

# Lesson 14



*Sign at Bangalore airport in English, Kannada and Hindi: the Kannada text communicates 'to-drink-non-past water'*

*The relative participle – interrogatives as relative words*

## The relative participle

The following section is rather lengthy, because it deals with a grammatical mechanism in the Dravidian languages that is unknown in Indo-European and therefore is less easy for most Western learners of Kannada to understand at first sight. It is, however, a very important mechanism, both because of its frequent use and because it demonstrates an important inner structure of the languages of this family.

One category of words that is used in everyday speech in the Indo-European languages is the relative pronoun, like the word 'whom' in a sentence such as "there goes the man whom I saw". Similarly, relative adverbs (such as 'where' in "he found the book where he had left it", or 'when' in "I saw him when he entered the room") also exist. Such words are used for expressing further specifications about that which is denoted by a noun or pronoun, or about the time, place or modality of a situation or action that is expressed in a sentence. The part of a sentence that contains such a relative word is called the relative clause of the sentence.

In Dravidian, such **relative words do not exist**, and therefore relative clauses and sentences that contain relative clauses, which are perfectly ordinary in everyday use in English and other Indo-European languages, cannot exist either.<sup>1</sup> Dravidian uses an entirely different mechanism, one that is highly efficient and very logical, but which can cause the learner some difficulties in the beginning because of its unfamiliarity. Because every statement implies a verb,<sup>2</sup> it is theoretically possible to express all such further specifications by means of verb forms; and this is exactly what happens in Dravidian.

To understand the use of these verb forms (which are commonly called **relative participles**; occasionally linguists also speak of **verbal adjectives**), it is useful to first consider a somewhat similar verbal construction in English. The sentence

*There goes the man whom I saw.*

could be rephrased as

*The man seen by me goes there.*

Although this second sentence sounds rather artificial in modern English, it is understandable.<sup>3</sup> In Kannada, the corresponding sentence would be

ನಾನು ನೋಡಿದ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾನೆ.  
*Nānu nōḍida manuṣya alli hōguttāne.*

Word by word, the Kannada sentence runs “I seen man there goes”.

What has happened here? The most remarkable part of this sentence is the third word, *nōḍida*. The past stem of the verb *nōḍu* ‘to see’ is *nōḍid*, after which, as we have seen in lesson 3, personal endings are added to create finite forms: *nōḍid* + *enu* gives *nōḍidenu* ‘I saw’, etc. If, instead of a personal suffix, one adds a short *a*, a **relative participle** is created. This participle can be considered a type of attributive word, like an adjective.<sup>4</sup> It carries the meaning that is expressed by the verb root from which it is derived, and it also carries an indication of time. (There is also a relative participle for the non-past, i.e., present or future, to be discussed later in this lesson, as well as a negative relative participle, to be discussed in a later lesson.) Thus the word *nōḍida* indicates that what is expressed by the word that follows it is in some way specified by the act of seeing, and that this seeing took place in the past.

Secondly, the word *nānu* in the model sentence deserves attention. This is of course ‘I’, in the nominative case. In the parallel sentence in an Indo-European language, the agent of the action (seeing) is not expressed by the nominative, but by means of a preposition (‘seen by me’, ‘von mir gesehen’, etc.), because the past participle that is used in these Indo-European languages is a past passive participle. Although the Dravidian languages have grammatical devices by which the Indo-European passive mood can to some extent be imitated, the passive

participle does not exist. The verb form *nōḍida* is active, and therefore the agent of the verb is put in the case that is customary for indicating the agent in any sentence, namely, the nominative.

The surprising result of the application of these syntactic rules is that the sentence *Nānu nenne nōḍida manuṣya alli hōguttāne* contains two nominatives: one expressing the agent of the verb *nōḍu* and another one expressing the agent of the verb *hōgu*.

The feature of the Dravidian relative participle that is initially confusing to the learner is that the phrase *nōḍida manuṣya* by itself does not indicate whether the ‘man’ is the subject, object, or anything else of the ‘seeing’. This is illustrated by the model sentence in a slightly, but importantly, modified form:

ನನ್ನನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾನೆ.  
*Nannannu nōḍida manuṣya alli hōguttāne.*

Here the original *nānu* ‘I’ (nominative), has been replaced by *nannannu* ‘me’ (accusative). This sentence too is grammatically perfectly acceptable, but it means something different. The ‘me’ is obviously the object of an action, and this action must be the ‘seeing’. Since *nannannu* cannot be the agent, it is understood that the next noun or pronoun following the participle must be the agent; hence this modified sentence means: “The man who saw me goes there.”

