



STEPHAN HILLYER LEVITT

## SANSKRIT *-ndr-* AND DRAVIDIAN

### 1. Introduction

There are relatively few forms containing the consonant-cluster *-ndr-* in the Sanskrit lexicon.<sup>1</sup> There are perhaps only 22 forms that contain it. As several of these forms constitute problems from the vantage of etymology, it has been viewed worthwhile to consider these forms together and, for reasons to be explained below under section 2, from the vantage of Dravidian. The goal herein is to see whether some of these problems can be solved.

The forms are *andraka*; *idandra* (*idaṃdra*); *indra*; *kendra*; *kundr-/gundr-*; *gundrā*; *candrā* (*°ścandrā*); <sup>1</sup>*candrila*; <sup>2</sup>*candrila*; *ātandra*, *tandrī*, *tandrā*: *tand-/tandr-*; *tāspandra/tāsyandra* and

<sup>1</sup> This paper was first penned in 1977-81. At that time, it included as well a first draft of my investigation into the etymology of the Sanskrit sacred name “Indra,” which was published after several revisions and updating in this journal in 2008. This work has also resulted in Levitt (1980) and Levitt (2003a), the data for which papers is updated and revised here. In this paper, the following abbreviations are used: *CDIAL* = Turner (1966-85), *DED* = Burrow and Emeneau (1961), *DEDR* = Burrow and Emeneau (1984), *DEDS* = Burrow and Emeneau (1968), *EWA* = Mayrhofer (1992-2001), *KEWA* = Mayrhofer (1956-80), *MW* = Monier-Williams (1899), *OED* = *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (1989), *PW* = Böhtlingk and Roth (1855-75), *TED* = Devaneyan *et al.* (1985-2004), *Webster’s* = *Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary* (1974). Abbreviations of Indo-European languages are the English equivalents of those in Pokorny (1959-69). However, Skt. = Sanskrit, Pa. = Pali, Pkt. = Prakrit, H. = Hindi, M. = Marathi. Abbreviations of Dravidian languages are those of *DEDR*. Also, Drav. = Dravidian, PDr = Proto-Dravidian, PCDr = Proto-Central Dravidian, PNDr = Proto-North Dravidian, PSDr = Proto-South Dravidian, etc. C = consonant, N = nasal, V = vowel, fV = front vowel. Abbreviations of Sanskrit works and periods of Sanskrit literature are those of Whitney (1885), supplemented in some instances by those used in *MW*. A modified version of the TransIndic Transliterator font used for some of the diacritics in this paper is available from [www.linguistsoftware.com/tintu.htm](http://www.linguistsoftware.com/tintu.htm), +1-425-775-1130.



*tāspindra(?)/tāšvindra; nánāndṛ, nānāndra; pundra; bhandra; mandrá; rándryā/rāṅḍyā; rundra; lāndra; vandra; sāndra; syandrá/spandrá; hāndra.* Sources consulted for the compilation of this list were *MW, PW*, Böhtlingk (1879-89), Viśvabandhu Śāstrī (1935-65), and Wilson (1832). Skt. *bhandra* is listed in the *Ad-denda* to *MW*.

Nine of these forms are in Vedic Sanskrit. These are *idandra* (*idaṃdra*); *indra*; *candrá* (°*ścandrá*); *átandra* etc.: *tand-/tandr-*; *tāspandra/tāsyandra* etc.; *nánāndṛ; mandrá; rándryā/rāṅḍyā; syandrá/spandrá.*

The origins of these forms are diverse.

Skt. *indra* was discussed fully earlier in this journal (Levitt 2008a), to which the reader is referred. It is viewed there to be inherited within Indo-European. See also Levitt (2011) for a brief synopsis of some of the significant linguistic aspects of the argument. This form has presented etymologists with a great deal of difficulty.

Skt. *candrá* (°*ścandrá*) which, too, occurs first in the *R̥gveda*, unlike Skt. *indra* is associated clearly with a root (*ścand-/cand-*) with an Indo-European etymology, though the form itself appears to be an Indo-Aryan development (Pokorny 1959-69/1.526, *EWA* 1.528-529).

Skt. *sāndra*, on the other hand, occurs first in classical Sanskrit. It is not associated with a Sanskrit root. Burrow (1955: 22; 1973 ed., 22) notes the form to be an example of forms shared by Sanskrit and Balto-Slavonic only. Pokorny (1959-69/1.906, 2.36) omits mention of the Sanskrit form and lists Germanic cognates for the Balto-Slavonic forms. *KEWA* 3.458 and *EWA* 3.509-510 consider the form to be unclear and focus on attempted explanation of it from within Sanskrit, though *EWA* does mention Burrow's connection.

Skt. *kendra* also occurs first in classical Sanskrit. It, however, has been identified as a loanword from Greek (*PW* 2.427, *KEWA* 1.266, *EWA* 3.121).

Skt. *nánāndṛ, nānāndra* which, too, occurs first in the *R̥gveda*, has been provided with both Indo-European and Dravidian etymologies. With regard to this, see *KEWA* 2.131 and *EWA* 2.10. Mayrhofer, in *EWA*, has backed away from a Dravidian connection



and views the form to rest on a babble form, or affectionate form of familiar address akin to *nanā́* ‘mother,’ an inherited Indo-European form. See also Pokorny (1959-69/1.754); and see *DEDR* 3644.

Skt. <sup>1</sup>*candrila* occurs only in classical Sanskrit lexicographic sources. It would appear to be a hypercorrect Sanskrit form for <sup>1</sup>*caṇḍila*, which on the basis of a connection proposed below would appear to be a loanword form Telugu. *EWA* 3.179, 178 has judged the etymology of this form to be “not clear.” To date, it has been provided only with a very questionable Munda etymology by Kuiper (1991: 71, 1948: 78, 160).

Skt. *pundra*, which occurs in an epic source, is considered by *PW* 4.774 to be an incorrect reading for *punḍra*, which appears to represent the merger of a number of non-Indo-European forms (*KEWA* 2.302, *EWA* 2.141, 3.328).

And Skt. *andraka* is a variant reading of limited occurrence in epic and classical Sanskrit for Skt. *ādraka*. It is due most probably to a confusion of script, regarding which see section 14.1 below.

Skt. *idandra* (*idamdra*) is an *ad hoc* formation in *Aitareyopaniṣad* for the sake of explaining Skt. *indra*, and has been discussed when discussing Skt. *indra* (see Levitt 2008a: 211-212).

In certain instances, the etymologies proposed at present are not at all convincing.

Skt. *mandrá*, for example, is associated with Skt. *mad-/1.mand-*. This associated root has cognate forms in Avestan, Scythian, Greek, Albanian, Armenian, Latin, Celtic, and Germanic. The semantic concord with its non-Indo-Iranian cognates, however, is not good. Thus, Gk. *μαδάω* ‘to melt, loosen oneself from, lose hair,’ *μαδαρός* ‘damp,’ *μαζός* ‘nipple’; Lat. *madeō*, *-ēre* ‘to be moist, drip with moisture, ripen, be full’; OHG *mast* ‘food, fattening feed’; Alb. *manj* ‘fatten, feed’; but Skt. *mad-/1.mand-* ‘to rejoice, be glad, drunk, intoxicated, inspirited, inflamed,’ *madana* ‘passion’; Av. *mad-* ‘intoxicating,’ *maḍa-* ‘intoxication, intoxicating drink’ (see Pokorny 1959-69/1.694-695, *EWA* 2.299-300). The meaning of the Sanskrit forms that is considered to be the base meaning is the infrequent Sanskrit signification ‘to boil, bubble (as water)’ (Grassmann 1873: 977, Lanman 1884: 211a). Lat. *mattus* ‘drunken’ is the single striking exception to the gen-





eral lack of semantic concord between the Indo-Iranian forms and the related Indo-European forms. Significant is that the Latin form clearly is an extended meaning, whereas in Sanskrit ‘drunk, inspirited’ is central to the definition of the root.

