

Adwell's Comparative
Grammar of the Dravidian
Languages

p. 1. "Tamil the representative language of the family" in proof of which the name Ṭṛi might be shown to be identical with Dravida. The Malayal. versions of the Purāṇas mention repeatedly the Dravilas (= Dravidas). Ṭ & ṛ interchangeable as in Vedic $\text{ṛṛṛṛ} = \text{ṛṛṛṛ}$ w. And $\text{ṛṛ} = \text{ṛ}$ as in ṛṛṛṛṛṛ from ṛṛṛṛṛṛṛṛṛṛ . Damilo the Pali form of Dravila

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 Malabar. They always distinguish from it the Badagas^{or Telugus} as the ruling class, introduced by the Rajas (the max. interruption in South Indian core.)



Ma I 864-8.

Nr 8

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

It is the language of the Beiga country
from Barcoor 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
midway between Old Can. & Tulu
on the one hand, Mal on the other.
The land appears once to have belonged
to the Mal. Commonwealth, & the old
Gods in it are still Malayalis. (The old
demons speak Malayalam all over ^{the} ^{country}.)
"Karnāṭaka" is a Sarsar word. I doubt
it. The name kār - nāṭu would
appropriately designate the black
cotton soil of the tableland. The
derivation from nāṭaka seems

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

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

" $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions" - fully 3 millions,
"all along the Mal. coast" too strong
an expression. I don't know exactly
how the case stands near the Neryyāru
in the So. But it is only in the gap
that Tamil colonization makes it-
self felt - on the 2 roads towards
Trichoor (Trissur perūr) & Ponnāni

"Tamil bid fair to supersede the Mala-
yālam," 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 (அ, இ, உ, எ, ஓ, ஶ, ஷ, ஸ, ஹ, ல, ள, ழ, ஶ, ஷ, ஸ, ஹ, ல, ள, ழ) 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 *keḷakku* & *mērku* have no doubt been invented in the Tamil country, & the western settlers accepted it a *parti fortiori*. *mēḷk* however is rare in Mal. They use instead *ḡḡḡ* (old *ḡḡḡ*, *ḡḡ* = sunset)

"Peculiar Mal forms" are only 1 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 *koduccā-y-innu*) & a whole verb with all modes & tenses is constructed

upon this foundation (fi. maragya
came not, kūdayum 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 Gōnd interrogative pronoun
bo may be like the Tulu vō.

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

p. 44. 4) nanikka - a sad mistake, arising probably from the fault of a Copyist, but repeated several times in the book.

It is minakk^u or minakk^u

- 6) 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." Scyth. kir I take to be unconnected with this radical

p. 50. māRu from maRu, but this certainly connected with 772, 777, 772

- Could be different from Tel. lēdu, this = ila_{du} (i + a = ē), the other composed with "it" is.

p. 56. The alteration of "rarer derivatives" hardly to be ascribed to intense rationalism or jealousy of Brahminical influence. The 2 instances adduced resolve themselves into cases with initial liquid, 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. lēdu: & u + a into ō f.i. lō = ula). "Icavū" might I take to be original Tamil, the root ir, iru as in irul (darkness) - the formative avu, or ā, as in vinā & other nouns;

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

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

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

p. 59^{line 4} The old Mal character is still
used with slight variations by the
Musliman colonists

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

An old Mal word in Herodotus^{3, III} is
kappē for cinnamon <sup>Mal & 22) &
222, whence carphura
camphor</sup>

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

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

*) ūral in M. sediment, hence camphor = sediment of Cin-
namon

- ~~Korru~~ rather from kōttei fort
which compounded with āṛu would
in Mal. sound like kōttyāṛu

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

⁶³ Kōvov probably heard by foreigners
in the oblique case "kāṭṭu". I believe
simple? they would have read
by 2, as p. 65. kōv is probably
kōdu or cōdi "corner"

"Coromandel" I take 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 Coulat (Quilon) to the
Udiginmale in the kingdom of Uria.
C instead of Ch is a later corruption

p. 63. "Cerobothras" compare note 62.
 Latin C certainly = Indian K

p. 71, 1. with Dandak - Aranya as also p. 81.

p. 72. Is "ten" sweet? I take ten honey
 to be = ti-y-an "sweetness." But the
 Cororant 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 (Cranganore) & Cochi

