

Negations in Mullukurumba and Kattunaikka Tribes in Nilgiris

Dr. K. Umaraj

Assistant Professor, Department of Linguistics, Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India

ABSTRACT

Negation is a grammatical term for the contradiction of some or all the meaning of an affirmative (positive) linguistic entity. Negation can go not only with verb but also with other elements like adjective and noun phrases while they occur within a sentence. The present paper tries to throw light upon from a comparative perspective and describe the negation and its kinds in Mullukurumba language and then in Kattunayakkan language and those patterns and kinds are compared for understanding commonness such as common care and overall patterns with relevant illustrations obtained through field study.

KEYWORDS: Mullukurumbas, Nilgiri's tribes, Kattunayakkans, Negation

INTRODUCTION

Negation is a grammatical term for the contradiction of some or all the meaning of an affirmative (positive) linguistic entity. In English certain phrases/words/sentences are commonly negated by inserting the words like not, don't, would not etc. An alternative negation process in English is prefixation in the morphological processes of certain words e.g like /dislike, regular/ irregular etc. Negations are the ways that grammar encodes negative polarity in verb phrases, clauses or other utterances. Essentially an affirmative (positive) form is used to express the validity or truth of a basic assertion, while a negative form expresses its falsity. Affirmative is typically the unmarked polarity, whereas a negative statement is marked in some way, whether by a negating word or particle. According to Caldwell (1976) "All verbal themes are naturally affirmative, and the negative signification is expressed by means of addition of changes". So Negative is marked one and positive is unmarked category.

Therefore, it is convenient to define this concept as the process of converting affirmative to negative is called Negation. The grammatical rules for negation vary from language to language, and in a given language may have more than one method of doing

How to cite this paper: Dr. K. Umaraj "Negations in Mullukurumba and Kattunaikka Tribes in Nilgiris" Published in International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (ijtsrd), ISSN: 2456-6470, Volume-6 | Issue-5, August 2022, pp.2103-2107, URL: www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd51779.pdf



Copyright © 2022 by author (s) and International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development Journal. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)



so. In some languages negation is marked either before a verb and in some other languages it will marked after a verb. In some languages it is marked before or after the verb. Examples In English he is a boy/ he is **not** a boy and in Tamil, avan paiyan/ avan payan **illai**. Negation can go not only with verb but also with other elements like adjective and noun phrases while they occur within a sentence. The present paper tries to throw light upon in a comparative perspective. This paper at first describe the negation and its kinds in Mullukurumba language and then in Kattunayakkan language and those patterns and kinds are compared for understanding commonness such as common care and overall patterns with relevant illustrations obtained through field study.

Negative in Mullukurumba

Mullukurumba is one type of Kurumba linguistic community like Bettakurumba, Pal kurumba, rumba etc. They inhabit in the selected hamlets located in the Nilgiris. Their linguistic situation is multilingual and the majority of the speakers of these languages know their own mother tongue, regional and dominant language Tamil and one or two neighboring tribal languages like Kota, Toda etc. Though the

multilingualism exists in individual and society, they try to maintain their own indigenous linguistic patterns. It is indeed very much essential to record those features, as these tribal languages are the threat to external and internal impacts.

In Mullukurmba language, the notion of negative is expressed in two ways morphologically by the addition of different negative markers to the verbal

examples

teTu-i-ttu-ila “ didn’t search”

eTu-ttu-ila “ didn’t take”

In the case of future negations, the negative marker -ula is directly added to the verbal stems.

examples

poo-ku-ula ‘ will not go”

veli-k-kula “ will not go”

viru-ula “ will not open or blossom”

thozuv -ula “ will not worship”

In the case of present tense forms the negative form -illa is added after the tense marker.

examples

nook-ku-unu-ila “ not to look”

pooku-unu-ila “ not to go”

tiri-inu-ila “ not wandering”

virik-kinu-ila “ not to spread”

koTuk-unu-ila “ not to give”

When the affirmative forms are negated the personal terminations which are present in the affirmatives are dropped.

{-a:} ‘negative marker’

/∞ -al ∞-ila∞ - ile ∞-ula∞- a:/

∞ - al occurs before the imperative markers -e and -i.

e.g. para-al-e [2.15]	>parayale ‘do not tell [you.sg.]’
naṭak-k-al-e [2.14]	>natakkale ‘do not walk [you.sg.]’
cirik-k-al-i [2.14]	>cirikkali ‘do not laugh [you.pl.]’
koṭuk-k-al-i [2.14]	>koṭukkali ‘do not give [you.pl.]’
veṭṭu-ik-k-al-e [2.4,14]	>veṭṭikkale ‘do not cause to cut [you.sg.]’
ayep-pik-k-al-e [2.14]	>ayepikkale ‘do not cause to send [you.sg.]’