Skt. *átandra*, *tandrī́*, *tandrā* are associated with Skt. *tand-*. This latter is viewed to be an old expanded form of Skt. *tan-* (Pokorny 1959-69/1.1065-1066, *KEWA* 2.476, *EWA* 1.623). Skt. *tandr-* is seen by one opinion to be a secondary root back-formed from the regular adjective *tand-ra* (see reference in Werba 1997/1.427). Again, however, semantic concord between the Sanskrit forms in question and the associated Sanskrit and other Indo-European forms is not good. Thus, Gk. *ταύω* ‘to stretch’; Lat. *tendō*, *-ere* ‘to span, stretch’; OIsl. *penja* ‘to spread out, extend’; and Skt. *tan-* ‘to stretch, extend’; but Skt. *tand-* ‘to become relaxed,’ *tandrī́* ‘lassitude, exhaustion, laziness’ (Pokorny 1959-69/1.1065-1066). *EWA* explains the semantic connection between *tand-* and *tan-*, “through tension, or tautness, one exhausts oneself, or wearies oneself.” But this seems cosmetic.

Several of these forms are not only without etymology at present, but are of such limited citation that they do not provide ample information for etymological work. These forms are *tāspandra*/*tāsyandra* etc., *rāndryā*/*rāndyā*, *rundra*, and *lāndra*.

In several other instances, on the other hand, there is ample material for etymological work, but the forms are nevertheless without firm etymology. These forms include *kundr-/gundr-*, *gundrā*, <sup>1</sup>*candrila*, *bhandra*, *sāndra*, *syandrā*/*spandrā*, *hāndra*.

Also to be considered in this connection is the opinion of Turner (1928-30: 128-129) that there was an Indo-Aryan dialect in which *-ndr-* > *-ṇḍ-* on the basis of Skt. *āṇḍa* < *\*āndra*, which he would relate to OSl. *jędro* ‘testicle.’ So also, he argued in that place that Skt. *cāṇḍa* ‘hot, ardent with passion, angry’ was to be derived from Skt. *candrā* ‘moon’ on the basis of the Sindhi forms *caṇdro* ‘passionate’ and *caṇdru* ‘moon.’ Turner’s suggestion has been responded to by Renou (1959: 43) and Burrow (1971: 545), and will be discussed below in section 5 when treating Skt. *cāṇḍa*.





## 2. The Argument

The examination of Sanskrit forms containing the consonant-cluster *-ndr-* from the vantage of Dravidian is suggested by the occurrence in Proto-Dravidian of a consonant-cluster *\*-nt-* the pronunciation of which is realized in some Dravidian languages in a form phonetically approximating Skt. *-ndr-* (see Zvelebil 1970: 97 n. 21, 172). That loanwords from Dravidian which contain such a consonant-cluster might appear in Sanskrit in forms containing Skt. *-ndr-* is, therefore, not out of the question.

In order to proceed, it was necessary to make certain assumptions.

The first of these involved rules of euphonic combination.

The rules of euphonic combination vary in the Dravidian languages that formally record such rules in their grammars – Tamil, Kannada, and Telugu. These rules as they appear in Kannada and Telugu grammars, however, are late and are comparatively few (Ramaswami Aiyar 1935-38: esp. 25.4: 267-270, 28.2: 94-96). It was posited, therefore, that the rules of euphonic combination in classical Tamil represent uniquely Dravidian rules that once were widely spread within Dravidian. The basis of this assumption is that Tamil preserved more faithfully than other Dravidian languages the Proto-Dravidian phonemic system, while classical Tamil is by a large period of time the oldest form of a Dravidian language of which we have records.

The second assumption involves the formation of consonant-clusters such as Ta. *-nr-* and Koṇḍa *-nr-* (= *-ṅdr-*) that correspond to PDr *\*-nt-*.

This consonant cluster is treated differently in different modern Dravidian languages. Thus, Ma. *-nn-*, To. Ko. *-ḍ-*, Ka. *-r-*, *-nd-*, Koṇḍa *-nr-* (= *-ṅdr-*), Tu. Kui Kuwi *-nj-/j-*, Br. *-s-*, all other Central Dravidian and North Dravidian *-nd-/ṅd-/ṅḍ-*. The merger of *\*t* in this cluster with a dental or retroflex stop, etc., began to operate comparatively late, and probably independently in each sub-family and/or language. Thus, in Old Telugu it was recorded as *-nr-* in inscriptions before the 9<sup>th</sup> c. A.D. and merged with *-ṅd-* later, less often with *-nd-* (*DEDR*, pp. xii-xiii; Krishnamurti 1961: 70, 2003: 169; Zvelebil 1970: 171-173).

The cluster is preserved in formal Tamil as *-nr-* in such forms



as *onru* ‘one’ (DEDR 990[d] Ta. *onru*), *mūnru* ‘three’ (DEDR 5052 Ta. *mūnru*), and *ēṇ enṛāl* ‘because’ (DEDR 5151 Ta. *yā* and DEDR 868 Ta. *eṇ* [*eṇp-*, *eṇr-*]).

In classical Tamil this consonant-cluster’s most frequent occurrence, however, results from the addition of a suffix *-nt-* to a root ending with *-l*. This results in *-nr-* by standard classical Tamil rules of euphonic combination:  $l + n > n$ ,  $n + t > nr$  (Subrahmanya Sastri 1930: 23 [*Tolkāppiyam* 1.5.150], Rajam 1992: 103; Emeneau 1967: 374a, Andronov 1969: 44). Examples of this formation are: *Maṇimēkalai* 6.3 *cānrōr* ‘the great’ < *cāl-*, *Maṇimēkalai* 6.15 *niṇṛīr* ‘you who stood’ < *nil-*, *Maṇimēkalai* 6.19 *akanraṇaṇ* ‘he left’ < *akal-*. Similarly, in modern formal Tamil, *konṛāṇ* ‘he killed’ < *kol-* and *ceṇṛāṇ* ‘he went’ < *cel-*.

In the dialects of Tamil with which I am familiar, this consonant-cluster is pronounced in forms that appear to have Proto-Dravidian integrity as *-nṇ-/-ṇ-*, and in instances in which the cluster is generated through the addition of a suffix *-nt-* to a verb the root of which ends with *-l* as *-nd-*. The cluster as preserved in formal Tamil is pronounced by speakers of Brahman and non-Brahman dialects whom I have heard as alveolar [*ndr*]. The history behind this latter development is not clear (Zvelebil 1970: 97 n. 21). It is, however, not un-indicative of the postulated interpretation of PDr *\*-ṭ-* as a “voiced alveolar plosive (with probably slight friction)” (Zvelebil 1970: 96-98).