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

p. 80. Ramēswaram, S. Ramēswaram

p. 84. If Tamil literature avowedly excels in ethics, may not the common name by which Northern neighbours designated the Tamils be derived from this peculiarity. The Arawas as Tel. & Can. call them, must signify "Moralists" (a Ram = Karma, 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. ūr appears to me older than ūru. The Greek Urmination in & carries little weight, see to p. 62. ūra 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 there-
fore identified this short " 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 Brah-
mins & Nayers they differ, & in
Poitry 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 diffi-
culty, almost insuperable, of imita-

ting European meters in Tulu
(Canarian 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" (= 6 or om 6) ūru
Down: all other vowels are followed
by this very short & peculiar Shva.
Cuttered somewhat like a very
short German ü, or French u, Guax 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"
or kiraxk? 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 6 6 6 6 6 or 6 6 6 6 6 in the
Dative, 6 6 6 6 6 near the mountain;
the neuter verb adayu forms the
active verb adeeku. The verb ura
has the past uranu, urei - urenjyucte

p. 101. The modification 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 ^{perwards} especially the Tulu - bolli ^{sihore} light-
velli, etc

p. 102. the law of surs & sonants as stringent in Mal as in Tamil.

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

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

"Tamil 3" should be written ch, on the same principle that uses ch to represent the Telugu to. The ancient pronunciation is probably retained by the lower classes: the very soft sound, when ~~z~~ is used as initial, appears to be an affectation of the higher castes.

p. 106. Initial ñj in Mal represents an ancient y f.i. ñjān = yān njāndu, 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, Pradaga & old Canarese likewise

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

p. 109. The hard R becomes often
j in Tulu & Tamil ka n̄Ru
calf, canji 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

η = C ηη = TT οοη = 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

○○○○

I wonder if you can

Decipher this hieroglyph

110. Is mūru more ancient than mūrdu?

Canarus distinguishes the Nasals throughout (except the halfanuswara, which it likes to introduce as *fi*: in *sainkya* = *sakya*).

kardu in Car. *karu*, which is the older?

I suppose *Ru* in *mūrdu* & *ordu* to be the formative *Du*, *Fu*, changed by its contact with final *oot* (*v*). *mun*, on appear to me the original forms, the one from the radical *mu* = to be before, excel (where *mun* & probably *T. mukha*, also *mūkk* = nose, & the verb *mūkka*) the other from radical *o* = to be one. Many old nouns are formed with *oot* (as *ēn* what? etc)

This *v* changes with *R*, as in *pin*, *pila* but also with *r*. (*fi*: *ulan* birth, also *ular*, *ulavu* etc). One therefore appears to me only the more liquid equivalent of the Noun *ov*.

sendu or *chedu* I would rather derive from *chel-ndu*, than *sel'du*, as the latter would have to become *se'Rdu*.

Is *nd* "always found in Celugu" 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 the² 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 ʔ
(aushadham in old Mal. aviṛḍam)
mostly by t, ʔ 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 Mahratta Concani & other neigh-
bouring Aryalanguages use it very
freely, & Sanscrit words both in Can.
& Mal. have retained it unvaryingly.

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

p. 115. IV) vātil^{or vādū} in Mal. is but a corruption
of vāgil (similar to Tulu pudar = pagar)

2. The softening of 3 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. ^{Tam.} pasi becomes ^{high} in Mal. regularly
pei (in the form peidāka hunger &
thirst), & peim is considered better
than pasum "green"

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

n to n. Thus indeed minakku to the
brides minakku. On the other hand tu-
niyu, "venture", becomes turniyu,
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 pen^{di}, 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 pika^{ka}
to be born) is another form of the
root pin, or piku of nil.

117. The euphonic change of ad into Can.
ar is not to my taste. I believe
this belongs altogether to the chapter
of the inflexions, & hope there to
indicate why I compare Can to

Tam. an (as fr. in 2800, 2801 & 2802)
ii) vayadu is the correct, vayas^u the vulgar
Tadm. of S. vayas(u). But I believe

that peyar became first pesar, & then
judar, even as vāyil became in Mal
vādil, by passing through Tam. vāṣil.
Similarly kirecka to past, pronounced
kiyecka, becomes in modern Mal
kidecka. - On the other hand t pas-
ses even into s f.i. mūtta old, often
mūssa; & low castes interchange them both
ludicrously, (saying f.i. seivatte
tēvicka "to serve God" instead
of Seivatte' sēv'icka)

iii.) the change of nd into nj after
palatal vowels prominent in Mal.
past tenses (akindu - a Riññu,
ārāyndu - āraññu, paReindu - paReññu)
p. 118 anju may still be older than
the apparently more regular cindu.

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

- Add to unarchi also kātchi,
Mal. kārcha, irulcha, aralcha, pu-
garcha

write Mal chiricha instead of siricha

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

For Sanscr. yuga, Yama become
in T. nugam, Naman - And a Can.
Indu corresponds with Tam & Mal
hinda to swim. Might we not rather
say, y passes into η & n?

