

Lesson 11

Pronominalization – comparatives and superlatives of adjectival expressions; ‘very’ and ‘too’

Pronominalization

In lesson 1, when the pronouns of Kannada were discussed, it was said that the pronouns of the third person (he, she, it, they) are not simple, primitive pronouns but actually combinations of demonstrative prefixes (for either distance or proximity: *a* or *i*)¹ and **pronominalization suffixes**: suffixes which, when added to an attributive word, form a substantive expression.²

The term **attributive word** here stands for any word or word form that can be used attributively, such as an adjective, a participle, the genitive of a noun or of a pronoun, or (very importantly: to be explained in lesson 14) the so-called relative participles or verbal adjectives. As explained in lesson 1, the *adu* ‘it’ consists of *a* [distant] + *du* [thing], in other words: *adu* means ‘distant thing’ (‘that’). Similarly, *idu* means ‘proximate thing’ (‘this’). In order to understand the principle of pronominalization, it is helpful to think of the other third-person pronouns in a similar way: that *avanu* means ‘distant male person’ (‘he’), *ivaḷu* means ‘proximate female person’ (‘she’), etc.

The full set of pronominalization suffixes in modern Kannada is:

vanu *male person*

varu *more than one
person*

vaḷu *female
person*

du *thing*

vu *more than one thing*

These suffixes can be used with other attributive words, exactly as with *a* and *i*, with the same effect:

doḍḍa + vanu	ದೊಡ್ಡವನು	doḍḍavanu	(a big male person)
cikka + varu	ಚಿಕ್ಕವರು	cikkavaru	(small persons)
keṭṭa + du	ಕೆಟ್ಟದು	keṭṭadu	(a bad thing)

Pronominalization is the device that is used for translating Indo-European sentences in which an adjective is used predicatively. To translate the sentences such as *Those boys are small* or *That girl is big*, one must re-think them as ‘Those boys are small persons’ and ‘That girl is a big female person’:

ಆ ಹುಡುಗರು ಚಿಕ್ಕವರು	<i>ā huḍugaru cikkavaru</i>	Those boys are small
ಆ ಹುಡುಗಿ ದೊಡ್ಡವಳು	<i>ā huḍugi doḍḍavaḷu</i>	That girl is big

Pronominalization is a very productive grammatical device: it is used by every Kannada speaker and writer very many times every day. Therefore the learner must learn to recognize and understand it well.

Once the powerful mechanism of pronominalization is understood, the learner will also be able to appreciate other, more complex applications of the mechanism. It is possible (although in practice this does not occur often) to stack pronominalization suffixes to build longer words. For instance, the common expression ನಮ್ಮವರು *nammavaru* consists of *namma* ‘our’ and the pronominalization suffix for the third person plural: it means ‘the people who are ours’ (i.e., our friends, our relatives, our compatriots, our coreligionists, members of the same caste, our sympathizers, etc. etc.). This pronominalized genitive of *nāvu* ‘we’ can again be inflected, for instance, in the genitive: ನಮ್ಮವರ *nammavara* means ‘of the people who are ours’.

ನಮ್ಮವರ ಮನೆ	<i>nammavara mane</i>	our friends’ (relatives’, etc.) house
------------	-----------------------	--

A user of the language can even go a step further, if he wants to: a house is, of course, a thing, which can be referred to as an *adu* ‘it’. Taking *nammavara*, which is an attributive word (as we have discussed above), we can create, by means of pronominalization, the word ನಮ್ಮವರದು *nammavaradu* (*namma* [genitive of *nāvu*] + *vara* [genitive of the 3rd person pl.] + *du* [3rd person sg. neuter]), ‘that which belongs to the

persons who are ours'. And of course, such words can again be declined:

ನಮ್ಮವರದನ್ನು	<i>nammavaradannu</i>	we saw the thing that belongs
ನೋಡಿದೆವು	<i>nōḍidevu</i>	to our friends
ಅವರದಕ್ಕೆ	<i>avaradakke</i>	we went to his (his thing, his
ಹೋದೆವು	<i>hōdevu</i>	house, etc.)