∞-ila occurs after the present tense markers.

e.g. no:kku-unu-illa [2.4]	>no:kkunilla ‘not look’
po:ku-unu-illa [2.4]	>po:kunilla ‘not go’
ṭiri-inu-illa [2.4,15]	>ṭiriyinilla ‘not run’
virik-k-inu-illa [2.4,14]	>virikkinilla ‘not spread’
koṭuk-k-unu-illa [2.4,14]	>koṭukkunilla ‘not give’

∞-ila occurs as past negative forms.

e.g. koy-ṭu-ttu-ila [2.4]	>koyṭuttuila ‘did not harvest’
ṭedut-i-ttu-ila [2.4]	>ṭedutittuila ‘did not search’
eṭuk-ṇtu-ttu-ila [2.4,16]	>eṭuttuila ‘did not take’

bases, syntactically by making use of the free forms ille, illa, ila. The negative markers are added to the verbal bases directly or after the tense markers or after the causative markers. But in the case of past negation, the auxiliary verb -ttu is added to the verbal participle form and then the negative form -illa is added.

va-ṅtu-ṭtu-ila-eṅki [2.4,23,26] >vaṅṅtuṭṭilenki ‘if did not come’

∞-ula occurs as future negation.

e.g. po:ku-ula [2.4]	>po:kula ‘will not go’
vellik-k-ula [2.14]	>velikkula ‘will not suck’
vaṭik-k-ula [2.14]	>vaṭikkula ‘will not share’
virī-ula [2.15]	>viriyula ‘will not open or blossom’
ṭoḷu-ula [2.4]	>ṭoḷula ‘will not worship’

oo-a: occurs elsewhere

e.g. koṭuk-k-a:- <u>ṅ</u> tu [2.14]	>koṭukka: <u>ṅ</u> tu ‘without giving’
eḷek-k-a:- <u>ṅ</u> tu [2.14]	>eḷekka: <u>ṅ</u> tu ‘without sitting’
ṭin-a:- <u>ṅ</u> tu [2.2]	>ṭinna: <u>ṅ</u> tu ‘having not eaten’
ṭi:ru-a:- <u>ṭ</u> tu-a [2.4]	>ṭi:ra: <u>ṭ</u> ta ‘which is not finished’
veṭṭu-a:- <u>ṭ</u> tu-a [2.4]	>veṭṭa: <u>ṭ</u> ta ‘which is not cut’
virik-k-a:- <u>ṭ</u> tu-a [2.4,14]	>virikka: <u>ṭ</u> ta ‘which is not spread’
ka:nu-a:- <u>ṭ</u> tu-a [2.4]	>ka:na: <u>ṭ</u> ta ‘which is not seen’
kiṭṭu-a:- <u>ṭ</u> tu-aṭu [2.4]	>kiṭṭa: <u>ṭ</u> taṭu ‘the act of not getting’
etuk-k-a:- <u>ṭ</u> tu-aṭu [2.4,14]	>etukka: <u>ṭ</u> taṭu ‘the act of not taking’

illustrations

nīyyu	po:le <u>ṅ</u> tekkale	beat-do not]		
[you [sg.]	polan [Accl]			
‘you do not beat polan’				
nunṅa	ra:kku	<u>ku</u> tikkali		
[you [pl.]	arrack	drink-do not]		
‘you [pl.] do not drink arrack’				
ra:mensko:ḷukku	po:kunilla	going-not]		
[Rama	school-to			
‘Rama is not going to school’				
a: utuppiya	na:nu	<u>e</u> tuttuṭṭila		
[that money	I	take-did not]		
‘I did not take that money’				
na:nuna:leve:lulupo:kula				
[I tomorrow paddy field –to go-will not]				
‘Tomorrow I will not go to paddy field’				
na:nu	kaṅṅanukku	utuppiya	koṭukka: <u>ṅ</u> tu	peyyiyen
[I	kanna – to	money	give-without	went-I]
‘Having not given money to kanna, I went’				
u:ṭṭi na:nuka:ṅa: <u>ṭ</u> taṣṭalon				
[ooty	I see-not place]			
‘ooty is a place which I have not seen’				

avanu co:tu kitṭa:ttatu koṇṭu catta:n
[he rice get-not-the act of because of died-he]

‘He died because of the act of not getting rice’