However, we can make the sentence still more complicated:

ನನ್ನನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ ಮನುಷ್ಯನನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿದರು.  
*Nannannu nōḍida manuṣyanannu alli nōḍidaru.*

Here again, the ‘me’ must be the object of the ‘seeing’, therefore the ‘man’ must be the agent; but ‘man’ here is also in the accusative case. This means that *manuṣyanannu* too must be the object of a verb, and this second verb appears at the end of the sentence: *nōḍidaru* ‘they saw’. (Here the subject is indicated by the personal ending.) This sentence means: “There they saw the man who saw me.” (literally: ‘me seen man there saw-they’).<sup>5</sup>

Other case forms are also possible:

ನನ್ನನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಪುಸ್ತಕ ಕೊಟ್ಟೆನು.  
*nannannu nōḍida manuṣyanige pustaka koṭṭenu.*  
 (Me seen man-to book gave-I.)

This means: “I gave a book to the man who saw me.”

From the above examples it should be clear that a relative participle such as *nōḍida* expresses nothing more than ‘seeing’ (*nōḍu*) + ‘past’ (*nōḍid*) + ‘related to’ (*nōḍida*). It is helpful for the beginning learner to think of the final *a* as a connecting suffix, similar to the marker of the genitive case.<sup>6</sup>

Sometimes, when translating into a Western language, one must actively and imaginatively think along with the Kannada speaker / writer to create appropriate translations of Kannada sentences.<sup>7</sup> One ‘problem’ for students who come from an Indo-European language is that the Dravidian relative participle is neither active nor passive, nor does it contain any information about person, gender, number or case of the words to which it relates in the sentence: it only communicates that some action or process took or takes place with regard to something or someone else at a certain time. Any further information is contained in the word order and in the grammatical case endings of other words: not in the relative participle. The sentence

ನನಗೆ ತೋರಿಸಿದ ಹಣ್ಣು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದೆ.  
*Nanage tōrisida haṇṇu cennāgide.*

means: “The fruit that was shown to me is tasty (good).” Here it is obvious that *nanage* ‘to me’, being a dative, cannot be the agent of the act of *tōrisu* ‘to show’, which is a transitive verb, and the *haṇṇu* ‘fruit’ surely did not show itself; *tōrisida* means that the following *haṇṇu* is somehow specified by the act of showing in the past. The broader context in which the sentence was used would communicate who or what had shown the fruit. Here the subject is not explicitly stated, and the relative participle is most easily translated as a phrase in the passive mood.

Examples with past relative participles derived from other verbs:

ನಾನು ಮಾಡಿದ ಕೆಲಸ	<i>nānu māḍida kelasa</i>	the work which I did (‘I-done work’)
ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಕೆಲಸ	<i>alli māḍida kelasa</i>	the work that was done there (‘there done work’)

ಅವನು ಹೇಳಿದ ಜಾಗ	<i>avanu hēḷida jāga</i>	the place about which he spoke ('he-said place')
ನನಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ ಜಾಗ	<i>nanage hēḷida jāga</i>	the place about which I was told ('me-to said place')
ಅವನು ಬಂದ ನಗರ	<i>avanu baṁda nagara</i>	the city to which he came
ಅವನು ವಾಸ ಮಾಡಿದ ನಗರ	<i>avanu vāsa māḍida nagara</i>	the city where he lived
ಅವಳು ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	<i>avaḷu bareda patra</i>	the letter which she wrote
ಅವಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	<i>avalige bareda patra</i>	the letter that was written to her
ನಾನು ಅವಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆದ ಪತ್ರ	<i>nānu avalige bareda patra</i>	the letter that I had written to her



English 'translations' can reveal problems in linguistic comprehension: ಈಡು-ಗಾಯಿ ಒಡೆಯುವ ಸ್ಥಳ means 'sacrificial-coconut to-break-non-past place'. At the Chamundi Temple, atop Chamundi Hill, Mysore<sup>8</sup>

Curiously, there are **no separate relative participles for the two other tenses, but only combined 'non-past' participles** that refer either to the present or to the future.<sup>9</sup> These participles are formed from the future stem, again with an *a* instead of a personal ending.

