sma makes its appearance (in three of the cases in the singular) in the inflexion of the pronouns of the third person, including the demonstrative, the relative, and the interrogative pronouns. Nothing could be further than this from the Dravidian use; and nothing also, I think, could show more clearly that the sma of asme and yushme cannot safely be regarded as in any sense a sign of the plural.

Twofold Plural of the Dravidian Pronoun of the First Person.—The ordinary plural of the Dravidian first personal pronoun is constantly used, not only as a plural, but also as an honorific singular, precisely as the royal and editorial 'we' is used in English; and the plural of every other Dravidian pronoun may optionally be used as an honorific singular in the same manner. It is not, however, this twofold signification or use of the same pronoun to which I now refer; but the existence of two pronouns of the first person plural, which differ from one another in signification almost as much as the plural and the dual of other languages. In all the Dravidian dialects, with the exception of Canarese, there are two plurals of the pronoun of the first person, of which one denotes, not only the party of the speaker, but also the party addressed, and may be called the plural inclusive; the other excludes the party addressed, and denotes only the party of the speaker, and may be called the plural exclusive. Thus, if a person said "We are mortal," he would naturally use the 'we' which includes those who are spoken to, as well as the speaker and his party, or the plural inclusive: whilst he would use the plural exclusive, or that which excludes the party addressed, if he wanted to say "We are Hindus; you are Europeans."

There is a similar distinction between the two plurals of the first person used in the Marâthi and the Gujarâthi—e.g., hame in Gujarâthi means we—the party speaking; whilst apane means we—the party speaking, and you also who are addressed. There is no connection between the particular pronominal themes used for this purpose in Northern India and in the languages of the South; but the existence of so remarkable an idiom in the North Indian family, as well as in the Southern, seems to demonstrate the existence in the Northern family of an ancient under-current of Dravidian, or at least of non-Aryan influences. The idiom in question is a distinctively Scythian one, and is one of those points which seem to connect the Dravidian family with the Scythian group. There is no trace of this twofold plural in Sanskrit, or in any of the languages of the Indo-European family, but it is found everywhere in Central Asia. Thus Manchu has mû, we—of the one party, and be, we—the whole company. Mongolian has a similar idiom. This peculiarity is found also in the northern dialect of the Chinese. In that dialect, tsa-men, we, includes

the persons addressed, whilst wo-men, we, does not. It is remarkable that it is found also in the Polynesian languages, in many of the languages of America, and also in those of the Australian tribes.

All the Dravidian languages do not use precisely the same plural pronouns as inclusive and exclusive plurals. The colloquial Tamil (with which the Malayalam agrees) forms the plural exclusive from nam, the ordinary and regular plural, by the addition of gal, which is properly a neuter sign of plurality; by which addition nam becomes nângal in Tamil, ñanal or ñanal in Malayâlam. The corresponding plural in Tulu is enkulu. Telugu, on the other hand, uses mêm-u (answering not to the Tamil nanggal, but to nam) as its plural exclusive; and as this is the simplest form of the pronoun, it seems better suited to this restricted use than the reduplicated form. though differing from Tamil in this point, agrees with Tamil in using mêmu as its honorific singular; and this use of the plural exclusive in Telugu as an honorific is more in accordance with philosophical propriety than the Tamilian use of the plural inclusive for this purpose; for when a superior addresses inferiors, it is evidently more natural for him to make use of a plural which excludes those whom he addresses, than one in which they would be included together with himself. agrees with Telugu, and uses &m-u (identical in origin with the Tamil vâm, nâm) to express the restricted signification which Tamil gives to naigal. Its plural inclusive is aju, the oblique form of which is amma; and the Telugu plural which corresponds to aju (but which in meaning corresponds to nam) is manam-u, the base and inflexion of which is mana. manam-u is probably derived from ma, the inflexional base of mêmu, with an euphonic addition, or possibly with a weakened reduplication.

I have now gone over the ground traversed in my first edition, with such additions and corrections as recently-published grammars have enabled me to make. The results are exhibited, for convenience of comparison, in the accompanying table. In this list, I include only those dialects which have been carefully studied, and of which grammars have been published. The pronouns of the first person contained in the Rajmahâl and Ûrâon are exhibited in a separate list, together with those found in Dr Hunter's lists of words contained in the rest of the Central Indian dialects. It is obvious, however, that it would be unsafe to deduce any inference, except one of the vaguest kind, from lists of isolated words collected by persons who had little or no real acquaintance with the dialects to which they belonged. We tread on firmer ground when we compare with one another dialects which have attained to the dignity of possessing published grammars.

## DRAVIDIAN PRONOUN OF THE FIRST PERSON.

Strongy
CINGOLDAN
Nominative, "I." hasis of "my," hations of the Verb. "me," &c.
ydm, ndn.  en.  en.  en.  en.  en.  en.  en.
en.