Negatives in Kattunaiyakan

Kattunayakan is another tribal community which also lives in the Nilgiris. This tribal community also lives along with other tribal communities viz Irula, Kurumba, Kotha, Toda etc and also with Tamils. This leads to have a multilinguistic setup in their living environment and in turn most of the speakers both men and women are multinationals. Because of this multilingualism, their mother tongue is in verge of extinction. So it is the need of the hour to document their grammatical pattern in general and negative pattern or process in question. So as did for Mullukurumbas, this portion of the paper tries to describe the negative in Mullukurumbas

There are three auxiliaries to express negative potential meaning in Kattunaikann tribes viz. /aagilla/ /aga/ and /illa/.

e.g. barak aagilla ‘can’t-come-someone’
 holig aagilla ‘can’t stitch-someone’
 kuḍupp aagilla ‘can’t drink-someone’
 tinnalu-saadhya villa ‘can’t eat-someone’
 tinna- aagilla “ cannot eat “

The auxiliary aagilla is analysable into a:g- and il-, being a defective verb.

NEGATIVE INJUNCTIVE

There are two different auxiliaries to express negative injunction viz. [i] – barathu and [ii] –a:gə. The auxiliary –a:gə can be related to the verb a:g- ‘to become’

e.g. i] ningəttinnabaradu ‘you should not eat’
 “ o:pabaradu ‘you should not go’
 “ barabaradu ‘you should not come’
 “ snana aga baradu ‘you should not bathe’
 ii] ningə o:gale a:gə [2.28] →
 “ o:gale:ə ‘you should not go’
 “ kuḍuppale:gə ‘you should not drink’

NEGATIVE EXISTENTIAL

The auxiliary –ille/- - ille is added to the neuter participle nouns to express past and non-past negation. The structure is as follows.

Neut. PPl.N.	+	Aux.	
e.g. band-a-t-ile		→	
banditile [2.13,17,22]		→	
bantile‘			did not come-some one’
band-a-t-ille		→	
bandatille‘			did not come-some one’
bar-iv-a-d-ille [2.13]		→	
barivdille‘			will not come someone’
bar-ϕ-a-d-ille		→	
baradille‘			will not come-someone’
o:-d-a-t-ille		→	

o:datille [2.13,17,24]	→	
o:tille‘		did not go-someone‘
o:g-id-a-t-ile	→	
o:gidatile‘		did not go-someone‘
o:x-p-a-d-ille [2.7,24]	→	
o:padille‘		will not go-someone‘
kari-d-a-t-ille [2.12]	→	
karedatille‘		did not call-someone‘
kari-p-a-d-ille [2.12,25]	→	
karevadille‘		will not call-someone‘

PROHIBITIVE

The auxiliary which expresses prohibition is be:ðə.¹⁰

e.g. bara-be:ðə	‘don’t come-you’
kaliya-be:ðə	‘don’t read-you’
gyalippa-be:ðə	‘don’t tear-you’

Conclusion

European languages usually form negatives in a fairly straightforward manner by the addition of some negative particle to the verb. However negation in tribal language is little bit complicated. Generally the negation in tribal languages involving sometimes several main verbs, verbal participles, aspectual verbs, “dais, or auxiliaries combined in such a way that the boundary between morphology and syntax is often indeterminable. When negation of any of these is introduced, the semantics of the whole phrase can become extremely intricate. If each of these complex negative constructions were to be treated as part of a morphological paradigm, a complete catalogue of them would consist of a list of all the sentences in the language. This is obviously undesirable.

Another aspect of negation in tribal languages is that, unlike modern Indo-European languages, where negation is often accomplished by the affixation of negative ‘particles’ such as English *not*, Russian *ne*, German *nicht*, Spanish *no*, to basic positive verbs, but in tribal languages exhibits several negative forms that often cannot be directly derived from the positive forms, or at least not from a single positive form. I will call these forms syntaotic negatives to distinguish

them from the morphological negative, which are older and simpler.

Reference

- [1] Agasthialingam. S, ‘*Sociolinguistics & Dialectology*’, Annamalai University, 1980.
- [2] Agasthialingam. S & Sakthivel. S, ‘*Bibliography for the study of Nilgiri hill tribes*’, Annamalai University, 1973.
- [3] Dell Hymes (Ed.), ‘*Language in Culture & Society*’ Harper & Row, 1966.
- [4] Karunakaran.K, ‘*Sociolinguistics Patterns of Language use*’, Annamalai university, 1983.
- [5] Karunakaran. K, ‘*Sociolinguistics Patterns of Language*’, All India Tamil Linguistics, 1983.
- [6] Robert Sathya Joseph, D., ‘*A Descriptive Study of MulluKurumba*’, Centre of Advanced Study in Linguistics, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, 1982.
- [7] Sam Mohan Lal, ‘*Convergence and Language shift in a Linguistic Minority*’ CIIL publication, 1986