go to the earliest literature in the Language. Thus, the remoteness of the Tamil country and the lateness of the Aryan contact with this region must have been the determining factors in preserving the comparative purity of Tamil. Just like Tamil, Telugu and Kanarese must have been free from Sanskrit element before the Aryan contact; but, when once Sanskrit scholars came to cultivate these languages, they naturally began to introduce a large amount of Sanskrit word material in their compositions. The old indigenous words began to drop away from the language yielding place to the new comers, so much so

that in course of time a composition in which a larger amount of native element appeared was felt to be difficult of understanding and accordingly denounced as insipid and obsolete. Such was the opinion held by Nripatunga, the author of *Kavirājamārga*, about 'Paḷagannada', the old Kanarese. He denounced its introduction into new Kāvyas to be as tasteless as making love to an old woman.* But there were other poets in Kanarese who advocated purism and denounced indiscriminate resort to Sanskrit in Kannada poetry. Nayasena, one of the earliest poets in the language, observes, "Is he a poet, who saying, I will write a good poem in Hosa Kannada, and being unable to think in Kannada words, uses incongruous Sanskrit that will not squeeze in? If he write Sanskrit, let him write entirely in Sanskrit; but to bring these Sanskritisms and thrust them into pure Kannada—will it do to mix ghee and oil?" † Nāgavarma also denounces the sticking in corrupt Sanskrit into Halagannada verses and asks "Can the poetry of such ruination poets please the hearts of the wise?" ‡ But in spite of such well-meant protests the process

* Paḷagannadamum.
dorakondire sogazisugum
purāṇa kāvyaprayōgadoḷtat kālam
virasam karamavu dēsige
jaradvadhū vishaya surata rasa rasikate vōl.

† Posa-Kannaḍadim vyāva-
rṇṇisuvem sat-kritiyam endu Kannaḍamamchin.
tisi kūḍalāṟad akkaṭa-
misukada-sakkadaman ikkuv avanum kaviyē.
Sakkadamam pēḷvaḍe neṟe
Sakkadamam pēlge suddha-Kannḍadoḷu tan-
dikku-ud ī sakkadagaḷa
takkude berasalke ghritamumamt ailamumam.

‡ Paḷe-Gannaḍam pudungoḷe
koḷe-sakkadamam tagulchi jāṇgide muttum
meḷasam gōḍ antire pē
ḷvaḷi-gavigala kavite budharan erdegoḷisugume.

of Sanskritisation of the language went on without let or hindrance. In Telugu, though Nannaya, who is considered as the first poet in the language, was a Sanskritist and began to translate Bhārata in a high flown style containing 75 per cent. of Sanskrit element, there were others after him, specially the Saiva poets, who denounced this kind of heavy importation of Sanskrit into the Telugu language and always advocated the use of what is called 'jānu Telugu,' which, as Palkuriki Somanadha observed, was easily understood by the general masses of the country unlike the high flown Sanskrit style which could be understood only by the learned few. Tikkana also condemned the use of "obsolete words", but being a nationalist by temperament, introduced far more pure Telugu or Dēsya element into his composition than Nannaya. But, as much of this Dēsya element has gradually been displaced by Sanskrit in ordinary usage and thrown out of currency, the Dēsya style of Tikkana is nowadays felt to be more difficult and ununderstandable than the Sanskritic or Tatsama style of Nannaya. Simply because we find a preponderating Prakritic or Sanskritic Tadbhava element in Telugu and Kanarese, owing to the peculiar historical vicissitudes through which the middle country had to pass even from the last few centuries of the pre-Christian era, we cannot deny either their independent existence before they came under the influence of the North Indian language, or their cognate relationship with other languages of South India like Tamil, Malayalam and Tulu, any more than we can deny the Teutonic origin of the English language and its independent existence before the Norman conquest, and call it only a language of the Italic group, because of the preponderating Latin element that entered into it

after that event. Since as it has already been observed, it is not the word material as presented at a later stage in the development of a language that should be taken as the prime factor in determining its relationship with other languages, it is indispensable that we should pay greater attention to the root-material that is available in Telugu and to the principles and methods of grammatical formation, and compare them with those of other South Indian Languages, with a view to tracing the common basic element from which they might have taken their rise. Then only can the question of ultimate relationship of these languages be determined with some approach to certainty.

Basic root-material of the Dravidian languages and its characteristics.

13. Thus as a collection of root-material common to the Dravidian group is felt absolutely necessary, not only for determining the nature of the relationship which these languages bear to one another and to the other languages of the country, but also as a help in tracing the history and methods of grammatical formation in them, an attempt is herein made in that direction. * A comparison of the roots in different Dravidian languages and an investigation into their nature and development, have brought the following points into prominence.

1. The roots in the Dravidian Languages are of two kinds, Primary and Secondary, and most of these, that are at present called roots in Telugu, are not original primary roots, but only secondary ones. e.g., the root *var, tar, ī, veḷ*, etc., are primary ones, while *vatsu, tetsu, itsu, velugu*, the corresponding

* See Appendix-A for Common Root-material.

forms appearing in Telugu and considered as roots in that language are only secondary ones.

2. The secondary roots were originally made up of two or more primary roots, one root being appended to another. When the appended root lost its original shape and independence owing to the rapidity in pronunciation or change of accent, it served for a time as a particle added on to the first root in order to modify its meaning, and when its identity was completely lost sight of, the whole thing was considered again as an original or primary root. The auxiliary words like *āgu*, *isu*, *utu*, added to primary roots in order to emphasize the verbal action of the roots lost their individuality in course of time, and gave rise to secondary roots in the language ending in *gu*, *su*, *tu*, etc. What Dr. Caldwell considered as formative additions to roots are nothing but such remnants of auxiliary roots appended to the original ones to convey a new shade of meaning.

3. Most of the Dravidian roots are monosyllabic, * though we cannot deny the existence of some dissyllabic roots even in the primitive stage of the language. They generally consist of a long vowel, or a vowel short or long followed by a consonant.

* In all families of languages we arrive at a list of predicative roots for that family; and it is hard to doubt that at some primitive stage these had been recognised as separate sound groups possessing a naming power of their own. The point is that families of languages provide us with predicative 'roots' which for all that we can discover of those families are irreducible. For the most part the roots reveal themselves as monosyllables, and the more sagacious and penetrating etymology becomes, the more simple is apt to be the form of the root arrived at. 'A Priori,' it would be supposed that a primitive utterance expressive of a single concept would consist of sounds uttered in one effort or impulse of the breath, that is to say, a single syllable, and the theory is, in general, borne out by etymological investigation. *Natural History of Language* by Tucker.

4. Telugu recognises very few monosyllabic roots, most of those in the language having grown to be dissyllabic or trisyllabic. Yet by a comparison of these with their cognates in other languages, or with other derivatives in the same language, we can generally get at the original monosyllabic root. The multi-syllabic nature of the Telugu roots is mainly due to many primary roots having been combined to form a compound word for conveying a special meaning. Such compound roots or words are called Dhātupallavas or Sabdapallavas by the grammarians, *e. g.*, *kūruchundu* = to sit (kūruchu + undu); *parundu* = to lie down (padu + undu); *īyakonu* = to accept (ī + konu); *trekkonu* = to kill (trenchu + konu); *mēlukonu* = to be awake (mēlu + konu); *konpōvu* = to take (konu + pōvu) etc.

5. The contained vowel of these roots generally evinces a tendency to change. This change may be a qualitative one or a quantitative one or at times even a qualitative-quantitative one, e. g., *i*, *u*, become *e*, *o*; *i* becomes *ī*; *a* sometimes changes to *e* or *ē* etc.

Tel. *ittsu* (root) = to give; *īvi* (noun) = gift.

Kan. *kuttu* = to beat, to strike.
Tel. *koṭṭu* = to beat.

Tam. *muṟangu* = to make sound.
Tel. *mrōgu* = to sound.

Kan. *tar* = to lead, to bring; Tel. tetchu = to bring, tēru (cf. ētēru = to come).

Kan. *aṟi* = to know, to learn; Tam. Mal. *aṟi*; Tel. *eṟugu* = to know.
(cf. aṟike, aṟivu = knowing, knowledge; Tel. eṟuka.)

6. A change in the consonant of certain roots consisting of a vowel and a consonant, signifies a

different shade of or a slight change in the meaning of the original root. A number of such forms thus radiate from a common root and form themselves into a cluster.

7. Dravidian roots are not all verbal roots. Besides these there are roots of quality, pronominal and demonstrative roots. *e. g.*, *pō*, *ī*, *var* (verbal); *veḷ* = white, *kar* = black etc., (qualitative); *nā*, *nī* (pronominal); *a*, *i*, *u* (demonstrative).

8. Unlike the roots in Sanskrit or other Indo-European languages * which are considered as elements brought into existence merely by the analysing process of the grammarians, but never found in actual use in the language, Dravidian roots are used both in literary and colloquial dialects to this day. These are not merely the hypothetical results of a grammatical analysis, but are live words conveying a definite meaning of their own. Every verbal root is still capable of being used as a form of imperative second person singular; *pō* = you go; *tar* = you bring; *paḍu* = you fall etc. From this we shall sometimes

* T. G. Tucker in his *Natural History of Language* says about the nature of the I. E. roots as follows:—Primitive Indo-European roots as induction arrives at them are monosyllabic. They have, however, no independent existence apart from stem-forming or word-forming suffixes. A person-ending or a case-ending may indeed occasionally be found attached directly to the root without the intervention of a stem-forming element, as in es-mi (I am) or vōgs (voice) but a simple 'es' or vog has no place in speech proper; usually the root is built into a stem or base by some element or elements out of a numerous list. Obviously these elements do not possess the distinct individuality of those employed in the typical agglutinating languages. Two classes of elements are readily distinguishable. The one is naming element whether of object or action and is commonly styled predicative, the other is a formative element or a grammatical sign and is frequently styled demonstrative or deictic; the term 'root' is often loosely and inaccurately applied. A predicative root is that naming element which is present in one and all of a series of cognate words each of these being formed upon it as upon a common base or nucleus by means of other elements which have their special purposes. Such a root, as far as we go back in the family of I. E., languages, is almost never found as an independent word.

be able to find out the original form of the root. Roots like *tetsu*, *itsu*, *pōvu*, *vatsu* in Telugu are not capable of being used as forms of imperative second person singular by themselves; *tē*, *ī*, *pō*, *rā*, are used in their stead, thereby showing that *tsu* etc., in such roots are but remnants of some other auxiliary roots added on to the main ones.

9. The Dravidian root is generally capable of a threefold use *viz.*, as a verb, as a noun, and also as an adjective.

10. In the primitive condition of these languages, when the machinery of a formal grammatical device had not yet been developed, the sentence must have consisted of only roots, standing one after another in close array. Each root conveyed a complete idea and was for a time a sentence by itself. But later on when it stood along with some others in the sentence, it discharged the function of a word by itself, the relation of these roots among themselves being attributive—the root preceding standing in an attributive or adjectival relation to the one following it.

We may very well recall here the following words of Whitney: "The grand conclusion, however, at which historical study of language has surely and incontrovertibly arrived, is that all the grammatical apparatus of languages is of secondary growth; that the endings of declension and conjugation, the prefixes and suffixes of derivation, were originally independent elements, words, which were first collocated with other words, and then entered into combination, and were more or less thoroughly fused with the latter, losing their primitive form and meaning, and becoming mere signs of modification and relation; hence, that the historically traceable beginnings of speech were simple

roots; not parts of speech, even, and still less forms; that these roots, moreover, signified external, sensible, physical acts and qualities; precisely what ones, we cannot yet tell, and shall perhaps never be able to tell." *

The Nature of the Primitive Dravidian Speech.

14. Thus, we may fairly assume that the primitive Dravidian speech, in times undoubtedly pre-historical, must mainly have been made up of roots, the relation between them being indicated by their position in the sentence. What we now call grammatical forms and inflexions did not then exist. They began to develop in the language when the root-words which were appended to other roots to convey a particular signification lost their original shape and meaning and came to be considered as mere formal suffixes. When they reached this stage, the suffix gained a new potency by being used to fulfil a special grammatical function in the sentence. The verb, as we now find it, denoting distinctions of time, gender, number, etc., is clearly a thing of later growth, as also the nominal inflexion. But, of the two, I am inclined to think that verbal inflexion may have been the first to develop. Since all inflexions in these languages, both verbal and nominal, seem to have been brought about only by means of post-positional suffixes, and as some of these post-positions still retain traces of their original character as independent auxiliary roots or words, we can very easily think of a time when there were no inflexional suffixes at all, but only roots or words which stood packed together in a sentence without any intervening particles. Thus all inflexions can be said to have been the result of gradual growth,

* *Oriental and Linguistic Studies* p. 283.

which should perhaps have been helped by the literary cultivation of the language. "The dialect of Tudas," says Dr. Caldwell, "shows its want of literary cultivation in the paucity of its case signs." There is no difference in it between the nominative, genitive and accusative which are exactly the cases in other languages felt to be very hard of explanation, as their terminations are not so easily traceable to independent words as those of other cases. Strictly speaking, there is nothing like a case in these languages, the relation between one word and another in a sentence being that of attributive or possessive. It is the influence of Sanskrit system that made South Indian grammarians formulate eight cases for the Dravidian languages. "The imitation of Sanskrit," says Dr. Caldwell "in this particular was certainly an error; for, whilst in Sanskrit there are eight cases only, the number of cases in Tamil, Telugu etc., is almost indefinite. Every post-position annexed to a noun constitutes, properly speaking, a new case and therefore the number of such cases depends upon the requirements of the speaker and the different shades of meaning he wishes to express. In particular, the 'inflexion' or inflected form of the base or oblique case, as it is sometimes called, which has sometimes a possessive, sometimes a locative and sometimes an adjectival signification, ought to have had a place of its own." From this it is clear that there can be no limit to the number of cases as it depends upon the requirements of the speaker and the different shades of meaning he wishes to express, and these shades of meaning were originally expressed by annexing an independent word to another word, the relation between the two words being, as Dr. Caldwell himself has made it clear, possessive, locative or adjectival. Notwithstanding this,

the usage of Dravidian grammarians has restricted the number of cases to eight; and though Dr. Caldwell admitted the existence of not a few disadvantages in this arrangement, he adhered to the ordinary usage in the analysis on which he entered, as he hoped it would conduce to perspicuity. But the influence of Sanskrit model on South Indian grammarians was such that they not only followed the order of the Sanskrit cases in analysing the nominal inflexion of the South Indian Languages, but even adopted or imitated the Sanskrit mode of denominating them, not by descriptive appellations as nominative or accusative but by numbers, as the first case, second case, etc.

Thus, if we carefully look through the vista of centuries and closely investigate the development of verbal and nominal inflexions in the languages of the Dravidian group we arrive at the root stage of those languages and feel convinced that this family bears to this day substantial evidence in favour of the root theory of the origin of languages, which still forms a subject of hot controversy among Philologists.

II

THE VERBAL INFLEXION.

Origin of Stem-forming Suffixes.

15. Now we have to consider how this root language of the primitive Dravidian gradually developed through the stage of agglutination to the semi-inflexional cultivated South Indian Languages of the present day.

To understand this, we have to investigate into the nature of the verbal and nominal inflexions of these languages, compare them with one another, and try to trace the successive stages of their development.

We have already noted that the Dravidian root is capable of being used both as a verb and as a noun, and that in primitive times when a distinction in meaning has to be signified one or more independent roots came to be added on to the original root. When the primitive Dravidians came to recognise the difficulties arising from the same form of the root being used as a noun and as a verb, they wanted to distinguish these one from the other.

To differentiate the verbal forms from the nouns, they emphasised the verbal function of the root, by the addition of other verbal roots signifying such ideas as *to be*, *to become* etc. In this connection the primary roots arising from the simple primary vowels, *a*, *i*, *u*, namely, *agu*, *ichu*, and *utu*, with their nasalised forms *angu*, *inchu*, and *undu*, seem to have played a very important part in the early stages of this family of languages. Most of the primitive roots have taken

one or other of these primary roots as their auxiliaries, and, in course of time, on account of the euphonic changes undergone they have lost their independent position and came to be considered either as part of the roots to which they were appended or as formative suffixes added on to convert them into verbs.

Some modern scholars like Dr. Caldwell in their investigations into the question of the formation of verbal forms in the Dravidian languages have considered *ku, gu, ngu, su, chu, nchu, tu, du, ndu,* as mere stem-forming suffixes. The Indian grammarians, on the other hand, have taken different views according to the different stages of development they found them in, when they approached them for analysis and study. Tolkappiyar, the earliest grammarian that analysed a Dravidian Language, considered these *ku, du, tu,* as particles added to the roots to form singular verbs in Tamil, and *kum, dum, tum,* as particles used to make plural forms from them. * Kēsirāja, a Kanarese grammarian, the author of *Śabdamaṇidarpaṇa,* considered this *kum,* as the formative added to roots in order to convert them into verbs, and said that this could be used without any distinction of number, gender, person or even time. †

* Am ām em ēm ennum Kiḷaviyum
Ummodu varum kaṭa ta ṟa yennum
Annaṟ kiḷaviyodu āyeṉ kiḷaviyum
panmai uraikkum tanmaichcholle.
Kaṭa ta ṟa ennum
Annāṉaku ūrnda kuṉṟiyalukara mōḏu
En ēn al enavarum ēḷum
Tanvinai uraikkum tanmaichcholle.

Tolkappiyam Sol. Vinai—5,6.

† Savanāgi bhūta doḷ lin
Gavachana doḷ taḷtu vartamāna bhavishyat
Vyavahṛitigaḷa gum kum sal
Puvu tāvanyaikavachana doḷṉelasirdum.

Śabdamaṇidarpaṇa, Ākhyātaprakaraṇa,—228

From this we understand that the grammarians of Tamil and Kanarese held the view that *ku* had a special function to fulfil, and that it did not form part of the root itself, but something quite different from it. The Telugu grammarians, who belong to a later age, could not see that this *gu* had a special function to fulfil, but treated the whole *gu* - ending form as the root considering *gu* as part of the roots itself. Thus while *aḍ*, *tun*, *vel* and *taṛ*, are considered as roots in Tamil and Kanarese, and *gu* as a suffix added to convey a particular meaning, Telugu considers *aḍagu*, *tunugu*, *velugu*, *taṛagu*, themselves as roots and adds other formative particles to form verbs out of them. Since a Dravidian root is capable of being used as a noun, and as a verb, these *gu* - ending forms also came to be used as nouns in Telugu. *adagu v.*, to become pressed, *n.*, bottom; *tunugu v.*, to be broken, *n.*, a piece. *Velugu v.*, shine, *n.*, light; *taṛugu v.*, to cut, *n.*, depreciation. It is clear that all such *gu* - ending roots in Telugu are only secondary ones. The root *taṛugu*, has given rise to another root in *taggu*, (where *r* got assimilated to the following *g* in *gu* and became *ggu*) which conveys a slightly different shade of meaning from that of the original, and on that account is considered as a different root altogether. Thus new roots with different shades of meaning have developed from the original monosyllabic ones.

Whether these remnants of auxiliary roots are considered as parts of roots themselves or suffixes by the grammarians, we find that the roots with these endings are in actual use as verbs though without any distinction of time, gender, number or person. It is clear that they fulfilled the function of converting the roots

into verbs. In course of time when the ideas of distinction of time, gender, number, etc., dawned on the early Dravidians and a necessity for giving expression to such a distinction in language was felt by them, they began to append to the original root such other roots or words as were considered capable of signifying those ideas, which again after a time underwent further modifications and came to be considered as mere suffixes of time, gender or person. Such is the strictly agglutinative nature of the Dravidian verb that, in the words of Dr. Caldwell "the particles which express the ideas of mood, tense, transition, intransition, causation and negation, together with the pronominal fragments by which, person, number and gender are denoted, are annexed or agglutinated to the root in so regular a series, and in so quiet a process, that generally no change whatever or at most only a slight euphonic change is effected either in the root or in any of the suffixed particles." That is why even at this distance of time, we still hope that our efforts to trace and find out the original root words in whose place these suffixes which are their remnants now stand will be crowned with success.

Grammarians' treatment of the Forms in 'gu.'

16. The Indian grammarians, who analysed these languages and framed rules for the formation of words and sentences in them, very often mislead us in our attempt to get at the full words for which these suffixes now stand, as they mostly followed the lead of Sanskrit grammar which made them prepossessed with the idea of unmeaning suffixes functioning as links between words in a sentence. Such an instance is supplied to us by the grammar of the Tamil language in the analysis and interpretation

of *seygum*, and *seygindru*, as forms of the present tense. Tolkappiyar merely makes mention of the forms in *kum*, *tum*, etc., but does not definitely state the time indicated by them. Later grammarians assign *kum*-ending forms to the present, and the rest to the past. But an investigation into the use of these forms in the earliest literature in the language seems to indicate that these forms are not restricted to any particular time, but denoted all tenses according to the context, *i.e.*, they seem to be tenseless, a point corroborated by the use of the form in Kanarese already referred to, as also in Telugu where they are considered as *taddharmārthaka* forms, *i.e.*, forms that denote the bare action expressed by the root.

Thus these *gu*-ending forms found common in all these languages take us to a period in their history, when the ideas about tense, voice, person, etc., had not yet developed, or at least had not entered into the forms of verbal expression. Later on, when these ideas dawned upon the early Dravidians, for instance, when they wanted to express the idea of an action of the present time, they sought the help of other auxiliary roots like *iru*, (*inru*), *undu*, meaning *to be*, *to exist*, and suffixed them to old tenseless forms in *gu*, to which the personal pronouns or pronominal fragments were also added at a still later time when they wanted to distinguish gender, number, etc. Thus Tamil *seygu* developed into *seygu*+*iru* or *inru* +*en* *seygirēn* or *seyginrēn*. Since *gu*, in *seygu*, is nothing but a remnant of the auxiliary root *āgu*, we meet with such older full forms as *seyyāginrēn*, though very rarely, where *gu* appears in its fuller and original form as *āgu*. This form with *iru*, added

on to the root as a sign of the present must have taken its rise in the language long before the time of Tolkappiyar and it was in actual use in his time along with *gu* forms. That these *gu* - ending forms were very much older than others in the language is clearly indicated by the very way in which Tolkappiyar and the Kanarese grammarians treated of them in their grammars. But neither Tolkappiyar nor any of the Kanarese grammarians attempted to trace the origin of this *ku* or *gu*. Nor could Tolkappiyar discover any connection between these *gu*-ending forms and other full forms of the present like *seygindrēn*, or *seygirēn* persisting in Tamil usage. On the other hand, he treated these two as quite independent of each other, and analysed the latter into three parts as *sey*, *kinru* or *kiru*, and *en*, and assigned to the middle portion *kinru*, the portion between the root and the suffix, the function of signifying present time. Thus in Tamil *kir*, *gir*, or *giru*, came to be the sign of the present, the independent root *iru*, meaning *to be* or *to exist*, which is added on to the base in *gu*, (āgu) having been converted into a meaningless sign or suffix, owing to the incorrect breaking of the grammarian at a later age. As the first grammarian analysed the form like that, all the later grammarians followed him and accepted *kinru*, or *kiru*, as the sign of the present. When once it is fixed in the language as a meaningless suffix, it becomes very difficult to get at the original form of the word which stood in the place of this suffix to denote the present. To get at it we have to compare and make a careful study of the forms in different cognate languages, and redistribute the syllables according to the propriety and probability of meaning, and the genius of the language. Luckily, the strictly agglutinative nature

that persists in the structure of these languages offers a great help to us in tracing out the original roots, though the malanalysis of the descriptive grammarian very often sets us on a wrong track and renders it extremely difficult to get at the original form of the so-called particles.

Sign of the Past tense.

17. It is not only the present form of the verb that has been thus subjected to a wrong splitting by the grammarians but even the form of the past was handled in a similar manner. Taking their stand on forms like *seydēn seydi seydān* of Tamil, and *geydem geyday* and *geydam* of Kanarese, the Tamil and Kanarese grammarians alike declared *d* as the sign of the past, while the Telugu grammarians considered *i* as its sign as they found this vowel persistently appearing in all the past participial forms and also before the consonant *d t* or *n* in most of the finite forms used in that language. The past participle in Telugu always ends in *i* only (cf. chēsi, pōyi, etc.), though in the finite forms of the verb like *chēsitini*, *pōyitivi* of the first and second persons, and in relative participles like *chēsina* and *pōyina*, *t* and *n* also make their appearance regularly. It is only in the later colloquial forms like *chēstini*, *chēstivi* developed from the fuller forms *chēsitini*, *chēsitivi* that we find in Telugu the past sign *i* dropping and *t* only appearing as the sign of the past, as in the forms of Tamil and Kanarese above referred to. This appearance of *i* before *t* or *d* in the forms of the past is not confined to Telugu alone. There are forms in Tamil and Kanarese also, though comparatively few, which take an *i* before *d* as in Telugu. Roots like *p̱āḍu* to sing, *paṇṇu* to make, *e̱ḻudu* to write,

tiruppu to turn, take an *i* in Tamil to form the past tense, *e.g.* *pāḍinān* he sang, *paṇṇinān* he made etc. So also in Kanarese *māḍu* to do, *māḍidēnu* I did, *bāḷu* to live, *bāḷidanu* he lived. In Malayalam where the preterite verbal participle constitutes by itself the preterite tense, without the addition of any pronominal signs, *i* is the only sign of the tense used in a large number of words. Thus *pāḍi*, which means 'having sung' in other dialects, signifies in Malayalam (he, she or it) sang. Even in Kanarese the past participle of the root *māḍu* is *māḍi*, having done, and not *māḍḍu*; but the root *bāḷ* has *bāḷi* in the classical dialect, while the colloquial dialect has *bāḷidu*, and *māḍidu*. Simply because it so happened that forms without *i* like *oḷdu*, *geydu*, which had lost their *i* owing to the rapidity of pronunciation or other causes, won special honour on account of their having gained currency in the classical dialect of the language, the grammarians who naturally devoted greater attention to that dialect considered *d* alone as the sign of the past in that language, and wherever *i* also appeared before *d* they explained it away as an *āgama*. The form *aṛitanu*, he knew, of Kanarese where *itu* appears instead of *idu* has a corresponding Tamil form in *aṛindān*. Telugu has *eṛigitini*, I knew. The identity of these forms in meaning and function clearly shows that *itu*, and not *t* or *d* alone, is the sign of the past. Whereas Kanarese grammarians considered *d* as the sign of the past, and *i* as an āgama in those few cases where it appeared, the Telugu grammarians have taken *i* as the regular sign of the past, and *t* as an āgama in the first and second personal forms, because *i* invariably appears in all the forms of the past found in the language.

Now taking the various forms of the past available in these languages into consideration, we find that forms with *itu* are common to all the languages. While forms with *d* predominate in Tamil and Kanarese, *i* having dropped away, it may be said that forms with *i* predominate in Telugu as there is not a single form of the past in the classical dialect without *i* though a few forms appear in the colloquial dialect. In the personal forms *t* also regularly appears after *i*. Now the question to be considered is which is the sign of the past and which is āgama.

Dr. Caldwell's treatment of the past forms.

18. While trying to fix the form of the sign of the Dravidian preterite, Dr. Caldwell found himself faced with a great difficulty. In a way he followed the footsteps of the Indian grammarians. As forms with *d* predominate in Tamil and Kanarese, he was first prepared to declare *d* as the sign of the preterite, explaining away the *i* in certain other forms as a sort of euphonic link that developed between the root and the sign of the preterite. But he could see that this explanation did not hold good in the case of many of the Telugu and Malayalam forms where *i* which is considered as a mere euphonic link, stands as the only sign of the past, though *d* in the form of *t* or *n* also appear in certain forms along with it. On seeing this, he was, in a way, forced to consider *i* as the sign of the preterite and explain away *t* as an euphonic link. This explanation of *t*, a consonant developing as a help to euphony between two vowels, appeared even to him to be far from satisfactory. So he tried to solve the problem by taking both *i* and *d* as distinct and independent signs of the past. I shall quote his own words here.

