

A CONTROVRSY

R. NARASIMHACHARYA M.A.

Translator to the Mysore Government

A Controversy.

NOTE

Mr. R. Raghunatha Rao B. A., Assistant Master, Central College, Bangalore, sent me a copy of his book—"Essays on Kannada Grammar, comparative and historical" and requested me to give my opinion on it. In compliance with his request I sent him my opinion. Not being satisfied with it he adopted the strange procedure of sending it to the press together with his own criticism thereon. My opinion and his criticism were published in the issues of the Evening Mail dated the 11th and 18th of December 1894. My reply to his criticism appeared in the issues of the Mysore Herald dated 21st January, 11th and 18th February, 4th, 11th and 25th March 1895. Mr. Raghunatha Rao got copies of his criticism printed and circulated. Several of my friends who had received copies of Mr. Raghunatha Rao's criticism and had had no opportunity of reading my reply in the issues of the Mysore Herald desired me to send them a copy of my reply. I thought it advisable to give Mr. Raghunatha Rao's criticism and my reply together so that persons interested in the subject may hear both sides and form their own opinion in the matter.

Mr. Raghunatha Rao has again written a reply. But I dare say that any one who reads dispassionately this pamphlet and his reply will agree with me in thinking that it is not worth my while to pen another reply.

R. NARASIMHA CHAR.

This is what Mr. Raghunatha Rao wrote to the "Evening Mail" :—

Essays On Kannada Grammar,

COMPARATIVE AND HISTORICAL.

A review reviewed.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—I shall feel highly obliged if you will kindly publish in your columns the accompanying review of my Kannada Grammar Essays, and my criticism of the same, as both may, in some degree, be interesting and instructive to some of the readers of your valuable journal.

The reviewer of my book is Mr. R. Narasimachar M. A., Translator to the Mysore Government.

His review is as follows :—

"My DEAR SIR,—I have carefully gone through your book. The 1st part is an adaptation of portions of Caldwell's Dr. Gr. (Dravidian Grammar), very useful to Kannadigas, ignorant of English, inasmuch as it gives them an idea of the family of languages to which Kannada belongs, and of the relationship between this language and the other sister languages of the Dravidian group. I attach much importance to this part of the book since the facts mentioned here cannot be had in any Kannada book yet published.

"When I went through the 2nd part, I could not but think that the so-called Telugu influence on the Kannada language to which you trace all the deviations of modern from ancient Kannada, was a foregone conclusion with you. Almost all the changes which you have taken much

pains to trace to Telugu influence existed in the language even before the kingdom of Vijayanagar was established. The Jains were the earliest cultivators of the Kannada language, and up to this time, I have not heard of a Jain Telugu writer, so that if many of the changes which according to you, were brought about by Telugu influence, are shewn to have existed in the works of Jain authors of the 11th century or so, then some other theory will have to be started about these changes. We have however, two names among Lingayat writers, who are supposed to have written in Telugu also—Palkuriko Soma and Mallana. Is it possible that these two, by reason of their having been authors of works in Kannada and Telugu could have caused so many changes in Kannada as to change the face of it altogether? The cause is too insignificant to produce the supposed result.

"Geographical contiguity may help the introduction of foreign words, but cannot produce any kind of change in the grammatical structure. This is one of the fundamental principles of philology.

"Kannada and Telugu being sister languages, there may be some grammatical peculiarities common to both; or the changes might have been brought about by same causes in both the languages.

"A portion of this part is taken up by your criticism on Mr. Rice. This takes up nearly 10 pages. I am compelled to think that in your remarks here you are uncharitably hypercritical. Nobody can fix a definite date for the stages of a language. A century this side or that side does not signify much. Purvada Hala Kannada does possess forms and words which are not found in Hala Kannada, compare ಸಂಸಂ &c. Nripatunga says that there was a Kannada anterior to him. With regard to this controversy your remarks in the preface and those in the body of the book do not agree.

"Some of the conclusions in this part appear to be drawn from insufficient premises. I have noted some points which appeared to me objectionable. I shall let you know what these are at some future time.

"The controversial portion may be printed in a foot note, if you choose to retain it.

"Hoping you will take these remarks in the spirit in which they are offered,

I remain

My dear sir,

Yours sincerely

(Sd.) B. Narasimbachar."

My reply to Mr. R. Narasimbachar is as follows:—

My dear sir,—I thank you for your letter of the 21st ult. I must tell you it created in me a feeling of considerable surprise; and if you had not signed it, I would not have believed it came from you.

To help you to a proper understanding of the position I have taken in the discussion of the subject treated of in my book, I find it convenient to consider your propositions *serialim*, and offer, as I proceed, a few suggestions and remarks, which, I hope, may be of some use to you.

Before I begin this, however, it is necessary to state in clear terms what the problem is that I have endeavoured to investigate scientifically. Briefly stated, that problem is the rise and growth of what has been popularly called Hosa Kannada. In this investigation the following points, among others, deserve special notice; viz:—

1. As far as I am aware, certain usages or forms, which are at variance with *Sabdamanī darpana*, appear here and there in literary works from about the 9th century.

2. From about the 14th century onwards these forms rapidly multiply, and are found in astonishingly large numbers in the works of certain authors.

3. These new forms, instead of superseding the old ones (as in the English language), exist alongside of them; and it cannot be said that the so-called Hala Kannada has become obsolete.

4. A great grammarian at the commencement of the 17th century ignores these new forms, and writes *Grammar*, rejecting them.

The investigation started by me is a philological one; and philology, as is well known, is a historical

science. The two methods, employed in the investigation are the comparative and the historical.

The key to the solution of the problem is to be sought for in the great philological principle that a language is, and must be, affected by its surroundings. "Language," says Professor Sayce in his principles of comparative Philology, p 176, "is the mirror of society and accordingly will reflect every social change."

I would request you to note the conditions of the problem. They may be grouped under three heads—geographical, ethnological, and historical.

Having thus endeavoured to give you a fair idea of the problem investigated, I proceed to consider your kind review.

I.

I am really glad to find that you have nothing to urge against the First Essay. Your approval of it is of great value.

Regarding the Second Essay. you say:—

"When I went through the 2nd part, I could not but think that the *so-called* Telugu influence on the Kannanda language to which you trace *all* the deviations of modern from ancient Kannada, was a foregone conclusion with you." (1). To begin with, allow me to point out that you are in error in supposing that I trace to the Telugu influence *all* the deviations of modern from ancient Kannada." Please read pages

79 to 102, noting carefully in how many cases I bring in the Telugu influence. I should also request you to *study* carefully pages 8 and 9 of my introduction. Without keeping in mind the facts mentioned there, it is in my opinion useless to attempt any investigation of the problem.

(2). "The so-called 'Telugu influence' you say. From this I am inclined to infer that you may not have carefully noticed the 2nd and third tables given at the beginning of my book. I, after minutely considering the question as to how languages are distributed in Southern India, and also all available information regarding the history of the Telugu people, you find any justification for ignoring the influence of the Telugu language upon Kannada, you may then speak of it as the "so-called" Telugu influence. A criticism on the lines I have suggested would be something to the point.

(3). You are pleased to say that the Telugu influence is a foregone conclusion with me. Be it so. Will you be so good as to try and offer a *rational* explanation of the following points without having recourse to the Telugu influence? They are:—

(a) The disappearance of the letter **೨** from Hosa Kannada.

(b) The use of **ವೆ** for all tenses in the subjunctive mood in Hosa Kannada.

The use of ಕೂ and ಅಂ for ಕಲ್ಲ and ಅಲ್ಲ.

