

DRAVIDIAN COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR - I

P.S. SUBRAHMANYAM



CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE FOR CLASSICAL TAMIL
CENTRAL INSTITUTE OF INDIAN LANGUAGES
MYSORE

INDIAN COMPARATIVE
GRAMMAR - I

Central Institute of Indian Languages
Publication No - 585

MADRAS

DRAVIDIAN COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR - I



Government of India
Central Institute of Indian Languages
MADRAS

**Central Institute of Indian Languages
Publication No - 580**

व्याकरणसंग्रहः

DRAVIDIAN COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR - I

P. S. SUBRAHMANYAM



Centre of Excellence for Classical Tamil
Central Institute of Indian Languages
Hunsur Road, Manasagangothri, Mysore - 570 006, India.

DRAVIDIAN COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR - I

AUTHOR:

P. S. SUBRAHMANYAM
No. 287 (ROHINI MANOR)
1st Floor, 1st Main Road
4th Cross, KEB Layout
ASWATHANAGAR
BANGALORE - 560 094

July 2008

First Published: _____
Ashada 1930

© Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore, 2008

This material may not be reproduced or transmitted either in part or in full in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from:

Prof. Udaya Narayana Singh
Director, Central Institute of Indian Languages
Manasagangotri, Mysore - 570 006, INDIA

Phone :	+91 0821-2515820	PABX :	+91 0821-2345000
Telex :	+91 0846-268 CIIL IN	Grams :	BHARATI
E-mail :	udaya@ciiil.stpmysoft.net	Fax :	+91 0821-2515032
	bhasha@sancharnet.in	Website:	www.ciiil.org

For further information contact

Dr. K. Srinivasacharya, Head, Publications

E-mail: srinivasakandala@hotmail.com	Phone: 0821-2345100
E-mail: chandrashekar@ciiil.stpmysoft.net	Phone: 0821-2345040

ISBN: 81-7342-180-3

Publication No: 580

Price: Rs. 350/- (US -10 \$)

Published by

Prof. Udaya Narayana Singh

Director, Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore - 570 006, India.

Printed by

Mr. S.B. Biswas

Manager, CIIL Printing Press, Manasagangotri, Mysore - 570 006, India.

FOREWORD

It gives me great pleasure to introduce Prof. P. S. Subrahmanyam's work entitled *Dravidian Comparative Grammar-I*. This book is being released as one of the first publications under the aegis of Centre of Excellence for Classical Tamil under Central Institute of Indian Languages. The first chapter of it is devoted to the question of classifying about twenty-five Dravidian languages into subgroups and on tracing the disintegration of Proto-Dravidian gradually into the present-day languages. The second chapter, which forms the bulk of the work, deals with matters concerning comparative phonology like the sound system of Proto-Dravidian which is reconstructed. It also focuses on the development in the daughter languages in different stages, formulation of rules for the splits and mergers in respect of Dravidian, and other related matters. It is at once a research work and a textbook, since apart from summarizing and making a lucid presentation of the advances in the subject until the present period with a detailed discussion and examples, it also adds some new findings by way of reviewing what are considered to be established facts and explaining certain developments for the first time. A valuable feature of this book is the collection of various phonological changes that affected a particular language in one place. Prof. Subrahmanyam's long experience of teaching the subject for more than thirty years at Annamalai University is reflected on each page of this work.

The study of Dravidian comparative grammar started with the identification of the family by Francis Whyte Ellis in 1816 (just thirty years after Sir William Jones had discovered the idea of a linguistic family) and with the monumental work by Caldwell published in 1856. Prof. Subrahmanyam has outlined the development of the subject (in particular, subgrouping and phonology) during a period of about two centuries that have passed. I congratulate Prof. Subrahmanyam for having successfully completed such an important work and I am happy to place it before students of Dravidian studies and Linguistics interested in the principles of historical and comparative aspects of Dravidian languages and linguistics.

Udaya Narayana Singh

Director

PREFACE

This book is designed as a textbook for students and is written with full coverage of each of the topics along with enough examples and with as much clarity as possible. In Chapter 1, the issues involved in the matter of subgrouping are discussed in detail and evidence, some old and some new, is presented for the classification. Chapter 2 is a revised version of my 1983 book. All recent developments are incorporated in it. It has also been shown in a few places that some rethinking and modification are necessary on topics that appeared so far to be well established and beyond questioning. A useful deviation from earlier works in the planning of the chapter on comparative phonology is the collection of changes in each individual language in one place. This new arrangement will be of immense help to a reader who wants to know the changes that have affected a particular language. When a change goes back to a proto stage of two or more languages, it is discussed fully under one of the languages (the first language according to the order adopted) and a reference to it is given under the other language(s). In each case, cognates are given only from one or two sister languages the selection of which depends on the absence of the change under discussion; one should consult Burrow and Emeneau 1984 for the full list. In a group of cognates, the meaning given for the first or the previous word holds good for the subsequent words not accompanied by any meaning. From §2.3, where the bare rules are given taking each proto sound as the starting point, one can find out not only the languages in which the particular sound has undergone a change but also the nature of the change involved in each language.