"How is the diversity in the formation of the preterite to be accounted for? Can *i* have been derived in any manner from *d* ?.....If we could form a judgment, therefore, from these instances alone, *i* would seem to have come into existence as a vocalic bond of connection between the root and the sign of the preterite.....The extent and prevalence, therefore, of the use of *i* as a sign of the preterite seems to forbid our supposing it to have been derived from an euphonisation of *d*; and as *d*, on the other hand, cannot have been derived from *i* it appears probable that *d* and *i* are distinct and independent signs of past time." Again, he says, "of these two signs of the past time *d* is to be considered, if not the older, yet at least the more prevalent and more characteristic." * Here he evidently bases his conclusions on the evidence supplied by Tamil and classical Kanarese. For, he says, "we have seen that in many instances in which colloquial Kanarese has *i* the classical dialect and Tamil have *d*. Telugu uses *i* as a sign of the preterite, but the great antiquity of the grammatical forms of Tamil and old Kanarese precludes the supposition that their most characteristic sign of the past time has been borrowed from that of Telugu."

Here, Dr. Caldwell, appears as though he was prepared to accept evidence only from the classical dialects of languages, for purposes of his philological investigation, and not from any of the colloquial dialects of those languages. He seems to brush aside the evidence furnished by the colloquial Kanarese on the ground that it is colloquial. Generally it may be true that the classical dialect preserves the older forms

* *Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages*, p. 499.

of the language better than the colloquial dialect, for, in the latter the tendency to change in form and meaning is greater than in the former. Yet on this ground alone we should not refuse to consider the evidence furnished by the colloquial dialect, as it may sometimes happen that the forms preserved by it have either not crept into the classical language, or rejected by it [at the time as unfit for dignified literary composition.

To a philologist who investigates into the nature and development of the forms of language all kinds of evidence, from whatever quarter it may come, must be quite acceptable and welcome, and it will be of great help to him in his investigation. He cannot favour one form as against another as all forms in the language is the field of operation to a linguist. The past forms in *i* found in colloquial Kanarese deserve as much attention and explanation as those in *d* of the classical language and it is even possible that the colloquial language sometimes preserves the older forms in usage better than the classical language itself, which selects and preserves only those it considers elegant. Though we need not suppose that the most characteristic sign of the past tense of Kanarese and Tamil has been borrowed from the Telugu, it is quite likely that Telugu, which is derived from the same common source as Tamil and Kanarese, has preserved the original sign of the past better than any of the other Dravidian languages; and all these languages having been dialects of a common primitive Dravidian tongue, it is not necessary that the most important characteristics of one language should be borrowed from another as each of these sister languages could have inherited them from the common parent. Though *i* is taken as the sign of the past in Telugu and Malayalam, and *d*

as the most characteristic sign in Tamil and Kanarese, it is clear that an *i* before *d* appears in certain cases of the latter group, while a *d* almost invariably appears after *i* of the former. Thus by a process of synthesis we can presume an *itu* to be the original source of both *i* and *t* or *d*. This *itu* is nothing but a form of the root to give. The root *ī* meaning *to give* might very well have supplied the early Dravidians with a device to indicate the idea of the past time. For, when you give, or rather give up doing a thing, it naturally becomes an action of the past time. Thus *gey+itu = geyitu* > *geyidu* > *geydu*, originally conveyed the idea of giving up doing a thing or an action. So also *seydu* in Tamil. But in Telugu the fuller form with *itu* persisted and we have *chēsitu*, which, when personal terminations were added became *chēsitu + nu = chēsitunu* > *chēsitini*, *chesitivi*, etc. Kanarese *māḍidēnu* answers exactly to Telugu *chēsitini*, though the Telugu form has been subjected to some slight change due to vowel harmony.

For a time the form *chēsitu*, *geyitu* or *seyidu* must have served the purpose of all forms of the past without any distinction of person, gender or number which developed in the language at a later time, when personal pronouns came to be juxtaposed to it, in the same way as the *pādi* (where *tu* of *itu* is lost) and *naḍannu* (corresponding to the Tamil *naḍandu* having walked) the participial forms from pāḍu and naḍa are now used in Malayalam language for all persons without any distinction of gender in the sense of (he, she, it or they) sang and walked respectively. Even in Tamil, instead of the more fully developed preterite, the poets used *seydu* for *I did* and *seydum* for *we did*. We have already noticed how the form in *kum* was used in

Kanarese for all persons and genders without any distinction. We shall see later on how the form in *udu* without any pronominal terminations, served in the early stages of these languages the purpose of the present future. This form is called 'tadhdharmardhakha' by the Telugu grammarians. These basic forms of the Dravidian verb made available by a close comparison of the froms in these languages take us back to a time in their history when a variation in the verb due to the idea of distinction of person, number, gender, etc., had not yet developed. Thus, it would appear that it is only by a close investigation of such agglutinative languages like these, where the form-making process has not developed to its utmost extent, that we can hope to trace the earlier stages in the development of grammatical formation and to reach the original natural condition of the primitive speech. Any amount of labour spent on languages like those of the Indo-European group which exhibit petrified inflexional forms even in the earliest stages to which philological investigation has been pushed will not be of any help for elucidating the condition of the primitive speech. *

* We must admit that in the Indo-European languages in general, material and form are far more intimately united than in the so called agglutinating languages, although in certain members of the Ural Altaic family especially in Finnish and Zakut, the connection of material and form is not so wholly superficial as Pott and other philologists are inclined to assume. The looser or closer combination of the material with form stands in intimate connection, not only with the nation's capacity of articulation but also with the age of the forms and the frequency of their use. I am strongly convinced that in the Indo-European languages, which in regard to this combination stand on a higher plane than for example the Ural Altaic, the form-making process began much earlier than in the latter languages. Within the Ural Altaic family, I believe that the Finnish reached the form-making stage earlier than the Zurco-Tartaric and this latter earlier than the Mongolian. In the oldest linguistic monuments of the Indo-European Nations we find the grammatical forms on a plane of development beyond which no other progress has been made. The Ural Altaic languages

The Tamil forms *pāḍinēn* I sang, *pāḍinān* he sang correspond to the above Telugu and Kanarese forms, *chēsitini* and *māḍidanu*, though we find *t* of the past sign *itu* of the latter, is replaced by *n* in the former. Telugu also has developed a form in *n* besides the form in *itu*, for it has the form *pāḍināṇu* also besides *pāḍitini*, though the latter is considered more elegant or classical than the former. While the old participial adjectives or relative participles retain *d* of *itu* as in Kanarese *māḍida*, *geyda*, Tamil *seyda*, later forms show *n* in place of *d* as in Tam. and Tel. *pāḍina*, *chēsina* etc. From these relative participles of the past, finite verbal forms are afterwards developed by suffixing pronominal forms or terminations to them. Hence it is that we have double forms in Telugu, and also in Tamil—one formed from the old *pāḍitu i. e*, *pāḍitini* (*pāḍitu* + *ēnu* = *pāḍitēnu* > *pāḍitini*, another from *pāḍina*, *i. e*, *pāḍināṇu*. cf. also in Tamil *seydēn* besides *pāḍinēn*.

The past relative participle.

19. Dr. Caldwell has taken great pains to explain this *d* and *n* found in these relative participles *māḍida* of Kanarese and *pāḍina* of Telugu and Tamil. He has tried to explain them by calling them euphonic links. Though it may be possible to conceive *n* being used as an euphonic link in certain

perhaps with the exception of Finnish, have not yet attained the culmination of the first form-making process; *if among them we meet with uninflected words, these are remains of an older period of the language*, where inflection has not yet developed; on the other hand the inflected words of the newer Indo-European tongues, are, as a rule, decayed inflectional forms.

A comparison of the Mongolian and Kalmuck popular dialects with the written language, shows us quite plainly how forms originated in the recent past. The Mongolian written language knows no affixed pronouns either possessive or predicative; *in the present language of the Buriats both sorts of affixed pronouns* (although not in wholly distinct forms) *have developed so that in the verb a variation takes place according to person.* (Bohtlingk quoted by Delbruck)

connections, it passes one's comprehension how *d* can develop as a euphonic link between two vowels *i* and *a* in *pādi* + *a*. '*n* is inserted in Tamil' says he "(as *d* in Kanarese) between the *i* which constitutes the sign of the preterite of certain classes of verbs and pronominal terminations, and also between the sign of the preterite and the sign of the relative participle. Whatever be the origin of this *n* it cannot be doubted that its *use* in Tamil is at present wholly euphonic; and this statement applies also to the use of the same *n* in the preterite relative participle of Telugu. It, in no respect, contributes to the expression of grammatical relation." Later on he observes, "if Tamil and Telugu alone were concerned, we should perhaps be justified in considering the purely euphonic origin of the *n* in question to be a settled point, but a difficulty arises on comparing those languages with Kanarese. Wherever Tamil and Telugu use *n* in the formation of preterite tense, there, Kanarese uses *d* *e.g.*, *māḍidēnu* = I did, not *māḍinēnu* and *māḍida* not *māḍina*. Now, though this *d* of the Kanarese is certainly euphonic in its present use, it has been shown that there is reason for suspecting it to be derived from *d* the old sign of the preterite," etc. * Thus Dr. Caldwell is inclined to call both of them euphonic links, and he has had recourse to this kind of explanation in many other like cases also. In attempting to explain the form and nature of the sign of the preterite in these languages, he had to invoke thrice the help of this theory of euphonic links declaring *i* as a euphonic link at one time, *d* at another time, and *n* on a third occasion, simply because he could not see how these contribute to the expression of grammatical relation. The whole

* *Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages*, p. 503.

difficulty is avoided by taking *itu* as the sign of the preterite, and this happily fits in with the theory of root agglutination which is admittedly one of the most important characteristics of the Dravidian family of languages. The *i* of *itu* is generally dropped in Tamil and Kanarese, while Telugu persistently retained its use. In course of time the *t* of *itu* has shown a tendency to change into *n*, giving rise in Tamil and Telugu to a new set of verbal forms. Telugu participial forms have dropped the *tu* and hence end in *i* only. These *i* - ending forms, which are used as incomplete verbs in Telugu and Tamil, are used even as complete verbs in Malayalam. The fact that some Tamil grammarians considered * *in* also as a sign of the past besides *i* and *tu* is worthy of notice, as they have not adopted the method of introducing āgamas or euphonic links in order to explain the nature and form of the sign of the preterite and if we identify this *in* with *itu* a form of the verb *ī* = to give, Telugu *ichchu*, the question of the origin of the sign of the Dravidian preterite meets with a happy solution.

Just as the Kanarese preterite relative participial form *māḍida* is made up of the root *māḍu* and the root *itu* added to it as a sign of the completed or past action, and *a* a demonstrative root or a remnant of the auxiliary root *agu* suffixed to it in order to convert it into a possessive or adjectival base, the relative participle form *pāḍina* of Telugu and Tamil is made up of the root *pāḍu* = to sing, and *inu* a form of the root *itu* to which *a* the sign of the relative is added; and the personal forms of the preterite tense

* "Taṟaṭa voṟṟu innē imbāl mūviḍattu iṟanda kālam tarum toḻiliḍainilai" *Nannūl.*

are formed by appending the pronominal forms to these relative participles in all these languages ; *e.g.*, *chēsina-vāḍu* > *chēsināḍu* ; *seydavan* > *seydān* ; *māḍidanu*.

Future Forms and their Formation.

20. Unlike the above forms of the past, the future tense in these languages is not formed from the future participial base. As a matter of fact there is nothing like a distinctive future participle in these languages. They are destitute of a future participle, and the future tense itself cannot be said to be a distinctive one. "The Future," says Dr. Caldwell, "is the least distinctive of the Dravidian tenses. It is used to denote what is, was, or shall be habitually done, and it is generally the connection only that fixes it to a particular time. When used alone it denotes the future more commonly than any other time." The fact is that those ancient forms ending in *ku* and *tu* which Tolkāppiyar makes mention of in his grammar and which Kanarese grammarians also consider as tense-less forms, but as indicated above owe their existence to the appended auxiliary roots *āgu*, *uṭu*, signified no time in the beginning. These forms were used in all tenses and as such may be called tenseless. But in course of time when a necessity was felt to distinguish the idea of past time, the primitive Dravidians sought the help of the root *itu* as a means of signifying that time. Then, the *gu*-ending roots began to signify other times than that of the past. Still later when the present tense was also formed by the addition of the roots like *iru* and *udu* (*unna*) the use of the *gu* - ending form came to be restricted exclusively for the future. Hence it is that the future tense had no special sign of its own in these languages. The *gu* itself or its altered form

vu, a remnant of the old auxiliary *āgu* was considered as a sign of the future by the grammarians of a later age who could not understand the origin and nature of this *gu* or *vu*. This *v* sometimes evinced a tendency to change into *p* and that is why *pān* came to be considered in Tamil as a sign of the 'future' along with *v* and *vān*, *e.g.*, *seyvān*, *uṟpān*. * *v* and *p* are also the signs of the future in Kanarese † *e.g.*, *geyvem*, *māḷpam*. Since this *v* is nothing but another form of *g* we can conceive of the existence of earlier forms like *geygem* and *malgem*, which must in course of time have changed into *geyvem*, *malvem* - *malpem*. This view is corroborated by the fact that we actually find forms with *g* used in strictly future sense in Tamil where they are considered as the oldest in the language, *e.g.*, *seygu* = I will do = *seygēn*. This *g* is sometimes hardened into *kk*, in future, as in many other cases—for *e.g.*, *adeikku* = I will shut. Tulu also makes use of this *v* as a sign of the present, though this present form is to be considered to have had a future - present meaning originally. Thus the *v* came to be considered as a sign of the present in one language and as a sign of the future in another, while in a third *i.e.*, in Telugu it is not considered, particularly as the sign of any time at all. Though *v* or *p* does not appear as a regular sign of time in Telugu, it appears there in its original form of *g* as a part of many of the roots. Since the

* "vān pān pākkina vinai echcham." (*Nannūl* : *Vinai-iyal.*) It is to be noted that Tolkāppiyar did not make mention of these at all.

† Dadapa vakāramgalta ppade kālatraya vibhakti mūla doḷakkum.

(*Sab-dar.* 220)

Raḷābhyām vasya pah.

(*Bhā-Bhā.* 212)

Negaḷdirda repharaḷanām tagānta sāntōtva didira vatvam patvam.
. . . nānta ṇāntam batvam.

(*Sab-dar.* 231)

gu-ending form itself was taken as the root, there was no possibility of its becoming the sign of the future in this language, and that is why Telugu did not develop a future participle of the verb or a future relative participle like the one in Kanarese which came into existence perhaps on the analogy of the participles of other tenses at a later time. Telugu also, as a matter of fact, later on developed what is now considered by the grammarians a regular future tense as well as a future relative participle by the addition of a form of the root *kalugu* meaning 'to happen', 'to be able', to the infinitive form of the verb, *i.e.*, to the form of the verb in *an*, *e.g.*, *chēyagalaḍu*, he will do, literally 'he is capable of doing' (*cheyu* + *an* + *kala* + *ḍu*). This is formed by affixing the personal pronoun to the future relative participle in *kala—chēyagala* = capable to do, *chēyagala* + (*vā*) *du* = *chēyagalavāḍu* or *chēyagalāḍu* literally means 'he who is capable of doing.' Thus it acquired the sense of the future 'he will do.'

In early and classical Telugu the conjunctive particle *um*, added to the root indicated the idea of the future time. But this *um* - ending form was almost impersonal and no regular tense forms have been formed from it. In course of time, the aoristic forms in *undu* or *udu* which developed from the form in *um*, and to which pronominal terminations like *nu*, *mu*, *vu*, *ru* were added, came to supplement the form in *um* to denote the future time, in the first and second persons, and the *mahat* plural of the third person, the form in *um* having been restricted in its use to the third person singular and the neuter plural only.

In Tamil the forms in *ku* and *kum* are used for the first person singular and plural respectively,

while in the second person forms ending in *du* are used, to which even personal terminations are sometimes added. (cf. Tamil *seydi, seydir.*) These are almost identical with the forms used in Telugu, *viz.*, *chēyuduvu* (chēyudu + (ī) vu), *chēyuduru* (chēyudu + (ī) ru). The same base in *du* without the personal termination could be used also in the first person of the future just in the same way as they are used in Telugu. (cf. Tamil: *seydu, seydum* = I will do, we will do; Telugu: *chēyudu* = I will do, *chēyudumu* = we will do.) Thus it appears that both in Tamil and Telugu forms with *du* appear in the future of the first and second persons as also for the third person plural epicine, while the form in *um*, which is perhaps older and the basis from which the other *du* forms have developed, stands for the rest of the third person.

Tamil.			Telugu.	
Person	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
1st Person	Seydu Seyku	Seydum Seykum	Chēyudu (nu)	Chēyudu(mu)
2nd Person	Seydi	Seydir	Chēyudu (ivu)	Chēyudu (iru)
3rd Person	Seyyum (He, she, it)	Seyvar Seyyum	Chēyunu (He, she, it)	Chēyudu (ru) Cheyunu

The form in *um* used in the third person without any distinction of gender and number seems to be older than the other forms in *du* used in the first and second persons which take even pronominal terminations to indicate those persons, and as such it is quite likely that it has given rise to these forms in *undu* and *udu*. This receives corroboration in the Sūtra

of Tolkāppiyar where he mentions that *um* sometimes takes the form of *undu*.

Thus it is clear that this *um* or *undu* also was originally an auxiliary added to convert roots into verbs. It did not signify any particular tense in the beginning ; but later on it formed the basis from which the present forms were developed in Telugu and modern Kanarese.

Formation of the Present.

21. Now we have to see how this present form has developed in Telugu and Kanarese. We have already noticed that the present forms *seygiru*, *seyginru* in Tamil were made from the base in *ku* by the addition to the original root of the forms of the auxiliary root *iru* or *inru* meaning to be, to stay, in order to indicate the present action of the verb. In Telugu and Kanarese it was developed from the base in *utu* by the addition of forms of other roots synonimous with *iru* to signify the idea of present action. Here we see the parting of ways in these languages. The primitive Dravidian which is the common source of all these languages supplied the verbal bases for the past and present future which are inherited by these languages in common. The personal forms of the past seem to have been developed independently in these languages after their separation from the mother tongue by the addition of personal terminations directly to the base of the past ; in the case of the present a special present base is developed by the addition of other auxiliary roots to the form in *utu*. In Telugu, to the base in *utu* a relative participial form of the root *ul* namely *unna* was added thus developing the base of a special present *viz.*, *chēyutunna* from which personal forms were made by the addition of the pronouns or

pronominal suffixes. In Kanarese there is a two-fold development of the present base, and accordingly we have one form prevailing in the classical Kanarese or Halakannada, and the other in the modern or Hosa-kannada. The modern form seems to have been directly derived from the base in *utu* as in Telugu—*e.g.*, *māḍuttu* + *ēnu* = *māḍuttēnu* and *māḍuttēne* = I do; *kaṭṭuttu* — *kaṭṭuttēne* = I tie; only with this difference, *viz.*, that in the form in what we now call the classical Telugu, the base in *utu* evinced a tendency to change into *utsu* while the colloquial language retained the old form in *utu* — *chēyutu*. Classical:—*chēyuchu*—*chēyutsunna*; colloquial;—*chēyutunna* > *chēsutunna*; > *chēstunna* where the semi-vowel of the root also is changed into a sibilant; *vanḍu* = (to cook) *vanḍutunna*. It is this *tsu* that is considered by the Telugu grammarians of a later age as the sign of the present, as they have taken into consideration only forms of the classical Telugu and did not pay attention to the corresponding forms current in popular usage.

Kanarese Present in 'DAPA'.

22. The present base of the classical Kanarese is not formed like the above from the original base in *utu*. It is formed by adding another auxiliary root *avu* meaning 'to become', 'to happen', not to the base in *utu* but to the base of the past in *itu*. We have in Kanarese not only forms like *bāḻdapem*, *geydapem*, which may even be considered as having developed from the base in *utu* by the dropping of the intermediary *u* but also forms like *mādidapem*, where the past sign *itu* appears clearly in its full form. We can expect that there was some confusion between the *utu* bases of the present, and *itu* bases of the past, when the preceding vowel happened to drop away owing to the rapidity of pronunciation.

Still, since the forms of the modern Kanarese formed from the *udu* base, strictly maintain the vowel *u* of *utu*, there is nothing that prevents us from supposing that the form *geydapem* has developed from the past base *geyitu*, rather than from *geyutu*. It is because of the frequency of the dropping of this *i* in *itu*, the sign of the past in forms like *bāḷdapem*, *geydapem* etc., was considered by the Kanarese grammarians to be merely *d* and not *itu* or *idu*. Hence the literal meaning of the classical Kanarese present form, (*māḍu* + *itu* + *apu* + *em*) *māḍidapem*, would be "having made I shall be." Dr. Caldwell quoting the opinion of Mr. Kittel regarding the origin of the particle *dap* preferred to call this form a second future. He writes:—"Mr. Kittel regards *dap*, as being properly *dapa* and *dapa* as consisting of *da* + *apa*. This *apa* he considers identical with *aha* the future participle of *ahu*, the colloquial form of *āgu*, to become; *da* he regards as the sign of the past tense. Hence *māḍi* + *da* + *apa* + *em* (*māḍidapem*) would mean 'having made I shall be.' He traces its origin to the custom of replying to a command by an answer in the past tense *e.g.*, you say to some one, come: and the reply is "I came *i.e.*, I come." The fact that this form was originally a second future accounts, he thinks, for the introduction at length into the modern or colloquial dialect, of a present tense distinctively denoting the present, formed from the present participle in use in both the dialects. This explanation appeared to Dr. Caldwell to be very ingenious, and also satisfactory. But he seems to have had his own doubts regarding the nature of the *d* in these forms, for he is of opinion that the use of *d*, the ordinary sign of the preterite in all the dialects, was not originally restricted to that tense so absolutely as it is now.

Really there is some apparent confusion regarding the use of this *d* as a tense sign in these Dravidian languages and Dr. Caldwell seems now to refer to it here. Though ordinarily *d* is taken to be the sign of the past, its use was not restricted to that tense alone. For, as we have already noted, some forms like *seydu*, *seydum* in Tamil, also signified future tense; *e. g.*, *seydu* = I will do, *seydum* = we will do. Evidently Dr. Caldwell based his conclusions mainly on the information supplied by Tamil. Anyhow he does not seem to have taken sufficient notice of the forms in Telugu nor has he used the information properly. We have already noticed that the Telugu forms persistently retained the *i* of *itu* in the past. The whole confusion arose since the vowels preceding the consonant *d* which is now taken as the sole sign of the past tense have dropped in a majority of cases in Tamil and Kanarese, thus creating an impression that *d* alone was the sign of that tense. But in Telugu we find these vowels retained and thus the difficulty in distinguishing between the signs of these tenses is obviated. Corresponding to *seydu*, *seydum* of Tamil, which gave the meaning of past as well as of future in that language, Telugu has *chēyudunu*, *chēyudumu* for the future or present future, and *chēsitini*, *chēsitimi*, for the past wherein the vowels before *d* or *t* persisted, thus clearly indicating that it is not merely the consonant *d* or *t* that was used as the sign of these tenses, but *d* or *t* preceded by *u* and *i* —*utu* being used for the future and *itu* for the past, which afterwards changed into *udu* and *idu*. As for the future, though the Telugu classical form shows regularly the soft dental *d* as in *chēyudunu* etc., the corresponding colloquial forms *chēstunu*, *chēstunnānu* (chēsutunnānu) show the hard dental *t* only, as

also the modern Kanarese form for the present—*māḍuttēne*, where we find the preceding vowel *u* also is retained. In the past while *d* appears more frequently in both Tamil and Kanarese, *t* appears in Telugu and Tulu, the preceding vowel *i* being regularly dropped in the former while it is as regularly maintained in the latter. If Dr. Caldwell had compared the forms in Tamil and Kanarese with the corresponding form in Telugu carefully, crediting the latter with the same degree of antiquity as the former, he would have easily found out that it is not merely *t* or *d* that was added as a sign of these tenses, but *utu* and *itu* which are forms of two independent roots meaning 'to be,' and 'to give,' respectively.

Now it is clear how *dap* or *dapa* came to be considered as the sign of the present in classical Kanarese, because of the incorrect breaking of the forms of the present. We are thus able to see that though the roots that were appended to the original bases appear to be different in different languages, the principle underlying the formation is the same in all, and at a later time, when the method of formation of these verbal forms was forgotten, the portion between what was then considered as the root in the beginning of the word and the personal termination at its end was considered as the sign of the tense. Hence it is that *gir, gindr* in Tamil, *dapa* in Kanarese, *chu*, or *chunna* in Telugu came to be considered as the signs of the present.

The other form of the present in Kanarese has developed from the base in *utu* by the direct addition of the personal terminations to it, *e.g.*, *pōgu* + *utu* = *pōgutu* + *āne* = *pōguttāne*, *māḍuttāne*, etc. This form

was in use only in popular dialect and did not get into the early classical poetry, and so was not considered as a literary form at all until about the 15th century, when, owing to the predominance of the Veera Saiva School, which used popular dialect for purposes of religious propaganda among the masses and began to produce elegant poetry in it, these and other forms of the popular dialect gained recognition as literary forms belonging to what is called the Hosa Kannada or the modern Kanarese.

From what has been said above, we are now in a position to understand to a certain extent the general condition of the primitive Dravidian language and the principle underlying the origin and development of verbal inflexion in the languages derived from it. We have also noted that it is the principle of root agglutination that stood at the bottom of the whole structure of this language.

The Principle of Root Agglutination applied to other Forms of Verbal Expression.

23. The same principle of root agglutination worked itself out in individual languages that developed from the mother-tongue and gave rise to various other forms as well as to many other secondary roots in those languages. What in grammatical terminology now called the causal forms, the frequentatives, the passive forms, the middle forms as also the forms of various moods and infinitives, all these owe their development to nothing but root agglutination. For instance, the idea of causation is expressed by adding the auxiliary root *isu* or *inchu* to other roots, *e.g.*, Kanarese, *māḍu* = to do; *māḍisu* = cause to make. Telugu *chēyu* = to do; *chēyinchu* = cause to do. The forms like *varuvi* to cause to come, *seyvi* to cause to do, which are

considered as forms taking *vi* for the causative in Tamil, are only forms with the root *i* (another form of *isu*) which is added to *gu*-ending stems, where *gu* changed into *vu e.g.*, *varugu* + *i* = *varugi, varuvi*; *seygu* + *i* = *seygi* > *seyvi*. *

The frequentative form is formed by doubling the root itself, *i.e.*, by adding the same form of the root to the root itself, *e.g.*, Tamil: *minuminuku* = to glitter, *veluvelukku*; Tel. *velavela bōvu* or *velavela lādu*; *mura-murakku* = to murmur etc.

The idea of the passive is expressed in many ways, and originally there was nothing like a regular passive voice in these languages. But it is generally and more frequently expressed with the help of the root *paḍu* meaning 'to suffer', *e.g.*, *pāḍappaḍum* = it is sung, Telugu-*pāḍabaḍunu*, literally, it suffers to be sung. Other roots or rather verbal forms derived from them, like *āyitru* from the root *agu* to become, *uṇḍān* from the root *uṇ* = to eat or *tinu* = to eat, in Telugu, are also added to the original roots in order to convey the passive signification, *e.g.*, Tamil: *muḍindāyitru*, *seydāyitru* = it is finished, it is done; *aḍiuṇḍān* = he was beaten; Telugu: *debbatinnāḍu* = he was beaten, literally 'he ate a beating.'

The idea of a middle voice (Ātmanēpada) is expressed by the addition of the root *koḷ* meaning 'to take'; Telugu *konu e.g.*, *paṇṇi-k-koṇḍēn* = I made it for myself; Telugu-*chēsikonnānu* = literally it means, 'I made and took it.'

