A GRAMMAR

OF THE

KŪI LANGUAGE.

BY

J. E. FRIEND-PEREIRA, B.A.,

OF THE PROVINCIAL CIVIL SERVICE, BENGAL.

A GRAMMAR

OF THE

KŪI LANGUAGE.

———◆———

BY

J. E. FRIEND-PEREIRA, B.A.,

OF THE PROVINCIAL CIVIL SERVICE, BENGAL.

———◆———

FIRST EDITION.

A GRAMMAR

OF THE

KŪI LANGUAGE.

PREFACE.

No one is more conscious of the imperfection of this work than the author. It was compiled during the scanty intervals of leisure of a busy official life; and it was unfortunately not completed before the author left the Kandh country for good. However, he has a hope that some one with better opportunities than he has had will one day bring out a revised edition of the book in which all errors will be corrected and not a few omissions supplied.

If this Grammar of a little known archaic Dravidian dialect be found to be of use to students in throwing some light on the early history of the growth of the modern literary Dravidian languages the author will be amply repaid for his labour.

The author takes the opportunity of expressing his deep obligations and grateful thanks to Dr. Grierson, C.I.E., PH.D., D. LITT., I.C.S. (retired), for his invaluable advice and suggestions at all times, and for his kindness in seeing the proof sheets through the press.

INTRODUCTION.

KANDH or, as it is called by the people themselves, Kūi is one of the uncultivated aboriginal dialects of the Dravidian group of languages.

The Dravidian languages belong to what is known as the class of Agglutinative languages. In the Agglutinative languages bare roots may be complete words in themselves. But when it becomes necessary to join together or agglutinate two or more roots in order to express the complex ideas that are involved in the grammatical relation of words in a proposition—such, for instance, as the cases of the noun, or the gender, number, person, and the tenses of the verb—the primary root exercises a certain amount of attraction on the secondary roots and converts them into prefixes or suffixes, but does not blend with them into a new organic whole as in the class of Organic languages.

The agglutinative languages differ widely from each other in their method of development; but they all retain a common feature in that they preserve the form of their primary roots howevermuch the secondary roots may have become altered under the influence of varying forces. In some agglutinative languages the secondary roots are added in the form of prefixes to the primary roots, in others they take the shape of postpositions or suffixes; in some the alteration in the form of the secondary roots is very marked, in others it is hardly noticeable; in some, again, the order of the words in a sentence is according to a certain fixed arrangement, in others it follows a different method; in some languages the secondary root has become a permanent prefix

or suffix, and has converted the compound word into a part of speech, in others the agglutination is so slight that the exact function and the particular meaning of the compound word has to be determined from the context.

The Dravidian languages have proceeded along a line of development that approximates towards the organic form of speech for they possess a declension for the noun and a conjugation for the verb that are not unlike those of the Indo-Aryan languages. The compounded words have, in fact, become real parts of speech.

In all languages roots may be divided into two classes : *first*, predicative roots that signify living beings, inanimate objects, qualities, states, and actions ; and *secondly*, demonstrative roots that mark the relation of words in a proposition. The first class may be further subdivided into nominal roots and verbal roots accordingly as they denote living beings, inanimate objects and qualities, and states and actions respectively.

In some agglutinative languages, as for instance the Munda family group, predicative roots, and even demonstrative roots in some cases, are used with considerable elasticity both as nouns and as verbs, and of necessity with a corresponding vagueness in meaning, *e.g.*, the nominal root *sim*, in Sonthali, signifies—a fowl ; as a verb *sim-ket'-ko-a-le* means literally—we *fowled* them. The usual meaning of the agglutination is—*we have obtained fowls*. But it may also mean—*we have had fowls to eat*. The exact signification of the word can only be determined from the context. In the Dravidian languages—unlike the Munda languages—many of the nominal roots cannot be used as verbal themes, but every verbal root in its participial form may be converted into a noun of agency.

It will be seen from the example taken from Sonthali that the greater the functional elasticity of a word the

vaguer is its meaning. Dr. Caldwell remarks—" It would appear that originally there was no difference in any instance between the nominal and the verbal form of the root in any Dravidian dialect. Gradually, however, as the dialects became more cultivated, and as logical distinction was felt to be desirable, a separation commenced to take place. This separation was effected by modifying the theme by some formative addition, when it was desired to restrict it to one purpose alone, and prevent its being used for others also. In many instances the theme is still used in poetry, in accordance with ancient usages, indifferently either as a verb or as a noun ; but in prose more commonly as a noun only or as a verb only."

Dr. Caldwell is of opinion, furthermore, that Dravidian roots were originally monosyllabic. He divides the formative elements that came to be attached gradually to the monosyllabic roots into two classes, and calls them *the formative addition* and *the particle of specialisation.* He observes— " Formative suffixes are appended to the crude bases of nouns as well as to those of verbs. They are added not only to verbal derivatives, but to nouns which appear to be primitive ; but they are most frequently appended to verbs properly so called, of the inflexional basis of which they form the last syllable, generally the third. These particles seem originally to have been the formatives of verbal nouns, and the verbs to which they are suffixed seem originally to have had the force of secondary verbs ; but whatever may have been the origin of these particles, they now serve to distinguish transitive verbs from intransitives, and the adjectival form of nouns from that which stands in an isolated position and is used as a nominative." In regard to the particle of specialisation he says—" The verbs and nouns belonging to the class of bases which are now under consideration, consist of a monosyllabic root or stem, containing the generic signification, and a second syllable

originally perhaps a formative addition, or perhaps the fragment of a lost root or lost postposition, by which the generic meaning of the stem is in some manner modified. The second syllable appears sometimes to expand and some-times to restrict the signification, but in some instances, through the absence of synonyms, its force cannot now be ascertained. As this syllable is intended in some manner to specialise the meaning of the root, I call it ' the particle of specialisation.'"

It is not necessary to enquire how the welding of these secondary roots or formatives with the primary root came to take place in the literary Dravidian languages : it will suffice for our purpose to state here briefly what the effects were on the vocabulary of those languages as well as on their power of expression.

First, by the addition of formatives to primary roots a distinction in form was drawn between the substantival and the verbal use of words. For instance, in Tamil the verb *kaḍu* means—to be sharp ; with the formative addition *gu* the same root becomes *kaḍu-gu* and conveys the signification of—that which is pungent, namely, *mustard ;* further, when the included vowel is lengthened and the root appears as *kāḍu*, the meaning becomes—what is rough, harsh, or rugged, namely, a *forest*. Similarly, from *nil*, to stand, is formed *nilam*, the ground ; from *naḍu*, to plant, *nāḍu*, the country, from *min*, to glitter, *mīn*, a fish ; and so on.

Secondly, by the addition of formatives to primary roots the transitive verb was distinguished from the intransitive, and the adjectival form of the noun from the substantival. In Tamil and Malayalam, where the systematic use of this class of formatives is most fully developed, the initial consonant of the formative is single

when it marks the intransitive or neuter signification of the verb or the substantival form of the noun, but it is hardened from a sonant to its corresponding surd and at the same time doubled when it implies the transition of the action or quality, that is, when it marks the transitive signification of the verb or the adjectival form of the noun, *e.g.*, in Tamil *peru-gu* (*intrans.*) means to become increased, but *peru-kku* (*trans.*) to increase; *kuru-ḍu*, (*noun*), blindness, *kuru-ṭṭu*, (*adjective*,) blind.

Thirdly, by the addition of the particle of specialisation to the generic primary root, clusters of kindred words were formed expressing the common signification contained in the primary root as modified by that contained in each one of the various secondary roots, *e.g.*, in Tamil a series of words radiate from a common base *aṇ* as follows:—

aṇu, aṇugu	...	to approach, to touch.
aṇei	...	to connect, to embrace; *as a noun*, a weir, a dam.
aṇavu	...	to cleave to.
aṇṇu	...	to resort to, to lean upon.
aṇmu	...	to be near.

It will be easily understood how the addition of these compounded root-words we have been considering enriches the vocabulary of a language and imparts to it a flexibility and exactness of expression that makes it a fit vehicle to follow thought into its finer and more intricate shades. By means of formative additions to primary roots we can readily coin words that will not only signify sharply drawn and distinct concepts, but will also convey in themselves a considerable amount of abstract thought.

The systematic addition of formative elements to root words in the cultivated dialects of the Dravidian tongue had

the effect of gradually developing them and converting them into an organic form with a copiousness of words and a power of expression that are the characteristics of the Organic class of languages.

Kūi has advanced sufficiently to develope a declension for the noun and a conjugation for the verb. But a development in that direction alone was a real weakness inasmuch as it involved the loss of the power which the primitive tongue possessed of employing roots indiscriminately as both nominal and verbal themes. On the other hand there was no compensation as in the literary languages for the loss of this power, because through mental indolence or perhaps incapacity no intelligent use was made of formative additions to obtain words that would convey a precise and definite signification. Accordingly, we find as the distinguishing feature of the Kūi language an exceedingly scanty vocabulary and a feebleness and vagueness in the expression of thoughts and ideas.

The general characteristics of Kūi are briefly:—

First, an entire absence of words that signify the higher forms of thought. Hence there are no abstract nouns to express an ideal entity as existing separate and distinct from a concrete object. Such a concept as 'divisibility' involving as it does a high degree of mental comparison and abstraction cannot be rendered properly in the language. Even a simple abstract noun like 'goodness' has to be expressed by circumlocution.

Secondly, an inadequate number of words to mark and differentiate between the various kinds of moral qualities and the various forms of higher activities, *e.g.,* the one word *nēg* has to do service to signify 'good,' 'kind,' 'generous,' 'sympathetic,' 'discreet,' 'modest,' 'pious,' etc.; and the one word *rō'i* to mean 'bad,' 'wicked,' 'unkind,' 'ungenerous,' etc. Similarly, *ēlu,* probably

from the Dravidian root *uḷ*, to be within, is used for 'wisdom,' 'reason,' 'judgment,' 'thought,' etc. When it is necessary to specify exactly a particular moral quality or mental activity recourse must be had to circumlocution, often without success. Individuals, who have an acquaintance with Uriya or Hindi, generally make use of the corresponding word in those languages.

Thirdly, the absence of any systematic attempt by the addition of formative particles as in the literary languages (1) to draw a distinction between the substantival and verbal form of words, (2) to discriminate between the intransitive and transitive signification of verbs and the substantival and adjectival form of nouns, and (3) to form a group of related words from a common generic root.

There are one or two instances in Kūi of a noun being distinguished from its verbal form by means of a formative addition, *e.g.*, *kō-mbo*, a sept, from the root *kō*, to cut (compare Tamil *kō-mbu*, a branch, from the root *ko-y*, to pluck off, to cut); *pa-ṅ-g-e-ni*, a plank, from the root *pag*, to divide (compare Tamil *pa-ṅ-gu*, a portion, from the root *pagu*, to divide); *vej-gu*, fuel, from probably the root *vaj*, to cook. In all these instances the substantival forms may have been taken bodily from one of the cultivated languages because the only kind of noun that is regularly formed from a verbal root in Kūi is not a derivative noun but a verbal noun, which merely expresses the action or state implied in the root, and which in fact is a gerund, *e.g.*, from the root *tīn*, to eat, comes the verbal noun *tīn-ba*, the eating. Now *tīn-ba*, or its causal form *tīs-ppa* may mean 'food' or 'feast' in certain connections, *e.g.*, *nakuri, tīnba-ki vātenju,*—the dog he has come to the feast. But we must say *mrāuni bōji-ki vātenju,*—he

has come to the daughter's feast (a part of the marriage ritual), because *mrāuni tīnba* or *mrāuni tīsppa* would mean not—the *feast* of the daughter, but—the *eating* of the daughter, or—the *feeding* of the daughter. *Bōji* is, of course, the Uriya or Hindi word *bhōj*, a feast. Similarly, from the root *sī*, to give, we obtain *sī-va*,—a giving, but no such word as 'gift' or 'gifted'; from the root *mēh'*, to see, *mēh'ppa*,—a seeing, but no word as 'sight' or 'scene' or 'scenery.' The neuter singular of the relative participial noun derived from the root *tīn* may also sometimes mean food, e.g., *ānu tīnari māne gā'e*,—is there any food for me. But *nange tīnari māne gā'e* would mean—is there something that will eat me, namely, *an evil spirit*. The verbal noun in *a* which has the force of the infinitive compounded with an appellative noun formed on the base *gāṭa* (from the Uriya *gōṭa*,) yields in certain cases a compound derivative noun of agency, e.g., *tōsppa gāṭanju*, a guide, from the root *tōs*, to show; *pūṇḍa gāṭanju*, a messenger, from the root *pūṇḍ*, to send. This process of forming a class of derivative nouns from verbs is already one step of progress on the part of the Kandhs.

In some instances the verbal nouns that have the force of the present verbal participle and the infinitive are used together with the signification of a verbal derivative noun of quality, e.g., *vesppi vesppa*, conversation (*lit.* saying to say); in other instances the infinitives of two synonymous words are used in a similar way, e.g., *sāh'ppa kosppa*, assault (*lit.*, beating killing). This peculiar crude method of forming derivative nouns indicates the relatively low mental condition of the people.

The characteristic Dravidian law that is seen very clearly in Tamil and Malayalam of hardening and at the same time doubling the sonant of the formative to its corresponding surd to express the transitive verb or the

adjective appears in Kūi in a few instances. Here again the words in which the law shows itself may have been borrowed from one of the literary languages, *e.g.* *grāmb*, to learn, and *grāpp*, to teach; *aj*, to fear, and *ass*, to frighten; *tōnj*, to appear, and *tōss*, to show; *tīn(j)*, to eat, and *tīss*, to feed; *dig*, to touch, and *dikk*, to kill. The hard forms are in a sense the transitives, or rather the causals, of *grāmb*, *aj*, *tōnj*, and *tīn(j)*, respectively. In *dig* and *dikk* the law is seen in another aspect, for the hardening and doubling of the sonant *g* to its corresponding surd *kk* is obviously for the purpose of intensifying the force of the action signified by *dig*, namely, from—'*to touch*' to—'*to kill.*' In *kōg*, small or to be small, and *kōkk*, to sit down, the same law is evidently at work also, for '*to sit down*' is really '*to make one self small,*' and the primary meaning of *kōkk* may have been to make small. In *rūnja*, thunder, and *rūss*, to grind,—if the two words are radically the same—the law appears in an irregular way, for the soft form is the noun and the hard form the transitive verb. It is possible, judging from the analogy of the other examples, that there was formerly a word like *rū-n-j* meaning *to be ground*, and *rūnja* is a derivative signifying that which was ground, namely, *thunder.*

The hardening of the sonant to its corresponding surd for the purpose of marking the adjective from the noun is not found in Kūi, and consequently, unlike the literary languages, there is no change in the theme of the noun in the oblique cases, *e.g.*, *iḍu*, a house; *iḍu-ni*, of a house. On the other hand, unlike the literary languages again, the characteristic law comes into operation and hardens and doubles the sonant in the theme of certain substantive nouns when the hard plural suffix *ka* or *kka* is used, *e.g.*, *iḍu*, a house; *plural*, *iṭṭ-ka*.

There is another instance of the curious working of the law in Kūi which it will be worth while to examine. In certain words contaning a sonant—and it does not matter whether it is in the beginning of the word or in the middle—the sonant is sometimes hardened, and possibly also doubled, with a change in the meaning of the word. For instance *gīna*, let us do, becomes *kkīna* when the meaning is specialised—to do in a particular way, *e.g.*, *nāṭṭu kkīna* let us *found* or *establish* a new village. In the example the sonants in both the verb and the noun are hardened with a change in meaning : *nāju gīna* means literally—let us build a village ; but *nāṭṭu kkīna*,—let us *found* a *new village*. The *ṭ* in the word *nāṭṭu* does not appear at first sight to be the surd of *j*, but as a matter of fact it is, for the *j* in *nāju* is really the softened form of *ḍ*—and this dialectical change frequently occurs in Kūi—of the Dravidian word *nāḍu*, a country. The law appears sometimes in the infinitive, converting the soft form of the formative *v* or *mb* into *p* or *pp*, *e.g.*, *kāma gīva taṅgi nājutari ārkamū*,—go call the villagers to work ; but *kāma gīppka taṅgi*,— *to work, to work* (for what else do you think I want them). In this example the hardening of the formative is apparently to lay particular stress on the word. Again the law is sometimes seen in the use of the hard plural suffix *ka* or *kka* for a special effect, *e.g.*, *kōḍiṅgani pēh'mū*,—drive away the bullocks ; but *u ! isiṅgi kōḍiskani aṅgina*,—oh ! how shall we manage these *wicked* bullocks (an exclamation often uttered by a ploughman). The peculiar manner in which this characteristic Dravidian law shows itself in Kūi would seem to point to the conclusion that it is something that is inherent in the language.

As no conscious effort was probably ever directed towards the formation of a set of related words containing a generic idea we find several names apparently from several independent and distinct roots for such a common object of every day use as a basket merely to distinguish its various sizes

and shapes, *e.g.*, *dēva, mugi, bōga, kōsa, būrki.* The Kandhs might very well have exercised their ingenuity in a higher direction and evolved distinct names for the various mental acts as 'wisdom,' 'intelligence,' 'reason,' 'judgment,' instead of being content with a single vague term *ēlu.* That they have not done so only shows that their intellectual condition remains in the same rude and undeveloped stage in which it was in primitive times. Dr. Caldwell, in discussing the præ-Aryan civilization of the Dravidian people, says— "........they had a word for 'thought' but no word distinct from this for 'memory,' 'judgment,' or 'conscience ;' and no word for 'will.'" This remark aptly sums up in a word the present mental condition of the Kandhs and the state of their language.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

THE NOUN.

CHAPTER II.

ADJECTIVES.

CHAPTER III.

PRONOUNS.

CHAPTER V.

ADVERBS.

CHAPTER VI.

CASE SUFFIXES OR POSTPOSITIONS.

CHAPTER VII.

CONJUNCTIONS.

CHAPTER VIII

INTERJECTIONS.

PART III.

SYNTAX.

PART I.

LETTERS AND SOUNDS.

As Kūi is a dialect of the Dravidian group of languages and possesses no written characters of its own, it will be expedient to adopt the Dravidian mode of transcription in writing it down in the Roman characters. The letters that will be used are to be pronounced in accordance with the standard system employed for the transcription of Oriental languages by European scholars.

The following are the *Vowels :—*

<div align="center">a, ā; i, ī; u, ū; e, ē; o, ō.</div>

The sound of each of these vowels will be understood from the following examples :—

a is pronounced like ' *a* ' in *America, e.g., ajji,* fearing.
ā „   „   „ ' *a* ' „ *father, e.g., āva,* to be or become.
i „   „   „ ' *i* ' „ *pin, e.g., iḍu,* house.
ī „   „   „ ' *i* ' „ *pique, e.g., gīva,* to do.
u „   „   „ ' *u* ' „ *put, e.g., unba,* to drink.
ū „   „   „ ' *u* ' „ *brute, e.g., pūnba,* to know.
e „   „   „ ' *e* ' „ *met, e.g., teka,* from.
ē „   „   „ ' *a* ' „ *mate, e.g., nēgi,* good.
o „   „   „ the *first* ' *o* ' in *promote, e.g., oṭe,* and.
ō „   „   „ the *second* ' *o* ' in *promote, e.g., kōg* small.

It will be noticed there is a *short e* and a *long e* and a *short o* and a *long o* as in all the Dravidian languages.

The long vowels will be invariably marked thus—*ā.* When no such accent is placed over a vowel, it is to be pronounced short.

When a word ends in a vowel, especially in *a* or *u,* the final vowel is generally short, *e.g., aba,* a father; *iḍu,* a house.

Short *u* frequently appears at the end of a word as a mere enunciative particle, *e.g.,* Tamil *mīn,* a fish, becomes *mīnu* in Kūi.

Sometimes the particle *ju* is used as the enunciative, *e.g.*, *pū-ju*, a flower, as compared with the Tamil *pū* (colloquial Tamil *pū-vu*).

Short *i* is used in a similar manner in the adjectives and the appellative and relative participial nouns, *e.g.*, *kōg-i*, small; *kōga-v-i*, small ones; *e-v-i*, these things.

Contiguous vowels retain their radical sounds in Kūi, *e.g.*, *ia*, mother; *vāi*, coming; *gīa*, done.

The euphonic copula *v* is sometimes inserted between two vowels to prevent hiatus, *e.g.*, *e-v-anju* or *e-anju*, he. The semi-vowel *y* may also be interposed between two vowels to keep them separate, *e.g.*, *i-y-a*, mother; *vā-y-i*, coming; *gī-y-a*, done.