Postulated here is that a suffix *-nt-*, which might be added to roots ending with *-l* so as to form a consonant-cluster that corresponds to reconstructed PDr *\*-nt-*, once had a wider active distribution within Dravidian than at present. Such a derivative suffix, of course, can be reconstructed for Proto-Dravidian (Krishnamurti 1961: 71-73). Within South Dravidian such a suffix carries most often a past force, and is used as well as a marker of the intransitive. But note such examples as classical Ta. *iṇṛiya* ‘non-existence’ < *il-* ‘not to be’ and classical Ta. *niṇru* ‘always, permanently’ < *nil-* ‘to stand, remain.’<sup>2</sup> The forces carried by such suffixes within Dravidian from a wide vantage, it must be emphasized, are not known. Such, therefore, has been left moot here

<sup>2</sup> For a full discussion of this suffix in the context of its usage as a past formative suffix and as a marker of the intransitive in South Dravidian, see Lisker (1951) and Emeneau (1967).





for procedural reasons. This enables us to make correspondences between Sanskrit forms that contain *-ndr-* and Dravidian roots that end with *-l* and to which there might have been added a suffix *-nt-* so as to arrive at a consonant-cluster comparable to Ta. *-nr-*, Te. *-nr-*, or Koṇḍa *-nr-* (= *-ṇḍr-*).

Similarly, by classical Tamil rules of euphonic combination,  $l + nt > nṭ$  (Subrahmanya Sastri 1930: 23-24 [*Tolkāppiyam* 1.5.151], Rajam 1992: 103; Emeneau 1967: 374a).

Zvelebil (1970: 178) similarly has suggested that many consonant-clusters in Dravidian, as well as long (geminate) consonants, may be explained in such fashion by assimilation. Among his examples (pp. 178-180) are Ta. *kāl* 'air, wind': Ta. *kārru* 'id.' < *\*kāl-tu*; Ta. *cil* 'some, few, small,' *cil-a* 'some, a few,' *cil-ku* 'to become few,' *cil-l-ai* 'humbleness,' *cir-p-am* 'fewness,' *ciṇ-mai* 'smallness, etc.:'; Ta. *uruḷ* 'to roll, revolve, spin, etc.,' *uruḷ-i* 'wheel,' *uruḷ-ai* 'id.,' *uruṭci* 'revolving' < *\*uruḷ-ci*: Ta. *uruṭtu* 'to roll' < *\*uruḷ-tu*, *uruṭtai* 'ball' < *\*uruḷ-nt-ai*.

Zvelebil's full listing of such examples shows that such assimilation follows the development of such consonant-clusters within Dravidian, as was argued as well in Levitt (1980 and 2003a). Such was also shown earlier by Ramaswami Aiyar (1935-38). More recently, Krishnamurti (2003: 61, 93-95) has argued for such assimilation in Proto-Dravidian, which assimilation he argues was held residually in classical Tamil. As his examples, too, show, such assimilation develops across the board in Dravidian in agreement with the developments of the consonant-clusters concerned.

On account of this procedure, and for the convenience of readers not familiar with the structure of Dravidian forms, when citing Dravidian etyma, the reconstructed Proto-Dravidian form or forms involved have been outlined. These have been used in the charts as summary statements for the purposes of reference to the etyma proper. **Such is not to be understood as implying derivation from such Proto-Dravidian forms. When derivation has been possible, this has been made from actual Dravidian forms containing a consonant cluster that might reconstruct to PDr *\*-nṭ-* or a root ending with *-l*, or *\*-l > -l*.**

A third assumption, perhaps implied in the second assumption, is that recorded Dravidian forms may not reflect the addition of





such a suffix *-nt-*. Thus, while in Sanskrit we might have a form containing *-ndr-*, in Dravidian we would have a root ending with *-l*, or *\*-l > -l*, perhaps with the addition of suffixes, but not necessarily a suffix *-nt-*. This assumption is based on the consideration that Sanskrit most certainly borrowed from Dravidian languages that no longer exist, and from earlier forms of contemporary Dravidian languages the Dravidian content of the lexicons of which is now in a decimated state through contact of these languages with Indo-Aryan and Iranian languages and the grammars of which, on the basis of a comparison of that of classical Tamil with that of modern Tamil, has most certainly changed radically.

During the course of this investigation, it was found that other correspondences between Sanskrit and Dravidian had to be considered as well in order to provide enough comparative material to support the assumptions outlined and some of the correspondences uncovered. Particularly considered were those few Sanskrit forms containing *-ndhr-*, *-ndh-*, *-ṇdhr-*, and *-ṇdr-*, and the large number of forms containing *-ṇd-*. It must be noted at the outset, however, that the Sanskrit forms containing *-ṇd-* reflect in the main a different set of problems with regard to their relationship with the Sanskrit lexicon (Burrow 1971, Levitt 2010: 23-25, 31-32, 76, etc.). When these problems did not obscure their utility as examples, however, or when these forms could be demonstrated to be cognate to Dravidian forms containing a root ending with *-l* or *-l̥* to which *-nt-* might have been added, they have been noted.

In addition, whenever a correspondence was made between Dravidian forms and Sanskrit forms containing *-ndr-* etc., the Sanskrit lexicon was checked for evidence of forms containing *-l-* as well. It also was found useful to check the Sanskrit lexicon independent of the Dravidian lexicon for forms that might contain *-ndr-*, *-nd-*, *-ṇd-* etc., in one place and *-l-* elsewhere.

On account of the assumptions made, which posit that the relationship between the Sanskrit forms and the Dravidian forms is obscured by an affixed suffix, semantic transparency was required in all cases.

The results indicate a number of features that are best to be discussed prior to considering separately the various Sanskrit forms containing *-ndr-*. These features will be discussed starting







in section 4. Internal Sanskrit evidence that Sanskrit borrowed forms from Dravidian in which a Dravidian suffix *-nt-* had been added directly to a Dravidian or Indo-European root ending with *-l* will be discussed in section 9.

Of note is that there is some indication of the hypothesis under question in *DEDR* itself. For example, Tu. *kavunḍrasa* in *DEDR* 1337 Ta. *kavul*. Also, compare the forms in *DEDR* 1973 Go. (many dialects) *kel* (pl. *-k*) ‘hair, feather’ and *DEDR* 2002 Pa. *kēndid* (pl. *kēndil*) ‘feather,’ Ga. (P.) *kendiṭ* ... (S., Krishnamurti) *kendī* etc. ‘feather, hair.’ In *DED* the single Gadba form that had been collected at that time was listed with question with the etyma now listed by themselves in *DEDR* 1973. The two short etymological sets are probably related.

Various sub-groupings have been proposed for Dravidian. For a brief discussion, their history, and the difficulties involved with them, see Zvelebil (1990: 54-60). Regarding a lack of consensus, see Gopinathan Nair (2004: 220). I have adopted here Krishnamurti’s old, but widely known sub-grouping, as suggested by Subrahmanyam (2004: 198-201).

### 3. The Background

There is now extensive literature on loanwords in Sanskrit. Especially for words of older attestation, the flourishing scholarship has produced several competing etymological suggestions – borrowing from Dravidian, borrowing from Austroasiatic, both countered by arguments of Sanskritization and naturalization in Sanskrit of Middle Indo-Aryan forms, and inheritance from Indo-European or, at least, Indo-Iranian.

Perhaps because of this situation, Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009), in their recent treatment of loanwords in the world’s languages, omit treatment of loanwords in South Asia completely. They write that certain imbalances in their coverage are due to their not being able to find a specialist for an area that was willing to invest the time and effort needed to complete the database and write a book chapter based on the findings (p. 3). No doubt for South Asia, the acrimony that would face anyone writing such a chapter was a





factor in their not being able to find anyone for their project.

With regard to loanwords in Sanskrit from Dravidian, early pioneering work such as that by Caldwell in 1856 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. in 1875) and Kittel in 1894 was generally ignored by Sanskritists (Emeneau 1954: 285b).