Grateful acknowledgements are due to Annamalai University, Annamalainagar, where I taught this and other related subjects for thirty-seven years and developed my ideas through that experience. I owe gratitude to that University also for publishing most of my earlier books. I must express my gratitude to the University Grants Commission and P. S. Telugu University, Hyderabad, for awarding me Emeritus Fellowship for the years 2001-2003 during which period I started work on this book. I wholeheartedly thank my colleagues, friends and old students who readily supplied me with photocopies of books and articles that are not otherwise accessible to me. But for their unstinted cooperation, I could not have written this book. I am grateful to Professor D. N. Shankara Bhat, Professor S. V. Shanmugam and to Professor K. Murugaiyan for going through parts of the manuscript and offering useful suggestions. I express my gratitude to Professor Udaya Narayana Singh, Director, Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore, for including this book in the publication programme.

under the Centre of Excellence for Studies in Classical Tamil - Scheme for Classical Tamil. My special thanks are also due to Dr. K. Ramasamy, Professor-cum-Deputy Director (Head, Scheme for Classical Tamil), Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore, for taking keen interest in the book and for taking all necessary steps for its publication. Last but not least, I wish to thank my wife, Satyavati, for all encouragement in my academic pursuits ensuring at the same time that I take adequate care of my health.

*anuprada:na:t samsarga:t stha:na:t karanavinyaya:t
ja:yate varnavaiseṣyam parima:ṇa:c ca pañcama:t*

(*Taittiri:yapra:tiṣa:khyam 23.2.*)

'The differentiation of sounds arises from the following five features: co articulation, contact (between the place of articulation and the articulator), place of articulation, articulator and quantity.'

*avai ta:m mey pirit a:taṅ mikutaḷ kuṅṅal eṅṅ
ivveṅa moṅipa tiriyaṅ a:re:*

(*Tolka:ppiyam, eḷuttatika:ram, su:tra 110*)

'Those sandhi processes are said to be change of a consonant, addition and deletion.'

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>List of tables</i>	xvi
<i>Note on transcription</i>	xvii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xix
1. Subgroup Classification of the Languages	1
1.0. Introduction	1
1.1. South Dravidian	5
1.1.1. Shared innovations in South Dravidian	5
1.1.2. Shared retentions in South Dravidian	10
1.1.3. Lexical items found exclusively in South Dravidian	11
1.1.4. Disintegration of Proto-South Dravidian	12
1.2. Central Dravidian	25
1.2.1. Shared innovations in Central Dravidian	27
1.2.2. Shared retentions in Central Dravidian	31
1.2.3. Lexical items found exclusively in Central Dravidian	32
1.2.4. Disintegration of Proto-Central Dravidian	33
1.3. North Dravidian	43
1.3.1. Shared innovations in North Dravidian	43
1.3.2. Disintegration of Proto-North Dravidian	46
2. Comparative Phonology	49
2.1. Proto-Dravidian sounds and their distribution	49
2.2. Proto-Dravidian phonological structure	50
2.2.1. Sounds - characteristic features and distribution	50
2.2.2. Old Tamil a:ytam	62
2.2.3. The enunciative vowel	65
2.2.4. Canonical shapes of words in Proto-Dravidian	70

2.3.	Proto-Dravidian sounds and their changed reflexes (Rules)	71
2.3.1.	PDr. *a	73
2.3.2.	PDr. *a:	73
2.3.3.	PDr. *i	74
2.3.4.	PDr. *i:	74
2.3.5.	PDr. *u	75
2.3.6.	PDr. *u:	75
2.3.7.	PDr. *e	76
2.3.8.	PDr. *e:	76
2.3.9.	PDr. *o	77
2.3.10.	PDr. *o:	77
2.3.11.	PDr. *k	78
2.3.12.	PDr. *c	79
2.3.13.	PDr. *ñ	79
2.3.14.	PDr. *ʈ	80
2.3.15.	PDr. *ɳ	80
2.3.16.	PDr. *ʡ	81
2.3.17.	PDr. *t	84
2.3.18.	PDr. *n	84
2.3.19.	PDr. *p	85
2.3.20.	PDr. *m	85
2.3.21.	PDr. *y	86
2.3.22.	PDr. *r	86
2.3.23.	PDr. *l	87
2.3.24.	PDr. *v	88
2.3.25.	PDr. *ʎ	89
2.3.26.	PDr. *z	90
2.4.	Quantitative variation	91