5. i.) Not merely initial p becomes in
Can. h/ haudu "yes" from a hudu,
an old form = apu, agu "to be such".
Similar bahudu = baruvadu)

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

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

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

III) Tam & Cul iraṇji Mal ilaṇji, Tam
pariṣei M palisa

Pl. teligu perhaps rather from teli
than Teri (Can teli)

p. 121. chikū = 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

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

ζ in Tulu words generally ζ , f.i.
pōdu Time. Canarese does not
use the same word as kottu. Mala-
yālam writes pōl, but merely be-
cause the sign ζ serves as final
 ζ & ζ , the Sative is pōrecku: now
& then are written & spoken ippōrum
appōrum

Can. karmāran is from the Sanskr.
karmakāra (no charge from āla)
123. anusham in Mal anizam. Ushyam
is in old medical works written kira-
yam, Lāshmana in an old Ramay-
ana Maṣṣkanan

sha discarded in Viṣṇu, Vinṇu, Vin (T. & Mal)
- Jushkam, chukku

sa = ta, f.i. in tei a plant from sasya
Can. sasi. Discarded in sandhya, andi
(evening) etc

Ja & Ira discarded in Irēni, ēni, Iravanam
Onam, Jyeshtha Ētha, Iravishtham Avittam

p. 124.1. Iwanda - rather Iwandwa
as also p. 103. 125

p. 128 vāḍlu is probably older than
vāḍlu. The masculine termination
of av-an, mag-an is in Telugu cere-
bralized ("nd"), even as the R.R. of
the same class becomes in Tel. tt.

IV) anda inda I would not derive
from adu 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.

Is maru fragrant?

131. "Originally we may be sure that
one consonant alone was used for
this purpose" Why should this be?
Labial ^{vowels} consonant affect as surely
the semi-vowel v, as palatals do
y. The question can only be how far
the use of each extends. Is 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 kaḍei & 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 T. "in" served
for the oblique (or locative) case.
padin mūndu is decisive to that
effect (old Mal. padimūnnu). Si-
milar ombadin-āyiram, and
enbadin kōḍi (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 vāṇdu, vēṇdu, 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. būrudu, 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

patnōd. du from the town (u on
account of ō) but marād.-d' from
the tree (Shra 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 Rad. 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 (Ra-
mayanam) - Can. kudure but kudre agree
fully (kudi in Can. to rise up).

In Common Mal displacement of vowels
seems very frequent. *fi*: *Kina* & *il*
in the well vulgo *ki* & *andil*.

p. 141. navel Mal *poikul* & *poekil*.

2) To Euphonic displacement I would
add "and amalgamation" of vowels. In
zōlu. *fi*: I take *ō* to be the result of
a + u (= Can. *oratu* & *orlu*). Tel to prob.
= *ula*; *ledu* = *illadu*. *Sina* *ē* night
= *irā*; *tē* = *ila*; *vray* = *varei*. *Tulu* ana
loggy (as in *lanku* rise, *leppu* = Hoarse
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*
= *yo*. *ebbisu* to raise, Caus. of *ēlu* -
emme (Tel. *erme*) = *erumei*; *kobbu*
Can. *komme* *Tu* both fat & pride
= *T. koruppu* & Tel *krovver* or
kovvu. 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* & *Cl*
p. 142. *odu* is the lengthening (= Verbal
Noun) of *oda* which is still as even
in Mal. poetry. Old Can. has *oda*, *odam*,
Aul. *odugu*, new Can. *odane* (= *Cam. udan*)
Surely this root is sufficiently estab-
lished to need no explanation from
Tora whose radical is *toru* (as
in *toril*). — *tudar* is better *toḍar*
& explains itself as *toḍu* (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
kāl, 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. *kareḥi*, *aleḥi* appear
to me Verbal nouns, but rather

secondary verbal themes, their roots.

p. 147. vical & viri both from a root

vir. - kadai perhaps as well as kadan,
kadei etc from kadu. - kudai from kudu,
whence also kudi, kudu. - kuzai per-
fectly distinct (Can. & Zul kotal) = ^{from kur} kurai
what is hollow, whence kuri etc. - Niral

I would just call a Verb. N. of the lost root
vir. - Chēgal in Mal. the breeding of poultry
chēku the place of roosting & breeding
(Tam. cheera strawed) I would derive
from an old root chē, (a. C. ~~go~~ kē, lie down,
to embrace sexually)

mādu perhaps from mā the strong
(beast) with formative du. mādu at
all events secondary Verb from mādu (Zulu mal.)

- ādu I call a Verb-Noun from ādu, to
fight, kill & cook, whether it signify
that mutton was the old food of the
Dravidas (as prob. of the Brahmis), or
what I prefer, that the goats are
considered as fighting together (ādu
to approach in combat, hence ādal).