III.

You say:—"Almost all the changes which you have taken much pains to trace to Telugu influence existed in the language *even before* the kingdom of Vijayanagar was established."

Do I say that they did not exist? Allow me to inform you that the Telugu influence existed even in the 7th century. Probably it began to exist some centuries before the Christian era. (See Caldwell's Comp. Gram. Introd. p. 30).

IV.

Next you say:—"The Jains were the earliest cultivators of the Kannada language, and up to this time, I have not heard of a *Jain Telugu writer*, so that if many of the changes which, according to you, were brought about by Telugu influence, are shown to have existed in the works of Jain authors of the 11th century or so, then some other theory will have to be started about these changes."

(1) I do not see why you want "*Jain Telugu writers*." Would not writers of other religious denominations do? By *writers* I understand you to mean *authors*. I think we would be committing a very serious mistake in supposing that the Telugu influence was limited to that of Telugu authors *alone*. The most important *stem* of the Telugu influence you do not seem to have taken note of. It is the fact of a *large* number of the population becoming *bilingual*. Is

one prepared to say that in certain parts of the Kannada country a *large* number of the population were not *bilingual* before the 11th century? Please keep in view the absence of effectual natural barriers between the Kannada and Telugu countries and consider also what History has to say on the subject.

V.

You proceed to say—"We have, however, two names among Lingayat writers, who are *supposed* to have written in Telugu also—Palkuriko Soma and Mullana. Is it possible that these two, by reason of their having been authors of works in Kannada and Telugu, could have caused so many changes in Kannada as to change the face of it *altogether*? The cause is too insignificant to produce the *supposed* result."

(1) "*Supposed* to have written in Telugu also," you say. Is Mr. Rice, then, wrong?

(2.) Who is it that says that two authors by writing works in Kannada and Telugu "have caused so many changes in Kannada as to change the face of it altogether? *Not I, please note it.* It is a pity that your argument should break down miserably just where you think it is *strong*. I am not responsible if you have thought it proper to reduce the Telugu influence to this "insignificant" quantity. I would advise you to ascertain for yourself in how many forms the Telugu influence has *noted* on Kannada and for how long.

science. The two methods, employed in the investigation are the comparative and the historical.

The key to the solution of the problem is to be sought for in the great philological principle that a language is, and must be, affected by its surroundings. "Language," says Professor Sayce in his principles of comparative Philology, p 176, "is the mirror of society and accordingly will reflect every social change."

I would request you to note the conditions of the problem. They may be grouped under three heads—geographical, ethnological, and historical.

Having thus endeavoured to give you a fair idea of the problem investigated, I proceed to consider your kind review.

I.

I am really glad to find that you have nothing to urge against the First Essay. Your approval of it is of great value.

Regarding the Second Essay, you say:—

"When I went through the 2nd part, I could not but think that the so-called Telugu influence on the Kannanda language to which you trace all the deviations of modern from ancient Kannada, was a foregone conclusion with you." (1). To begin with, allow me to point out that you are in error in supposing that I trace to the Telugu influence "all the deviations of modern from ancient Kannada." Please read pages

79 to 102, noting carefully in how many cases I bring in the Telugu influence. I should also request you to study carefully pages 8 and 9 of my introduction. Without keeping in mind the facts mentioned there, it is in my opinion useless to attempt any investigation of the problem.

(2). "The so-called 'Telugu influence' you say. From this I am inclined to infer that you may not have carefully noticed the 2nd and third tables given at the beginning of my book. If, after minutely considering the question as to how languages are distributed in Southern India, and also all available information regarding the history of the Telugu people, you find any justification for ignoring the influence of the Telugu language upon Kannada, you may then speak of it as the "so-called" Telugu influence. A criticism on the lines I have suggested would be something to the point.

(3). You are pleased to say that the Telugu influence is a foregone conclusion with me. Be it so. Will you be so good as to try and offer a rational explanation of the following points without having recourse to the Telugu influence? They are:—

(a) The disappearance of the letter **೨** from Hosa Kannada.

(b) The use of **ವೆ** for all tenses in the subjunctive mood in Hosa Kannada.

The use of ಕೂ and ಅಂ for ಕಲ್ಲ and ಅಲ್ಲ.

III.

You say:—"Almost all the changes which you have taken much pains to trace to Telugu influence existed in the language *even before* the kingdom of Vijayanagar was established."

Do I say that they did not exist? Allow me to inform you that the Telugu influence existed even in the 7th century. Probably it began to exist some centuries before the Christian era. (See Caldwell's Comp. Gram. Introd. p 30).

IV.

Next you say:—"The Jains were the earliest cultivators of the Kannada language, and up to this time, I have not heard of a Jain Telugu writer, so that if many of the changes which, according to you, were brought about by Telugu influence, are shown to have existed in the works of Jain authors of the 11th century or so, then some other theory will have to be started about these changes."

(1) I do not see why you want "Jain Telugu writers." Would not writers of other religious denominations do? By *writers* I understand you to mean *authors*. I think we would be committing a very serious mistake in supposing that the Telugu influence was limited to that of Telugu authors *alone*. The most important item of the Telugu influence you do not seem to have taken note of. It is the fact of a large number of the population becoming *bilingual*. Is

one prepared to say that in certain parts of the Kannada country a large number of the population were not *bilingual* before the 11th century? Please keep in view the absence of effectual natural barriers between the Kannada and Telugu countries and consider also what History has to say on the subject.

V.

You proceed to say—"We have, however, two names among Lingayat writers, who are *supposed* to have written in Telugu also—Palkuriko Soma and Mallana. Is it possible that these two, by reason of their having been authors of works in Kannada and Telugu, could have caused so many changes in Kannada as to change the face of it *altogether*? The cause is too insignificant to produce the *supposed* result."

(1) "Supposed to have written in Telugu also." you say. Is Mr. Rice, then, wrong?

(2.) Who is it that says that two authors by writing works in Kannada and Telugu "have caused so many changes in Kannada as to change the face of it altogether? Not I, please note it. It is a pity that your argument should break down miserably just where you think it is strong. I am not responsible if you have thought it proper to reduce the Telugu influence to this "insignificant" quantity. I would advise you to ascertain for yourself in how many forms the Telugu influence has *noted* on Kannada and for how long.

(3.) You say —“Is it possible that these two...could have caused so many changes in Kannada as to “change the face of it altogether ?” Please compare the Halakannada passages and their modernisations given in p. p. 103 to 108 of my book. The difference is found mainly in the terminations; the words and the grammar have changed very little. Such being the case, I am of opinion that the use of your strong expression—“change the face of it altogether” is not warranted by facts.

VI.

You further say —“Geographical contiguity may help the introduction of *foreign* words, but it cannot produce any kind of change in the grammatical structure. This is one of the fundamental principles of Philology.

“Kannada and Telugu being sister languages, there may be some grammatical peculiarities common to both; or the changes might have been brought about by the same causes in both the languages.”

(1). Allow me to remind you that you are talking here of Kannada and Telugu, and that you call them *sister* languages. How then can you speak of the introduction of *foreign* words? Is the Telugu vocabulary *foreign* to Kannada?

If you want to apply the philological principle you have stated to the *sister* languages, Kannada and Telugu, it becomes not a fundamental principle of philology, but what I may call a *perverted* version of

it. Even in the case of *unallied* languages, your principle is not, strictly speaking true. Professor Sayce says:—

“Until therefore, some more convincing example can be brought forward, we must abide by the belief that the grammar of a nation will remain pure and native, unless supplanted wholly by another through a kind of natural selection, although under certain circumstances foreign influences may occasion the *adaptation* of existing *formative* machinery to new uses.”