The *Consonants* are :—

Gutturals	... k.	g.	ṅ.
Palatals	... s (ch).	j.	nj.
Cerebrals	... ṭ.	ḍ.	ṇ.
Dentals	... t.	d.	n.
Labials	... p.	b or v.	m.
Liquid consonants or semi-vowels.	y, r, l, v:	ṛ (*cerebral*),	ḷ (*cerebral*)
Sibilant	... s.		
Aspirate	... h.		

The consonants are not aspirated in Kūi, and consequently there are no sounds like *kh*, *gh*, &c.

Although a characteristic of all the Dravidian languages is the absence of the aspirate—a characteristic in which Kūi shares when it refuses to utter the *h* sound in words borrowed from Uriya or Hindi, *e.g.*, *alea*, a farm servant, from Uriya *halia*; *kōnde*, a piece, from Uriya *khōndo*, still there are instances peculiar to Kūi of an aspirate appearing: *first*, in the middle of certain words; and *secondly*, as the final consonant in another class of monosyllabic words.

In the first class of words like *dēha*, much, many; *viha*, thatching grass; *vēha*, boiled rice; *plaha*, paddy plant, the aspirate sound *h* is probably a liquid guttural, for the word *viha* is also found in another form, namely, *viga*; and *plaha* seems to be from the same root as *pla-(n)-g-a-ri*, a nursery bed for paddy seedlings—that is to say, from *plag*.

In the second class of words—and it does not appear that these words are of Indo-Aryan origin—the aspirate sound *h* is checked or stopped in a curious abrupt manner by a sudden sharp stoppage of the breath just before the word or syllable is completely uttered. This checked or stopped sound will be represented by the sign—' placed after the aspirate, *e.g., āh',* to catch; *mēh',* to see; *ūh',* to beat. These words are pronounced somewhat like *ākh, mēgh, ūkh,* respectively; but there is hardly more than the merest suggestion of a *k* or *g* sound.

Dr. Caldwell in remarking on the use of the aspirate in Tamil says—"It professes to possess a letter, half vowel, half consonant, corresponding in some respects to the Sanskrit *visarga,* and called *āydam* (that which is subtle, minute). It is pronounced like a guttural *h,* but is only found in the poets, and is generally considered a pedantical invention of the grammarians." The sound *h* in Kūi appears to bear a resemblance to the *āydam* of the Tamil grammarians.

The checked or stopped sound of the final aspirate—or a sound similar to it—occurs in Kūi in certain agglutinations with both vowels and consonants, *e.g., gi'ī,* I do; *vēs'ī,* I speak. When the theme ends in a consonant there is a tendency to suffix an euphonic vowel to sustain the abrupt sound. For instance the sound is always found at the end of the theme before the personal pronominal termination is added in the first person, indeterminate tense, indicative mood, affirmative form, of the finite verb, *e.g., gi'ī,* I do. Should the root end in a consonant, *e.g., kak,* to laugh, the theme is formed by suffixing the vowel to the root, and the verb becomes *kak—i'ī,* I laugh. On the other hand in all the persons and both numbers of the indeterminate tense, indicative mood, negative form, of the finite verb, the root generally remains as the theme even when it ends in a consonant, and the negative particle *a',* on being suffixed to the theme, disappears or becomes coalesced with the pronominal desinences and leaves only the abrupt sound added to the theme, *e.g., kak'enu,* I do not laugh; *kak'ai,* thou dost not laugh; *kak'enju,* he does not laugh. When the root ends in a nasal the *n* is in some cases thrown back on the vowel that precedes it, *e.g., tīn,* to eat, gives *tī'ī,* I eat; but *tīn'enu,* I do not eat.

The abrupt sound in this class of words probably had its origin in the endeavour to keep the agglutinated syllables separate. This is seen clearly in the word *la'a,* a maiden, which is also pronounced as *ia-v-a.* The insertion of the euphonic copula *v* prevents the hiatus which is so marked in the first form of the word.

The checked or stopped sound takes place invariably with the negative particle *a'* in Kūi.   Dr. Caldwell is of opinion that the original form of the Dravidian negative particle *al* or *a* was *a*, the short vowel. The short vowel *a* evidently became *a'* in Kūi on account of the necessity that was felt in an unwritten language to keep this particle distinct and separate from the other syllables of the agglutinated word in which it enters.

The palatal surd is usually pronounced as *s*, and it is almost a sibilant.   The *ch* sound in words borrowed from Uriya or Hindi is also uttered as *s*.   But sometimes the full *ch* sound appears in some Kūi words in the East Kandh Māls and Gūmsar dialects, *e.g.*, *gochi* or *gosi*, a sept.

The palatal sonant *j* is a well marked sound in Kūi.   It frequently replaces the cerebral *ḍ*, *e.g.*, Telugu *nāḍu*, the country, becomes *nāju*, a village ; Telugu *paṇḍi*, a pig, becomes *paji*.

The palatal nasal is never *n mouillé* : it is really a double sound *nj*— not *ny* ; and accordingly it will be represented by the double letters *nj*.

The labial sonant *b* is very frequently pronounced as *v*, *e.g.*, *ba* or *va*, to come.

The cerebral *ṛ* and the cerebral *ḷ* are characteristic Dravidian sounds.   The sound of *ṛ* resembles that of the *r* in the English word *farm*, but it is pronounced further back in the mouth, *e.g.*, *naṛi*, fire. The related sound *ḷ* is uttered by turning up the tip of the tongue high up in the palate, *e.g.*, *ēḷu*, wisdom or mind.   Together with the cerebrals *ṭ*, *ḍ*, and *ṇ* they are well marked in their pronunciation.   But there is a tendency in Kūi as in Telugu for the cerebrals to be softened down to their corresponding dentals, *e.g.*, Tamil *kaṇ* and Canarese *kaṇṇu*, the eye, become *kanu* in Kūi and *kannu* in Telugu.

The sibilant *s* is sometimes prefixed to words beginning with a vowel, *e.g.*, *ēḷu* or *sēḷu*, wisdom ; *oṭe* or *soṭe*, and or again.

In the west Kandh Māls dialect the initial *s* in some words is pronounced as *h*, *e.g.*, *halmū*, go, instead of *salmū*.

There are signs in Kūi of nunnation or nasalisation as in the Dravidian languages, *e.g.*, from the root *pag*, to divide, we get *pa-n-g-e-ni* the thing divided, namely, a plank.

In accordance with the laws of euphony certain changes take place in the nasal letters : —

(i) When a word or syllable ending in a nasal is abruptly checked in sound, the nasal is sometimes thrown back on the vowel that immediately precedes it, and the vowel becomes nasalised, *e.g.*, *mān-ba*, to be or exist, *mã'ĭ*, I am or I exist; *tĭn-ba*, to eat, *tĭ̃'ĭ*, I eat.

(ii) When a word or syllable ending in a nasal agglutinates to itself a suffix the nasal is sometimes, but not always, transferred to the vowel that immediately precedes it and the vowel becomes nasalised, *e.g.*, *prē-nu*, a bone, becomes *prē̃-ka*, bones ; and *tān-ju*, a finger, *vã-s-ka*, fingers ; but *peŋ-u*, a god, has for its plural *peŋ-ka*; and *mĭn-u*, a fish, *mĭn-ka*.

Accent in Kūi, as in the other Dravidian languages, is on the syllable that constitutes the *base* of the word prior to the addition of formatives and inflexional forms, *e.g.*, in *gĭ-ppk-i-nenju*, he is doing, the accent is on *gĭppk*.

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

THE NOUNS.

CLASSES OF NOUNS.

WE shall first of all examine the kinds or classes of nouns there are in Kūi, as otherwise the rules for gender and number will not be understood clearly.

There are four classes of nouns—

(1) Substantive nouns.
(2) Nouns of agency.
(3) Verbal nouns.
(4) Derivative nouns or verbal derivatives.

Substantive nouns are the names of rational and irrational beings and inanimate objects, *e.g.*, aba, father; *kōḍi*, cow; *iḍu* house.

Nouns of agency are compound words formed on a nominal or verbal base by the addition of certain suffixes. They divide themselves into two classes: (*i*) appellative nouns, and (*ii*) relative participial nouns, accordingly as they are formed on a *nominal* or *verbal* base respectively.

The *appellative nouns* (in which are included the *personal pronouns* of the third person) express the *quality* or *relation* implied in the root-word as existing concretely in a being or agent, that is, a person or an animal or a thing, *e.g.*, from the nominal root *kōg*, small, we get the following appellative nouns :—

kōg-a-nju, a small male rational being, namely, *a boy;*

kōg-a-ru, small male rational beings, namely, *boys;*

kōg-a-ri, a small being, namely, (*i*) *a girl,* (*ii*) *a small animal* of either sex, (*iii*) *a small thing;*

kōg-a-vi, small beings, namely, (*i*) *girls,* (*ii*) *small animals* of either sex, (*iii*) *small things.*

Similarly, from the demonstrative nominal root *i*, this, we get the following demonstrative pronouns, or personal pronouns of the third person :—

> *ι-ʋ-anju*, this male rational being, namely, *he ;*
>
> *i-v-aru*, these male rational beings, namely, *they ;*
>
> *i-ri*, this being—a woman or an animal or a thing, namely, *she* or *it ;*
>
> *i-vi*, these beings—women or animals or things, namely, *they.*

The *relative participial nouns* express the *state* or *action* implied in the root-word as existing concretely in a being or agent, *e.g.,* from the present relative participle *gīni*, the doing (something), we get the following relative participial nouns :—

> *gīn-a-nju*, the male rational being that does, namely, the *man* or *boy that does ;*
>
> *gīn-a-ru*, the male rational beings that do, namely, *men* or *boys that do ;*
>
> *gīn-a-ri*, the being that does, namely, the *woman,* or *girl,* or *animal,* or *thing that does ;*
>
> *gīn-a-vi*, the beings that do, namely, the *women,* or *girls,* or *animals,* or *things that do ;*

We shall see later on in the chapter on the Verb that these appellative and relative participial nouns are conjugated for the various persons, *e.g.*—

> *kōg-a-nu*, I the small boy ;
>
> *kōg-a-ti*, or *kōg-a-n-ti*, thou the small boy ;
>
> *gīn-a-mu*, we who do ;
>
> *gīn-a-teru*, or *gīn-a-n-teru*, you who do.

It is important to bear in mind the formation of the appellative and relative participial nouns in order to understand what gender and number are in the Kūi language.

Verbal nouns express the state or the act implied in the verbal root in itself, *e.g.,* *mānba*, the state of being ; *gīva*, the act of doing.

Derivative nouns or *verbal derivatives* are nouns formed from a verbal root, *e.g.,* *kō-mbo*, a sept, from the root *kō*, to cut.

The formation of the verbal nouns and derivative nouns has been indicated in the Introduction, and will be referred to again in the chapter on the Verb.

GENDER.

In the primitive Dravidian tongue, substantive nouns, that is, the names of living beings and inanimate objects, did not possess in themselves any inherent sign of gender as such. With the exception of a few rational nouns, like man and woman, father and mother, brother and sister, which are so instinct with personality that they connote sex in their very signification, all nouns were neuter or, strictly speaking, without gender. When it was necessary to distinguish between the sexes of living beings some word equivalent to 'male' and 'female' was prefixed to the noun. This older method of distinguishing sex—and it is something different from grammatical gender—is still found in modern Tamil and Malayalam and Canarese as in Kūi *e.g.*, Tamil: *āṇ kuṛaṇḍei*, a boy, *peṇ kuṛaṇḍei*, a girl; Malayalam: *āṇ peidal*, a boy, *peṇ peidal*, a girl; Kūi: *mrēh' mīḍa*, a boy, *āsa mīḍa*, a girl. This older method also is the only one that exists for marking the difference of sex in irrational beings in all the modern Dravidian languages, including Kūi *e.g.*, Kūi: *pōṛa pāji*, a boar, *tali pāji*, a sow; *ṭeḍra kōju*, a cock; *taḍi kōju*, a hen.

In the second class of nouns the suffix denoting the being or agent in which the quality or relation (appellative noun) or state or action (relative participial noun) implied in the root-word is made to exist concretely takes two forms as we have seen : one for *male rational beings*, and the other for all the rest, namely, *female rational beings, irrational beings of both sexes* and *inanimate objects*, and also the *deities of both sexes*. The same distinction between male rational beings and all the other beings and things is observed in the personal desinences of the finite verb in the third person.

From this it will be evident that there are two grammatical genders in Kūi :—

    (1) the *masculine*, for male rational beings alone, and

    (2) the *neuter*, or properly *neutral*, for all the rest, namely, female rational beings, irrational beings, inanimate objects, and the deities.

The suffixes implying being are :—

	Singular.	Plural.
Masculine ...	*anju, ănju.*	*aru, āru.*
Neuter ...	*ri,* or *li.*	*vi,* (*u* and *a*, rarely).

The essential difference between the masculine and neuter suffixes is in this that the former connotes, in addition to the signification of a being in general, the idea of a personality of the male sex, whereas the latter does not carry any connotation of gender at all.

Although there is no grammatical feminine gender in Kūi, nevertheless there are signs of a feminine singular that resembles the feminine singular of Tamil, Malayalam, and Canarese.

Now as a general rule the feminine singular of the appellative and relative participial nouns as well as of the predicative verbs in the third person in Kūi is identical in form with the neuter or neutral, but still there is a special case in which the purely feminine singular suffix *ali* or *āli* is used in certain compounds as a feminine and cannot be replaced by the ordinary neuter or neutral suffix *ri, e.g.—*

> *kū-ali,* a Kandh woman, never *kū-ari* or *kū-ri.*
> *mrēh'-ali,* a wife or woman, never *mrēh'-ari* or *mrēh'-ri.*

There are two appellative nouns in Kūi in which the being implied in the noun can only be a rational being. They are *mrī-enju,* a son, and *mrāu,* a daughter ; and *lāv-enju,* a youth, and *lā'a* or *lā-v-a,* a maiden. It is curious that the feminine form of these words does not add the rudimentary feminine suffix *ali* or *āli.*

In the patois spoken in the West Kandh Māls and Chinna Kimḍi the more commonly used form of the third person singular neuter of the personal pronoun, namely, *eri,* a woman, or animal, or thing, becomes *eli.* Similarly, *li* is the suffix employed to form appellative and relative participial nouns to signify both female rational beings as well as irrational beings and inanimate objects instead of the more common *ri* of the East Kandh Māls and Gūmsar dialects.

The interchange of *r* and *l* is only a dialectical peculiarity. The *l* of the West Kandh Māls and Chinna Kimḍi dialects does not appear to be radically the same as the rudimentary feminine

gender suffix *ali* or *āli* in which the vowel is a part of the root. An examination of the construction of the demonstrative or personal pronouns of the third person will show this : the masculine *evanju* is a compound of *e* (*demons. particle*) + *v* (*euphonic particle*) + *anju* (*masc. gender suffix*), which is equivalent to *evanju* or *evānju,* but the neuter *eri, eli,* is a compound of *e* (*demons. particle*) + *ri* or *li* (*neuter gender suffix*). A fully developed feminine form corresponding to the masculine would have been *e* (*demons. particle*) + *v* (*euphonic particle*) + *ali* or *āli* (*fem. gender suffix*), namely, *evali* or *evāli,* which does not exist.

As the feminine of appellative and relative participial nouns both in the singular and plural is indistinguishable from the neuter in Kūi, an explanatory phrase has to be introduced sometimes to distinguish between women and animals or things when the meaning is not clear from the context. For instance, the word *nājutaska* means literally—those in the village (*neuter*) ; but generally it signifies—the women of the village, *e.g., nājutaska vatu,* —the women of the village came. However, the expression may also mean—the *animals* of the village or the *gods* of the village came. If the listener did not understand the sentence correctly, it would have to be made clear in some such way as this: "You know the animals (or gods) of the village ? Well, they of the village (*nājutaska*) came."

Although there are only two genders in Kūi—a masculine and a neuter or neutral, there are various ways of distinguishing the sex of living beings :—

    (*i*) By the use of words that connote sex in themselves, *e.g., aba,* father, *ia,* mother; *ambēsa,* younger brother, *būḍi,* younger sister.

    (*ii*) By prefixing a word indicating sex in the case of both rational and irrational beings, *e.g.—*
        mrēh' lōku, a man, *āsa lōku,* a woman ;
        pōṛa pāji, a boar, *tali pāji,* a sow;
        teḍra kōju, a cock, *taḍi kōju,* a hen.

    (*iii*) By the use of suffixes to distinguish a male rational being from all other beings, *e.g.—*
        mrēh'enju, a man or husband ;
        mrēh'ali, a woman or wife ;
        kōg-anju, a boy ;
        kōg-ari, a girl, or small animal, or small thing.

The last mode as we have seen is imperfect because no distinction is drawn (1) between women and animals and things, and (2) between the sexes of animals.

Although the generic signification of the suffixes in nouns of agency is that of a being or agent without any specification of sex, still it will be convenient to call the suffixes the *gender* suffixes to distinguish them from the purely *number* suffixes with which they will be treated in the next section.

<div align="center">NUMBER.</div>

In Tamil irrational and inanimate nouns are rarely pluralised in ordinary conversation, the singular form of the noun being used in an indefinite singular-plural sense, and the idea of plurality being left to be understood from the context. In Telugu it is otherwise, and all irrational and inanimate nouns are pluralised as regularly as rational nouns. Kūi follows the practice of Telugu and pluralises all its nouns.

Accordingly there are two numbers in Kūi: (1) the *singular* and (2) the *plural*.

<div align="center">*Singular number.*</div>

There is no special sign or suffix to indicate the singular number, and the singular is therefore—

   (*i*) the root, including the formative if any, with or without the gender suffix, and

   (*ii*) the theme or inflexional base with the addition of the gender suffix.

The gender suffixes are:—

Masculine.	Neuter.
anju, ănju.	*ri, li, ḍi.*

The employment of the gender suffix is regulated as follows:—

(1) *Rational substantive nouns* that connote a personality in themselves and therefore sex, as for instance the words expressing family relation, do not generally add the gender suffix, *e.g.*—

        aba, a father;
        ia, a mother;
        ambēsa, a younger brother;
        būḍi, a younger sister.

The forms *aba-nju, ia-li,* etc., are really appellative verbs of the third person, as we shall see in the chapter on the Verb.

(2) *All other substantive nouns* as such, that is, the names of irrational beings and inanimate objects, do not add the gender suffix, as singularity is sufficiently indicated by the form of the words themselves, *e.g.*—

<div style="text-align:center">

kōḍi, a bull or cow.

pāji, a pig.

mīnu, a fish.

iḍu, a house.

</div>

(3) The *appellative* and *relative participial nouns* always add to the root or theme the gender suffixes, *e.g.*—

Root.	Euphonic particle.	Inflexional particle.	Suffix.	
kōg-		*a-*	*anju*	a boy.
kōg-		*a-*	*ri* *li*	a girl, a small animal, a small thing.
dīt-		*a-*	*anju*	a man that fell down.
dīt-		*a-*	*ri* *li*	a woman, or animal, or thing that fell down.
e-	*v-*		*anju*	he.
e-			*ri* *li*	she *or* it (woman, animal *or* thing).

The suffix *ḍi* instead of *ri* or *li* appears in a few words in the East Kandh Māls and Gūmsar dialects, *e.g., nāju-taḍi,* a woman of the village (or a deity, or animal, or thing of the village).

<div style="text-align:center">

Plural number.

</div>

The plural is formed by adding suffixes that imply plurality to the root or the theme.

The suffixes of plurality are of two kinds:—

(*i*) those with a fundamental signification of plurality, and

(*ii*) those with a signification of plurality as well as of a being or agent, that is to say, the plural forms of what we have termed the gender suffixes.

The merely plural suffixes are:—

ṅga, the soft or ordinary form with the nasal inserted euphonically.

ka or *kka*, the hardened, and the hardened and doubled
form, respectively, of *ṅga* without the nasal.

ska, the euphonic form of *kka*.

The gender suffixes are:—

<table>
<tr><td>Masculine.</td><td>Neuter.</td></tr>
<tr><td>*aru, āru.*</td><td>*vi, u, a.*</td></tr>
</table>

The three forms *vi, u,* and *a,* of the plural neuter gender
suffix appear to be radically the same as the common Dravidian
neuter plural suffix *a.* The *v* in the first or most common form
vi is an euphonic consonant inserted between the base and the
real suffix *i* to prevent hiatus. The suffix *i* itself appears to be
a weakened form of the plural particle *a.* The forms *u* and *a*
are used very rarely and appear to be the older forms. Dr.
Caldwell remarks on the tendency of the pluralising particle
short *a* to be weakened into *e, u, ei,* and *i.* The plural gender
suffixes are therefore really a pluralising particle in their origin:
they are not gender suffixes in the same sense as the plural
masculine gender suffixes *aru, āru,* are gender suffixes.