The conditional forms of the Kanarese and Malayalam are formed by adding *re* and *āre* respectively,

* In the early stages of the language, the causative seems to have been formed by the doubling and hardening of the final syllable of the root. *e.g.*, T. adangu- adakku; viḻangu-viḻakku.

e. g., Kanarese-*bandare*, Malayalam = *vannāre*. These particles are explained to be nothing but different forms of the word *āru*, meaning a way. Classical Tamil has the form *vandavāru* which literally means 'in the way of his having come'. Kanarese-*māḍidare* if (I, thou, he, she, they) do, did, or shall do. This is equivalent to the Telugu form *chēsinan*, which is formed by the addition of *an* the locative sign to the past relative participle, meaning 'in the place of its being done'. The word *chōn* an abbreviated form of the word *chōṭ-an* = in the place, the locative form of the noun *choṭu* meaning place, is also added in Telugu to this past relative participial form, *e.g.*, *chēsinachōn* = if it is done, literally 'in the place of its being done; cf. Tam. seyda-v-iḍattum. The word *ayitē* a past indefinite form from the root *āgu* is also added in Telugu to the past relative participle or to a form of the past tense in order to form the subjunctive—*e.g.*, *chēsinaṭṭayite*, *chēsinavāḍuayitē*. Thus most of the forms like *attayite*, *ayite*, *āyenā*, *nu* (Tam. *um*) (cf. Tel-*chēsinan*; Tamil-*seyyin-um*) Tamil *āyin* (as in-*seydadāyin*) Telugu, *ēni* (*chēsenēni*) Tamil-*kāl* (as in *seydakkāl*) added to roots or verbal forms in order to form the subjunctive, are independent words added on to the roots or verbal bases for the purpose.

The infinitives in *a* which are formed in Tamil, Telugu and Kanarese, are again, the verbal bases to which the word *al* meaning a place, has been appended. This *l* of *al* sometimes changes into *n* or is dropped; *e.g.*, Tamil — *solla* = to say; Kanarese-*māda* to do; Telugu — *chēyan* or *chēya* = to do. These were originally in the form of *sollal*, *māḍal*, and *chēyal* (*chēyan*), meaning in the place of saying or doing etc., *i.e.*, in doing, to do. cf., Tamil *sollarku* (*sollal* + *ku*) = to say.

This principle of root agglutination has given rise to many other secondary roots in these languages, with meanings which are at times quite different from those of the original roots; *e.g.*, Telugu *ēgu* = to go and *tenchu*; (*techchu* < *ter-tar*) = to bring, have given rise to a root *ēguḍenchu* meaning to come; *paḍu* = to fall; *konu* = to take, gave rise to *paḍukonu*, to lie down; *īyu* = to give + *konu* = to take > *īyakonu*, to consent; *mēlu* = good + *kanu* = to see > *mēlukanu*, to awake; *kūruchu* = to be affectionate + *unḍu* = to be > *kūruchunḍu*, to sit; *mey* = body + *konu* = to take > *meykonu*, to consent; *veli* = open + *paḍu* = to suffer > *velivaḍu*, to start; *vāy* = mouth + *pōvu* = to go > *vāpōvu*, to cry or to lament, etc.

We have thus traced the lines of the development of verbal inflexion in these languages and noted how it developed from the various kinds of modifications which some auxiliary roots had undergone when they were appended to the original roots in order to signify different ideas. When, on account of the modification they underwent in course of time, their original form and meaning became unrecognisable they came to be considered as particles merely conveying a particular signification. When once the idea of a full word with an independent meaning of its own passes out of the minds of the people, and its remnants begin to function, the grammarians who undertake the analysis of the language at a later time, naturally make short work of these forms, cut them up into portions and assign to those parts meanings which they are capable of conveying at the time of their dealing with them. That is how, as we have already seen, *gir* came to be considered as the meaningless suffix signifying present tense in Tamil, *d* as the sign of the past in Tamil and Kanarese, *i* in Telugu,

v as the sign of the future in Tamil and Kanarese and *ku*, *du* etc., as the stem-forming suffixes. The whole verbal inflexion can thus be explained on the principle of root agglutination.

III

THE NOMINAL INFLEXION.

Declensional Terminations are independent Words.

24. Turning to nominal inflexion we find that in the Dravidian Languages it developed on lines similar to those of verbal inflexion. What are now considered as the signs of different cases or case terminations, as also the signs that mark off the gender and number of nouns, and the various increments of nominal inflexion, are all traceable to distinct words, capable of being used independently in a sentence and having meanings of their own. It is only when they were appended to some independent words in order to show their relation to other words in the sentence, and thus had to play a subordinate role in it, that they gradually began to undergo modifications in form or meaning or both, and in course of time became suffixes or particles of nominal inflexion. In the primitive stage of these languages, as we have already seen, a sentence consisted of only independent roots or words one placed after another, the connection between them being one of attributive relationship. The noun preceding, even by virtue of its position, became the attribute of the word succeeding it, *e.g.*, *pon* = gold + *muḍi* = crown, *ponmuḍi* = the golden crown; *veṇḍi* = silver + *chembu* = vessel, *veṇḍichembu* = silver vessel (vessel made of silver). So also *talli-pālu* = mother's milk, *cheṭṭu komma* = tree branch, tree's branch or branch of a tree. In like manner we can say *talli tōḍu* = mother's (touch) help; *āvu tōḍan dūḍa* = the calf (in the touch of) along with the cow; *rōgamu chētan bādha* = suffering (in the hand of) on account of disease; *jnānamu koraku*

yatnamu = endeavour (to the purpose of) for knowledge. *Puṭṭa lōpalan pāmu* = snake (in the interior of) in the ant-hill; *tala yandu* = on (in the place of) the head etc., etc. All these forms *tōdan, chētan, valanan, koraku, lōpalan, andu* etc., which are now termed as case terminations, are nothing but independent words placed after the nouns. Only some of them end in *an*, (originally *al*,) which is another independent word meaning 'a place',—another form being *andu*, that place, and this word of location connected the word before it with the succeeding and served to indicate the attributive relationship between them. This *an* denoting a place came to be the sign of the locative, and those other signs which end in *an* should likewise be considered as words in the same case. Since an object that is in, or contained in a particular thing, may be also said to belong to it, or connected with it, the locative idea gave rise to the possessive idea, and its signs were considered as the signs of the possessive also.

Attributive Nature of the Dravidian Sentence.

25. Thus, when we analyse the inflexional forms of these languages we understand that the suffixes themselves stand as substantives while the nouns before them stand as mere attributes to them. Thus *āvu tōḍan dūḍa naḍachinadi* "Cow touch in the calf walked" comes to mean that the calf walked in the touch of the cow, *i.e.*, touching the cow or along with the cow. Here *tōḍan* which is considered as the sign of the conjunctive case is made up of two words *tōḍu* = touch, *an* = place, and *āvu tōḍan* means (cow touch in) in the touch of the cow, wherein the word *āvu* (meaning cow) itself becomes an attribute to the word meaning 'touch'. The touch is of the cow, and the calf walked in that touch. Thus the word *tōḍan* or its contracted form *tōn*, though

now considered as an almost unmeaning suffix of the conjunctive case, is a combination of two independent words. Again the words of the whole sentence are in an attributive construction. The touch (is) of the cow-the calf (is) in the place of the touch. The word *naḍachinadi* is again attributive to the word meaning calf. *Naḍachinadi* is made up of *naḍachina*, a past relative participle from *naḍu* = to walk, placed before *adi* it, *i.e.*, he or it that walked, and this word is in apposition to the word *dūḍa* = the calf. So the whole sentence cannot be said to be *kriyānvayi i.e.*, one depending on the verb in the sentence, but *visēshyānvayi*, one agreeing with and qualifying the subject of the sentence. Thus all the words in the sentence including what is now called the verb are only so many attributes to the subject of the sentence.

So is the case with the sign of the instrumental *chētan*. *Chētan* is the word *chēyi* = hand, ending in *an*. It means the place of the hand, *i.e.*, in the hand. *Rōgamu chētan bādha* means 'pain in the hand of the disease', *i.e.*, on account of the disease. Since the hand (or the instrumentality) is that of the disease, the word denoting disease becomes an attribute to the word denoting hand, namely, *chēta* which is afterwards considered as a mere suffix. The sign of the locative *lōpalan* (*lōpalu** + *an*) means 'in the interior'. The sign of the ablative *valanan* (*valanu* + *an*) means 'in the side of'. Thus almost all the case terminations except those of the genitive, dative and accusative end in *an*. It is a matter of common knowledge that *al*, *il*, *ul*, (with their alternative forms *an*, *in*, *un*) are forms denoting place in Dravidian Languages, and that they are used as signs of the locative case. cf. Tamil: *marattinil*;

* *ul* > *lō* + *pu* = *lōpu* + *al* = *lōpal* + *an* = *lōpalan*. cf. Tel. *lōpala*, *velapala* and *dāpala* where the final *n* is dropped.

Kanarese: *maradalli-maradoḷ*; Tel:-*iṇṭilō*. This *an* a sign of the locative comes at the end of most other case signs thereby converting them all into forms of nouns in the locative case. These forms in the locative are themselves appended to other nouns which become their attributes in turn. But later they are considered as case suffixes showing the relation of the words to which they are appended with other words in the sentence.

'In', the Sign of the Locative, Genitive, Possessive, as an Inflexional increment.

26. *In*, another form of the word *il* meaning a place (a house) which was originally a sign of the locative, came to be the sign of the genitive also, since, as already mentioned, what is or is contained in a place, can be said to be a thing of that place or belonging to that place. Thus, as the idea of the genitive is not far removed from that of the locative, *in* came to be the sign of the genitive also. In Telugu it sometimes appears in the form of *ni*, as well as *i* losing its final *l* or *n*. Thus the signs of the locative, genitive and even the aupavibhaktika sign *i* in Telugu have all originated from the appended words *in* or *an* (*il* or *al*) which mean here, there, house or that place. When their original meaning was forgotten they came to be considered as inflexional increments or aupavibhaktikas. Besides *i*, *ṭi* and *ti* are also considered as inflexional increments by the Telugu grammarians. But these are only forms of *attu* (> *adi* = that) ending in *i* added to the base in the same manner as *i*. (*cf.* Tam: *marattināl* = *maram* + *attu* + *in* + *āl*). The signs of the other cases like the instrumental, conjunctive, ablative, have already been shown to be independent words ending in *an*, the sign of the locative.

27. Now there are only two more cases, Dative and Accusative, which may be looked upon as harder of explanation than the above, since the nominative need not be taken as a case at all. The *ku* of the dative, and *ni* or *nu* of the accusative seem to be really difficult to explain as their origin cannot be so easily traced as that of others. The source of the genitive *i* which developed from *in* being almost forgotten, that too is generally considered as an equally difficult case. That is why some scholars * hold that we have only three cases in Telugu—the accusative, dative and genitive. Now even the dative and the accusative are not too hard to be explained. The *ku* of the dative, I presume, takes its origin in the auxiliary root *agu* to become. The dative case is called the *sampradāna* case, that is, the giving case; it refers to the person to whom the thing denoted by the object in the sentence is intended to be given. *Karmaṇā yam abhipraiti sa sampradānam*, says the grammarian Pānini. In all likelihood though this case has now got other kinds of application, originally it should have referred to the idea of *sampradāna* 'giving to.' So when we say, 'He gives the cow to the Brahman,' *viprunaku gōvu nichchuchunnāḍu*, it means *viprun* (*adi*) *agu* (*naṭlu*) *gōvu nichchuchunnāḍu* = he gives the cow so that it *becomes* that of the Brahman. And as a matter of fact in the forms of the dative like, *Rāmunaku, viprunaku* etc., we find the full form *aku* making its appearance though this *ku* of *aku* changes into *ki* when it is appended to words ending in *i* - like *hariki, talliki*, etc., owing to the harmonising influence of the preceding vowel. When the origin and meaning of this *ki* or *ku* was forgotten, and when it came to be considered as a sort of

Dative and the Accusative — the Origin of their Signs.

* Introduction to Nannechodadeva's *Kumārasambhava* Part II by M. Ramakrishna Kavi, M. A.

meaningless suffix or sign of the dative case, other words began to be added to this suffix so as to bring out the full force of the dative case. And what is that other word that is added to *ku* in Telugu? It is again no other than a form of the root *agu*, namely, *ayi*, the past participial form of the root; *e.g.*, *Rāmuniki-Rāmunikayi* (*Rāmuni* + *ki* + *ayi*) for the sake of Rāma or that it might become Rāma's—literally—that it might be to Rāma. So we now say *Rāmuniki ichchenu*, *Rāmunikayi ichchenu* and both mean the same thing. * The Tamil forms *enakku*, *ninakku*, etc., also show the original form of the root *agu*. Here *en* and *nin* are the forms of the inflexional base of the pronouns *ēn* and *nīn*, *i.e.*, of the possessive, and when *agu* is added to them they mean 'so that it becomes yours, so that it becomes mine.' In Telugu since the inflexional base of these pronouns contains the long vowel as in the nominative, the *a* of *agu* seems to have been merged into it. *nā* and *nī* are the inflexional bases of the first and second personal pronouns *nān* and *nīn* (Tel: *nēnu*, *nīvu*) and dative forms from these are *nāku* (*nā* + *aku*) *nīku* (*nī* + *aku*). So much for the dative which does not seem to be after all such a difficult case as to defy explanation.

But the accusative seems to be one such. Properly speaking there was nothing like an accusative case in Dravidian Languages originally as the nominative form itself was generally used for the accusative also. But this kind of usage is preserved only in the case of neuter nouns, while all nouns denoting animate objects began to take the accusative termination *nu* or *ni*. Though we can say *cheṭṭu koṭṭenu*, *cheṭṭunu koṭṭenu*; *pālu trāgenu*, *pālanu trāgenu*; we say only *tallini chūchenu*

* But the Telugu grammarians now take *ki* and *ku* as the signs of the genitive, and *kayi* as the sign of the dative. cf. Tam. *rāmunikāy=rāmunikāga*.

(he saw his mother), and not *talli chūchenu*, which means "the mother herself saw." Thus in the case of nouns denoting animate objects the absence of *nu* converts the noun into the subject of the sentence, whereas its presence makes it an object. It makes so much difference in meaning.

Accusative Sign 'nu'.

28. What is the origin of this *nu*? As this distinction seems to have arisen specially in the case of nouns denoting the animate objects, I think it must first have arisen in personal pronouns. And what is it that we see there? In all the languages of the Dravidian group the included vowel of all the personal pronouns in the nominative case is long, while the vowel of the inflexional base or the oblique base becomes shortened. This shortening of the included vowel of the pronoun of the nominative case seems to constitute all the difference between the nominative and the oblique or the inflexional base. But while the accusative and the inflexional base happen to be one and the same in all other Dravidian Languages, in Telugu it happens to be different. Here the shortening of the included vowel of the personal pronoun appears only in the accusative case, while the base of the inflexion retains the long vowel except in the case of the reflexive pronoun *e.g.*

	Nominative.	Accusative.	Inflexional.
Tamil ...	nān—yān	nan—en	nan—en
Kanarese ...	nīn	nin	nin
Malayalam ...	tān	tan	tan
Telugu ...	nēnu	nannu	nā
	nīvu	ninnu	nī
	tānu	tannu	tana

So in Telugu we find some difference between the accusative and the inflexional base specially in the case of 1st and 2nd personal pronouns. cf.

Nominative	...	*nēnu*
Accusative	...	*nannu*
Instrumental, ablative, etc.	...	*nāchētan(u)*, *nāvalanan(u)*, etc.

It is perhaps on account of this difference in form between the accusative and the other cases that *nu* at the end of the accusative (which is only a part of the inflexional base in other Dravidian Languages) came to be considered in Telugu as the sign of that case as distinguished from the nominative and other cases. This *nu* when once considered as the sign of the accusative, came to be added to all the other nouns denoting animate objects on the analogy of these personal pronouns. Just as *ku* is changed to *ki* when added to words ending in *i*, *nu* also is changed to *ni* when suffixed to words ending in *i*, *e.g.*, *vanamunu*, *harini*. Hence this accusative sign *nu* or *ni* does not stand for any independent word suffixed to the noun, but only developed as a case sign, when applied to other nouns on the analogy of the forms of 1st and 2nd personal pronouns of which it originally formed a part.

Nominative is no Case in these Languages.

29. Neither can the nominative be said to be a case in the Dravidian Languages. For, originally, there was no sign for the nominative and generally the original base or what we call the *prātipadika* stood as the form of the nominative. This is the case specially with all the neuter nouns and also nouns denoting feminine gender, *i.e.*, with all words that come under the *Amahat* class, according to the classification of the Telugu Grammarians. *e.g.*

Telugu	Tamil	Kanarese	Meaning
Cheṭṭu ...	Cheḍi	Giḍa	Tree
Illu ...	Il	Il	House
Kallu ...	Kal	Kal	Stone
Gūḍu ...	Kūḍu	Kūḍu	Nest
Āku ...	Ākku (in Killākku)		Leaf
Ūru ...	Ūru	Ūru	Village
Kannu ...	Kaṇ	Kaṇ	Eye
Kālu ...	Kāl	Kālu	Leg
Tala ...	Talai	Tale	Head
Nāluka ...	Nākku	Nākku	Tongue
Cheyi ...	Kei	Keyi	Hand
Talli ...	Taḷḷei	—	Mother
Ālu ...	Āḷ	Ālu	Woman, person, wife
Akka ...	Akkai	Akke	Sister (elder)
Pilla ...	Piḷḷei	Piḷḷe	Child
Chellelu ...	Tangai	Tangi	Sister (younger)
Pāmu ...	Pāmbu	Hāvu	Snake
Chiluka ...	Kiḷi	Giḷi	Parrot

Some words denoting masculine gender also are like the above and they do not take any special termination in the nominative, *e.g.*,

Telugu	Tamil	Kanarese	Meaning
Tanḍri ...	Tandai	Tande	Father
Anna ...	Aṇṇa (also aṇṇan)	Anna	Brother (elder)
Tammuḍu (Tambuṇḍu)	Tambi	Tamma	Brother (younger)
Māma ...	Māman	Māve	Uncle
Vindu ...	Virundu (M) Virundu		A guest

Thus the original word itself was the form of the nominative, and also served as the base for the other cases, *i.e.*, it stood as the inflexional base without being subjected to any change. For example, *anna* = elder brother is the form of the nominative, and also the base for other cases even now. Accusative — *annanu*; Instrumental—*annachētanu*; Dative—*annakoraku*; Genitive—*annayokka*; Locative—*annayandu*. In the same manner *talli* a word denoting feminine gender, and *cheṭṭu* neuter gender, take for the base in the oblique case the same form as the nominative without any change whatever. This seems to be a relic of the condition of things that existed in the primitive stage of these languages, a relic which persists to the present day.

"In the Dravidian Languages," says Dr. Caldwell "the nominative is not provided with a case termination.

The Dravidian nominative singular is simply *peyar* the noun itself—the inflexional base of the noun without addition or alteration, but it necessarily includes the formative, if there be one."

Tamil Grammarians' view of the Nominative Case.

30. The Tamil grammarians did not assign any special sign or suffix to the nominative case, but considered the name itself as the form of the nominative. This shows that the idea of considering the nominative as a special case did not enter their mind. The earliest grammarian of the Tamil language, Tolkāppiyar, while giving the signs of different cases mentioned *peyar* for the nominative, * thus indicating that the name itself without any addition stood as the form of the nominative. The word, *maram* meaning a tree, stands for the nominative. Here the Tamil grammarian did not consider *mara* as the base and *m* as the sign of the nominative. But the Kanarese grammarian separated *m* from the word and called it the sign of the nominative taking *mara* itself as the base. Telugu grammarians also followed in their footsteps, and declared not only *mu* but some three more viz., *ḍu*, *vu*, *lu*, also as the signs of the nominative case. So far as *mu* is concerned, these grammarians seem to have followed the lead of the Sanskrit grammarians, and on the analogy of words of neuter gender like *vanam* and *jnānam* declared *m* or *mu* as the sign of the nominative. At this rate we have to take *nu* also as the sign of the nominative in

* "Avai thām
peyar, ai, oḍu, ku
in, adu, kan, viḷi, ennumīttra"
(548 *Vettrumai Iyal*, Tolkāppiyam).

"Avattrul
eḷuvāyvettrumai peyarthōndru nilaiye."
(549, *Vettrumai Iyal*, Tolkāppiyam).

Telugu, since the word *maram* of Tamil and Kanarese has by a process of change called Metathesis has become *mrānu* (a tree) in that language. Then *mra* has to form the base in Telugu as *mara* in Kanarese. But it is to be noted that neither the *nu* of Telugu nor the *m* of Kanarese forms the exclusive characteristic of the nominative case. It makes its appearance in other cases also, thereby showing that it is an integral part of the word itself and not the sign of any particular case. *e g.*, Telugu-*mrānu*; Acc.—*mrānunu*; Inst.—*mrānuchēta*; Abl. —*mrānuvalana*; Gen.—*mrānuku*; Loc.—*mrānunandu*. Even in Tamil and Kanarese though this *m* does not appear in all the singular forms of other cases, it appears in all the forms of the plural.

	Tamil		Kanarese	
Case	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Nominative.	Maram	Marangal	Maram	Marangal
Acc.	Marattei	Marangalei	Maramam	Marangalam
Instr.	Marattāl	Marangalāl	Maradim	Marangalim
Conj.	Marattōdu	Marangalōdu	Maradoḍane	Marangalōḍane

'Mu,' 'Vu' of the Telugu.

31. Since it so happened that in the case of neuter words like *vanam*, *jnānam* etc., the *am* is taken as a sign of the nominative in Sanskrit, and because a good number of *dēsya* words belonging to the primitive language ending in *mbu* like *saṇambu*, *elumbu*, *pāmbu*, *vēmbu*, etc.,

have got their ending softened into *mu* in Telugu as *janumu*, *emmu*, *pāmu*, *vēmu*, thus giving rise to a large number of *mu*-ending words in the language, like those borrowed from Sanskrit, the Telugu grammarians were led into thinking that *mu* formed the sign of the nominative case as *am* in Sanskrit. If it were really so this *mu* of *vanamu* etc., must have been dropped when terminations of other cases were suffixed to it. But, on the other hand, the *mu*-ending word itself formed the base for the other cases also as *vanamuchēta*, *vanamuvalana*, *vanamunaku*, *vanamunandu*, *vanamulaku*, *vanamulandu*, etc., unlike what we find in Sanskrit as in *vanēna*, *vanāt*, *vanasya*, *vanē*, *vanaiḥ*, *vanēbhyaḥ*, *vanānām*, *vanēṣu*, wherein the *m* of the nominative is dropped without exception. Thus neither the *mu* of the *tatsama* words like *vanamu* etc., nor the *mu* appearing at the end of pure Telugu words, can be considered as the sign of the nominative case. The *mu*-ending *tatsama* word has become the base of the oblique case as also the form of the nominative, just in accordance with the genius of the language into which it has entered.

The case of the Telugu nominative termination *vu* is almost similar to that of *mu*; only this has no Sanskrit counterpart. Sanskrit words like *taru* and *go* ending in *u* or *o* take the forms *tarus* or *taruḥ*, *gous* or *gouḥ*. These words have not entered into the Telugu language in their nominative forms, but only as mere bases *taru* and *gō*. When naturally an euphonic *u* was added to them at the end, and a *v* came between them to prevent the hiatus, they became *taru* + *u* = *taru* + *v* + *u* = *taruvu*, *gō* + *u* = *gō* + *v* + *u* = *gōvu*. Thus *taruvu* and *gōvu* are the *tatsama* forms of Sanskrit words *taru* and *go* in Telugu, where they stand not only as the forms of the nominative, but also as the bases of the oblique cases.

Just as *mu* was separated from words like *vanamu* and called the sign of the nominative (for in the view of the grammarian since Sanskrit has got a sign for the nominative, the Telugu language also should have one or more) this *vu* also was cut off from words like *taruvu* and *gōvu*, and included in the number of the signs of the nominative case. *ḍu* is considered to be the sign of the masculine nouns, while *mu* and *vu* are assigned to those of the neuter, and words of the feminine gender only are considered by the Telugu grammarians to have got no special sign or termination for the nominative case. That is why all those nouns whether masculine (like *hari*) or neuter (like *gōḍa* = wall, *mēka* = goat, etc.) that do not take any of these terminations, are said to have got the '*strīvadbhāva* or the 'feminine nature'. Thus the grammarians seem to have considered the use of these endings in the case of masculine and neuter words in the language as normal, and their non-use exceptional. Moreover, it is mostly *tatsamas* and a few of the *dēsya* words denoting men, and some of those that are endowed with masculine nature like gods, that take this termination *ḍu* as *Rāmuḍu*, *Bhīmuḍu*, *magaḍu*, *tammuḍu Sūryuḍu*, *Chandruḍu*, *Agnihōtruḍu*, etc., while most other *dēsya* words of even masculine gender like *taṇḍri* = father, *anna* = brother, *māma*, = uncle, *koḍuku* = son etc., go without any termination at all in the nominative. In the case of words denoting animals, which generally take either a neuter termination or no termination at all, gender is distinguished by prefixing a word denoting male or female viz., *maga* or *āḍa*. Thus to the word *gurramu* = horse ending in the neuter termination *mu*, the word *maga* is prefixed to denote the male of that kind of animals. Thus for purposes of grammatical classification all words denoting

females and animals are taken together and called *Amahat* while those denoting males only are classed separately as *Mahat* and this *ḍu* appears at the end of some words (specially those that end in *a*) belonging to this *Mahat* class.

The Origin of the Telugu Nominative Suffix 'Du'.