The ^(secondary) Verb ādu I would then derive from
the Noun. frisking like a goat etc

"mūga" in Can nose. There is no Verb mūga

to melli, but muggu tal, muckcha tal
muggu Can. (T. & mal. mugar) these are
certainly related. I would rather derive
it (together with muckham) from
mu "prominence", whence mugar &
mugal = muckham.

Strange that kir is called undervivd,
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", whence mīdu,
Tal midda etc. In Can. myētē is still
written

Vin = Vichau

"Nouns of quality" rather Verbs of quality.
"mun" undoubtedly Verb. Noun of mu-
with the formative N.

p. 148. al = āgal Inf of āgu. The meaning
would be "being for it" or "being along
with it". I prefer the latter on account
of the Turku tā which no doubt is =
Tam & Mal. al, & 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 *cāyātā trānātā mahi-
mētā yēnēnigātā nīnāu ādūndu* - in
Imper. *bal-tā* = 21 11 13 10)

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

"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* - *radacku*, *mīdku* etc)

p. 149. Davidian 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'* - *ku'* - several consonants are
regularly interchanged as *g* = *h* *du* = *l*

(*nīdu* = *nīl*) *du* = *n* (*nadu*, *nan*) *l* = *Ru*
(*nīl*, *nīRu* - *nal*, *naRu*) *n* = *du* (*nīdu*
pun - perhaps *mīdu*, *mīn*: 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 *tir*
answers all purposes (*tirei*, *tiral*, *tiri*,
tirugu, *tirumb* etc are easily derived
from it, & the different dialects even *telu*
quite itself agree - compare *telu tirugu*, *tirigali*,
tiripe, *tirlika* 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 formative,
still discoverable in Verbal Nouns
(*padu*, *padai*, *padu* V. N. or derivating
from *padu*). It alone I take 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. To 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 protrusion, 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. minunga & distinguished from minna appears to be a frequentative (as the verbal adverbs valingana, cherangana, at a great rate, small rate) - Iteratives or descriptive, like velu velucka - kiku xi kuona - nukunukungu etc. might also be mentioned here.

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

p. 155. *tungu* from old *tu* (where *tugil*)

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

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

"*vambu*" from *rei*? 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} ~~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 &

purpos, & becomes again a verbal
theme - "mugaku" in Mal = mugam
pace. - "il" a real compound verb, that
wherein heat lodges, kudil that wherein
one lives together. - "ul" the same, arul fi:
the Verb Noun of "aru" previous, point
of pour

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. edru 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, ā chiefly
in combinations before Vowels: but
originally a Verbal Noun. kār in Mal
cloud. - pār from par (where Mal
patude "in vain", patudu "void, intestine")

- 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 (fs: 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,
kada be rough - kādu etc)

p. 167. 15 Doubt the length of the "rootvowel"
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
shortvowelld preterite is chattu

p. 173. write "peidal" rather than peital

p. 177. ān 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? *n̄du* is then like Canarese *nu*, Tam. *n*: and the expression of this Tamil *n* (nasal) 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~~ not identify *an* with *an̄*: for the *an* in *payan*, *balan* (Tam) *mānu* (Tel.) is hardly different from the Masculine formative, though freely used in Neutres (as observed p. 207)

p. 179. illat "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. broth-
ern, anglosaxon merely brōðra. Dutch
uses now both broeders & broederen,
middle Dutch preferred the first form.

p. 189 Is not makka! properly speak-
ing the plural of maga, a neuter?

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

p. 190. "the same practice adopted in Can-
nese." ? Hardy. Even in Mal. avar is
constantly used for the real plural,
avargal is rather a honorific singu-
lar (cf. Sahibavargal). Can. avaru
is real plural; atanu is looked upon
as the honorific singular, though ava-
ru 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
ār & ōr not merely euphonic mu-
tations from ar, but contracted
plurals of 3d pers. pronoun.

The same is the origin of mār.

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

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

In Mal. & vāzvavan, vāzvon of
the futur. relat. participle becomes
often vāzuvan. 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 vinnor, old vinnar)
for "those in heaven, celestials",
but also Izavar = Ceylonese from Izam,
& with Sanskrit words mūrkhā
var, uragavar, kumbhīmukha
van etc, in common life kāranavar

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

p. 193. "na becomes ū? I doubt it strongly

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

p. 194. "In Mal" gal or kal

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

p. 196. T 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, chila are
neuter plurals, used in poetry - now
commonly palava, chilava

p. 199. why is not Tam. ivei, avei
mentioned, as the transition from
Mal. iva, ava to Telugu iri
avi. As in illei, Mal. ^{u. 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 "peyrê" - rather peyarê

*) and' has quite the meaning of Mal
adé lit. that very thing = yes. Its form
is the same as of ind', which is = Tam. idu, & of undu =
Tulu

p. 204 The neuter termination *am* signifies probably "it."