ನಾನು ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸ	<i>nānu māḍuva kelasa</i>	the work which I (will) do
ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸ	<i>alli māḍuva kelasa</i>	the work that is being / will be done there
ಅವನು ಹೇಳುವ ಜಾಗ	<i>avanu hēluva jāga</i>	the place about which he speaks
ನನಗೆ ಹೇಳುವ ಜಾಗ	<i>nanage hēluva jāga</i>	the place about which I am being told
ಅವನು ಬರುವ ನಗರ	<i>avanu baruva nagara</i>	the city to which he comes
ಅವನು ವಾಸ ಮಾಡುವ ನಗರ	<i>avanu vāsa māḍuva nagara</i>	the city where he lives
ಅವಳು ಬರೆಯುವ ಪತ್ರ	<i>avaḷu bareyuva patra</i>	the letter which she writes
ಅವಳಿಗೆ ಬರೆಯುವ ಪತ್ರ	<i>avaḷige bareyuva patra</i>	the letter that is being written to her

The adjectivizing suffix *-āda*, which we learnt about in an earlier chapter, is actually the relative participle (past tense) of the verb *āgu* ‘to become’. Therefore, an expression such as *oraṭāda mātu* ‘a coarse word’ literally means ‘a word that became a coarse thing’; *nijavāda kathe* ‘a true story’ is literally ‘a story that became a true thing’.

Relative participles can also be pronominalized:

ನಾನು ಓದಿದ ಪತ್ರ	<i>nānu ōdida patra</i>	the letter which I read
ನಾನು ಓದಿದುದು	<i>nānu ōdidudu<sup>10</sup></i>	the thing which I read
ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದವನು	<i>ī kelasa māḍidavanu</i>	he who did this work

Such pronominalizations of relative participles are very common, and it is important that the learner understands the mechanism behind them.

ನಡೆಯುವ ಹುಡುಗ	<i>naḍeyuva huḍuga</i>	a boy who is walking / a walking boy
ಅರಳಿದ ಹೂ	<i>araḷida hū</i>	a blossomed flower / a flower that has bloomed

When in lesson 1 the pronouns were discussed, it was shown that the pronouns for the third person are actually pronominalization endings that are preceded by demonstrative prefixes for ‘distance’ or ‘proximity’ as possible attributes of the person that are expressed in the ending (a male *-vanu*, a female *-vaḷu*, etc.). But all kinds of attributes are imaginable. We have already come across pronominalized genitives of nouns and adjectival expressions (such as *kelasada-vaḷu* and *cikka-vanu*). Relative participles, too, are attributes, and they can be pronominalized. Just as it is possible to speak of ‘he’ (‘that male person’) as ಅವನು *a-vanu* ‘distant-male-person’, it is possible to, for instance, speak of ‘he who wrote’ as ಬರೆದವನು *bare-d-a-vanu* (‘writing-[past tense]-male-person’), or ‘she who walked’ as ನಡೆದವಳು *naḍe-d-a-vaḷu* (‘walking-[past tense]-female-person’). In this example, instead of the simple prefixed *a* ‘distant’, we have something more complex, namely, a relative participle based on the verb root ಬರೆ *bare* ‘to write’, plus the marker *-d-* for the past tense (which creates a stem for the past tense) and the suffix *-a-* which indicates a connection between this past stem and that which follows (in these examples the masculine suffix *-vanu* or the feminine suffix *-vaḷu*). This type of word is a **pronominalized relative participle**, because the resulting word behaves grammatically like a pronoun.

In the above two phrases, the two relative participles *naḍeyuva* and *araḷida* are attributive words: they provide additional information about the nouns that follow (‘boy’, ‘flower’). Pronominalization suffixes can be added to them:

<i>naḍeyuva</i>	<i>-vanu</i>	<i>naḍeyuvavanu</i>
(walking)	(male person)	he who walks
<i>araḷida</i>	<i>-du</i>	<i>araḷidudu</i> <sup>11</sup>
(blossomed)	(thing)	the one that blossomed

A word such as *naḍeyuvavanu* can be inflected, exactly like the corresponding pronouns (*avanu* etc.). In the following table we see examples

of two such pronominalized relative participles in the accusative case, recognizable by the distinctive case suffix *-annu*:

ನಡೆಯುವ ಹುಡುಗನನ್ನು ಕರೆಯುತ್ತೇನೆ	<i>naḍeyuva huḍuganannu kareyuttēne</i>	I call the boy who is walking
ನಡೆಯುವವನನ್ನು ಕರೆಯುತ್ತೇನೆ	<i>naḍeyuvavanannu kareyuttēne</i>	I call the one who is walking (walking-[male]-person I call)
ಅರಳಿದ ಹೂವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದೆನು	<i>araḷida hūvanu nōḍidenu</i>	I saw the flower that blossomed
ಅರಳಿದುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದೆನು	<i>araḷidudannu nōḍidenu</i>	I saw the one that blossomed (blossomed-thing I saw)

We can also use these pronominalized relative participles to say something about (for instance) a boy who came home and saw the flower that blossomed ('the one who came home saw the one that had blossomed' becomes 'home-to come-male-person [nominative] blossomed-thing [accusative] saw [3rd person singular masculine]'):

ಮನೆಗೆ ಬಂದವನು ಅರಳಿದುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದನು	<i>manege baṁdavanu araḷidudannu nōḍidanu</i>
-------------------------------------	---

A sentence such as this last one could be literally translated as 'the man who came home saw the thing that had blossomed', or, depending on the context of the sentence, 'when he came home he saw what had blossomed'. (We will see a more usual method of indicating time in lesson 18.) This same second sense could also be communicated by *ಮನೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ಅರಳಿದುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದನು manege baṁdu araḷidudannu nōḍidanu*, simply using a gerund.

A relative participle can also be combined with *aṣṭu* to create an expression that means 'as much as' or 'to the limit that the action X is done':

ಅವನು ಹಾಡಿದಷ್ಟು ನಾನು ಹಾಡುವೆನು	<i>avanu hāḍidaṣṭu nānu hāḍuvenu</i>	I will sing as much as he sang ('he sang-that- much I will sing')
---------------------------------	--	---

Similarly, a relative participle can be combined with *āga* 'then' to create expressions of time (ಹಾಡಿದಾಗ *hāḍidāga* 'when [someone] had sung', ಹೋಗುವಾಗ *hōguvāga* 'when [someone / something] goes', etc.) or with *hāge* or *aṃte* to create expressions of manner (ಹಾಡಿದಹಾಗೆ *hāḍidahāge* 'as [someone] had sung', ಹೋಗುವಂತೆ *hōguvamte* 'as [someone / something] goes', etc.). See also below, lesson 18.

## Interrogatives as relative words

What was described above (attributive constructions with the so-called relative participle) is the typically Dravidian equivalent of Indo-European relative clauses. There is, however, another method in which one can express similar attributes without using a relative participle. This second method is generally considered a bit unnatural and clumsy, and its use is limited mainly to formal written language and literary usage.<sup>12</sup>

What in effect happens in such sentences is that the speaker asks a rhetorical question using an interrogative (a question word), ends the question with the suffix *-ō*, and then immediately answers the question himself:

ನಾನು ನೆನ್ನೆ ಯಾವ ಮನುಷ್ಯನನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದನೋ ಅವನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾನೆ	<i>nānu nenne yāva manuṣyanannu nōḍidenō avanu alli hōguttāne</i>	the man whom I saw yesterday goes there
ಯಾವ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ನೆನ್ನೆ ನನ್ನನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದನೋ ನಾನು ಅವನಿಗೆ ಪುಸ್ತಕ ಕೊಟ್ಟೆನು	<i>yāva manuṣya nenne nannannu nōḍidanō nānu avanige pustaka koṭṭenu</i>	I gave a book to the man who saw me yesterday

Literally, what is said in these two sentences is "which man did I see yesterday? He goes there", and "which man saw me yesterday? I gave him a book".