2.5.	Merger of short high and mid vowels in South Dravidian and Telugu-Kuwi	104
2.6.	Other widespread developments	118
2.6.1.	Irregular voicing of word-initial stops in languages other than Tamil-Malaya:lam and Toda	118
2.6.2.	Lenition of stops in the medial position	124
2.6.3.	PDr. *PP	127
2.6.4.	PDr. *NP	128
2.6.5.	PDr. *NPP	129
2.6.6.	PDr. *c	132
2.6.6.1.	PDr. *c- (phonetic characteristics and reflexes)	132
2.6.6.2.	PDr. *c > Ø / # ___ (SDr. and Te.)	134
2.6.6.3.	PDr. *c > k / # ___	138
2.6.6.4.	PDr. *c > t / # ___	139
2.6.6.5.	PDr. *c > y / V ___ V	139
2.6.6.6.	PDr. *ac(u) > a: / ___ # (Ta.-Ma.)	140
2.6.7.	PDr. *t̪	141
2.6.8.	PDr. *ñ > n / # ___	144
2.6.9.	PDr. *y > Ø / # ___	145
2.6.10.	PDr. *v	146
2.6.10.1.	PDr. *v > b / # ___	146
2.6.10.2.	PDr. *-v-	148
2.6.11.	PDr. *-ay	149
2.6.12.	PDr. *n > Ø / # ___	150
2.7.	Phonological changes in the individual languages	152
2.7.1.	Tamil	152
2.7.2.	Malaya:lam	162
2.7.3.	Iruḷa	167
2.7.4.	Kuṛumba (Pa:lu and A:lu dialects)	169

2.7.5.	Koḍagu	171
2.7.6.	Kota	177
2.7.7.	Toda	189
2.7.8.	Kannaḍa	216
2.7.9.	Tuḷu	229
2.7.10.	Telugu	234
2.7.11.	Gonḍi	253
2.7.12.	Konḍa	259
2.7.13.	Pengo	261
2.7.14.	Manḍa	264
2.7.15.	Kui	265
2.7.16.	Kuwi	270
2.7.17.	Kolami-Naikṛi-Naiki (Ch.)	272
2.7.18.	Gadaba	275
2.7.19.	Parji	277
2.7.20.	Kuṛux	282
2.7.21.	Malto	288
2.7.22.	Brahui	289
Appendix - I.	The Dravidian Family and the Languages -an Outline	295
1.	The Dravidian family	295
1.1.	Introduction	295
1.2.	Phonological features	295
1.3.	Syntactic features	297
1.4.	Morphological features	301
1.5.	Dravidian and Indo-Aryan	310
1.6.	Dravidian - Speculations on genetic connections	314
1.7.	Major works and trends	317

2.	The languages	335
2.1.	Tamil	335
2.2.	Malaya:lam	338
2.3.	Iruḷa	341
2.4.	Koḍagu	342
2.5.	Kota	343
2.6.	Toda	344
2.7.	Kannaḍa	346
2.8.	Kuṛumba	349
2.9.	Tuḷu	350
2.10.	Telugu	352
2.11.	Gonḍi	357
2.12.	Konḍa	359
2.13.	Pengo	361
2.14.	Maṇḍa	363
2.15.	Kui	364
2.16.	Kuwi	366
2.17.	Kolami-Naikṛi-Naiki (Ch.)	367
2.18.	Gadaba	369
2.19.	Parji	371
2.20.	Kuṛux	373
2.21.	Malto	375
2.22.	Brahui	377
	References	379

LIST OF TABLES

252			171
253			177
254			187
255			192
256			202
257			207
258			212
259			217
260			222
261			227
262			232
263			237
264			242
265			247
266			252
267			257
268			262
269			267
270			272
271			277
272			282
273			287
274			292
275			297
276			302
277			307
278			312
279			317
280			322
281			327
282			332
283			337
284			342
285			347
286			352
287			357
288			362
289			367
290			372
291			377
292			382
293			387
294			392
295			397
296			402
297			407
298			412
299			417
300			422
301			427
302			432
303			437
304			442
305			447
306			452
307			457
308			462
309			467
310			472
311			477
312			482
313			487
314			492
315			497
316			502
317			507
318			512
319			517
320			522
321			527
322			532
323			537
324			542
325			547
326			552
327			557
328			562
329			567
330			572
331			577
332			582
333			587
334			592
335			597
336			602
337			607
338			612
339			617
340			622
341			627
342			632
343			637
344			642
345			647
346			652
347			657
348			662
349			667
350			672
351			677
352			682
353			687
354			692
355			697
356			702
357			707
358			712
359			717
360			722
361			727
362			732
363			737
364			742
365			747
366			752
367			757
368			762
369			767
370			772
371			777
372			782
373			787
374			792
375			797
376			802
377			807
378			812
379			817
380			822
381			827
382			832
383			837
384			842
385			847
386			852
387			857
388			862
389			867
390			872
391			877
392			882
393			887
394			892
395			897
396			902
397			907
398			912
399			917
400			922
401			927
402			932
403			937
404			942
405			947
406			952
407			957
408			962
409			967
410			972
411			977
412			982
413			987
414			992
415			997
416			1002
417			1007

NOTE ON TRANSCRIPTION

(Special phonetic symbols)

[Vowel length is uniformly represented in this work by /:/. Nasalized vowels are indicated by a tilde, e.g. \tilde{a} . t and d without any diacritic represent the dental stops.]