Modern Canarese has the termination *am* in the form *aru*. Occasionally *am* occurs in compositions of nouns with verbs, as *kāda kollu* to borrow, also *kādam gollu*. Also compounds like *angei* (Can. & Tulu) = ^{& Mal} *Zam*, *agangei*, from *agam* inside, may here be taken into consideration.

207 "in" appears to me identical with it, ^(compare the Conditional *ayin - āgil*) house, place, the oblique cases would all seem to be modifications of the Locative, as expressing something happening in or about the noun, whilst the Nominative pronounces its totality. In Mal. the postposition *il* is rarely found following in: forms like *guruvinil*, *mātāvinil* occur only in pedantic poetry (whilst *guruvinat*, *guruvinikal* etc are quite common).

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
neuter demonstrative adu.

"Tulu ad" not quite exactly "used where
Canarese uses ar" - p. i. Bhūmida
mitt' upon the earth. padike - 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
dialectal 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 dislike of Nasal combinations

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

p. 212. ellāw-um occurs in old Mal
& the neutr. plur. ellāvu corresponds
evidently with the 2 others pala-vu
chila-vu
arkhu stake to arise from the
combination an-thu, & to favor
my derivation of Can-ar. Peh-
ti agrees with it, as organically re-
presenting Rk

p. 216. Mal enikk" & inikk", also
(poët) en-akk" - to thee ~~in~~ ninakk"
or ninakk" - umark namukk"
(rarety^{ed} namakk"), with which
a rarely used tamukk" corre-
sponds.

nāleikk" in Mal. nālekk"
chiefly temporal affix, f.i.
āndeccu to the year, enneccum forever

p. 218. old Mal. accusative often
merely a palatala (thus
vāna ekumanta mala in Ram-
Charit). ē is another form of
this Mal. & expression of the eikaran

p. 219. vinu from Vishnu shortened
to vin, as ka^{kamm}mam to kam.

p. 219 Tulu Acc. n^o - observe the pre-
ceding e, which is certainly = Can. a
(fi. und-en' = idei Tam. idannu Can.)
in plur. kāryōthlen' = 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. Accusative
like pātera occurs 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 ^{ninan' 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 Kara
Use 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 Social, than that the latter
is unknown to Sanscrit? Jam. Mal
at - *condū* - *odu* are the different
~~trans~~ renderings or equivalents
of the 3d Sanscrit case. But I
quite agree that the Mal. Dravi-

dian 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
Can. thither, *uril-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* pronounced 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. &c. The postposi-
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. *kk* " *Tul k'g'*

227. again Mal. *nanikka*, instead
of *nanikka* " *Tul. nikk'*. In old

Mal. you meet with *ulagukku*
& *mū-v. ulagickum*: in modern

Mal with *onnu* " besides *onni-*
na. *Innu* cannot be derived
from *inku*, which in Mal would
become *ilku* & finally *icku*
(as *kōyilku*, *kōyilka* - *kōyickal*,
vādilka at the door & *vādiccal*
& now *vāduccal*). I would deri-
ve it from the Genitive. *enke*
my is evidently to be resolved
into *en-ada-e. marattinRe =*

marattin-ad.^u The Dative marattianu
I consider as softened from marattinRu
even as ninnu, innu from T. ninnu,
inRu. The Sanscrit Dative is in
Mal versions rendered by aykondy
& other strengthenings of the Dravi-
dian Dative, whilst the Sanscr.
Genitive is continually rendered
by ku (f.i. tesham asti = averkk'
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 nn^u -
f.i. nagarkkum nāttin^u in
Rāma Charitam - nāyinu coduttu
(Panchatantra = nāy^{kk}^u) - magan^u = ma-
garu - jāṭāyū-nu mōxam nalg; etc.
In the Dativ of the mascul. termina-
tion it is still most common (avan^u
to him etc). Here it might be most
probable that ku has been simply

Dropped. Muselmans who in various points, as 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 agentive suffix, but agree to its being locative

atti-illi stand probably for *a-il*, *i-il*, as *kaudu* does for *ahudu*, *hāge* & *hige* for *ā bage*, *i bage* (= *vagei Tam.*)

p. 231. *en, nin* I consider as a Composition case, rather than as Adjective.