The one advantage of this somewhat stilted construction is that anything in the composite message can be precisely relativized by pointing to it by means of a question word:

ನಾವು ಹಿಂದೆ ಎಲ್ಲಿ	<i>nāvu hiṁde elli bhēṭi</i>	I will see her where
ಭೇಟಿ ಆದವೋ	<i>ādevō nānu alli</i>	we met before
ನಾನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಳನ್ನು	<i>avaḷannu nōḍuvenu</i>	
ನೋಡುವೆನು		

Or more literally: “where did we meet before? I will see her there”.  
Such quasi-questions can also be used in equative sentences:

ಅವಳು ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೆಲಸ	<i>avaḷu eṣṭu kelasa</i>	I will not do so
ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾಳೋ ನಾನು	<i>māḍiddāḷō nānu</i>	much work as she
(ಅಷ್ಟು)	<i>(aṣṭu) māḍuvudilla</i>	has done (‘how
ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ		much work has she
		done? I will not do
		so much’)

Curiously enough, although this construction is considered clumsy and artificial and is rarely used, whether in conversation or in writing, a shortened form is often used colloquially to express doubt about something:

ಅವನು ಯಾವಾಗ	<i>avanu yāvāga</i>	[I] don’t know
ಬರುತ್ತಾನೋ	<i>baruttānō gottilla</i>	when he’ll come <sup>13</sup>
ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ		
ನಗಬೇಕೋ	<i>nagabēkō aḷabēkō</i>	I don’t know
ಅಳಬೇಕೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ	<i>gottilla</i>	whether I should
		laugh or cry

More literally: “When will he come? It is not known”, and “Should one laugh? Should one cry? It is not known”.

## Cultural note

When less sophisticated speakers of Kannada, typically in rural areas, tell stories, they will often interrupt the flow of their story

to ask questions that help to clarify details of the story. The storyteller may say something like ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾನು ಬಾವಿಗೆ ಹೋದೆ. ಎಲ್ಲಿ? ಆ ಬಾವಿಯ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಬ್ಬಣ್ಣನ ಮನೆ ಇದೆ, ಅಲ್ಲವಾ? ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಚಂದ್ರು ಸಿಕ್ಕ. ಯಾರು ಚಂದ್ರು? ಅಂಗಡಿಯವನು. ಅವನು ಸಿಕ್ಕ *Ā mēle nānu bāvige hōde. Elli? Ā bāvīya pakkadalli Subbaṅṅana mane ide, allavā? Alli hōde. Alli Caṁdru sikka. Yāru Caṁdru? Aṁgaḍiyavanu. Avanu sikka* (“Then I went to the well. Where? Next to that well is Subbaṅṅa’s house, isn’t it? I went there. There I met Caṁdru. Who is Caṁdru? The shopkeeper. I met him”). This is much more long-winded than ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ನಾನು ಸುಬ್ಬಣ್ಣನ ಮನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಬಾವಿಗೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಗಡಿಯವನಾದ ಚಂದ್ರು ಸಿಕ್ಕ *Ā mēle nānu Subbaṅṅana maneya pakkadalliruva bāvige hōdāga alli Caṁdru sikka* “Then, after I had gone to the well next to Subbaṅṅa’s house, I met Caṁdru there”. But simple people tend to tell their stories in the aforementioned halting manner, avoiding the usage of more than one relative participle in more complex sentences (here *iruva and hōda*). Often writers will imitate this style in their novels and stories to evoke a rural setting.

## Exercise

Read and translate the following sentences:

೧. ನಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ವಿಷಯ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ.
೨. ನೀವು ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿದ ಸಮ್ಮೇಳನಕ್ಕೆ ತುಂಬ ಜನ ಬಂದರು.
೩. ನಾವು ಕೇಳುವ ಸಂಗೀತ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದೆ.
೪. ನೀವು ಬರೆಯುವ ಪತ್ರ ಯಾರಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಇದೆ?
೫. ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಪಾಠ ತುಂಬ ಕ್ಲಿಷ್ಟ.
೬. ನನ್ನ ಮಗು ಬೆಳೆದ ಊರು ಸುಂದರವಾಗಿದೆ.
೭. ಪುರೋಹಿತರು ಮಲಗಿದ ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ತುಂಬ ನೆರಳು ಇದೆ.
೮. ನಾಳೆ ನೀವು ಸುದ್ದಿ ಓದುವ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ ಮಾತುಗಳು ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.
೯. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಹಣ್ಣುಗಳು ಸಿಗುತ್ತವೆ.
೧೦. ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿದೆ.
೧೧. ತುಂಬ ಹೆಮ್ಮೆಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಿದ ಕೆಲಸದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದ.

೧೨. ನೀವು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿದೆ.