- ä probably identical with ə (Iruḷa)
- ə mid central vowel (Malaya:ḷam)
- ī high back unrounded vowel (Iruḷa, Koḍagu, Toda, Kuṛumba and Tuḷu)
- ë mid back unrounded vowel (Iruḷa, Koḍagu, Kuṛumba)
- ü high front rounded vowel (Iruḷa, Toda)
- ö mid central rounded vowel (Toda)
- ö lower-mid back rounded vowel (Gowda Kannaḍa)
- E lower-mid front unrounded vowel (Tuḷu, Telugu)
- c voiceless palatal affricate (in languages other than Toda but post-dental in Toda; for Tamil and Telugu, see §2.6.6.1.1)
- č voiceless palatal affricate (Toda)
- ḍ voiced retroflex stop
- ḍ voiced alveolar stop (Kota and Toda)
- ḍ voiced dental fricative (Malto)
- ḷ voiced palatal affricate (Sanskrit loans)
- G voiced velar fricative (Hill-Maṛia dialect of Gonḍi, Malto and Brahui)
- ḷ retroflex lateral (South Dravidian, Telugu, Naikṛi)
- L voiceless alveolar lateral (Toda and Brahui)
- L voiceless retroflex lateral (Toda)
- n dental nasal in Tamil-Malaya:ḷam but alveolar in others except before a dental stop

ŋ	alveolar nasal (Tamil-Malaya:lam)
ɲ	palatal nasal (Tamil-Malaya:lam, Kodagu)
ɳ	retroflex nasal (South Dravidian, Telugu)
ŋ	velar nasal
q	voiceless post-velar stop (Malto)
R	voiceless alveolar trill (Konda)
ɾ	voiced alveolar trill (Tamil, Malaya:lam, Toda, Irula, Kurumba, Paniya, Kannada, Telugu, Konda)
ɽ	voiced retroflex flap (in many languages but retroflex trill in Toda and vocalic r in Sanskrit)
ʂ	voiceless apico-alveolar sibilant with flattened body of tongue (Toda)
ʃ	voiceless alveo-palatal sibilant (Toda)
ʂ	voiceless retroflex sibilant (Toda, Sanskrit loans in many languages)
ʈ	voiceless retroflex stop
t	voiceless alveolar stop (Kota and Toda)
x	voiceless velar fricative (Spoken Tamil, Toda, Kurukh and Brahui)
z	voiced post-dental sibilant (Toda)
z	voiced alveolar sibilant (Toda)
ʐ	voiced retroflex fricative/approximant (Tamil, Malaya:lam, Old Kannada and inscriptional Telugu)
ʒ	voiced alveo-palatal sibilant (Toda)
ʒ	voiced post-dental affricate (Toda)
θ	voiceless inter-dental fricative (Toda)
ʔ	glottal stop

ABBREVIATIONS

Technical terms, languages, dialects and books

A.	Adilabad dialect of Gondī or Kolami
A.	A:lu dialect of Kurumba
AFR	affricate
APR	approximant
ALV	alveolar
AP	alveo-palatal
ASP	aspirated
ASu.	Adilabad dialect of Gondī recorded by Subrahmanyam
abl.	ablative
accus.	accusative
adj.	adjective
B	voiced plosive
B.	Brahmin dialect of Tuḷu
Ba.	Baḍaga
BRV	back rounded vowel
BUV	back unrounded vowel
BV	back vowel
Br.	Brahui
C	consonant
C(≠ x)	consonant other than x
C.	Common dialect of Tuḷu
caus.	causative
Central Dravidian	Telugu-Gondī-Konḍa-Pengo-Manḍa-Kui- Kuwi- Kolami-Naikṛi-Naiki (Ch.)- Gadaba-Parji
Ch.	Chindwara dialect of Gondī
Ch.	Naiki of the Chanda district
CV	central unrounded vowel
dat.	dative
DBIA	Emeneau and Burrow 1962
DEN	dental