In another place he says:—

“The proximity of two languages implies that a certain number of the population are *bilingual*, and where this is the case to any large extent, the *idioms* of the two dialects will often be exchanged, and along with the idioms an *opening* is made for the introduction of *new grammatical forms*.”

While such is the case when two *unallied* languages are in question, how the law will act when *sister* languages like Telugu and Kannada are concerned, I must leave you to imagine for yourself. Don't you know that such things as Teluguified Kannada and Kannadified Telugu do exist? Kindly allow me to refer you to the 5th chapter of Sayce's Principles of Comparative Philology.

2. I would request you in this connection to consider the following subjects:—

(a) The influence, (if any) of

the Sanskrit language upon the vocabulary, the grammar, and the structure of the Dravidian languages.

(b) The influence of the English language upon the Dravidian vernaculars.

(c) The influence of Tamil upon the vocabulary, the grammar, and the structure of Kannada.

(d) The causes by which the language of ordinary life and the language of literature are modified.

(3) You speak of "grammatical peculiarities common to both." I do not catch your meaning. To me it seems that what is a peculiarity cannot be common, and what is common cannot be a peculiarity.

(4) If I were you I would avoid arguments of *may-be's* and *might-have-been's* in the treatment of scientific matters generally, and in the present argument in particular.

VII.

Regarding my criticism of Mr. Rice's theories I am sorry I have to inform you that you have missed the real point of contention between him and me. Mr. Rice thinks that one form of Kannada has "merged" into another, and so he assigns approximate dates to mark the close of each period, while I contend that such is not the case (vide para 6 of this reply), and that his dates in this connection are highly misleading.

The phrase "uncharitably hypercritical" which you apply to me, is high-sounding, and I am glad, it is pleasant to your ear. Please remove

the glasses of prejudice, which you seem to have put on while reading my book, and I feel sure that the "uncharitably hypercritical" will then appear to you as nothing more than sifting but fair criticism.

VIII.

You say—"Purvada Halakannada does possess forms and words which are not found in Halakannada, compare ಸಂದಾನ್ &c."

I am exceedingly glad to hear that you know all the words and forms of Halakannada, and that you are in a position to underline "does" and say authoritatively that a particular word and its form, such as ಸಂದಾನ್, is not Halakannada—a state of things which, I thought, could only be possible a hundred years hence, when a large number of Halakannada works had been collected in the Oriental Library at Mysore. The word ಸರ್ಥ (ಸಲ್ಲಾ) is in every day use now, and with regard to its form ಸಂದಾನ್, which you are sure is not Halakannada, please refer to Subdamani darpana, Sutra 118, and think why Kesiraju thought it right to insert it in his grammar. You may also compare the Tamil form. How would you explain the use of "ವಾನ ದೋಳ, ಬಂದೇಂ, ಕಲ್ಲಾಂ" &c. for ವಾನ ದೋಳ, ಬಂದೆಂ, ಕಲ್ಲಂ?

IX.

You observe—"Nripatunga says that there "was a Kannada anterior to him." What is your meaning?

Does he speak of a Halakannada in the sense in which we commonly speak of a Halakannada now? If so, please point it out.

X.
You say—"With regard to this controversy, your remarks in the preface and those in the body of the book do not agree."

I fail to understand in what sense you use the word "agree." Please explain your meaning.

Now I may think of closing my letter. You say that you have "carefully" read my book- I say that I thank you for the statement.

Excuse me, please, for this long reply. Probably you were compelled by circumstances to send me your review without having had sufficient time to give the subject as

much consideration as it deserved. The opinions of a Master of Arts carry weight; they must, therefore be expressed after due consideration. Otherwise more harm than good will result. As a friend, therefore, I have thought it my duty to point out to you wherein it appeared to me you have gone wrong. It is now left to you to consider over my arguments and see if they are not reasonable and fair. I shall for my part, be prepared to correct my mistakes, if any, provided you show them to me with proper reasons. Hoping that no book that you may publish, may be reviewed in the manner in which you have done mine,

I remain
Yours sincerely
R. RAGHUNATHA RAO.

(This is the reply that appeared in the Mysore Herald.)

MR. RAGHUNATHA RAO'S ESSAYS ON KANNADA GRAMMAR.

Sir,—The readers of the Evening Mail may have read in the issues of the 11th and 13th Ultimo Mr. Raghunatha Rao's criticism of my review on his book—" Essays on Kannada Grammar, comparative and historical ". He has also kindly sent me "with his best Compliments " a copy of his criticism on my review printed separately perhaps for circulation. To repeat his own words, " I must tell him that it created in me a feeling of considerable surprise ; and if he had not signed it, I should not have believed it came from him," since I was under the impression that a gentleman like Mr. Raghunatha Rao was not capable of perpetrating such a breach of etiquette. It was after repeated requests that I gave my honest opinion on the book having carefully gone through it more than once. If Mr. Raghunatha Rao was not satisfied with my opinion, the proper course for him to take was either to ignore it altogether, or to

write to me asking for an explanation of my remarks. He did neither. He rushed into print. Ordinary courtesy required him to ask my permission to publish my opinion, especially when he wanted to have his criticism also published along with it.

Before I proceed to consider his remarks *seriatim*, I should like to simply draw the attention of your readers to the following points in connection with his criticism:—(1) His solicitude to offer suggestions to reviewers for criticising his book. (2) The objectionable tone of his criticism. (3) His intolerance of opposition.

I.

To begin with, he says "I am really glad to find that you have nothing to urge against the First Essay. Your approval of it is of great value."

I must tell your readers that the 1st Essay is mostly an 'adaptation of portions of Caldwell's Dravidian Grammar, and it is in the 2nd Essay that Mr. R. brings forward arguments for proving his theory of Telugu influence on Kannada. I did not surely think of his gladness or otherwise when I wrote my opinion, nor of the greatness or littleness of the value which he would attach to it.

in supposing that I trace to the Telugu influence all the deviations 79-102 of his book, and to pages 8 and 9 of his Introduction.

In the portion of the book to which he refers me, viz., pp 79-102, he gives 6 important points of difference between ಹಳಗನ್ನಡ and ಹೊಸಗನ್ನಡ. He has brought in Telugu influence under 5 of these—A. B. C. E. and F. I am sorry I said "all the deviations" instead of "all the important deviations with the exception of one." On p. 78, however, he seems to say that ಹಳಗನ್ನಡ has become ಹೊಸಗನ್ನಡ by Telugu influence.

I have studied pages 8 and 9 of his Introduction. Many of his statements here are questionable. He says, "The *usages*

7

(సంకలనము) of Telugu, Tamil, Malayalam, Tulu, Marathi and Hindustani have been more or less adopted by Kannada by reason of their contiguity." In this list he has mixed up allied and unallied languages. With regard to the allied languages, the statement is open to question, since it is more reasonable to suppose that the usages are common property than that Kannada has borrowed them from the other languages. With regard to the unallied languages, the statement is still more open to question. What does he mean by Kannada borrowing Marathi and Hindustani usages? If he said that Kannada borrowed words from them, there could be no objection. Usage means, I think, something more than mere words—something connected with idiom and grammar. If this be his meaning, the statement is not correct. Again, "Marathi has not influenced Kannada to any large extent, because the Maharattas rose to power only under Sivaji." Surely the Marathi language did not spring into existence under Sivaji; it had existed for centuries before Sivaji, as the northern neighbour of Kannada. What does he say to Marathi words being found in Kannada works written centuries before Sivaji was born—in the works of Kumaravyasa and Jain authors who preceded him? Then again, "There were no mountains or forests separating the Telugu from the Kannada people. It must be said that by this reason only one alphabet was found sufficient for both the languages." I do not know if palaeographers will accept this as the sole reason for the similarity of the Telugu and Kannada Alphabets, for there are instances where, in spite of mountains &c. the alphabets are similar. Again, "many say that the court language of Vijayanagar was Telugu." This is more heresay and must be taken for what it is worth. What we know is that one or two kings of Vijayanagar patronised Telugu poets also; "Bhattanurbi was encouraged by Narasa Raya and Allasani Peddanna by Krishna Raya." We have, however, evidence of some kings themselves of Vijayanagar having written works in Kannada. Even supposing, for argument's sake that Telugu was the court language of Vijayanagar, what does it prove? These are the



facts which Mr. Raghunatha Rao wants me to study carefully and keep in mind, as otherwise, in his opinion, it is useless to attempt any investigation of the problem (of Telugu influence on Kannada.)