The rules to be observed in the use of the various plural
number and gender suffixes are somewhat confusing, as they
are not symmetrical:—

(1) *Rational substantive nouns* that connote sex in themselves
add to the root—

    (*i*) When *male rational* beings, only the plural masculine
suffix *aru, e.g.*—

<table>
<tr><td>Root.</td><td>Inflexion.</td><td>Suffix.</td></tr>
<tr><td>*aba-*</td><td></td><td>*aru,* fathers.</td></tr>
<tr><td>*ambēsa-*</td><td></td><td>*aru,* younger brothers.</td></tr>
</table>

    (*ii*) When *female rational* beings—

        (*a*) The plural number suffix *ska,* and

        (*b*) A combination of the singular neuter suffix *ri*
or *li* with *ska, e.g.*—

<table>
<tr><td>Root.</td><td>Inflexion.</td><td>Suffix.</td></tr>
<tr><td>*ia-*</td><td></td><td>*ska*
ri-ska } mothers.
li-ska</td></tr>
<tr><td>*būḍi-*</td><td></td><td>*ska*
ri-ska } younger sisters.
li-ska</td></tr>
</table>

(2) *Neuter substantive nouns,* namely, the names of irrational beings (including the deities) and inanimate objects, add the merely plural number suffix *ṅga* or *ka* or *kka* or sometimes *ska* to the root, *e.g.*—

Root.	Inflexion. Suffix.	
kōḍi-	*ṅga* *ska*	} cattle.
mīn(u)-	*ka*	fishes.
iḍ(u)-	*(iṭṭ)-ka* *(iḍu)-ṅga*	} houses.
nakuri-	*ska* *ṅga*	} dogs.
vāḍi-	*ṅga* *ska*	} stones.
pēṇ-(u)	*ka*	gods.

(3) *Appellative nouns* excepting the personal pronouns of the third person add the following plural number or gender suffixes to the theme—

(i) When *male rational* beings—

    (a) the plural masculine suffix *aru,*

    (b) the plural number suffix *ṅga* or *ka,*

    (c) a compound of *aru* and *ṅga* or *ka,* or *aru* and *ṅga* and *ka,* or *ṅga* and *ka* alone, *e.g.*—

Root.	Inflexion.	Suffix.	
kōg-	*a-*	*aru* *ṅga*	} boys.
mri-		*(ē)ru*	
		ṅga *ka* *ṅga-ru* *ka-ru* *ka-ṅga* *ka-ṅga-ru*	} sons.

The example *mrīeru* happens to be a typical word to illustrate the compound plurals which are so peculiarly a characteristic of all the Dravidian languages.

(*ii*) When *female rational* beings—

    (*a*) the plural neuter suffix *vi*,

    (*b*) the plural number suffix *ska*,

    (*c*) a compound of *ri* or *li* and *ska*,

    (*d*) a compound of *vi* and *ska*, e.g.—

Root.	Inflexion.	Suffix.	
kōg-	*a-*	*vi*	
		ska	
		ri-ska	girls.
		li-ska	
		vi-ska	

(*iii*) When *irrational* beings—

    (*a*) the neuter plural suffix *vi*, e.g.—

Root.	Inflexion.	Suffix.	
kōg-	*a-*	*vi*,	small animals.

(*iv*) When *inanimate* objects—

    (*a*) the plural neuter suffix *vi*.

    (*b*) the plural number suffix *u* or *a*, e.g.—

Root.	Inflexion.	Suffix	
kōg-	*a-*	*vi*	
		u	small things.
		a	

In the following example the uncommon form of the plural neuter gender suffix *u* is used idiomatically instead of the ordinary form *vi*:—

    Vadinga tā'i? Ā, kōgi kōga-u,—Shall I bring the stones? Yes, small ones, *lit.* small small-ones.

(4) *Relative participal nouns* add the following plural gender suffixes and number suffixes:—

    (*i*) When *male rational* beings—

        (*a*) the plural masculine suffix *ru* alone, e.g.—

Root.	Inflexion	Suffix.	
dīt-	*a-*	*ru*,	the men that fell down.

    (*ii*) When *female rational* beings, *irrational* beings, or *inanimate* objects—

        (*a*) The plural neuter suffix *vi* alone, e.g.—

Root.	Inflexion.	Suffix.	
dīt-	*a-*	*vi*,	the women, or animals, or things that fell down.

(5) The *demonstrative* or *personal pronouns* of the third person form their plural somewhat differently from the appellative nouns by adding the following plural gender and number suffixes to the demonstrative particles:—

(*i*) When *male rational* beings—

(*a*) the plural masculine suffix *ru* alone, *e.g.*—

Root. Inflxion. Suffix.

e- (*v* euphonic) a- *aru*, they.

(*ii*) When *female rational* beings—

(*a*) the plural neuter suffix *vi*,

(*b*) a compound of *ri* or *li* and *ska*, and

(*c*) a compound of *vi* and *ska*, *e.g.*—

Root. Inflexion. Suffix.

e-

$$\left.\begin{matrix} vi \\ ri\text{-}ska \\ li\text{-}ska \\ vi\text{-}ska \end{matrix}\right\} \text{they.}$$

(*iii*) When *irrational* beings and *inanimate* objects—

(*a*) the plural neuter suffix *vi* alone, *e.g.*—

Root. Inflexion. Suffix.

e- *vi*, they.

Although a distinction in form has been drawn between female rational beings and animals or things in the appellative and relative participial nouns, it is not to be understood that the rule is a hard and fast one. There is a tendency to discriminate between female rational beings and animals or things, but it would not be a grammatical mistake to use one form for the other, *e.g.*, *kōgaviska* may be used for small animals and small things as well as for girls.

It is to be noted that Kūi instead of using the plural masculine suffix *aru* with an epicene or common gender signification as in the literary Dravidian languages employs one of the doubled and hardened forms of the purely plural suffix *ṅga*, namely, *ska*, to pluralise rational substantive nouns that represent female beings, *e.g.*, *ia*, mother, *ia-ska*, mothers ; *būḍi*, younger sister, *būḍi-ska*, younger sisters.

We saw in the Introduction the characteristic Dravidian law of doubling and at the same time hardening a sonant to its corresponding surd for the purpose of expressing the transition

of an action, etc. The principle underlying the law is found in the use of the doubled and hardened form of the particle of plurality, namely, *kka* for the sake of emphasis on or specialisation of the meaning of the word to which it is suffixed as the following examples will show :—

> *Viduṅga āh'hanai gōsaki vādūrē*,—Take your bows and come to the forest.
>
> But, *uh! viṭṭka āh'hanai gōsaki vādūrē*,—Uh ! Come with your *bows*. I called out to you to come with your bows, and here you are coming with sticks only.
>
> *Kōḍiṅgani pēh'mū*,—drive away the bullocks.
>
> But, *uh! īsingi kōḍiskani aṅgina*,—Uh ! How shall we manage these *wicked* or *unruly* bullocks—an exclamation frequently uttered by a ploughman.
>
> Another example is seen in the infinitive mood of the verb : *Kāmagīva taṅgi nājutari ārkāmū*,—go call the villagers to work.
>
> But, *uh! kāmagippka taṅgi nājutari ārkāmūrē*,—Uh ! I told you to call the villagers *to work*, for what else do you think I want them.

Now the sound *k* is very liable to be softened into *ch* or its equivalent *s* in the Dravidian languages, *e.g.*, *kōg*, small, in Kūi is *kinna* in Canarese, but *chinna* in Telugu and *sinna* in Tamil. Accordingly, the rule we get in Kūi is that when *kka* is added to a noun to emphasise or specialise its signification the first *k* is softened to *s* when the noun ends in a vowel.

As rational substantive nouns that are the names of female beings usually end in a vowel, the emphasised or specialised form of the plural suffix *kka*, which is the only form used with these nouns, becomes *ska*, *e.g.*, *ia-ska*, mothers ; *būḍi-ska*, younger sisters ; *bāi-ska*, elder sisters ; *mrāu-ska*, daughters.

The emphasised or specialised form of the plural suffix *ska* is also used as we have seen to distinguish more or less women from animals and things in the nouns of agency.

A curious instance of the frequent use of the particle *ska* with a substantive noun that is not the name of a woman is the case of *nākuri*, a dog. The ordinary plural of *nākuri* is *nākuriṅga*; but as the word is often employed as a term of abuse both for human beings and dogs, the plural form of the word

is generally *nākuri-ska* even when no emphasis is meant, and *nākuri-ṅga* is scarcely ever heard.

Some substantive nouns of the neuter gender undergo modifications in their root or theme before adding the plural suffixes. The following are the principal modifications:—

(*i*) Some nouns ending in *u*, which appears to be an enunciative vowel, drop the *u* before adding the plural suffix, *e.g.*—

> *kā-u*, fruit ;   *plu. kā-ṅga.*
> *prā-u*, rice ;   *plu. prā-ṅga.*
> *mīn-v*, fish ;   *plu. mīn-ka.*
> *prī-u*, worm ;   *plu. prī-ka.*
> *tlā-u*, head ;   *plu. tlā-ka.*
> *kan-u*, eye ;   *plu. kan-ka.*

The plural of *ṭūṭŭ*, stomach, is *ṭūṭuṅga* as well as *ṭūṭṭ-ka.*

(*ii*) Some nouns ending in *ju* drop the *ju* before adding the plural suffix, *e.g.*—

> *ū-ju*,   flesh ; *plu. ū-ṅga.*
> *kā-ju*,   hand ; *plu. kā-ka.*
> *pierē-ju*, a stream ; *plu. pierē-ka.*

But, *pū-ju*, flower, has for its plural *pū-ju-ṅga* as well as *pū-ṅga* or *pūss-ka.* *Dān-ju*, the moon, has *dān-ju-ṅga.*

(*iii*) Some nouns ending in *ju, du, ḍu*, where the *j, d, ḍ* are a part of the root or theme and the final vowel an enunciative short *u* or *a*, drop the final vowel and double and harden the sonant which ends the word to its corresponding surd when the hard form of the plural suffix is added, *e.g.*—

> *kō-ju*, a fowl ; *plu. kō-ss-ka.*
> *sō-ju*, a sore ; *plu. sō-ss-ka.*

But *ni-ju*, oil, has for its plural *ni-ss-ka* or *ni-j-ka.* Some other examples are—

> *mrā-ḍu*, a hare ; *plu. mrā-ṭṭ-ka.*
> *drā-ḍu*, a calf ; *plu. drā-ṭṭ-ka.*
> *rā-ḍu*, a kite ; *plu. rā-ṭṭ-ka.*
> *en-da*, a dance ; *plu. en-ṭṭ-ka.*

(iv) Some nouns ending in *nu* drop the final vowel and transfer the *n* to the preceding vowel or consonant which becomes nasalised when the hard plural suffix is added, *e.g.*—

pr̄ḗ-nu, a bone ; *plu. pr̄ḗ-ka.*

But, *pē-ṇu*, a gods, has *pē-ṇ-ka* for its plural; *mrāh'ṛu*, a tree, has *mrāh'ka* for its plural (compare ancient Canarese *maram*, a tree; *plu. mara-gai*).

(v) Some nouns ending in *nju* drop the final *u* and double and harden the *j* into *ss*, and transfer the nasal to the vowel or consonant preceding the *j* when the hard plural suffix is added, *e.g.*—

vā-n-j̈u, a finger; *plu. vā̃-ss-ka.*

(vi) Some nouns ending in final *i* drop the *i* before adding the plural suffix, *e.g.*—

jōeli, maize; *plu. jōel-ka.*

paheri, road; *plu. paher-ka.*

But, *mūngeli*, nose; *plu. mūngeli-ka.*

And, *vāngōsi*, tongue; *plu. vāngōsi-ka.*

CASE.

For the purpose of expressing the case relations of a proposition, that is, of marking the particular function a noun or pronoun performs in a proposition—such for instance, as its being the subject of the sentence (nominative case), or the direct object of the predicative verb (accusative case), etc.,—the noun or pronoun in Kūi agglutinates to itself certain auxiliary words or particles which grammarians call the postpositions or case-suffixes or the case-signs.

The case-suffixes in several instances still retain traces of their original character as auxiliary nouns, but a few of them have dwindled down to mere case-signs or desinences as the Dative case-suffix *ki.*

In the Dravidian languages the case-suffixes are added to what Dr. Caldwell calls 'the inflexional base of the noun,' namely, 'that form a noun assumes when it qualifies or is qualified by a subsequent noun, or when it stands to such noun in the relation of an adjective.'

The inflexional base of the noun in Kūi is sometimes the same as the crude base or natural form, that is to say, the form in which it appears in the nominative case both in the singular and in the plural. In the other cases the inflexional base is obtained (*i*) by a modification in form of the crude base, *e.g.*, shortening the included vowel or dropping the enunciative particle, and (*ii*) by the addition of a particle, namely, the inflexional increment or augmentation, to the crude base.

The formation of the inflexional base by a modification in form of the crude base is seen in the personal pronouns of the first and second persons where the included vowel of the theme is shortened, *e.g.*, *ānu*, I; but *ana-ni*, of me.

The second mode of forming the inflexional base by the addition of an inflexional increment is as common in Kūi as in the literary Dravidian languages.

The inflexional increments in Kūi are—

> *ni* (compare Telugu *ni* and *na*),
> *ti* (compare Telugu *ti* or *ti*),
> *i* (compare Telugu *i*),
> *a* (compare Telugu *a*),

and their various combinations as—

ni + *i*, or *ni*, *ti* + *ni*, *i* + *i*, or *ī*, etc.

The particle *ni* in Kūi is generally suffixed to a noun when it represents an object near at hand or in view of the speaker or the person spoken to, *e.g.*, *kōḍi-ni pēh'mū*—Drive away the cow, namely, *the one here before us*. On the other hand, *ti* is used when the object is some distance away or not in view of the speaker or the person spoken to, *e.g.*, *gōsa-ki sāsenju, sājanai krāṇḍi-ti vīh'tenju*,—He went to the forest and shot a tiger, namely, *the tiger that was there;* but *vādū vādū kraṇḍi-ni mēh'dū*,—Come and see the tiger, namely, *the one he has shot*.

As Kūi is not a literary language, the difference in use between *ni* and *ti* is not strictly observed.

The particles *i* and *a* are used generally as the inflexional increments for the masculine and neuter gender respectively of appellative and relative participial nouns.

As the inflexional increment is the hinge on which the case suffixes are attached, the inflexional base might be called the *general oblique case* of the noun.

General Oblique Case.

The general oblique case is—

(1) Of substantive nouns of both genders:—

    (i) the crude base, and

    (ii) the inflexional base in *ni* or *ti*, or sometimes in *i*, or a compound of two or three of them, *e.g.*, *dāda*, elder brother; *crude base, dāda; inflexional base, dāda-ni, dāda-ti, dāda-i, dāda-ti-ni, dāda-ni-i, dāda-ti-i, dāda-ti-ni-i, dāda-i-i.*

(2) Of appellative and relative participial nouns of the masculine gender:—

    the inflexional base in *i* or sometimes in *ni*, or a compound of the two, *e.g.*—

        kōganju, a boy; *inflexional base, kōgan-i, kōgan-ni, kōgan-i-i, kōgan-ni-i.*

(3) Of appellative and relative participial nouns of the neuter gender:—

    the inflexional base in *a*, or generally in *a* + *ni*, or sometimes in *a* + *ti* and the various combinations as *a* + *i*, *a* + *ni* + *i*, *a* + *i* + *i*, &c., *e.g.*—

        Kōgari, a girl or small animal or small thing: *inflexional base, kōgar-a, kōgar-a-ni, kōgar-a-ti, kōgar-a-i, kōgar-a-ni-i, kōgar-a-i-i,* &c.

The general oblique case may be used for any one of the oblique cases; but as there are no special auxiliary case-signs for the genitive and accusative, it is the genitive as well as the accusative case in Kūi, *e.g.*—

    nāi dāda-ni mīda,—My elder brother's child (*genitive*).

    nāi dāda-ni ārkāmū,—Go call my elder brother (*accusative*).

We shall now examine the formation of each one of the various cases in Kūi.

Nominative Case.

There is no distinctive case termination attached to the noun when it is the subject of a proposition, that is to say, when it is in the nominative case. The nominative case is therefore (*i*)

the bare root, including the formative, if any, and (ii) the form compounded of the root and the gender and number suffixes. However, as the enunciative particles of the gender suffixes *ju* of *anju*, *u* of *aru*, as well as the enunciative final vowel *u* of the personal pronouns of the first and second persons are dropped in the oblique cases, they are peculiar to the nominative case, and may therefore be considered as nominative case signs.

Genitive case.

There is no auxiliary genitive case sign as we have seen, and the general oblique case is also the genitive case. Accordingly, for nouns that do not add the gender suffixes the genitive case is the crude base or the inflexional base with the augmentations *ni*, *ti*, *i*, and their compounds, and for nouns that add the gender suffixes the inflexional base with the augmentation *i* as well as the compounds of *i* with *ni*, *i*, for the masculine gender, and *a* as well as the compounds of *a* with *ni*, *ti*, *i*, for the neuter gender.

Substantive nouns do not generally add the augmentation for the genitive, especially where there can be no ambiguity from the position of the words, *e.g.*—

> *nāi dāda mīḍa ārkāmū*, instead of *nāi dāda-ni mīḍa*,—Go call my brother's child.

The inflexional increment *ni* is not generally used with the plural of masculine nouns ending in the gender suffix *aru*, *e.g.*—

> *nāi dādar-i mīḍaṅga ārkāmū*, instead of *nāi dādar-ni mīḍaṅga*,—Go call my brother's children.

The inflexional increment *ti* is not generally used with plural nouns, *e.g.*—

> *kṛāṇḍi-ti mīḍa mēh'teru*,—they saw the tiger's cub.

But the form *kṛāṇḍi-ṅga-ti* or *kṛaṇḍi-ṅga-n-ti* would be unusual.

It is difficult to give any hard-and-fast rule as to the employment of the various combinations of the augmentations. For instance *a* + *ni*, and not *a* alone, is the ordinary form for the demonstrative or personal pronouns of the third person neuter singular and plural, and the other combinations would be very unusual and perhaps a mistake.

The method of forming the genitive of the personal pronouns must be noted here:—

First person, by adding the inflexional increment *a* plus the inflexional increment *i* or *ni*, e.g.—

<div style="text-align:center">

ānu, I;   *gen.* *nā-i*, or *an-a-ni*.

āmu, we;   *gen.* *mā-i* or *am-a-ni*.

</div>

Second person, by adding the inflexional increment *i* or *i* plus *i*, e.g.—

<div style="text-align:center">

īnu, thou; *gen.* *n-i*, or *ni-i*, which becomes *nī* sometimes.

īru, you; *gen.* *m-i*, or *mi-i*, which is equivalent to *mī* sometimes.

</div>

It will be observed that the first or more common form of the first person *nā-i*, *mā-i*, drops the initial vowel *ā* and lengthens the inflexional *a* to *ā*, and the second or less common form *ana-ni*, *ama-ni* shortens the initial vowel *ā* to *a* before adding the augmentation in the usual Dravidian manner.

The second person singular *īnu* sometimes, but very rarely, uses a form *ina-ni* corresponding to the forms *ana-ni*, *ama-ni* of the first person. But there is no form like *ima-ni* for the second person plural.

The commonly used forms for the second person singular and plural are: *nī* and *mī* respectively.

Third person, the genitive of the pronouns of the third person are formed in the same way as the genitive of appellative nouns of the masculine and neuter genders.

There is an auxiliary genitive suffix *de* or *di* which is used for the possessive absolute in all three persons and both genders and numbers of pronouns, e.g.—

<div style="text-align:center">

ānu,   I; *poss. abs.* *nā-n-de*, or *ana-n-de*.

āmu,   we; *poss. abs.* *mā-n-de*, or *ama-n-de*.

īnu,   thou; *poss. abs.* *nī-n-de*.

īru,   you; *poss. abs.* *mī-n-de*.

evanju,   he; *poss. abs.* *eva-n-di*.

evaru,   they; *poss. abs.* *eva-r-di*.

eri,   she, it; *poss. abs.* *era-n-di*.

evi,   they; *poss. abs.* *eva-n-di*, or *eva-ska-n-di*.

</div>

Accusative case.