CHAPTER 1

SUBGROUP CLASSIFICATION OF THE LANGUAGES

1.0. Introduction

1.0.1. The problem of determining the interrelationships of the languages of the Dravidian family attracted the attention of scholars since the beginning of comparative Dravidian studies.¹ Robert Caldwell himself has led the way in this aspect of the study also. He observed, for example, that Tamil and Malaya:lam 'are most nearly related' (1956:40), that 'the farthest removed from each other are Tamil and Telugu' (1956:41). His statement on Tuḷu (1956:32) reveals that he recognized the fact that it is not closely related either to Tamil or to Kannaḍa: '[Tuḷu] differs far more widely from Malaya:lam than Malaya:lam does from Tamil. It differs widely, but not so widely, from Canarese; still less so from Coorg. The dialect from which it differs most widely is Tamil.' Sten Konow (1906:283-85) also attempted the classification of the languages indicating the points of similarity among

¹ This chapter is a revised version of 'Subgroups in Dravidian' (Subrahmanyam 1971a: 505-31). Since the publication of that, only Krishnamurti (1976a:140-41, 1985:223, 2003:492-502) and Southworth (1976) expressed views that are different in some respects from those stated in it. Southworth questioned most of the evidence put forth by Dravidianists for setting up larger subgroups and set up eight subgroups of which Gonḍi-Telugu as an exclusive subgroup and Tuḷu and Kannaḍa as languages with no close connections are outright unacceptable (the other subgroups, namely North Dravidian, Kolami-Parji, Kui-Kuwi-Konḍa-Pengo-Manḍa, Toda-Kota and Tamil-Malaya:lam-Koḍagu known from earlier times were left untouched by him). Further, three of the five isoglosses considered by him as shared innovations can be said on strong grounds to be not shared innovations at all (see Subrahmanyam 1988: 64-66). Krishnamurti not only considers Telugu-Kuwi and Kolami-Parji as independent subgroups rather than two subdivisions of what is normally called the Central Dravidian subgroup but also considers the former as the second branch of Proto-South Dravidian ('There has emerged clearer evidence that the Ta-Ka. subgroup (SDr.) and the Telugu-Manḍa subgroup (SCDr.) had a common ancestor (stage of development) which is Proto-South Dravidian.' [1985:223]). He uses the term 'South Dravidian II' (1976:140-42, 2003:492)/ 'South Central Dravidian' (1978:2, 1985:223, 2003:492) for Telugu-Kuwi reserving the term 'Central Dravidian' for Kolami-Parji alone. This view does not appear to be acceptable since the evidence provided by him is fraught with so many problems (Subrahmanyam 2004:198-201; also see note 24).

the various languages. His classification of the languages into the Tamil group and the Telugu group may be said to be the harbinger of the establishment of the South and the Central Dravidian subgroups at a later time. The following are the main works that are devoted to various aspects of the study of subgrouping: Bray (1909:18-19, 1934:20), Ramaswami Aiyar (1928c, 1936a:141-42), Burrow and Bhattacharya (1953:x-xi), Emeneau (1955:141-63, 1962a:62-70, 1967b), Krishnamurti (1961:236-74, 1976, 1985, 2003:489-501), Southworth (1976), Subrahmanyam (1968b, 1969a, 1971a:505-31) and McAlpin (2003).

1.0.2. It seems reasonable to assume the existence of three major subgroups in Dravidian, namely South Dravidian (§1.1), Central Dravidian (with two sub-subgroups, Telugu-Kuwi and Kolami-Parji, §1.2) and North Dravidian (§1.3).²

1.0.3. The languages of the South Dravidian subgroup are: Tamil, Malaya:lam, Iruḷa, Koḍagu, Kota, Toda, Kannaḍa (Baḍaga, which started as a dialect of Kannaḍa but is heavily influenced by the other Nilgiris languages),³ Kuṛumba and Tuḷu (Koraga with scant information available is a dialect of or a language closer to Tuḷu). Emeneau (1957a) showed that

² The term 'South Dravidian' (but including Telugu) was already used by Ramaswami Aiyar (1937-38, 1938b) and Burrow (1940-42, 1947), 'Central Dravidian' (excluding Telugu) by Burrow (1947:146) and 'North(ern) Dravidian' by Bray (1934:20). Konow (*The Linguistic Survey of India*, vol. 4 [1906]:285) considers Brahui as the direct offshoot of Proto-Dravidian; Steever (1993:6) and McAlpin (2003:542) take this as a viable alternative but it requires much further study.