(2) He says I have not carefully noticed the 2nd and 3rd Tables given at the beginning of his book. These are tables taken from the census of 1891. The 1st table shows that in Mysore 15 p. c. of the population speak Telugu, and the 2nd shows that in one district, Kolar, the Telugu-speaking population is larger than the Kannada-speaking population and that there is more or less a sprinkling of Telugu-speaking people in some other districts. Do these facts prove that Telugu influenced Kannada? What does Mr. R. say to identical changes existing in parts of the Kannada country where there has been no contact at all with Telugu? He wants me to consider all available information regarding the History of the Telugu people. I confess I do not know much of the History of the Telugu people. What I have learnt from Caldwell about them is that they were very migratory at one time, that they made settlements in Sumatra and Java in the early centuries of the Christian era, though this is doubted by Burnell who says "For these reasons, it appears to me that the source of the primitive Hindu civilisation in Java must be looked for in the North Tamil coast, rather than in Kalinga proper, or the Telugu sea-coast" (South Indian Palaeography p. 132), that a dynasty of their kings was established in northern India in Puranic times, that their language is mentioned by Hwen Thsang and that they overran the Tamil country in the 16th and 17th centuries. To my mind, these facts do not even raise a presumption in favour of Telugu influence on Kannada. If there are any specific historical facts proving Telugu influence, I earnestly request Mr. R. to state them and thus enable me to correct my opinion.

(3) He says, "Will you be so good as to try and offer a rational explanation of the following points without having

recourse to the Telugu influence? They are:—(a) The disappearance of the letter *es* from Hosakannada (b) The use of *ಃ* for all tonics in the subjunctive mood in Hosakannada (c) The use of *ಃ* and *ಃ* for *ಃ* and *ಃ*." Before proceeding to consider these points one by one, I have to observe that it is unscientific to jump to conclusions by observing similarity of form in one or two instances. We must not be carried away by superficial resemblances but must try our best to trace effects to proper causes. These resemblances may be, for ought we know "the result of like forces working independently in different languages," or they may be independent developments of tendencies commonly inherited. My opinion is that when the language itself does not afford a tolerably satisfactory explanation, then it is reasonable to postulate external influence. In these cases I shall try to show that the theory of extraneous influence fails miserably, and that the changes have been *ab intra*.

(a) The disappearance of *es* from Hosakannada. Mr. R. thinks that no *rational* explanation of this is possible unless we postulate Telugu influence. Let us see what the state of things is. It is doubtful whether Telugu had this letter at any time. Caldwell says, "This sound *es* does not now exist in Telugu, and it cannot clearly be proved that it ever had it; but the analogy of all the other dialects leads us to conclude that it had it originally, and that it lost it in course of time, as we know that Kannarese did." p 37. So the existence of this sound at any time in Telugu is at best a conjecture. Telugu scholars say that even the earliest extant Telugu work does not show any trace of this sound. Mr. R's argument amounts to this: It is doubtful whether Telugu had this sound; or rather, Telugu had not this sound (p. 70 of his book). The Telugu and the Kannada people have been in contact with each other. Kannada has now lost this sound. Therefore it must have lost it by Telugu influence. Leaving the argument to speak for itself, I would ask Mr. R. why Tulu lost this sound although it was never in contact with Telugu. Again Mr. R's silence about the

letter *es* is very significant. Telugu retains this letter even now. Kannada had it once and has lost it now, though it has been in contact with Telugu which retains it. How does he explain this? Perhaps Telugu influence is, according to him, onesided: it is destructive and not constructive. Further, according to his own statement under III, Telugu influence probably began to exist some centuries before the Christian era. It is strange indeed that this Telugu influence should have been in a state of incubation for a period of 1500 years, inasmuch as it banished *es* from Kannada only in the 13th century. It is also strange that in spite of this influence Kannada should have been refractory in getting rid of *es*.

My view of the disappearance of *es* from ಕನ್ನಡ is this:—All philologists agree that in all languages the principle of Laziness or Phonetic Decay is at work. "The law of least effort brings about the attrition and degradation of the forms of words as well as of letters." According to this principle there is a tendency in all languages to soften down difficult sounds. The Dravidian languages have taken the sound *es* from the Vatteluttu. The sound being a difficult one, each language tried and is trying to soften it down in its own way. From what Caldwell says on p. 28 of his Grammar, we may suppose that even Telugu had this sound once. Now, in Telugu *ɛ* is the ordinary substitute for it; in some cases Telugu uses *ɛ̃*, *ɛ̄* or *ɛ̂* instead; sometimes it omits the consonant altogether without any substitute. (Caldwell. p. 59) The same softening process has been and is in operation in the other Dravidian languages also. "Even in Tamil, it (*es* sound) seems merging, in most parts of the country, either into *ɛ̂* or *ɛ̃* and the true pronunciation is now seldom heard." (Caldwell p. 37.) "*es* is changed into *ɛ̂* in Kanarese, and the same characterises the pronunciation of the mass of the Tamil people in the southern districts of the country." "In Malayalam, *es* is sometimes converted into *ɛ̂* but more frequently into *ɛ̃*." "In Tulu *es* is changed into *ɛ̂*." Caldwell p. 59. In Tulu *es* is also changed into *ɛ̃* and *ɛ̂*. Sub.

damanidarpana. Preface, p. VII. So that you see the operation of a general principle in all these languages. I am of opinion that postulating Telugu influence does not help us much unless we are prepared to prove that the same influence was the cause of similar changes in all these languages. Moreover, *es* cannot be said to have disappeared from Kannada in the same sense in which it can be said it has disappeared from Telugu. In Kannada it is represented by *ç* a nearer sound than *ç* which is its most general substitute in Telugu. Again, in such words as *ಬೌಳ*, *ಬೌಳೆ*, *ಬೌಳೆ* &c. with more than one meaning, we cannot but call to mind the obsolete *es*. Such is not the case in Telugu.

(b) The second point for which a rational explanation is required is the use of *ವೆ* for all tenses in the subjunctive mood in *ಹೊಸಕನ್ನಡ*. Here, I do not clearly see any connection whatever between the forms used in Kannada and Telugu. In Kannada the particle *ಅರೆ*, probably a corruption of the old Kannada *ಅರೆ* is suffixed to the past relative participle. In Telugu, there appear to be 3 ways of forming the conditional:—(1) by adding *ವಿ* to the past tense of a finite verb, *ಹೇಳಿ, ನೇನಿ* (2) by adding *ಎ* to the root of the verb, *ಹೇಳನ* (3) by adding the particle *ತೆ* to the past participle, *ಹೇಳಿತೆ*. The 3rd form has some resemblance to the Kannada form, in that both of them end in *ಎ*. But in Kannada the conditional particle is *ಅರೆ*, probably a corruption of *ಅರೆ* as I have said before, or of *ಅರೆ* according to Gundert, and in Telugu it is *ತೆ*. I fail to see any connection between these two particles. Further, in Kannada the particle is added to the relative participle, but in Telugu it is added to the past participle. The particle is different in the two languages, so also the formation of the conditional form. "Even when the root and the suffix are identical, the similarity may be the result of like forces working independently in different languages." Schrader. Prehistoric Antiquities p. 147. But here there is no philological equation at all.