The accusative case like the genitive is identically the same as the general oblique case.

Irrational and inanimate substantive nouns are generally used in their crude nominative form for the accusative when there is no ambiguity, *e.g.*—

Krāṇḍi vīh'mū, instead of *krāṇḍini vīh'mū*,—Shoot the tiger.

The inflexional increments *ni*, *ti*, *i*, and their combinations, and *i*, *a*, and their combinations, are used in the same way as in the genitive case, the first set as augmentations to nouns that do not add the gender suffixes, and the second set to nouns that add the gender suffixes, *i* being the particle for the masculine gender and *a* for the neuter.

In the personal pronouns of the first and second persons there is a distinct accusative case sign which is the same as the dative case sign, *e.g.*—

> *ānu*, I;   *accu. nāṅge*, or *anaṅge*.
> *amu*, we;   *accu. māṅge*, or *amaṅge*.
> *inu*, thou;   *accu. nĩṅge*.
> *iru*, you;   *accu. mĩṅge*.

In the first person the general oblique case forms *anani*, *amani*, are sometimes used. But there are no corresponding forms for the second person.

Dative case.

The dative case is formed by adding the auxiliary dative case suffix *ki* to the inflexional base or general oblique case, *e.g.*—

> *dāda-ki*, or *dāda-n-ki*, or *dāda-ti-ki*, or *dāda-n-ti-n(i)-ki*, or
> *dāda-i-ki*, *sīmū*,—Give to the elder brother.

In the personal pronouns of the first and second persons the usual dative case suffix is the same as the accusative case suffix, namely, *ṅge*, *e.g.*—

> *ānu*, I;   *dat. nāṅge*, or *anaṅge*, or *ananki*.
> *āmu*, we;   *dat. māṅge*, or *amaṅge*, or *amanki*.
> *inu*, thou;   *dat. nĩṅge*, or *inanki*.
> *iru*, you: *dat. mĩṅge*.

It will be noted that there is no corresponding form to *inan-ki* in the second person plural.

The other cases are formed in the same way as the dative case, namely, by the addition of an auxiliary suffix to the oblique case form or inflexional base, which is sometimes, as we have seen, identical with the crude base. Accordingly, there may be any number of cases in Kūi. The following are some of them :—

Locative case, which is formed by the addition of the suffix *ta,* in, *e.g.*—

> *Idu-ta māne,*—It is in the house.

A more intensive sign is *lai* or *lai-ta,* meaning inside or within. Similarly, *baha* or *baha-ta* signifies near, and so on.

Ablative case, which is formed by the addition of the suffix *teka,* from, or *baha-teka,* from near, *e.g.*—

> *Idu teka sālmū,*—Go from the house.
> *Mṛāh'nu bahateka pīnjitenju,*—He ran away from near the tree.

Instrumental case, which is formed by the addition of the suffix *dai, tai, rai,* by means of, through, *e.g.*—

> *Dūradai ūh'tenju,*—He beat with a stick.

Conjunctive case, which is formed by the addition of the suffix *kee,* with, in the company of, *e.g.*—

> *Nāikee vāmū,*—Come along with me.

Vocative case. The vocative case is formed in a peculiar manner in Kūi. The noun is put into the form of an appellative verb of the second person and the expletive *ē* is placed before it, *e.g.*—

> *Ē mrīka-ṅga-n-deru,*—O boys, *lit.* O you who are boys.

Sometimes the ordinary crude form of the noun (nominative case) is used, *e.g.*—

> *Ē mrīka,* or *ē mrīkaṅga,*—O boys.

A list of the commonly used case suffixes or postpositions will be given in the chapter on the Postpositions, or case suffixes.

CHAPTER II.

ADJECTIVE.

ADJECTIVE.

The adjective in Kūi, as in all the Dravidian languages, is a noun of quality or relation which acquires the force of an adjective properly so called by being placed in apposition before another noun. The adjective accordingly undergoes no change in form to agree with the noun it qualifies.

Besides the nouns of quality or relation nouns of state or action, that is, verbal nouns and participles, are used as adjectives as in the other Dravidian languages.

The following are the various ways in which nouns and verbs are used as adjectives:—

(1) Nouns of quality or relation become adjctives by being placed in apposition before the noun they qualify, e.g.—

> Dēṛi lōku, a big man.
> Dēṛi lōkuru, big men.
> Dēṛi iṭṭka, big houses.

The final i in this class of nouns of quality or relations, e.g., dēṛi, big, kōgi, small, nēgi, good, appears to be an enunciative vowel, or it may be a sign of the crude base or genitive.

(2) Some substantive nouns become adjectives by being placed in apposition before the noun they qualify, e.g.—

> Nāju lōku, a man of the village or villagers.
> Vāḍi iḍu, a stone-house.

(3) The relative or adjectival participle in every tense performs the functions of an adjective, e.g.—

> Vāni lōku, the coming-man or the man that comes.
> Vāti lōku, the came-man or the man that came.

The final vowel i in the relative or adjectival participle also appears to be an enunciative particle, or a sign of the crude base or genitive.

(4) The infinitive prefixed in apposition to a noun gives (i)
an adjective that signifies the action or state implied in the
verbal root without reference to time, and (ii) an adjective that
is sometimes different in meaning from the corresponding
relative or adjectival participle from the same root or base,
e.g.—

> *Pūnba lōku,* a knowing man, that is, a skilful or clever
> man.

> But, *Pūnni lōku,* a man that knows simply, not
> necessarily a skilful or clever man.

> *Ūṛgi mānba lōku,* a rice-possessing man, that is, a well-
> to-do or wealthy man.

> But, *ūṛgi mānni lōku,* a man that has rice in his posses-
> sion, not necessarily a wealthy man.

(5) Nouns of all kinds may append the indeterminate tense
of the relative or adjectival participle of *mān,* to be or exist,
and its negative *siḍ,* not to be or not to exist, and *ā,* to be
or become, and its negative *ā'a,* not to be or not to become,
and be used as adjectives, e.g.—

> *Sanja mānni āsa mīḍa,* a beautiful woman, *lit.* a woman
> that has beauty.

> *Rāja āni loku,* a kingly person, *lit.* a person that is
> king.

> *Krau siḍa'ni piṅgūḍi,* a shallow bowl, *lit.* a bowl that is
> not deep.

The other tenses of the relative or adjectival participle yield
adjectives with a somewhat different signification, e.g.—

> *Sanja māsi āsa mīḍa,* a once beautiful woman, *lit.* a
> woman that was beautiful.

> *Rāja āja māsi lōku,* one who had been a kingly person,
> *lit.* a person that had been king.

(6) The inflexional increments *ni, ti, i, a,* suffixed to nouns
give them the force of an adjective, but they are really parti-
tive genitives, e.g.—

> *Vāḍini iḍu,* a stone-house, or house of stone.

(7) Adjectives borrowed from Uriya or Hindi generally remain unchanged, *e.g.*—

    Būḍa kṛāṇḍi, an old tiger.

Degrees of Comparison.

(1) Comparative degree.

In the expression of the comparative degree Kūi follows a method of its own :—

(*i*) the term which forms the basis of comparison is put in the dative case instead of, as in the literary Dravidian languages, the locative case, *e.g.*—

    Evanki ānu ḍēṛanu, I am bigger than he is, *lit.* to him I am big.

(*ii*) Sometimes the particle *oṭe* signifying *and* or *more* is placed before the adjective, *e.g.*—

    Evanki ānu oṭe ḍēṛanu, to him I am more big.

(*iii*) Sometimes the term of comparison is put in the ablative case as in Uriya and Hindi, *e.g.*—

    Evani baha ieka ānu ḍēṛanu, I am bigger than he is, *lit.* from him I am big.

(2) Superlative degree.

The superlative degree is expressed in various ways :—

(*i*) By placing the particle of number *gūle*, all, before the term of comparison which is in the dative case, *e.g.*—

    Gūle lōkutiki evanju ḍēṛanju, he is bigger than all, namely, biggest of all.

(*ii*) By placing before the qualitative which remains unchanged the particle of number *deha*, *dehane*, much many, *e.g.*—

    Evanju dehane ḍēṛanju, he is very big.

(*iii*) By repeating the adjective, *e.g.*—

    Evanju ḍēṛi ḍēṛi lōku, he is a very big man.

(*iv*) By putting the term of comparison in the ablative case instead of, as in Uriya and Hindi, the dative case, *e.g.*—

    Gūleteka evanju ḍēṛanju, he is big from all, namely, the biggest.

NUMERALS.

(1) Cardinal numerals.

In the Southern Gūmsar dialect there are distinct words to express the cardinal numbers from one to seven; but further north in the Kandh Māls the Kūi numerals, with the only exception of *rō*, one, and *rī*, two, have been displaced by the Uriya terms. The Uriya terms themselves have undergone slight phonetic modifications in the course of their utterance from the lips of a Kanadh, as for instance *ohāro*, four, becomes *sāro*, and *chho*, six, *so*, and so on.

The following are the cardinal numerals:—

	Gūmsar dialect.	*Kandh Māls dialect.*
one	*rō*	*rō.*
two	*rī*	*rī.*
three	*mū̃*	*tīn.*
four	*nal*	*sāro.*
five	*siṅg*	*paso.*
six	*saj*	*so.*
seven	*oḍ*	*sālo.*
eight	*aṭo (Uriya)*	*aṭo.*
nine	*no (Uriya)*	*no.*
ten	*doso (Uriya)*	*doso.*
eleven	*doso oṭe rō*	*doso oṭe rō.*
twelve	*doso oṭe rī*	*doso oṭe rī.*
twenty	*kori*	*kori.*
twenty-one	*kori oṭe rō*	*kori oṭe rō.*
thirty	*kori oṭe doso*	*kori oṭe doso.*
forty	*rī kori*	*rī kori.*

The numbers from above ten to twenty are formed by saying ten and one, *doso oṭe rō;* ten and two, *doso oṭe rī*, etc.

The Uriya or Hindi word *kūri*, pronounced *kori*, is used for twenty.

From twenty onwards the counting is done by twenties, as for instance forty is two twenties, *rī kori*, sixty three twenties, *mū̃ kori*, etc.

The cardinal numerals given above are the adjectival or concrete forms as distinguished from the substantival or abstract forms.

The substantival forms of *rō*, *rī*, etc., are—

> one, *rōṇḍe*.
> two, *rīṇḍe*.
> three, *mūnji*.
> four, *nalgi*.
> five, *singi*.
> six, *sajgi*.
> seven, *oḍgi*.
> eight, *aṭo*.
> nine, *no*.
> ten, *doso*.

The substantival forms are often used without any change as numeral adjectives, *e.g.*—

> *Rō nākūri* or *nākūri rōṇḍe*, one dog.

When thus used they are generally placed after the noun they qualify.

The adjectival forms are used to make up appellative nouns of number and appellative verbs, *e.g.*—

> *rōanju*, one man.
> *rīaru*, two men.
> *ānu rōanu*, I alone.
> *āmu rīamu*, we two alone.

(2) *Ordinal numerals*.

In the literary Dravidian languages the ordinal numerals are formed from the cardinal numbers by means of suffixed verbal participles or participial forms. This construction is not found in Kūi, which uses generally the cardinal numbers as ordinals and has recourse to circumlocution when the meaning is not evident from the context, *e.g.*—

> *Rō sāki gāṭani ārmū*, call the first witness (the context showing that the first witness and not one witness is meant).

> But, *Rī mrāh'nu pih'hanai tīn mrāh'nuti krāh'mū*,—cut the third tree, *lit.* having left two trees cut the three-tree.

> Or, *Rī mrāh'nu rioti oṭe ro mrāh'nu māne, mrāh'nuti krāh'mu lit* after two trees there is one tree, cut that tree.

The ordinal numbers may also be expressed as follows:—

Vēle, the first, *lit.* before.

Oṭe, the second, *lit.* again.

Oṭe oṭe mānjanai tīn pāli, the third, *lit.* again again having been the three-one (*pāli* is an Uriya or Hindi word).

Oṭe oṭe mānjanai sār pāli, the fourth, and so on.

Vioṭi, vioṇḍi, the last, *lit.* behind.

(3) Distributive numerals.

The distributive numerals are formed by reduplication of the cardinal numbers and sometimes by circumlocution, *e.g.*—

Rō rōanki rī rī pāisa sīmū, give to each one two pice, *lit.* to one one give two two pice.

Rī rī dīna pih'hanai rō rō dīna vāmū, come every third day, *lit.* having left two two days come on one one day.

CHAPTER III.

THE PRONOUNS.

PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

The personal pronouns in Kūi bear a close family likenes to the personal pronouns of the other Dravidian languages.

In common with the other Dravidian languages Kūi is destitute of personal pronouns of the third person, and uses instead demonstrative particles with the addition of the gender and number suffixes.

The personal pronouns in Kūi are:—

	Singular.	Plural.
1st person ...	ānu.	{ āmu. āju (inclusive plural).
2nd person ...	īnu.	īru.

DECLENSION.

First Person.

	Singular.	Plural.
Nom. ...	ānu	āmu.
General Oblique & Genitive.	{ nā-i, nā-i-i, nā-ī ana-ni, ana-ni-ı, &c. ana-i, ana-i-i, &c.	mā-i, mā-i-i, mā-ī. ama-ni, &c. ama-i, &c.
Poss. absolute ...	{ nānde. anande.	mānde. amande.
Accus. ...	{ nāṅge. anaṅge.	māṅge. amaṅge.
Dat. ...	{ nāṅge. anaṅge. ananki.	māṅge. amaṅge. amunk;

D

Second Person.

	Singular.	Plural.
Nom. ...	ĭnu.	ĭru.
General oblique & genitive.	nĭ, nĭ-i, nĭ-ĭ. ina-ni, &c. ina-i, &c.	mĭ, mĭ-i, mĭ-ĭ.
Poss. ab-solute.	nĭnde.	mĭnde.
Accus. ...	nĭnge.	mĭnge.
Dat.	nĭnge. inan-ki. inan-i-ki, &c.	mĭnge.

The method of formation of the general oblique case and the other oblique cases of the personal pronouns has been examined in the chapter on the Noun.

As in all the Dravidian languages, there are two forms for the first person plural of the pronouns: one, the *inclusive* form, implying the person or persons speaking, as well as the person or persons spoken to, and the other, the *exclusive* form, denoting only the persons speaking and excluding the person or persons spoken to.

The ordinary form *āmu* is the exclusive form, e.g.—

Iru kāh'i mānjeru āmu sāi namu,—you are playing, but we are dying.

The inclusive plural is *āju,* which is declined as follows:—

DECLENSION OF *aju*.

Nom. ...	āju.
General oblique & genitive.	amnāni, &c. amnāi, &c.
Poss. absolute,	amnānde.
Accus.	amnānge.
Dat.	amnānge. amnānki. amnān-i-ki, &c.

e.g.—

Vādu āju sāna, come let us go.

REFLEXIVE PRONOUNS.

The reflexive pronoun possesses all the characteristics of the personal pronoun, and may almost be considered a personal pronoun of the third person when it stands as the nominative to a verb.

The reflexive pronoun in Kūi is:—

Singular.	Plural.
tānu, self.	*tāru*, selves.

The reflexive pronoun is declined as follows:—

DECLENSION.

	Singular.	Plural.
Nom. ...	*tānu*	*tāru.*
General oblique & genitive.	*tānani, &c.* *tāna-i, &c.*	
Poss. absolute,	*tānde.*	Wanting.
Accus. ...	*tānge.*	
Dat.	*tānge.* *tānan-ki* *tānan-i-ki, &c.*	

Tānu and *tāru* have the force of the personal pronoun of the third person in the following examples:—

> *Tānu vēstenju,*—he himself said.
> *Tāru vēsteru,*—they themselves said.

When *tānu* and *tāru* are employed as reflexive pronouns in the oblique cases the singular number is used for the plural, which is wanting, e.g.—

> *Evanju tānu tānge tōṭi krātenju,*—he cut his own throat, *lit.* he himself cut himself his throat.
> *Evaru tāru tānge tōṭi krāteru,*—they cut their own throats, *lit.* they themselves cut himself his throat.

The plural *tāru* is the same in form as the plural masculine of the demonstrative pronoun *tānju*. The more regular plural of *tānu* should have been on the analogy of the literary Dravidian languages *tāmu* or *tāmaru*, which, however, is not found.

The reflexive pronouns are not used in the first or second person in Kūi. An emphatic particle *ne* added to the pronoun gives it the force of a reflexive pronoun, *e.g.*—

> *Ānunē nāi ṭōṭi krāte,*—I cut my own throat, *lit.* I indeed cut my throat.

DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS.

In many languages relative proximity or remoteness of an object is denoted by the inflection of the voice, the higher pitch in which the demonstrative particle is uttered implying nearness and the lower tone remoteness of the object pointed out.

The following are the demonstrative particles in Kūi:—

> *i,* this (close at hand).
>
> *e,* that (close at hand).
>
> *a,* that (further away).
>
> *o,* that, yonder (furthest away).

These particles are lengthened to *ī*, *ē*, *ā*, and *ō*, respectively, for the sake of emphasis.

When used by themselves the particles are demonstrative adjectives, *e.g.*—

> *i lōku,* this man.
>
> *e āsa mīḍa,* that woman.

When the gender and number suffixes are added to the demonstrative particles, they become demonstrative pronouns or properly demonstrative nouns or nouns of relation, *e.g.*—

> *ivanju,* this man, namely, *he.*
>
> *eri,* this woman, or animal, or thing, namely, *she* or *it.*

The demonstrative pronouns, especially the set formed on the base *e*, are used as personal pronouns of the third person.

DECLENSION OF THE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN *e.*

Masc. Gender.

		Singular.	*Plural.*
Nom.	...	*evanju.*	*evaru.*
General Oblique, Genitive & Accus. cases.	}	*evan-i, evan-i-i, &c.* *evan-ni, &c.*	*evar-i, &c* *evar-ni, &c.*
Poss. Abs.	...	*evan-di*	*evar-di.*
Dat.	... {	*evan-ki* *evan-i-ki, &c.* *evan-ni-ki, &c.*	*evar-ki.* *evar-i-ki, &c.* *evar-ni-ki, &c.*

Neuter Gender.

	Singular.	Plural.
Nom.	... *eri*	*evi, eri-ska, evi-sk*
General Oblique, Genitive, & Accus. cases.	*era-ni, era-ni-i, &c.*	*eva-ni, &c.* *eri-ska-ni, &c.* *evi-ska-ni, &c.*
	era-i, &c.	*eva-i, &c.* *eri-ska-i, &c.* *evi-ska-i, &c.*
Poss. Abs.	... *eran-di.*	*evan-di, eri-ska-n-di,* *evi-ska-n-di.*
Dat.	*era-n-ki.* *era-ki.* *era-ni-ki, &c.*	*eva-n-ki, &c., &c.* *eva-ki, &c., &c.* *eva-ni-ki, &c., &c.*

Sbbal As each demonstrative base consists of a single vowel, when the gender suffix begins with a vowel, an euphonic *v* is generally inserted between the base and the suffix in order to prevent hiatus, *e.g.*—

E-v-anju, he.

But, *e-ri,* she or it.

In some of the dialects, for instance that spoken in Gūmsar, the rule of euphony is not strictly observed, and instead of *evanju, evaru,* we find *eanju, earu.*

A noun formed like the demonstrative pronoun on the base *ta* is sometimes used as an emphatic personal pronoun of the third person. It is also used to form compound nouns of relation or state, *e.g.*—

Tānju vēstenju, he said.

But, *Tānu* (or *tānunē*) *vēstenju,* he himself said.

Tānju (*mas.*) and *tāri* (*neuter*) are declined like *evanju* and *eri.*

The following are some examples of nouns of relation or state formed with *tānju, tāri* :—

Nāju tānju, a villager.

Vēgali tānju, a different man, another man.

Ro'i tānju, a bad man.

INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS.

There are two kinds of interrogative pronouns: (1) the *indefinite*, and (2) the *definite*.

Indefinite interrogatives.

The ordinary or indefinite interrogative pronouns are:—

Imba'e	
Umba'e	Who? Which?
Omba'e	
Ina	
Ena	What?
Ana	

The pronouns *imba'e, umba'e, omba'e*, appear to be formed from the adverbial nouns of place: *imba*, here, in this place; *umba*, where, in what place; *emba*, there, in that place. They are used for rational beings alone.

DECLENSION OF *imba'e*.

	Singular.	Plural.
Nom.	*imba'e.*	
General Oblique, Genitive, and Accus.	*imberi.*	
Poss. Absolute	*imberdi.*	Wanting.
Dat. ...	*imber-ki.* *imberi-ki, &c.*	

Imba'e, umba'e, omba'e, are used indiscriminately in both numbers and for both men and women. Their indefinite signification is apparent from the absence of separate forms to differentiate number and sex.