The 5th form of the Genitive (p. 240) should I conceive monopolize whatever 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 ivid. attu vānu* came here

avidatt-an he who is in that place)

p. 233 maraimadu 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
tanadu & perhaps enadu (whence
tanke-e, enke)

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

p. 245. ute, bitter ude Mal - mine
enke-du - 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
exists in (ill-a) the doing a, however

much ~~this~~ usage may have dis-
appeared with it (in in Ri? iji' Cul.
etc). Even as in French pas personnel
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 Cul 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: 00 2 00. 00 0 2 00
00. 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 - in
the mouths of Rama & of Krishna -). In
modern poetry Sanskrit analogy has
conquered, as foreign influence has done
in prose (ivanRegum avanRegum
kūdikārchā - their interview). Still
there is no real case which has to
struggle with this difficulty.

p. 249.
The Tulu locative is not mentioned, but would
require elucida-
tion.

It is possible that in toḥodu, āxā
ḥodu - o is the result of a + u (assuming
uḥ to be like ul. T. ūḥu Mal.) -
or of a + i (re) with a v to serve
against hiatus (when idei, ede
would suggest a suitable noun of
place). But oḥu, as treated in
my remarks on the Taim & Mal
Social or conjunctive case, might also
well be supposed to survive here,
however ~~lost~~ ^{much} after other termina-
tions (~~ādi~~ ^{ādi}?, kattale?, āya? in him plur. Keiled'ett
in the hand)
the initial vowel may be obliterated.
Forms like ^{dinōtu} keit' in the hand, suggest rather Telugu
analogies.

The local Dative ~~radiku~~ ^{adiku} - ~~radil~~
ēcku in Mal - ittinādeg'ulu (= 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.  locative - direction
or  into the land
 does hardly belong to this
chapter,  signifying in this case
rather "to be within" (where )

The old form is , , ,
Al. The Ablative is often found con-
tracted fi.  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

Tim. 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 ~~is~~ ^{has} been allowed of compounds like
 gold-fat (arghosaxon). The fact is only that we have two forms, where
 the Dravidian 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 to an & ar terminations (māra-
 chalam, kāttā-lapati, māramāl).

3. Instead of calling $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$ adjectival, I would
 rather give it a locative meaning. $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$
 on the grain in the Ardaman $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$
 the side which is on the right $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$
 an elephant in the jungle $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$
 the Island Ceylon

p. 254 $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$, $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$, $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$, $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$, $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$
 $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$ are some of the few Mal instances
 that survive. $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$, "monkey army"
 is an instance of the change of ngu
 into kku.

$\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$ fr. $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$ often pronounced
 & written - $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$

$\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$ - $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$ - $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$ - $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$
 (Glemre - $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$ (a name of Malabar)
 - $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$ - $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$ - $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$
 - $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$ - $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$ - $\text{m} \text{ } \frac{1}{2}$

An adverbial aff very common
 എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു - ഇരിക്കുന്നു -
 adjective റിയിരിക്കുന്നു (break
 fast) - കൊല്ലം കൊല്ലം കൊല്ലം a few
 backbone - without Locative
 എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു

Nouns എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു & എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു
 എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു - എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു -
 എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു - എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു, എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു
 എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു

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

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

p. 260. Comparison common in Mal. po.
 etry എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു. എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു - എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു,
 എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു - also എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു - എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു
 എന്നിരിക്കുന്നു etc

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

p. 264 Mal onn"
 p. 265 Mal munn"

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

olRei I derive from *Booy* as
attei from *āndu* (fi in *āttakanni*
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 1 2, *3 3 3 3* interchangeably
with *3 3* after the Social case

p. 268 *Tel. ceadu* has *ce* for *ira*
ol. Mal. has ičandu (esp. compare
as *1000 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 defence of holy
numbers (as also *ēdu* 7 signifies
eminence, majesty)

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

The formative to be discoverable in
onRu, *irādu*, *mūnRu*

p. 274 In Tulu padināl = 14, padināji = 16
p. 275. I consider it not quite proved that
cin-du is Davidian - at least I know
nothing of a Radical "ei." Can. kanchu
"to divide" together with the Analogies of
Spancha & amśa looks tempting. A
grammatically correct ~~form~~ ^{afterwards} cindu
might also have been formed, as
peim was from paśum. Aija is also
found in T. poetry & therefore not mere corruption
- At all events I would prefer cim by
far to an original eid. (compare
o o o o o = o o o o o) - du would be the
same formative as in the 3 first Num.
p. 277 I doubt whether the process of softening
ing away the initial consonant is
so very common.