32. Now, what is this *ḍu*, how did it arise, and why should it appear only in *akārānta* words? It may be said that this arose in the same manner as *mu* and *vu* but with this difference, that it is the result of a far greater modification of the original sound of the primitive language than the above, and so seems to have got a better claim to be called a nominative termination than the others. This *ḍu* appears at the end of the words ending in *a* because the original words from which it has taken its rise had an *a* preceding it. At a particular period in the history of these languages when the masculine forms had to be distinguished from those of the other genders, the primitive Dravidians seem to have added to the original casteless form the termination *an* with which they have been very familiar in the masculine pronominal form *avan*. Since *avan* indicated the male person that is before you at a distance (*i.e.*, that man) and *ivan* that is near you (this man) they considered *an* as the sign of the masculine as distinguished from *athu* neuter, (that thing), and began to suffix it to words like *maga*, *paida*, etc. Then *magan*, *paidan*, etc., became the masculine forms developed from the originally casteless bases of *maga*, *paida*, etc. on the analogy of the pronominal *avan*. If *avan* with *an* at the end indicated the male person, and *aval* with an *aḷ* at the end indicated the female person, why not say *magan* and *magaḷ*, *paidan* (*payyan*) and *paidal*, to indicate the male and female respectively of

the class of persons signified by those words. Thus these words seem to be clearly analogical formations. When once this method crept into the language, it was easily extended also to the words borrowed from Sanskrit. When we can say *magan*, *paidan*, to indicate the masculine, why not we also say *Rāman*, *Krishnan*, *putran*, etc. Thus even Sanskrit words ending in *a* and denoting masculine gender began to take this termination *an*. This *an* of *avan* and also of words like *magan* has in course of time undergone a change in the Telugu Language. Like most other words in Telugu these *halanta* words *i.e.*, the words ending in a consonant, took a *u* at the end to help the pronunciation and became *avanu*, *maganu* etc. There was also an accent-shift to the last syllable along with this leading to an increase of emphasis in pronouncing that syllable. As this final *n* is not the ordinary dental *n* of these languages but the final *alveolar n* of the primitive language which is still preserved in Tamil, it has developed a glide sound as a help for pronunciation. The glide sound that can come after this *alveolar* nasal is no other than a *t* or *ṛ* pronounced as *ṭr* in Tamil, having the same place of production as *n*.* This final *n* is called *ṛannakaram* by Tamil grammarians, in order to distinguish it from the other dental *n* which goes by the name of *tannakaram*. Many words ending in this final *n* have developed a *ṛ* after them in Tamil which in later Telugu assumed the form *ḍ*, *e.g.*, *oṉṛu* = Tel. *onḍu* ; *mūṉṛu* = *mūnḍu* > *mūḍu*. Thus *avanu* became *avandu* and *maganu* became *magandu*. Then by a process of displacement of sounds and perhaps also owing to the weakening of the front *a* due to shift of accent, *avandu* became *vāndu* which later on gave rise to the

* Tolkāppiyar in his classification of consonants mentions *ṛ* as the corresponding valleḻuttu-hard consonant, for the melleḻuttu—soft consonant or nasal # *Valleḻuttenpa kacaṭatapaṛa* ; *Melleḻuttenpa ñaṇanamana* (Tol.-*Eḻut* : 19, 20.)

form *vāṇḍu*. So also *maganṟu* became *maganḍu*. Classical Telugu Literature by the time of Nannaya adopted the form in *ḍu i.e.*, *vāṇḍu*, and even the form with its nasal dropped, namely *vāḍu* came into vogue. From this we have to take it that the transformation of the form into *vāḍu* had been complete by that time. Though the forms with the full nasal after a long vowel occur very rarely in literature after Nannaya gave a sort of fixity to the language in his time, forms with *ṟ* after the nasal do not occur at all. But inscriptions of the pre-Nannaya period contain certain forms with a letter very much resembling *ṟ*, and it is even read as *ṟ* in words like the following : *

ḍachchuvāṇṟu	*Ep. Col.*, No. 364 of 1920.
gōtruṇṟu	*Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XI. p. 345.
satyāditunṟu	
vēvāṇṟuṟlu	
bādi (rāje) nvāṇṟu	
mūṇṟu	
maganṟu	

While some scholars read this as *ṟ*, others have read it as *tha* (ఠ) and some others are inclined to think that this is something else than these, as there seems to be some difference in the form of the script between this letter and *ṟ* occurring in the same inscription.† As this appears mostly after the final *n*, we may take it naturally to be the alveolar consonant *d* that developed after it as a help for pronunciation. As Tamil has recognised only one alveolar sound other than the final *n*, namely the *vallinam ṟ* (the hard rough *r* as Rev.

* *Prachinandhrabhashaswarupamu* by Mr. M. Somasekhara Sarma, in *Rajarajanarendra pattabhisheka sanchika* p. 61 (Rajahmundry).

† cf. *Akadanakara Inscription* by Mr. Veturi Prabhakara Sastry, published *in Bhārati*, Madras.

Caldwell called it), the same must have served the purpose of helping the pronunciation of the final *n* in that language, while Telugu of the inscriptional period seems to have got the consonant *d* also in that alveolar series, with a sign (———) which is very near in form to the *vallinam* ర (ఱ) on one side and to the cerebral డ (ఢ) on the other. Gradually the distinction between the final *n* and the dental *n*, and the alveolar *t* or *d* that came after the final *n* and the cerebral ḍ seems to have disappeared from the language. When this *d* got identified with the cerebral ḍ, the *n* standing before it also got cerebralised; and that is why in later inscriptions we meet with forms having ṇḍ, the two cerebral sounds instead of *nd* the original alveolar sounds. Thus *avan* and other words in *an* seem to have undergone many modifications in Telugu before they became *vāḍu* etc., and got fixed finally in the language of Nannaya; —*avan* > *avanu* > *avandu* > *vāṇḍu* > *vāṇḍu* > *vāmḍu* > *vāḍu*. It is quite possible to consider this ర or *d* which appeared in the inscriptional forms noted above, in place of later ḍ, as the sign of the nominative case singular, at an earlier period in the history of the language. But before coming to any such conclusion we have to trace its history a little further and compare it with forms available in other closely-related languages. If we are to base our conclusions only on the two kinds of forms now available to us in Telugu, namely, the inscriptional and the literary, we have to say that *vān* or *vā* is the stem of the third personal pronoun (masculine), since the history of the form in the language takes us only so far and no further. But for earlier history of the word and its formation we have to go to other cognate languages, like Tamil and Kanarese. There we find the word appearing in a still earlier form *avan*, which itself is composed of

two elements *a* + *an*, the first being the demonstrative base, which is found separately even in the Telugu language, and the other being a form of the word *āṉ* signifying male or a person. (cf. *āṉ kudirei*, *peṇ kudirei*) Anyhow it is clear that *avan* (= Kanarese *avam*) is the form of the third personal pronoun in the early language, and if *vāṉṛu*, *vāṉḍu*, and *vāḍu*, are to be taken as mere developments from the original form *avan*, we shall not be justified in calling *ḍu* or *ṛu* of *vāḍu* or *vāṉṛu* as the sign of the nominative case and *vā* or *vāṉ* as the stem of the third personal pronoun. The same is the case with *maganḍu*, *manumanḍu*, *ballidụḍu* *Rāmuḍu*, *satyādityuṉḍu*, etc., since all these forms seem to have developed from the original forms in *an*-as *magan*, *manuman*, *ballidan*, *Rāman*, *satyādityan*, etc. When once the language got under the axe of the descriptive grammarian, and when *ḍu* of *maganḍu*, and *vāṉḍu* was separated from the rest of the word as a particle signifying the idea of the nominative case, it became the termination of the nominative case to be naturally added on to other words in the language. If this *ḍu* of *vāḍu* and *magaḍu* is to be taken as a sign of the nominative, we may as well have to take *nu* of *nēnu* and *vu* of *nīvu* also as the signs of the nominative case. Thus though the grammarians of the language make us think that *ḍu*, *mu*, *vu*, are the signs of the nominative, the genius of the Dravidian Languages does not support us in considering them as such. In fact they form parts of the original words and are not at all signs of a case.

'Lu' a Sign of Plurality.

33. The same is the case with *lu*. It is only a sign of plurality and it is neither the sign of the nominative nor of any other case. Simply because it appears as *lu* in the nominative case, and *la* in all other cases,

the grammarians considered *lu* as different from *la*, and called it a sign of the nominative. This *la* is nothing but *lu*+*a*, the latter being the sign of the possessive similar to *i* which appears at the end of the singular base in the oblique cases of the words ending in *a* (or *an* as we have to take them). This *i* with the previous nasal is termed as *nigāgama* by the grammarians and *(lu*+*a*=*) la* as *laḍāgama* both of which they considered as mere *āgamas* or intrusions without having anything to do with *an* of the singular or *lu* of the plural. Since what are called the case terminations like *chēta*, *valana*, etc., have been shown to be nothing but independent words added on to the possessive or adjectival base, the bases in *ni* of the singular and *la* of the plural could easily be assumed to be the possessive or adjectival bases in *i* or *a*. *i* has been recognised even by the grammarians to be an *aupavibhaktika pratyaya*, *i.e.*, an inflexional increment, added to certain dēsya words in order to convert them into inflexional or possessive bases. Though *a* is not considered by them as such, it appears in pronominal forms like *tana*, *mana*, which are recognised by them as possessive bases. Kanarese nouns also form their possessive or genitive bases in *a*, *e.g.*, *maram* = tree, *marada* = of a tree, *maragala* = of trees. The form in *la* in Telugu is only a possessive of the word ending in *lu*, *vanamulu* = forests, *vanamula* = of forests. Hence *lu* which appears in all the cases is only a sign of plurality and cannot be said to be the sign of the nominative case.

Thus, so far as Telugu is concerned, there is nothing like a case termination, and those that are called case terminations are nothing but independent words placed after nouns to denote attributive relationship. The same holds true with the case

terminations of other Dravidian Languages also, as the underlying principles on which they developed are the same. For instance, *oḍu* the instrumental, *in* the ablative, *inadu*, *ina*, the genitive, *in*, *kan* and *il* the locative case terminations of Tamil, as also the *im* of the instrumental (another form of *in*) *attaṇim* (*attaṇa* + im*) of the ablative, *oḷ* or *alli* the locative case terminations which are only variants of *ul* (Tel: *lo* = inside) and *al* both meaning 'place' or 'inside,' of the Kanarese language are all independent words having meanings of their own and capable of being used independently in a sentence. The primitive Dravidian language did not possess any such clearly defined cases or such inflexions. Any word placed after any other word in order to show its relation with other words in a sentence formed a case by itself, and as such there could be no restriction to the number of cases that could be formed in that way. †

Various means adopted to express the Attributive relation of Words in a sentence.

34. In the early stages of this language no sign at all was used to indicate the relation of one noun with another in a sentence. The position alone was enough to indicate the attributive relationship. After a time when it was felt that this relation should be made clearer, *in* (*ni*) was added to the nouns in general and *attu* to neuter nouns ending in *am*. Later on when *attu* itself was not found sufficient, *in* which had by that time become fixed in the language as a sign of the genitive, was suffixed to the noun ending in *attu*. Thus Tamil *maram* has *marattu* for its possessive or inflexional base, *e. g.*, *marattu-k-kombu* = the branch of a tree.

* *Attaṇa* itself is the genitive form of *atta* = that side, in that place etc.

† cf. *Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages* by Caldwell p. 255.

At an earlier stage it must have been *mara-k-kombu* only. Afterwards when *in* also was added it became *marattin kombu*. That is why in some cases we have double or even treble forms, like accusative - *marattai*, *marattinei*; instrumental - *marattāl*, *marattināl*; conjunctive-*marattōḍu*, *marattinōḍu*, *maramōḍu*. Here we find *m* of the nominative appearing in the conjunctive case. The same *attu* of Tamil forms appears in Kanarese as *adu*; cf. (Kanarese) instrumental-*maradim*; ablative - *maradattaṇim*; genitive-*marada*; locative-*maradoḷ*. This does not appear in plural forms, as *adu* is only a singular neuter demonstrative base. Telugu has its counterpart in *ti* which is called an *aupavibhaktika* termination by the grammarians. This *ti* is formed by adding *in* or *i* (the possessive sign) to *attu*. *e.g.*, *nēyi* + *attu* + *i* = *nēyatti* > *nēti* = of ghee; *chēyi* + *attu* + *i* = *chēyatti* > *chēti* = of hand. Just as we now say in Telugu *nāyadi* 'that of me' or belonging to me, so in early times they must have used the form *nēyatti* which afterwards became *nēyti*, *nēti*; *nēti-chembu* = ghee vessel. *ṭi* is only a development from *ti* in certain combinations, such as with *l*, *n*, etc. *e.g.* *il* + *ti* = *inṭi* (of the house); *pal* + *ti* = *paṇṭi* (of the tooth); *kaṇ* + *ti* = *kaṇṭi* (of the eye) etc. Sometimes only *i* the abbreviated form of *in* is suffixed to certain nouns to convert them into possessives *e.g.*, *ūru*—*ūri* = of a village. Thus we see the *aupavibhaktika* terminations in Telugu (the inflexional increments) are only different forms of the *attu* and *in* appearing, either independently or in combination, after a noun in order to show its relation with another noun following it. When this latter noun again stands as an attribute to some other noun that comes after it, the possessive termination *i* or *ti* is again added to it. Thus *Rāmuni chēyi* means 'the hand of Rāma.' 'The bow in (or of) the

hand of Rāma' would be '*Rāmuni chēti villu.*' Then 'the arrow of the bow of the hand of Rama' would come to be *Rāmuni chēti viṇṭi bāṇamu.* Here we have first *ni* which, when got separated from *Rāmuni* (*Rāman*+*i*), was called *nigāgama*, showing the hand is that of Rāma; then *ti* showing that the bow is of the hand; and again *ṭi* showing that the arrow is of the bow. Let us complete the sentence and say 'by this Rāvaṇa was killed.' We have already seen that the idea of instrumentality is indicated by the use of a word meaning 'hand' put in the locative, the 'hand' symbolising the idea of an instrument. *Chēyi* = hand, *chētan* = in the hand = by. Through the instrumentality of the arrow or by the arrow would be expressed by the words meaning 'in the hand of the arrow,' *i.e. bāṇamu chētan.* On account of this arrow 'Rāvaṇa died'—*Rāvaṇuḍu chachchināḍu.* Here though the word *chachchināḍu* may for all practical purposes be considered as a verb, it is really a pronoun (*vāḍu*) with a relative participle of the preterite from the root *chachchu*(*tsā*) = to die, standing before it and qualifying it—meaning 'he who is dead,' and this again stands in apposition with the noun *Rāvaṇuḍu.* Thus the whole sentence hinges on the subject *Rāvaṇuḍu,* and all other words in the sentence are mere attributes to it. The whole sentence would mean "Rāvaṇa is he (the person) who died on account of—or through the instrumentality of—or more literally—in the hand of the arrow of the bow (that is) in the hand of Rāma." This comes very near to the Sanskrit sentence *Rāmēṇa baṇēna hatō Vālī* in meaning as well as in construction. But this kind of participial construction without a regular finite verb is considered as altogether a new and later feature in the history of the development of Sanskrit language, and is attributed by some scholars to the influence of the Dravidian languages on Sanskrit. At the

early stage of the introduction of the Aryan language into India it showed an abundance of finite verb material, but this began to fall off gradually as the Aryans came into closer contact with the people and languages of India and began to adopt the participial construction. In the case of the Dravidian languages on the other hand, the use of a finite verb seems to be a thing of later growth, the participial construction having been the rule in their earlier stages. The fact that what is called the Dravidian finite verb is made up of a pronoun or a pronominal termination attached to a verbal participle or more frequently to a relative participle of the verb qualifying it, and that in its earliest stage it had no distinction of time, person, gender or number, clearly shows that the verb as we now understand it is only a thing of later growth, which has developed from participial construction.

Principle of Root Agglutination applicable to all Dravidian Languages.

35. We thus see how these languages of South India having started from a common root language of the primitive times gradually developed grammatical forms of expression in accordance with the expanding necessities of the people who spoke that language and also in keeping with the development of their ideas, by following the principle of root agglutination. This has given rise to what we now call verbal and nominal inflexions in those languages. It also appears to be quite possible to explain the grammatical phenomena of these languages from purely indigenous Dravidian elements, without having recourse to any foreign sources. As it seems to be quite clear that these languages developed gradually on the principle of agglutination from what is called the root stage to the present condition, it is but right that we should try to trace all the linguistic phenomena

of this group to nothing but Dravidian sources. Though these languages have now entered partly on the stage of inflexion, the fact that they still adhere to the principle of agglutination helps us a great deal in penetrating through the wild growth of the grammatical phenomena and arriving at the root sources, rather the root foundation, on which the whole structure of the language was afterwards raised.

As for the word material which can easily be borrowed by one language from another when there is a contact between the two, the nature, extent, and form of the borrowed material depends more upon the time, intensity and the mode of contact between the peoples speaking those languages than on anything else; and one language of a group may be affected more than another by the contact in such a way as to create an impression that that particular language belongs to another group altogether. Thus when we have to determine whether a particular word belongs to this group of languages or that, we have to take into consideration all aspects of the question and try to trace its origin, history and development, not only in that particular language to which it belongs, but in other closely related languages also, before we think of tracing its origin to a language of an altogether different group.* Though Telugu, owing to its geographical position and its very early and intimate contact with Prakrit spoken by the Aryan tribes, has been influenced by Prakrit and Sanskrit to such an extent as to make certain scholars believe that it is a mere derivative of Sanskrit or Prakrit, a thorough investigation and comparison of its root material with that of the

* cf. Keith: *History of Sanskrit Literature*. How foreign words are sanskritised, Gk. hydrochoos, Skt. hṛdroga (*makara*); diametron-Jamitra; Old Persian *dipi*, Skt. *lipi*; camel— *kramel* as from root *kram*, go.

other languages of South India and of the methods of development of its grammatical forms will certainly lay bare the truth that the languages of South India have all developed from a common source of their own and that they have a development quite characteristic and wholly independent of Sanskrit or any other Aryan language. The principle of root agglutination on which these languages seem to have developed into what is now called the semi-inflexional stage cannot, from what all we know at present, be so consistently applied to the languages of the Indo-European group where root-words do not at all function in a sentence as in the Dravidian Languages to this day. The view that the Dravidian Languages are nothing but the disintegrated forms of the Aryan speech is only the result of a hasty skimming on the surface, without coming to grips with the fundamental problems, phonological, and morphological, which tell a different story altogether. All available evidences point to the conclusion that the Dravidian Languages form an independent group by themselves and refuse to be merged in the highly inflexional Aryan; and going a step further one can confidently assert that the history of these languages takes us back to a stage in the evolution of language far earlier than what the history of the Indo-European group of languages can possibly lead us to.

IV

DERIVATIVES.

36. Now that we have learnt something about the methods of development of verbal and nominal inflexions in these languages, we shall next try to investigate into the nature and formation of derivative nouns or verbal derivatives. We have already noted that in the primitive condition of these languages the root itself was capable of being used as a verb as well as a noun and that, in order to make the verbal function of the root more expressive, other auxiliary roots were added to the original ones, thus giving rise to what are called secondary roots. These secondary roots also in their turn came to be used as nouns, just in the same manner as original roots, so long as the auxiliary roots placed after them were considered as not signifying the idea of time. Participial nouns were formed by suffixing the pronominal terminations to the present, past and future relative participial forms developed from bases of the tenses. But most of the abstract nouns have developed from the roots themselves both primary and secondary, sometimes with a slight change either in the included vowel or consonant and sometimes without it. Some roots like the following are used either as a verb or as a noun without being subjected to any change :—

Tam., Tel., Kan., Mal., and Tu. :—

Verb	Noun
kaṭṭu, to bind	*kaṭṭu*, binding, a band, a tie.

Verb	Noun
	a pack, bundle (cf. Tel., *kaṭṭa*) Tam., *kaṭṭu - k - kaṭṭu*., Tel., *oka kaṭṭu kaṭṭu*.
	a fabrication, a fiction (cf. Tel, *kaṭṭu-kathalu*)

Tam., Kan., and Tel. :—

puṭṭu, to arise, to originate, to be born, to spring up.	*puṭṭu*, birth, origin.
taṭṭu, to tap, to touch, to pat, to strike, to clap.	*taṭṭu*, touching, a slap, a pat, a blow.
meṭṭu, to place the foot.	*meṭṭu*, a step.
naḍa, *naḍe*, *naḍu* to walk, to march, to proceed, to continue.	*naḍa*, *naḍai*, walking, going, a walk.
pōr, to fight, to wrestle.	*pōr*, wrestling, fight, battle, quarrel.
nuḍu, *nuḍi*, to speak.	*nuḍi*, *noḍi*, speech, word.
piḍi, to seize.	*piḍi*, a handle.
tūgu, to weigh.	*tūgu*, weight.
bigi, to fasten.	*bigi*, tightness ; also *biguvu*.
konku, to get crooked.	*konku*, hesitation.
taḍe, to delay, to lose time, to stop, to wait.	*taḍe*, *taḍa*, *taḍai*, a check, an obstacle, restraint. cf. Tel., *taḍaka*, a bamboo screen.

Kesi Raja in his Grammar *Sabdamaṇidarpaṇa* * while dealing with the formation of abstract nouns gives the following other instances where the verbal theme (*nijadhātu*) itself forms an abstract noun in the language.

taḍe, naḍe, bisu, perchu, marchu, urku, sorku, dāṇṭu, kūṇṭu.

37. Abstract nouns are also formed according to Kesi Raja by a slight change in the verbal theme, *viz.*, its penultimate; *i* becomes *ē*; *u*, *ō*; short vowel becomes long; *ḍu* becomes *ṭa*. *eg.*—

Verb	Noun
i > *ē*: *kiḍu* to go to ruin, to be destroyed, to spoil.	*kēḍu*, ruin, destruction, disaster. cf. Tel., *kīḍu.*
isu to throw.	*ēsu* a throw, a shot.
u > *ō*: Kan., *tuḍu* to join, to put on as ornaments or clothes.	*tōḍu* joining, putting (an arrow to the bow), a pair, an equal.

Short vowels become long:—

Tam., Tel., Kan.—

paḍu, to suffer	*pāḍu*, suffering.
toḍu, to join, to wear.	*tōḍu*, help; *tōḍā*, an anklet.
iḍu, to put down, to throw, to apply, put on.	*īḍu*, joining together. Tel., fitness, equality—*īḍu-ṭōḍu.*

* *modalitvakkētvamumu*
tvado ḷōtvamumeseva dirghamum jaramakka
tvada vidhiyum dhātuge bhā
vadoḷakkum dhātunijade bhāvamadakkum. (*Sabdamaṇidarpaṇa*: Taddhita, 212 sūtra).

Verb	Noun
viḍu-biḍu, to let loose, to discharge.	*vīḍu*, *bīḍu*, leaving, dismissal, a halting place, a camp, a house.
suḍu, to burn.	*sūḍu*, fire, heat. Tel. *sūḍu*, an enemy.
kiḍu-keḍu, to be spoiled.	*kīḍu*, *kēṭu*, *kēḍu*, ruin, evil.
koḷ, to take-Tel. *konu*.	*kōḷ-kōlu*, taking. cf. Tel. *vēḍikōlu*.
kaḍi, *kaṛachu*, to bite.	Tel., *kāṭu*, a bite.
min, to glitter.	*mīn*, a star, Tel., *minnu*, sky.
Tel. *vinu*, to hear.	*vīnu*, ear.

The included vowel of the root is lengthened, combined with a change in the final consonant, *i.e.*, the hardening of the same.

Verb	Noun
Tel:—	
paḍu, to suffer.	*pāṭu*, suffering.
cheḍu, to be spoiled.	*chēṭu*, ruin, evil.
naḍu, *(nāṭu)* to plant.	*nāṭu*, planting.
miḍu, *(mīṭu)* to strike with the finger.	*mīṭu*, striking, a stroke.
poḍu, to pierce.	*pōṭu*, a blow.
Tam. *nakku*, to lick.	*nākku*, tongue.

The root *paḍu* is added to some words and from these newly-formed roots derivative nouns are formed by lengthening the *a* and hardening the *ḍ* of *paḍu*, *e.g.*,

chēḍpaḍu	*(cheḍu + paḍu)*;	*chēḍpāṭu,*
porabaḍu	*(pora + paḍu)*;	*porapāṭu,*
ērpaḍu	*(ēru + paḍu)*;	*ērpāṭu.*

Other consonants also are sometimes hardened *e.g.*

gīru;	*gīṭu*
vrēyu;	*vrēṭu*
ūru;	*ūṭa*
ēyu;	*ēṭu*
ōmu	*ōṭa.*

38. The final vowel of the derivative nouns may sometimes differ from that of the roots. As most of the Dravidian roots originally had consonantal endings *(i. e., halantas)* there seems to be no consistency in the nature of the final vowel of the root as it appears in different languages of this group. Each language developed euphonic endings of its own according to the nature of the speech habits prevailing among the speakers of that language. For instance, a primary root *mū*, Tel.—*mūyu* = to cover has developed another form in *mūḍu* with a slightly different meaning. This form is generally used in the sense of happening, coming to an end, some evil overtaking one. But compare Tikkana's expression *mūḍa manchu*, meaning, "snow that covers up everything," which has been explained as 'thick snow' according to the context. From *mūḍu*, we have in Telugu a noun form *mūṭa* meaning 'a bundle'—what is covered or closed up, and from its alternative form in short *u* namely *muḍu (> muduchu)* we have *muḍi* = a knot. But since the root in Telugu ends in *u* and the noun form in *i*, this latter is sometimes taken as a noun-forming suffix. But in Kanarese the root itself is considered as ending in *i*. Kesi Raja takes *muḍi* itself as the root; (cf. *muḍi-kēsa*

bandhanē). The existence of an *i*-ending form of the verbal base in a closely related language makes us think that the word *muḍi* (a knot, or a knot of hair) found in Telugu was formed at an earlier period in its history when *muḍi* itself was considered as a verbal base in this language also. Then the form in *u*—*muḍu*, as well as *muḍuchu* with the additional *chu*--have to be considered as later forms in the language *(muḍi* + *chu* = *muḍichu* > *muduchu)*. The base *muḍuchu* has given rise to a derivative noun *muḍuta*, * just as the still earlier forms *mūyu* (or *mūsu)* and *mūgu* have given rise to *mūta* meaning a cover or a covering lid and *mūka* = a crowd respectively. Thus the final vowels of these roots do not seem to have any independent value of their own, but are to be considered merely as helps to pronunciation. The same is the case with most of the final vowels of the nouns derived from these roots. The *a* of the noun *mūka* or of the noun *muḍiya* (derived from *muḍiyu*) has no more special significance than the final *i* of the word *muḍi* derived from the verbal base *muḍi*. We have already seen that though the root *pāḍu* = to sing, has the same form in Tamil as in Telugu, the derivatives in these languages end in different vowels, the one in Tamil *pāṭṭu* retaining the *u* of the root, while the other in Telugu *pāṭa* ending in *a*. But this makes no difference in meaning. Some roots in Kanarese like *ore* = to draw, *are* = to grind, *bare* = to write, *paḍe* = to acquire, *taḍe* = to delay, *moḷe* = to sprout, *mare* = to forget, *tere* = to open, *mere* = to make manifest, are said to end in *e*, but the corresponding forms in Telugu take *a* and end in *yu*; *e.g.*, *orayu*, *arugu*, *vrāyu*, *paḍayu*, *taḍayu*, *molachu*, *marachu*, *terachu*, *merayu*, etc. This is why some derivative nouns like *naḍe*, *tere*, which end in *e* in

* This shows that the *chu* at the end of such roots is not the original form, but only a later transformation of '*tu*' coming at the end of certain roots or words added to the original root.

Kanarese, appear as *naḍa*, *tera*, with a final *a* in Telugu. The corresponding forms in Tamil end in *ai* as *nadai*, and *tirai*.

Certain forms with *e*, like *naḍe*, *naḍeyisu* of the classical Kanarese show a tendency to change into *naḍa* and *naḍasu*, in the modern Kanarese. There are many instances in which the final *ei* and *e* of Tamil and Kanarese words fall in with final *a* in Telugu, *e.g.*, Tam. *talei*, Kan. *tale*, Tel. *tala*; Tam. *malai*, Kan. *male*, Tel. *mala*; Tam. *valai*, Kan. *vale*, Tel. *vala*; etc.

Though we do not find derivative nouns ending in *ei* or *e* in Telugu, we find forms ending either in *u* or *a* from the root in *u*, as in other languages, *e.g.*,

Verb	Noun
Tel. *gīṟu*, to rub off, to scrape, to scratch.	*gīṭu*, *gīṟa*.
Kan. *kīṟu*, *gīṟu*, *gīku*, *gīchu*, *kiṟuku*.	*gīṭu*, *gīṟu*, *gere*.
Tel. *māṟu*, to be changed, altered, to exchange.	*māṭa*, a word, saying, a reply.
Kan. *māṟu*.	*mātu*, *māta*.
Tam. Mal. *māṟu*.	*māṟu*, *māṟṟa*, *māṟṟu*.
Tel. *tēṟu*, to be clarified, to become clear as water.	*tēṭa*, clearness, purity, *tēṭu*.
Tam. Kan. *tēṟu*.	*tēṭe*, *tēṟṟa*.
Tel. *tūṟu*, to enter, to enter into a hole, to pierce, to penetrate.	*tūṭu*, a hole, *tūṭa*, a piece.

Verb	Noun
Tel. Tam. Kan. *ūru*, to spring or issue forth, ooze.	*ūṭa*, *ūṟṟu*, *ūṭe* a natural spring of water.
Tam. Mal. Kan. Tu. *ēru*, to rise, to ascend, to mount.	*ēta*; *ēru*, rising, rising ground.
Tel. *ekku*, *ettu*.	*ekka*(*m*), *ettu*, height, *ēta* (*mu*).

Tel:—

vaṇḍu, to cook.	*vaṇṭa*
paṇḍu, to become ripe.	*paṇṭa*
tivuru, to endeavour.	*tivuṭa*.
vēsaru, to become exhausted.	*vēsaṭa*.