The neuter irrational and inanimate *ina, ena, ana*, is formed by suffixing the neuter formative *n* to the demonstrative particles *i, e, a*. The formative *n* is more abstract than the neuter formative *r*. A compound form is obtained by suffixing the particle *r* to *ina, ena, ana: inari, enari, anari*.

DECLENSION OF *inari*.

	1st form	2nd form.
Nom. ...	*ina.*	*inari.*
General Oblique, Genitive and Accus.	*ina*	*inara.*
Dat.	*ina-ki.* *ina-n-ki, &c.*	*inar(a)-ki.* *inar(a)-n-ki, &c.*

The plural is wanting. The final *a* of *inā* appears to be a neuter plural suffix, and it is therefore plural; the second form *inari* is singular. But whether they are singular or plural in their origin the two forms are used indiscriminately for both numbers.

The adjectival formative *i* appended to the base *in, en, an,* gives the interrogative adjective *ini, eni, ani, e.g.—*

> *Ni pada ini pada,—*what is thy name, *lit.* what name thy name.

Definite Interrogatives.

There is a class of words which we might call the definite interrogatives. They are:—

> (*i*) *Isti* or *iste*, which of these close by.
>
> *Esti* or *este*, which of those close by.
>
> *Asti* or *aste*, which of those further off.
>
> *Osti* or *oste*, which of those furthest away.

The generic signification of these words is—'which particular one or ones out of several,' *e.g.—*

> *Estanju,* which man, namely, who out of several.
>
> (*ii*) *Ise* or *ese*, how much, how many, how large or small.

This particle is used both as a definite interrogative and a definite demonstrative adjective. In the former case it asks for information, and in the latter it gives information as to number, quantity, or size, *e.g.—*

> *Ese lōku māneru,* how many persons are there (*def. interrog.*)
>
> *Ese se māneru,* there are several (*def. demons.*).
>
> (*iii*) *Ising,* how, what kind.

It asks for information as to kind or quality or manner, *e.g.—*

> *Isingtānju* or *ising vāka tānju,* what kind of a man.

When the gender suffixes are added to the particles *iste, este,* etc., which are adjectives, they become definite interrogative pronouns, or properly nouns, and are declined like the definite demonstrative pronouns formed on the base *i, e,* etc.

The crude forms *iste, este,* etc., are sometimes used without any variations for gender or number as a neuter definite interrogative

pronoun corresponding to the neuter indefinite interrogative pro-
noun, *ina*, *e.g.*—

> *Vāine vāine !* it comes, it comes !
> *Iste vāine ?* what thing comes ?

The difference between *iste* and *ina* in the above example
would be : *iste* would convey the idea—I am expecting several
things, *e.g.*, we are hunting and I am expecting deer and hare
and peafowl, etc., so I ask my companion which of these is com-
ing ; *·inā* would imply—I do not know what my companion
refers to, *e.g.*, we are going through a forest at dusk, and my
companion suddenly exclaims *vāine vāine !* I ask *ina ?* what ?
Is it a wild animal, or a robber, or a ghost, or what ?

Iste, este, etc., seem to be compounds of *ise, ese,* etc., and the
base *ta* which, as we have seen, is employed to form nouns of
relation. The component parts of *istanju, estanju,* etc., would be
ise + ta + nju, what (*number, quantity, size*) man, that is,
which man.

Ise, ese, are both adjectives and pronouns. But when they
are pronouns they do not add the gender suffixes, *e.g.*—

> *Ese se māneru,* there are several.

Ising in itself is an adjective and becomes a pronoun when
compounded with the particle *ta* with the gender suffixes, *e.g.*—

> *Ising tānju,* what kind of a man.

Indefinate Pronouns.

Though Kūi shows a scientific regularity in the formation of
its definite demonstratives and also its definite interrogatives, it in
very deficient in the expression of its indefinite pronouns, and
has recourse sometimes to circumlocution to state such concepts
as anyone, someone, etc.

The following are some indefinite pronouns :—

Imba'e āteka, umba'e āteka, omba'e āteka, any one, *e.g.*—

> *Imberi āteka ārmūrē,* call any one.

Imba'e, etc., are, as we have seen, indefinite interrogative pro-
nouns. *Āteka* is the conditional form of the impersonal *āte,* there

is or it is. *Imba'e āteka* means literally—who if there be, that is, if there by any one (*indefinite*).

Estanju āteka (*masc.*), *estari āteka* (*neuter*), some one, *e.g.*—

   Estani (or *estara*) *āteka ārmūrē*, call some one.

Estanju, *estari*, are definite interrogative pronouns and their literal meaning is—which one if there be, that is, if there be some one.

Ina or *inari ātekā*, anything, *e.g.*—

   Ina āteka ūh'ppa tañgi tāmū, bring anything to beat with.

Ina is the neuter of the indefinite interrogative pronoun and signifies what. *Ina āteka* means literally—what if there be, that is, if there be anything (*indefinite*).

Este or *estari āteka*, something, *e.g.*—

   Este āteka ūh'ppa tañgi tāmū, bring something to beat with.

Este and *estari* are the neuter of the definite interrogative pronoun, and signify—which one. *Este āteka* is literally—which one if there be, that is, if there be something·

It will be observed that *imba'e āteka, ina āteka*, are more indefinite than *estanju āteka, este āteka*.

The forms *inari* and *estari* are somewhat more explicit than the forms *ina* and *este* respectively.

The addition of the particle *vē* to the indefinite pronoun gives emphasis, *e.g.*—

   Ina ātekave uh'ppa tañgi tāmū rē, bring anything whatever
      to beat with.

This emphatic particle *vē* is always used in negative propositions with a negative force, so that the proposition has really a double negative. This is a Dravidian characteristic, *e.g.*—

   Imba'e ātekavē vāa'te, no one came.

Vēgatānju (*masc.*), *vēgatāri* (*neuter*), or *vēgalitānju* (*masc.*), *vēgalitāri* (*neuter.*), another one, a different one, some other one, some one else, *e.g.*—

   Vēgatānju nāñge vēstenju, some one else told me.

Vēɡa is a noun meaning different, *e.g.*, *vēɡa dina*, a different day. *Vēgali* is a neuter noun compounded of *vēɡa* and the

neuter suffix *h* (or *ri*). *Vēga* or *vēgali* compounded with the base *ta* and the gender suffixes yields the indefinite pronouns, *e.g.*—

> *Vēgatānju (masc.), vēgatāri (neut.), vēgalitānju (masc.), vēgali tāri (neut.),* a different one, another, some other.

Indefinite Adjectives.

The following are some of the indefinite adjectives. They generally perform the functions of pronouns without taking the gender suffixes :—

> *Dēha,* much, many, several.
> *Īke, īkōki, kōksi,* little, few.
> *Oṭe,* more.
> *Gūle,* all.
> *Rō,* one, a certain.
> *Rī,* two, both.
> *Jore (Uriya),* a pair, both.
> *Gōṇḍe (Uriya),* some.
> *Rō* and *rī* are sometimes declined like the demonstrative pronoun formed on the base *i, e,* etc., *e.g.*—
> *Rōanju, rōantānju (masc), rōari, rōantāri (neuter), Rīaru (masc.), rīavi (neuter).*

Gūle is sometimes compounded with the base *ta* and declined like the demonstrative pronoun, *e.g.*—

> *Gūletāru (masc.), gūletāvi· (neuter).*

Relative Pronouns.

There are no relative pronouns in Kūi. A remarkable characteristic of all the Dravidian languages is the absence of the relative pronoun. Its want is, however, compensated for by the peculiar employment of the relative or adjectival participle and participial noun, and the indefinite or interrogative pronoun in correlation with a definite demonstrative. This construction will be examined more fully in the chapter on the Verb.

CHAPTER IV.

THE VERB.

FUNCTIONS OF THE VERBAL ROOT.

In Kūi the verbal root or ultimate base is not a part of speech in itself. It becomes a verb or a noun by the agglutination of a particle—

First, when the action or state implied in the verbal root is referred to some subject or agent in a proposition, by the addition of certain particles, the compound word becomes a *finite verb.*

Secondly, when the action or state is expressed subjectively in itself, also by the addition of certain other particles, the compound word becomes a *verbal noun.* This verbal noun expresses not the abstract idea contained in the root but the act or state itself with certain specifications.

Thirdly, when the act or state is expressed as existing concretely in a being or agent, by the addition of another set of particles, the compound word becomes a *relative* or *adjectival participle.*

FINITE VERB.

The finite verb in Kūi is characteristically Dravidian in its structure for it is strictly agglutinative. To the verbal root or theme are suffixed in regular order the various specifying particles of negation, mood, and tense, together with the personal pronominal terminations by which gender, number, and person are denoted.

(1) Voice.

In Kūi as in all the Dravidian languages there is no *passive voice.* A construction which may be called a passive voice is sometimes made use of by joining the infinitive of the verb that expresses the state or action to the indeterminate or past tenses of the auxiliary verb *ā*, to be or become, in such expressions as :—

> *Vi tāna rūva āne,*—to-morrow the field will be ploughed *lit.* to-morrow the field to plough will be.
>
> *Kāma gīva āte,*—the work is done, *lit.* to do work it was

This construction is properly a *neuter-passive* because the passive signification will not be brought out if the subject of the auxiliary verb is a person.

The infinitive with the indeterminate tense of the auxiliary *ā*, to be or become, is, however, more an obligatory mood than a passive voice, for in the expression ' *viē ṭāna rūva āne* ' the real signification is 'to-morrow the field must be or ought to be ploughed.'

As in the literary languages the passive voice may be expressed idiomatically by the verbs *tīn*, to eat, *pān*, to obtain, etc., as in the following sentences :—

> *Māḍa tīnji*,—thou wilt be beaten, *lit.* thou wilt eat a beating.

> *Doṇḍo pātenju*,—he was punished, *lit.* he got punishment.

(2) *Form of the Verb.*

Affirmative and Negative forms.

The *affirmative* form of the verb is its natural form, that is, the form that consists of the root or theme and the various specifying particles of mood and tense with the personal pronominal terminations.

The *negative* form is obtained from the affirmative form by inserting the negative particle *a'* between the root or theme, and the particles of mood and tense *plus* the personal pronominal terminations, *e.g.*—

> *Gī–(n)-enju*, he does.
> *Gī'-enju*, he does not.
> *Gī-t-enju*, he did.
> *Gī-a'-t-enju*, he did not.

In Tamil the particle *al* negatives the attributes of a thing and the particle *il* its existence. The corresponding forms in Kūi are *a'* and *siḍ* respectively. The substantive verb in Kūi is *mān*, to be or exist, and its negative is *siḍ*, not to be or exist. Very curiously, *siḍ* adds *a'* in its past tense and becomes a double negative, *e.g.*, *siḍe*, it is not, but *siḍ-a'-te*, it was not.

The negative form of the verb is found in all the moods and tenses of the finite verb as well as in the relative participles, but not in the verbal nouns, that is, the infinitive and the present and past verbal participles. The latter are negatived by the addition of the negative substantive verb *siḍ*, e.g., *vāvatangi*, for the purpose of coming; *vāva-siḍ-a'-tangi*, for the purposes of not coming.

Reservative form.

There is a peculiar form of the verb in Kūi, which must be examined in this place. The particles *kā* and *tā* are suffixed to some transitive verbal roots or bases to signify that the agent of the action is brought into a certain state and allowed to remain in that state.

The particle *kā* denotes the *intention* of the agent of the action as regards the effect of the action, e.g.—

> *Ninge ūh'ĭ*,—I shall beat thee.

But, *Ninge ūh'kā'ĭ*,—I shall beat thee and leave thee lying there.

The particle *tā* expresses the *determination* of the agent to do the action in spite of a custom or order, e.g.—

> *Ninge ūh'ĭ*,—I shall beat thee.

But, *Ninge ūh'tā'ĭ*,—I shall beat thee whatever the consequences may be.

The particle *kā* is softened to *gā* when the verbal root or base ends in *l* or *n*, e.g.—

> *Sālgāmū*,—go away (and do not return).
> *Tĭngāmū*,—eat up (and finish it).

The Reservative form appears to have been berrowed from the Mūnda languages.

(3) *Mood.*

Mood is the manner in which a proposition is stated. It may be uttered as an *assertion* (indicative mood), as a *command* (imperative mood), as a *condition* or *hypothesis* (conditional or subjunctive mood), as a *wish* or *prayer* (optative or concessive mood).

Properly speaking, there is only one mood in Kūi, namely, the *Indicative*. The forms which correspond to the *Conditional*, the *Imperative*, etc., of other languages are really verbal compounds rather than moods·

(i) Indicative Mood.

There is no special particle of manner or mood characteristic for the purpose of expressing an assertion or denial in Kūi. The indicative mood form of the verb is therefore the root or theme *plus* the tense characteristic and personal pronominal terminations, *e.g.*, from the root *sī*, to give, we obtain *sī(n)*, the indeterminate tense-form, and *sīt*, the past tense-form, which on the personal pronominal terminations being added become full verbs of the indicative mood as follows :—

INDETERMINATE TENSE.

Affirmative Form.

			Singular.	Plural.
1st person	...		*Sī'-ī.*	*Sī-(n)-amu.*
2nd ,,	...		*Sī-di.*	*Sī-d-eru.*
3rd ,,	...		*Sī-(n)-e-nju* (masc.).	*Sī-(n)-eru* (masc.).
			Sī-(n)-e (neut.).	*Sī-(n)-u* (neut.).

Negative Form.

			Singular.	Plural.
1st person	...		*Sī'-e-nu.*	*Sī'-a-mu.*
2nd ,,	...		*Sī'-a-i.*	*Sī'-e-ru.*
3rd ,,	...		*Sī'-e-nju* (masc.).	*Sī'-e-ru* (masc.).
			Sī'-e (neut.).	*Sī'-u* (neut.).

PAST TENSE.

Affirmative Form.

			Singular.	Plural.
1st person	...		*Sī-t-e.*	*Sī-t-a-mu.*
2nd ,,	...		*Sī-t-i.*	*Sī-t-e-ru.*
3rd ,,	...		*Sī-t-e-nju* (masc.).	*Sī-t-e-ru* (masc.).
			Sī-t-e (neut.).	*Sī-t-u* (neut.).

Negative Form.

			Singular.	Plural.
1st person	...		*Sī-a'-t-e-nu.*	*Sī-a'-t-a-mu.*
2nd ,,	...		*Sī-a'-t-i.*	*Sī-a'-t-e-ru.*
3rd ,,	...		*Sī-a'-t-e-nju* (masc.).	*Sī-a'-t-e-ru* (masc).
			Sī-a'-t-e (neut.).	*Sī-a'-t-u* (neut.)

(ii) Imperative Mood.

For the utterance of a command to a second person the suffixes *mū* (*sing.*) and *dū* (*plu.*) are added for the affirmative form, and *a'ā* (*sing.*) and *a'tū* (*plu.*) for the negative form to the verbal root or theme, *e.g.*—

	Singular.	Plural.
2nd person ...	*Sī-mū*, give thou.	*Sī-dū*, give you.
2nd ,, ...	*Sī-a'ā*, give not thou.	*Sī-a'tū*, give not you.

The inclusive plural form of the indeterminate tense is often used as a first person plural of the imperative, *e.g.*—

Āju sāna,—You and I shall go; also,—let us go.

Āju sāl'a,—You and I shall not go; also,—let us not go.

(iii) Conditional and Subjunctive Mood.

A proposition in the conditional mood expresses a fact as depending on a given condition. The principal clause is that which states the fact and the dependent clause is that which expresses the condition.

In Kūi a conditional sentence is really a simple proposition containing one subject and one predicate, and the conditional clause is an adverbial phrase that modifies the predicate. This adverbial phrase is made up of the *indefinite* form of the verb in the past tenses and the suffix *kā*, *e.g.*—

Iru kāma gīte-kā ānu sā'ī,—If you work I shall go.

Evaru kāma gīte-kā ānu sā'ī,—If they work I shall go.

The literal meaning of *gīte-kā* seems to be: *gīte*, did, and *kā*, let it be (*kā*, the intensive form of *ā*, being used as a concessive), that is: *be it that* (*I*, *thou*, *he*, etc.) *did*.

As the conditional mood form is not a finite verb, the personal pronominal terminations are not suffixed to it, and it remains unaltered whatever the gender, number, and person of the conditional clause may be.

The adverbial phrase retains its force as a verb, and hence it may have a subject and if a transitive verb an object, *e.g.*—

Ānu kāma gīte-kā ḍeri ā'ī,—If I do work I shall become great.

If the subject of the conditional clause be the same as that of the principal clause, it is generally not expressed, *e.g.*—

 Ēhengi gīte-kā sādi,—If thou dost so thou shalt die.

 But, *Inu ēhengi gīte-kā ānu sā'ī,*—If thou dost so I shall die.

Adversative form of the Conditional Mood.

The adversative form of the conditional mood which is expressed in English by—'though', 'although', 'even if,' is made up by suffixing the particle *vē* to the conditional mood characteristic *kā, e.g.*—

 Iru kūte-kā-vē ānu sā'ī,—Although you demur I shall go.

Negative form of the Conditional Mood.

The negative form of the conditional mood is obtained in the usual way by inserting the negative particle *a'* between the root or theme and the tense characteristic, *e.g.*—

 Evaru kāma gī-a'-te-kā ānu sā'ī,—If they be not working, I shall go.

Subjunctive Mood.

Besides the conditional mood of dependent clauses, there is also a subjunctive mood in Kūi, which is used in the principal clause when an idea or imaginary contingency (Subjunctive Mood) is expressed instead of a positive or negative fact (Indicative Mood).

The subjunctive mood is formed by joining the present or past verbal participle that expresses the idea or imaginary contingency to the indeterminate tense of the verb *dū*, to continue, and appending the expletive *mā* or *māre, e.g.*—

  Evaru kāma gīa-se-kā ānu sāja dū'ī mā,—If they had been working, I might have gone (*a pure imaginary contingency*).

(iv) Optative and Precative or Concessive Mood.

The optative mood implies that the speaker expresses a wish or desire, and the precative or concessive mood that he asks or grants a favour or concession.

The optative and precative mood is formed by joining the infinitive, or noun, which expresses the wish or desire the speaker utters, or the favour or concession he asks or grants, to the particle *kā*, which becomes the base of an appellative verb. This appellative verb formed on the base *kā* indicates the person or thing affected by the wish of the speaker or by the favour he asks or grants, *e.g.*—

> *Gĭva kānu*, let me do—it is the desire of the speaker namely, myself, to do; and the first person *kānu* indicates that my wish is that *I* do.
>
> *Gĭva kādi*, mayest thou do—it is my desire that *thou* do.
>
> *Gĭva kānju*, may he do—it is my desire that *he* do.

Negative form of the Optative ana Precative Mood.

The negative form is obtained by prefixing the negative particles *siḍ-a'* to the appellative verb formed on the base *kā*, *e.g.*—

> *Gĭva siḍ-a'-kānju*,—may he not do.

The expletives *mā* and *māre* are added to the optative and precative mood form to signify that the wish or desire is unattainable, or that the favour or concession is not likely to be granted, or that the prayer has been previously refused, etc.

The following examples will show the difference in meaning of an expression with and without the addition of the expletives *mā* and *māre*:—

> *Nāju ki sālva kānu*,—let me go to my village (I do not want to stay longer—it is my wish to go home).
>
> *Nāju ki sālva kānu māre*,—would that I had gone to my village (for some reason I did not go—I cannot go now—or it would be useless my going now).
>
> *Pāla tīnba kānju*,—let him eat his rice (I wish him to eat his rice—please let him eat).
>
> *Pāla tīnba kānju māre*,—would that he had eaten his rice (I asked you to let him eat his rice; I left it here; and now the dog has eaten it up).

The addition of the emphasised or specialised form of the infinitive of *ā*, to be or become, namely, *āppa*, to the noun alters its meaning, *e.g.*—

> *Dēri kānu*, let me be big.

But, *Dēri āppa kānu*, let me become big.

The characteristic Dravidian law of hardening and doubling the sonant to its corresponding surd is seen very clearly in the following example:—

> *Vāva kādi māre,*—would that thou hadst come.
>
> *Vāppa kātti māre,*—why didst thou not come. (*a reproach*).

The optative and precative mood is sometimes used instead of the subjunctive, *e.g* —

> *Ānu sālva kānu māre āja dūne mā,*—If I had gone it might have taken place.
>
> *Ānu sāja se-kā āja dūne mā,*—If I had gone it might have taken place.