As regards ~~one~~ ^{the} the question is only
whether it be not derived from the
Number, ~~signifying~~ ^{signifying} a five new, fist,
handful

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

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 Zulu 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 torḍa 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 Malay to be close in Tam., certainly cognate with naḥ & nadu, but not deriv 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 panḁti, Taḁḁh pandi - which survives fr. in pantirandu. Compare compounds like panḁtiṣyandana = 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. ~~Still~~ It is however hazardous to be positive on this queer word.

p. 287. Erratum mudu for Nuku. I 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 ^{Emp} Yama, Nama, why should not the Mal. Gayān be supposed to be also an intermediate step between original Yan & subsequent Nan. N is a very infirm

Consonant & often replaces y
(as in katina, = kadiya). Any how
I think the statement p 294 that
y evinces no tendency to be changed
into n, to be untenable. (nandu, T.
gayandu a T. & Mal. from Tul & Can. Tul.
endri, yandri, also edi. Can.) 5810 from
yuga - nindu to swim, Tul. nyanda
(Can. iju, ichu)

p. 294. Tulu inflexion yan' short
p. 301 I cannot consider na or yan
to be connected with Indo European
ma. Telugu mēnu 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 yē, 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.
p. 308. Mal Dat. mōm 683, mōm 683

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 (fi: iddeham
Mal = I, angu = thou honorifi)
(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 mār from vār (Tel vāru).
The v of this vin I take to be
long to the 2d future, and
in to be an abbreviation of
im.

p. 324. The long forms of the Plural
Nominatives are still extensively
used in Mal. chiefly with an honorifi.

objekt.

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

p. 334 Tulu and^a used for yes (not atu)

p. 336. Tulu wō ought to be explained

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

Strange that mūlu "here" corre-
sponds with this vōlu. Does it
stand for ivulu (ālu 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 ^{only} not compound,
with prepositions, but with
Nouns, mēt (miggāl) being a Verbal Noun.

359. Double Accusatives not
uncommon in Mal (ninne gyan
irakkuannu ²āpa 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 gayu
went not pōgāyum will not go.

The past Verb. Participle with the
Conditional is often used (pōgā
gayu he not having gone, pōgā
gayāl if not go ~~et~~ pōgāygilum
tho' he do not go etc)

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

- aḷigilēr is a compound = aḷigā-
ilēr, mā R Ralan the enemy (7.

& Mal) = mā R Ra - 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 ^{shortening} can hardly be the
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 Orahui Negative
-*f*- to be explained? Can it be
a *v* euphonicall^y 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. *naaackunn* - *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 Tan. very doubtful example. On the contrary Mal. unnu seems to me to prove the modern corruption of Tamil iRu for iVRu

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

p. 400. In fact the present mode of writing m s m s (Verb Part) m s m - 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. āyer' = ḡḡḡḡ it

but $\bar{a}d^u = \text{Zhu. } p\ddot{o}yer' = \text{Owpi}$
but $p\ddot{o}du = \text{Owpi}$. $bududu = \text{Owpi}$
 $batt'd' = \text{Owpi}$, but $budiye = \text{Owpi}$
 $or \text{Owpi}$, $batte \text{Owpi}$. Therefore
 i of great extent in finite verb
(nearly like Telugu), - the adopted for
the Verb-Participle.

" i of secondary origin? Tulu at least
is not in favor of this view. Take
 i to be nearly as old as d . $Ayi, p\ddot{o}yi$
are even older than Tulu $p\ddot{o}du$,
in which I see only a tendency
to ^{have a separate fine} ~~equ~~ 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
 $cheydu \text{ to } dangi$, ($cheyya \text{ tu } dangi$, - only in po)
 $cheyv\ddot{a}n \text{ tu } dangi$, with but little
diversity of meaning.
p 409 the second future not merely

in poetry - āva ^{fi.} very common
& used a little differently from
āgum, ām - 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. vēnduwa

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

p. 415. Tulu not merely ti (āyi =
root) Tiri = ^{ti} & &) - The present
cul. Part. ^{pi} similar to the Behistun
partule. - But ^{the} Tulu present does
hardly ^{in the description of the verb} appear. 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 āre
Can. bandare = Mal vanna-v-āre or
vannāre

= in the way of coming, = when he has come, = Can. loves to shorten long
p. 419. *kāl*. I take in the sense of place, spot, ~~travels~~
as in *oru-kāl* "one spot," & in the ^{as is seen in angādi}
Mal locative *kāl*. All locative Nouns & other adverbs
when generalized may serve for time ~~from āga com~~
periods - as it, *idei* etc. (*ā-al* ^{period with āga;}
āl I have hardly any doubt is = *āgal*) & corresponding
which in ^{Can} *teḷuḡ* esp. is used for tempo in *ne* (from *ane*,
raḷ *preḍḍanu* & 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
ⁱⁿ from which an action rests, or the
result which it produces. The proof
taken from the 2d plur. *keḍum*
is at best weakened by what I
remarked to p. 307. Why should
not the future (^{termination} *keḍum*) 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 more restricted.
(*ḥi. cheyya vēṇam* must do)

p. 434. *Mal. pūgarācha* leans rather
to the *Can* termination *te* (*hogalte*)
than to the *Tam. ti*