Early work such as the set of essays translated from French in Lévi, Przyluski, and Bloch (1929), which covered both Dravidian and Austroasiatic, and Bloch (1924, 1930, 1965 [French original in 1934]), was followed by an important series of essays by Burrow in 1945, 1946, 1948, and more recently in 1983. These present many suggestions for loanwords in Sanskrit from Dravidian. Among these, Burrow lists some 25 words in Vedic Sanskrit that he considered to be of Dravidian origin (1946: 22-24). He notes that this is not many compared with the number in later Sanskrit. But it is enough to show that the process had already begun at this early period.

In 1971, Burrow then picked up on Harold Walter Bailey's work on "spontaneous cerebrals" in Sanskrit (principal references given in Burrow 1971: 540 n. 4). And in 1972, Burrow reformulated Fortunatov's Law, which law states that in Indo-Aryan words inherited from Indo-European, *l* + a dental yields a single retroflex consonant. Both Burrow (1972: 532-533) and Emeneau (1974: 92-93) commented that these two efforts made much smaller the list of words in Sanskrit with seemingly unexplained retroflexes, and that many such words could no longer be viewed as loans.

Kuiper, in 1955, collected and presented "the words [in the *Rgveda*] the foreign origin of which seems probable on morphological or phonetical grounds, even though a convincing etymological explanation cannot be given for them" (p. 137). He notes not only proposed Indo-European explanations when these have been given, but also Dravidian and Munda explanations. For some words he prefers Dravidian explanations; for others Munda explanations. Most frequently, he gives the benefit of the doubt to Munda explanations. See also Kuiper (1948) with regard to Munda words in Sanskrit.

In 1967, arguing that there occur in the *Rgveda* words of apparently foreign origin, that words of foreign or doubtful origin with retroflexes in the *Rgveda* and *Atharvaveda* increase with time, and that most of them are *hapax legomena*, or words of





a single occurrence, he further discusses new traits of sentence structure in Indo-Aryan – one connected with a new grammatical category (the gerund), and the second with a completely new use made of the inherited word *iti* ‘thus.’ Both are comparable to common Dravidian usage. Along with the development of a retroflex series of consonants in Sanskrit, Kuiper sees here three pre-Vedic innovations that “seem to leave little doubt as to the role of Dravidian in the Indian subcontinent” (p. 97).

Very significantly, he concludes “that the period between the arrival of the Indo-Aryans in the Indian subcontinent and the composition of the oldest Vedic hymns must have been much longer than was previously thought” (pp. 97-98), as Levitt (1980: 46-47) also observed independent of Kuiper’s considerations.

In 1991, Kuiper updated his work. He maintained the foreign origin of most of the words sorted out in his earlier 1955 publication. Then, in a lengthy and seemingly exhaustive treatment, he proposed phonological criteria for distinguishing foreign words in the *R̥gveda*. He also seems to take a clue from Southworth (1974: 218) that,

“It is difficult to see how non-I[ndo]-A[ryan] features could appear in the ritual language of that period, unless original speakers of non-I[ndo]-A[ryan] languages or their descendants were included among the participants in rituals (and perhaps even among the composers of the hymns themselves).”

In a very significant discussion, Kuiper (1991: 5-8) outlined with detail the specifics of just such a situation.

Emeneau is more skeptical of loanword studies than either Burrow or Kuiper. He lists, though, 13 of Burrow’s suggested loanwords in Sanskrit that he thinks are fairly certain (1954: 288a-291b). He further discusses in 1971 *R̥gvedic* and *Atharvavedic* words that he thinks are, if not certain loanwords from Dravidian, then examples that hold up well (pp. 46-50). “We end, then, with a small, but precious, handful of Vedic forms for which Dr[avidian] etymologies are as certain and acceptable as may be expected in this field of areal linguistics” (p. 50). Emeneau (1974: 93-111) also adds to Kuiper’s listing of grammatical features in Sanskrit that seem to rest on Dravidian, discussing in detail a comparison between Skt. *api* and Dravidian *\*-um*.



Emeneau argued that bilingualism led to phonological, lexical, and structural borrowings in Sanskrit from Dravidian (see, for instance, Emeneau 1962). It is for such arguments, and treating India as a linguistic area (see, for instance, Emeneau 1956, 1971, and 1974), focus he inherited, in part, from American anthropological linguistics (1956: 3-5), that Emeneau is well known.

Burrow and Emeneau have collaborated on a comparative Dravidian etymological dictionary (1961; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1984), at the end of which they list cross-references mentioned in the course of the dictionary to Sanskrit and other Indo-Aryan forms.

Witzel (2001) has argued that the early *Ṛgveda* was borrowing words from what he terms as “Para-Munda,” “an unknown western Austro-Asiatic language” (p. 15). He argues that Dravidian loanwords do not appear in Sanskrit until the middle *Ṛgveda*. He sees loanwords in the *Ṛgveda* and in later Vedic and Sanskrit literature, and like Kuiper he attributes some to Austroasiatic and some to Dravidian. But very often, where Kuiper would argue a Dravidian etymology, Witzel opts for an Austroasiatic etymology as, for instance, with regard to Skt. *kumāra* ‘boy, young man’ and Skt. *kurīra* ‘women’s hairdress’ (p. 12).

With regard to the argument of Southworth (1979: 198-199) as to the possible relationship between Skt. *tanū* ‘self, etc. (often used like a reflexive pronoun)’ and the Dravidian forms in *DEDR* 3196 Ta. *tān*, which forms carry such meanings as ‘oneself,’ Witzel (2001: 28) comments that the comparison of the Indo-Iranian and Dravidian words would suppose a very close relationship between Dravidian and (pre-)Indo-Aryan tribes, indeed, as pronouns are not taken over easily. He then goes on to state that there is no other evidence of such close contact.

But it is just such a period of contact that is argued by Levitt (2001), which agrees with Southworth and further relates those forms both within Indo-Aryan and within Dravidian to Skt. *ātmán/tmán*. Levitt argues that this is the result of merger of inherited Indo-European material with Dravidian material. Note that the analysis of the semantics of Skt. *ātmán/tmán* by Mme. Hélène de Willman-Grabowska (1929-30) agrees with that proposed by Levitt, but she could not identify the Dravidian source. See also Levitt (2003b) in this regard. And, of course, see the



referred to above arguments of syntactic convergence argued by Kuiper and Emeneau.

In consideration of the criticism of arguments of syntactic convergence by Kuiper and Emeneau, such as that by Hock (1975: 89-90; 103-104 [*api*], 105-107 [absolutives], 107-111 [quotative *iti*]), Scharfe in 2003 accepted that features of Old Indo-Aryan such as retroflexes, the quotative marker *iti*, and even the morphology of the gerunds could have developed without influence from another language family. He argued, though, that as absolute constructions increase in frequency they gradually develop syntactical features that conform to Dravidian patterns. Further, he discussed the evidence for compound-like structures with multiple members in classical Tamil. He suggests that the emergence of lengthy nominal compounds first of all in Prakrit literature, and then in certain literary genres of classical Sanskrit, may be attributed to bilingualism and cultural exchanges between Indo-Aryan and Dravidian speakers in the post-Vedic and early classical periods.

Because of the later dating this, indeed, may demonstrate process on a less controversial footing.