In the following sentence, we see two pronominalized words:

ನನ್ನದು	<i>nannadu olleyadu</i>	mine is good (= 'my
ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು		thing is a good thing')

In this last sentence, *nannadu* is *nanna* 'my' (genitive of *nānu*) + *du*, or 'my thing'. This *nannadu* is the subject of this nominal sentence, and this 'thing that is mine' is identified as *olleyadu*, which is the adjective *olleya* 'good' + *du*. The adjective *olleya* must be pronominalized here, because it is used predicatively (because we must say 'the thing that is mine is a good thing').

In the preceding example, *olleya* is, of course, an adjective. Pronominalization can also be done with complex adjectives ending in *-āda*:

ಅದು ಭಾರವಾದುದು	<i>adu bhāravādudu</i>	that one is heavy
---------------	------------------------	-------------------

The one thing to notice here is that when such an adjective is pronominalized, the final *-a* (here: of *bhāravāda*) is usually turned into an *-u*. But this is not necessarily so: the form *bhāravādudu* is equally correct, but is considered to have something of a regional flavour to it (northern Karnataka).³

Reduction of *dudu* to *ddu*. Also quite commonly, especially in the spoken language and in the kind of writing that tries to represent colloquial usage, the penultimate short vowel is elided: hence one can also find words such as ಭಾರವಾದ್ದು *bhāravāddu*, 'a heavy one', ಸುಂದರವಾದ್ದು *sumḍaravāddu* 'a beautiful one' instead of *bhāravādudu*, *sumḍaravādudu*, etc.

One word that is used extremely often in everyday conversation, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ *āddarimḍa*, is the ablative case of the third personal singular neuter pronominalization of the past relative participle (relative participles or 'verbal adjectives' are to be discussed in detail in lesson 14)

of the verb ಆಗು *āgu* ‘to become / happen / occur’. Literally, this word means ‘because of what has happened’ (*ādu-darimda*, from *ādudu* ‘what has happened’: *āda* + *du*). At the beginning of a sentence or clause this word is almost always more idiomatically, and better, translated as ‘therefore’.

Incorrect doubling. In the speech (and writing) of some Kannadigas one can also hear and read the doubled *ddu* where there is no etymological or grammatical reason for doing so: for instance, ಚಿಕ್ಕದ್ದು *cikkaddu* where one would expect ಚಿಕ್ಕದು *cikkadu*. Strictly speaking, this is grammatically incorrect; but in some regions this doubling has become so common that it is no longer considered an error.⁴

Idiomatic pronominalizations. Some words that have simple or completely differently derived equivalents in English are pronominalized genitives of nouns:

ಕೆಲಸದವಳು	<i>kelasadavaḷu</i>	housemaid (‘of-the-work she’)
ಮನೆಯವರು	<i>maneyavaru</i>	spouse (‘of-the-house person’)
ಪಕ್ಕದ ಮನೆಯವರು	<i>pakkada maneyavaru</i>	neighbour (‘person of the house of the side’)

In these examples, we see attributive words, namely, the genitives of *kelasa* ‘work’ and *mane* ‘house’ (*kelasada* and *maneya*, respectively) with pronominalization suffixes added to them. Grammatically, the resulting new words are used just like pronouns.

Cultural note about expressions for ‘spouse’

In a traditional society like India’s, as in most parts of the world, marriage and family life play an extremely important role. Weddings are seen as crucial turning points in the lives of the persons who are involved, and they are ceremonies of intense societal importance, often lasting for days, bringing together hundreds of relatives and friends over large distances. Perhaps more than anywhere else in the world, in India the family is the cornerstone of society: a source of stability, identity, and support, of

which many people in the modern Western world could be jealous. Lovers of Indian movies will be familiar with weddings as focal points in screenplays.