೧೩. ನಮ್ಮ ತಮ್ಮ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ನನಗೆ ಕೋಪ ಬಂತು.<sup>14</sup>

೧೪. ಗ್ರಂಥಾಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋದವನು ನನ್ನ ತಮ್ಮ.

೧೫. ನಾನು ಗ್ರಂಥಪಾಲಕ, ಗ್ರಂಥಾಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವವರಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

## Vocabulary

ಅಧ್ಯಾಪಕ	<i>adhyāpaka</i>	teacher
ಅರಳು	<i>araḷu</i>	to bloom, blossom
ಕೋಪ	<i>kōpa</i>	anger
ಗ್ರಂಥಪಾಲಕ	<i>gram̐thapālaka</i>	librarian
ಗ್ರಂಥಾಲಯ	<i>gram̐thālaya</i>	library
ಜಾಗ	<i>jāga</i>	spot, place
ತಮ್ಮ	<i>tamma</i>	younger brother
ನೆರಳು	<i>neraḷu</i>	shade, shadow
ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ	<i>patrike</i>	magazine
ಪಾಠ	<i>pātha</i>	lesson
ಪುರೋಹಿತ	<i>purōhita</i>	priest
ಮಾತನಾಡು	<i>mātanāḍu</i>	to speak
ಮಾತು	<i>mātu</i>	word, utterance
ವಾಸ	<i>vāsa</i>	living, dwelling
ಸಹಾಯ	<i>sahāya</i>	help
ಸಿಗು	<i>sigu</i>	to be obtained, to be met
ಸುದ್ದಿ	<i>suddi</i>	news, message
ಹೆಮ್ಮೆ	<i>hemme</i>	pride

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> A kind of quasi-relative clauses can, however, be constructed in what should be considered a Dravidian imitation of an Indo-European relative construction. This will be discussed later in this lesson.

<sup>2</sup> This is also the case in nominal sentences, as we shall see further below.

<sup>3</sup> In some other European languages, like German, the corresponding *Der gestern von mir gesehene Mann geht dort* sounds considerably less artificial. This kind of construction is far more common in German, Dutch and several other languages, and in its word order resembles the Dravidian construction somewhat, although of course the grammatical case of the agent is different, and (very importantly) a relative participle is not passive.

<sup>4</sup> One could also consider naming this verb form a 'verbal adjective' or 'verbal attribute', which are more precise terms, because strictly speaking there is no 'relativeness' in this form; but the term 'relative participle' has already become rather established.

<sup>5</sup> This 'literal' English reproduction of the Kannada sentence is confusing because English has no accusative case endings. The Kannada sentence is clear to a native speaker.

<sup>6</sup> In explanations of verb conjugations as given in indigenous Kannada grammars, the past stem of a verb like *nōḍu* is given as *nōḍida*, i.e., like the relative participle, and the final *a* is elided before the initial vowel of the personal ending.

<sup>7</sup> This is of course the foremost golden rule of all good translating: **never switch off your mind, but think along with the author.** But in the case of relative participles, the obvious truth of this rule becomes still clearer than usual.

<sup>8</sup> The Indian translator evidently did not understand the use of Indo-European participles.

<sup>9</sup> This is one indication that the present tense in Kannada is a relatively late development in the history of the language.

<sup>10</sup> Note that the form *ōḍidadu* is considered equally correct. Just as in the case of words like *yāvudu* / *yāvadu*, this form has a regional (northern) flavour. In quick speech, one often hears the shortened form *ōḍiddu*, which nowadays is also found in writing.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the previous note: the form *araḷidadu* is considered equally correct, and one also finds the shortened form *araḷiddu*, which nowadays is also found in writing.

<sup>12</sup> Sridhar quotes an unpublished doctoral thesis submitted in 1970, in which Kannada and Konkani syntactic structures are compared in support of the view that this second method has been borrowed from Indo-Aryan (i.e., the sub-family of the Indo-European languages in northern India). See Sridhar 1990: 47 (§1.1.2.3).

<sup>13</sup> See lesson 16 for an explanation of this extremely common expression ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ *gottilla* 'knowledge is not'.

<sup>14</sup> ಬಂತು *baṁtu* is the irregularly shortened form of ಬಂದಿತು *baṁditu* 'it came'. It occurs far more frequently than the original, longer form.