If Mr' R's idea is that *ವೆ* the past form, is used for all the

tenses in Kannada as the form with ತೆ is used in Telugu, and that therefore Telugu influence must be at the bottom of this then his argument amounts to this: Telugu uses the form ತೆ for all the tenses; Kannada which has been in contact with Telugu uses the form ವಾಡಿವರೆ for all the tenses; ergo Telugu has influenced Kannada. I have to inform Mr. R. that his statement that ವರೆ is used for all tenses in ಹೊಸಗನ್ನಡ is not quite correct. It is not used in ಹೊಸಗನ್ನಡ with verbs in the past tense. ಬಂದರೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟನು is not an expression commonly heard. (Even in ಹಳಗನ್ನಡ such an expression is very rarely met with). The same is the case in Telugu and Tamil also. Again, there is also a future conditional form used in Shatpadi works in Kannada—ವಾಡಿವರೆಕಾಡಲರೆ; and this future form appears to be very common even in ordinary talk in Mangalore. Even granting that ವರೆ is the form used for present and future tenses in most parts of the Kannada country, is it absolutely necessary to postulate Telugu influence to account for this? How can Mr. R. account for the fact form being used for the present and future tenses in Tamil? Is he prepared to prove that Telugu influence was at work here also? My view of the matter is that these resemblances are due to similarity in mental development, and not to any special influence of one language of the group over the others. Caldwell says, "different particles are used for this purpose in the different dialects, and they are not in each dialect suffixed to the same part of the verb; but the principle on which they are suffixed, and the use to which they are put, are the same in all," p. 145. What need is there for supposing that one language influenced another?

I now come to the 3rd point:—the use of ಹಲ and ಅಲ for ಹಲ್ಲ and ಅಲ್ಲಿ. Let us see what Telugu Grammar says on this point. The 36th rule in the 2nd chapter of ಅಂಧ್ರಚಿಂತಾಮಣಿ says that in compounds the final double ನು and ಲು of the 1st word may become single, but not when followed by a vowel: ಪ್ರಥಮಲೂ ಗವಿದ್ವಿನುಲೋಃ. It will be seen that this rule is optional; it operates

only in compounds in which the 1st words end in double ಉ or ಊ and it does not operate when the first words are followed by a vowel. Mr. R. thinks it necessary to press into his service a part only (because he does not concern himself with words ending in double ಉ) of this optional rule to explain the form ಪಲ್ಲು in Kannada. The word ಪೆ or ಪಲ್ಲು is the common property of these two languages as also of many others of the Dravidian group. Because there is a similarity in the forms of a word used in two languages of the same group, is it scientific to assert the influence of one language over the other? Similar causes, or even different causes may bring about independently similar results in different languages. I shall try to show that the forms in Telugu and Kannada have been arrived at in different ways. In Telugu, as the rule quoted above shews, the original form of the word was ಪಲ್ಲು. For metrical purposes the double ಊ was sometimes made single. (Brown's Grammar, p. 206). But in Kannada the original form was ಪೆ. This form is changed into ಪಲು or ಪಲು in compounds in Shatpadi works. The principle according to which this change takes place is this—Sanskrit words are made ತದ್ಭವ by separating double letters and adding some vowel, generally ಉ, to the 1st letter to secure easy enunciation. E. g. ಪಪ್ಪ—ಪನುಪು, ನನ್ಯೈವತು = ನನುನೈವತು, ಕಲ್ಯಾಣ = ಪಲಗಾಣ &c. The same principle is at work in ಕೂನಕನೈವತು with regard to ಹಂಸನೈವತು words also. E. g.

ಹಲ್ಯಾಠಿತು = ಹಲನುಠಿತು, ಕಲ್ಯಾಣೈವತು = ಕಲನುಮಾಣುಗಲು, ಉಪಾಣ = ಉಪಾಣಿತು &c.

So that in Kannada we cannot say a double ಊ has become single. ಉಲ is only a modified form of ಪೆ since there is no adjective as ಪಲ್ಲು in ಹಂಸನೈವತು. Consequently the two languages have arrived at the same form in different ways; and you see how unscientific it is to assert the influence of one language over the other by a superficial observation of the similarity of them. I may also add that the form ಪಲು or ಪಲು does not occur in colloquial Kannada.

now come to the 2nd word అలి. In connection with this form, Mr. R. dogmatically asserts "ఇదుకలుగినవదలి" "This is the Telugu usago" (p. 92 of his book). I ask Mr. R. whether Telugu uses అలి as a locative suffix and whether it changes it into అలి. In Telugu the locative suffix is అందు or అందు and a particle అలి is sometimes added to the locative suffix, but this అలి is distinctly stated to be an augment used only in forming compounds. It answers to అవ of Kannada. అవలి = అల్లివ, అల్లిరువ. It is true that under the rule quoted above we have an example also given of అల్లి becoming అలి in compounds. I do not see how this can help Mr. R. His argument amounts to this:—In Telugu a noun like అల్లి when forming the 1st word of a compound becomes అలి. In Kannada the locative suffix అల్లి has become అలి. Ergo Telugu has influenced Kannada. I leave your readers to judge of the validity of this argument. Let us see if we can account for this form in Kannada. We know it is optional in Kannada to use either of the forms అందవం, అందవం; అందం, అందం; అందకం, అందకం &c. Metrical requirements are, I think, at the bottom of this option. The same may be the case with the locative suffix అల్లి though the fact is not mentioned in any of the grammars. The form అలి occurs in works and inscriptions of even the 11th century. Inserting or dropping a double consonant for metrical purposes is very common in Tamil and Telugu. I am therefore inclined to think that even here we see the operation of a general law in all these languages, and need not postulate the influence of one over another.

III.

He says, "Allow me to inform you that the Telugu influence existed even in the 7th century; probably it began to exist some centuries before the Christian era," and refers me to Caldwell's Grammar p. 30. Caldwell says that the Kalinga branch of the Telugu nation, inhabiting the remote sea-board, perhaps less cultured than the Andhra branch, made settlements

In Sumatra and Java in the early centuries of the Christian era, (This fact is called in question by Barnell as I said before.) He also says that Hwen Thsang of the 7th century states that the language of the Andhras differed from that of Central India, and draws from this the questionable inference that Telugu culture had already made considerable progress. Do these facts prove that Telugu influence on Kannada existed in the 7th century and began to exist some centuries before the Christian era? Caldwell says that the Kalingas made settlements *in the early centuries of the Christian era*; but Mr. R. is able to go a step further than his teacher, since he says Telugu influence on Kannada began to exist *some centuries before the Christian era*. What evidence has he to show that there was any kind of influence exercised by the *Kalingas* on the Kannada language some centuries before the Christian era? Has he any inscriptions of that date to prove that so much was pure Kannada and so much was "Telugufied" Kannada? Again, how can the fact that Hwen Thsang makes mention of the language of the Andhras in the 7th century help Mr. R. to assert that Telugu influence on Kannada existed in the 7th century? If Mr. R. can shew from inscriptions or extracts from literature of the period that such and such were the changes produced in Kannada owing to Telugu influence, then nobody can question his statements. Until then, I dare say every reasonable man will look upon his statements as mere assumptions and nothing more.