Also worthy of note here is Levitt (2010: 23-25, 76), which argued that the solution to the problem posed by “spontaneous cerebralization” lay in the merger of alveolar and retroflex phonemes in some of the languages of Central Dravidian and North Dravidian, with similar decisions being made by the Indo-Aryan languages of the area. This insured that the Sanskrit phonemes that are today dental but that were originally alveolar, it would seem, were at times reinterpreted as retroflex:

CDrNDR merger of alveolars and retroflexes

[Skt. dental ← alveolar] → retroflex

As Hock (1996: 35-36) argued earlier as well, the development of consonant clusters in Central and North Dravidian is paralleled by Prakrit sound changes in the same areas, and these may well be related. I would argue that such also explains the development of many of our retroflexes in Sanskrit.

Complicating a complex situation even further, we must today also consider Nostratic studies and, in general, genetic connections between different families of languages. Thus, two Ṛgvedic words that Emeneau considered to be near certain loans from



Dravidian, Skt. *phála* ‘fruit’ < *DEDR* 4004 Ta. *paṛu* (-*pp-*, -*tt-*), which carries such meanings as ‘to ripen (as fruits, grain), grow mature ... ripe fruit ... fruit,’ and Skt. *budbuda* ‘bubble’ < *DEDR* 4249 Ka. *buḍa*, *buḍu*, *boḍa* ‘sound in imitation of that produced by a vessel, etc., when immersed into water, or by water issuing from the spout of a vessel’ ... Te. *budabuḍa* ‘with a bubbling noise,’ Levitt has argued are inherited forms within Indo-European. Skt. *phála*, which has no firm Indo-European etymology to date (*KEWA* 2.394-395, Emeneau 1971: 58 n. 22; see, though, *EWA* 2.201), is seen to have cognates as well not only in Dravidian, but also in Afroasiatic, Austroasiatic and Austronesian, and Sumerian (Levitt 1998: 143-144, 2008b: 31-32, 2010: 30-31). Skt. *budbuda*, which to date is also not seen to have secure non-Indic cognates in Indo-European (Emeneau 1969: 294-295, 1971: 47, 57-58 n. 21), is seen to have cognates not only in Dravidian and Austroasiatic (*KEWA* 2.437-438 and *EWA* 2.228 argue for independent origination for the forms in each language family, which opinion Emeneau criticizes), but also in Indo-European in Eng. *bubble*, *burble* and Lat. *bulla* ‘bubble.’ The form in Sanskrit, though, is seen to have merged with a form of Dravidian origin in the post-Vedic Skt. *budabuḍa* (Levitt 2010: 23, 71-72; see, also, Hock 1996: 39-40).

Skt. *budbuda* and *budabuḍa*, Emeneau (sources cited immediately above) considered to have a clear areal etymology involving three language families, with a Dravidian source for the Sanskrit form being the more convincing.

So also, Santali *puṭkə* ‘a sacred mushroom’ and the etymologically related Santali *puṭi* ‘to swell, bloat, puff up’ can be seen to share an areal etymology with the etyma in *DEDR* 4499 Pa. *boḍḍa* ‘edible fungus ... mushroom’ and cognate sets of etyma within Dravidian (Levitt 2011; with regard to the Dravidian etyma, see Levitt 1989a: 10<sup>1</sup>-11<sup>1</sup>, 29, 32, 2-sided foldout chart). Kramrisch (1975) has argued for an etymological connection between the Santali form *puṭkə* and Skt. *pūtika*, the name of a *sóma*-substitute in the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*. Kuiper (1984) has commented on this, with regard to which see Levitt (2011).

And so also, R̥gvedic Skt. *lāṅgala* ‘plough’ shares an areal etymology with Dravidian etyma listed in *DEDR* 2907 Ta.





*ñāñcil*, *nāñcil* ‘plough’ and Austroasiatic and Austronesian words for ‘plough.’ The Sanskrit word is generally seen to be a loan from Austroasiatic (Burrow 1946: 25-26, Hock 1975: 86, 116 n. 9, *KEWA* 3.97-98). *EWA* 2.477 seems to back away from this opinion, noting that the origin is unclear, but that it is probably a *foreign* word [italics mine]. Further, Blažek and Boisson (1992: 17-19) have now added to the discussion Afroasiatic, Sumerian, and Sino-Tibetan cognates. So, again, we have not only an areal etymology, but what would appear to be genetically related forms shared by more than one language family (Levitt 2008b: 32).

Most of the forms considered in the supporting arguments in this paper are judged by Mayrhofer in *KEWA* and *EWA* to be “not clear,” “not convincingly explained,” or are given some such similar assessment.

I must note that I have not had the opportunity to see Hoffmann (1941). According to the brief overview of this work given by Zistl (1955: 142-143), this material treats fully Skt. *cāṇḍa* and *punḍārika*, two of the forms treated here as well.

#### 4. Metathesis

The correspondence proposed below for Skt. *vandra*, and one set of the proposed correspondences involved in the discussion of Skt. *mandrá*, entail in one interpretation of the data the possibility of metathesis of  $C_2$  and the consonant of an associated derivative suffix (=  $C_3$ ) in the Dravidian forms in question.

A clear instance of metathesis of  $C_2$  and a consonant-cluster of the associated derivative suffix in a Sanskrit loanword from Dravidian is Skt. *manthara* (*E* +). This is also a good example of a form containing a common Dravidian suffix *-nt-* most certainly from outside South Dravidian. Skt. *manthara* is presently treated by *MW* 787b as being allied to Skt. *manda* (so also *EWA* 2.312, 3.386), to what *MW* lists as Skt. 2.*mand-* and, in some few significations, to Skt. *math-* (see also *PW* 5.546-547). Such, perhaps, is illusory in that the collocation of the meanings ‘lazy, tardy, silly, bent, crooked, humpbacked’ does not fit well with these supposedly allied Sanskrit forms. The semantic fit, however, is good





with the group of etyma in *DEDR* 4977 Ta. *muri* (-v-, -nt-):

*DEDR* 4977 Ta. *muri* (-v-, -nt-) to bend, lack in strength, be gentle; n. curve, bend ... *murivu* contracting, fold, laziness; *mūri* laziness, indolence; shaking off laziness; *mūri nimir* (-v-, -nt-) to stretch oneself as from laziness. Ma. *muṛuṭuka* to pluck by twisting (as coconuts); *mūri* numbness, apathy, stiffness; *mūruka*, *mūri niviruka* to stretch oneself. Ko. *muniv-* (*munivd-*) to stretch and groan when one wakes ... To. *mūry fuṛy-* (*fuṛs-*) to stretch the body in yawning. Ka. *muri* to bend, be bent, grow crooked, wind, meander, stretch oneself with windings of the limbs ... n. state of being bent, curved, etc. ... *muruhu* a bend, curve, winding course of a river, a surrounding place, crookedness of mind, a crooked object, a pervert; turn, repetition ... *mor(a)ku* to be turning round or be giddy from pride ... Tu. *muri* curve, circle, ring, twist, the creases of a hand, windings of a conch, etc.; *murigè* twist, entanglement ... Pa. *murg-* to be bent; *murgal* hunchback. Ga. (S. P.) *murg-* to bend (while peeping) ... Go. ... (Tr.) *mur-jupnī aiānā* to be crooked (*Voc.* 2909); (LuS.) *moorga* humpbacked. Kuwi *murli kriyū* deformed ear. [PDr \**mur-V-*: \**mūr-*/\**mor-*]

The correspondence is charted in Table I.

By such a proposed identification, Skt. *manthara* would be the result of metathesis between  $C_2$  of the Dravidian root and a consonant-cluster -nt- of a derivative suffix  $NC_3$  added to a form of the shape \**mur-V-*. The situation with regard to the vowels cannot be determined on the basis of the Sanskrit word as here Dravidian *u* > Skt. *a* (see sec. 11).