Some roots take only *a* in the noun forms derived from them.

pāy, to cross, to flow, to jump.	*pāya*, course, way, and manner.
kāy, fruit to grow	*kāya*, fruit.

The word *kāy* itself is used as a noun in Tamil and Kanarese *e. g.*, *māngāy*, Telugu-*māmidi kāya* = mango fruit. It has become *kāyi* also in modern Kanarese. Hence neither this *i* of the modern Kanarese nor *a* of the Telugu form conveys any special signification as they are merely euphonic additions to the original word *kāy* which is still in use in Tamil and classical Kanarese. This tendency of converting *halanta* roots or words into *ajanta* words by adding *a* or *u* at the end, seems to have developed in these

languages at a later stage, so that almost all the words in Telugu, and a larger part of those in Kanarese became *ajantas*. The same tendency seems to appear very early in the Prākrits and the Pāli thus helping to drive out consonantal declensions from them. * The tendency of converting *halanta* words into *ajanta* words appears even in the case of Dravidian borrowings from Sanskrit, *i.e.*, in the formation of *tatsama* words in these languages, *e.g.*, *vāk-vākku*, *rājan-rāju* etc.

Derivative Nouns from Secondary Bases.

39. Most of the above derivatives are formed from the primary roots either with or without a slight change. The next stage in the formation of the derivative nouns is that of their derivation from the bases formed by the addition of auxiliary roots like *agu*, *utu*, to the original roots. Here again the secondary root thus formed may stand by itself as a noun or it may undergo a slight change.

Tel.	
velugu, to shine	*velugu*, light. cf. Tam. *viḷakku*.
pōgu, to go	*pōka*, going. cf. Tam. *pōgai*.
īgu, to give	*īgi*, or *īvi*, gift. cf. Kan. *īvudu*.
Tam.	
seygu, to go	*seygai*, an action. cf. Kan. *keytam*.
Tel.	
kāgu, *kā(n)gu* to be boiled ;	*kāgu*, a vessel in which water is boiled. *kāka*, Tam. *kā(n)gai*, heat.

* Pāli inflexion—*Introduction to Comparative Philology*—Gune.

"The peculiar tendency of the Pāli shared also by the Prākrits either to drop end-consonants or add an *a* to them has resulted in almost driving out consonantal declension from the Pāli."

Tel.

āgu, to stop	*āka*, stoppage.
e̤rugu, to know	*e̤ruka*, knowledge.
tunugu, to be cut and separated.	*tunuka*, a piece.
nalagu, to be bruised or powdered.	*nalaka*, a small particle.
munugu, to be immersed in water.	*munuka*, immersion.
mūgu, to be crowded.	*mūka*, a crowd.
vangu, to bend.	*vanka*, a bend. Kan. *banka*.
maḍagu, to become folded.	*maḍaka*, a folded cloth.
malagu, to be bent.	*malaka*, a ring, a bend.

In order perhaps to bring home the abstract nature of these nouns, *am* also was added to certain forms in *ka* as :—

māṟu	*māṟakam*.
tūgu	*tūkam*. Tam. *tūkkam*.
pampu	*pampakam*.
ammu	*ammakam*.
nammu	*nammakam*, (*nammiga*)

The *gu* found at the end of the above roots is only part of the auxiliary root *āgu* added to the primary roots or bases, they in their turn being used in the language as nouns. Just as in the case of the nouns previously mentioned some of these like *kāgu*, *velugu*, end in *u*, while others end in *a*. Comparing some of the above forms like *āka*, *pōka*, *naḍaka*, with the corresponding forms in Tamil and Kanarese viz., *āgal*, *pōgal*, *naḍakkal*, (K-*naḍeyal)* we are led to think that some of the *a*-ending forms of Telugu might have been originally forms in *al*. This *al* meaning 'a place' seems

to have been added to roots that have taken the auxiliary *agu*, or *utu*, in order to convert them into verbal nouns. For, besides *āgal* and *pōgal*, we have *āgudal* and *pōgudal*, and also *ādal* and *pōdal* in Tamil. Telugu also has corresponding forms in *ta*. Besides *naḍaka* which was formed from *naḍagu* we have *naḍata* which developed from the base in *utu* viz., *naḍutu*. This later on assumed the form *nadutsu*. We have already noted under verbal inflexion that all the roots that now end in *tsu* were originally roots ending in *utu* of which *tu* later on changed into *tsu*. Other roots from which derivatives in *ta* have developed :—

maḍatsu, to fold ;	*maḍata*, a fold, besides *maḍaka* (already noted).
mūyu, to shut up ;	*mūta*, a lid, besides *mūka*.
kūyu, to cry out ;	*kūta*, a cry, besides *kūka*.
chēyu, to do ;	*chēta*, doing. cf. Tam. *seydal*, doing, besides Tam. *seygai* doing.
alayu, to be exhausted ;	*alata*, exhaustion.
kōyu, to cut ;	*kōta*.
gīyu, to scratch ;	*gīta*.
nēyu, to weave ;	*nēta*.
mrōyu, *muḷanku* to make sound ;	*mrōta* besides Tam. *muḷakku*.
pūyu, to bear flowers ;	*pūta*.
vrāyu, to write ;	*vrāta*.

In all these cases we have to presume the existence of the forms in *utu* like *vrāyutu*, *mēyutu*, *pūyutu*, etc., developed from the primary roots in order to account for the noun forms like *vrāta*, *mēta*, and *pūta*.

These forms contained a nasal which is represented by a half nasal (*arthānuswāra* in later Telugu. This shows that the bases in *utu* namely *vrāyudu*, *mēyudu* etc., had originally a nasal in them as *vrāyundu*, *mēyundu* etc. (cf. earlier Tam. forms in *undu—pōgundu*, *nekkundu* etc.) Since the noun form *chēta* may be considered as a back form from the infinitive in *al*, viz., *cheydal*, developed from *cheydu*, all the above forms also, may have developed in the same manner—*mūyudal* > *mūyuta* > *mūta*. etc. (cf. Tam. *meyttal*, Tel. *mēta*; Tam. *nadattal*; Tel., *nadata*.) The root *īdu*, in Telugu has got a noun form *īta*. The earlier form of this Telugu *īdu* seems to be *īndu* and Tamil has got *nīndu* which is perhaps a still earlier form, if it is to be considered as having something to do with the word *nir*. From *nīndu* the noun form in Tamil is *nīttam* = swimming. In Kanarese *d* of *nīdu* is further softened into *j* and so we have *īju*, which itself is also used as a noun form. In some parts of the Kanarese country the initial *n* is retained in pronunciation, and it is pronounced as *nīsu* and even the Tulu language has the form *nīndu*. Thus *nīndu* seems to be the earliest form from which *īndu*, *īdu*, *īju*, have all been derived. From the root *tōnḍu* = to dig, a noun form *tōṭṭam* is derived in Tamil. This has the form *tōṭa* in Telugu. The root *tōnḍu* or *tōḍu* also appears in Telugu in the sense of digging and *tōṭa* may be considered as the earlier form developed from it (cf. *pāḍu* = *pāṭa*), while the form *tōṭṭam* found in Tamil may be a latter one as it takes the neuter termination *am*. A number of other roots also take this *am* to form derivatives in Tamil:—*āgu*, to become; *ākkam*, increase; *vīngu*, to swell, *vīkkam*, a swelling; *anju*, to fear, *achcham*, fear; *kūḍu*, to join, *kūṭṭam*, a company; *virumbu*, to desire, *viruppam*, a desire; *paḻu*, old, *paḻam*, fruit; *nal*, good, *nalam*, goodness. Unlike the words *tōṭa* and *īta* the

word *kūṭam* derived from the root *kūḍu* appears in the same form in Telugu as in Tamil, *i.e.*, with *am* as *kūṭam*. This *am* which may at first sight be identified with *am* the neuter termination of *akārānta* words in Sanskrit, like *jnāñam* and *phalam*, seems to have got a native origin as it makes its appearance in some of the very early forms of these languages. In this connection Dr. Caldwell suggests that it may be an indefinite neuter demonstrative form derived from the base *a*, just in the same manner as *em* is derived from the interrogative base *ē*. We have *edu* and *edi* the definite neuter forms derived from *ē*, similar to *adu* and *adi* from the base *a*; and corresponding to the *ēm*, Tel. *ēmi*, Kan. *ēnu*, the indefinite neuter from *ē*, the primitive language might have got *am* from the base *a*, which was made use of to form neuter nouns from verbal bases.

Besides *utu*, *uḍu* an alternative form of *unḍu* added to roots gave rise to forms like *kōyuḍu*, *mēyuḍu*, *vrāyuḍu*, *āruḍu*, *ammuḍu*, *dampuḍu*, and when the final *ḍ* was sometimes hardened into *ṭ*, we have forms like *kōyuṭa*, *mēyuṭa*, *vrēyuṭa*, *āruṭa*, *ammuṭa*, *dampuṭa*, on the one hand, and when the neuter termination *am* was added to the forms in *ḍu*, we have *kōyaḍamu*, *mēpaḍamu*, *vrāyadamu*, etc., on the other. But as these forms still retain more of the verbal nature of the base, they are called verbal nouns, as distinguished from the abstract nouns above referred to. These verbal nouns can take an adverb to modify them, while the abstract nouns can take only an adjective to qualify them and not an adverb.

Besides the roots ending in *utu*, or *utsu* which have given rise to abstract nouns in *ta* there are other roots formed by the addition of *intsu* another form of

the root *isu*, which gave rise to abstract nouns in *inta*. *e.g.*

āvalintsu, to yawn ;	*āvalinta*, a yawn.
igilintsu, to grin ;	*igilinta*, a grin.
ōkalintsu, to get disgusted ;	*ōkalinta*, disgust.
kruḷḷagintsu, to suffer mentally ;	*kruḷḷaginta*, mental pain.
giligintsu, to tickle ;	*giliginta*, tickling.

Abstract Nouns in Pu.

40. Some other roots end in *chu* which according to the Telugu grammarians gave rise to some abstract nouns in *pu*. How *chu* of these roots can become *pu* of the noun forms is beyond one's comprehension. We have to take it that it is only so far as the meaning is concerned that the root in *chu* corresponds to the noun form in *pu*. It is already noted that at a particular period in the history of these languages most of the primitive roots ending in consonants have been converted into verbal bases by adding *utu*, *utsu*, or *tsu* which was taken as a part of the root itself or as a stem-forming suffix. That is why many roots ending in consonants in other languages came to end in *tsu* in Telugu. For instance,

aḍ = to beat, to strike — *aḍachu*.

ēru = to rise, *ēru* + *utsu* > *ērutsu* > *ērtsu* > *ētsu*.

kā—*kāy* = to bear fruit, *kāy* + *utsu* > *kāytsu* > *kātsu*.

From these roots in *chu*, abstract nouns like *aḍapu*, *ēpu*, and *kāpu* are formed. Similarly, we have from *chū-chu* — *chūpu*, *talachu* — *talapu*, *trōchu*–*trōpu*, *trēchu* > *trēpu* ; *poluchu* > *polupu*, *mechchu* > *meppu*, *valachu* > *valapu*, *tīrchu* > *tīrpu*, and *mārchu* > *mārpu*. Not only the roots ending in *chu* but even a few of those that end in *yu*,

like *māyu*, *mēyu*, and also the root *kāṇ*, *kanu*, to see, gave rise to forms in *pu*, as *māpu*, *mēpu*, and *kānupu*. So it is clear that it is not *chu* that is converted into *pu*; in fact the form in *chu* has really nothing to do with the noun in *pu*, nor has it developed from *chu*. The noun in *pu* must have developed from another source, *i.e.*, from another auxiliary root appended, and because of the correspondence in meaning these forms have been brought together by the grammarians. Comparing the noun forms in *vu* developed from the primary roots like *nil*, to stand, *gel*, to win, such as Tam., *niluvai*, *nilavu*, Tel., *nilava*, remainder, balance, arrears, Kan., *nilavu*, Tel., *niluvu* standing, position, state, condition, and Kan., *gelavu*, *geluvu*, Tel., *gelvu*, gain, victory, with the Tel., *gelpu*, Mal., *kelpu*, Tam., *kerpu*, strength, power, on the one hand, and with forms in Kan., *nilku*, *nilke*, and Tel., infinitives *nilvan*, *gelvan*, on the other, we are forced to think that these forms in *vu* must have arisen from the roots ending in auxiliary *agu* or *gu*—*gelgu* > *gelvu* > *gelpu*. The fact that *vu* makes its appearance in the infinitive forms of most of the roots ending in *chu* in Telugu as *geluchu*—*geluvan*, *niluchu*–*niluvan*, *aḍachu*-*aḍavan*, *karachu*-*karavan*, and *moluchu*—*molavan*, seems to justify the conclusion that these along with the noun forms with *v* or *p* have developed from the roots in *gu* and not directly from *chu*. For, we have no infinitive forms in *chan* in the language as *geluchan*, *niluchan*; and as *chu* cannot give rise to *vu*, this must have developed from *gu* itself—*gelgan*> *gelvan*.

We have already noted that the future forms in *v* and *p* like Tam., *seyvān*, *iruppēn*; Kan., *geyvem*, *māḍpem*, could be no other than the forms developed from the roots with the auxiliary *gu*, since as a matter of fact, we find forms like Tam., *geygu*, I will do, *geygum*, we will do, (Kan., *geygum*) with *gu* itself, actually in use, as

forms of the future in the early period of these languages. In the same way the *g* of the auxiliary *agu* which was originally appended to certain roots changed into *v* and then hardened into *p* and is preserved only in the abstract noun forms derived from those bases, while the verbal base in *gu* has gone out of use, being replaced by the form in *chu*. Thus roots like *gel*, to win, have taken both the auxiliary roots *agu* and *utu* and the bases *gelgu* and *geltu*, were originally formed. Just like the form *geygu* (I will do) of the ancient language, *gelgu* also from the root *gel* to win, must have been used as a verbal base for some time. Like Telugu *cheyvu* from *geygu*, a noun form *gelvu* from *gelgu* has also developed. The noun form *gelvu* later on changed into *gelpu*, and got fixed in the language, while the form in *gu* ceased to be the verbal base and got out of use, as the form in *tu*, (later *chu*) became more prevalent and used as the common base of the verb. Thus we see the noun form in *pu* is derived from a base different from that in *chu*, though these are connected together by grammarians at a later period. Bases in *chu* gave rise to abstract forms in *ta* like *mōchu—mōta*, *pūchu—pūta*, *kalachu—kalata*, besides the forms in *pu* or *ku—mōpu*, *pūpa*, *kalaka*. From the root *mēyu* = (an animal) to eat grass, we have *mēpu* as well as *mēta*. When once this *pu* came to be considered as noun-forming suffix, it might be applied to other roots also, though actually they did not take the auxiliary root which gave rise to such a form. We have a clear instance of such application of this suffix in the formation of nouns from some adjectival roots in the language as the following :—

pasur + *pu* = *pasurpu* (yellowishness). Tel., *pasupu*.

kem + *pu* = *kempu* (redness) red stone.

kar, black, *kar* + *pu* = *karuppu*; Tel., *kappu*, blackness. *veḷ* + *pu* = *velpu*; Tel. *telupu*, *nalupu*.

Thus from a study of these noun forms as well as the bases of the verb, we understand how prevalent was the use of the auxiliary roots, *āgu* and *utu* in the early stages of these languages.

Abstract Nouns in mi, padi, ka, vi, gada, tana.

41. Abstract nouns are also formed from the primary roots by appending roots or words other than those already mentioned. The word *mey* meaning body (= Tam., *mai*) was added to roots to form abstract nouns from them.

Root	Telugu	Tamil	Kanarese
pēr	*pērmi*	*perumai*	*perme*
kūr	*kūrimi*		*kūrme*
bal	*balimi*	*vaṉmai*	*balme*
tāḷ	*tālimi*	*tāḷmai*	*taḷme*
nēr(ehu)	*nērimi*	*nērmai*	
ōr(chu)	*ōrimi*		
kal(ugu)	*kalimi*		
keli-cheli	*chelimi*		
veḷ		*venmai*	
siru		*sirumai*	
ol		*oṉmai*	*olme*
jāṉ			*jāṉme*

The word *paḍi* a form of the root *paḍu*, Tam., *padai*, Tel., *paḍayu*, to obtain, to get, to incur, (n) manner, way, method, was added to some roots in

order to make abstract nouns from them. This *paḍi* appears in Kanarese as *vaḷi*, or the Kanarese *vaḷi* might be another word *vaḷi* having almost the same meaning *i.e.*, *way, method.*

Root	Telugu	Tamil	Kanarese
chel	*chellubaḍi*		*selvaḷi*
naḍu	*naḍavaḍi*	*naḍabaḍi* } *naḍabaḍike* }	*naḍivaḷi*
nuḍu			*nuḍivaḷi*
ēlu	*ēlubaḍi*		
kaṭṭu	*kaṭṭubaḍi*	*kaṭṭubaḍi*	
kon	*konubaḍi*		
chēr	*chērubaḍi*		
tīr	*tīrubaḍi*		
pō	*pōbaḍi*		
va(chchu)	*vachchubaḍi* } *rābaḍi* }	*varumbaḍi*	
sā(gu)	*sāgubadi*	*sāgubaḍi*	*sāguvaḷi*

The forms in *ika* might have developed from the base in *iku*, a form of the root *ī* to give. These forms in *iku* or *iki* are common to all the languages.

Root	Telugu	Tamil	Kanarese
kōr	*kōriki*	*kōrikai*	*kōrike*
kāṇ	*kānuka*	*kāṇkai*	*kāṇke*
pūṇ	*pūnika*		*pūṇke*
teral			*teraḷke*

Root	Telugu	Tamil	Kanarese
arayu	*arayika*		
anju	*anjika*		*anjike*
tūgu (*tūnugu*)	*tūnika*	*tūngugai*	(*tūka*)
kūḍu	*kūḍika*	*kūḍugai*	*kūdike*
ōpu	*ōpika*		
pōl	*pōlika*	*pōlugai*	*pōlke*, *hōlike*
chūḍu	*chūḍiki*		
vinu	*viniki*		

Some abstract neuter nouns are formed by adding *vu* to the root. We may expect this *vu* also to have been derived from *gu*, the remnant of the auxiliary *agu*, for, though most of the roots have not preserved verbal bases in *gu* in Telugu, some at least like *nō* show such a base in other languages; cf. Tamil-*nō*, *nōgu* = to feel or suffer pain. Or this *v* might be due to euphonic development when *u* was added to roots ending in long vowels like *nō*, *pū*, *kā*, and *sā*. Later on this final *vu* might have been taken as a noun-forming suffix and added on to other roots for that purpose.

Root	Telugu	Tamil	Kanarese
nō Tel. *nochchu* Tam. *nōgu-nō* } to suffer pain	*nōvu*, also *novvu*, *novvi*, *noppi*	*nōy* *nosivu*	*nōvu*
sā = to die *chachchu*	*sāvu*	*chāvu*	*sāvu*

Root	Telugu	Tamil	Kanarese
pū(*chu*), to bear flowers	*pūvu*	*pūvu*	*pūvu*, *puvvu*
nil, to stand	*niluvu*	*niluvai* *nilavu*	*niluvu*, *nilavu*
puḷu	*puruvu* *pruvvu* (cf. also *purugu*)	*puḷu* *puḷuvu*	*pura*, *puḷu*, *huḷavu*
taḍai	*taḍavu*	*taḍaivu* (delay or obstruction)	*taḍevu*
teḷ, to become pure, clear	*telivu*	*teḷivu*	*tiḷivu* (*tiḷiyuvike*)
tēr, *teliyu*, to know	*telivi*	*terivu* *	
kāy, to protect	*kāvu*	cf. *kāppu*	*kāpu*

kaḍa is another word added on to roots to form nouns. It means a place, side and it is appended to roots in order to convert them into abstract nouns.

Root	Telugu	M. Kanarese
chēru	*chērugaḍa*	
tirugu	*tirugaḍa*	*tirugaḍe*
manu	*manugaḍa*	
viḍu	*viḍugaḍa*	*biḍugaḍe*
virugu	*virugaḍu*	
nil	*nilukaḍa*	*nilugaḍe*

* Noun forms like *aṟivu*=knowledge, in Tamil, when compared with the verbal base in *erugu* in Telugu, clearly indicate that *vu* has arisen from *gu* of the verbal base.

The word *tana* also is added mostly to words denoting animate objects, * in order to make abstract noun forms from them. But this *tana* should not be added to Sanskrit bases. Kesi Raja in his *Sabdamaṇi-darpana* clearly forbids appending this to Sanskrit bases by saying '*Samskritadoḷ idu salladu, ārohakatanam embudu abaddham*'. This clearly shows that this *tana* is only of a Dravidian origin and has nothing to do with *ta* or *tva* of Sanskrit, though it is put to a similar use in the Dravidian languages. This *tana* that denotes the quality of the object denoted by the base to which it is appended, *i.e.*, the very nature itself of that object, can be no other than a form of the reflexive pronoun *tana*. The various ways in which it is used in combination with other words in Dravidian Languages, in order to signify different meanings warrants our supposition that it was also used as a particle to form abstract nouns. In the present day colloquial Tamil *tān* is added to many words in order to add a sort of emphasis to the idea expressed, *i.e.*, in the sense of 'only that' or 'merely that' 'that by itself'; *e.g.*, *avan tān* = he himself, *avaḷavu tān* = that much only. Similarly it is quite likely that *tan* with the common neuter suffix *am* added to it, (*tan* + *am* = *tanam*) could have been appended in early times to words in order to form abstract nouns from them. Just like the Kanarese grammarians Telugu grammarians also do not recognise the use of this *tana* after Sanskrit bases. It is appended only to *tatsama*, *tadbhava* and *desya* words in Telugu; *i.e.*, we may say *Rāmu*(*ni*)*tanamu*, but not *Rāma tanamu*.

This again is added only to nouns and adjectives but not to verbal bases, and it does not signify the act

* "*Chetaneshvike ume tanūni.*" *Karnataka Bhasha Bhushanam* p. 179. (*Chetana vishayadalli Bhāvārdhakke ike, u, me, tana, emba pratyayagal untu.*)

but the nature of the object denoted by the base. Anyhow it serves as an illustration to show how noun forms were developed in the language on the principle of agglutination.

Base	Kanarese	Telugu
kali	*kalitanam*	*kalitanamu*
āḷ	*aḷtanam*	
eggu	*eggatanam*	
marul	*marultanam*	
peṇ	*peṇtanam*	
per—pedda	Tam., *periyatanam*	*pettanamu*
chinna	Tam., *chinnatanam*	*chinnatanamu*

Common Dravidian Noun-forming Suffixes.

42. A comparison of the forms of the derivative nouns found in the most important of the Dravidian languages shows that the following suffixes are common to them, thereby showing that they have all developed from a common basis.

Tamil	Kanarese	Telugu
kai *irukkai* a seat (from *iru* to be)	*ke* *eruke* knowledge *kāṇke*, *pūṇke*	*ka* *eruka*, knowledge, *kānuka*, *pūnika*
vai *pārvai* gracious sight, *pāru* to see	*ve* *paḷave*, *eḷave*,	*va* *niluva* what stands or remains (*nil* to stand)

Tamil	Kanarese	Telugu
vi	*bi-vi*	*vi*
kēlvi what is heard, rumour, *kēl* to hear	*kibi* ear *aḷavi*	*chevi* ear
pu	*pu*	*pu*
iruppu being (*iru* to be) *uḍuppu* overcoat	*balpu*, *taṇpu*	*mārpu* change *tanupu*, *uḍupu* clothes
ti	*te*	*ti-di*
maṟati forgetting *mara* to forget	*negaḷte*, *agaḷte*.	*cheydi* doing, action (from *sey* to do) *kuditi* drink for animals, rice water (from *kudchu* to drink)
tal		*dala*
aṟidal knowing (from *ari* to know)		*oppudala* consent (from *oppu* to give consent)
am		
nōkkam sight, looking (*nōkku* to see) *tūkkam* weight from *tūngu* to weigh		*tūkam* weight (from *tūgu* to weigh)
ai	*e*	*a*
naḍai walk (*nada* to walk) *kolai* killing (*kol* to kill)	*naḍe*	*naḍa* walk *kola*
mai	*me*	*mi*
seyyāmai not doing (*sey* to do) *perumai* greatness	*perme*	*chēyami* not doing *pērmi*
mati		*mati*
ēṟṟumadi (from *ēru* to rise) *iṟakkumadi* (from *iṟangu* to descend)		*egumati* *digumati*

Tamil	Kanarese	Telugu
pādu *sāppādu* (taking) food		*pāṭu* *ērpāṭu* from *ērpaḍu* *porapāṭu* from *porapaḍu*, *tīrupāṭu*
aḍam *kaṭṭaḍam* building (from *kaṭṭu* to bind)		*kaṭṭaḍamu* building

43. An investigation into the formation of derivative nouns too in these languages makes it clear how the principle of agglutination has been at work even from the earliest stages of the development of the languages belonging to the Dravidian group; and it is now evident that all the words in them which go under different classes, according to the present classification, as nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc., have developed on the principle of root agglutination from the original primary roots of the primitive Dravidian Language. It may, however, be said that the same would be the case with all other languages of the world, since all of them must have developed from the root stage by some method or other. Granting even that, we cannot at least help recognising the fact that the Dravidian Languages have followed a method of their own in their development all through these ages, keeping close to the principle of agglutination and leaving behind perceptible marks of their growth. It is by deciphering these that we are able to trace the line of their development back from their present condition to the earliest stage while it must be said that the same method cannot be adopted in the case of most other languages, especially

Conclusion.

of the members of the Indo-European family, like Sanskrit. This inquiry into the nature and condition of the primitive Dravidian Language thus carries us back to a period "beyond all history, beyond all mythology" when the primitive Dravidian expressed his ideas in the language of roots.

APPENDIX

COMMON ROOT MATERIAL

Roots in which the included vowel undergoes a change in different languages :—

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
aṟi	*aṟi* to know, to understand.	*aṟi* to know.	*eṟugu* to know.
āḷ	*āḷ* to govern, rule.	*āḷ* to govern. Tu. *āḷu.*	*ēlu* to rule, govern.
en	*en*, M. *ennu* to speak, to say.	*en*, *an* Tu. to say, to speak, to call.	*anu* to say, speak.
eri	*eri* to flame, to burn, to suffer pain, smart.	*uri* to burn, to blaze. Tu. *eri.*	*eriyu* to burn, to smart, to suffer.
pey	*pey*, to rain, to fall as rain M. *peyyuga* cf. Tam. *poigai* a tank.	*poy* to pour down, to give or pour water. cf. *poy nīr.*	*pōyu* to pour water.
piṟ	*piṟa* to proceed from, be born, arise. cf. *pēṟu* birth.	*peṟ*, *peṟu* to get, to acquire, obtain, to beget, to bear, give birth to.	*puṭṭu* to be obtained, to get, to be born, to proceed from.
tar	*tar*, *taru*, *tār* to lead or conduct near, to bring, to give.	*tar*, *taru* to bring.	*techchu* to bring cf. *tēraḍu*, *tēran.*
chal	*callu* to sprinkle water.	*chellu*, *challu*, *chil* to scatter about or strew, to throw away.	*challu*, to sprinkle water.