p. 434. *Can* has also *pu* besides *vu*
(*bidupu* & *biduvu*, the first *ḥi* *vin* *ḥi* *ḥi*)

p. 442 kāv-eri why not from
kā, kāva-

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

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

p. 444 nūr probably Verb. Noun
of niru to be level

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

p. 455. ellā - Is the ^{an} 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 Beng.
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 57. 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 58. sack. no doubt Phoenician
& therefore an imported mer-
cantile term

p 59. shāttu = chār-tu & there-
fore hardly to be compared
to shut

p 59. tagu = Drk? But this is
plainly = Sans. dis (vīrodhik =
upādēśā). Rather compare
German ^{Goth. Dugan} taugen, tugend, Engl
doughty (G. tüchtig)

& co. 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
(Imean, tiras, trans, durch,
through)

p. 463 pampu. Telugu Initials
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.

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

p. 466. pēy, Cadoh. of pīśācha
= pyāy

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

peyan, peidal - the fresh one -
from the root pa's, pei

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

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

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

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

469 metta I fear from medu
Latth of medu - therefore

not referable to a Dravid. root -

Adray = Tam 2100 of 2000

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

bēdu Canareu shortening from
bēndu, as bēku is from old bēlku.
But the root may be either
vēn or vēl.

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

p. 472. tē Tel = ida tēdu = iladu
p. 476. maRu = מָרָה & מָרָה מָרָה, מָרָה
p. 478 anya also hungarian mother,
in Lappish edne, @dne

p. 479. 36 Hung. ala under

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

ēju Can. to swim, Hung. usz- ni

ul Hung. ül to sit

to arrive Hung. jūt
(speak yut)

8444 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

kannin Hung. können

p. 482 kal. Hung kö

kal Hung tsal to heat

käl Hung. gyalog on foot

kira Hung kor age

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

kittä near Hung közel

p. 484. kél Hung. kër to ask, kër fame

p. 485. chappu, suck, Hung szop

chäl line, furrow, Hung szál thread

chër gather. Hung szed & szer to love

cherippu M shoe Hung tzipello

chiragu T. M wing Hung szarny

chol T. M speak Hung szol.

chör M. (Can & Tel. törü) to lean Hung

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

Süt T pregnancy szül to bring forth

churukan to be narrow, choruga to tuck in

Hung. szoit, szoros, szük

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

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

tonRu Hung tüani

nätige Can tongue, nyelo Hung
nagei, Hung neret

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

p. 488 pugei Hung füst
pul grass Hung fü

pēsü speak Hung berze

potta M. fool Hung. buta

betta Can. mountain Hung. berty

magu T. child, magzat H.

mārga - Hung. mul to perish

Maldives are in Malabar called

maloe 300, maloe 600

p. 489. murugu - Hung. mely Deep

muru to (Mal mura hard, excessive)

be come thick & sticky, compare Hung
merö quite, firm

mugal T. M (nosalu tubi) hare = nyul Hung

p. 489 mulei breast Hung. mellj
 vadi M. stick (also Tel Can. Tul) bot Hung
 valla Mal any Hung. vala any
 vāy mouth Hung. ajak lip
 vāj mouth
 vār to flourish Hung. boldog happy
 ve boil, bug in Hung
 vinei T. vina M. action, sin - Hung.
 būn sin
 vir to unfold. Hung. virr to dawn.
 virāg to blossom
 viru to fall, bukni Hung
 vit to sow Hung. vet
 vilacku a light világ

p 498. Are not Nālar to be derived
 from mal "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 Phoenician
4. Lat or Pali alphabet originated to meet the requirements
of Turanian Dravid. Dialects. Asoka's monoliths
let prove it to be the current writing of Indian
continent B.C. 250. (Norris, Caldwell). Hindi Devanagari. —
A similar if not identical character furnished the proto-
type of all Ind. alph. from India to Egypt & Persia, till
Pali meets Chinese Alphabet in Siam
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

Antizyge Ant Caldwell's
Grammatik der Dialekte, d. f.
für indische Sprachen

Casswell's Comparative

mar of the Dravidian
languages

the representative lan-
the family" in proof
the name of $\text{D} \text{I} \text{D}$ might
to be identical with

The Malayal. versions of
as mention repeatedly
ilas (= Dravidas). &
chargeable as in Vedic
w. And $\text{D} \text{I} \text{D}$ = D as
from $\text{D} \text{I} \text{D} \text{D}$. Darnils
form of Drarnila

called Malabar by the
because coming from
coast they found the
of the Paravas etc nearly
with that spoken in Ma-
always distinguish from
or Telugus as the ruling class,
by the Rayers (K max.
ptions in South Travancor



Ma I 864-8.

Nr 8