Significant here from the vantage of what Emeneau (1956: 6, 1971: 35) has commented must have been extensive bilingualism in order to account for the Dravidian elements that entered Indo-Aryan is that the name “Mantharā” of a humpbacked female slave of Bharata’s mother, Kaikeyī, is here shown to have been Dravidian in origin.





TABLE I

MANTHARA	
Present Sanskrit derivation: <i>manda</i> , 2. <i>mand-</i> , <i>math-</i>	Proposed Dravidian derivation: <i>DEDR</i> 4977 Ta. <i>muri</i> (-v-, -nt-) [PDr * <i>mur-V-</i> : * <i>mūr-/*mor-</i> ]
lazy tardy	laziness (Ta.) indolence (Ta.) apathy (Ma.) meander (Ka.) curve (Ta. Tu.)
bent	bend (Ta. Ka. Pa. Ga.) to stretch the body (in yawning, as from laziness) (Ta. Ma. Ko. To.) to stretch oneself with windings of the limbs (Ka. Tu.)
crooked	a crooked object (Ka.) to be crooked (Go.) deformed (Kuwi)
silly	crookedness of mind (Ka.) be giddy from pride (Ka.) a pervert (Ka.)
humpbacked ( <i>ā</i> ), name of a humpbacked female slave of Bharata's mother	a hunchback, humpbacked (Pa. Go.)
	Through metathesis of C <sub>2</sub> and a consonant-cluster -nt- of a derivative suffix NC <sub>3</sub> .

Another possible form containing such metathesis is Skt. *maṇḍūka* 'frog' (*RV* +). This has been given a wide variety of imaginative and frequently forced Indo-European, Dravidian, and Austroasiatic etymologies (*KEWA* 2.561-562, *EWA* 2,295). See, for instance, Burrow's fanciful Dravidian etymology suggested earlier (1946: 23). Compare, however, in the context of the present discussion of metathesis *DEDR* 5023 Kur. *mūxā*:

*DEDR* 5023 Kur. *mūxā* frog. Malt. *múqe* frog. [PNDr \**mūk-V-*/*\*mūkk-V-*]

In Dravidian, -*ṇt-* is as well a not uncommon derivative suffix. See, for example, Skt. *māruṇḍa* 'cowdung or a place spread with it' below (sec. 7).

As this paper will demonstrate, our recorded Dravidian forms do not always display the Dravidian suffixes that Sanskrit evidence indicates must have been attached at one time to cognate Dravidian forms.



By such a proposed identification, Skt. *maṇḍūka* would be the result of metathesis of  $V_1C_2$  of the Dravidian root, and  $V_2$  and the consonant-cluster *-nt-* of a derivative suffix  $NC_3$  added to this root. Not to be entirely ruled out at present, however, is that it may be the North Dravidian forms that display metathesis and “syllabic loss” (see sec. 7[v]).

In favor of this proposed etymology is phonological simplicity and semantic transparency.

This set of etyma has been connected previously to Skt. *mūkaka* ‘frog’ (Burrow 1948: 391; *DEDR*, p. 762b).

Metathesis of  $V_1C_1$  in Dravidian roots beginning with V-, and of  $V_1C_2$  in roots beginning with C-, has been demonstrated to be a feature of the Te.-Kui-Kuwi-Koṇḍa sub-group of Central Dravidian (Krishnamurti 1961, 51-52, 58-62; 2003: 157-163). Metathesis of  $C_2C_3$  occurs frequently in Kui (e.g., *DEDR* 1080 Kui *kapka* [*<kak-p-; kakt-*], *DEDR* 2180 Koṇḍa *kok* [*-t-*] ... Kui *gōpka* [*<gōk-p-; gōkt-*], *DEDR* 4761 Ta. *maṛaṅku* [*maṛaṅki-*] ... Kui *mabga* [*<mag-b-; magd-*]). It is also noted for Parji (*DEDR* 1337 Ta. *kavul* ... Pa. *gavla*, *galva*) and for Parji, Gadba, and Gondi (*DEDR* 2334 Ta. *cappu* [*cappi-*] ... Pa. *cavl-*, *cal-*, [S.] *calv-*; Ga. [S.<sup>3</sup>] *savl-*, [*salv-*, *saluv-*]; Go. [Ko.] *alv-* [*<\*avl*, with metathesis of *-vl-* to *-lv-* as in Pa. Ga.; *Voc.* 91]). Metathesis of  $C_2C_3$  appears to be indicated for North Dravidian in, for example, Malto in *DEDR* 1285 Ta. *karu-nilam* (Ma. *kari*, *karivi*, *karuvi* ... Malt. *qawru*); with vowel loss in Kuṛux and Malto in *DEDR* 11 Ta. *akar* (*-v-*, *-nt-*) (Kur. *arxnā*; Malt. *arge*); and perhaps in Kuṛux and Malto in *DEDR* 1996 Kur. *xēs<sup>e</sup>r* (*xesr-*), Malt. *qasru*, cross-referenced with *DEDR* 1366 Ta. *karutu* (Ir. *kaṇucu*).<sup>3</sup> We also probably have a clear example of metathesis of  $V_1C_1$  in North Dravidian in a probable relationship between *DEDR* 1517 Kur. *kiss*, Malt. *kisu* ‘pig’ and *DEDR* 771 Ka. *ekala* ‘wild hog,’ Go. (Ph.) *akṛā*, *akṛāl* ‘wild pig,’ with regard to which latter set of etyma see section 5 immediately below.<sup>4</sup>

Levitt (2009) has also suggested that such metathesis is as well a feature in Meluhhan words recorded in Ancient Mesopotamian sources. These words show several North Dravidian phonological

<sup>3</sup> Ta. *r* = Kur. Malt. *r* (*DEDR*, pp. xii-xiii; Krishnamurti 2003: 152).

<sup>4</sup> Go. *r* = Kur. Malt. *s* (Krishnamurti 2003: 146).



features. The Ancient Mesopotamian “Meluḥḥa,” of course, is identified by modern-day archeologists as Indus Valley Civilization.

## 5. “Syllabic Loss”

With regard to Skt. *vandra* and one set of the proposed correspondences involved in the discussion of Skt. *mandrá*, such metathesis would have been followed by loss of  $C_2$  in its new position. Also to be considered as a possibility for the correspondences proposed below for these Sanskrit forms is that they are due to loss of  $C_2$  followed by vowel contraction, or loss of  $V_2$  followed by consonant-cluster simplification. The result is, of course, nevertheless “syllabic loss.”

Examples of such “syllabic loss” in the forms concerned are evident in *DEDR* 4723 Ta. *maruḷ* (*maruḷv-*, *maruṅ-*) ... *maruḷal* ... *maruḷi* and Ka. *maruḷi*, *maruḷi* ... *maruḷ*, but also Ka. *maḷ*, *maḷḷu*, *meḷ* [PDR \**mar-*: \**mar-ul-*]. We also have in this instance Skt. *malva* carrying the same signification as Skt. *manda*, the phonology of which relationship will be discussed in section 14.15 below.

Earlier, Zvelebil (1970: 36, 66-67, 75; 1990: 15) discussed what he referred to first as the “South Dravidian Syncope” in which, in South Dravidian, the root and suffix vowels commonly contract with the loss of a medial \*-*k-*, \*-*y-* < \*-*y-* or \*-*c-*, or \*-*v-* < \*-*v-* or \*-*k-*. Sometimes also, he notes, \**t*, \**ṭ*, and \**r* seem to be lost (p. 66). This results in the lengthening of the radical vowel. He also notes opinion that in some cases forms that seem to be later and “contracted” are actually older.