But there is a difference in meaning between the two expressions: the idea of the first is—I regret I did not go, for who knows if I had gone it might have taken place; and of the second—the taking place of the event was contingent on my going.

(4) *Tense.*

Formation of Tense.

In Kūi, as in all the Agglutinative languages, the action or state implied in the verbal root may be specified in respect to its occurrence in time by the suffixing to the root or base of a temporal particle or tense characteristic.

The tense-form, that is, the verbal root or base with the additional specifying particle of time, is the stem on which verbs as well as the relative participles and participial nouns are formed.

It is necessary to note here that there is a class of verbal roots ending in a consonant that insert the particle *i* between the root or base and the tense characteristic, *e.g.*, *pag*, to divide; present tense-form *pag-i-n;* past tense-form *pag-i-t.* This particle *i* is not found in the verbal nouns, *e.g.*, *pag-a*, to divide; *pag-i*, dividing; *pag-a*, divided; nor is it found in the imperative mood, nor in the negative form of the verb in the indicative mood.

Tenses of the Verb.

There are two kinds of tenses: the primary or simple tenses and the compound tenses.

Primary or Simple Tenses.

There are two primary tenses: a vague indeterminate tense implying the future as well as the present and the past (the aorist of Telugu grammarians), and a past which signifies an action or state as simply past without any further specification.

Indeterminate Tense.

The indeterminate tense is used (*i*) to express the future, (*ii*) to state general principles or universal truths, and (*iii*) to point out customs and habits not yet extinct, as well as regularly recurring actions and events, *e.g.*—

> *Ānu sā'ĭ*,—I shall go (*futurity*).
> *Ispor amaṅge mēh'ne*,—God sees us (*universal truth*).
> *Paherita kāma gĭnenju*,—he works on the road (*it is his regular occupation*).

There is no special tense characteristic for the indeterminate tense, and the bare root or theme is the tense-form. However, there is a peculiarity which must be noticed here: the first person plural and the third person singular and plural of the affirmative form of the verb, but not the negative are formed on a theme that ends in *n*—the relative participial theme, *e.g.*, *gĭ*, to do; *gĭ-n-amu*, we do; *gĭ-n-e*, it does; *gĭ-n-u*, they (*neut.*) do. It seems also as if the first person singular of the affirmative form of the verb is formed on the same theme in *n*, *e.g.*, *gĭ'ĭ*, I do, appears to be pronounced sometimes as *gĭ'ĭ*, that is, *gĭ-n'-ĭ*, the nasal being thrown back on the preceding vowel according to rule when the stopped sound—' occurs.

The absence of a particle denotative of time in the indeterminate tense-form is well calculated to imply that the action or state signified by the verbal root holds good of the future as well as the present and the past.

Another peculiarity must also be noticed. In the negative form of the indeterminate tense the negative particle *a*' disappears and only the stopped sound—' is added to the theme, *e.g.*—

> *Gĭ'enu*, I do not.
> *Gĭ'ai*, thou doest not.
> *Gĭ'enju*, he does not.
> *Gĭ'e*, she or it does not, etc.

Past Tense.

The past tense represents the action or state signified by the verbal root as having taken place without any reference to the time of our speaking, *e.g.*—

> *Ina vestenju,*—What did he say?

It is also used to express (*i*) events that have just happened, and (*ii*) past actions that have an abiding effect, *e.g.*—

> *Tise,*—I have *just* eaten.
> *Nāi miḍa sātenju,*—My child is dead.

The tense characteristic of the past tense is *t* (or *tt*), and in a few cases *s* (or *ss*), *e.g.*—

Root or base.	Past tense-form.
vā, come	*vā-t.*
mān, be or exist	*mā-s.*

As far as I have been able to gather, the following are the only verbs that form their past tense in *s* : —

Root or theme.	Past tense-form.
mān, to be or exist.	*mā-s.*
tīn, to eat.	*tī-s.*
pūn, to know.	*pū-s.*
vēn, to hear.	*vē-s.*
in, to say.	*i-s.*

Also, *sāl,* to go, an irregular verb, which has *sā-s.*

It should be noted that although the nasal is inherent in the root of *mān, tīn,* etc., it disappears in the past tense-forms, *mās, tīs,* etc.

The final *l* of *sāl* disappears in the indicative mood, but it is found in the imperative mood and in the negative form of the verb ; it is also found in the infinitive, but not in the verbal participles. Its past tense-form *sās* distinguishes it from the past tense-form *sāt* of the regular verb *sā,* to die.

Compound Tenses.

There are four compound tenses in Kūi:—

Present Definite.

The present definite is formed of the indeterminate tense of *mān,* to be or exist, or *siḍ,* not to be or exist, and the present

participle. It expresses the action of the verb as going on at the present moment, e.g.—

> Iru kāh'i mānjeru āmu sāi namu,—You are playing but we are dying.

Imperfect.

The imperfect is formed of the past tense of mān or siḍ and the present participle. It expresses the action as going on in some past time not then finished, e.g.—

> Nākuri teḍra kōju toṇe āh'pisŭ,—A dog and a cock were friends, lit. a dog and a cock were catching friend.

The imperfect is also used to express customs and habits that prevailed at a past time as well as recurring actions and events that took place in past time, e.g.—

> Pūrba dīna gānina lōkuni mūspi māsamu,—In former times we buried a human being, lit. in former days we were burying a human being.

Perfect.

The perfect is formed of the indeterminate tense of mān or siḍ and the past participle. It implies that the action is completed and the effect is still continuing, e.g.—

> Penḍika dīa māneru,—Crowds have gathered together (and are still here), lit. crowds have fallen.

Pluperfect.

The pluperfect is formed of the past tense of mān or siḍ and the past verbal participle. It implies that the action was completed before some other past act, e.g.—

> Prēki gāṭani āh'ppataṅgi sāsenju, prēki gāṭani pīnja senjŭ,— He went to catch the thief, but the thief had run away.

A shortened form of the substantive verb mān is generally used in the compound tenses; it is obtained by eliding the first syllable, e.g.—

> Gippki nji for gippki mānji, thou art doing.

Besides the four compound tenses there are two other tenses that are formed of the present and past tenses of the verb dū

to continue, and the present verbal participle, which may be called the present and past continuative tenses respectively :—

Present Continuative.

The present continuative tense denotes that the action is being continued at the present time, *e.g.*—

> *Ni mōno inarki i bogari gīppki dūdi*,—Why doest thou persist in this spite, *lit.* why doest thou continue doing in thy mind this spite.

Past Continuative.

The past continuative tense denotes that the action was being continued at some past time, *e.g.*—

> *Kūrma dīna dīnaki kāma gīppki dūte*,—The spider worke daily, *lit.* the spider continued working day to day.

It is also used to express a habit or custom in the past,—

> *Nāi dāḍa bahata lōh'ppi sava krāṇḍi vīppki dūte*,—I used to kill tigers when I was staying with my brother.

(5) Gender, Number and Person.

The personal pronominal terminations by which the gender, number, and person of the verb are expressed in Kūi are suffixed to the verbal theme in the same way as in the literary Dravidian languages. In some cases they have been so influenced by the primary root that they have shrunk into mere desinences and cannot be easily recognised in their modified shape.

The tense-form as we have seen performs two functions : (*i*) that of the finite verb, and (*ii*) that of the relative or adjectival participle.

The tense-form becomes a finite verb when the action or state implied in the verbal root is referred to some subject or agent in a proposition. The reference is made by suffixing the proper personal pronominal termination to the tense-form so as to make it agree with the subject of the proposition.

The following are the personal pronominal terminations of the affirmative and negative forms of the verb in the Indeterminate and past primary tenses of the Indicative mood :—

AFFIRMATIVE FORM.

Indeterminate Tense.

	Singular.	Plural.
1st person ...	— ĭ or *i*.	{ — (n)-*amu*. { — (n)-*aju* (incl. plu.).
2nd „ ...	{ — *d-i*. { — *j-i*.	{ — *d-eru*. { — *j-eru*.
3rd „ ...	{ — (n)-*e-nju* (masc.) { — (n)-*e* (neut.)	{ — (n)-*e-ru* (masc.). { — (n)-*u* (neut.).

Past Tense.

	Singular.	Plural.
1st person ...	— ĕ or *e*.	{ — *amu*. { — *a* (incl. plu.).
2nd „ ...	— *i*.	— *eru*.
3rd „ ...	{ — *e-nju* (masc.). { — *e* (neu.).	{ — *e-ru* (masc.). { — *u* (neu.).

NEGATIVE FORM.

Indeterminate Tense.

	Singular.	Plural.
1st person ...	— *enu*.	{ — *amu*. { — *asu* (incl. plu.).
2nd „ ...	— *ai*.	— *eru*.
3rd „ ...	{ — *e-nju* (masc.) { — *e* (neu.)	{ — *e-ru* (masc.) { — *u* (neu.).

Past Tense.

	Singular.	Plural.
1st person ...	— *enu*.	{ — *amu*. { — *asu* (incl. plu.).
2nd „ ...	— *i*.	— *eru*.
3rd „ ...	{ — *e-nju* (masc.). { — *e* (neu.).	{ — *e-ru* (masc.). { — *u* (neu.).

It should be noted:—

(*i*) that the neuter of the third person is different in form from what we have called the neuter gender-suffixes of the noun and the personal pronouns of the third person. In fact in the singular it appears to be an *indefinite* form,—that is, the form that does not denote either gender, number, or person. This indefinite form of the verb is used, as we have seen, in the conditional mood whatever the gender, number, and person of the verb may be ;

(*ii*) that in the negative form of the indeterminate tense, the particle *d* or *j*, which appears to be a pronominal fragment, disappears ;

(*iii*) that in the first person singular of the indeterminate and past tenses of the affirmative form of the verb the personal pronominal termination *i* and *e* respectively seem to contain *a nasal* for they are pronounced so sometimes, and the desinences are therefore really *ĩ* and *ẽ* which would be contractions of *ānu;*

(*iv*) that the first person plural of the indeterminate tense of the affirmative form of the verb is identically the same in form as the first person plural of the appellative verb, *e.g., gī-n-amu,—*we do, as well as,—we who do. This is a well-known characteristic of the literary Dravidian languages.

Verbal Nouns.

There are three regularly formed *verbal nouns* in Kūi. One of them has the force of the *infinitive,* and the other two of the *present* and *past verbal participles* respectively.

The verbal nouns are formed by the addition of a specifying particle to the verbal root or theme. The formation from the verbal root seems to be the exception rather than the rule. The theme on which verbal nouns are formed is the root *plus* the formatives *v* or *b* or *pp* for the infinitive, and the formative *k* or its euphonic equivalents *s* or *j* sometimes alone or sometimes in combination with the formatives *v* or *b* or *pp* for the present and past verbal participles.

A glance at the list of typical verbs given at the end of the section will show the peculiar shapes these formatives assume

either singly or in their combinations in the different classes of verbs:—

(1) The Infinitive.

The infinitive is formed by the addition of the suffix *a* to the root or theme, *e.g.*—

Root.	Formative.	Suffix.
pānd-	—	*a*, to send.
pīnj-	—	*a*, to run away.
lāk-	—	*a*, to worship.
gī-	*v-*	*a*, to do.
sī-	*v-*	*a*, to give.
vā-	*v-*	*a*, to come.
tīn-	*b-*	*a*, to eat.
un-	*b-*	*o*, to drink.
mān-	*b-*	*a*, to be or exist.
mēh'-	*pp-*	*a*, to see.
tōs-	*pp-*	*a*, to show.
tīs-	*pp-*	*a*, to feed.

In accordance with the characteristic Dravidian law, the sonants *v* and *b* are doubled and hardened to their corresponding surd *pp* in certain instances. The difference in use between the sonant and surd appears to be due in the first instance to euphony alone. But the hard form is employed in certain connections, as we have seen, for the purpose of emphasis or specialisation.

The principal rules to be observed in the ordinary use of the soft or hard form of the formative are:—

(*i*) When the root ends in the abrupt checked sound, the *v* is generally hardened to *pp*, *e.g.*, *mēh'ppa*, to see; *sah'ppa*, to beat; but *uh'va*, to plant.

(*ii*) When the root ends in a nasal, the soft form *b* is generally used instead of the soft form *v.*, *e.g.*, *tīnba*, to eat; *unba*, to drink; but *inja*, to say; *pānppa*, to send.

(*iii*) When the root ends in *s* the hard form *pp* is generally used, *e.g.*, *vesppa*, to speak; *tōsppa*, to show.

(*iv*) When the root ends in *g* the soft form *b* is generally
used, and the final consonant and the formative
change places, *e.g.*, *nōg* gives *nōbga*, to wash; *tōg*
gives *tōbga*, to kick.

(*v*) When the root ends in *k* the hard form *pp* is generally
used, and the final consonant and the formative
change places, *e.g.*, *kōk*, to sit, *kōppka*; *kāk*, to
laugh, *kāppka*; *lek*, to break, *leppka*; *dik*, to kill,
dippka.

(*vi*) Some verbs ending in *k* or adding a *k* in the indeter-
minate or past tense retain the *k* for the infinitive,
e.g., *nip* or *nipk*, to save, *nipka*; *bre* or *brek*, to
carry on the shoulder, *breka*.

As Kūi is not a cultivated language the rules I have tried to
formulate are not strictly observed. For instance in Tamil the
rule is for the formative to be soft *v* after *l ḷ* and *r ṛ*; but
in Kūi the infinitive of *vel*, to pull, is *velba* and not *velva*; of
nil, to stand, *nilppa* and not *nilva*; of *ur*, to drink, *ār*, to call,
mūr, to cut up, *kār*, to dig, *urppa*, *ārppa*, *mūrppa*, *kārppa*,
instead of *urva*, etc.

The use of the hard form of the particle for the purpose of
emphasis or specialisation has already been examined in the sec-
tion on Gender. The following illustration is repeated:—

I say to a servant, '*Kāma gīva taṅgi nājutari ārkamū,*—go
call the villagers to work'; not hearing me distinctly,
he asks '*inataṅgi*, for what?' I reply impatiently,—
'*Kāma gīppka taṅgi*, to work and for what else do
you think you dunderhead.'

The infinitive behaves like a noun, inasmuch as it takes the
case-suffixes *ki* and *taṅgi*, especially with verbs of motion, but
it is not regularly declined nor has it a plural, *e.g.*—

Soṭe soṭe tīnba nēgi a'e,—it is not good to eat frequently
(*nominative*).

Nākuri tīnbaki gūppki nenju,—the dog he runs to the feast
(*dative*).

Pala tīnba taṅgi ārkamū,—go call him to eat rice (*dative*).

The double function of the infinitive as a noun and as a verb is seen in the following examples:—

   (i) *Noun*: *Nāi tīnba tangi siḍe,*—There is no more food for me, *lit.* for my eating there is not.

   (ii) *Verb with a subject:* *Amu tīnba tangi siḍe,*—There is no eatable thing for me, *lit.* I to eat there is not.

   (iii) *Verb with an accusative:* *Nānge tīnba tangi siḍe,*—There is no evil spirit (or animal) to eat me, *lit.* there is nothing to eat me.

The negative form of the infinite is used in an idiomatic way as a finite verb in replying to a question, *e.g.*—

   Vātenju gina'e? Has he come?—reply: *a'e vāva siḍe,* instead of *vāa'tenju,* No, he has not come.

(2) *Verbal Participles.*

Two of the verbal nouns have the force of a present and a past verbal participle respectively:—

PRESENT VERBAL PARTICIPLE.

The formation of the present verbal participle appears to be analogous to that of the infinitive. A suffix *i* is added to the verbal root or theme, *e.g.*—

Root.	Formative.	Suffix.
pānd-	*a-*	*i*, sending.
pīnj-	*a-*	*i*, running away.
lāk-	*a-*	*i*, worshipping.
gī-	*ppk-*	*i*, doing.
sī-	*ppk-*	*i*, giving.
vā-	—	*i*, coming.
tīn-	*j-*	*i*, eating.
ūn-	*b-*	*i*, drinking.
mān-	*j-*	*i*, being or existing.
mēh'-	*pp-*	*i*, seeing.
tōs-	*pp-*	*i*, showing.
tīs-	*pp-*	*i*, feeding.

The particles that form the theme of the present verbal participle take such fantastic shapes (*vide* the list of typical verbs at the end of the section) that all attempts to reduce their formation

to definite rules have proved unsuccessful. Sometimes two forms
are found : for instance the ordinary present verbal participle of
rī, to cry, is *rīki*, but *rīppki* appears in the Chinna Kīmḍi dialect ;
again the ordinary form of *kāk*, to laugh, is *kāppki*, and of *kōk*,
to sit, is *kōppki*, but *kāki* and *kōki* also occur.

PAST VERBAL PARTICIPLE.

The genesis of the past verbal participle is as obscure as that
of the present verbal participle. The past verbal participle is
formed by adding the suffix *a* to the root or theme, *e.g.*—

Root.	Formative.	Suffix.		
pānḍ-	—	*a* ,	having	sent.
pīnj-	*j-*	*a* ,	,,	run away.
lāk-	*k-*	*a* ,	,,	worshipped.
gī-	—	*a* ,	,,	done.
sī-	—	*a* ,	,,	given.
vā-	*j-*	*a* ,	,,	come.
tīn-	*j-*	*a* ,	,,	eaten.
un-	*j-*	*a* ,	,,	drunk.
mān-	*j-*	*a* ,	,,	been or existed.
mēh'-	*h-*	*a* ,	,,	seen.
tōs-	*s-*	*a* ,	,,	shown.
tīs-	*s-*	*a* ,	,,	fed.

When the root ends in *j* or *s* or sometimes in *k* the final
consonant appears to be doubled to form the theme of the past
verbal participle, *e.g.*, *pīnj*, to run away, *pinjja*; *aj*, to fear, *ajja*.
Some roots ending in *h'* distinctly add another *h*, *e.g.*, *mēh'*, to
see, *mēh'ha*; *ūh'*, to beat, *ūh'ha*. Some roots ending in *k* add
s, *e.g*, *kāk*; to laugh, *kāksa*; *kōk*, to sit, *kōksa*.

The past verbal participle in Kūi sometimes forms the base
of a finite verb which is generally used in the first person singular
and is indeterminate in respect to time. This finite verb conveys
a signification different from that of the parent verb as the
following examples will show:—

From the root *vris*, to write, *lit.* to scratch, we get *vrisi'ī*,
I write; and from the theme *vrisa*, having written, we
get *vrisa'ī*, I shall write up. Similarly, *sī'ī*, I shall
give; *sīa'ī*, I shall give away; *vēsi'ī*, I shall speak ;
vēsa'ī, I shall speak for or intercede.

This finite verb formed on the past verbal participial theme may be compared with the reservative form of the verb in *kā* and *tā*.

The present and past verbal participles are used alone as adverbs. Their additional function is to form the compound tenses.

The present verbal participle alone or more often repeated has the force of an adverb, *e.g.*—

Jōppi jōppi kōppki senju,—He was sitting watching.

The past verbal participle is used in the characteristic Dravidian way to connect sentences or clauses together so that the necessity for the copulative conjunction 'and' is done away with, *e.g.*—

Iḍuki sālmū, sājjanai tambēsani ārmū, ārsanai nāi ḷahatani tāmū,—Go to the house and call my brother and bring him to me.

When used as a conjunctive participle, the past verbal participle invariably suffixes the particles *na-i, na-i-ka* or *naṅga*. These particles appear to be the relative participle of the verb *ā*, to be or become, in the oblique case, and the effect of their union with the past verbal participle is to convert it into an adverb (*vide* chapter on the Adverb):—

LIST OF TYPICAL VERBS.

Root.	Pres. participle.	Past participle.	Infinitive.
sī, *give*,	sī-ppki,	sī-a,	sī-va.
gī, *do*,	gī-ppki,	gī-a,	gī-va.
rī, *cry*,	rī-ki,	rī-a,	rī-va.
mī, *bathe*,	mī-ki,	mī-a,	mī-va.
dī, *fall*,	dī-ki,	dī-a,	dī-va.
vā, *come*,	vā-i,	vā-ja,	vā-va.
sā, *die*,	sā-i,	sā-ja,	sā-va.
ā, *become*,	ā-i,	ā-ja,	ā-va.
kū, *deny*,	kū-i,	kū-a,	kū-va.
rū, *plough*,	rū-i,	rū-a,	rū-va.
ḍo, *sleep*,	ḍo-ppi,	ḍo-sa,	ḍo-ppa.
ja, *want*,	ja-ppi,	ja-sa,	ja-ppa.
ār, *cry out*,	ār-ppi,	ār-sa,	ār-ppa.