Given this central position of the family and of wedlock in social life, it is not surprising that Kannada has a differentiated vocabulary for the terms 'husband' and 'wife'. The original Dravidian words are *gaṃḍa* for 'husband' and *heṃḍati* for 'wife'. But since most of Indian (and Karnatakan) society is quite patriarchal, the word *gaṃḍa* is considered by many to be insufficiently respectful. When a woman speaks about *avaru*, 'he' in the respectful honorific plural, the context may indicate that she is speaking about her husband. For being more explicit, Sanskrit loan words are used, such as *pati* 'lord' and (in very traditional settings) *yajamāna* 'master' (of course always in the honorific plural: *yajamānaru*). When there is mention of another woman's husband, one may hear the highly respectful expression *patidēvaru* 'god who is the lord'; nowadays, especially in urban settings, this expression may be thought to have a somewhat ironical ring to it. Although *heṃḍati* is certainly not considered a disrespectful word, some Kannada speakers prefer to speak of their wives using the more ceremonious Sanskrit loan word *patni* 'mistress'⁵ or, more emphatically, *dharmapatni* 'mistress in the cosmic order'. A more neutral, and very common expression is *maneyavaru* 'person of the house' (again: always in the respectful plural), which can be used either for 'husband' or 'wife': husband and wife together form the basis of the *mane*, which is not merely 'house' but also the social unit that is intimately related to the house.⁶

In the big cities of southern Karnataka, feminism, like many things Western, has made inroads in recent decades, and many younger women want to avoid all the traditional expressions for 'husband' altogether. Along with 'Western' ideas comes the 'Western' (i.e., English, because the entire Western world is popularly thought to be English-speaking) word ಹೆಸ್ಟಂಜೆ *hasbaṃḍu*. Similarly, there are men who have a *waiḥu* / *waiphu*.

Comparatives and superlatives of adjectival expressions; 'very' and 'too'

The modern languages of India lack forms of the adjective which most Western learners of these languages expect to find: comparatives and superlatives. The classical Indo-European languages of India (Sanskrit and the Middle Indic languages: the various kinds of Prakrit) have comparatives and superlatives, and a few such words have been borrowed into modern Indian languages (e.g., the Sanskrit *śrēṣṭha* 'best'), but these are only very few. Dravidian seems never to have had comparatives and superlatives, and it appears certain that the loss of these in the later stages of development of the Indo-European languages of northern India is due to influence of the Dravidian substratum.

Comparison of qualities between two objects is achieved in a different way in Kannada (and in Dravidian in general). Comparison means that one quality that is common to two objects is singled out and is found to a greater extent in one of the objects that are being compared. When in English we say 'John is taller than Paul', what we are communicating is the same as 'in comparison with Paul, John is tall'. This is exactly what is said in Kannada. For 'in comparison with' or 'compared to', the language uses a special postposition, *-imta*, which unlike the great majority of postpositions is added not to the genitive but to the dative case (like *ōskara / ōsuga*), with elision of the final *e* of the dative. Thus this compound suffix of comparison becomes *-(i)gimta* or *-kkimta*, and we get sentences like:

ರಾಮನಿಗಿಂತ ಗಣೇಶ ದೊಡ್ಡವನು	<i>Rāmanigimta</i> <i>Gaṇēśa</i> <i>doḍḍavanu</i>	Gaṇēśa is taller than Rāma ('compared to Rāma, Gaṇēśa is a big male person')
ಈ ಕುರ್ಚಿಗಿಂತ ಅದು ಭಾರ	<i>i kurcigimta adu</i> <i>bhāra</i>	that chair is heavier than this one ('in comparison with this chair, that [one] is weight')

ಧಾರವಾಡ ಎಲ್ಲಿದೆ ?	<i>Dhāravāḍa ellide?</i>	Where is Dharwad?
ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ	<i>Adakkimta</i>	Bangalore is closer
ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಹತ್ತಿರ	<i>Beṅgaḷūru hattira</i>	than that ('in comparison with that, Bangalore is nearness')

There is a bit of flexibility in the word order here: one can also say ಗಣೇಶ ರಾಮನಿಗಿಂತ ದೊಡ್ಡವನು *Gaṇēśa Rāmanigimta doḍḍavanu*.