³ The Baḍagas migrated to the Nilgiris plateau from the Mysore plains in several waves starting from the 12th century. There is concrete evidence to show that the Baḍagas were there already by the beginning of the 17th century (Emeneau [1967b:394], citing Rivers [*The Todas*, 1906:721-30], points to the 1603 letter of Father Finicio as proof for this). Basically Baḍaga originated as a dialect of Kannaḍa but it differs from most of the other dialects of Kannaḍa in some important respects like the signalling of intransitive ~ transitive contrast by the use of different past suffixes; further, its personal pronouns are heavily influenced by Tamil. Because of such differences, it can even be considered as a separate language as pointed out by Emeneau (1997b:77): 'Baḍaga started as a dialect of Kannaḍa but is now probably to be recognized as a closely related, but a separate, language.' Pilot-Raichoor (1997:189-90) also expresses a similar opinion: '... the present speech forms of the Baḍagas have been deeply influenced by the neighbouring languages and cannot any more be said to be dialects of Kannaḍa. The differences with modern Kannaḍa extend throughout the language from phonology to lexicon, but are particularly evident in the morphology of both nominal and verbal systems.'

Toda and Kota are closer to Tamil-Malaya:lam than to Kannaḍa although the contrary view was held by earlier scholars. Ramaswami Aiyar (1928c) established with evidence that Koḍagu is closer to Tamil-Malaya:lam rather than to Kannaḍa (according to Caldwell, Mögling of his times had already expressed this opinion).⁴ Although Krishnamurti and Emeneau had not favoured the idea of placing Tuḷu in the South Dravidian subgroup, Subrahmanyam (1968b), after a detailed comparative study of the phonology and the morphology of that language, arrived at the conclusion that it indeed is a member of the South Dravidian subgroup and that the differences between it and the other South Dravidian languages are largely due to the fact that it first branched off from Proto-South Dravidian; both Krishnamurti and Emeneau have accepted this view in their recent publications.⁵ The interrelationships of the South Dravidian languages excluding Tuḷu are discussed in detail in Emeneau's 1967b paper particularly with regard to the formation of the past stem.

⁴ It is of historical interest to note that at first it was considered to be a dialect of Kannaḍa. 'In the first edition of this work this language had not assigned to it a place of its own, but was included under the head of Canarese. It had been generally considered rather as an uncultivated dialect of Canarese, modified by Tuḷu, than as a distinct language. I mentioned then, however, that Dr. Mögling, a German missionary, who had resided for some time amongst the Coorgs, was of opinion that their language was more closely allied to Tamil and Malaya:lam than to Canarese. It is not quite clear to me yet to which of the Dravidian dialects it is most closely allied. On the whole, however, it seems safest to regard it as standing about midway between Old Canarese and Tuḷu.' (Caldwell 1956:33) Emeneau (1967a:366) notes that his study of the past tense formation supports Ramaswami Aiyar's view: 'The central point of this paper, the past tense, as well as other points to be adduced, agree with the first part of his [i.e., Ramaswami Aiyar's] thesis, which I put in the form that in most respects Koḍagu belongs more closely with the rest of SDr. than with Kannaḍa, with the proviso that in a few points there are isoglosses that join Koḍagu with Kannaḍa. On a close connection with Malaya:lam I am not convinced.'

⁵ 'There seems to be considerable justification for considering Tu. as an independent off-shoot of PCDr.' (Krishnamurti 1961:272). Krishnamurti completely omitted Tuḷu in his discussion on subgroupings in his 1969 (pp. 325-27) and 1976 (p. 140) articles, included it under South Dravidian in his 1978 (p. 2) article but expressed reservations about it in his 1985 (p. 223) article. While admitting that the position of Tuḷu can be determined only after the availability of good evidence on the language and its dialects, Emeneau (1967b:365) accepted the 'generally held opinion' that it is not a South Dravidian language and added that the formation of the past tense bears this out; but he included it under South Dravidian in his 1988a (pp. 241, 248) article referring to Subrahmanyam's 1968b article. Similarly, Krishnamurti in his latest publication (2003:490) has expressed views similar to those of Subrahmanyam but without any overt reference to the latter's work.

1.0.4. The languages of the Central Dravidian subgroup are: Telugu, Gonḍi, Konḍa, Pengo, Maṇḍa, Kui, Kuwi, Kolami (Wardha and Adilabad dialects), Naikṛi, Naiki (Ch.), Gadaba (Ollari and Salur/Koṇ(ḍ)e:ko:r dialects) and Parji (it is possible that both Naikṛi and Naiki (Ch.) could also be treated as dialects of Kolami). The sharp differences between the Telugu-Kuwi group consisting of the first seven languages of the above list and the Kolami-Parji group consisting of the remaining five languages lead us to conclude that the divergence between them must have taken place at a very early date (see §1.2.4). Telugu was earlier regarded as in some manner ambivalent showing some features in common with South Dravidian and others with Central Dravidian. But Krishnamurti (1961:269) demonstrated conclusively that: 'The weight of comparative evidence discussed in some detail in this chapter is in favor of considering Telugu as an off-shoot of the Central Dravidian branch of Proto-Dravidian with very intimate genetic relationship with the Kui-(Kuwi)-Konḍa subgroup. Since it has also several exclusive features in common with South Dravidian in phonology rather than in morphology, it may be considered that Telugu has been in intimate geographical contact with the members of South Dravidian from a very remote past. The morphological evidence puts it rather conclusively with Central Dravidian.' That Kolami-Naiki-Naikṛi-Gadaba and Parji constitute a subgroup was first indicated by Burrow and Bhattacharya (1953:xi) and the full evidence for it was presented by Emeneau (1955:141-63). Burrow and Bhattacharya (*loc.cit.*) have also indicated that 'there are also many signs of special connection between Gonḍi-Konḍa and Kui-Kuwi'. The important isoglosses of shared innovation in the Central Dravidian languages along with a discussion of the interrelationships among them are presented in Subrahmanyam's 1969a paper.