Root.	Pres. participle.	Past participle.	Infinitives.
ūh', *beat,*	ūh'ppi,	ūh'ha,	ūh'ppa
toh', *tie up,*	toh'ppi,	toh'ha,	toh'ppa.
mēh', *see,*	mēh'ppi	mēh'ha,	mēh'ppa.
peh', *drive away,*	peh'i,	peh'ha,	peh'a.
gūh' *run,*	gūh'i,	gūh'ha,	gūh'a.
ves, *speak,*	ves-ppi,	ves-sa,	ves-ppa.
tōs, *show,*	tōs-ppi,	tōs-sa,	tōs-ppa.
tīs, *feed,*	tīs-ppi,	tīs-sa,	tīs-ppa.
tīn, *eat,*	tīn-ji,	tīn-ja,	tīn-ba.
pūn, *know,*	pūn-ji,	pūn-ja,	pūn-ba.
mān, *exist,*	mān-ji,	mān-ja,	mān-ba.
vaj, *cook,*	vaj-ji,	vaj-ja,	vaj-ja.
aj, *fear,*	aj-ji,	aj-ja,	aj-ja.
kāk, *laugh,*	*kā-pp-ki,*	kāk-sa,	*kā-pp-ka.*
kōk, *sit,*	*kō-pp-ki,*	kōk-sa,	*kō-pp-ka.*
lek, *break,*	*le-pp-ki,*	lek-sa,	*lepp-ka.*
nōg, *wash,*	*nō-b-gi,*	nōg-ja,	*nō-b-ga.*
tōg, *kick,*	*tō-b-gi,*	tōg-ja,	*to-b-ga.*
un, *drink,*	un-bi,	un-ja,	un-ba.
vel, *pull,*	vel-bi,	vel-ja,	vel-ba.
sol, *enter,*	sol-bi,	sol-ja,	sol-ba.
pān, *obtain,*	pān-ppi,	pān-a,	pān-ppa.
mū, *be able,*	mū-ppi,	mū-a,	mū-ppa.
aḍ, *be willing,*	aḍ-i,	aḍ-a,	aḍ-a.
toṇḍ, *begin,*	toṇḍ-i,	toṇḍ-a,	toṇḍ-a.
kōḍ, *buy,*	kōḍ-ai,	kōḍ-a,	kōḍ-a.
pāṇḍ, *send,*	pāṇḍ-ai,	pāṇḍ-a,	pāṇḍ-a.
pūṇḍ, *meet,*	pūṇḍ-ai,	pūṇḍ-a,	puṇḍ-a.
tak, *walk,*	tak-ai,	tak-ka,	tak-a.
mask, *change,*	mask-ai,	mask-ka,	mask-a.

RELATIVE OR ADJECTIVAL PARTICIPLE.

A marked characteristic of the Dravidian languages is the absence of the relative pronoun. Its want is supplied by the relative or adjectival participle and the noun derived from it.

The difference between the relative and the verbal participle is in this: the relative participle expresses the act or state implied

in the verbal root as in a being or agent, whereas the verbal participle expresses the same act or state in itself, *e.g.*—

> *Gīni* (*pres. rel. part.*), the doing (something), namely, the one that does; *gī-ti* (*past rel. part.*), the did (something), namely, the one that did; *gīppki* (*pres. verbal part.*), the (act of) doing; *giā* (*past verbal part.*) the (act of) having done.

There are two primary relative participles in Kūi: (*i*) the indeterminate tense participle in *ni*, and (*ii*) the past tense participle in *ti*. A combination of the two verbal participles with the relative participles of the substantive verb *mān*, to be or exist, and its negative *sid*, not to be or not to exist yields relative participles of all the compound tenses, *e.g.*—

> Indeterminate tense: *vāni lōku*, the man that comes, *lit.* the come-man.
>
> Past tense: *vāti lōku*, the man that came, *lit.* the came-man.
>
> Pres. definite: *vāi ni lōku*, the man that is coming, *lit.* the is-coming-man.
>
> Past Imperfect: *vāi si lōku*, the man that was coming, *lit.* the was-coming-man.
>
> Perfect: *vāja ni lōku*, the man that has come, *lit.* the has-come-man.
>
> Pluperfect: *vāja si lōku*, the man that had come, *lit.* the had-come-man.

The formation of the relative participle is analogous to that of the adjective, namely, by the suffixing of the adjectival formative *i* to the tense-form and making it a qualitative, *e.g.* from the indeterminate tense-form *vā(n)* we get *vā(n)-i*, the coming-(something), and from the past tense-form *vāt* we get *vāt-i*, the came-(something); similarly from *mān* are obtained the indeterminate tense participle *mān(n)-i*, the existing-(something) and the past tense participle *mās-i*, the existed-(something).

It will be observed that a nasal is inserted between the indeterminate tense-form which is the *root* or theme of the verb and the adjectival formative. It is not a tense characteristic, but an euphonic particle, for, as we have seen, there is no tense characteristic for the indeterminate tense-form.

The negative forms of the relative participle are obtained by inserting: (i) the negative particle a' between the root or theme and the tense characteristic *plus* the adjectival formative i for the primary tenses, e.g., gĭ-n-i lōku, the man that does; gĭ-a'-n-i lōku, the man that does not; gĭ-t-i loku, the man that did; gĭ-a'-t-i lōku, the man that did not; and (ii) by using the negative siḍ for the compound tenses, e.g , gĭppki ni lōku, the man that is doing; gĭppki siḍa'ni lōku, the man that is not doing.

We saw in the finite verb that the third person singular and plural, indeterminate tense, indicative mood, of the affirmative form of the verb is formed on a base in n, and that the nasal is not found in the corresponding negative form of the verb. It is to be noted that the n appears in both the affirmative and negative forms of the relative participle in the indeterminate tense.

As the negative of the substantive verb mān, to be or exist, is siḍ, not to be, not to exist, the negative of mānn-i, mās-i is siḍ-a'-ni, siḍ-a'-ti. The forms siḍ-a'-ni, siḍ-a'-ti, are double negatives.

Although the relative participle has the form of an adjective it retains its inherent force as a verb; and it may therefore have a subject, and if a transitive verb also a direct object; it may even sometimes be modified by an adverb.

The following examples will show the manner in which relative clauses are rendered in Kūi by the relative participle:—

Nominative case: *Eranju vēh'ha ni kṛānḍi*,—The tiger which he has killed, *lit.* the he-has-killed tiger.

Accusative case: *Evani vēh'ha ni kṛānḍi*,—The tiger which has killed him, *lit.* the him-has-killed tiger.

Genitive case: *Aba sāti kōganju*,—The boy whose father is dead, *lit.* the father-is-dead boy.

Dative case: *Evanju vājani iḍu*,—The house to which he has come, *lit.* the he-has-come-to house.

Ablative case: *Ānu vie mrāh'nu krāsa ni kūre*,—The knife with which I cut the tree yesterday, *lit.* the I-yester-day-have—cut-tree-with knife.

Locative case: *Ānu vēle dōsa si iḍu*,—The house in which I had slept formerly, *lit.* the I-had-formerly-slept-in house.

Intercourse with the Uriyas, whose construction as regards the relative clause is so radically different from that of the Kandhs, has influenced the latter in their mode of thought to a certain extent, so that, with the exception of the wildest tracts to which Uriya has not yet penetrated, the Kandhs frequently use the indefinite or interrogative pronouns in correlation with definite demonstratives or they split up the relative proposition into question and answer, instead of employing the characteristic Dravidian idiom of the relative participle, *e.g.*—

Correlation of interrogative and definite demonstrative pronouns. { *Umba'e sāji nenju evani ārkamū,*— Go call the man that is going, *lit.* who is going, go call him.

The more idiomatic rendering would be:—

Sājinani ārkamū,—Go call the one that is going.

Relative proposition split up into question and answer. { *Evani kraṇḍi vēh'ha ne gina'e, krāṇḍiti vih'ppa taṅgi sāna,*—Let us go and shoot the tiger that has killed him, *lit.* has not a tiger killed him, let us go to shoot the tiger.

The relative participial construction would be:—

Evani vēh'hani kraṇḍiti vih'ppataṅgi sāna,—Let us go to shoot the him-has-killed tiger.

APPELLATIVE VERBS.

There is a class of words in the Dravidian languages that are called appellative verbs. They are formed by suffixing the personal pronominal terminations to a noun or adjective. The appellative verbs are conjugated through every number and person, but they are restricted to indeterminate time, or properly to no time at all, as the idea of time is excluded from them.

In Kūi the appellative verb is constructed in the same way as in the other Dravidian languages, but the personal pronominal terminations are not identically the same in form as those of the finite verb.

F

The following are the personal pronominal terminations of the appellative verb :—

	Singular.	Plural.
1st person ...	*anu*	{ *amu.* *asu (incl. plu.).*
2nd ,, ...	{ *adi* *ati*	*aderu.* *ateru.*
3rd ,, ...	{ *anju (masc.).* *ari (neu.).*	*aru (masc.).* *avi (neu.).*

e.g.—

> *Ānu nēganu*, I am good.
> *īnu nēgati*, thou art good.
> *evanju nēganju*, he is good.
> *eri nēgari*, she *or* it is good.

It will be observed the appellative verb in the third person s identical in form with the appellative noun. *Nēganju* would therefore mean (*i*) the good man *or* good boy (*appellative noun*), and (*ii*) he is a good man *or* a good boy (*appellative verb*). The appellative verbs in the first and second persons may also be used as appellative nouns of those persons : accordingly *nēganu* means (*i*) I the good man (*appellative noun*) and (*ii*) I am good (*appellative verb*) ; and *nēgati* (*i*) thou the good man (*appellative noun*), and (*ii*) thou art good (*appellative verb*).

Sometimes the personal pronominal terminations are suffixed to the inflexional base in *n* of the noun. This is the more common form for the second person singular and plural of the appellative noun, and is, as we have seen, the idiomatic way of expressing the vocative case, *e.g.—*

> *E nēga-n-ti*, O thou good man.

Sometimes the particles *n-te* (*n.* being the inflexional base particle) are inserted between the noun or adjective and the personal pronominal terminations for the first and third persons, *e.g.—*

> *Ānu kūe-n-te-nu*, I am a Kūi.
> *Īnu kūe-n-te-ti*, thou art a Kūi.
> *Evanju kūe-n-te-nju*, he is a Kūi.
> *Eri kūe-n-te-ri*, she is a Kūi.

This form is uncommon in the third person.

The plural may also take the following form :—

Āmu kūi-ṅga-n̠-ḍ-amu, or *kūi-ṅga-n-amu.*
Iru kūi-ṅga-n̠-ḍ-eru, or *kūi-ṅga-n-eru.*
Evaru kūi-ṅga-n̠-ḍ-eru, or *kūi-ṅga-n̠-eru.*

The neuter *kūi-ṅga-ṇḍ-evi* or *kūi-ṅga-n̠-evi* for women does not seem to be used.

The relative or adjectival participial noun is conjugated like an appellative verb, and appears in both numbers and the three persons as well as in all the tenses of the verb, *e.g.*—

PRESENT TENSE.

Singular.

Gīnanu, I who do.
Gīnati or *Gīnanti,* thou who doest.
Gīnanju, he who does.
Gīnari, she or it who does.

Plural.

Gīnamu, we who do.
Gīnateru or *Gīnanteru,* you who do.
Gīnaru, they who do.
Gīnavi, they who do.

PAST TENSE.

Singular.

Gītanu, I who did.
Gītati or *Gītanti,* thou who didst.
Gītanju, he who did.
Gītari, she or it who did, &c.

Plural.

Gītamu, we who did.
Gītateru or *Gītanteru,* you who did.
Gītaru, they who did.
Gītavi, they who did, &c.

The infinitive of the verb is used as an adjective and compounded with the appellative noun formed on the word *gāṭa* to express a meaning that is somewhat different from that of the verbal root, *e.g.*—

Pūnba gāṭanti, O thou clever fellow.
But, *Pūnanti,* O thou who knowest.

VERBAL DERIVATES OR DERIVATIVE NOUNS.

These have already been considered in the Introduction. They are formed in various ways :—

    (1) By the addition of a formative to the verbal root, *e.g.*—
        ko-mbo, a sept, from the root *ko,* to out.
        vej-gu, fuel, from the root *vaj,* to cook.
        paṅgeni, plank, from the root *paq,* to divide.

(2) By the infinitive of the verb, *e.g.*—
>   *tisppa*, a feast, *lit.* to feed.
>   *timba*, a feast, *lit.* to eat.

(3) By the infinitive of two synonymous verbs, *e.g.*—
>   *sah'ppa kosppa*, assault, *lit.* to beat, to kill.

(4) By the present participle and infinitive of the verb, *e.g.*—
>   *vesppi vesppa*, conversation, *lit.* sayiny to say.

CHAPTER V.

THE ADVERBS.

The adverb is formed in practically the same way as the adjective from nouns and verbs.

(1) Nouns of quality or relation in the nominative, dative, ablative, or locative case are used as adverbs. They are placed before the verb they modify. Sometimes they are preceded by another noun which qualifies them. These adverbs may be divided into :—

(*i*) Adverbs of place, *e.g.*—

> *Imba,* here; *imbata,* in this place.
> *Emba,* there; *embata,* in that place.
> *Umba,* where; *umbata,* in what place.
> *Imbanki,* hither, to this place.
> *Embanki,* thither, to that place.
> *Umbanki,* whither, to what place.
> *Imbateka,* hence, from this place.
> *Embateka,* thence, from that place.
> *Umbateka,* whence, from what place.

These series of adverbs are formed with much symmetry from the demonstrative particles *i, e, u,* as bases with the common Dravidian formative *mb* as a suffix, and the compound words become nouns of place.

Some other adverbs of place are :—

> *Sendo,* above; *sendota,* in the place above; *sendoki,*
> to the place above; *sendoteka,* from the place
> above.
> *Nede,* below, etc.
> *La'i,* inside, etc.
> *Ve'o, ve'oti, veto,* after (in place), etc.
> *Ine,* this side, etc.
> *Ene,* that side, etc.

A correlative adverbial clause of place is rendered by the relative or adjectival participle with the noun *baha*, place (*vide* the subordinate clause in Part III).

(*ii*) Adverbs of time, *e.g.*—

Ese vela, when.
Idali, now.
Eseka, ever.
Esekave, never.
Vēle, before.
Purba dīna, formerly.
Da'u, da'u-ki, after (in time).
Neenju, to-day.
Vie, to-morrow.
Reesi, yesterday.
Rāndu, last year.
Vega dīna, every day.
Ronisi, one day.

A circumstantial adverbial clause of time is rendered by the relative or adjectival participle with the particle *va* (*vide* subordinate clause in Part III).

(*iii*) Adverbs of quantity, *e.g.*—

Deha, much.
Ike, ikoli, ikoka, koksi, little.
Ote, more.
Ese, how much.

(*iv*) Adverbs of manner, *e.g.*—

Deha, very.
Donde, soon.
Vide, in vain, for nothing.
Sāra Sāra, quickly.
Krẽ krẽ, loudly.
Ehengi,
Dehengi, } like, as.
Isingi, how.

A correlative adverbial clause of manner is rendered by *dehengi*, alike, as, (*vide* the subordinate clause in Part III).

(2) The present verbal participle repeated, or the past verbal participle with the relative participial suffixes *nai, naika,* or

ananga of the verb *a*, to be or become, are used as adverbs. These adverbs are generally adverbs of manner, *e.g.*—

> *Gūh'i gūh'i vātenju*, he came running, *lit.* running running he came.

> *Ria naika ārtenju*, he called out crying, *lit.* having cried he called out.

(3) Some nouns of quality or relation are turned into adverbs of manner by adding the relative participle suffix *nai*, *naika*, *ananga* of *a*, to be or become, *e.g.*—

> *Nēganai* or *nēganaika vēsmū*, speak well, *lit.* it having been well speak.

(4) Some nouns of quality or relation compounded with the past participles of *a*, to be or become, *gī*, to do, *sī*, to give, &c., become adverbs of manner, *e.g.*—

> *Māni āja naika vēsmū*, speak obediently, *lit.* having become obedient speak.

> *Ēḻu gīanai vēsmū*, speak wisely, *lit.* having done wise speak.

> *Mōno sīanai kama gīmū*, work willingly, *lit.* having given your mind work.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CASE-SUFFIXES OR POSTPOSITIONS.

We have seen the formation and use of the case-suffixes in the chapter on the Noun. They may be divided into two classes :—

    (1) the inflexional increment or general oblique case-sign, and

    (2) the auxiliary case-suffix which is in fact a noun.

The various inflexional increments and their combinations have been given in the chapter on the Noun.

The following is a list of the principal case-suffixes :—

    ki, to, towards.

    tangi,
    tingi, } towards, for the purpose of, on behalf of.
    tiki,

    gēlu,
    gēli, } on account of.

    sendo, above.

    nēde, below.

    kui, *kuili*, upon.

    langi, under.

    mūo, *mūo-ta*, in front of, before.

    veo, *veo-ta*, at the back of, behind.

    baha, *baha-ta*, near.

    teka, from.

    dai, *rai*, *tai*, by means of, through.

    ta, in.

    lai, *laita*, inside.

    kee, with.

CHAPTER VII.

CONJUNCTIONS.

Kūi is somewhat weak in conjunctions. Subordinate clauses which are introduced by a conjunction in the Indo-Aryan languages are generally rendered in Kūi by an adverbial phrase (*vide* the manner of rendering subordinate clauses in Part III).

The following are the various ways in which words or sentences are joined together :—

(1) *Copulative Conjunction.*

The particle *oṭe*, more, is sometimes used as a copulative conjunction, especially to link words together in an enumeration, *e.g.*—

> *Ānu, oṭe nāi dada, oṭe nāi tambēsa, oṭe nāi mrienju, sāna,*—I and my elder brother and my younger brother and my son will go.

Oṭe is seldom used as a co-ordinate conjunction to connect propositions together. The more idiomatic way of connecting co-ordinate sentences is to repeat the verb in each proposition but the last in the past participle, especially when simple priority of one action over another is denoted, *e.g.*—

> *Sāse, sājanai mēh'te, mēh'hanai vēste,*—I went, having gone I saw, having seen I said, instead of *sāse oṭe mēh'te oṭe vēste,*—I went and I saw and I said.

The adverb *embateka*, and then, *lit.* from there, is sometimes used as a co-ordinate conjunction to connect propositions when a sequence of events is denoted, *e.g.*—

> *Sāsenju, sāja nai prēki gāṭani āh'tenju; embateka nājutāru vāteru, vāja nai prēki gaṭani uh'teru,*—he went and caught the thief; and the villagers came and beat the thief.

The emphatic form of *oṭe*, namely, *oṭege*, also, moreover, is used as a copulative conjunction.

(2) *Disjunctive Conjunction.*

There is no disjunctive conjunction. A disjunctive sentence like—"He neither came nor saw" would be rendered thus:—

"*Vāa'tenju mēh'a'tenju,*—He did not come he did not see."

(3) *Conditional Conjugation.*

We have seen the formation of the conditional mood in Kūi. The particle *ka*, which is added to the indefinite form of the past tenses of the verb of the conditional clause, may be called the conditional conjunction, *e.g.*—

Ehengi gīte-kā sādi,—If thou doest so thou shalt die.

The adversative form of *kā* is *kāve, e.g.*—

Ehengi gīte-kāve sādi,—Although thou doest so thou shalt die.

(4) *Causal Conjunction.*

The causal conjunction is the dative case suffix *ki* appended to the past tenses of the relative participle of the verb of the causal clause, which in fact becomes an adverb (*vide* the causal clause), *e.g.*—

Ehengi gīta-ki sātenju,—Because he did so he died.

(5) *Temporal Conjunction.*

The temporal conjunction is *va*, which appears to be the infinitive of *ā*, to be or become; it is suffixed to the relative participle of the verb of the temporal clause, and the compound word becomes an adverb (*vide* the circumstantial clause of time), *e.g.*—

Vēspi sā-va rītenju,—He cried while he was speaking.

(6) *Adversative Conjunction.*

The adversative conjunction is *maska*, but; it is, however, seldom used, *e.g.*—

Vātenju maska sāsenju,—He came, but he went away.

The more idiomatic way of rendering this would be by repeating the verb of the subordinate clause in the adversative form of the conditional mood, e.g.—

> *Vātenju vāte-kā-vē sāsenju,*—He came: although he came, he went away.

(7) *Restrictive Conjunction*.

