

Caldwell's Comparative
Grammar of the Dravidian
Languages

p. 1. "Tamil the representative lan-
guage of the family" in proof
of which the name $\text{Ṭ} \text{Ṭ} \text{Ṭ}$ might
be shown to be identical with
Dravida. The Malayal. versions of
the Purānas mention repeatedly
the Drāmidas (= Dravidas). Ṭ
& Ṭ interchangeable as in Vedic
 $\text{ṛṛṛ} \text{ṛṛ} = \text{ṛṛṛ} \text{ṛ}$. And $\text{ṛṛ} = \text{ṛ}$ as
in $\text{ṛṛ} \text{ṛṛ}$ from ṛṛṛṛṛṛ . Tamil
the Pali form of Drāmidā

p. 4. Tamil called Malabar by the
Portuguese, because coming from
the western coast they found the
language of the Paravas etc. nearly
identical with that spoken in Ma-
labar. They always distinguish from
it the $\text{Ṭ} \text{Ṭ} \text{Ṭ}$ ^{or Telugus} as the ruling class,
introduced by the Aryan (to max-
imize interruptions in South Aryan
core.)



Ma I 864-8.

Nr 8

p. 4. "Tamil" probably french ortho-
graphy - & by them correctly pronounced
p. 6. Kariñataka, also the language of
the So. Mahratta country.

It is the language of the Beiga country,
from Barooor to Sadashegar, but
by the Brahmans at least written
with the Mal. or Tulu character.

"Tuluva" is not coextensive with the
Canara district, but in the So. the
Chandragiri river, in the No. the
Calyanapur river are considered
as its old boundaries, & the language
does not appear to have ever much
extended beyond them.

"Codaya" appears to me to lie about
midways between Old Can. & Tulu
on the one hand, Mal on the other.

The land appears one to have belonged
to the Mal. Commonwealth, & the old
Gods in it are still Malayalis. (The old

"Kariñataka" is a Sanscr. word. ^{Some speak Malayalam all over here.} Doubt
it. The name kār - nādu would

appropriately designate the black
cotton soil of the tableland. The
derivation from nātaka reminds

of other artificial Sans. Etymologies
p. 7. "five millions" I should think
seven nearer the mark

"from Mangalori" better the Payaswini
river near Chandragiri - caste may be
lost by crossing that river.

"2½ millions" - fully 3 million,

"All along the Mal. coast" too strong
an expression. I do not know exactly
how the case stands near the Neyyaru
in the So. But it is only in the gap
that Tamil colonization makes it-
self felt - on the 2 roads towards
Trichoor (Trisiva perur) & Ponnani

"Tamil bid fair to supersede the Mala-
yalam," I fear this is only Sir E. Perry's
view, & he has taken it from commu-
nications of mine, which perhaps
were not worded as cautiously as
might have been done had this inference
been foreseen. Three millions do not
change their language in 100s & 1000s
of years under a pressure like
the one applied in this case. But I
believe that Christianity will make
Tamil literature extensively

useful in Malabar, as Malayalis
willing to learn Tamil (& Christiani-
ty supplies the willingness) find it
very easy indeed.

p. 8. "Tulu" can hardly be said to be so
near Malayalam. It is such a pecu-
liar language, that Mal people
learn Canarese long before they
catch Tulu. It may be desirable that
it "soon disappear", but I do not
hope it. The Tulu people are perhaps
the most obstinate of all Dravidians.
All ^{Tulu} Christians are taught Canarese
as well as Tulu.

p. 12. "Mal has not been cultivated
ab intra" - formerly this was the
case. The oldest poetry is much
more of the Tamil than the Sans-
krit mould. All letters besides the 32 were
regularly eschewed, the whole literature
being in the Tamil (அஃசுழ்) cha-
racter; Tamil metres abounded,
others of a similar character were
invented - yet without slavish imitation.
The Brahminization of the language
& literature appears to me of

comparatively modern date.

"mērku" appears too slight a proof for the immigration of the Mal. people from the East by way of the gulf.

The western coast must have been people before the eastern, if the course of ancient commerce, the analogous progress of the Arians to the South etc. be taken into account. But *keidakku* & *mērku* have no doubt been invented in the Tamil country, & the western settlers accepted it a *parti fortiori*. *mēlk* however is rare in Mal. They use instead in *Oron* െ (old = *Oron*, െ = sunset)

"Peculiar Mal forms" are only I sup-
pose those of the Neg. verb, which occur in all Sanskritized writings.

Verbal roots like *pō*, *var* - are taken in their negative form *pōgā*, *varā* & then treated like positive verbs.

The affix of the present being originally *innu*, a *y* is inserted (*pōgā-y-innu*, *varā-y-innu*: *codā-y-innu*, & more modern *koduckā-y-innu*) & a whole verb with all modes & tenses is constructed

upon this foundation (cf. varāgṇa
came not, kūḍāyum not when it
will not be possible etc).

"In writing Tulu" Mal. characters
were used by the old Tulu Brahmans,
at present only Sanskrit is written
with them, & for all ordinary pur-
poses Canarese letters are employed
p. 19. The God interrogative pronoun
so may be like the Tulu vō.

"The conjugational system" of the Tulu
offers some analogies to that of
the God. It is the result of a very
voluble contraction of compound
verbs.

p. 44. A) manikka - a sad mistake, arising probably from the fault of a Copyist, but repeated several times in the book.

It is minaxx^u or minaxk^u

- B) oka Tel. from the Tam. & Mal. root o - infin. ooka "to agree, to be one". This root appears in another shape in the numeral "on" or "oru." kyth. kir I take to be unconnected with this radical

p. 50. māru from maru, but this certainly connected with 772, 777, 772

- Uald both different from Tel. tēdu, this = iladu (i + a = ē), the other composed with "it" is.

p. 56. The alteration of "larger derivatives" hardly to be ascribed to intense rationalism or jealousy of Brahminical influence. The 2 instances adduced resolve themselves into cases with initial liquids, which appear to have the power of dissolving ō into u + a, ā into a + a, (as on the other hand Telugu changes i + a into ē, f. i. tēdu: & u + a into ō f. i. tō = ula). "Ivau" might I take to be original Carnil, ^{& Mal.} the root iv, iru as in irul (darkness) - the formative avu, or ā, as in vinā & other nouns;

8
tātri appears therefore Dravidian
(the real Sanscr. nis-² nakt)

57. tatsama, tadbhava I would under
"the same with it" "arising from it"

- b.) kam I take to be = kammu
& would refer to Devanāgarī changes
eliminating the r (as in kattiri
soissors, katten = kartta). The
real Tamil word is kammam

p. 59¹⁰ The old Mal character is still
used with slight variations by the
Muslim colonists

p. 61. why should Sōra not be written
Chōra (see notes to & p. 105)

An old Mal word in Herodotus^{3, 111} is
kappes for cinnamon ^{Mal & 2 = 2} & ^{where cassia} ^{camphor}

p. 62. The Pāndya embassy to the
Western empire proves to my mind
that the Malabar coast was then
subject to those kings.

κροδοδος Plin. Celebothras. In Mal
Kēlan, Kēlu are very common names,
corrupted from Kēralan. The
king's title was no doubt Kērala
putra & Kēlaputra (p. pronounced
b as now in Tam & Mal)

*) ūral in M. sediment, hence camphor = sediment of lin-
nemo

- Kōttē rather from kōttei fort
which compounded with āru would
in Mal. sound like kōttāru

- "Dialectic peculiarities of Mal." I
would never find upon termina-
tions preserved by Greeks, as they
could little to reproduce the original
sounds (compare kōttē)

⁶³ Kōttē probably heard by foreigners
in the oblique case "kōttu". I believe
simple? they would have it rendered
by ε, as p. 65. kōttu is probably
kōttu or cōtti "corner"

"Coromandel" name to be derived
from Chōra mandalam. "Compounds
of indigenuous Drav. words like
chōlam & Sanscr. words" are hardly
inadmissible, if the instance adduced
a few lines after (Tondamandalam)
be considered. The first Portuguese
(^{Barbosa} Barros, Castanheda etc) write Choramun-
del, which they say stretches from the end
of the kingdom of Coulaō (Quilon) to the
Udgiromale in the kingdom of Mra.
C instead of ch is a later corruption

p. 65. "Cerobothras" compare note 62.