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
oḻi	Tam. *oḻuku, vaḍi*, M. *oḻi*.	*oḍi, oḻku* to flow in a small stream, to trickle.	*ōḍu, vaḍiyu oluku* to flow down, to trickle down.
iṟ	*iṟanku* to descend; (M) *iṟa ñ ñu* to alight, to bow respectfully etc.	*eṟagu* to descend, to bow.	*eṟagu* to bow down, to prostrate.
iṇai	*iṇai* to join, unite, to agree.	*eṇe* union, conjunction; Tu. *iṇe*.	*enayu*, to join, to unite.
isa	*iyangu* to shine.	*ese* to shine, to be brilliant, beautiful.	*esagu* to shine; cf. (n) *esakamu* brilliance.
ira	*ira* to beg alms, solicit aid.	*ere* to beg alms, pray, beseech.	cf. *tiriyu* (?) to beg alms.
	(n) *iraval* alms, anything borrowed.	(n) *eravu* begging, anything borrowed.	(n) *eravu* anything borrowed.
iṟai	*iṟai* to scatter abroad, to draw or pour out water.	*eṟachu* to sprinkle, to scatter, to sow.	
ilir	*ilir* to stand erect as the hair, to sprout.	*elarchu* to sprout, germinate.	*elarchu* to bloom.
	(n) cf. *iḻanagai* smile.	*elanage*.	*elanagavu*.
iḻu	*iḻu, iji* to draw, to pull, drag.	*eḻe, iḻ* to pull, drag.	*iḍ(chu)* to drag along.
uḍei	*uḍei, oḍi* to break, to crack, split, to open as a boil.	*oḍe* to break, to burst into fragments. Tu-*uḍe*.	*ōti (kunḍa)* a broken po *ūḍchu* open.

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
uṇa	*uṇangu* to dry as grain.	*oṇagu* to become sapless; Tu. *uṇungu.*	*vaṭṭu* to become dry.
udai	*udai* to kick.	*ode* to kick.	
uri	*uri* to peel as skin, to strip off, to slough off as a serpent.	*urichu* to flay, to strip off as bark.	*oluchu* to peel, to strip off as bark.
urai	*urai* to be effaced by rubbing, to rub into paste.	*ore* to rub. Tu. *ure.*	*orayu* to rub against, *aragadīyu* to rub into paste.
urai	*urai* to tell, to say.	*ore* to speak.	
uṟaku	*uṟanku* to sleep, to feel drowsy, to become closed.	*oṟagu*, to sleep.	cf. Tel. *oṟagu* to droop down, to recline.
uḷai	*uḷambu* to make noise. *(ulai)*	*uli* to sound.	*uliyu* to make sound, to cry.
	oli to sound, to roar, as the ocean (n) a cry.	(n) *uli* a cry.	(n) *ulivu* a cry, a sound.
ekku	*ekku* to contract the abdominal muscles.	*akkaḷisu* to contract the belly.	*akkaḷinchu.*
eḷku	*eḷku* to fear.	*aḷku* to fear; Tu.	*aḷku* to fear.
oḷi	*oḷi* to cease, stop, desist, abandon.	*uḷi* to leave, to abandon, to be left. Tu. *oḷi.*	*uḍugu* to desist from, to leave, abandon.
edir	*edir* to oppose.	*idir* that which is opposite.	*eduru* to oppose.
kiḍu	*keḍu* to be spoiled.	*kiḍu* to go to ruin; Tu. *keḍagu.*	*cheḍu* to be spoiled.

Probable Primitive Form	Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
kuṭṭu	*kuṭṭu* to beat. *koṭṭu* to strike.	*kuṭṭu* to beat, strike ; Tu.	*koṭṭu* to beat.
kuṇuku	*kuṇuku* prattle, talk pleasantly.		*goṇugu* to prattle, talk indistinctly.
kuḻi	*kuḻi* to be hallowed out as a pit, to sink hollow.	*kuḻi* to sink a pit ; Tu.	*grochchu* to dig a pit.
kiḍa / *kīḻ?*	*kiḍa* to fall down, to sink, perish.	*keḍe*, to fall down, to drop ; Tu.	*keḍayu* to die, perish.
kuy	*koy* to cut.	*kuy*, *kuyi*, *koy* to cut. cf. *kuyilu* reaping ; Tu.	*kōyu*, to cut, to pluck. cf. (n) *kayilu*.
koṟe	*koṟe* to bite, to gnaw.	*kuṟuku kuṟanku*, to bite.	*koṟuku* to bite.
kō, *kōr*	*kō*, *kōr* to thread, to string (as pearls, upon a thread.)	*kō*. *kōsu* to thread.	*kruchchu*, *guchchu* to string as pearls, to thread.
cār	*cār* to approach, reach, to be near to, to be associated with.	*sār* to approach ; Tu. *sēr*.	*cēru* to be near, to approach, to be associated with.
cel	*cel* to go, to occur, to last, endure, to pass as coin, to be suitable.	*sal*, *sallu* ; Tu. *sal*.	*cellu*.
teli	*teḷi* to become clear or pure.	*tiḷi*, *taḷi* ; Tu. *teri* to become clear, bright, to come to light, to be known.	*teli*(*yu*) to be known.

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
tuḍu	*toḍu* to join, to put on as ornaments.	*tuḍu, toḍu* to join, put on ; Tu.	*toḍu, toḍugu* to put on as clothes.
tuḷ	*tuḷanku* to be agitated, to shake as water.	*tuḷaku* to be agitated ; *tuḷuku* to scatter in drops.	*tolaku, tonaku.*
tuḷai	*tuḷai*, to make a hole.	(n) *tola* hole.	*toluchu* to bore.
tuḷir	*tuḷir* to bud, shoot, sprout.	*teḷir* to bud.	*talirchu* to bud, to put forth leaves.
tiṟa	*tiṟa* to open ; M. *tura* to show the way.	*teṟe* to be unclosed, to open ; Tu.	*teṟachu* to open.
narai	*narai* M. *nare.*	*nare, nere* to become grey as the hair ; Tu.	*nariyu, narayu* to become grey.
nil	*niṟ, nil* to stand still.	*nil, nilu* not to walk, to stand; *nelasu* to settle stay; *nela* ground, soil.	*nilu* to stand ; *nelavu* place, residence.
nīṟ	*nīṟu, nūṟu* to be reduced to powder.	*nīṟu* powder, ashes.	*nūṟu* to be reduced to powder; *nīṟu* ashes.
pugaḻ	*pugaḻ* to praise.	*pogaḻ* to praise.	*pogaḍu.*
vīḻ	*viḻu, vīḻ* to fall, to die.	*biḻu, bīḻ* to fall, die; Tu. *būru.*	*biddu.*
aḻ	*aḻu* to weep, cry.	*aḻ, aḻu* Tu. *ar.*	*ēḍtsu* to cry, weep ; *aḍalu.*

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
ā	*āgu* to become manifest, happen, to come into being.	*āgu agu*, to become; Tu. *ā*, *āpini*.	*agu*, *avu* to become.
	ā to bind. (*yā*)	cf. Tu. *aḍḍa* obstacle.	*āgu* to obstruct. (n) *aḍḍamu*.
ī	*ī*, *īgai* to give. (n) *īvu* giving.	*ī* to give, to bestow, *ikku*, *ingu*.	*ī*, *ichchu*. cf. (n) *īgi*, *īvi* gift.
īn	*īnu* to bring forth young, to yean.	*īn* to bring forth young as animals; (n) *īta* the act of bringing forth.	*īnu* cf. *īta*. (n).
īnd	*nīnd*, to swim.	*īsu* ; Tu. *īju*.	*īdu*.
īḻ	*īḻ* to pull, drag along.	*īḻ* (*īr*) to pull, to draw.	*īḍu*, *īḍuchu* to pull, draw.
ō	*uva* to love.	*ō* to love, to be attached to.	*ōmu*, to love. cf. *ovvani* (neg.)
aḍ	*aḍu* to kill ; *aḍi* to drive in, to beat, strike.	*anunku* to destroy ; *aḍachu*.	*aḍuchu*.
aṭ, *aṇ*	*aṭu* to be next, near ; *aṇṇu* to join, come in contact with.	*aṭṭu*. Tu. *aṇe* to press, come into contact with.	*aṇṭu*.
aḍ	*aṭu* to cook, boil dress, fry ; M. *aṭuka*.	*aḍu* to cook. Tu. *aḍ*.	cf. (n) *aḍasāla* kitchen ; *aḍabāla* cook.

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
att	*attu* to unite as two parts, to apply, press down.	*hattisu.*	*attu, addu* to unite, to apply, press down.
al	*alai* to wave, shake, move, go to and fro ; M. *ala.*	*ale* to move, wander; Tu. *alang.*	*ala* wave. (n) *allāḍu* to move about, wander, to go to and fro.
ār	*ār* to become full, to be satisfied.	*āru* to become full, to spread over.	*āru* to be full ; cf. *pempāru, tanupāru.*
ār	*ār* to shout, roar.	*ār* to shout ; Tu. *ārkuni.*	*ārchu* to cry out.
al	*allu* to join, knit nets.	*allu* Tu. *ala.*	*allu* to join, knit.
āy	*āy* to diminish, to be reduced, to suffer pain.	*āy* to diminish.	cf. *āyi* (colloq.) pain.
āḷ	*āḷ* to sink, plunge.	*āḷ* to be immersed, to sink ; Tu. *āḷa* depth.	*āḍu* in *tīrthamāḍu, lōgu.*
āṟ	*āṟu* to be appeased, cool, to grow cold.	*āṟu* to grow cold; Tu. *ār.*	*āṟu* to grow cold, to heal as a wound.
ir	*iru* to exist, to remain, to live, to be, to sit.	*iru* to be, to exist, to sit, to live.	*iruvukonu* to be settled, to become established ; cf. *iravu* a place, house.
uṇ	*uṇ* to eat or drink, take food, enjoy.	*uṇi* to eat, to enjoy; Tu.	cf. *uṇ ṇ-āsa*, desire for food.

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
uṟ	*uṟu* to be, to exist, befall, approach. (P.P. *uṟṟu*.)	*uṟ*, *uṟu* to be, to stay, to stop, to come about.	*uṟu*, to be fit; cf. *oppu*.
ur	*urpu* to become big, to bloat, puff up.	*urbu*, *ubbu*, *urvu* to swell; Tu. *urpu*, *ubiku* to overflow.	*ubbu* to swell, puff up; *ubuku* to overflow.
uy	*uy* to ride, drive.	*uy* to carry off.	*ūgu*; cf. *ūyala*.
uḷ	*uḷ* to be, to have, to possess; *unṭu*.	*uḷ (oḷ)* to be, to have; K.; Tu. *uṇḍu*.	*uṇḍu* to be.
ūd	*ūdu* to blow.	*ūdu*; Tu.	*ūdu*. cf. *ūyala*.
ūḷ	*ūḷai* an outcry, a howl.	*ūḷ* to call near from a distance, to cry out, to howl.	(n) *ūḷa* howling.
ūr	*ūṟu* to flow up as a spring.	*ūṟu* to ooze.	*ūru* to spring as water.
ey	*ey* to discharge arrows.	*ēy* to discharge arrows; Tu. *eyi*.	*ēyu*.
ēḷ	*eḷu* to rise as from a seat, to appear, arise, to start, to awake.	*eḷ*, *ēḷ* to stand up, to rise, to awake, to arise, spring up; Tu. *yēruni*.	cf. *ekku*, *eṭṭu*, *lēchu* to stand up, rise.
ol	*ol*, *ollu* to be able, to desire, to agree, to be fit.	*ol*, *val* to be pleased, to like, love; Tu. *oḷi*.	cf. *allāru*; *val* to be pleased.
eṟ	*eṟi* to pick up as flowers.	*ēṟu* to glean, select.	*ēṟu* to pick up as flowers, to select.
kal(r)	*kal*, *kaṟṟal* to learn study.	*kal* to learn; Tu.	*kaṟachu* to learn.

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
kā	*kā*, *kāy* to protect.	*kā*, *kāy* to protect, guard, save ; Tu.	*kāchu* to protect.
kāṇ	*kāṇ* to see, perceive, to gain sight of.	*kāṇ* to see, perceive ; Tu. *kaṇṇu* eye, sight.	*kanu* to see.
kāy	*kāy* to grow hot, to be warm.	*kāy* to grow hot, be heated, to burn ; Tu. *kāyi*.	*kā(n)gu*, *kāyu* to grow hot, be heated.
kāy	*kāy* to bear fruit.	*kāy* to bear fruit ; Tu. (n) *kāyi*.	*kāchu* to bear fruit.
kāṟ	*kāṟu*, *kāl* to vomit, to emit.	*kāṟ*, *kāṟu* to vomit ; Tu.	*krāyu* to vomit.
ki	*chī* to become pus.	*kī* to become pus.	*chīku*, *chivuku* to rot ; cf. *chīmu* pus.
kiḷ	*kīḻ*, *kīḷ* to rend, tear, split.	*kiḷ* to pull out, pull off, uproot ; Tu. (n) *kīru* a split.	*chīru* to split, to rend, tear ; *chīlu* to be split.
kūr	*kūr* to be abundant, excessive ; M. *kūru* to love.	*kūr* to be attached, to love.	*kūru*, *kūruchu* to be attached, to love.
kū	*kūgu*, cry out.	*kūgu* ; Tu. *kūg*.	*kūyu* to cry.
key	*sey* to do, to perform.	*key*, *gey* to perform ; Tu.	*chey* to do, to perform.
kēḷ	*kēḻ* to hear, to listen to, to ask, demand.	*kēḷ* to hear, to listen, to ask, to demand ; Tu. *kēṇ*.	cf. (n) *chevi* ear.
kel	*keli*, *kel* to win, conquer, overcome.	*gel* to conquer, win.	*geluchu* to win, to conquer, to overcome.

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
kol	*kol* to kill, to slay.	*kol* to kill, to slay; Tu. *kole* murder.	*kola* killing.
koḷ	*koḷ*, *koḷḷu* to seize, to take, to lay hold of, to accept.	*koḷ* to seize, to buy, to take away; Tu. *kol* cleave.	*konu* to take, to buy.
kōr	*kōru* to request, solicit, wish, desire; M. *kōṟu*.	*kōṟu* to request, wish, desire; Tu. *kōru*.	*kōru* to request, to wish.
kīṟ	*kīṟu*.	*kīṟu*, *gīru* to rub off, to scrape; Tu.	*gīṟu*.
kēr	M. *chēṟu* to winnow.	*kēṟu* to winnow.	*cherugu*.
chā	*chāy* to happen, to succeed.	*sāgu* to go, to lengthen; Tu.	*sāgu* to proceed, to lengthen.
chū	*chuṭṭu* pointing at; M. *chūṇḍu* to point at.	*chūpu* (n) sight; Tu. *tū* to see.	*chūchu* to see; *chū* see, behold.
cāl	*cāl* to be abundant, full, extensive.	*sāl* to be abundant, suitable, fitting.	*tsālu* to be abundant, full.
cōr	*cōr* to languish, to be weary, to faint.	*sōr* to fall, to faint, to be weary.	*sōlu* to faint, to languish.
taṇ	*taṇi* to be allayed, mitigated, soothed, to be satisfied; cf. *taṇ* coolness.	*taṇ*, *taṇi* to grow cool, to be refreshed, satisfied; Tu.	*taniyu* to be satisfied, refreshed.
tāḷ	*tāḷ*.	*tāḷ*, *tāḷu* to hold, to take, suffer, endure, wait; Tu.	*tāḷu* to bear, to wait; cf. (n) *tālimi* patience.

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
tī	*tī*, *tiy* to burn.	*tī*, *sī*, *tīy* to burn ; Tu. *tū* fire.	*tīṇḍrinchu* to be fierce, to burn.
tīr	*tīru* to end, expire, vanish, to be completed.	*tīru*, *tīr* to be finished, to cease, to be accomplished, to die.	*tīru* to be finished.
	tīrpu.	*tīrisu* to decide ; Tu. *tīruni*.	*tīruchu* to decide, to give judgment.
tō	*tuvai*, *tōy* to bathe in cold water; become wet or moist, to be dipped, soaked, to wash, to dye, to tinge.	*tō*, *tuy*, *tōy* to become wet, to be dipped ; Tu. *toi* to wash.	*tōgu* to be dipped in water; cf. Tel. *tōpu* colour.
tōṟ	*tōnṟu*, *tōṟṟu* M. *tōnnu*, to appear, to be visible, to come to mind, to be born, to exist, seem.	*tōṟ*, *tōṟu* to appear, to be visible, to come into existence, to show; Tu. *tōj* to appear.	*tōchu* to become visible, to appear; cf. (n) *trōva* path.
tir	*tiri* to walk about.	*tiri* to turn round ; Tu. *tirduni*.	*tirugu* to go round.
	tirugu wander, to turn.	*tirugu* to turn, to go round.	*tirugu* to wander, to turn.
	tirumpu to turn, turn back, return.		*trippu*.
	tirundu to be correct, to be amended, improved.	*tindu* to be correct, to be reformed.	*diddu* to correct.

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
tin	*tinnu* to eat.	*tin*, *tinnu* to eat specially by using teeth; Tu.	*tinu* to eat.
tīṟ	*tīṭṭu* to whet.	*tīḍu* to press, to rub, to whet, sharpen.	*tīḍu* to whet, sharpen.
tūn	*tūkku*, to weigh, to swing.	*tūgu* to weigh; Tu. *tūku*.	*tū(n)gu*, *tūchu*.
tuṇ	*tuṇi* to cut to pieces.	*tuṇḍisu* to cut or break into pieces.	*tunumu* to cut to pieces.
naḍ	*naḍa* to walk.	*naḍe*, *naḍi* to walk, go, proceed; Tu.	*naḍachu* to walk.
nāṭ	*naḍu* to fix; *nāṭṭu* to fix in the ground, to plant.	*naḍu*, *nāṭu* to fix firmly, to plant, to enter, to pierce; Tu.	*nāṭu* to plant, to pierce, to fix firmly.
nō	*nō*, *noy*, *nōgu* to suffer pain.	*nō*, *noy*, *nōyu* to suffer pain; Tu.	*nochchu* to feel pain.
nān	*nān* to get wet, moist, damp, or soaked.	*nān*, *nānu* to get moist or soaked.	*nānu* to get soaked, to be wet.
nēy	*nēy*, *ney* to weave.	*ney*, *nēy*, *nēyu* to weave; Tu.	*nēyu* to weave.
nōn	*nōn* to observe a vow or a religious obligation.	*nōn*, *nōnu* to perform any meritorious act of devotion.	*nōmu*, *nōchu*.
nīḷ	*nīḷ* to extend, to stretch out, to grow long.	*nīḍu*, *nīḷ* to extend as the arms, tongue etc., to spread.	*nikku* to stretch out ones limbs; cf. *nīlgu* (n).

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam., Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
nir	*nira* to spread, expand.	*nere* to bring or put together, to join.	*nerapu* to spread.
niṟ	*niṟappu* (caus.) to fill, satisfy.	*neṟapu* to fill ; Tu. *neri*, *nere* to be full.	*nimpu* to fill ; *neṟapu*.
	niṟai to become full, to abound.	*neṟe* to become full.	*neṟayu*, *niṇḍu* to be full.
pāy	*pāy* to spring, leap, to flow, to jump down, to run.	*pāy* to spring, to move ; Tu. *pāyi* to ripple, be agitated.	*pāyu* to be separated from, to move away.
piḷ	*piḷ* to burst, open, to be rent, to cleave asunder.	*piḷigu* to be rent.	*pigulu* to be rent; cf. *peelika* a rag.
pīr	*pīr* to suck.	*pīr* to suck up; Tu. *pīr* to ooze.	*pīrchu*, *pīlchu* to suck up.
pū	*pū* to flower.	*pū* flowers to be produced ; Tu.	*pūchu* to flower; cf. *pū* (n).
pūṇ	*pūṇ* to undertake, to begin, bear a burden.	*pūṇ*, *pūḍu* to join, unite, to yoke, put oxen to carts, to begin, arrange.	*pūnu* to undertake, to begin; *pūnchu* to join, to yoke oxen etc.
pūḻ	M. *pūḻu* to be buried.	*pūḻ* in inwrap, to insert, to bury.	*pūḍu* to be covered.
	pūndu to sink in the ground.		*pūḍchu* to bury.
pūy	*pūcu* to smear, daub, to apply.	*pūsu* to smear, to apply ; Tu. *pūju*.	*pūyu* to smear, apply, to plaster.

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
peṟ	T. *uṟai* M. *piri* to coagulate as milk, to become disjoint, separate.	*peṟ* to thicken, to congeal, to curdle; Tu. *perpuni* to be curdled.	*pĕrukonu* to thicken, to congeal, curdle; *viṟugu* to break, go to pieces.
pĕr	*peragu*, *perukku*.	*perchu* to become more, to grow.	*perugu*, to increase, grow.
pĕl̤	*pĕcu* to utter, say.	*pĕl̤* to utter, say, speak.	*prĕlu*, *pĕlu* to chatter, prattle.
pol̤	*pol̤e* to pour, to pour down or out.	*poy* to beat, to pour, to cast.	*pōyu* to pour, to cast in metal.
poḷ	*poḷe*, *oḷe* to shine.	*poḷe* to shine, to be bright.	*poluchu* to appear, to shine.
pō	*pōgu* to go.	*pōgu* to go ; Tu.	*pō*, *pōvu* to go.
pōr	*pōr* (n) wrestling, quarrel, fight.	*pōr* to wrestle, to fight ; Tu.	*pōru* to fight, wrestle, quarrel.
pōl	*pōl* to resemble.	*pōl* to be like, to resemble.	*pōlu* to resemble.
māṇ	*māṟu*, *mān* to heal.	*māṇ* to stop, to cease, to desist from, to heal ; Tu. *māṇā* to abate, to decrease.	*mānu*, to leave, to desist from, to heal, *mālu* to lose.
māy	*mā*, *māy*, *māchu* filth, dirt.	*māsu* to grow dim, dirty ; Tu.	*māyu* to become dirty.
		māy, *māṇ* to cease, to be healed.	*māpu*, to make dirty, destory.
māṟ	*māṟu* to barter, to sell, to be changed.	*māṟu* to take or give one thing for another, to sell.	*māṟu* to be changed, altered, to exchange.

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
min	*min* to shine, to glitter.	*minuku* to shine; *mintsu*; Tu.	*minuku* to shine.
mīṟ	*mīṟu* to go beyond, to transgress, to pass.	*mīṟu* to go beyond, to surpass, exceed; Tu. *mīr*.	*mīṟu* to exceed, to surpass, to go beyond.
meṟ	*meṟugu* to glitter.	*meṟe* to shine, to glitter; Tu. *mere*.	*meṟayu* to shine.
mēy	*mēy* to graze, to eat grass.	*mē, mēy, mēyu* to graze, to feed, to eat grass; Tu.	*mēyu* to graze.
var	*varu* to come.	*baru, bar* to come; Tu. *barpini*.	*vacchu* to come.
vil	*vil* to sell.	*bil* to sell, to buy.	*viluchu* to buy.
vēḷ	*vēd, vēḷ* to sacrifice.	*bēl, belu* to offer into fire as ghee.	*vēlchu* to sacrifice.
vē	*vē* to be burnt.	*bē, bisu, beyyu*; Tu. *beseyuni* to get hot.	*vēgu* to be burnt, scorched.
vāy	*vāy*.	*bā, bāyu* to swell.	*vāchu* to swell.
vāḍ	*vāḍu* wither, fade.	*bāḍu* fade; Tu.	*vāḍu* wither.
vīḻ	*vīḻ, vīḻ* to fall, to slip from the hand; *biḍu*.	*biḻ, biḻ* to fall, to slip from hand; *biḍu* to let loose, quit.	*vīḍu* to fall, slip, to leave off, quit.
sā	*sāy* to die; *chāy* to happen, to succeed.	*sāy* to die; *sāgu* to go, to move forward.	*tsatsu* to die; *tsāvu* (n.); *sāgu* to go, to lengthen.
sēr	*chēr, chēru*.	*sār, sēr* to become or be close, to go to, to approach, join.	*chēru* to approach, to go near,

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
veḷ	*veḷ, veṇ* whiteness.	*beḷ, biḷa* whiteness; Tu. *biḷi* white.	*vel, vella* white; *velaru, velugu* to shine.
payir	*p a y i r, pasupu, payappu* greenness.	*pasir, pasur, payir* green, yellowishness, tenderness, young; *pasurpu* greenness; Tu. *paji.*	*pasaru* green; *p a s u p u* yellowishness.
kem	*cem* r e d; *cembarutti.*	*kem* red; *kembatti*; Tu. *kenja* red.	*kem, cem* red; cf. *cendova.*
kar	*kari* black.	*kar, kari* black; Tu. *kariya.*	*kari* black; *kappu* blackness.
nal	*nal* black		*nalla* black.
iru	*iru* black; *i r u l* darkness.	*iru* dark; *irā* night; Tu. *irlu* darkness.	*irulu* darkness.
nal	*nal, nan* good; *nalla* good.	*nal* good, d e a r ness; Tu. *nal.*	*nali* p r o p e r, good.
tim	*tim* sweet, pleasant.	T u . *tīpe* sweetness, sweet.	*tīpi* sweet; *tiyani* sweet.
puḷ	*puḷi* acidity.	*puḷi* acidity; Tu.	*puḷla* acid, sour; *puḷpu* acidity.
ogar	*uvar*, s a l t n e s s; *tuvar* astringent.	*ogar, ogaru* an astringent taste.	*vagaru, ogaru* astringent.
vem	*veyil* sunshine; *vekkai* heat.	*bem, bisu, beccane* heat, hot; Tu. *becca.*	*veccana* hot; *vēḍi* heat.
tol	*tol* old, ancient, natural.		*toli* old, first, previous.
naḍu	*naḍu* that which is middle.	*naḍu* middle; Tu.	*naḍumu* middle.