IV.

He says "I do not see why you want *Jain Telugu writers*. Would not writers of other religious denominations do? By *writers* I understand you to mean *authors*." The reason why I mentioned Jain writers (by *writers* I certainly meant Authors and I never thought that anybody would take it in the sense of *Clerks* here) is that they were the earliest cultivators of the Kannada language and continued to write good works down to the middle of the 13th century; and if some of them had written in Telugu also, that would have been one of the arguments in his

favor for postulating Telugu influence, as he seems to attach some importance to it in p. 77 of his book. Writers of other religious denominations will also do very well for me. But they all appear on the arena of Kannada literature mostly after the 13th century, and cannot well be supposed to have contributed their quota in producing the changes that had already existed in the language in the 11th century. He says that the most important item of the Telugu influence is a large number of the population becoming *bilingual*, and adds "Is one prepared to say that in certain parts of the Kannada country a large number of the population were not *bilingual* before the 11th century?" It is natural to suppose that people were *bilingual* in all the border districts. In some districts such as Canara and Malabar, people were even trilingual. Still there is no evidence of one language affecting the Grammar of another. What proof has Mr. R. produced to shew that a large number, a number large enough to produce the changes, of the population spoke Kannada and Telugu in the Kannada country before the 11th century? Some Telugu people came and settled in the Kannada country, let us say some centuries ago. The settlers at any time must necessarily form a minority when compared with the Kannada-speaking population of the country. In such cases history teaches us that it is generally the language of the minority that is influenced by that of the majority. (Sayce P. 177). Many Telugu people in Mysore have given up or forgotten their language and have adopted Kannada. He says, "Please keep in view the absence of effectual natural barriers between the Kannada and Telugu countries, and consider also what History has to say on the subject." Even effectual natural barriers will not prevent *cognate* languages from shewing resemblances or parallelisms in grammatical forms. Gond is more closely allied to Tamil though locally of all Dravidian dialects the farthest removed from it, than to Telugu, its neighbour. (Caldwell P. 518). "The minuteness with which languages of the same family though separated by centuries and by continents intervening have preserved their grammatical features is surprising." (Max

Muller Harvey of languages P. 10). *Brahui though spoken in Beluchistan, has many grammatical forms which are identical with those of the languages spoken in Southern India. Nor does geographical contiguity necessarily increase the resemblance. Tulu and Malayalam are spoken in the same locality. "Still Tulu differs far more widely from Malayalam than Malayalam does from Tamil" (Caldwell P. 36) Kannada differs even more widely from Telugu than it does from Tamil." (Caldwell P. 44) "The Dravidian languages naturally separate themselves into 2 classes—the Telugu which stands by itself, and the Tamulic dialects which comprehend all the other languages of Southern India." (Burnell, South Indian Paleogeography, P. 124). He wants me to consider what History has to say on the subject. I do not see clearly what the word subject here refers to. If it refers to "a large number of the population becoming bilingual," I request him to name the historical work that deals particularly with this subject. If it refers to Telugu influence generally, I do not know of any work specially treating of this subject. My knowledge of the history of the Telugu people is derived mostly from Caldwell, and what Caldwell says does not even raise a presumption in favour of Telugu influence on Kannada. In case there are any special historical facts proving Telugu influence known to Mr. R. I shall be very glad to know them.*

V.

He says, "supposed to have written in Telugu also," you say. Is "Mr. Rice, then, wrong?" I used the word *supposed* advisedly. I have strong reasons for supposing that the author of *Rammatavarnana* is not identical with *Gubbi Mallanarya* the author of *Bhuvnehintaratna*. The Telugu writer is a devotee of Vishnu whereas the Kannada writer is a Virasaiva. There is no doubt about *Palkurike Somu* being a Telugu writer but I am not sure about his having written any poetical works in Kannada. The *Someswara Stabaka* which is generally attributed to him is, I have reason to think, by a different author—*Puligere*

Somayya. Therefore I am inclined to think that Mr. Rice is wrong here. (2) In P. 77 of his book, he has brought forward the fact of the same authors writing in Kannada and Telugu as one of the factors in producing the changes in Kannada. No doubt, this is a very important factor, though he seems to assign it a subordinate place here. The influence of one language over another can be observed only in the writings of the influenced language. These are the only materials available for examination; they will be all the more valuable if they are works by authors who have written in Telugu also, as we can naturally expect that such authors will unconsciously introduce the idioms of the one language into the other. If there were a pretty good number of such authors, there would certainly be a strong presumption in favor of Telugu influence. But one or two such authors cannot be expected to do much in changing the language. It is however a pity that there is scarcely any author who has written in both the languages. (3) The change brought about by Telugu influence is, according to him nothing less than the conversion of *Halagannada* into *Hosagannada*. Does not the transition from one stage of the language to another imply a momentous change? There is a great deal of difference between a *Halagannada* passage and its modern equivalent, notwithstanding Mr. R's questionable assertion that "the words and the grammar have changed very little."

VI.

(1) What I have stated in the 1st Para is a general principle. In the 2nd Para I have stated my view of explaining the resemblances in the grammatical forms of Kannada and Telugu; and it is the 2nd para that has special reference to these two languages. He says that even in the case of *unrelated* languages, my principle is not strictly speaking true, and quotes from Sayce two sentences in corroboration of his statement. Now, these sentences occur in the middle of the discussion whether there is any possibility of a mixture in Grammar, and must be understood, I think with special reference to the context. The first sentence occurs where he (Sayce) speaks of

Semitic influence on the Persian language and also of some phenomena met with in the languages of Northern India. On p. 195, however, he says "unfortunately this question is by no means settled as yet. So his opinion here is not conclusive. Even the 2nd sentence does not appear to be conclusive inasmuch as he expresses his conclusion further on on p. 188:—"On the whole, therefore, the evidence before us will confirm the *absolute denial* which Glottology gives to the old notion of a mixture of grammatical forms." Before he begins the discussion he also expresses the same opinion on p. 183: "Before the rise of comparative Philology, Grammatical differences went for very little; and we still hear "Philologists" of the old school, talking about borrowed grammatical forms. Glottology, in which grammar forms the chief *fundamentum divisionis* of languages, meets this belief with a decided negative &c." Now you see that what I have stated in the 1st Para is "strictly true" according to Sayce. Mr. R. has, however omitted to quote the conclusion of Sayce, and has taken two sentences out of their context with the object of disproving my statement. Max Muller says "Few nations have admitted into their grammar the termination of other dialects." Survey of Languages p. 7.

The general principle that I have enunciated may also be applied, in some degree, to the sister languages—Kannada and Telugu. Even here, when once the languages have become distinct in consequence of the peculiar elements which made each in the course of time, an individual language, one language cannot borrow the grammatical forms of another. Sayce says, "Although two nations may have started from the same source with a common stock of ideas and a common Psychological tendency, yet in so far as their experiences have been different, the formative elements of their languages will be different and not interchangeable" p. 118. After quoting from Sayce the two sentences referred to above Mr. R. says, "While such is the case when two unallied languages are in question how the law will act when sister languages like Telugu and Kannada are concerned,

I must leave you to imagine for yourself." I have to inform Mr. R. that it is in *cognate* languages that we have to exercise the greatest possible caution in pronouncing an opinion about their grammatical forms, inasmuch as there is every likelihood here of our being misled into thinking that forms which have been commonly inherited or have been the result of independent developments of common tendencies are borrowed by one language from another. There is not so much danger in the case of unallied languages.