Latin C certainly = Indian K

p. 71, 1. write *Dandak* - *Aranya* as also p. 81.

p. 72. Is "ten" sweet? I take ten honey to be = *ti-y-an* "sweetness." But the Corcorant rather = Southern tree, as tradition derives it from Ceylon.

p. 75 "wearing the hair long" is still the custom of Mal. mountaineers & other aboriginal castes. There are good representations of Tivar & other Mal. castes in ancient voyages, & they appear invariably with the long hair.

p. 77. The 18 Royal families of Malabar are mostly Ariyanized Sudras. But five of them are stated to be Chatriyas, viz. the 2 families of Codungatur (Canganore) & Cochi

p. 78 "tin" & "zinc" have in 2. foreign names, but also "lead" (tiam = susam)

p. 80. Ramēswaram, S. Ramēswaram

p. 84. If Tamil literature avowedly excels in ethics, may not the common name by which Northern neighbours designate the Tamils be derived from this peculiarity. The Arawas as Tel. & Can. call them, must signify "Moralists" (a Ram = Dharma, perh. distinctly = Buddhist religion?) Whence the Name Tigalar, which the Tamils bear in Canarise?

p. 89. The "lethargy of the Dravidian mind" ^{seems} appears not to have extended to Malabar. The Kerala upatti & many other works appear to be written in the last century, of course before Hyder's invasion.

p. 98. It appears to me older than uru. The Greek Urmination in & carries little weight, see p. 62. ura is certainly but modern Malaya Tam. "

p. 100. The Mal. uses invariably short a for u." This is a mistake, that

prevails the whole Grammar. The very short u of Tamil is still farther shortened in Mal & hence it has become customary, not to write it when final. Foreigners who are led more by the written sign than by the spoken sound have therefore identified this short u with short a. And there is no doubt that the Syrians especially, & the Cochinese in general affect to pronounce them equally. But in the pronunciation of Brahmins & Nayers they differ, & in Poetry u is invariably written. In the North of Malabar a dot or little circle over the letter is used to express this sound (f. i. u° = u°). The same custom prevails yet more extensively in Tulu, where the pronunciation is yet more Shva-like. In Tulu you can hardly distinguish if this vowel forms a syllable or serves as a mere apostroph. Hence the difficulty, almost insuperable, of imitating

ting European metres in Tulu
(Canaan hymns are sung
by the Tulu Christians). The rule
which obtains in Tulu is this, short
u is retained after labial vowels
f. i. todu "must" (= 60 or om 6) uru
down: all other vowels are followed
by this very short & peculiar Sva.
Cutted somewhat like a very
short German i, or French u, Greek v).

I suppose that the Telugu i in
so many terminations is the result
of a similar law of transition.

Meanwhile I think, short u ought
to be written in Mal, except an
apostrophic sign be preferred both
for Mal & Tulu. (p. 12. kiraxk^u
or kiraxk^u a Dative in "nu" or n)

p. 101. the final a in tala is not
a pure a, but a slight modification
of the palatal sound ei. Hence
the forms 00000 or 00000 in the
Dative, 00000 near the mountain;
the neuter verb adaya forms the
active verb adeeku. The verb ura
has the past urannu, urei - urenjunct

p. 101. The modifications undergone by the vowels i & u before t, n, etc I should rather ascribe to the influence of the following vowel. It is the power of an a or its cognate sound which penetrates into the preceding syllable.

p. 102. the change of e into o ^{parvadi} especially the ^{sihore} ~~bolli~~ ^{bolli} ~~light~~ ^{light} velli, etc

p. 102. the law of sords & sonants as stringent in Mal as in Famil.

p. 103. Dantam, pampa etc can never be correctly pronounced by Malayatis, who are on this account ridiculed by Northern Brahmans. As they invariably pronounce nt = nd, mp = mb, they have changed the pronunciation of Sanscrit nd mb, nj, ng etc into something like agemination of the respective nasals (ambandi fi. becomes sammandi), thus vitiating also the Sanscr. sonants, in order to keep up a distinction between them & the sords.

p. 105. The soft pronunciation of g true
of Mal as well.

"Tamil ʒ" should be written ch, on
the same principle that uses ch
to represent the Telugu ts. The
ancient pronunciation is probably
retained by the lower classes: the
very soft sound, when ʒ is used
as initial, appears to be an af-
fection of the higher castes.

p. 106. Initial ñj in Mal represents
an ancient y f.i. ñjān = yān
ñjāndu, arab, in Can. yāndri.

p. 108 irā & iravu belong, I suspect,
rather to the chapter of the formation
of nouns, than to that of euphonic
changes (Compare unā & unavu)

r is found not in Tam "only" but in
Mal, Pradja & old Canarese likewise

! not "invariably" used instead of r
in Canarese. r appears to have become
a in some words (f.i. ardu wept)
as is still the case in Tulu, & then
it was dropped as happens often
to a before double consonants
f.i. portu becomes hottu (time)

p. 109. The hard R becomes often
j in Tulu & Tamil ka n̄ka
caly, caiji in Tulu.

ii) The letter n is found in Canarese
in the form E , & of course in Mal
where the old writing distinguishes
it pretty correctly from the dental
n. - I am not quite satisfied
with the way in which this class
of letters is represented. We require
in fact three sets of t-d-n to
represent distinctly the powers of
the Can & Mal sounds. If dots
be used to distinguish the cere-
brals, Greek letters might do
for the sounds ^{lying} midway between
the cerebrals & dentals, thus

$\eta = c$ $\eta\eta = \text{TT}$ $\text{oo}\eta = \text{vd}$

In pronunciation this TT is per-
haps nearest to the English t, &
it is used for this purpose
by some learned Malayalis. I
received one from Cottayam
a bundle with the inscription

$\text{oo}\eta$ $\text{oo}\eta$ I wonder if you can

Decipher this hieroglyph
110. A mūru more ancient than mūrdu?
Canarese distinguishes the Nasals throughout
(except the halfanuswara, which it likes
to introduce as *fi*: in *sainhya* = *sahya*).
*ka*rdū in Can. *karu*, which is the older?
I suppose *Ru* in *mūrdu* & *orū* to be
the formative *Du*, *Fu*, changed by its
contact with final *ōt* (*v*). *mun*, on
appear to me the original forms, the
one from the radical *mu* = to be
before, excel (where *mun* is probably
T. mukha, also *mūkk* = nose, & the
verb *mūkka*) the other from radi-
cal *o* = to be one. Many old nouns are
formed with *ōt* (as *ēn* what? etc)

This *v* changes with *R*, as in *pin*, *pika*
but also with *r*. (*fi*: *ulan* birth, also
ular, *ularu* etc). *Oru* therefore ap-
pears to me only the more liquid
equivalent of the noun *or*.

sendu or *chedu* I would rather de-
rive from *chel-ndu*, than *seldu*, as
the latter would have to become *sel^hdu*.

Is *nd* "always found in Telugu" instead
of *ndr*? I merely ask, but cannot

remember instances to the point.
Only it strikes me that in repre-
senting RR Telugu differs syste-
matically from Canarese. I allude
to words like mātu C mātu Tel
which are the same with Tam. māRR
"answer, word". Canarese takes in-
deed often a Telugu word, as fi pattu
= Tam paRRu, whilst it retains
also its appropriate form hattu. Still
there can be no doubt that the lan-
guages follow a different course
in the treatment of the double
R: we should therefore expect
them also to differ in their ways
of using the NR

sh is in Mal represented by a
(aushadham in old Mal. avizdam)
mostly by t, 3 by ch & y

Mal. also destitute of h

112. l has nearly disappeared from
Telugu: also Tulu changes it very
often into l. Sanskrit influence has
hardly caused the transition,

as Mahratte Concani & other neigh-
bouring Angalanguages use it very
freely, & Sanscrit words both in Can.
& Mal. have retained it unsparingly.
p. 114 g in mal. often lost, f.i. chagadu a
cart, chadu

i) As in Tel. so may also in Mal. V be changed
into g. f.i. chuvanna red often chuganna

ii) Fam. chirei in Mal. kira - ^{very} rare change

p. 115. IV) ^{or vād it} vātil in Mal. is but a corruption
of vāyil (similar to Tulu pudar = peyar)

2. The softening of ʒ into y is here treated
as a corruption, & p. 120 ascribed to
a peculiar perversity. I look upon
the transition as perfectly legitimate,
& suspect it will be difficult to pronounce
which is ^{in each case} the original sound. If Tel.
chēsi is decidedly later than chēyi,

Can. pesar, kesaru etc may be dialectal
forms younger than peyar, chēru
etc. ^{Fam.} pasi becomes in ^{high} Mal. regularly
pei (in the form peidaka hunger &
thirst), & peim is considered better
than pasum "green"

p. 116. Mal. can hardly be said to prefer

n to n. Thus indeed minarku to the
brides minarku. On the other hand tu-
niyu, "venture", becomes turnyu,
kambu, kambu, embadu embadu etc
ii) ettu is hardly euphonic change
from en, but the same formative
which is added to the numerals of
1, 2, 3, is also at work here.

pendu = pen + du, as is shown by
the other form pendi, in which the
formative ti is the common feminine
termination.

pedei I look upon, as formed by
adding the formative ei to pedu,
which is another form of the root
pen, even as piku (where pikacka
to be born) is another form of the
root pin, or piku of nil.