Very few adjectives are semantically comparative, i.e., by their meaning they imply that two or more things are compared. Examples are ವಾಸಿ *vāsi* and ಲೇಸು *lēsu*, both of which mean 'better'.

A similar device is used for expressing the superlative. When we say, for instance, 'Russia is the largest country', we mean 'in comparison with all [other] countries, Russia is big'. The Kannada word for 'all' is *ella*. The use of this word has a few peculiarities, which are discussed in a later lesson. For the moment, the learner should know that there is a form of *ella* for persons (ಎಲ್ಲರು *ellaru*, which is declined regularly, just like any human-denoting noun in *a*, such as *manuṣyaru*, *hudugaru*, etc.) and another form for things (ಎಲ್ಲ *ella*) which is slightly irregular in its declination (see lesson 19) but largely is like *adu*, and its comparative form is ಎಲ್ಲದಕ್ಕಿಂತ *elladakkimta* ('in comparison to all / everything'). With these words we can create sentences such as the following:

ಈ ಕುರ್ಚಿ	<i>i kurci</i>	this chair is the
ಎಲ್ಲದಕ್ಕಿಂತ	<i>elladakkimta</i>	biggest
ದೊಡ್ಡದು	<i>doḍḍadu</i>	
ರಾಮ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗಿಂತ	<i>Rāma ellarigimta</i>	Rāma is the biggest /
ದೊಡ್ಡವನು	<i>doḍḍavanu</i>	tallest

Literally, these sentences mean 'this chair, in comparison with all [other chairs], is a big one', and 'Rāma, compared to all, is a big fellow'.

To express that a certain quality is present to a high degree ('very'), modern Kannada uses mainly two words: ತುಂಬ *tumba* and ಬಹಳ *ba-haḷa*:

ಇದು ತುಂಬ ಕಷ್ಟ *idu tumba kaṣṭa* this is very difficult
 ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ *idu bahala kaṣṭa* (the same)

Two other words, ಹೆಚ್ಚು *heccu* and ಜಾಸ್ತಿ *jāsti* (both of which literally mean ‘excess’) are used as similar qualifiers before an adjectival expression, in two different meanings: (a) ‘extremely, exceptionally’, (b) ‘too’. When in English we say that something is ‘too big’ (as in German *zu groß*, Dutch *te groot*, French *trop grand*, etc.), what we are actually saying is that we have a notion of a maximum size for the thing under discussion, and that the size of that thing exceeds that maximum in a way that is inappropriate or undesirable. For instance, if I wish to buy a shirt, and I try on a shirt in a garment store and find that it is so big that I cannot wear it without feeling uncomfortable or looking ridiculous (in other words: the shirt is unsuitable), then I will say ‘the shirt is too big’. In Kannada, I can say ಆ ಅಂಗಿ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ದೊಡ್ಡದು *ā aṅgi jāsti doḍḍadu*. However, if somebody speaks about a new movie and says ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಜನ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ *alli jāsti jana baruttāre*, this does not necessarily mean that ‘too many people’ come to see it, but probably ‘a huge number of people’. In other words, the use of *jāsti* (or *heccu*) may or may not mean that a certain tolerable measure is exceeded.