He criticises the use of the word *foreign*. This word is used in the 1st Para in which I have stated the general principle. Even when applied to Telugu words I do not think it can be objected to. Foreign means "not native." Words peculiar to Telugu i. e. words which are not the common heritage of the two sister languages, are certainly foreign to Kannada. I am at a loss to know which other word can express this idea. I must confess my ignorance of "Telugified Kannada" and "Kannadified Telugu." If the expressions mean Kannada with Telugu grammatical forms, I can only say that such a state of things is impossible.

(2) (a) I am not at all concerned with the influence of other languages on the vocabulary of a language, since a language is free to admit any number of foreign words; but I have doubts as to the influence of Sanskrit on the Grammar and structure of the Dravidian Languages. Vide Caldwell pp. 43—55. No doubt there are in the Dravidian languages a few primitive underived Indo-Europeanisms as Caldwell calls them p. 76.

(b) The kind of influence exerted by English on the Dravidian Vernaculars is not specified here. At any rate I do not think English has influenced their grammar.

(c) The coincidences in the Grammars of Tamil and Kannada are very remarkable. Most of the declensional, conjugational and other suffixes, pronouns &c. are identical. Nearly half the words found in the Vocabularies of the two languages are identical or almost so. The Jains were the earliest

cultivators of both the languages, and they were followed by Saivas and Vishnavas in both. Many of the Lingayat religious works are only translations or adaptations of Tamil works. Further, history teaches us that at 3 powerful kingdoms of the Tamil people—the Pallava, the Chera and the Chola, were established in parts of the Kannada country and held their sway for centuries. Some parts of the Kannada country must, therefore, have been bilingual in the sense of speaking Kannada and Tamil from the earliest times; and some parts are so even now. No effectual natural barriers exist in some parts between the Tamil and Kannada peoples. Consequently you see there is a greater reason to say that Tamil influenced Kannada than to say that Telugu did. Still I hesitate to say that Tamil influenced Kannada. We cannot be too cautious in pronouncing an opinion in such matters. The identity of grammatical forms in these languages may be due to the fact that they have preserved the original forms commonly inherited from the parent language in greater purity than the other languages. The analogies are radical and deep-seated and do not admit of the assumption that one language borrowed from the other. There are some forms of Modern Kannada such as ಯಾವನು, ಯಾವಳು, ಯಾರು, ನೀ, the suffix ಅದು used instead of the *Hulagannada* ಉದು &c. which I think, can only be explained by Tamil influence. But these stray instances are not to be regarded as furnishing conclusive evidence of the influence of one language over another. Yet this is what Mr. R. has done with regard to the forms ಜಲು, ಅಲಿ &c. forms which can be explained (and I have explained them) without postulating any Telugu influence. Caldwell says "The Tamil pronouns of the 1st and 2nd person cannot be understood without a knowledge of ancient Kanarese; and the Khond, one of the rudest dialects, is the only dialect, which throws light on the masculine and feminine terminations of the Dravidian pronouns of the 2nd person." P. 89. Does it follow that one language borrowed from another?

(d) I do not clearly see what bearing this has on the subject under discussion.

(3) He criticises the expression "grammatical peculiarities common to both," in my sentence—"Kannada and Telugu being sister languages, there may be some grammatical peculiarities common to both", on the ground that "what is a peculiarity cannot be common and what is common cannot be a peculiarity." I have to inform Mr. R. that peculiarities may belong to an individual thing as well as to a group of things. In the latter case, the peculiarities of the group are common to the things composing the group i. e. the peculiarities of a genus are common to the species composing the genus. For instance, there are certain grammatical peculiarities marking off the Aryan Family of languages from other families of speech. These grammatical peculiarities can be said, I suppose to be common to all or a few of languages composing the Family. I have distinctly stated in the 1st part of the sentence that Kannada and Telugu are sister languages. So I think the expression is not wrong.

(4) He says, "If I were you I would avoid arguments of *may-be's* and *might-have-been's* &c. Unfortunately I am not he; so I must beg his excuse for not being able to dogmatise as he has done. The science of Philology has not yet become an exact science; so the greater the caution the better.

VII.

He says, "Mr. Rice thinks that one form of Kannada has "merged" into another, and so he assigns approximate dates to mark the *close* of each period, while I contend that such is not the case (vide para 6 of this reply), and that his dates in this connection are highly misleading." Let me quote what Mr. Rice says. "From the works of authors and from inscriptions there may be distinguished 3 stages of the languages,—*Puradahalayannada*, *Halayannada* and *Homayannada*. This early form of the language (*Puradahalayannada*) may be said to have continued in use to the end of the 7th century. From the 8th to the 14th century was the *Halayannada* period &c." *Bhashabhushana*, p. VI. "There are 3 distinct stages or periods of the

Kannarese language namely, *Purnadahalaganmada*, *Halagannada* and *Hosagannada*. This early form of the language (*Purvada-Halaganmada*) prevailed down to about the end of the 7th century, when the form called *Halaganmada* succeeded, remaining in use to about the 14th century, being followed in its turn by the now current *Halaganmada*." *Sabdanusasana* p. 12. Here Mr. Rice has assigned a number of stages or periods to the Kannada language just as others have done to other languages. When you assign certain stages or periods to a language, you have also to say that the periods *begun* and *closed* at a certain time. Mr. R. has underlined the word *close*, and taking this along with his statement, "These new forms instead of superseding the older ones (as in the English language) exist alongside of them; and it cannot be said that the so-called *Halu Kannada* has become obsolete", I have to suppose that he understands Mr. Rice to mean that the language which prevailed in a certain period became obsolete or dead (p. 110 of Mr. R's book) at the close of that period. I am at a loss to know how this interpretation can be put on what Mr. Rice says. Certain grammatical forms of one period may become obsolete in the next period; the whole language does not become obsolete making way for an entirely new language.

Even in English some old forms do exist along with new forms as in *Kannada*. No one can vouch for all the forms of one period disappearing altogether in the next period, being superseded by new ones. All that one can say is that there are certain characteristics marking off one period from another, and some of these may linger in the next period also. The changes that take place in a language are gradual and imperceptible. "Slow differentiation by minute variations prove historically to have been the method by which the transformation of languages has been effected." Mr. R. says that Mr. Rice thinks that one form of *Kannada* has "merged" into another. I do not know where Mr. Rice says this. Nor do I see how exception can be taken to this statement. The three stages of the language

mentioned by Mr. Rice are not to be considered as three distinct languages; one stage "merges" into the next, and that into the next; only the distinctive characteristics of one stage may, to a large extent, disappear in the next stage, and the language need not undergo a thorough change so as to lose its individuality altogether.

Nor does the fact of writers of one period using the forms of a previous period constitute an argument against distinguishing the different stages of a language and assigning dates to them. There have been and are such writers in all languages, even in English—poets using forms of a previous period considered archaic in their own. The same has been the case in *Kannada*: even in the *Hosakannada* period poets have used *Halakannada* forms. This must be looked upon as an exception to the general tendency of the period and must not be caught hold of as an argument against the division of a language into periods and assigning dates to them. Yet this is what Mr. R. has done in p. 110 of his book. Mr. Rice has never said that at the close of a period the language becomes dead so that no vestige of it is left in the next period. Yet Mr. R. assumes that Mr. Rice has said so and makes uncharitable remarks on pp. 61 and 110 of his book and p. 8 of his preface. And this he calls "sifting but fair criticism." I don't see how Mr. Rice's dates are highly misleading.