117. The euphonic change of ad into an.
ar is not to my taste. I believe
this belongs altogether to the chapter
of the inflexions, & hope there to
indicate why I compare Cap to
Tam. an (as fr. in 4800, 4810)
ii) vayadu is the correct, vayasu the vulgar
Taddh. of S. vayas(u). But I believe

that peyar became first pesar, & then
pudar, even as vāyil became in Mal
vādil, by passing through Tam. vā'it.
Similarly kirecka to part, pronounced
kiyecka, becomes in modern Mal
kidecka. - On the other hand t pas-
ses even into s f.i. mūtta od, often
mūssa; & lowers interchange them both
ludicrously, (saying f.i. seivatte
tēvicka "to serve God" instead
of seivatte' sēvicka)

iii.) the change of nd into nj after
palatal vowels prominent in Mal.
past tenses (arindu - ariññu,
ārāyndu - āraññu, pakeindu - pakeññu)
p. 118 anju may still be older than
the apparently more regular cindu.

iv.) # changed into chch, f.i. T. pe
ruttu, old C. perchochu, mod. C. hechchu

Ad to unarchi also kātchi,
Mal. kārcha, ierulcha, aralcha, pu-
garcha

write Mal chiricha instead of siricha

v.) n softened into y? Rather the
reverse. (āya older than āyina, āna
jōlli-y-a older than jōllina)

For Sanscr. *nyaga*, *yama* become
in T. *nugam*, *Naman* - And a Can.
Indu corresponds with *Can* & *Mal*
nindu to swim. Might we not rather
say, *y* passes into *ny* & *n*?

5.1.) Not merely initial *p* becomes in
Can. *h* (*haudu* "yes" from *ahudu*,
an old form = *apu*, *agu* "to be such".
Similar *bahudu* = *baruvadu*)

p. 119. iii) "soften into *v*"? Questⁿ
ionable, since there is a *v*₂ ^{in Tam.} extensively
used in inflexions, whilst an independ^t
ent *b* is wanting.

iv. "m changes into n" The termination
an is probably more than a euphonic
change of *am*.

120. ii) *pedda* rather = *perda*, as here is in Can.
continually changed into *hegg*, *hebb*, *hedd*.

III) Tam. & *Can* *irañji* *Mal* *ilañji*, Tam
parisei *M* *palisa*

Tel. *teliyu* perhaps rather from *teli*
than *heri* (*Can* *teli*)

p. 121. *chiku* = *chil* & *chin*, other forms
of the same root. But *par* grows
looks quite distinct from *per*

In *Mal* "v is always w." I doubt it, our

lies between those 2 English words
122. Old Canarese possesses the ζ .
In Mal r is not often converted into
 ζ rather into y as Malayāy ζ ma, often
written & spoken Malayāy ζ ma

ζ in Tulu words generally r ; fi.
pōdu time. Canarese does not
use the same word as hottu. Mala-
yalam writes pōl, but merely be-
cause the sign ζ serves as final
l. & ζ , the Sative is pōrecku: now
& then are written & spoken ippō ζ rum
appō ζ rum

Can. karmāran is from the Sanscr.
karmakāra (no charge from āla)

123. anusham in Mal anizam. Shyam
is in old medical works written kira-
yam, Lashmana in an old Ramay-
ana Naçkkanan

sha discarded in Vishnu, Vinnu, Vin (T. & Mal)

- Jushkam, chukku

sa = ta, f.i. in tei a plant from sasya

Can. sasi. Discarded in sandhya, andi
(evening) etc

Ta & Tra discarded in Trēni, ēni, Travanam

Tham, Jyestha Etta, Travistham Avittam

p. 124.1. Dwanda - rather Dwandwa
as also p. 103. 125

p. 128 vādhu is probably older than
vādhu. The masculine termination
of av-an, mag-an is in Telugu cere-
bratized (nd^u), even as the Rk of
the same class becomes in Tel. tt

IV) anda inda I would not derive
from ada idu, but rather from an
old noun am im. This with the for-
mative ^{"direction"} ku gives angu, ingu -
with the da of relative participly
the adjectives anda, inda - besides
many other formations.

↳ maru fragrant?

131. "Originally we may be sure that
one consonant alone was used for
this purpose" Why should this be?
Labial ^{rowels} consonant affect as surely
the semivowel v, as palatals do
y. The question can only be how far
the use of each extends. In Mal y
has gradually encroached upon
the domain of v, pure a having
become rare, & y being preferred after
the palatal a.

133. I doubt the derivation of T. & M.
um from Tel. nu. The copulative
particle would seem to be a prono-
minal noun: um, analogous
to the am & im from which
inda, angu etc are derived. The
Tel. inversion of the sounds is
quite of a piece with their te & to
& kre & kro (for kadei & kodu) etc

p. 134. padin hardly an example of
n used for the prevention of hiatus.
The numeral 10 is a very difficult one,
but I doubt not that in "in" served
for the oblique (or locative) case.
padin mūndu is decisive to that
effect (old Mal. padimūnnu). Si-
milar ombadin-āyiram, and
enbadin kōdi (in Rāma charitam)

The proof of the original ^{exclusive} use of
n appears to me far fetched. Words
like a-w-an, i-w-an, with all their
changes into vāndu, vēndu, prove
sufficiently the original employ-
ment of v for preventing hiatus.

p. 136. In the harmonic sequence of
Vowels Tulu nearest to Telugu
f.i. būradu, falling, has two u in con-
sequence of the labial vowel ū in the
radical syllable: jatt'd', coming
down, has two ūs because the ra-
dical vowel is other than labial
pat nōd. du from the town (u on
account of ō) but marād. d' from
the tree (ū after a)

p. 138. med. - Tulu words terminate
likewise in vowels. Mal = Tamil
but inclining rather more to the
Northern way.

p. 140. l. 13 from below - why "pro-
bably"?

"kudirei" from Raō. kudi to jump.
In Mal. poetry this origin is well
preserved f.i. In Rama Charitam
kuditt. erum kudira. Or the fre-
quentative (iterative): kudi kudi-
chu mañdunna kudiragal (Ka-
mayaram). Can. kudure but kudre agree
fully (kudi in Can. to rise up).

In Common Mal displacement of vowels
seems very frequent. fi. Kina & Kil
in the well vulgo kiRāndil.

p. 141. navel Mal poikul & poekil.

2.) To Euphoni displacement I would
add "and amalgamation" of vowels. In
Tolu. fi. I take ō to be the result of
a + u (= Can. oralu & orlu). Tel. to prob.
= ula; ledu = illadu. Sera ee night
= irā; te = ila; vray = varei. Tulucana
logg (as in lanku rise, leppu = Hoops
call) would show, that this unsettled-
ness of the vowels attaches chiefly
to radicals with liquid consonants.

p. 142. rejection of liquid consonants
in Can. as frequent as in Tel. eppattu
= go. ebbisu to raise, Caus. of ēlu -
emme (Tel. erme) = erumei; kobbu
Can. komme Tu both fat & pride
= T. kozuppu & Tel. prover or
kovou. Also Tel. poddu from an older
proddu. But Can. hottu from a.c. portu.
(Tu portu). — medicine Tu & a.c. mardu
mod. C. maddu: thus showing a tendency

to reject the nasal of Cam & Cel.
p. 142. odu is the lengthening (= Verbal
Noun) of odu which is still as even
in Mal poetry. Old Can. has oda, odam,
Cul. oduge, new Can. odare (= Cam. odan)
Surely this root is sufficiently estab-
lished to need no explanation from
Tora whose radical is toru (as
in toril). - tudar is better todar
& explains itself as todu (contact)
with the ar of Verbal Nouns. These
3 roots I take to be altogether distinct
from each other.

"the first syllable" remaining "always
unchanged" ought to warn us against
identifying Tora with odu, al with
kal, as also against the very question-
able associations of idi, adi, odi etc (p. 163)

p. 145. 3, particles? rather pronominal
roots

p. 145. 1. Verbal themes ought to be kept
more distinct from the Verbal roots,
than is the case. karei, alai appear
to me Verbal nouns, but rather

secondary verbal themes, these roots.

p. 147. vical & viri both from a root
vir. - kadal perhaps as well as kadan,
kadei etc from kadu. - kudal from kudu,
whence also kudi, kudu. - kuzal per-
fectly distinct (Can. & Tul kotal) = kuzei
what is hollow, ^{from kur} whence kuri etc. - Nical
I would just call a Verb. N. of the lost root
nic - cheyal in Mal. the breeding of poultry
cheeku the place of roosting & breeding
(Tam. cheera strawed) I would derive
from an old root che, (a. C. ~~ge~~ ke, lie down,
to embrace sexually)

mādu perhaps from mā the strong
(beast) with formative du. mādu at
all events secondary Verb from mādu (Tulu mal.)
- ādu I call a Verb-Noun from adu, to
fight, kill & cook, whether it signify
that mutton was the old food of the
Dravidas (as prob. of the Brahmins), or
what I prefer, that the goats are
considered as fighting together (adu
to approach in combat, hence adal).
The ^(secondary) verb ādu I would then derive from
the noun: frisking like a goat etc
"miga" in Can nose. There is no Verb miga

to smell, but muggu Tul, mūchcha Tel
muggu Can. (T. & Mal. mūgar) these are
certainly related. I would rather derive
it (together with mukham) from
mu "prominence", where mugar &
mugal = mukham.