This was restated in brief and with more generality, but still restricted to South Dravidian, by McAlpin (1981: 29) in his “Stem Mutation Rule.”

Krishnamurti (2003: 96) considers such “syllabic contraction” to be reconstructable within Proto-Dravidian, and to continue as a change in sub-groups and languages in later periods.

Examples are *DEDR* 4410 Ta. *peyar*, *piyar* ...: Ta. *pēr* and *DEDR* 4886 Ta. *muka* (-*pp-*, -*nt-*), *mukar* (-*v-*, -*nt-*): Ta. *mō* (-*pp-*, -*nt-*).

What I refer to here as “syllabic loss” appears to be broader in





instances and does not uniformly result in the lengthening of the radical vowel. See, for instance, the example from *DEDR* 4723 Ta. *maruḷ* immediately above.

Bhat (1965-66: 13-14), it ought be noted, refers to the elision of an initial vowel in Tulu (see also Krishnamurti 1961: 51 and 130 n. 67). And David (1966: 4-8) has referred to syncope in Tamil, with elision of a medial *u*.

“Syllabic loss,” I would submit, is not uncommon in Sanskrit loans from Dravidian.

Compare, for example, Skt. *pogaṇḍa* ‘not full grown, young; a boy’ (C); ‘having a redundant or defective member, deformed’ (L) and Skt. *paugaṇḍa* ‘boyhood, boyish’ (C) with *DEDR* 4603 Ma. *pōra*. This is an instance in which we have a clear example of “syllabic loss” in the Sanskrit loan form.

*EWA* 3.336 opines regarding this form “not clear” (see also *KEWA* 2.344). *EWA* mentions, “perhaps *apogaṇḍa* is primary (an *apa-* composition?).” Also with question, *EWA* mentions the connection of this form in *CDIAL* with *CDIAL* entry no. 8394.1, which lists continuations of \**poṅga* ‘young of animal or plant’ (H. *pūḅṛā* m. ‘boy,’ M. *pōgā* ‘young snake, shoot,’ *pōgdā* ‘strip-ling,’ etc.). *CDIAL* would connect these forms with its entry no. 8399 Skt. *pōta* ‘young of animal or plant,’ which it notes to be probably in origin a Dravidian form, citing Burrow (1948: 386).

Rocher (1973) had argued that *apogaṇḍa* is not an *a-* negative formation, as it is understood by *MW* 56c, for instance, but rather that it is the primary form that on the basis of incorrect interpretation led to a form *pogaṇḍa*. Skt. *apogaṇḍa* he understood to be a negative formation in *apa-*. “As soon as the meaning of the second element in *apogaṇḍa* was lost, this negative form in *apa*<sup>o</sup> could easily be confounded with those negative forms in *a*<sup>o</sup> the second element of which began with *pa*<sup>o</sup>, ...” (p. 473).

Kuiper (1948: 49-50, 78) argued that the “*po-*” in *pogaṇḍa* is a Proto-Munda prefix added to a word for ‘stunted, short, dwarfish, small, blunt, dull.’

Consider, though, the Telugu form *porigāḍu* ‘boy, child’ in *DEDR* 4603:

*DEDR* 4603 Ma. *pōra* silly, a glutton. Ka. *pōra* child, little boy, little girl, young and inexperienced person; *pōri* little girl. Tu. *pōra*,







*pōre* lad; *pōri* lass. Te. *pōrāḍu* boy, child, young man; *pōri* girl; *pōrigāḍu* boy, child. Go. (S.) *pōri* young of a pig; (F-H.) *pori* chicken; (Pat.) *pitteng poring* young of birds (*Voc.* 2451). [PDr \**pōt-V-*]

The loan is clearly from Te. *pōrigāḍu* with loss of the second syllable of the form in Sanskrit.

The details of Rocher's argument regarding Skt. *apoganda*, though, are well taken. It can be suggested here that these terms in *DEDR* are related to *DEDR* 156(a) Ta. *appan*, *appu* which contains primarily words for 'father.' Note in this regard the Kui forms in *DEDR* 156(a), Kui *āpo* (pl. *āporu*) boy, son; *āpi* girl, wife. Also, in Tamil usage one endearingly addresses a young boy as *appā* 'father.' As *DEDR* 156(a) notes for Ta. *appan*, *appu* 'father; term of endearment used to little children or inferiors.' Also, Ma. *appan* 'father,' *appu* 'affectionate appellation of boys.' And so forth for Kannada, as well. It can be suggested here that *poganda* and *apoganda* are simply alternate forms for one another that demonstrate an etymological origin in Dravidian of the etyma in *DEDR* 4603 Ma. *pōra* from the etyma in *DEDR* 156(a) Ta. *appan*, *appu*.

Compare, as well, Skt. *kola* 'hog' (*Yājñ* +) and Skt. *kroḍa* 'hog' (C), *kroḍī* 'sow' (C) with *DEDR* 771 Ka. *ekkala*:

*DEDR* 771 Ka. *ekkala* wild hog. Te. *ēkalamu*, *ēkalīḍu* wild hog. Go. (Ph.) *akrā*, *akrāl* wild pig; (Se.) *ikundāl* boar (*Voc.* 9, 150). [PDr \**ekk-/\*ēk-*]

The Sanskrit borrowing of *kroḍa* 'hog,' on the basis of the evidence, would be from a Gondi form. In both the older borrowing (Skt. *kola*) and the later borrowing (Skt. *kroḍa*) there is a loss of the initial vowel. The later borrowing, of course, merged with a pre-existing Sanskrit form *kroḍa*, which led to a lexical transfer to Skt. *kola* of meanings more firmly associated with Skt. *kroḍa*. See *EWA* 3.127, 130 (also *KEWA* 1.272, 281; 3.684). *EWA* opines, "Not clear." And compare Kuiper (1991: 75) who has suggested a relationship of Skt. *kroḍa* with Austroasiatic forms for 'an un-castrated boar.'

In the instances of Skt. *vandra* and one set of the proposed correspondences involved with the forms related to Skt. *mandrā*, though, "syllabic loss" is most certainly within the Dravidian forms themselves.

One possible clear example of such an occurrence is in Brahui forms for 'lizard' in *DEDR* 1338 Ta. *kavūḷi*, *kauli*:





DEDR 1338 Ta. *kavūli*, *kauḷi* lizard. Ma. *gauḷi* lizard, esp. *Lacerta gecko*. Ka. *gavūli*, *gavaḷi* house lizard. Koḍ. *gavḷi* big lizard. Tu. *gauḷi* a kind of lizard. Te. *gauḷi* lizard. Go. (Tr.) *gūwhāl* a poisonous lizard smaller than the monitor; (Mu.) *goyhal* iguana (*Voc.* 1173). Br. *glūnt*, *gulōnt*, *klōnt*, in *garrī-glūnt*, etc. rough lizard (*garrī* mangy), *tāzī-glūnt*, etc. common lizard (*tāzī* greyhound, swift animal). [PDr \**kav-ul*-/\**kav-al*-]

The Brahui forms are at present included in this entry with question. They not only display the process in discussion, though, but also provide forms of appropriate shape that might serve as the source for the so far unexplained Sanskrit form *kuṇḍṛnācī* (*RV*<sup>1</sup>, *VS*<sup>1</sup>), ‘house lizard’ according to Sāyaṇa’s commentary on *Rgveda* 1.29.6. (According to commentary on *Vājasaneyi-saṃhitā* 24.37, it is a ‘woodland creature.’) In the context of Sāyaṇa’s identification, observe that if we collapse the Brahui forms somewhat differently – thus, for *gulōnt*, \**kul-nt* instead of *glūnt* or *klōnt* (the vowel -ō- of the suffix -ōnt being structurally a union vowel, though in origin it may perhaps be a strengthened root vowel; -ōnt being a suffix on the basis of its position in the form *gulōnt*) – we bring the -l- into contact with the -nt. This would require euphonic combination, and would give us our Skt. *kuṇḍṛ-* in Skt. *kuṇḍṛnācī*. Thus, Skt. *kuṇḍṛ-nācī* – the formation being comparable to Br. *garrī-glūnt* and *tāzī-glūnt*, the last two syllables of the Sanskrit form being a separate lexical item, its semantic nature and function in final composition in the Sanskrit form being suggested by Br. *garrī* ‘mangy’ and Br. *tāzī* ‘swift animal.’