Occasionally one comes across the use of the Sanskrit verbal prefix ಅತಿ *ati* (also adverbialized to ಅತಿಯಾಗಿ *atiyāgi*) to express the aforementioned notion of excessiveness. For instance, if it is said ಅವನು ತನ್ನ ಮಕ್ಕಳನ್ನು ಅತಿಯಾಗಿ ಬಯ್ಯು *avanu tanna makkaḷannu atiyāgi bayda*, this could be translated as ‘he scolded his children excessively’ or ‘he scolded his children too much’.⁷ But also, a bookstore in Bengaluru prides itself on being ಭಾರತದ ಅತಿದೊಡ್ಡ ಪುಸ್ತಕದಂಗಡಿ *Bhāratada atidodḍa pustakadaṅgaḍi*, as it prints on its shopping bags, which obviously should mean ‘India’s largest bookstore’ (and not ‘India’s excessively large bookstore’ or ‘India’s bookstore that is too large’).⁸

ಕನ್ನಡ ಮತ್ತು ಇಂಗ್ಲಿಷ್ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳ ಭಾರತದ ಅತಿದೊಡ್ಡ ಭಂಡಾರ

From the sign on the front of the largest bookstore in Bangalore:
 ‘India’s biggest store for Kannada and English books’

Equatives: ‘as much as’

As for comparisons in which two things are said to be comparable or equal, the word ಅಷ್ಟು *aṣṭu* ‘that much’ is used. Thus, if we wish to say ‘Rāma is as tall (= big) as Surēśa’, we must reformulate the sentence to something like ‘Surēśa is that much tall as Rāma’, or ‘as big as Rāma is, Surēśa is that much big’:

ಸುರೇಶ ರಾಮನಷ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡವನು	<i>Surēśa Rāmanaṣṭu</i> (= <i>Rāmana-aṣṭu</i>) <i>doḍḍavanu</i>
ರಾಮ ಎಷ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡವನೋ ಸುರೇಶ ಅಷ್ಟು ದೊಡ್ಡವನು	<i>Rāma eṣṭu doḍḍavanō Surēśa</i> <i>aṣṭu doḍḍavanu</i> (how big is Rāma? Surēśa is so big)

The second possibility in the above table illustrates one way in which Indo-European relative clauses can be imitated in Dravidian, namely, by using a question word (here: *eṣṭu* ‘how much’) together with the suffix for doubtful questions -*ō*, and the correlative (here: *aṣṭu* ‘that much’) in the main sentence. In effect, what one does is to ask a rhetorical question and then immediately answer it oneself. Far more common, however, is the use of relative participles (the ‘verbal adjectives’ that are discussed in lesson 14).

In practice one often reads and hears the *aṣṭu* combined with the emphatic particle *ē*: *Surēśa Rāmanaṣṭē doḍḍavanu* ‘Surēśa is just as tall as Rāma’, *Rāma eṣṭu doḍḍavanō Surēśa aṣṭē doḍḍavanu*, etc.

This *aṣṭu* often is also combined with relative participles and relative syntactic constructions:

ಅವಳು ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾಳೋ ನಾನು (ಅಷ್ಟು) ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ	<i>avaḷu eṣṭu kelasa</i> <i>māḍiddālō nānu</i> (<i>aṣṭu</i>) <i>māḍuvudilla</i>	I will not do as much work as she has done
--	---	--

i.e., ‘how much work did she do? I will not do (so much)’.⁹

Religions of Karnataka

ಉಡುಪಿ ಕೃಷ್ಣ



Temple car in front of the Sri Krishna Matha, Car Street, Udupi

ಕೃಷ್ಣ ವಿಷ್ಣುವಿನ ಅವತಾರ. ಇಡೀ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವನ ಭಕ್ತರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಉಡುಪಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇವನ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಇದೆ. ಉಡುಪಿ ನಗರದ ಮಧ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ^a ರಥಬೀದಿ ಇದೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಮಠಗಳು^b ಇವೆ. ಕೃಷ್ಣಮಠದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವನ ಮೂರ್ತಿ ಇದೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿ ದಿವಸಾ ಕೃಷ್ಣನಿಗೆ ಪೂಜೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಮೂರ್ತಿಯ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೋಲು ಇದೆ, ಅದು ಉಡುಪಿ ಕೃಷ್ಣನ ವಿಶೇಷವಾದ ಗುರುತು.