Strange that kir is called undervived,
whereas p. 157 its root kir & some deri-
vatives are mentioned. kir is in fact
the verb. Noun of kir.

mēl is no doubt = mī-y-al Verb Noun
of mī "to be above", where mīdu,
Tul midda etc. In Can. myētē is still
written

Vin = Vihnu

"Nouns of quality" rather verbs of quality.
"mun" undoubtedly verb. Noun of mu-
with the formative N.

p. 148. āl = āgal Inf of āgu. The meaning
would be "being for it" or "being along
with it". I prefer the latter on account
of the Tulu tā which no doubt is =
Tam & Mal. āl, & serves at present
in all the significations of um.
The 3d case would thus rather be

a social in its original import, than
an instrumental. (for Zulu compare:
in Lord's prayer *cajyala trānala mahi-
meta yēnēnigala nināu ādundu* - in
Imper. *bal-tā = 21 17 13 10*)

"kal" serves for the Locative, & is for this
purpose by Mal. shortened to "kel".

"the copulative particle" shows its origin
from pron. root *u*. *Um* corresponds with
Am, *Im* in *angu* etc

"gid" in 7. I should separate *k'* in *Ru*
& take the latter in its original sense
of today now.

"ku" a formative, signifying direction
(*angu - vadaku*, *mēaku* etc)

p. 149. Dravidian roots are certainly
monosyllabic, of 2 classes, ending in
a vowel, which may be long (*ā - chā -
mī - pō -*) or ending in a consonant,
in which case the radical vowel is short
- ad' - an' - kud' - Several consonants are
regularly interchanged as $\frac{g}{n} = \frac{d}{n}$ $\frac{du}{n} = l$
(*nidu = nīl*) $\frac{du}{n} = n$ (*nadu, nan*) $l = Ru$
(*nīl, nīRu - nal, naRu*) $n = du$ (*pidu*
pun - perhaps midu, mun: but

here already formative & secondary
verbal themes may be suspected)

p. 150. "Euphonic lengthening" to me
very doubtful. I derive *viral*, *virei*,
viri from *vir*, & suppose that the
Verb. Nouns derived from the root be
come the themes of secondary Verbs.

"the best proof" appears to me no
proof at all

p. 151 why suppose an original *tri* or
vri in opposition to the principles
of syllabation as p. 138. A root *tri*
answers all purposes (*tirei*, *tiral*, *tori*,
tirugu, *tirumb* etc are easily derived
from it, & the different dialects even *telu*
quite itself agree - compare *tel. tirugu*, *tirigali*,
tiripe, *tirlik* etc.)

the "second mode" is not much better
than the first. Too much is explained
by euphony. The statement of p. 150
& 151 is much more to the purpose.
But in *i*, *a*, *ei* I see vocal formatives,
still discoverable in Verbal Nouns
(*padī*, *padēi*, *padu* V. N. or derivatives
from *padu*). It alone I have to be

a euphonic vowel (as in ada). These ^{other} auxiliary vowels as they are called, are not "all interchangeable", but the different dialects prefer the one or the other formative. The Canarese dialect likes nade, the other nadi. The Mal prefer pure nada for watering but the root is no doubt nadi (to plant? enter?) - "T. mulei" is thus from "mul" to come forth, itself a Noun a protusion, thorn" & derivative from mu.

p. 152. With the "formative Addition" I can better agree, but would call "gu" etc in the first place Verbal Nouns.

p. 153. No doubt the "original distinctive meaning" of many of these formatives is lost. In some it may be discovered fr. mirunga & distinguished from miranu appears to be a frequentative (as the verbal adverbs valingana, cherunga na, at a great rate, small rate) - Iteratives or descriptive, like veluvelucka - kiku xikukka - nukunukungu etc might also be mentioned here.

p. 154 Tel. pen = Tam. per (hence pedda)

p. 155. *tūngu* from old *tu* (where *tuyil*)

p. 156. *Tel appavi* surely not = *lam oppuvi*?

p. 157. why again return to "considerations of euphony"?

"*vambu*" from *vei*? or = *vanbu* (as in Mal) - "Canarese *vayyu*" rather *bei bayyu*

"*parandu*" rather from spreading wings (to fly *par*, not *par*)

p. 158. "euphonic addition"? doubtful.

"formative particles" true; but how are these to be distinguished from the particles of specialisation?

"*adar*" f.i. is = *chudar* a ^{Noun} In Mal *ular-aga*, *ulan-aga* are poetical synonyms of *ulaw-aga* "being born". -

p. 161. "Not the only purpose for which these vowel additions are used" is euphony: why not rather then assume, that at first they had always a meaning, which they still retain in some cases, but lost in others

p. 162. This is a mistake to call *valar* (f.i.) a root. It is a noun to all intents &

purpose, & becomes again a verbal
theme - "mugaku" in Mal = mugam
pace. - "il" a real compound veṅil, that
wherein heat lodges, kuḍil that wherein
one lives together. - "ul" the same, arul fi:
the Verb Noun of "aru" previous, porul
of poru

vilei, Can. bele signifies, I believe, to
grow white (vil = vel)

p. 163. the comparison of idi, adi, odi very
venturesome, & opposed to the "rigi-
dity & persistency characteristic
of the Dravidian roots p. 164"

p. 164. eḍḍi etc see to p. 142. belongs
to the nature of the liquid consonants.

"vandu" from a double root vā or var,
tā or tar

p. 166 the change of pēr, kār, ār chiefly
in combinations before vowels: but
originally a Verbal Noun. kār in Mal
cloud. - pār from par (wherein Mal
patude "in vain", patudu "void, interstices")

- para "old" another derivative of the
same root

"wholly euphonic" why again? It is a ^{form of the} Verbal Noun.

p. 167 "not to grammatical relation, but"
this is not at all obvious. Every noun
in Dravid. language may serve as
adjective: any verbal root may
even without change be used as
Noun (fi. chol - say - word). Still
this difference, of the short vowel
belonging rather to the Verb,
the long to the Noun, remains
unshaken (nadu^{to} plant - nādu,
kadu be rough - kādu etc)

p. 167. 15 Doubt the length of the "rootword"
in the numerals, if not in the pronouns.
The numerals (being probably Verbal
nouns) can hardly be treated as roots.

p. 168. A further instance of the
short vowelled preterite is chattu

p. 173. write "peidal" rather than peital

p. 177. an deserves hardly the name
of a corruption, it being the older
contraction of a + an, whereas in
the more modern on the v ofavan
however meaningless, is likewise
represented

p. 177. Telugu *du* is certainly identical with Tamil *n*, but should not the Nasal that precedes the *du* be duly expressed? *ndu* is then like Canarese *nu*, Tam. *n*: and the expression of this Tamil *n* (oo) by a Telugu Cerebral has its analogy in Ta. *R**R* becoming in Telugu *tt* (whereas in Can. *tt*), our *n* and *R* both belonging to the same organ.

p. 178. I cannot identify *an* with *an*: for the *an* in *payan*, *balan* (Tam) *mrānu* (Tel.)^{etc} is hardly different from the Masculine formative, though freely used in Neutres (as observed p. 207)

p. 179. *illāt* "she of the house" - no euphonic lengthening, rather composition of it with the pronoun (p. 177)

p. 180. I have no doubt of the identity of Tam. *āl* & Tel. *ālu*

p. 182. *Mal ata, ita*: rather *ad* "id".

p. 188. middle english has the plur. brethren, anglosaxon merely brōðra. Dutch uses now both broeders & broederen, middle Dutch preferred the first form.

p. 189 Is not makkal properly speaking the plural of magu, a neuter?

Mal. has the plural magalar for daughters (only in poetry)

p. 190. "the same practice adopted in Canarese."? Hardy. Even in Mal. avar is constantly used for the real plural, avargal is rather a honorific singular (cf. Sahibavargal). Can. avaru is real plural; atanu is looked upon as the honorific singular, though avaru is likewise used for it. ningal in Mal both plur & honorif singular as niru in Can.

p. 190. 1. Telu. er' or era - Tam. plurals ar & or not merely euphonic mutations from ar, but contracted plurals of 3d pers. pronoun.

The same is the origin of mar.

p. 191 I suppose it identical with Telugu varu, & to have

been originally joined to termination an: thus purushanvar became purushamar (as Mal & a. T. kānvān "about to see" kānman).
p. 192. en-mar poit = en-var; ^v rather of future origin, than pronominal?

In Mal. & vāzvavan, vāzvōn of the futur. relat. participle becomes often vāzvavan. Thus unmar (& unmar, which yet I have not yet met with) = eaters.