The following is a restrictive conjunction:— *ese rai*, as far as, as much as, e.g.—

> *Ese rai pũ'ĭ nēganju,*—As far as I know he is a good man.

(8) *Comparative Conjunction*.

The adverb *deheṅgi*, like, as, is used as a comparative conjunction; it is suffixed to the relative participle of the verb of the subordinate clause (*vide* the correlative clause of manner), e.g.—

> *Kōdi tīnni deheṅgi kāma gīnenju,*—He works as a cow grazes.

(9) *Final or Conclusive Conjunction*.

The final or conclusive conjunction is the dative case suffix *taṅgi*, for the purpose of, added to the infinitive of the verb of the final clause (*vide* the final clause), e.g.—

> *Anu tīnba taṅgi pāla tāmŭ,*—Bring the rice in order that I may eat, *lit.* for me to eat.

CHAPTER VIII.

INTERJECTIONS.

The following are some of the interjections:—

e !,	o! (*address*).
uh !,	oh! (*an exclamation of annoyance*).
aigo !, *aĭke !,*	} alas.
aba !,	father!
ia !,	mother!
sa !,	come along!
ă !,	yes! (*affirmative particle*).
a'e !,	no! (*negative particle*).

PART III.

SYNTAX.

MATTERS that properly belong to Syntax have been examined and discussed in the principal or etymological part of the grammar, as this method of treatment was found to be more convenient. It is necessary to note here one or two points that have not been considered as yet : —

THE ARRANGEMENT OF WORDS IN A SENTENCE.

The arrangement of words in a sentence is as follows :—

the sentence begins with the nominative case or subject and ends with the verb or predicate ;

the adjective precedes the noun it qualifies and the adverb or adverbial phrase precedes the verb it modifies ;

the direct and the indirect object, together with the qualitatives, precede the predicate ; and

a noun in the genitive case precedes the word it governs.

The following sentence is an illustration :—

Dādani (*genitive*) kōgi (*adjective*) mrīenju (*subject*) sāki-gātani (*indirect object*) pala (*direct object*) vēga dīna (*adverb*) sīnenju (*predicate*),—(My) brother's little son gives rice every day to the hungry man.

THE MANNER IN WHICH SUBORDINATE CLAUSES ARE RENDERED.

In the agglutinative languages a proposition is essentially a simple sentence which contains one subject and one predicate; and all the subordinate clauses are merely explicitations or amplifications of the subject or the predicate. This is seen very clearly in Kūi, for the idiomatic way to render subordinate

clauses in that language is to convert them into adverbs or
adverbial phrases. In fact, an accurate speaker goes even so far
as to subordinate all but the last of a string of co-ordinate
sentences to the final sentence when simple priority of one
action over another is denoted (*vide* the copulative conjunction),
e.g.—

> *Sāse, sājanai mēh'te, mēh'hanai vēste,*—I went and I saw and
> I spoke, *lit.* I went, having gone I saw, having seen
> I spoke.

Relative Clause.

The type of the subordinate clause is the relative clause.
We have examined fully how the relative clause is rendered (*i*)
by the relative or adjectival participle or participial noun, (*ii*)
by the indefinite or interrogative pronoun used in correlation
with a definite demonstrative, and (*iii*) by the splitting up of
the relative clause into question and answer. All the circum-
stantial clauses of time, place, manner, etc., can be rendered,
more or less, in all these three ways; the first way being, of
course, the most idiomatic and in consonance with the genius of
the language.

Besides the relative clause and the conditional clause, the
construction of which we have already examined in detail, the
following are the various subordinate clauses :—

Circumstantial Clause of Time.

A circumstantial clause of time is rendered idiomatically by
the relative or adjectival participle with the addition of the
particle *va*, the compound word becoming an adverbial phrase,
e.g.—

> *Vēsppi sava rītenju,*—He cried while he was speaking.

The particle *va* appears to be the infinitive *ava* of the verb
ā, to be or become.

Concomitance is also expressed by the temporal particles *ise-ka*,
when let be,—*ese-ka*, then let be, used in correlation with each
other, *e.g.*—

> *Sāhebenju iseka vānenju eseka pala kūsa tāmū,*—Bring the
> food as soon as the saheb arrives.

The same sentence may also be rendered by repeating the verb of the subordinate clause in the past participle, *e.g.*—

    Sāhebenju vānenju vāja naika pala kūsa tāmū, lit. the saheb will come, having come bring the food.

When priority of time is implied in the subordinate clause the verb is put in the past participle, *e.g.*—

    Pala kūsa tīnja nai ka vāmū,—Come when thou hast eaten thy food, *lit.* having eaten the food come.

Causal Clause.

A causal clause is expressed by the past tenses of the relative or adjectival participle with the dative case-suffix *ki*, the compound word becoming an adverbial phrase, *e.g.*—

    Ehengi gīta-ki sātenju,—Because he did so he died.

Another way of expressing the same is by the infinitive of the verb with the particle *ne*, *e.g.*—

    Ehengi gīva-ne sātenju,—On doing so he died.

The particle *ne* appears to be *āne,* the indefinite form of the indeterminate tense of the verb *a*, to be or become, and the literal meaning of the sentence is, to do thus it is he died.

Sentences containing causal clauses are sometimes split up into co-ordinate propositions, *e.g.*—

    Ehengi gītenju ēgeli sātenju,—He did so, on that account he died.

Final Clause.

The final clause in a sentence is rendered by the infinitve with the dative case-suffix *tangi*, *e.g.*—

    Ānu tīnba tangi pala tāmū,—Bring the rice in order that I may eat, *lit.* I, for the purpose of eating, bring the rice.

The final clause may also be put in the optative mood, the sentence being split up into co-ordinate clauses, *e.g.*—

    Pala tāmū tīnba kānu,—Bring the rice, let me eat.

Restrictive Clause.

A restrictive clause which is introduced by such words as—as for . . . . as far] as . . . . with regard to . . . . , etc., is rendered as a co-ordinate clause with the modifying phrase *eseṛai*, by this much, *e.g.*—

> *Eseṛai pǖ'ĭ ejoki sāsenju,*—As far as I know he went home.

The more idiomatic way is by the use of the infinitive, *e.g.*—

> *Nāi pūnba ejoki sāsenju,*—To my knowing he went home.

Correlative Clause of Manner.

The adverb *dehengi*, like, is suffixed to the relative or adjectival participle in the subordinate clause to express correlation, *e.g.*—

> *Kōḍi tīnni dehengi kāma gīnenju,*—He works as a cow grazes.

Correlative Clause of Place.

The relative or adjectival participle qualifying the noun *baha*, place, is used idiomatically as a correlative clause of place, *e.g.*—

> *Evaru mrāh'nu krāsa si bahata kōktenju,*—He sat down there where they had cut the tree.

The sentence may also be rendered by co-ordinate clauses with the correlative adverbs of place : *umba*, where ; *emba*, there, *e.g.* —

> *Umba mrāh'nu krāsa seru emba kōktenju,*—Where they had cut the tree there he sat down.

DIRECT AND INDIRECT FORM OF SPEECH.

There is no indirect form of speech in Kui. The words of a third person must be left as he repeated them, *e.g.*—

> *Vie sā'ĭ inji rēstenju,*—He said he would go to-morrow, *lit.* I shall go to-morrow saying he said.

The following sentence is rendered idiomatically by the direct form of speech :—

> *Mūnda tūh'ĭ inji nājutānju taki taki sāsenju,*—A villager was going along to throw up an embankment, *lit.* saying I shall throw up an embankment a villager was going along.

APPENDIX.

First, the personal pronouns of the first and second persons, which
of all words are the least liable to change and decay, are undoubtedly
Dravidian, as the following comparative table will show:—

FIRST PERSON.

Singular.

Tamil.	Canarese.	Telugu.	Kūi.
nān, (*colloquial*)	nānu, (*colloquial*)	nēnu, (*colloquial*)	ānu,
yān, nān, } (*classical*)	ān, yān, } (*classical*)	ēnu, ē, } (*classical*)	

Plural.

nām, nāṅgal, } (*colloquial*)	nāvu, (*colloquial*)	mēmu, manamu, } (*colloquial*)	āmu,
yām, nām, } (*classical*)	ām, avu, } (*classical*)	ēmu, (*classical*)	āju, (*inclusive plural*).

SECOND PERSON.

Singular.

nī, nīy,	nīnu, (*colloquial*) nīn', (*classical*)	nīvu,	īnu,

Plural.

nīr, nīyir, nīvir, nīṅgal,	nīm, īr, (*termination*) nīvu,	mīru, īru,	īru,

Secondly, the numerals, which are also a persistent set of words in a
family of languages, are unmistakably Dravadian:—

	Tamil.	Canarese.	Telugu.	Kūi.
one,	oṉru	ondu	okaṭi	roṇḍe
two,	iraṇḍu	eraḍu	reṇḍu	riṇḍe
three,	mūṉru	mūru	mūḍu	mūnji
four,	nālu, nāṅgu	nāluku	nālgu	nālgi
five,	aindu, aiñju	aidu	aidu	singi
six,	āru	āru	āru	sājgi
seven,	ēru	ēḷu	ēḍu, ēḷḷu	oḍgi
eight,	eṭṭu	eṇṭu	enimidi	aṭa
nine,	onbadu	ombatu	tommidi	no (*Uriya*)
ten,	pattu	hattu	padi	doso (*Uriya*)

Thirdly, root-words that originated most likely in primitive times are found in Kūi is almost the same form in which they exist in Tamil and Canarese, more especially in the ancient or classical dialects.

(*i*) The names of the more prominent parts of the human body—

Tlau, the head : *Tam.* talai, *Can.* tale, *Tel.* tala.

Kanu, the eye : *Tam.* kaṇ, *Can.* kaṇṇu, *Tel.* kannu.

Mū, the face : *Tam.* mūñji, *Can.* môṛe, *Tel.* mūti.

Mūṅgeli, the nose : *Tam.* mūkku, *Can.* mūgu, *Tel.* mukku. The root of all these cognate words is *mōr* or *mō, to smell.*

Palu, a tooth : *Tam.* pal, *Can.* hallu, *Tel.* pallu.

Kriu, the ear : *Tam.* śevi, *Can.* kivi, *Tel.* chevi.

Kaju, the hand : *Tam.* kai, *Can.* kai, *Tel.* chey.

Vāṅgosi, the tongue : *Tam.* nā, nākku, *Can.* nālige, *Tel.* nālika. *Vaṅgosi* seems to be derived from the Dravidian word *vāy, the mouth* ; while the Tamil, Canarese, and Telugu terms are from the Dravidian root *nakku, to lick.*

(*ii*) The names of the simple family relationships —

Aba, tānji, father : *Tam,* appa, tandai, *Can.* appa, tande, *Tel.* abba, taṇḍri.

Ia, taḍi, mother : *Tam.* tāy, annai, *Can.* tāyi, *Tel.* talli. In classical Tamil we find *āyi* or *āy* for *mother, matron, lady.*

Ake, grandfather : *Tam.* tāta, pāṭṭaṇ, *Can.* tāta, *Tel.* tāta. In Tamil *akkai, akka, akkāl,* and in Canarese and Telugu *akka,* mean *an elder sister.*

Ata, grandmother : *Tam.* pāṭṭi, *Can.* ajji, *Tel.* avva. In classical Tamil *attai, āttāl,* mean a mother.

Mrienju, a son : *Tam.* magan, *Can.* maganu, *Tel.* koḍuku.

Mrau, a daughter : *Tam.* magaḷ, *Can.* magaḷu, *Tel.* kūturu. The Gond words for *son* and *daughter* are : *marri* and *miar* respectively. In Kūi the verbal root *mar* means *to give birth to.* In Canarese *maṛi* means the young of any animal ; it also means *a young child, a shoot, a sapling* ; *maṛi koḍu* means *to bring forth young, to cub.*

Ambesa, tambesa, younger brother : *Tam.* tambi, *Can.* tamma, *Tel.* tammuḍu.

(*iii*) Words denoting the most common actions of every day life—

Vā, to come : *Tam.* vā, *Can.* bā, *Tel.* rā.

Sal, to go : *Tam.* śel (classical), pō, *Can.* hōgu, *Tel.* pō. The Telugu *chellu* and the Canarese *sal* mean *to enter upon a course, to be current* ; the Tamil word *śel* is also used in this meaning.

Tin, to eat : *Tam.* tin, *Can.* tinnu, *Tel.* tinu.

Un, to drink : *Tam.* uṇ (*classical*), kuḍi, *Can.* kuḍi, *Tel.* trāgu.

Sā, to die : *Tam.* śā, chā, *Can.* sā, *Tel.* chā.

In, to say : *Tam.* en, *Can.* annu, *Tel.* anu.

Ves, to speak ; *Tam.* pēśu, *Can.* mātāḍu, *Tel.* mātlāḍu.

Sol, to speak : *Tam.* śol, *Can.* hēḷu.

Gi, to do : *Tam.* śey, chey, *Can.* gey (*classical*), māḍu, *Tel.* chey.

Ri, to cry : *Tam.* aṟu (to weep), irai (to cry out), *Tel.* ēḍu.

Nil, to stand : *Tam.* nil, *Can.* nillu, *Tel.* nilu.

Mi, to bathe : *Tam.* muṅgu, mūṟgu, *Can.* mīy, munugu, *Tel.* muṇugu.

Aj, to fear ; ass, to frighten : *Tam.* añju, achchappaḍu, *Can.* aṁjike (fear), bayapaḍu, *Tel.* amjika (fear).

Kokk, to sit down : *Tam.* uṭkār, *Can.* kūr, koru, *Tel.* kuko kūkkonuṭa.

Ā, to be *or* become : *Tam.* ā, āgu, *Can.* āgu, agu, *Tel.* aguṭa, kā, avuṭa.

Mān, to be *or* exist, and its negative siḍ, not to be *or* not to exist : *Tam.* iru and il, *Can.* iru and il, *Tel.* unḍu and lē. It is curious that Kūi should diverge so much from the literary languages in such a fundamental word as the substantive verb. The primary meaning of *iru, unḍu,* is *to sit,* that is, *to be without doing anything,* hence *to exist.* The root *maṇ* in classical Tamil signifies *that which has position, that which is spread out,* hence *the ground* or *the earth ;* as a verb it means *to remain, to abide,* hence the derivative noun *manai, a house.* The Kūi word *māṇ* seems to be radically the same as the classical Tamil *maṇ.* The negative *siḍ* although seemingly different from *il* appears to be really another form of the word = Tamil *l* becomes *ḍ* in Kūi (compare Tamil *il, a house*

and Kūi *iḍu*; Tamil *vil*, *a bow*, and Kūi *viḍu*; Tamil *pāl*, *milk*, and Kūi *pāḍu*). Now Kūi sometimes prefixes *s* to certain Dravidian words that begin with a vowel, *e.g.*, Tamil *ēr*, Canarese *ēru*, *a plough*, become *sēru* in Kūi; Telugu *i*, *to give*, becomes *si* in Kūi; Telugu *ai*, *five*, and *aj*, *aji*, *six*, become *siñgi* and *sajgi*, respectively, in Kūi. In Kūi itself *ēlu* and *sēlu*, *wisdom* or *mind*, *oṭe* and *soṭe*, *and* or *again*, are instances of two forms of the same word. Hence Kūi *siḍ*, *not to be*, is another form of *iḍ* or its equivalent the Tamil and Canarese *il*.

(*iv*) The names of natural objects:—

Pēṇu, a god: in the literary languages the Sanskrit derivatives *devu*, *devan*, etc., are the only words found to denote the deity. The Dravidian root *pēṇ* means *to cherish*, *to love*, hence *to worship*.

Vela, the sun: the pure Dravidian term is *nāyiṛu* or *ñāyiṛr*, but all the literary languages have adopted the Sanskrit derivatives *suriya*, *suriyam*, etc., *vela* in Kūi and *veyil* in Tamil mean really *the sunlight*, and both are of course Sanskrit derivatives. When the sun is referred to as a deity by the Kandhs the word *dormo* is used: *dormo pēṇu*, *the sun-god* or *creator* (compare *darmi* of the Oraons and *darme* of the Maler or Rajmehal Paharias with this word).

Danju, the moon: this is not traceable to the Dravidian word *tiṅgal*, *the moon*. But the expression *tiṅgal danju* in Kūi means the *crescent moon*. As a deity the moon is *chāndo* in Kūi; *chando pēṇu*, *the moon-god*.

Suka, a star: *Tam.* sukkai (literally a spot), *Can.* chukke, *Tel.* chukka.

Mrah'nu, a tree: *Tam.* maram, *Can.* mara, *Tel.* mānu or mrānu.

Pūju, flower: *Tam.* pū, *Can.* pū, pūva, *Tel.* pū.

Kau, fruit: *Tam.* kani (classical), *Can.* haṇṇu, *Tel.* paṇḍu The root *kanuṭa* in Telugu means *to bear* or *bring forth* (*young* or *fruit*).

Soru, hill: *Tam.* kunṛu, *Can.* guḍḍa, guṭṭu, *Tel.* gutta, guṭi, konḍa. *Gonḍa* or *konḍa* is used in Kūi with the

names of villages to denote their situation on a hill, *e.g.,* *Buichegoṇḍa, Palakoṇḍa.*

(v) Words that would be used by primative hunters and shepherds :—

Ḍura, a club or stick : *Tam.* tari or taḍi, *Can.* kōlu, *Tel.* karra. *Tari* means in Canarese *a stake, a post.*

Viḍu, a bow : *Tam,* vil, *Can.* villu, *Tel.* villu.

Ambu, an arrow : *Tam. Can.* and *Tel.* ambu.

Sūli ḍura, a spear : *Tam. Can. Tel.* śulam.

Mīnu, a fish : *Tam.* mīn, *Can.* mīnu, *Tel.* mīnamu.

Priu, a worm : *Tam.* puṛu, *Can.* huḷu, *Tel.* purugu or puru.

Pēnu, a louse : *Tam* pēn, *Can.* hēnu, *Tel.* pēnu.

Nākuri, a dog : *Tam.* nāy, *Can.* nāyi, *Tel.* kukka.

Oḍa, a goat : *Tam.* āḍu, *Can.* mēke, *Tel.* mēka.

Plambo, hunting : *Tam.* vēṭṭei, *Can.* bēṭe, *Tel.* vēṭa. But in Kūi the word viṭ means *to let loose an arrow, to shoot;* the corresponding Tamil verb is *viḍu.*

(vi) Terms that were probably used at a rudimentary stage of husbandry :—

Sēru, a plough, also cultivation : *Tam.* ēr, *Can.* ēru.

Nāju, village : *Tam,* ūr, *Can.* uru, *Tel.* ūru. But *nāḍu* in Tamil means *the cultivated country.* *Nāṭo* or *nāṭṭo* in Kūi is *a new village, one recently established.* Compare Tamil *naḍu* (verbal theme), *to plant,* and *nāṭṭu, to set up, to establish.*

Pāju, paḍi, a village (now used only with the names of certain villages, *e.g.* Beraṅgpaju). In Tamil *paḍi* means *a large village;* it is also found as a termination of the names of villages.

Iḍu, a house : *Tam.* vīḍu, *Can.* mane, *Tel.* illu. In classical Tamil *il* means *a house.* The change of *l* to *d* in Kūi is common, and *iḍu* is radically the same as ancient Tamil *il.*

Nāṛi, fire : *Tam.* neruppu, *Can.* beṅki, kenda, *Tel.* nippu., Compare with these the pure Dravidian word for *Sun* : *nāyiru.*

Sāru, salt : *Tam. Can.* and *Tel.* uppu; but *uppu* is a generic word. In Tamil *uvar* means *saltish.*

Niju, oil : *Tam. Can.* and *Tel.* ney.

Joeli, maize : *Tam.* chōla, *Can.* jōla, *Tel.* jonnalu.

Paji, a pig : *Tam.* paṇri, *Can.* handi, *Tel.* pandi.

Kōju, a fowl : *Tam.* kōri, *Can.* kōli, *Tel.* kōḍi. All these appear to be from the root *ku, to cry.*

Kōḍi, a cow : *Tam.* ā, *Can.* hasu, *Tel.* āvu. There is an older Dravidian word for cow in Kūi which is obsolete; it is now only used when the priest goes through certain rituals. The word *kōḍi* appears to be derived from the verbal root *kōḍ, to* purchase (compare the Dravidian word *kol, to purchase*).

(*vi*) The names of the metals are all Uriya words. But the Dravidian word *irumbu, iron*, appears in the expression *rumba vaḍi, iron-stone*, although *iron* itself is always *lua* (Uriya *loha*). The *war-god* is referred to as *lua pēṇu.*