ಮಹತ್ವದ ಚಿಂತಕರಾದ ಮಧ್ವಾಚಾರ್ಯರು ಹದಿಮೂರನೆಯ ಶತಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷ್ಣನ ಈ ಮೂರ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಸಮುದ್ರತೀರದಿಂದ ಉಡುಪಿಗೆ ತಂದರು. ಆ ಕಾಲದಿಂದಲೇ ವೈಷ್ಣವಧರ್ಮದ ಮಧ್ವಾಚಾರ್ಯರ ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಉಡುಪಿ ತುಂಬ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಊರು. ದಿವಸಾ ದೇಶ-ವಿದೇಶಗಳಿಂದ^c ಭಕ್ತರು ದರ್ಶನ-ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಬರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

Notes to the text:

^a ಉಡುಪಿ ನಗರದ ಮಧ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ 'In the middle of Uḍupi town' = in the middle of the city of Uḍupi.

^b ಮಠಗಳು. A *maṭha* is a monastery-like institution, always including at least one temple and often a library, a school, and a guest house for pilgrims. The head of such an institution, the *maṭhādhīpati* (who is usually referred to as the *svāmi*, 'lord'), is comparable not only to an abbot in Western Christian monasteries but also to a bishop, and access to a *maṭha* is open to all followers (also lay followers) of the religious community to which it belongs.

^c ದೇಶ-ವಿದೇಶಗಳಿಂದ 'From the country and the foreign countries': from India and abroad.

Cultural note about *darśana*

The Sanskrit word *darśana* (derived from the verb root *drś* 'to see') literally means 'seeing', but in the course of time acquired more than one secondary meaning. Nowadays the most common meaning of the word is an act of seeing an object or person that is thought to be imbued with some kind of special power or charisma that has a blessing effect upon the person who sees. – In fact, this is not basically different from the experiential intensity that is also felt by Westerners when they see a famous person or an object of great historical or religious significance; but already many centuries ago, India, with its traditionally great interest in psychology, conceptualized the phenomenon and has a word for it.

Vocabulary

ಅವತಾರ	<i>avatāra</i>	incarnation of a god
ಇಡಿಯ	<i>iḍiya</i>	entire
ಊರು	<i>ūru</i>	town, village, city
ಕೆಲವು	<i>kelavu</i>	some
ಕೋಲು	<i>kōlu</i>	stick

ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ	<i>kṣētra</i>	holy place of pilgrimage
ಗುರುತು	<i>gurutu</i>	mark, characteristic
ಚಿಂತಕ	<i>cim̄taka</i>	thinker
ಜಾಸ್ತಿ	<i>jāsti</i>	excess; excessively
ತಂದರು	<i>taṁdaru</i>	he (hon.) brought
ತನ್ನ	<i>tanna</i>	his / her / its own
ತೀರ	<i>tīra</i>	coast
ದರ್ಶನ	<i>darśana</i>	ritual viewing of an object of reverence
ದೇಶ	<i>dēśa</i>	land, country
ದಿವಸಾ	<i>divasā</i>	every day
ಪೂಜೆ	<i>pūje</i>	ritual of worship
ಭಕ್ತ	<i>bhakta</i>	devotee
ಮಠ	<i>maṭha</i>	monastery
ಮಧ್ಯ	<i>madhya</i>	middle
ಮಧ್ವಾಚಾರ್ಯ	<i>Madhvācārya</i>	(name)
ಮುಖ್ಯ	<i>mukhya</i>	something important
ರಥಬೀದಿ	<i>rathabīdi</i>	Temple Street
ವಿದೇಶ	<i>vidēśa</i>	foreign country
ವೈಷ್ಣವ	<i>vaiṣṇava</i>	devotee of Viṣṇu
ವಿಶೇಷ	<i>viśēṣa</i>	something special
ಶತಮಾನ	<i>śatamāna</i>	century
ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯ	<i>saṁpradāya</i>	tradition
ಸಮುದ್ರ	<i>samudra</i>	sea, ocean
ಹತ್ತಿರ	<i>hattira</i>	near; nearness
ಹದಿಮೂರನೆಯ	<i>hadimūraneya</i>	thirteenth
ಹೆಚ್ಚು	<i>heccu</i>	excess; excessively