Probable Primitive Form.	Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
mĕ, mēl	*mē, mēl* above, high.	*mĕl, mēge, mēle* that which is above, high, that which is more ; Tu.	*mēlu* good.
kīḻ	*kīḻ* low.	*kīḻ* below, under, down ; Tu. *kīḻ* base, low.	*kri, krinda* under, below, down.
mun	*munu* before.	*mun, mum* before, at a previous time ; Tu. *mum* in front.	*mun, munnu* before.
pin	*pin* back, behind.	*pin, pir* behind ; Tu. *pira* behind.	*pin* ; cf. *pimmaṭa* afterwards.
ven	*ven* back.	*ben, bennu* back ; Tu. *beri* the back.	*ven, venuka, pingali, vīpu* back.
nuṇ	*nuṇ* slender, fine.	*nuṇ* smoothness, softness, fineness.	*nunu* fine; *nunupu* smoothness ; *nunna* smooth.
in	*in, inippu* sweet.	*in, impu* sweet, pleasant.	*impu* sweetness, pleasant, happiness.
kiṟu	*chiṟu* small, little.	*kiṟu, cikka* small ; Tu. *kiru, kinni.*	*chiṟu, chinna* small.
pĕr	*periya* large, great; M. *peru.*	*pĕr* great.	*pĕr, peru, pedda* great.
tāḻ	*tāḻ, tāḻu* low, deep.	*tāḻ* being low ; *tālu* the bottom.	*tāṟu* to become concealed ; *tarugu, taggu* to become depressed, low.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
agaḻ	*agaḻ* to excavate, dig out, to uproot.	*agaḻ* to excavate etc.	cf. *agaḍta* (n) moat, ditch round a fort.
aci	*ajai* to move, shake.	*asi* to move, dangle.	*asi-yāḍu* to move, shake.
añcu	*añcu* to fear, dread.	*añju* to fear; Tu.	*añju* to fear.
aḍai	*aḍakku* to condense, pack.	*aḍaku* to control, to condense.	*aḍagu* to be pressed; *aḍachu* to repress, pack.
aḍi	*aḍi* to beat, strike.	*aḍachu* to beat, strike.	*aḍuchu* to strike.
attu	*attu* to unite, as two or more parts.	*hattisu* to unite.	*attu* to unite, to apply.
adir	*adir* to shake, quake.	*adir* to shake; Tu. *aḍr*, *adar*.	*aduru* to shake, tremble.
andu	*andi* to be united, to agree.	*andu* to meet with; Tu. *ane* to touch.	*andu* to reach, obtain, gain.
amar	*amar* to abide, to rest, to be suitable, to become established.	*amar* to be suitable; Tu. *amar-chu* to join, fix.	*amaru* to be suitable; *amarchu* to fix on.
aḻku	*arugu* to be reduced.	*aragu* to decay, to be digested.	*aṟagu* to digest.
allāḍu	*allāḍu* to wander from place to place.	*allāḍu*; Tu. *alachuni* to move, shake.	*allāḍu*.
allu	*allu* to knit, weave, to interlace closely.	*allu* to knit; Tu. *alavuni* to mix, level.	*allu* to knit.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
alar	*alar* to blossom, to open up, expand.	*alar* to blossom, to expand ; Tu. *aral, alar.*	*alaru* to expand, to be pleased.
ala	*alangu* to be weary, fatigued, tired.	*alasu* to be weary.; Tu. *ale.*	*alayu* to be tired, fatigued.
alai	*alai* to wave, shake, move, go to and fro.	*ale* to wave ; Tu. *ale* to wander, roam.	*ala* (n.) wave.
aḻu	*aḻu* to cry, weep to cry aloud.	*aḻu* to weep, cry ; *aḻal, aḍal.*	*aḍalu* to cry aloud.
aḻku	*aḻukku* to be frightened.	*aḻaku, aḻuku* to fear, to be afraid of ; Tu. *aḻku*	*aluku, aḻku* to be afraid of.
aṟu	*aṟu* to break, to cease, to become extinct.	*aṟi* to be ruined, to perish, to cease, to end.	*aṟu* to go out to be destroyed, to cease, to be extinguished.
aracu	*aracu* to speak loudly, to say.	*aṟicu* to cry aloud.	*aṟachu* to cry, to speak loudly.
āḍu	*āḍu* to move, wave, swing, play in water, to go, to say, to do etc.	*āḍu* to move, to speak etc., Tu.	*āḍu* to move to speak etc.
inku	*iñchu* to be absorbed, to evaporate.	*ingisu* to be absorbed.	*inku* to be absorbed.
iḍu	*iḍu* to place, deposit, to throw, to put on, to give.	*iḍu* to let go from hand, to put, to throw, to give ; Tu.	*iḍu* to place, to give.
iruku	*iruku* to become tight, to harden, to thicken.	*iruku* ; Tu. *iriyuni* to squeeze between hands.	*iruku* to be close.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
nīnd	*nīndu, nīchchu, nīnju* to swim.	*īsu, īju* to swim; Tu.	*īdu* to swim.
uraicu	*uraicu* to rub against, to wear away by use, scour, scrape; M. *ura.*	*ore* to rub hard.	*orayu* to rub against.
ūdu	*ūdu* to blow.	*ūdu* to blow, to purify; Tu.	*ūdu* to blow.
ūṟu	*ūṟu uvaṟṟu* to cause to swell up, to flow.	*ūṟu* to leak out, to ooze, spring; Tu.	*ūṟu* to swell up, to spring.
ekku	Tam., *engu* to separate.; M. *ekku* carding cotton.	*ekku* to divide, separate, to dress cotton; Tu. *ekkuni* to gin cotton.	*ēku*, to dress cotton.
ettu	*eṭṭṟu, ēṟṟu* to reach up to.	*ettu* to lift, to raise; Tu.	*ettu* to lift.
ōḍu	*ōḍu* to run.	*ōḍu* to run, to flee; Tu.	*ōḍu* to run, to be defeated, to be afraid.
oṭṭu	*oṭṭu* to paste, to cause to adhere.	*oṭṭu, oḍḍu* to make one to join, to put together; Tu.	*oṭṭu* to put, to place, join.
odugu	*otunku, oḍugu* to get out of the way.	*odugu* to get out of the way.	*odugu* to step aside.
iyaṟ	*iyaṟṟu* to do, to take up.	*esagu* to undertake, to make.	*esagu* take effect, become great.
ottu	*ottru, oṟṟu* to bring into contact, to press, strike.	*ottu* to press together, to squeeze; Tu.	*ottu* to press.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
oppu	*oppi* to agree with.	*oppu* to agree with, to suit, to be fit, to consent ; Tu.	*oppu* to be fit, to consent; cf. *oppukonu.*
oḻuku	*oḻuku* to flow, to leak, to spread out.	*oḻku* to leak, drop as water.	*oluku* to flow, to leak, drop as water.
kaṭṭu	*kaṭṭu* to tie, bind, fasten.	*kaṭṭu* to tie ; Tu.	*kaṭṭu* to bind.
kaḷe	*kaḷei* to remove, to let go, transgress.	*kaḷe* to remove, to transgress ; *kaḍe* to pass.	*kaḍachu* to pass over, transgress.
	kaḍa to pass over.	Tu. *kaḍapuni* to cross, ford, pass.	
kaḍi	*kaḍi* to bite, eat, grasp.	*kaḍi* to bite off; Tu. *kaḍe.*	*kaḍi* a morsel; cf. *kaḍi-kanḍalu.*
kaḻi	*kaḻi, kaḍi* to bite, to bite off.	*kachchu, karchu* to bite, to sting ; *kaḍi* to bite.	*kaṟachu* to bite; *kaḍigonu.*
kaḍe	*kaḍai, kavar* to churn.	*kaḍe* to churn.	*chiluku* to churn; *kavvam* churning stick.
kam	*kandu, kanru.*	*kandu* to be burnt, scorched, to fade.	*kandu* fade, wither.
		kamaru to be singed.	*kamaru.*
kala	*kala* to join, to mix, to appear, to come into being.	*kali, kale* to join, to be mixed, to meet; *kalasu*; Tu. *kala.*	*kaliyu* to meet; *kalugu* to appear, to come into being.
kani	*kanal* to burn ; *kani* to glow.	*kanal, kanalu* to chafe, to be angry.	*kanalu* to burn, to be angry.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
kara	*karai* to wear away, to dissolve, to melt.	*karagu, karangu* to be dissolved, to melt; Tu.	*karagu* to dissolve, to melt, to liquify.
kal	*kalanku* to be stirred, agitated, ruffled.	*kalanku* to be stirred; Tu. *kalankuni* to be turbid.	*kalangu* to be ruffled, agitated.
kavi	*kavi* to cover, overspread, bend in or over, surround; *kappu.*	*kavi* to come upon, to cover, to overspread; *kappu.*	*kaviyu, kappu* to cover, to overspread.
kavvu, kavar	*kavvu, kavar* to seize, grasp with eagerness, catch.	*kavar* to seize, grasp, catch.	*kavvu* to seize, to grasp.
kaval	*kavar* to branch off, to bifurcate.	*kaval.*	*kavagonu.*
kaḷal	*kaḷal* to become loose as a nail, to be unhinged, to slip off, to pass away, run away.	*kaḷal* to become to loose, be unhinged; Tu. *kadal.*	*kadalu* to be put out of joint, to pass away, to start.
kaḷi	*kaḷi* to pass as time, to elapse, to walk, proceed.	*kaḷi* to pass, to slip away, to pass through.	*kaḍachu* to pass, to elapse, to walk, proceed.
	kaḷippu to spend, pass.		*kaḍapu* to spend, pass as time.
kaḷuvu	*kaḷuvu* to wash, purify.	*kaḷi* to wash, purge.	*kaḍugu* to wash, to cleanse by washing.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
kaḻu	*kaḻuvu* to melt and mould as metal.	*karagu*	*karugu* to melt; *karugu* (n.) a mould.
kaḷ	*kaḷ, kalai* to weed, to pluck.	*kaḷ, kaḷe* to weed ; Tu. to remove.	*kalupu-tīyu* to weed.
kaḏ	*kadi* to grow thick, increase.	*kade* to join, approach.	*kadiyu* to approach.
kaṟu	*k a ṟ u* to grow black, darken, to become impure.	*kaṟangu* to grow black, *kare* blackness.	*kaṟa* blackness, stain, black ; *kāru* black.
kala	*kala* to join, mix.	*kali* to come together, to meet.	*kalayu* to meet; *kalugu* happen.
kanṟu	*kanṟu* to mature, grow old, to be scorched, to be sun-burnt.	*kandu* to be scorched, sun-burnt, to fade, to become pale; Tu.	*kandu* to be scorched, to fade.
kāl	*kāl* to flow as saliva from the mouth, to issue.	cf. *kāl, kāluve* a water course, channel ; Tu. *kalive.*	*kāru* water to flow or issue out ; cf. *kāluva.*
kiṭṭu	*kiṭṭu, kiḍai* to draw near, to approach.	*k i ṭ ṭ u, giṭṭu* to touch, to reach; Tu.	*kiṭṭu* to come near, to approach.
kiḍu	*keḍu* to perish, to be destroyed, to go to ruin, to decay, rot.	*keḍu* to be destroyed, to perish, rot ; Tu. *k e ṭ ṭ a* bad.	*c h e ḍ u* to be spoiled, rot, to fall on evil days, etc.
kiḻi	*kiḻi* to be torn, rent in shred, to give away, burst out.	*kīḻ* to pluck out, pull off.	*chirugu, chinugu* to be torn, rent.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
kiḷaru	*kiḷaru* to poke, ransack, to disturb, derange, confuse, stir.	*keḷar* to disturb, derange; Tu. *kilek*.	*kelaku* to stir, to disturb, derange, confuse.
	kulukku shake.	*kuluku* shake.	*kuluku*.
kuḍi	*kuḍi* to drink.	*kuḍi* to drink.	*kuḍuchu*, to drink, to eat.
	kural, throat.	*koral* throat, neck.	*krōlu* to drink.
kuṭṭu	*kuṭṭu* to puncture, pierce, to sew.	*kuṭṭu* to prick, to beat, strike; Tu.	*kuṭṭu* to sew, to puncture, pierce, sting.
	koṭṭu to beat, to sting as a scorpion.		*koṭṭu* beat, strike.
kuttu	*kuttu* to blow with the fist, box, buffet.	*kuttu*, *guddu*, to blow with the fist, cuff, box.	*guddu* to box, to blow with the fist.
kudi	*kudi*, to jump, leap.	*kuduku* to trot, leap, spring, leap over.	*kudulu* to jolt, shake; cf. *kudinchu*.
kutir	*kutir* to be settled, determined, fixed up.	*kuduru* to be settled.	*kuduru* to be settled, fixed up.
kuntu	*kuntu* to sit on heels; (M) *kuntu* to stand on tiptoe.	*kuḷir*, *kuṇḍru*, *kūr* to bend, to sit, squat; *kuntu*.	*gontu kūrchuṇḍu* to sit on heels.
kummu	*kummu* to pound in a mortar, to knead; *kumai*.	*kummu*, to beat with a pestle, to pound.	*kummu* to beat with a pestle; *gumuku*.
kuṟi	*kuṟi* to mark, to intend, to design, to aim at.	*kuṟi* to mark, to make note of, to aim at; Tu. *guri*.	*guṟinchu*, *gurtinchu* to mark, to make note of, to aim at.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam., Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
kuḻgu	*kunku* to decrease, diminish, sink.	*kuggu* to sink or become low, diminish ; Tu.	*krukku* to press down ; *gṻkṷu* go down.
	kuṟu to become short, to contract, shrink.	*kuṟu* to shrink, to become short ; *kurgu*, *kuḻgu*.	*krungu* to become diminished, to shrink.
kuni	*kuni* to bend, to bow, to stoop.	*kuni* to bend.	*kuni* bend (n); *gūnu*.
kuṇṭu	*kindu* ; M. *kittu*.	*kuṇṭu* to limp, to hop ; Tu.	*kuṇṭu* to limp.
kūḍu	*kūḍu* to come together, to join, meet, collect together.	*kūḍu* to come together, join, meet, assemble ; Tu.	*kūḍu* to come together, to join, assemble.
kentu	*kentu* to hop, skip.	*gantu*.	*gantu*, *gentu*.
kettu	*kettu* to split ; *chedukku* M. *chettu* to chop, cut off.	*kettu* to make thin, to chip as a plank ; Tu.	*chekku* to make thin, to chip.
kidaṟ	*cidaṟu*, *cindu*, to scatter, to disperse.	*kedaṟu*, *keḍaṟ* to scatter ; Tu. *chadar* to be scattered.	*cedaru* ; to be scattered about ; cf. *cindu*.
kay	*kaḍu*, *kaya*, to be bitter ; M. *kai*.	*kay* to be bitter ; Tu. *keipe* bitter.	*chēdu* (n).
koḻu	*koḻu* to prosper, flourish, grow fat.	*korvu*, *korbu* to increase, to grow fat.	*kovvu* to grow fat.
koṟi	*koṟi* to nip off the husks of grains, to graze, to pick up food here and there.	*koṟe* to cut, bore, excavate.	*kōṟu* excavate ; cf. *koṟakulu* birds picking up food.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam., Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
gīku	*chīku*; M. *kīru*.	*gīku, kirukku*, to scrape, scratch; Tu. *gīch, gīr*.	*gīku, gīru* to scratch, to scrape.
cikku	*cikku* to be entangled, to be caught.	*sikku*.	*chikku*.
chivvu	*chivvu*; M. *chīvu*.	*civvu* to cut thin, to peel, to bark.	*chivvu* to cut thin.
cāṟṟu	*cāṟṟu* to publish, announce, speak, mention.	*sāru* to publish, to beat as a drum.	*tsāṭinchu* to publish, announce, mention; *tsāṭu*.
cuḍu	*cuḍu* to be hot, to burn, to heat.	*suḍu* to be hot, to burn, to roast, to burn up; Tu.	*tsūḍu* to burn, to heat, to brand.
cur	*curunku* to shrink, contract, shrivel, to be reduced.	*surku* to shrink, to be reduced, to dwindle; Tu. *sūrunṭ*.	*surugu* to shrink, contract, to be reduced.
cuḷi	*cuḷi* to become curved, curled, contracted.	*suḷi* to become curved; Tu. *suḷi* to shake.	*suḍigonu*.
	cuḻal to whirl, rotate, roll, to revolve.	*suruḷ* to curl, to roll; Tu. *suraḷi* to coil, roll.	*suḍiyu* to whirl, roll, revolve.
cuṟṟu	*cuṟṟu* to revolve, to move here and there, roam, to be coiled, to go round.	*suttu* to revolve, circulate, whirl.	*tsuṭṭu* to revolve, to go round, etc.
ceruku	*ceruku* to insert, to slide into.	*serku* to insert.	*ceruvu* to insert.
jaḍi	*kaḍi* to fear, to reprove.	*jaḍi* to use threatening language, to frighten.	*jaḍiyu* to be afraid.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
jāṟu	*jaṟi* to slide or slip, roll down; *caṟukku.*	*jarugu, jaragu* to slip, to slide; *jāṟu* to slip, to flow; Tu. *jari.*	*jarugu* to slide, move forward; *jāṟu.*
tagu	*tagu* to be fit, appropriate, proper, to be excellent or deserved.	*tagu* to be fit, proper.	*tagu* to be fit, proper.
taṭṭu	*taṭṭu* to knock at, to tap, pat, to strike.	*taṭṭu* to strike, to knock at, to touch; Tu.	*taṭṭu* to pat, to knock at.
tappu	*tappu* to err, mistake, blunder.	*tappu* to err, mistake, to go wrong as a tune, to slip, fail, to offend.	*tappu* to err, to go wrong, to slip, fail, to offend.
taḍe	*taḍai* check.	*taḍe* to delay, hinder; Tu.	*taḍayu* to delay.
taḷi	*taḷai* a shoot.	*taḷi, taḷal* to shoot, to sprout; *tigur.*	*talirchu* to put forth leaves; *chigurchu.*
tāku	*tākku* to touch, to come in contact, collide, strike against.	*tāku, tāngu* to join, to come in contact with, touch; Tu.	*tānku, tāku* to touch, strike against.
tāṇḍu	*tāṇḍu* to cross, skip over.	*tāṇḍu, dāṇḍu,* to jump, to transgress; Tu. *dāṇṭu.*	*dāṇṭu, dāṭu* to cross, to step over.
tāḷi	*tāḷi* to season and flavour curry with spices etc.	*tāḷisu.*	*tālinchu.*
tigaṟu	M. *tiṟṟu* to press, treat harshly.	*tigaḍu, tikku* to rub, treat harshly; Tu. *tegu* revile.	*tegaḍu* to treat harshly, abuse.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
tiḷi	*teḷi*, *teri* to be seen, perceived, to be understood; *terivu* (n.) understanding, knowledge.	*tiḷi* to become clear, to come to light, to be known, to know.	*teliyu* to know, to be known ; *telivu*, *telivi* (n.) understanding.
tiṭṭu	*tiṭṭu* to abuse, revile.	*tiṭṭu* to abuse, curse.	*tiṭṭu* to abuse.
tuḍu, *tuḷu*	M. *tuḍi* to splash violently; T. *tuḷaʳku*.	*tuṇuku*, *tunaku* *tuḷḷu* to shake or be agitated; *tuḷaku* to be agitated; Tu. *tuḷḷu* to leap, jump.	*toṇaku*, *toḍaku*, *tolaku*.
turu	*turuvu* to seek, enquire into, to scrape as the pulp of a cocoanut.	*turuvu* to bore, drill, perforate, to scrape as the pulp of a cocoanut ; Tu. *turi*.	*tuṟumu* to scrape.
tuṟu	*tuṟu* to insert, stick in as flowers, cram in, thrust in.	*tuṟugu*, to force or crowd things into, to cram, to stuff ; *turubu* to insert ; *tuṟumbu* to enter a hole, to penetrate.	*tuṟugu* to stuff; *turumu* stick in as flowers ; *tūṟu* to enter, to pierce, penetrate.
tulanku	*tulanku* to shine, glitter, to be polished.	*toḷagu* to shine, to be polished, to be clear.	*tulakincu* to shine, glitter, to be polished.
tūṟ	*tūṟu*, *tūṭṭṟu* to drive off the chaff from gram, to winnow.	*tūṟu* to winnow ; Tu. *tū*(*puni*).	*tūrupāṟabaṭṭu*.
tuḷi	*tugai*, *tuvai* ; M. *toḷi*.	*tuḷi* to tread, to trample upon ; Tu. *tor*.	*trokku* to tread, to trample upon.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
tēlu	*tenku, tēlu* to be afloat.	*tenku, telku, tēku* to be afloat, to swim; *tēlu* to be afloat; Tu. *tēluni.*	*tēlu* to be afloat.
tīṟṟu	*tīṟṟu* to rub and clean, smear.	*tīḍu* to press, squeeze, to rub, clean; Tu. *tik.*	*tīḍu* to rub; cf. *tīṭa* itch.
toḍagu	*toḍangu.*	*toḍagu* to engage, to undertake; Tu.	*toḍagu.*
tuṟa	*tuṟa* to renounce worldly pleasures, to leave, abandon.	*toṟe* to put away, to abandon, reject; Tu. *tore.*	*toṟagu* to abandon.
tolai	*tulai* to become extinct, perish, end, leave.	*tolagu* to depart, to be separated; Tu.	*tolagu* to go away, to leave, depart.
takku	*takku.*	*dakku* to accrue to, to be obtained, got as one's share.	*dakku* to be obtained, fall to one's share.
tūṟu	*tūṟu* to spread as news, to traduce, slander.	*dūṟu* to bear tales, to blame, abuse; Tu. *dūru.*	*dūṟu* to blame, slander.
tēṟ	*tēṟṟu* to make clear, to know, understand, to comfort, encourage.	*tēṟu* to be successful in examination; Tu. *tēḷu* pure, clear.	*tēṟu* to become clear; *tēṟucu* to comfort, encourage.
tuḷḷu	*tuḷḷu* to leap, frisk, jump up, to tremble, quiver, be haughty.	*tuḷḷu* to frisk, jump up; Tu.	*tuḷḷu* to spring up, leap, to be haughty.
tiṉu	*tekku* to receive, take.	*tege* to draw towards oneself, take; Tu. *teg.*	*tīyu* to receive, take, extract, etc. (<*tigiyu.*)

Probable earlier Form.	Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
tēnku	*tēnku* to fill, to become full ; *tēkku* to be full, glutted, to belch.	*tēgu* to belch, to be glutted ; Tu. *tēguni*.	*tēncu* to belch, to be satiated.
na(l)ku	*nakku* to lick; *nākku* tongue.	*nakku* to lick ; *nālige* tongue ; Tu. *nak*, *nālayi* tongue.	*nāku* to lick ; *nāluka* tongue.
nagu	*nagu* to laugh.	*nagu*, *nage* to laugh, to smile.	*nagu*, *navvu* to laugh.
naccu	*naccu*, *nambu* to confide, to rely on.	*narchu*, *naccu*, *nambu* to confide, to believe in.	*nammu*, *naccu*.
nari	*nari* to torment, to crush, to perish ; *narukku* to smash, grind or crush to pieces, to cut in pieces ; *naṟukku*.	*naraku* to bruise; Tu. *naragụḍuni* to bruise, crush.	*naṟuku* to cut, to bruise.
nali	*nalanku* to grow faint, to suffer, to lose stiffness.	*nalagu* to suffer, to become rumpled ; Tu. *nalag* fade, wither.	*nalagu* to suffer, to lose stiffness, become rumpled.
niḍu	*niḍu* to grow long, to be lengthened ; M. *niṭṭu*.	*niḍu* to extend, to stretch out ; Tu. *niḍu* tall.	cf. *niḍu*, long ; *nidivi* (n) length.
nīgu	*nīkku*, *ningu* to quit.	*nīgu* to quit, leave, get rid of.	*nīgu* to remove, to take away.
nungu	*nugar*, *nungu* to swallow.	*nungu* to swallow; Tu. *ningu*.	*mringu* to swallow ; *mingu*.
nuḍi	*noḍi*	*nuḍi* to utter, speak, to say ; Tu.	*nuḍuvu*, *noḍuvu* to say, to speak.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
nūkku	*nūkku* to shove, to push, to swing, to impel, incite.	*nūku* to push, to incite; Tu. to thrust.	*nūku* to push aside, remove.
nōl	*nōn*, *nōl* to practise, to do; M. *nōlka* penance, to do austerities.	*nōn* to do penance; Tu. *nōmbuni* to fast.	*nōtsu*, *nōmu* to practise austerities.
nigaḷ	*nigaḷ* to happen, occur, to abide, continue; *nigaḷtu* to effect, perform, to bring to pass.	*negaḷ* to happen, occur, pass, abide; *negaḷu*.	*negaḍu* to continue, to prosper, to shine.
pagu	*pagu* to divide; M. *paḷu* to divide; *pangu* part, division.	*pasu* to divide; *panchu* to divide, separate, part; Tu. *pagi* to split, rend.	*pagulu* to be split, to break into two; *pagulutsu*, *panchu* to divide, cut into pieces.
pagai	*pagai* to hate, oppose.	*page* to hate; Tu.	*paga-gonu* to hate.
paṛṛu	*paṛṛu*.	*paṭṭu* to seize, to catch, to hold.	*paṭṭu* to seize, catch, hold.
paḍu	*paḍu*.	*paḍu*, to get, to obtain, to beget; Tu.	*paḍayu*, to get, obtain, beget.
paci	*paci* to be hungry.	*pasi* to be hungry.	*pasi* (n) hunger.
paḍu	*puḍu* to suffer, to go down.	*paḍu* to suffer, to get down, to set as the sun; Tu.	*paḍu* to suffer; *paḍukonu* to lie down.
paṇṇu	*paṇṇu* to make, perform.	*paṇṇu* to make ready, to equip; Tu. *paṇipuni* to give a shape.	*pannu* to make ready, cast the net; cf. *pani* work.

Probable earlier Form	Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
padaṟu	*padaṟu*.	*padaṟu* to be overhasty, to speak unadvisedly.	*vadaru* to speak unadvisedly, to blabber.
pari, *pāṟu*	*pari*, *paṟa* to fly.	*pari* to run, to move, to flow, proceed ; *paṟi*, *paṟu* to fly ; Tu.	*parugettu* to run ; *pāṟu*.
parbu	*pambu*, *parambu*.	*parbu* to spread, to be extended; Tu.	*pambu* to spread, to increase; *prabbu*.
paḻu	*paḻu* to ripen, grow old.	*paḻsu* to become old, worn out ; Tu. *parnd* ripe.	*prātagilu* to become old ; *paṇḍu* to ripen.
pāḍu	*pāḍu* to sing.	*pāḍu* to sing.	*pāḍu* to sing.
piḻi	*piḻi* to squeeze, to express, to shed, pour as rain.	*piḻi* to squeeze out ; Tu. *pinḍi* what is squeezed.	*piḍuchu*.
pidi	*piḍi* to catch.	*piḍi* to seize, to lay hold of, to catch.	*pucchukonu* to take, catch accept ; cf. *piḍi* handle.
pigi	*pigi* to be hard knit.	*bigi* to tighten, to bind, to be hard knit.	*bigintsu*.
piḻu	*piḻukku* to turn out, to dismiss, to wrest ; M. *piḻu* to pull, to wrest.	*pīku* to pull out, to pluck up.	*pīku*, *peruku* to pluck up.
pudi	*pudai* to cover; *podi* to set jewels in.	*pudi*, *pode* to enter into, to be hidden ; Tu. *pode* to put on clothes, to brood.	*podugu* to cover ; to set jewels in ; cf. *poda* a bush.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
pūḻ	M. *pūḻu* to be buried.	*pūḻ* to inwrap, to bury.	*pūḍu*, *pūḍuchu* to bury.
pugaḻ	*pugaḻ* to praise.	*pugaḻ* to praise.	*pogaḍu*.
pore	*pōṟṟu* to preserve, save.	*pore* to nourish, foster.	*prōchu* to nourish, preserve, save.
bonku	cf. *pokka* a lie.	*bonku* to lie, speak falsely; Tu.	*bonku* to tell a lie.
maguḻ	*maḍangu*.	*maguḻ* to turn round, to turn back, to recede.	*maguḍu* to turn back.
maḍi	*maḍi* to die; M. *maḍi* to be foiled, faint, tired of.	*maḍi* to die.	*maḍiyu* to die.
maṟa	*maṟa* to forget.	*maṟe* to forget, to become unmindful; Tu. (n) *marapu*.	*maṟachu* to forget.
mingu	*mingu*, *miḻungu* to eat.	*mingu* to swallow.	*mringu*, *mingu* to swallow.
miḍi	*mīṭṭu*	*miḍi*, *mīṭṭu* to strike with a finger.	*mīṭu* to strike with a finger.
mikku	*mikku*	*mikku* to grow abundant, to exceed; Tu.	*mikkilu*, *migulu* to exceed, to shine.
mincu	*minchu* to shine, to flash.	*minchu* to shine, glitter; Tu. *minuku*.	*minchu* to shine, to exceed.
mugi	*mugi*	*muge* to contract, shut up, close as a flower.	*mugiyu* to come to a close; *moguchu* to close as a flower.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
muḍu	*muṯṯu*, *muṯugu* ; M. *muḷu*.	*muḍu* to advance in growth, in years ; Tu.	*muḍiyu* to grow old.
muri	*muri*, *murungu* to putrefy, rot.	*muggu* to get or have smell of corruption.	*murugu*, *mukku* to putrefy, rot ; *muggu* fruit to ripen.
muṭṭu	*muṭṭu* to dash against, knock, strike.	*muṭṭu* to touch, to come in contact with, to reach ; Tu.	*muṭṭu* to touch, to dash against an enemy.
muṯṯu	*muṯṯu* to be close ; *mūḍu* to be covered.	*muṭṭu* to inclose, to cover, encompass, besiege, to attack.	*mūḍu* to enclose, to cover, encompass, to happen.
muḍi	*muḍi* to knot, to put a knot.	*muḍi* to bind or tie hair, to set flowers in the hair ; Tu.	*muḍivēyu* to tie ; *muḍuchu* to set flowers in the hair.
muḻagu	*muḻuga*	*muḻungu*, *muṇugu* to go or sink under water ; Tu. *murku*.	*munugu*, *mulugu* to sink.
muṯi	*muri*	*muṯi* to sever by fracture, to break.	*mukkachēyu* to break into pieces ; *muṯi* small ; *muriya* piece.
mūr	*mōru*, *mogaru* to smell.	*mūsu* to smell; Tu.	*mūrkonu*, *mūchūchu* to smell.
meṯ	*mechchu* to praise, laud.	*mechchu* to assent, to approve, to be pleased with; Tu.	*mechchu* to praise, laud.