1.0.5. The languages of the North Dravidian subgroup are: Kuṛux, Malto and Brahui. That Kuṛux and Malto are very intimately connected with each other was known even at the time of Caldwell. He (1956:36) states: 'This tradition of the original identity of the Ma:lars and the Ora:ons is borne out by the evident affinity of their languages and, as Colonel Dalton mentions, by the similarity of their customs.' Although Caldwell (1956:39) noticed that Brahui 'contains not only some Dravidian words but a considerable infusion of distinctively Dravidian forms and idioms', he did not include it in the Dravidian family 'because the Dravidian element contained in it bears but a small portion to the rest of its component elements.' After a somewhat detailed comparative study of the phonology and the morphology of the language, Bray (1909:18-19) concludes that: 'There can be but one verdict on this evidence. This verdict is not that of Caldwell, who summed up his final position in the words "The Brahui language, considered as a whole, seems to be derived from the same source as the Panjabi and Sindhi, but it

evidently contains a Dravidian element", but the converse, first suggested by Lassen in the early days of the study of the language and reasserted by Trumpp a quarter of a century ago. The Brahui language is sprung from the same source as the Dravidian language group; it has freely absorbed the alien vocabulary of Persian, Baluchi, Sindhi and other neighbouring languages, but in spite of their inroads its grammatical system has preserved a sturdy existence.' He (1934:20) has also noted: 'Thus the phonetic and etymological evidences converge towards Bra:hu:i's special affinity with the northerly Dravidian languages, which was the conclusion enunciated by Professor J. Bloch some time ago on morphological grounds'. Emeneau (1962a:62-70) collected the full evidence for the establishment of the North Dravidian subgroup (however, see note 2).

1.0.6. The following paragraphs provide evidence for the setting up of the three major subgroups and for the further classification of the languages within each of them. It is hardly necessary to emphasise here that the whole discussion on subgroupings is based mainly on shared innovations. Shared retentions in phonology and morpho-logy, which are explicitly mentioned to be so, and similarities in lexical items are given as secondary evidence to substantiate further the groupings already arrived at on the basis of shared innovations. When there are different words for one and the same object in different daughter languages (and when borrowing from some other family is ruled out), it is impossible to tell what the proto word was; for example, is SDr. *va:zay 'plantain' (DR 5373) Proto-Dravidian or Te. arāṭi (DR 205)? But when a group of languages already established as forming a subgroup have a number of lexical items exclusively common to them, it does not appear to be wrong to use them as supporting evidence.

1.1. South Dravidian

The languages of this subgroup are: Tamil, Malaya:lam, Iruḷa, Koḍagu, Kota, Toda, Kannaḍa (dialect Baḍaga), Kuṛumba and Tuḷu (dialect Koraga); though further work is required to determine the exact position of Iruḷa and Kuṛumba, the former appears to be closer to Tamil-Malaya:lam and the latter to Baḍaga (Kannaḍa) (data from these two are sparingly used in the following discussion).

1.1.1. SHARED INNOVATIONS IN SOUTH DRAVIDIAN

1.1.1.1. Loss of initial *c-

Proto-Dravidian *c- is lost sporadically in the South Dravidian languages (§2.6.6.2). This isogloss covered the neighbouring Telugu also at

the same time; in other words, this is a typical change that covered a subgroup plus a neighbouring language right at the beginning.⁶