Notes

¹ This *a* and *i* should be thought of as shortened forms of the demonstrative adjectives *ā* ‘that, those’ and *ī* ‘this, these’.

² In some modern writings on Dravidian linguistics, one finds the term **substantivization** for the same phenomenon. I prefer the term ‘pronominalization’, because grammatically these new, derived words behave like pronouns rather than nouns (cf. the 3rd ps. neuter singular genitive in *dara*, the 3rd person neuter plural nominative in *vu*, etc.).

³ The common explanation which one finds among Kannada grammarians for the short *u* before the suffix *du* is that in Old Kannada there was a pronoun *udu*, expressing an intermediate distance of the thing in question to the speaker (besides the proximate *idu* and the distant *adu*; these intermediate Dravidian pronouns are discussed in Krishnamurti 2003: 256, §6.4.2.2). Here the question could be asked why the corresponding intermediate Old Kannada pronouns *uvanu*, *uvaḷu*, *uvaru* are not the basis for pronominalized relative participles (which would produce, for instance, **māḍuvuvanu* for ‘he who makes’, etc.). The present author rather believes that the preference for *-udu* rather than *-adu* among the majority of Kannada speakers today is rather a matter of vowel harmony, where the short *a* between two syllables containing a *u* (which occurs in the vast majority of cases) also becomes a *u*.

⁴ The reason for this doubling is probably a suprasegmental matter, namely, sentence rhythm.

⁵ Of course ‘mistress’ here should be understood in the original sense (the feminine counterpart of ‘master’), and not in the nowadays usual, ironical one. For ‘mistress’ in the ironical sense, Kannada uses the Sanskrit loan word ಪ್ರೇಯಸಿ *prēyasi* ‘more beloved woman’.

⁶ Cf. European usages such as the English ‘the house of Windsor’ or the German ‚das Haus Wittelsbach‘. The word *mane* can also be used elliptically in reference to persons or objects that are related to the family. For instance, one could speak about a boy named *Kṛṣṇa* who is a member of the family (e.g., a brother or cousin), saying *namma maneya Kṛṣṇa* ‘the *Kṛṣṇa* of our house’.

⁷ This use of ಅತಿ *ati* seems to be a rather modern innovation that serves to remedy what is felt to be a lack in the traditional language. It is true that in Sanskrit this prefix carries a meaning of undesirable or intolerable excessiveness, as is found in words such as ಅತಿಕ್ರಮಣ *atikramaṇa* ‘attack’ (‘excessive stride’) or ಅತ್ಯಾಚಾರ *atyācāra* ‘rape’ (‘undesirable and excessive conduct’), but I have not come across this separate adverbial use in older literature.

⁸ The distinctions between ‘too’, ‘very’ and ‘most’ are European ones, which Indians generally find difficult to make, as one also frequently hears in ‘Indian English’ sentences like ‘there were too many people there’, when the speaker actually wants to communicate ‘there were very many people there’.

⁹ Far more common is the use of a relative participle: this verb form is discussed in lesson 14. Sentences of this type are like ಅವನು ಹಾಡಿದಷ್ಟು ನಾನು

ಹಾಡುವೆನು *avanu hāḍidaṣṭu nānu hāḍuvenu* 'I will sing as much as he sang ('he sang-that-much I will sing').