Pronominal v is however a very common formative in Mal. & I think it deserves being recorded in connection with mar. We say not merely vinnavar, vānivar (contracted vinnōr, old vinnar) for "those in heaven, celestials," but also Izavar = Ceylonese from Izam, & with Saasrit words mūrkhavar, uragavar, kumbhimūkhavan etc, in common life kāranavar

the head of the household, mother's
brother, anantarevar descendants
heirs etc

p. 193. "nu becomes ū! I doubt it strongly

p. 193. enmanār appears to me a free
composition of the singular an with
a plural pronoun ār. Similar
to the honorific use of ar (= avar)
in Bhagavānār, Dēviyār, modern
Rājāv. avargal

p. 194. "In Mal" gal or kal

p. 195 In Tulu kulu (not kulu) fi:
ākulu they, nikulu you, enkulu we

p. 196. Is older than k? a delicate
question, particularly in Greek,
where Tus etc is newer than quis,
(Samm. kas)

197. ell connected with all? I suspect
that ellām contains a negative
a, & the original meaning
is "boundless, unlimited". The
positive el as in elgei

p. 198 also in Mal. pala, chita are
neuter plurals, used in poetry - now
commonly palava, chilava

p. 199. why is not Tam. ivei, avei
mentioned, as the transition from
Mal. ira, ara to Telugu iri,
avi. As in illei, Mal. ^{or Can} illa, final
a lapses easily into a palatal sound

p. 200 Tulu avu, rather a-u (v is
not written), as I believe, merely a
corruption from adu. The form
used for yes, is and' (not atu),
which appears to be am, the
same from which anqu is formed,
with the old neuter termination
du*) That tu existed formerly in
Tulu, is plain enough: fi. att' is
the word used for no, & is evident-
ly = al-tu, as ijji "not existing" is
= il-tu, iR Ru; onji = Can. ondu one etc
p. 204 "peyre" - rather peyare

*) and' has quite the meaning of Mal
ade' lit. that very thing = yes. Its form
is the same as of ind', which is = Tam. idu, & of undu =
T. idu

p. 204 The neuter termination am
significs probably "it."

Modern Canarese has the termination
am in the form avu. Occasionally
am occurs in compositions of
nouns with verbs, as kada kollu
to borrow, also kadam golle. Also
compounds like angei (Can. & Tulu)
= Tam, ^{& Mal} agangei, from agam inside,
may here be taken into consider-
ation.

207 "in" appears to me identical
(compare the conditional ayin - agil)
with it, house, place, the oblique
cases would all seem to be modifi-
cations of the Locative, as express-
ing something happening in or
about the noun, whilst the
Nominative pronounces its totality.
In Mal. the postposition it is rarely
found following in: forms like
guruvinil, matavinil occur only
in pedantic poetry (whilst guruv-
nal, guruvinkal etc are quite com-
mon).

p. 209. Can. ad & ar I cannot consider
as identical. ad agrees fully with
attu, of Tam & Mal, & is I have
also no doubt identical with the
greater demonstrative adu.

"Tulu ad" not quite exactly "used where
Canarese uses ar" - f.i. Bhamida
mitt' upon the earth. padice - d - ākulu
"those who are of the evil, or in the evil
= the wicked" so patna - d - ākulu
etc for citizens

Can. ar is I believe = ar, but not by
dialectic change from ad, rather
instead of an (as p. 207) which even
in Tam. can become (~~adar~~ - ku
ar (before words, as adarku), & be-
comes such easily in Can. because
of its distinctness of Nasal combinations

p. 210. Tel. ti appears to me = Tam
Rru; that is the produce of t
& R. - tolli corresponds with
Tam. Mal. tol, & is therefore differ-
ently treated

p. 212. *ellāw-um* occurs in old Mal
& the neutr. plur. *ellāvū* corresponds
evidently with the 2 others *pala-va*
chita-va

alRhu stake to arise from the
combination *an-thu*, & to favor
my derivation of *Can-ar. Feb*
ti agrees with it, as organically re-
presenting *Rh*

p. 216. Mal *enikkⁿ* & *inikkⁿ*, also
(poit) *en-akkⁿ* - to thee *ninakkⁿ*
or *ninakkⁿ* - remark *namakkⁿ*
(rarity^{ad} *namakkⁿ*), with which
a rarely used *tamukkⁿ* corre-
sponds.

nāleikkⁿ in Mal. *nālekkⁿ*
chiefly temporal affix, f.i.
āndeccu to the year, *enneccum* forever

p. 218. Old Mal. accusative often
merely *apalatala* (thus
vāna ekumanta mala in *Ram.*
Charit.) *ē* is another form of
this Mal. expression of the *likaram*

p. 219. vinna from Vishnu shortened
to vin, as kannam^{kammui} to kann.

p. 219. Tulu Acc. n² - observe the pre-
ceding e, which is certainly = Can. a
(fi. und. en² = idei Tam. idannu Can.)
in plur. kāryō^{len} = kāryangalei,
kāryagalannu). In words like satyan'
yanan' = satyavannu, nannannu the
Accus. termination may lay as much
claim to the preceding a, as the
stem of the noun. Plur. Accusatives
like pātera occuras in Canarese.

p. 220. I believe likewise the Can. ^{p. 220 the Tulu}
& Tel. Accusatives to be identical, ^{accusatives}
& this old am to be the same, which ^{are yanan' me}
forms so many neuter nouns ^{niran' the}
viz. an old nomen am or an
= adu (the like of which survives
in the Interrogative noun en)

p. 222. "in" or "im" no doubt originally
locative. the signification of motion
as in Tam. Ablative appears secondary.

Tulu 'Da consists probably of a
Locative noun *ede* = *idei*, or *odu* -
& the general oblique case in *da*,
which also appears in the *Cara*
Case compound "in-da"
at an nodoubt Verbal Nouns
of *āgu*, & signifying: "being
also there." - (I doubt if there is a
Bengalee *kāl* Channel)

p. 223. Various adverbial participles
may serve instead of the Instru-
mental in *Mal. fi.* knowing
doing seeing considering, putting
saying etc

p. 223. Is the case not rather this,
that the Sanscrit Instrumental
is also a local, than that the latter
is unknown to Sanscrit. - *Jam. Mal*
al - conda - odu are the different
~~trans~~ renderings or equivalents
of the 3^d Sanscrit case. But I
quite agree that the *Mal. Dravi-*

dician list of cases ought to be differ-
ently arranged. first the Nomin
then the Inflexion, then the Locative
etc. The Dative fi. ought to follow
~~the latter~~ locative as we have
many locative Datives (allige
Car. thither, uiril-e-ku into
the town Mal. etc)

p. 224
odu is probably older than odu,
in Mal. it is still used as a mere
Locative noun fi. ang-odⁿ
thither. - odu pronoun in Mal
odⁿ, not ota - The necessity for
identifying odu with toz I
cannot understand. Why should
not odu signify junction in a
place, union, if the derived
othu has the same meaning in
Tam. Can. Tulu. Tel. The preposi-
tions may be freely chosen in
the different dialects - even as
Tam. & Mal prefer it for the Locative
whilst Tel. & Tulu affect rather ul,

without obliging us in the least
to try & identify it with ul, which
might be done with even less
expense of ingenuity
today with today belongs alto-
gether to the derivations from
tod to touch

225. Mal. Dat. kka " Tul k'g'
227. again Mal. nanikka, instead
of nipakka " Tul. nikk'. In old
Mal. you meet with ulagukka
& mü-v. ulagickum; in modern
Mal with onnucka besides onni-
na. Innu cannot be derived
from inku, which in Mal would
become ilku & finally iccku
(as köyilk, köyilkal - köyickal,
vädilkal at the door ~~at~~ vädickal
& now vādūckal). I would deri-
ve it from the Genitive. enke
my is evidently to be resolved
into en-adu-e. marattinRe =

marattin-ad. The Dative marattianu
I consider as softened from marattin^{ku}
even as ninnu, innu from T. nin^{ku},
in^{ku}. The Sanscrit Dative is in
Mal versions rendered by ay^ondu
& other strengthenings of the Dravi-
dian Dative, whilst the Sansc.
Genitive is continually rendered
by ku (f. i. tesham asti = aver^{ku}?
undu). I therefore assume that
in this form of the Dative we
have a relic of the Genitive.
Only one circumstance makes
me doubtful. Simple nu is as common
in the old Mal. as double naⁿ -
f. i. nagarkkum nāttinum in
Rāma Charitam - nāyiru coduttu
(Panchatantri = nāy^{ku}) - maganⁿ = ma-
garu - jatāyū - nu mōxam nalgi etc
In the Dative of the mascul. termina-
tion it is still most common (avanⁿ
to him etc). Here it might be most
probable that ku has been simply

Dropped. Musulmans who in various
points, as f: in their Mal. alphabet &
in the discarding of Aspirates, etc, hold
fast antiquated forms, will generally
say Suttānikk, other castes Suttānu
p. 229. I doubt "in" being originally
a genitive suffix, but agree to its
being locative

atti-illi - stand probably for a-ill,
i-ill, as kauddu does for ahuddu, hāge
& hige for ābage, ībage (= vagei Tam.)

p. 231. en, nin I consider as a Compositi-
on case, rather than as Adjective.