I believe that any man who reads dispassionately Mr. R.'s criticism on Mr. Rice will agree with me in saying that he is uncharitably hypercritical, nay, will use perhaps a *stronger* phrase than I have done. At any rate, the phrase expresses my honest opinion and I can assure him that I do not use it because it sounds high and is pleasing to my ear.

I admit I am suffering from Myopia and wear glasses. I also admit that I put on glasses while reading his book. But I have to inform him that his statement that they are "glasses"

of prejudice" is a baseless assumption indicative of his intolerance of opinion and fondness for substituting abuse for argument.

VIII.

In reply to my statement "*Purvada Halakannada does* possess forms and words which are not found in *Halakannada*; compare ಸಂದಾನ್ &c," he says, "I am exceedingly glad to hear that you know all the words and forms of *Halakannada* and that you are in a position to underline "*does*" and say authoritatively that a particular word and its form, such as ಸಂದಾನ್, is not *Halakannada* &c."

I cannot say that I know all the words and forms of *Halakannada*, nor is it absolutely necessary for our present purpose. I can only say this much. There are nearly 100 Manuscript copies of *Halakannada* works in the Oriental Library. I have read almost all of them. I have also read almost all the printed *Halakannada* works. In none of these have I come across a form like the 3rd person singular ಸಂದಾನ್. This form is met with in Inscriptions of the 8th and the 9th centuries and also in those of an earlier date. If Mr. R. refers to "Inscriptions in the Mysore District Part I," he will find on p. 324 the form ಸೋದಾನ್ and on p. 109 the form ಹೋದಾನ್ for ಪೋಸಂ. With regard to the form ಸಂದಾನ್ he refers me to Sutra 118 in *Sabdamanu darpana*. I have to inform Mr. R. that this Sutra does not explain the form. It only states that a vowel in the midst of words is optionally lengthened; and from the examples given he will see that this rule does not apply to the vowels of case-endings and conjugational endings. Otherwise there was no necessity for giving a separate rule in the latter part of this Sutra for the lengthening of the vowel of the accusative suffix, and also for the rule in the previous Sutra enjoining the lengthening of the vowel of the genitive suffix; and the examples do not contain a single instance of the lengthening of the vowel of a

conjugational suffix. Of the three words given by Mr. R., namely ವಂದೋರ್, ಎಂದೋ, ಕಲ್ಯಾಂ. ಕಲ್ಯಾಂ is the only one explained by Sutra 118. The use of ಲೋ for ಲೆ is not found in any standard *Halagannada* work, nor does a single instance of this occur in the examples given in any of the three standard works on Kannada Grammar *Subdamanidarpana*, *Bhaskarabhushana* and *Sabdanusasana*. It is used by now-a-day poets; and to say that this suffix has the sanction of *Kesiraja* according to Sutra 118 is simply ridiculous, since the rule does not apply to the vowels of case-suffixes. The form ಎಂದೋ cannot be explained by this rule, as here the vowel of a conjugational suffix is lengthened nor can it be explained by any other rule in *Subdamanidarpana*. Perhaps the School of grammarians represented by *Kesiraja* did not recognise this as a proper form. We do not find a single instance of this in *Subdamanidarpana* either in the text or in the examples. *Bhattakalanka* however, says under Sutra 442 that in the opinion of some, the vowel of the 1st person suffix may be lengthened. He does not say anything about the lengthening of the 3rd person suffix. I hope these facts will shew Mr. R. that ಎಂದೋ is a form peculiar to *Purcanda Halagannada*.

I shall now proceed to give him some other forms. *Kaviraja* says the form ಎಂದೋ may be used for ಎಂದಂ. But in Inscriptions of the 8th and 9th centuries and of an earlier date the lengthened form ಎಂದೋರ್ is very common. Mysore Inscriptions, Part, I. p. 324. ಪೂಸುಪೋರ್ p. 338. ಅಳಿದೋರ್, ಕಲಿಸುಪೋರ್, p. 127 ಅಪ್ಪೋರ್; p. 117. ಉಂದೋರ್, ಕೊಂದೋರ್. Again ಉಳ is used as the locative suffix of ಲೋ: p. 324. ಲಕ್ಕುಲೋ, p. 339. ಪಕ್ಕುಲೋ, ಪಸುಲೋ p. 340. ಕೊಲ್ಲುಲೋ. again, the form ಕೊಲೋ occurs instead of the *Halagannada* form ಕೊಲೋ. Besides, the tendency of this period appears to be to retain the half consonant ಳ at the end of words instead of substituting the *bindu* for it, to use ಎ instead of ಎ as ಎನ್ನಂ, ಎನ್ನಿ &c. to make a copious use of the lengthened form of the accusative. The instances given above are quite enough for the purpose. Now, the forms ಎಂದೋರ್, ಎಂದೋ

ಬರ್ಗ, ಉಳ, ಕಡುಗ &c. which are not found in *Halagannada* are identical with the forms used in Tamil. I am inclined to think that as we go further back to the early period of Kannada literature we may expect the forms to approximate more and more to the Tamil ones. Now I hope Mr. R. will see why I underlined "does" in my sentence—" *Purvada Halagannada does* possess forms and words which are not found in *Halagannada.*"

IX.

Nripatunga mentions a "*Palagannada,*" compares it to an old woman, says that the language was too inelegant to be used at his time and condemns those that use it. Does not this shew that there was a Kannada anterior to him? Mr. R. has himself quoted Nripatunga's verses on pp. 6 and 7 of his preface.

X.

Mr. R. says he fails to understand in what sense I use the word "agree" in my sentence—"With regard to this controversy, your remarks in the preface and those in the body of the book do not agree," and requests me to explain my meaning. I never thought the word required any explanation. I used the expression "do not agree" in the sense of "do not hang together," or (in plain language) "are contradictory." On pp. 7 and 8 of his preface, Mr. R. accepts the fact that there was a stage of the language called *Purvada Halagannada*. But on p. 54, he attacks Mr. Rice for having mentioned this very fact. Again on p. 59 he says Nripatunga has not said anything about the form of Kannada that prevailed before his time. But on p. 7 of his preface he admits that Nripatunga mentions the fact.

I have thus tried to answer Mr. R's criticisms, and now leave your readers to judge whether or not my opinion on his book was expressed "after due consideration." The supposition that Telugu has influenced Kannada is at best a theory.

NOTE.

Mr. R. Raghunatha Rao B. A., Assistant Master, Central College, Bangalore, sent me a copy of his book—"Essays on Kanada Grammar, comparative and historical" and requested me to give my opinion on it. In compliance with his request I sent him my opinion. Not being satisfied with it he adopted the usual procedure of sending it to the press together with his own criticism thereon. My opinion and his criticism were published in the issues of the Evening Mail dated the 11th and 12th of December 1894. My reply to his criticism appeared in the issues of the Mysore Herald dated 21st January, 11th and 18th February, 4th, 11th and 25th March 1895. Mr. Raghunatha Rao sent out copies of his criticism printed and circulated. Several of my friends who had received copies of Mr. Raghunatha Rao's criticism and had had no opportunity of reading my reply in the issues of the Mysore Herald desired me to send them a copy of my reply. I thought it advisable to give Mr. Raghunatha Rao's criticism and my reply together so that persons interested in the subject may hear both sides and form their own opinion in the matter.

Mr. Raghunatha Rao has again written a reply. But I dare say that any one who reads dispassionately this pamphlet and his reply will agree with me in thinking that it is not worth my while to pen another reply.

R. NARASIMHA CHAR.