1.1.1.2. Generalisation of the enunciative *i*

In Tamil, Malaya:lam (in some dialects), Koḍagu and Tuḷu, the more common enunciative vowel is the back unrounded *i* (§2.2.3). It is an allophone of *u* in Tamil-Malaya:lam but attained phonemic status in Tuḷu and Koḍagu⁷ due to some other changes in the structure of those languages. In the northern dialect of Tuḷu (both Brahmin and Common), *i* is assimilated to *u* when the vowel in the preceding syllable is a back vowel, e.g. (NB) *poḷtu*/ (NC) *portu* corresponding to (SB/SC) *portī* 'time' (Kekunnaya 1994:45). Since all final vowels as well as original short vowels in non-initial syllables are lost in Kota-Toda (§2.7.6.12), we cannot be really sure whether their proto stage had any enunciative vowel. But, since they are otherwise known to be closer to Tamil-Malaya:lam-Koḍagu, we may suppose that Proto-Kota-Toda had lost the enunciative *i*. It is probable that Proto-Dravidian contained both *u* and *i* as enunciative vowels and that Proto-South Dravidian innovated by extending the *i* to the majority of the cases (the conditioning for the two in Proto-Dravidian may not be the same as that found in Old Tamil or any of the other South Dravidian languages since, if *u* were severely restricted in Proto-Dravidian as in the South Dravidian languages, it could not have spread to all cases in Telugu). The presence of *i* in Tamil-Malaya:lam-Koḍagu on the one hand and in Tuḷu on the other makes such a hypothesis highly plausible (note also that it is not found outside South Dravidian). Thus, it is an analogical change rather than a sound change. Standard Kannaḍa seems to have replaced it by *u* under areal influence from Telugu. Malaya:lam replaced it with *ə* at a later stage.

⁶ The Hill-Maṛia and the Koya dialects of Gonḍi also show this feature but the change in these must have taken place at a later date; the following points of difference establish beyond doubt that it cannot be linked directly with the change in South Dravidian plus Telugu. The change is regular in Hill-Maṛia-Koya while it is sporadic in South Dravidian plus Telugu; further, unlike the latter one, it involves an intermediary stage of *h*, i.e. **c*- > *s*- > *h*- > Ø as evidenced by other Gonḍi dialects; we may suspect the influence of Telugu in the deletion of *h*-.

⁷ In Koḍagu the rounded *u*, instead of the more common *i*, serves as the enunciative vowel after *v* as in *ca:vu* 'corpse' (Emeneau 1970b:151). There are other instances for *u* occurring at the end of a word due to loss of the following *m* or due to contraction of a sequece of sounds but it is not enunciative in such cases (see §§2.7.5.17, 2.7.5.20).

1.1.1.3. Creation of the feminine category

In all the South Dravidian languages (with the exception of Toda which has lost gender distinctions), there are separate demonstrative pronouns for the feminine category (*av-aḷ [dist.], *iv-aḷ [prox.], *uv-aḷ [intermediary]) with the suffix *-a:ḷ/ *-aḷ (< *a:ḷ 'woman' [DR 400]). There are also finite verbs that correspond to them with the same suffix in some of the languages, e.g. Ta. varu-v-a:ḷ '(she) will come/comes', Ka. baru-v-aḷu/bar-t-a:ḷe, Tu. bar-p-aḷi/bar-p-olu (Malayaḷam with no personal suffixes at all and Koḍagu and Kota-Toda with no distinct personal suffixes in the 3rd person presumably lost these forms). Since the above forms have no cognates outside South Dravidian, the creation of the feminine category (in the pronouns and the finite verbs) in the languages of this subgroup can be taken as a shared innovation (the Pengo-Manda feminine pronouns are not formally relatable to the corresponding South Dravidian forms, see note 31).

1.1.1.4. Change of PDr. *ya- > e

In South Dravidian and North Dravidian, the Proto-Dravidian oblique bases *yaṅ- (of the 1st person singular pronoun *ya:ṅ [5160]) and *yam- (of the 1st person exclusive plural pronoun *ya:m [5134]) change to *eṅ- and *em- respectively because the sequence ya-, though it must have been present at the Proto-Dravidian stage, is not found elsewhere in any of the daughter languages, e.g. Ta. eṅ-akku 'to me', To. en-k, Old Ka. en-age in contrast with Te. na:-kun (< PCDr. *an-akku(n)), Kol. an-u:ṅ. The similarity between South Dravidian and North Dravidian in this respect must only be a parallel development (for further details, see Subrahmanyam 2006a).

1.1.1.5. Addition of a dental to the negative participles

The negative adverbial and adjectival participles in Proto-Dravidian contained only the negative suffix *-a: as evidenced by Old Tamil and some other languages. In the later stages of South Dravidian, they have been extended by the addition of a dental, which presumably was a past suffix in origin (see Subrahmanyam 1971a: 390-93).

	<i>Negative adverb</i>	<i>Negative adjective</i>
Old Ta.	ceyy-a:, ceyy-a:tu 'not having done'	ceyy-a:, ceyy-a:t-a 'that did/ do(es) not do'
Ma.	ceyy-a:tu 'not having done'	ceyy-a:tt-a 'that do(es) not do'
		ceyy-a:-ññ-a 'that did not do'
Koḍ.	keyy-ate 'not having done'	keyy-at-ē 'that did/ do(es) not do'

Price: Rs. 350/- (US-10\$)

For more details please contact

**Central Institute of Classical Tamil
#40, IRT Campus, 100 ft Road,
Taramani**

Chennai - 600 113.

www.cict.in