The 5th form of the Genitive (p. 240)
should I conceive monopolize what
ever of Adjective Character can be
long to a Dravidian case

p. 231.2. attu having still such decided
locative power proves to me
that the composition case partakes
rather of locative than of possessive
Character (ku lattu min fish in the
tank - Mal. ividattu vānu came here

avidatt-ān he who is in that place)

p. 233 maramadu appears to me
likewise adjectival or appositional.

In Mal poetry we continually meet
with adu porudu = appot. Therefore

adu = a

3.) the use of adu common in old Mal
Antakanadu chinam etc in Ram. Char.

In modern usage scarcely beyond
tanad^u & perhaps enad^u (whence
tanke-e, enke)

p. 237. an-am appear to me the same
formatives of pronominal offspring
as fi: in ad-ak-ku

p. 245. ute, bitter ude Mal - mine

enke-d^u - Tulu ta-da I look upon
as originally rather locative &
composition-form

p. 246. udaya occasionally used in Mal
- ude still further mutilated in modern
poetry & prose (Site de of Sita, putri-de
of the daughter)

p. 247 NB. Is it = not? Perhaps rather
= ul, undu: & the negative power
cuts in (ill-a) the closing a, however

much ~~this~~ usage may have dis-
persed with it (in in Ri? iji' Cal.
etc). Even as in French pas, personne
have become Negatives by mere
association (in German - kein)

p. 247. alli - illi - adverbs of place? hardly
as the Dative allige; allinda etc show
p. 248 Cal. andu, inda I would com-
pare to the Tulu demonstr. neuter
and' ind' undu & call them nouns
rather than adverbs

p. 248" The locative is more likely
to be derived from the genitive
than - I doubt it. The different
contrivances employed to obtain
a Dravidian Genitive go far to
show that originally its want
was not felt; a composition form
with Locative meaning, judicious
employment of the Dative etc
would suffice instead. In Mal & Tam.
it is felt difficult to combine two
possessives with um. Old Mal. eschews

this constantly (for: - in
the mouths of Rama & of Krishna -). In
modern poetry Sanskrit analogy has
conquered, as foreign influence has done
in prose (ivan Reyum avan Reyum
kūdikārchā - their interview). Still
there is no real case which has to
struggle with this difficulty.

^{p. 249.} The Vulu locative is not mentioned, but would
require elucidation.

It is possible that in tokodu, ākā
3odu - o is the result of a + u (assuming
udu to be like ul. T. ūdu Mal.) -
or of a + i (re) with a v to serve
against hiatus (when idei, ede
would suggest a suitable noun of
place). But odu, as treated in
my remarks on the Tain & Mal
Social or conjunctive case, might also
well be supposed to survive here,
however ^{much} lost after other termina-
tions (~~adi~~ ^{ādi}?, kattale?, āya? in him plur. Keile? etc
in the hands)
the initial vowel may be obliterated.
Forms like ^{dinōtu} keit' in the hand, suggest rather Telugu
analogy.

The local Dative ~~adil~~ ^{adil} - ~~adil~~ ^{adil}
ēku in Mal - ittinādeg' lulu (= to
the place where is) ^{etc} appears nowhere
mentioned (p. 250)

p. 249. Vocative in Mal often formed
by lengthening a closing vowel
(tōrī of female friend. arachā o
king - (old poet) virāyō o hero)
besides many Sanskrit forms
even in Davidian words
fi. tattē o parrot amme' o
mother = S. priyē fem

p. 250. In Mal. $\text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ}$ locative - directive
or $\text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ}$ into the land
 $\text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ}$ does hardly belong to this
chapter, $\text{ṛ} \text{ṛ}$ signifying in this case
rather "to be within" (where $\text{ṛ} \text{ṛ}$)

The old form is $\text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ}$, $\text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ}$, $\text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ}$
Ṛ. The ablativus is often found con-
tracted fi. $\text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ}$ $\text{ṛ} \text{ṛ} \text{ṛ}$ from the
Cammālar

p. 252. Compound nouns are purely
not contrary to the original genius
of Indo-European languages, nor are
they the result of a process of corrup-

tion. goldwatch and other English compounds
 are only the result of carrying that
 liberty to its utmost limit which from the ^{first} age
 of the language ^{has} been allowed of compounds like

goldfāt (anglosaxon) The fact is only that we have two forms, where
 the Savidian language must be content with one

p. 253. 2. "imitation of Sanskrit deriva
 tives?" If such be the case it extends
 certainly not only to the am, but
 also the an & ar terminations (māra-
 cakalam, kātālapati, māramāl).

3. Instead of calling *ni* adjective I would
 rather give it a locative meaning. *ni*
 on the grain in the Ardaman *ni* (निगण).
 the side which is on the right (निगण)
 an elephant in the jungle *ni* (निगण)
 the Island Ceylon *ni* (निगण)

p. 254
ni are some of the few Mal instances
 that survive. *ni* "monkey army"
 is an instance of the change of *ngu*
 into *ku*.

ni fr. *ni* often pronounced
 & written - *ni*.

ni - *ni* - *ni* - *ni*
ni - *ni* (a name of Malabar)
ni - *ni* - *ni*
ni - *ni* - *ni*

An adverbial aff very common
 എന്തിനെക്കുറിച്ചും - ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്ന -
 adjectival റിഫറൻസ് നോട്ടേഷൻ (break
 fast) - കൊല്ലം നഗരം നഗരം ^{പുഴ} a few
 backbone - without Locative
 എന്തിനെയും കൂടെ

Nouns എന്തിനെയും കൂടെ & എന്തിനെയും
 അതും - ^{എന്നതും} എന്നതും - എന്തിനെക്കുറിച്ചും -
 അത്രയും കൂടെ - അത്രയും കൂടെ, അത്രയും
 കൂടെ - അത്രയും കൂടെ

p. 256. A second future നല്ല (is good)
 നല്ല, പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു exists still in Mal
 p. 257 In Mal. പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു, പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു, പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു,
 കരിച്ചു, നന്നായി, പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു - നന്നായി - പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു
 കരിച്ചു - also പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു & കരിച്ചു (though
 now called Sanskrit)

നല്ല - നല്ല - പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു - നല്ല - പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു - പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു
 without the mark of the past tense

p. 260. Comparison common in Mal. po.
 etry ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്ന. അതിനും - എന്തിനും,
 പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു - also പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു - പരിഷ്കരിച്ചു
 എന്തിനും etc

p. 262. In Canar. ondu kei one hand,
 obba maganu one son.

p. 264 Mal onn"
 p. 265 Mal minn"

p. 265 I take both *ol* & *on* to be Verbal Nouns of the root "o" to be one (as *ular* = *ulan* or *ulavu*)

olRei I derive from *300y* as *ättei* from *ändu* (fi. in *ättakanni* a cow which has every year a calf)

p. 267 Tel. *oka* is no doubt = Mal *300* to be one, which means "all" when 2 or 3 are joined to it - we use *3 m 2*, *3 3 d 2*, *3 3 3 m 3* interchangeably with *3 0 5* after the social case

p. 268 Tel. *ceadu* has *re* for *ira* old Mal. has *icandu* (esp. compare as *00 100 12*) - root the same as in *irul*, *irā*, *īra* (to saw)

p. 271 *mū* or *mu* "to be before" might be used to strengthen the dependence of holy numbers (as also *ēdu* 7 signifies eminence, majesty)

Tel. *mūdu* = Tam. *mūn* (as *vāndu* = *avan*)
Tan. *mūru* shortened from *mūnRu* according to constant analogy.
j in Tulu *mūji* is the representative of *2*.

The formative to be discoverable is
onRu, *irandu*, *mūnRu*

p. 274 In Tulu padināl = 14, padināji = 16

p. 275. I consider it not quite proved that
ein-du is Davidian - at least I know
nothing of a radical "ei." Can. kanchu
"to divide" together with the Analogy of
Spancha & amśa looks tempting. A
grammatically correct ~~form~~ eindro
might also have been formed ^{afterwards} as
peim was from paśum. Aiju is also
found in T. poetry & therefore not mere corruption
- at all events I would prefer eim by
far to an original eid. (compare
ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ = ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ) - du would be the
same formative as in the 3 first Num.
rels.

p. 277 I doubt whether the process of softening
away the initial consonant is
so very common.

As regards ॐ ॐ ॐ the question is only
whether it be not derived from the
Number, * signifying a five-ness, fist,
handful

p. 278 aru to cut, go in pieces
eśu eminence - The short form origin-
al, the lengthened form constituting
the Noun, as the addition of du
does in other cases

16
p. 279. on "the number" probably in
the same sense, in which ashta at one time
closed the list of Arya Numerals, so that
navam, when added afterwards, could
be called the new number.

p. 285 I take ombada (with the Tulu word)
to be quite distinct from tol, although
the significations of both additions have
similar meaning. ombada one to ten
as padinon is one after ten. tol = before,
the number before ten, whence
toradu g, as it were the number preceding
10, or the foremost, highest number
among the units.