Probable earlier Form.	Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
muḻgu	*m u r a n g u* ; M. *muraññu.*	*moḻagu* to sound as a musical instrument, to roar, to thunder.	*mrōgu, mrōyu* to make sound; *m o r u g u* to bark.
moṟe	*moṟe, murumuru* to murmur, grumble.	*moṟe* to roar as the sea, tiger, to cry aloud; Tu. *moresu.*	*mora-veṭṭu* to cry aloud.
muḷe	*muḷei* to sprout.	*moḷe* to germinate, to sprout; Tu.	*molachu* to germinate.
mottu	*mottu, mōdu*	*mōdu* to strike, to beat, to smite.	*mottu, mōdu.*
vāḻ	*vāḻu* to live.	*bāḻ, bāḻu* to live, to be alive, to live by.	*bratuku* to live, to be alive.
vaṟ	*vaṟa* to grow dry.	*baṟe* to dry up, to grow lean.	*vaṭṭu* to dry, to grow lean; *vaṟapu* draught.
sade	*cadai*	*s a d e, s a d i* to pound, to bruise, to crush.	*cadiyu* ; cf. *saddinchu.*
sikku	*sikku*	*sikku* to become entangled, to be caught, to be obtained; Tu. *ikku.*	*cikku* to be caught, to be obtained; *cikkupadu* to become entangled.
sūṟe	*cūṟai* to plunder.	*sūṟe* to plunder, to pillage.	*cūṟagonu.*
sēdu	*jāmbu*	*s ē d u* to d r a w water; Tu.	*chēdu* to draw water.

Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
akal to excavate, dig out, to uproot.	*agal* to dig out.	*agaḍta*(n).
aṇai to embrace, hold, in arms.	*aṇe* to embrace.	
aḍu to cook, dress, fry, boil.	*aḍu* to cook, etc.	
ṻppu to stick, to apply repeatedly, to press against.	*appu*.	
ayar to become weary, to forget.	*ayilu* to become weary, to faint.	
arakku to rub with the hand, to waste, to cut, to sever.		*aragadīyu* to rub, to waste.
alampu to sound, murmur as in a brook, to move, wander.	*alambu* to sound, to wabble as water in a vessel ; Tu. *alambuni*.	
aluke to rot, to decompose, putrefy.	*aluku* to rot.	
aḷavu to measure, to fathom, to extend.	*aḷe* to measure.	cf. *alavu*.
arai to slap, strike, beat, cut to pieces.	*aṟu* to slap, to cut to pieces.	cf. *aṟavaṟalu* pieces; *aṟimuṟi*.
ārāy to investigate, to scrutinize, to examine.		*arayu* to seek, search.
aḻu to weep, cry.	*aṯu* ; Tu. *ar*.	
iṟa to die, destroy, to shed, pour forth.	*ikku*, *irku* to kill, etc ; *iṟi*.	

Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
iḍaru to stumble, to be afflicted, troubled.	*iḍaṟu* to stumble, to be troubled.	cf. *eḍaru* trouble.
irattai to double, to repeat.		*rettinchu* to double, to repeat.
iṟai to splash, dash, scatter, to draw or pour water.	*eṟe*, *eṟachu* to pour, to sprinkle.	
uḍampaḍu to harmonize, to agree.		*oḍambaḍu* to come to an agreement.
uṇar to become conscious of, to know, to think.	*oṇar* to know, perceive, understand.	
udir to drop off as leaves, fruits, to drop down, to be nipped, to crumble.	*udir* to fall of; Tu. *udar*.	
udai to kick.	*ode* to kick.	
umiḻ, *umi* to spit, to vomit, to emit as a ray of light.	Tu. *ubbi*.	*umiyu* to spit; *ummu*.
uy to direct, guide, to conduct, lead, to carry, enjoy.	*uy* to direct, conduct, give, present.	
uyir to revive.	*usir*, *uyir* to revive.	cf. *usuru*.
urai to rub as an animal against a tree.		*rāyu* to rub.
urumu to thunder, roar.		*uṟumu* to thunder, roar.
uḻal to oscillate, swing, to wander, roam about.	*uḻal* to swing, to lie in motion.	cf. *uriyāḍu*? *vadulu*?
uḻu to plough.	*uḻu* to dig up, root up; Tu. *ud*.	

Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
ulai to labour hard, toil, drudge.		cf. *ūḍigamu*.
urai to drop as the rain.		*uriyu* to fall in drops.
uruṭṭu to roll, revolve.	*uruṭu* to roll.	
unnu to think, to consider.	*unnisu* to think.	
ūnku to swing.		*ūgu* to swing.
ūnṟu to be fixed, to stop in a place, to fix firmly, to lean upon, support.		*ūnu* to lean upon.
ōdu to read, study.	*ōdu* to utter, sound, to read, recite, study.	
edirkol to advance or go towards a guest, to accept.		*edurukonu* to go towards, to attack.
ekkaru to suffer from weariness, to languish, to desire.		*ēkaru* to languish, to desire.
ĕgu to go, pass.		*ēgu* to go, pass, walk.
oṭṭu to stick, to betake oneself to, to paste.	*oṭṭu* to stick, to pile up.	
ollu to be able, to agree.		*ollu* to agree, to brook, tolerate.
karai to call, to speak, clamour.	*kare* to call, invite, to emit a sound. ; Tu. *kare* to crow.	
kari, karugu to become black, to be charred.	*kari* to be scorched or singed, to be charred, to fry, roast in oil.	

Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
kaḍai to churn with a churning rod.	*kaḍe* to churn.	
kaviḻ to be capsized, to be turned bottom upwards, to turn down.	*kavicu* to be capsized.	
kaṟa to milk.	*kaṟe* to milk, to yield milk.	*chēpu ?*
killu to pinch with the finger, to pluck, to nip.		*gillu* to pinch, to pluck, to nip.
kumi to accumulate, to be heaped up, to crowd.		*gumigūḍu* to form into a crowd.
kumai to be hot, sultry, to faint, to droop.		*kumulu* to feel hot, sultry.
kol to kill, murder.	*kol*, *kolu* to kill.	*kolla* robbery.
kuḻai to become soft, mashy, pulpy, to melt ; (M) *kuḻayu.*	*koḻe* to become soft ; Tu. *kure.*	
	cācu to stretch out.	*cācu* to stretch.
cāṟṟu.	*sāṟu* to cry out, proclaim.	*cāṭu* to proclaim.
cavu to fall in price, to become cheap.	cf. *cavuka* (n).	*cavuka* (n).
caḷḷu to slacken, abate.		*saḷḷu* (*saḍalu.*)
cikku to become lean or emaciated.		*cikku* to become lean.
cilai to sound, resound, to roar.	*kele* to sound, roar, to rage.	
cokku to copulate.		*cokku* to be intoxicated.
cuṭṭu to point out, to indicate, show.	*suṭṭu* to point out, show.	

Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
ce to dwell, remain, to lie, to sleep.	*ke* to repose, to sleep, to lie down.	
col to say, to speak, tell, recite.	*sol* to speak.	*cheppu* ?
tagai to stop, to resist, check, overpower.	*tage* to stop.	
tanku to stay, to sojourn, remain, to exist, halt.	*tangu* to stay, to tarry.	
taḍa, *taḍai* to hinder, to stop, dam, block, curb.	*taḍe* to hinder.	cf. *daḍi* a fence.
tavvu to leap, jump, to boast.	*tavu* to leap, jump, to tread gently.	
taḻuvu to clasp, embrace, make friendship.	*taḷ* to clasp, embrace, hug.	
tallaṇisu to be agitated from fear, alarmed.		*tallaḍinchu* to be troubled.
taṟe to enter, to be fixed.	*taṟu* to join, to enter in.	cf. *taruvāta*.
taṭṭu, *tarru* to winnow, to shift off bad articles from good.		*tālcu* to winnow.
tavaṟu to diminish, to waste away.	*tavu* to decrease, to come to an end, diminish.	
taḷḷu to be removed, to shrink, to push.	*taḷḷu* to be removed, to push, to expel; *taḷ* to refute, reject.	*taralu* ?
taḷar to droop, faint, to suffer in mind.	*taḷar* to droop, faint.	

Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
taḷ, *talai* to tie, fasten, bind.	*taḷ* to hinder, obstruct ; *taḷe* (n) tie, bondage, cord, rope.	cf. *tāḍu* rope.
tāḻ, *tāḻu* to be low, low, deep.	*tāḻ* being low, sinking.	*taggu* ?
	teral to move, stir, to set out, to go away.	*teralu* to be stirred ; *taralu* to start.
	teppiru to become conscious.	*teppirillu* to become conscious, refreshed.
tiṇi to be crowded, dense, compact.	*tiṇi* to be crowded, packed.	
	tiṟ to exchange, pay, barter.	*tiṟuchu* pay as loan.
tiṟṟu to smear, to rub and smooth the folds of a cloth.	*tīḍu* to smear, to rub and smooth.	
teviḷ to be full.	*tivu* to become full, abound.	
tukai to tread down, trample on, to pound in a mortar, to roam about, walk.		*tokku* to tread or trample on, to pound in a mortar, walk.
tuḍakku to tie, bind, to bring together.	*toḍaku* to entangle, inveigle.	
tuḍi to quiver, tremble, to be eager.	*duḍi* to quiver, tremble, throb.	cf. *duḍuku*.
tummu to sneeze, to breathe.		*tummu* to sneeze.
tuḻavu to stir with the hand, to feel, grope.		*taḍavu* to feel or grope with the hands.

Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
	toḷe to wash, to remove by washing.	*toluchu* to wash.
teṟi to strike and fly off, to break, to burst asunder, to split, snap in twain as a rope.		*trencu* to break asunder.
tēy to wear away by friction, to become exhausted, waste away, to lapse as time, to be effaced, erased, to rub off.	*tēy*, *tē* to be emaciated, grow thin, to be rubbed, to grind.	
tĕr to examine, to understand, to know, to acquire, to obtain, to be well versed in.		cf. *kaḍatēru* to obtain the end, reach the end, succeed.
toku to assemble, collect, to be crowded, compact.		*toga* collection, crowd.
tonku to hang, to be suspended, dangle, to be dependent, servile.	*tongu* to hang, to hang down.	
toṭṭu to catch, to touch.		*toṭṭu* to touch, to spread, to flow.
toḻu to worship.	*tuḻil* to worship, adore.	
nacu to waver, to be undecided in speech or action.		*nasuku* to be undecided.
naḍamāḍu to go about or move about, to haunt or frequent.		*naḍayāḍu* to go or move about.
naṇṇu to draw near, to be attached to.	cf. *nanni* love, attachment.	*nanuchu* to love, to be attached.

Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
naya to desire gently, long for, to respect, to please, to love, to be cheap, to excel, surpass; *nayam* grace, favour, happiness, goodness, love, advantage, superiority, cheapness.	*naya* goodness, happiness, fineness, cheapness.	*nayamu* good, advantageous, cheap.
naral to sound, to make noise, creak, roar.	*naral* to low as cows, to cry, to hum as many voices.	
nāṭu to seek, enquire after, peruse, to examine, to approach, to investigate ; M. *nāṭuka.*	Tu. *nāduni* to seek, to resemble, reach, approach.	
nāṇu to be shy, to feel bashful, to be abashed, to shrink back, to fear, to close as flowers.	*nāncu* to be shy, to fear, to feel abashed.	cf. *nāna* shame, shyness.
nāṟu to emit a sweet smell, to give forth perfume, to stink, to appear, arise, to come into being, to sprout, to shoot forth.	*nāṟu* to emit sweet smell, to stink, to sprout, to shoot forth, to appear; cf. K. *nare* (n) shoot.	cf. *nāru* shoot, sprout.
nĭmir to become erect, to stand upright, to be stretched, to grow tall, to extend.	*nimir* to be straightened, to shoot up.	
niṟa to spread, expand, to be full, to be sufficient.		*neṟayu* to be sufficient.
niva to rise, to be elevated, to grow, spread.	*negapu* (old K.) to rise, to become high, to grow.	

Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
ninai to think, to consider, to know, to understand.	*nene* to think, to remember, to meditate.	
	nivaru to smooth, to pass the hands gently over.	*nivuru, nimuru* to rub gently.
nunku to swallow, devour, to take possession of, capture.	*nungu* to devour.	
nuni to sharpen to a point, to powder.		*nunupuchêyu.*
nunukku to powder, to make very small, to pound, grind.		*nugguchêyu.*
neṭṭu to thrust, to push.		*neṭṭu* to thrust, to push.
nēr to befit, appropriate, to be complete, to happen, to occur, to agree.	*nēr* to agree, to accord.	*nera* full, complete, etc ; *nērcu* to befit, to be able to, to learn, to be skilled.
nērpaḍu to meet, to learn well, to occur, to appear.		*nērucu* to learn well.
	nuli to twist as a rope, to turn round.	*nulumu* to twist, wring.
paḻi to revile.	*paḻi* to revile, to scold, to upbraid, to deride.	
pār to see, look at, examine, to know, to desire.	*pāru* to see, view, notice, to examine.	cf. *pāṟuḍu* a Brahmin.

Tam.; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
pāvu to extend, to be diffused, to pervade, to spread as creepers on the ground.		*pāku* to spread as creepers, to extend, to crawl on the ground like children.
pāḻ to go to ruin, to be laid waste, to become useless.		*pāḍagu* to become useless.
piy, *pikku*; M. *pīccu* to separate, comb, to card cotton.	*pikku*, *pinju* to divide, separate, card cotton.	cf. *pinja*.
pidunku to pull out, pluck out, to extort, wrest, to vex, annoy.	*pīku* to pluck up.	*pīku* to pluck up.
pini to tie, to fasten with ropes.		*penavēyu* to entwine.
pinai to entwine, conjoin, unite.		*penagu*.
	puruḍisu to stand in competition with a rival.	*puraḍinchu* to rival, to resemble.
pīṟu to become disjointed, to be split, to vary, to be untwisted, to collect, to part, separate.	*pīṟ* to scatter, to spread, to throw about.	
	puṭṭu to arise, to be born.	*puṭṭu* to be born.
pugu to enter.	*pugu* to enter in, to enter.	
	puḍuku, to search or feel for with the hands, to seek for.	*puḍuku* to give, to touch with the hands.

Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
puḻu worm.	*puḻi* to be eaten or infected by worms, putrefy; Tu. *purku*.	*pucchu* to be eaten by worms.
māḍal doing.	*māḍu* to make, to do, to perform, accomplish ; *māḷke* manner, mode, business.	*māḍki* way, manner.
	maḷgu to grow dim, perish; *maggu* to grow pale or sallow.	*maggu* to become soft by being boiled.
	maḍisu to bend, fold.	*maḍacu* to bend, fold.
	maṇi to bend, fold.	*maṇugu*.
	mallaḷi turning round, wandering about.	*malagu* to wander about ; cf. *mallaḍigonu*.
	masagu to expand, to break forth, to grow furious, to be enraged.	*masagu* to be extended, to be furious.
	masal delaying.	*masalu* to delay.
	mukkalisu to rinse the mouth with water and spit it out.	*pukkilincu* to rinse the mouth with water.
munai to be angry.	*muni* to become angry, to be displeased.	

Tam. ; Mal.	Kan.	Tel.
	rubbu to grind in a mortar.	*rubbu* to grind.
	rēgu to rise as dust.	*rēgu* to rise as dust.
	rōsu to dislike, to feel disgust.	*rōyu* to feel disgust.
	saddu to cease, to stop talking among people.	*saddu* to stop, to arrange properly.
	savaru to rub in as oil.	*tsamuru.*
	sāku to bring up, to protect, nurse.	*sāku* to protect.
vai to abuse, revile.	*bay*, *bayi* to revile.	
	bān to make pots, to form earthenware.	*vānu* to make pots.

INDEX

A

Abstract nouns, formation of 107, 109.
Accusative sign *nu* 87.
Accusative 86, 88.
Adharvana 17.
Ahadanakara Inscription 97.
Āgama 58-9, 66.
Āgamas 100.
Agastya 16, 20.
Agglutination 51, 105.
Aitereya Brāhmaṇa 20.
Alveolar n 96.
Amahat 88, 95.
Anaptyxis 29.
Andhra 17, 20-2.
Andhras and their migration to the south 20.
Āndhrabhāshābhūshaṇam 4, 37.
Āndhrasabdachintāmaṇi 4, 17.
Apabrahmsa 37-8.
Aryan 5-10, 12, 14-20, 22-3, 25-9, 32-6, 38-40, 104, 106.
Aryanisation of India 8, 18, 20.
Aryavarta 15, 19.
Atmanēpada 77.
Attributive relationship 81, 101.
Attributive nature of the Dravidian sentence 82.
Aŭpavibhaktika 84, 102.
Aupavibhaktika pratyaya 100.
Austric 23, 29.
Auxiliary roots 53, 66, 76, 79, 107.

B

Bālavyākaraṇam 4.
Beluchistan 9.
Bengal 9, 17.
Bengali 15, 31-4.
Bhandarkar R. G. Dr. 10-1, 24.
Bhārata 42.
Bhujanga Rao 4.
Bhūta bhāsha 38.
Bohtlingk 64.
Brachycephalic 17.
Brahmanas 25.
Brahuis 9, 24, 34.
Brihatkatha 21.
Buddhism 17.
Buddhist 19-20.

C

Caldwell, Dr. 2-3, 24, 27-8, 35, 44, 49-50, 52, 54, 59-60, 64-5, 67, 73-5, 90, 98, 101.
Caldwell's treatment of the past tense 59.
Case terminations 83.
Causal forms 76.
Celts 3.
Cerebrals, occurrence of 29.
Chandragupta 19.
Chenchaiah 4.
The Chronology of the early Tamils 7.
Collected Works of R. G. Bhandarkar Vol. IV. 11.
Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages 35, 60, 65, 101.
Compound verb 31.
Conjunctives 31.
Copula, omission of 34.

D

Dandaka 15.
Dasyus 25.
Dative and the Accusative, the origin of the signs of 85.

Deccan 17.
Declensional terminations 81.
Dekhan 29.
Delbruck 64.
Demonstrative base 99.
Dental *n* 98.
Derivatives 107.
Derivative noun 107, 111-2.
Desinamamala 6.
Desya 6, 42, 92, 94, 100.
Dēvabhāsa 14, 37.
Dhātupallavas 45.
Dravida 39.
Dravidi 36-37, 39.
Dravidian 1-10, 14-5, 17, 19, 23, 25, 27-36, 39, 44, 46-55, 61-63, 66, 74, 76, 90-1, 101, 103-4, 111, 130.
Dravidic 9.
Du 94-5, 99.
Dutt, N. K. 8, 18.

E

Echo words 33.
English 16, 31, 33, 42.
Ep. Ind. Vol. XI. p. 345, 97.
Ep. Col. 364 of 1920, 97.
Euphonic change 52, 54.
Euphonic endings 111.
Euphonic insertion of semi-vowels 29.
Euphonic link 59, 64-5.
Europe 3, 24.
Eurasia 2.

F

Finnish 28, 63-4.
Finno-Ugrian 2.
Formation of the present 71.
Formative suffixes 52.
Frequentatives 76.
Frequentative form 77.
Future forms and their formation 67.

G

Gandhara 14.
Godavary, the 21.
Gond 18.
Grammar as the true test of relationship 4.
Greek 9, 24, 31, 105.
Grierson 4, 7, 10, 17, 24.
Guṇāḍhya 21.
Gustave Oppert 5.

H

Halakannada 72.
Halanta 96, 111.
Hemachandra 6.
Hindus 13.
Hindi 31-4.
Hinduism 8, 12.
History of Language 2.
History of Sanskrit Literature : Keith 105.
History of Telugu Literature 4.
Hodgson 25.
Hosakannada 41, 72, 76.

I

Ĭdu 109.
Ĭḍu-tōḍu 109.
India 4, 6-10, 12-5, 18-9, 22-3, 25, 27-31, 33-4, 37, 106.
Indo-Aryan 6, 8-9,13, 17, 29-34, 36-7, 39.
Indo-Iranian 37-8.
Indo-European 2-4, 6-7, 13, 24, 28-32, 34, 46, 63-4, 106.
Indus 8-9.
Indus Valley 10.
Infinitives 76, 78.
Inflexion 105.
Inflexional base *en*, *nin* 86.
Inflexional forms 63.
Inflexional increments 84.
In as an inflexional increment 84.

Instrumental *chĕtan* 83.
Introduction to Prākrit 10, 37.
Iranian 8, 13-4, 24.
Italic 42.

J

Jain 16, 19-20.
Jainism 17, 19.

K

Kalinga 17.
Kalmuck 64.
Kanarese 5, 16, 18-20, 33-4, 39-42, 45, 52-3, 56-63, 73-80, 83, 90, 92, 98-102, 107-30.
Kanarese present in *dapa* 72.
Kannada 41.
Kanva 16.
Karikas of Adharvaṇa 17.
Karṇāṭabhāshābhūṣaṇam 17.
Kavirājamārga 41.
Kāvyālankārachūḍāmaṇi 38.
Kesiraja 52, 109.
Keith 105.
Kĕtana 37.
Khond 18.
Kittel 73.
Kol 12-4, 23, 29.
Krishna, the 21.
Kriyānvayi 83.
Kshatriyas 25.

L

Laḍāgama 100.
Language and its history 1.
Language, its nature and development 1.
Languages of South India 4.
Linguistic Society of India 5.
Linguistic Survey of India Vol. IV 4, 7, 10, 24.
Locative sign 78, 84.
Lu a sign of plurality 99.

M

Madhyadĕśa 37.
Magadhan 31-2.
Maharashtra 15, 17.
Mahat 95.
Mahat plural 69.
Malayalam 18, 42, 58-9, 61-2, 66, 77-8.
Manu 27.
Marāṭhi 18, 25, 33.
Mārkaṇḍeya 39.
Marshall, Sir John 8.
Middle forms 76.
Missionaries 16.
Mlĕchchas 25.
Mohenjo Daro and Harappā 8.
Mohenjo Daro and the Indus civilisation 8-10.
Mongolian 28, 63-4.
Moods 32.
Morphological 106.
Morphological evidence 30.
Mother Goddess 8.
Mu, vu of the Telugu 92.
Mu-ending words 93.
Mauryas 17.
Mutibas 20.
Mysore 27, 29.

N

Nāgavarma 41.
Nannaya 16, 42, 97-8.
Nannechodadeva's Kumārasambhava Pt. II, 85.
Nannūl 66-8.
Narayana Rao, Dr. C. 6.
Nasal 97.
Natural History of Language 44, 46.
Nature of the Aryan migration to the South 15.
Nature of the Primitive Dravidian speech 48.
Nayasena 41.

Nepal 25.
Neuter words 92.
Nigāgama 100, 103.
Nijadhātu 109.
Nishādas 25.
Nominative 86, 88.
Nominative case 90-3.
Nominal inflexion 48, 50, 107.
Non-Aryan 8, 26-7, 36-8, 40.
Non-Aryan element 13, 23, 29.
North Indian 7.
North Indian vernaculars 23, 36.
Noun 107, 109.
Nripatunga 41.

O

Onomatopoetic 33.
On the Classification of Languages 5.
Oraon 18.
Origin and Development of the Bengali Language 2, 9, 13, 29.
Origin of the Prakrits 8.
Origin of the Telugu nominative suffix *ḍu* 95.
Oriyā 32.
Otto Jesperson 1.

P

Paisachi 38.
Paḷagannada 41.
Pali 11-2, 34.
Palkuriki Somanadha 42.
Panini 37, 85.
Participial nouns 107.
Passive forms 76.
Past relative participle 64.
Patanjali 37.
Periphrastic future 32.
Persian 31, 33, 105.
Peyar 91.
Phala 13.
Philological Lectures 11.
Philological Lectures, Collected Works 24.
Phonological 106.
Pope, Dr. 3.
Prachinandhrabhasaswarupamu 97.
Prakrit 4, 6, 8, 10-2, 14-5, 18-9, 21-4, 26, 34-9, 42, 105.
Prakrits, origin of the 8.
Prātipadika 88.
Prepositions, gradual disuse of 30.
Preterite 58-60, 66.
Pulindas 20.
Punjab 8.

R

Ragozin 20.
Rajahmundry 97.
Rājarājanarēndra pattābhiṣēka Sanchika 97.
Ramakrishna Kavi, M., M.A. 85.
Rāmāyaṇa 27.
Rig Veda 9, 13.
Root-agglutination 76, 79-80, 104, 106.
Roots, secondary 43, 79.
Root theory 50.

S

Sabdamaṇidarpaṇa 52, 109.
Sabdapallavas 45.
Sālivahana 21.
Sampradāna case 85.
Sauraseni 37.
Sanskrit 2, 4-7, 10-1, 14, 16-9, 22-7, 29-32, 34, 36-42, 49-50, 91-4, 96, 103, 105-6.
Saptasati 21.
Satem 24.
Science of Language 1.
Scythian 2-3, 24-8, 35.
Secondary roots 79, 107
Second future 73.

Semi-inflexional 51, 106.
Sign of the dative case 86.
Sign of the genitive 86.
Sign of the past tense 57.
Sign of the nominative case singular 91, 98-9.
Similarity in idioms 34.
Singular verbs 52.
Sistas 14.
Sivaraja Pillai, K. N. 7.
Slavs 13.
Somasekhara Sarma, M. 97.
South Indian grammarians 49-50.
South Indian Languages 38, 40, 43, 50-1.
Stevenson, Dr. 25, 35.
Strivadbhāva 94.
Swarabhakti 29.
Sweet, Henry 2.
Sudras 18.
Suffixes 54, 81-2, 86.
Sumerians 8.
Suniti Kumar Chatterjee 2, 29.
Syntactical evidence 33.
Syntax 33-4.

T

Taddharmārthaka 55, 63.
Tamiṛmuni (Tamil sage) 20.
Tamil 9, 17-21, 27, 29-34, 39-40, 52-4, 56-9, 61-2, 64-8, 70-1, 74-5, 77-80, 83, 86, 90-2, 96, 98.
Tareporevala, Dr. 5.
Tadbhava 6, 22, 40, 42.
Tatsama 6, 40, 42, 93-4.
Tenses 32, 107.
Telingana 27, 29.
Telugu 2, 4-6, 17-9, 21-3, 31-4, 37, 42-5, 47, 49, 53, 55, 57-68, 70-2, 74-5, 77-9, 84-6, 88, 90-4, 96-102, 105, 107-9, 111-12, 129-30.
Teutonic 42.
Third personal pronoun (Masculine) 98.
Tikkana 42, 111.
Tolkāppiyam 52, 91, 96.
Tolkāppiyar 16, 52, 55-6, 67, 71, 91, 96.
Tucker, T. G. 44, 46.
Tudas 49.
Tulu 18, 42, 68, 107.
Turkish 28.

U

Udvṛtta vowels 29.
Undu 70-1.
Ural Altaic 2, 63.
Uriya 18.

V

Vaḍugu 21.
Vaiśyas 25.
Vedic 4, 6, 8-10, 12, 14, 20, 26-9, 32, 36.
Vedic India 20.
Veera Śaiva School 76.
Verbal base 112.
Verbal action 44.
Verbal inflexion 51, 76, 79-81, 107.
Verbal and nominal inflexions 51, 104, 107.
Veturi Prabhakara Sastry 97.
Vibhāshās 37, 39.
Vikriti 4, 6.
Vikritic character 37.
Vindhyas 15, 20.
Vinnakota Peddana 38.
Viprakarsha 29.
Visēshyānvayi 83.
Vu-ending words 93.

W

Whitney 47.
Wilson, Professor 11, 25.
Woolner, Professor 10, 37.