The euphonical change p. 284 is not
proved (nanbu from root nan to love
remember in Mal, to be close in Tam.,
certainly cognate with nal & nadu, but
not ~~deceit~~ so that nbu be a derivation
from nbu)

p. 286 nadu "oldest extant form"? I
doubt it. I am half inclined to derive
it from pancti, tadoh pandi - which
survives fr. in pantirandu. Compare
compounds like pancti syandana
= dasamukha. Both five and

ten might possibly be derived
from the same root panth. N is
naturally thrown out in Canarese on
account of the ^{its} aversion to Nasal
combinations. But in hanneradu C
pannerdu Tulu etc the old Nasal is still
found. ~~But~~ It is however hazardous to
be positive on this queer word.

p. 287. Erratum mudu for Nūki. Take
mudu to mean powder, as signifying
what is innumerable

p. 289. mudal- & mun both V. Nouns
of the root mu to be before (where
also mukham face)

p. 293. I prefer the radical yān, yan
to nā, & would assume that ē-e
are only other forms of yā, ya, as
is the case in the interrogative
Pronoun. If Yama becomes in
Tamil successively ^{Emas} Gayama,
Nama, why should not the
Mal. Gayān be supposed to
be also an intermediate step
between original Yan & subse-
quent Nan. N is a very infirm

Consonant & often replaces y
(as in katina, - nadiya). Any how
I think the statement p 294 that
y evinces no tendency to be changed
into n, to be untenable. (nandu, T.
Guyandu a T. & Mal. from Tel & Can. Tel.
endri, yandri, also edi. Can.) 15810 from
yuga - nindu to swim, Tel. nyanda
Can. iju, ichu)

p. 294. Tulu inflexion yan' short
p. 301 I cannot consider na or yan
to be connected with Indo European
na. Telugu nēnu follows easily
enough out of nēnu. The repeti-
tion of final n in nin and tan
should warn us lest we lay too
much stress on this consonant.

I think in fact that ye, ye is the
only essential part of this pronoun,
as i is of the 2d person, & ta of
the 3d

307. the um of the Imperative plu-
ral I consider to be nothing else
but the common Particle um, (and-

also), to which in Tulu tā corresponds
most regularly. Hence Tulu kortā
is altogether = kodum in Tamil. The
explanation of the pronominal plurals given p. 329 is supported by this fact.
p. 308. Mal. Daḥ. mōm oō, mōm oō

p. 310. Comparing the two first
persons with the demonstrative
radicals a & i, has especially this
objection that in Dravidian usage
i as the nearer is constantly used
for I, a for thou, you (f. i. iddeham
Mal. = I, angu = thou honorific)

(Mal. kēlp-in)
p. 324. min in kēn min, I consider
as euphonic change from vin,
still used in Malayalam. The
same as the plural termina-
tion mān from vān (Tel. vān).
The v of this vin I take to be
long to the 2d future, and
in to be an abbreviation of
im.

p. 326. The long forms of the Plural
Nominatives are still extensively
used in Mal. chiefly with an honorific

objekt.

p. 333. ata - ita Mal ad^u, id^u

p. 334 Tulu and^u used for yo (not aty)

p. 336. Tulu wō ought to be explained

I take it for a euphonic change
of ^{eva} eva fi. vōlu where = e.v.vulu.

Strange that mūlu "here" corre-
sponds with this vōlu. Does it
stand for ivulu (āulu is there)
passing into vyulu, the vy re-
solved into a m?

p. 347. Tulu has the interrogative
ā, which in Mal. & Can. is hardly
known. In fact I have never
found interrogative ā in Mal,
though an interjectional use
of it may be found in ada
(look there! behold). The state-
ment of all Dravid. langua-
ges using the same ā is therefore
too broad.

353. Dravidian Verb ^{early} not compound,
ed with prepositions, but with
Nouns, mēt (miggal) being a Verbal Noun.

359. Double Accusatives not
uncommon in Mal (ninne gyan
iatakuanu ²apa moxattē - mantram ava
nē grahippichohu - avane yama lokam
pūgichohu etc)

p. 368 Mal has formed a whole
Negative verb with 3 tenses f. i.

pōgā-y-innu I go not pōgā gyan
went not pōgāyum will not go.

The past verb. Participle with the
Conditionals is often used (pōgā
gyan he not having gone, pōgā
gyāl if not go ~~et~~ pōgāygilum
tho' he do not go etc)

p. 374. it = ul, al I suppose = ā, āgu.

- akligitir is a compound = arigu-
itir, mā Ralan the enemy (?
& Mal) = mā Rā - alan he who is

not to be changed. So is the whole
Negat. voice of the Tulu but the
produce of ijji being inserted
between stem & personal termina-

tions. But the real Negative form
in its expressive ^{short} ~~is~~ I suppose ~~no~~ corruption of

a compound. Neither does *a* appear to be a negative in itself but only with the addition of the Negative *a* (*ala*, *alla* - even as *illa*, *illei*). I believe the pronoun *a* forms the negative verb, conveying the idea of a remote action - just as this *a* in its interjectional form has the signification of question (& consequently of negation - *adu varumā*, will it come? - it will never happen).

How is the Brahmi Negative *-ṣ-* to be explained? Can it be a *v* euphonicly inserted to keep a former *a* ^{distinct} from neighbouring vowels?

p. 375. In Mal. only *adiyēn*,
thy servant (old Mal. *ellirum*
ye all)

p. 382. *naḍackunn* - *undu* rather affirmative

p. 383. Mal. has two Verbal participles the past & future

p. 388. Is not in the original form added to the future of the verb to signify "today, now"?

p. 389 unnu, in old Mal. continually innu, esp. in the Negative Verb.

(varāyinnu "comes not" etc)

p. 390 mūru can. very doubtful example. On the contrary Mal. unnu seems to me to prove the modern corruption of Tamil iRu for iNru

p. 398. y changed into n - may be as true as the contrary case. Consider ḡḡḡ, ḡḡḡ as older than ḡḡḡḡ, ḡḡḡḡ

p. 400. In fact the present mode of writing m s m s (Verb Part) m s m s as if it were the Relat. Part. is a blemish in Mal. Orthography which ought to be systematically altered (I would propose m s m̄, as is written in No. Malabar)

p. 403. The Zulu part has requires a particular study. 'ayer' = ḡḡḡḡ

but ~~ad~~ = ad^u = ad^u . pöyer^i = $\text{ad}^u \text{pöy}^i$
but pödu = $\text{ad}^u \text{pö}^u$. bududu = $\text{ad}^u \text{bu}^u \text{du}^u$
 batt^i = $\text{ad}^u \text{bat}^i$, but budije = $\text{ad}^u \text{bu}^u \text{di}^e$
 $\text{ad}^u \text{bat}^i$ $\text{ad}^u \text{bat}^i \text{ad}^u \text{bat}^i$. Therefore
 ad^u of great extent in finite verb
(nearly like *celugu*), - ~~the~~ adopted for
the Verb-Participle.

"i of secondary origin?" Tulu at least
is not in favor of this view. stake
i to be nearly as old as d. Ay^i , pöy^i
are even older than Tulu pödu ,
in which I see only a tendency
to ^{have a separate form for} ~~each~~ appropriate ^{each} one form for
~~each~~ ^{each} meaning.

p. 408 irippan in Mal. Verb-Participle,
not infinitive. The infinitive is iri
 cka . In Mal. Syntax the domains
of the Verb-Participle & of the
Infinitive border indeed very close-
ly on each other f.i. you can say
 cheydu todangi , (cheyya tudangi - only in po)
 cheyvān tudangi , with but little
diversity of meaning.
p. 409 the second future not merely

in poetry - āva fi. very common
& used a little differently from
āvam, am - this 2d future is like
wise used as a relative participle
(fi. āvōlam, marippōlam till it be
come - die)

p. 413. like māduva Can. a Malayal
rel. part. fut. vēnduava

p. 415 why not derive a from the
demonstrative root. ^{me as ip} apptol & cheyda
ppol do not seem to be at all
different.

p. 415. Tulu not merely ti (āyi =
root) Tiri = $\begin{matrix} \text{Ṭ} \\ \text{ā} \\ \text{ṣ} \\ \text{ṣ} \end{matrix}$) - The present
rel. Part. pi similar to the Behistun
participle. - But ^{the} Tulu present does
hardly appear ^{in the description of the verb.} It is derived from the
future (malpe I shall do, malpuwe I
do), another reason for accepting
only 2 original tenses in the Dravid.
languages (malpe fut, malte past) & ex-
plaining the present as a secondary
form or modification of the future.
p. 416 - re I suppose shortened from are
Can. bandare = Mal vanna-v. are or
vannaRe

= in the way of having come, = when he has come. Can. loves to shorten long
p. 419. kal I take in the sense of place, spot ^{as is seen in angadi}
as in ou-kal "one spot," & in the ^{(angadi's) message}
Mal. locative kal. All locative Nouns & other adverbs
when generalized may serve for time ^{from āga com-}
porals - as it, idei etc ^{posed with āga,}
āI I have hardly any doubt is = āgal, ^{& corresponding}
which in ^{Can} ~~telugu~~ esp. is used for tempo. in ne (from ane,
ral precedence & condition. ^{ena = āga})

421. I doubt whether the Imperative
can be called a noun - since it is the
most active part of the Verb, whilst
Nouns are more or less the origin
from ⁱⁿ which an action rests, or the
result which it produces. The proof
taken from the 2d plur. kedum
is at least weakened by what I
remarked to p. 307. Why should
not the future ^{termination} (kedum) do also the
work of the Imperative, as in Hebrew etc.

422. There is an Inf. in Mal, the same
as in T. only its use now restricted.
(fi. cheyya vēnam must do)

p. 434. Mal. pugarcha leans rather
to the Can termination te (hogatte)
than to the Tam. ti

p. 434. Can. has also pu. besides vee
(bidupu & viduvu, the first in ewin Dubu)

p. 442 kāv-ēri why not from
kā, kāva-

kācha from S. Kucha (short u) &
chuchuka, hardly Dravid.

p. 443. kulam rather from cool
a coolness, kuli to cool oneself

p. 444 nīr probably Verb. Noun
of niru to be cool

p. 447. add rātri from irā (root
iru, whence iru-! etc)

p. 455. eḷḷā - Is the ^a Euphonic
? Or not rather negative to
signify what is unbounded?
Then the analogies ^{exist} are only
in appearance

p. 456 kan. is found in Sanskrit
- kānak oreed, which is Berg.
becomes kānā blind. Is the
former already a semi-
negative? or does it mean
one who can still see? The
latter must nearly be a
Dravidian Negative

p 457. Kiramei = what is under,
goes down. kirawan one who
sinks. In Mal. ārchā is used
just like kiramei (gnyāyar-
ārchā Sunday) a day of the
week & subsequently a
week. But the original mean-
ing can only be: Sunset.

If kiramei means possession
it means only, what is under you.

p 458. sack. no doubt Phoenician
& therefore an imported mer-
cantile term

p 459. shāttu = chār-tu & there-
fore hardly to be compared
to shut

p 459. tagu = duk? But this is
plainly = Sans. diś (vīrodhik =
upadēśā). Rather compare
German ^{Goth. dugan} taugen, tugend, Engl
doughty (G. tüchtig)

460. Dup etc sufficiently explained
by dvāra Sans. Even another

same derivation, though it
would offend against the
character of the consonants,
is in my opinion preferable
to the Dravidian etymology
(Imian, tiras, tras, durch,
through)

p. 4 b 3 pampu. Telugu Initi-
als are difficult to be trusted.
Anuppu is plainly = Tel. anuchu
Can. enisa, & means make
to say. But if panuchu be
compared, pampu may
like it be the Causal of
pan, which in Tulu means
to say to tell.

pan - plainly only one root
to grow ripe, old.

p. 4 b 6. pēy, Radh. of pīśācha
= pyāy

Engl. fay, fr. fée = Lat. fatum
Ital. fata (personified)

peyan, peidal - the fresh one
from the root pas, pei

puer rather from putra
boy a difficult word, not found
in Anglo-Sax. Goth. or Old German.

Germ. Bube, Bue perhaps from
bû to build, make (whence
boon, bower)

469 mingo seems explained
by S. majj - as frango is by
phanj

mugil I suppose entirely
different from megha, opixim
etc in all which the meaning of
mingo lies at the bottom. Where
as mugil the covering comes
from (an. mug (much) to cover,
shut up

469 metta I fear from medu
radh of medu - therefore

not referable to a Dravid. root -

Arāy = Tam 2100 of row

p. 470. vinda what comes from
the sky or Vishnu
ventus = wāta. Samur. from vā
(Germ. wehen)

bēdu Canarese shortening from
bēndu, as bēku is from old bēku.

But the root may be either
vēn or vēl.

Tel vīāy is = Tam. vareī, Can. bare
to draw lines & has no connection
with erudu

p. 472. te Tel = ida tedu = idadu
p. 476. maku = 772 & 772, 772, 772
p. 478 anya also hungarian mother,
in Lappish edne, @dne

p. 479. 23 & Hung. ala under

p. 480. also Hung. a'm yes, surely

ēju Can. to swim, Hung. usz - ni

ud Hung. ül to sit

20 20 to arrive Hung. jūt
(speak yūt)

844 Hung. keserü

katti Hung kes

p. 481 kal Can & Tel. = kad to bite
Hung. karap (Hung h. corresponding
with Finnish k)

kattu Hung. köt - kötel rope

kannir Hung. könny

p. 482 kal. Hung kö

kal Hung tsal to cheat

käl Hung. gyalog on foot

kira Hung kor age

p. 483. kiru Can = Dog, Hung kis, kits small,
little

kitta near Hung közel

p. 484. kél Hung. kér to ask, kir fame

p. 485. chappu, suck, Hung szop

chäl line, furrow, Hung szäl thread

cher gather. Hung szed & szer to love

cherippu M shoe Hung szipello

chiragu T. M wing Hung szarny

chol T. M speak Hung szol.

chör M. (Can & Tel. söm) to bear Hung
tsorga

Judu T. M. Ceti. Hsül to roast, süt bake

süt T pregnancy szül to bring forth

churuoku to be narrow, chorugu to tuck in

Hung. szoit, szoros, szük

tarei T. M (teru M) to sprout H. terem

p. 486 titei T (tilambu, Tilakka Mal)
to be full Hung. tel, töl full, fill

tonRu Hung tünni

nätige Can tongue, nyelo Hung
nagai Hung neret

p. 487 podi dust Hung. por
por fight Hung per

p. 488 puzei Hung füst
pul grass Hung fü

pēsü speak Hung besze

potta M. fool Hung. buta

betta Can. mountain Hung. bertz

magu T. child, magzat H.

mārga - Hung mil to perish

Maldives are in Malabar called

മലോദ്വീപ്, മലോദ്വീപ്

p. 489. murugu - Hung. mēly Deep

muru to (Mal mura hard, excessive)

be come thick & vertice, compare Hung

merö quite, firm

Muyal T. M (nosalu tubu) hare = nyül Hung

p. 489 mulei breast Hung. melj
vadi M. stick (also Cal Can. Tul) bot Hung
valla Mal any Hung. vala any
vāy mouth Hung ajak lip
vār to flourish Hung ^{zāj} mouth boldog happy
ve boil, buz in Hung
vinei T. vina M. action, sin - Hung.
viri to unfold. Hung. virr to dawn
viru to fall, bukni Hung ^{virag} to blossom
vit to sow Hung. vet
vilacku a light vilag

p. 498. Are not Nālar to be derived
from māl "black"

Thomas (April 9¹⁹⁶⁶ Asiatic Society) says: The Aryans in-
vented no alphabet of their own

1. Persian cuneiform from Assyria, & Assyria from
an antecedent Turanian symbolic character
2. Greek & Latin from Phoenician
3. Bactrian amplification of Phoenic.
4. Lat or Pali alphabet originated to meet the requirements
of Turanian. David. Dialoq. Asoka's monoliths
(Lat) prove it to be the current writing of Indian
continent B.C. 250. (Norris, Caldwell). Hence Devanagari. —
A similar if not identical character furnished the proto-
type of all Ind. alphs. found to S. Ind. & Burma, till
Pali meets Chinese Alphabet in Assam
5. Pehlvi from Phoenician, & thence Zand
6. The Aryan immigrants in Panjab (Vedic hymns) con-
structed an alphabet out of a very archaic type of
Phoenician, whose graphic efficiency was singularly
aided by the use of burnt bark. This continued
as the official writing under Greek & Indo Scyth
rulers of Northern India till superseded by the
superior fitness of the local Pali

Ärztzüge von Caldwell's
Grammatik der Indischpfeiler, d. f.
Indischpfeiler Gewässer

Adams: Comparative

near of the Dravidian
languages

the representative lan-
the family" in proof
the name of D^{D} might
to be identical with

The Malayal. versions of
as mention repeatedly
ilas (= Dravidas).
chargeable as in Petic
w. And D^{D} = D^{D} as
from D^{D} . Darnilo
form of Dravidila

called Malabar by the
because coming from
coast they found the
of the Paravas etc nearly
with that spoken in Ma
always distinguish from
gas^{or Delughs} as the ruling class
by the Nayers (K. max.
ptions in South Travancor



Ma I 864-8.

Nr 8

VierFarbSelector Standard - Euroskala Offset

Copyright 4/1999 XxyMaster GmbH www.xyymaster.com