With regard to this form, *EWA* 1.364 judges, “Not clear” (see also *KEWA* 1.227).

Other examples in *DEDR* that indicate such “syllabic loss” are, for example, *DEDR* 1902 Tu. *kūruni* for Kuṛux and Malto, possibly *DEDR* 2814 Ta. *cēr* (-v-, -nt-) for Brahui, and *DEDR* 329 Ta. *aṇuppu* (*aṇuppi*-), *DEDR* 3955 Tu. *paraṇṭu*, *DEDR* 4226 Ta. *pīli*, *DEDR* 4341 Ta. *punḅu* etc., and *DEDR* 4616 Ta. *maka*, for example, for within Proto-Dravidian itself. Such data is referred to more fully below (sec. 7[v]).

The clearest examples comparable to the situations that appear to exist in the instances of Skt. *vandra* and one of the sets of proposed correspondences involved in the discussion here of Skt. *mandrá* are





to be found with regard to Skt. *cāṇḍā*, *caṇḍī*, and Skt. *caṇḍatā*.

Skt. *cāṇḍā*, °ī (*AV*<sup>1</sup>, E +) means ‘fierce, violent, cruel, impetuous, hot, ardent with passion, angry,’ in compound also ‘harsh,’ and is a name of the goddess Durgā. Skt. *caṇḍatā*, a derivative, means ‘warmth, pungency.’

*EWA* 1.525 notes that the etymology of these forms is disputed (see also *KEWA* 2.369, 3.702). With question, *EWA* notes Turner’s argument that the word is from Skt. *candrā* ‘moon’ on the basis of the Sindhi forms *caṇḍro* ‘passionate’ and *caṇḍru* ‘moon.’ Regarding the latter, see Turner (1928-30: 128-129) and *CDIAL*, entry nos.4584 and 4661. In response to this, see Renou (1959: 43) who argued that *cāṇḍa* is an epithet of the sun, of which the rays are ‘violent’; whereas *candrā* designates no less typically the moon, but never the sun. The two values are antithetical and do not seem to be able to lead to the same etymology. He further points out that Middle Indic also distinguishes *caṇḍa* and *canda*.

Burrow (1971: 545), as well, mentions in passing Turner’s argument as having been given in support of the latter’s argument that Skt. *āṇḍā* developed from \**āndra*, which Turner would relate to OSl. *jeḍro* ‘testicle.’ Burrow points out, though, that there is in *Aitareyāranyaka* 3.1.2 the word *ānda* ‘egg.’ That this word shows no trace of an *-r-* would seem to speak against the theory, Burrow argues. Further, by “spontaneous cerebralization,” there is no need to assume an *-r-* to explain the *-ṇḍ-*. Regarding the theory, though, as well as regarding a relationship between Skt. *cāṇḍa* and *candrā*, Burrow remains neutral.

I might note that we probably have in Sindhi merger of two etymologically distinct forms.

Also to be noted is that Kuiper (1948: 136) suggests a Munda origin.

For the etymology given here, it was necessary to hypothesize “syllabic loss.” In this regard, from among the forms in the etymology given here for Skt. *cāṇḍā*, °ī, note Kur. *aṅṅā* in *DEDR* 276 Ta. *aṛal* (*aṛalv-*, *aṛaṅṛ-*) and the Kui forms *dlāva*, *dlāba*, *jlāva* listed with question in *DEDR* 3115 Ta. *taṛal* (*taṛalv-*, *taṛaṅṛ-*).

Compare Skt. *cāṇḍā* etc. with *DEDR* 276 Ta. *aṛal* (*aṛalv-*, *aṛaṅṛ-*) and *DEDR* 3115 Ta. *taṛal* (*taṛalv-*, *taṛaṅṛ-*):

Skt. *cāṇḍā*, °ī fierce, violent, cruel, impetuous, hot, ardent with passion, angry (in compound, impetuous, harsh; *caṇḍa-kara* the sun); *caṇḍā*, °ī name of the goddess Durgā; *caṇḍatā* warmth, pungency.





DEDR 276 Ta. *aṛal* (*aṛalv-*, *aṛaṇṛ-*) to burn, glow, shine, be acrid, become angry, envy; n. fire, flame, heat, pungency, rage; (Koll.) *aṇal* warmth; *aṛalavaṇ*, *aṛalōṇ* Agni, sun; *aṛali* fire; *aṛalikkai* burning, smart; *aṛarru* (*aṛarri-*) to burn (tr.), heat, cause smarting (as a burn, caustic poison), irritate; *aṛarri* that which causes burning; *aṛaṇam* heat, fire; *aṛukku* envy; *aṛukkaru* (*aṛukkari-*) to be envious; *aṛukkāru* envy; *aṛuṅku* (*aṛuṅki-*) to suffer, be in distress, anguish, grieve, sorrow, regret; *aṛuṅkal* affliction, compassion, pity; *aṛukkam* care, anxiety, concern; *aṭalai* trouble, distress (prob. < Te.). Ma. *aṛal* heat, fire, heat of pepper, brightness, inflammation, grief; *aṛaluka* to burn (as a wound, the eye from pepper), be chafed, burn from grief, envy, or lust; *aṛalca* excessive heat, inflammation; *aṛarruka* to burn as with pepper, afflict. Ko. *aṛc-* (*aṛc-*) (flame) shoots up, to make (flame) shoot up; *ari* fever (or with 214 Ta. *ari*). To. *aṣ* heat of sun or fire. Ka. *aṛal* (*aṛald-*), *aḍalu* (< Te.) to grieve, be afflicted; n. grief; *aṛaṭu* to be in anguish (as the sick in a violent fever); *aṛalike* state of being afflicted; *aṛalcu* to make sorrowful, harass; *aṛkaja*, *ak-kaja* envy, jealousy; (PhB.) *aṛv-* to burn. Tu. *arluni* to burn, blaze, smart; *aratè*, *aradè* heat, burning, impetuosity; (B-K.) *areggālo* hot season, summer. Te. *aḍalu* to grieve, be sorry; n. grief, misery; *aḍaru* grief; (B, K.) to burn, shine. Go. (A. Y. S.) *eṛki*, (M. Ko.) *eṛk*, (Tr.) *aṛkī*, (W. Ph.) *arkī* fever (*Voc.* 362; the vowel is difficult). Kuwi (Su.) *rīnj-* (*-it-*) to blaze; (Isr.) *rīh-* (*-t-*) to make fire burn, light fire. Kur. (Hahn) *aṅgnā* to feel pain in the soles of the feet from walking on a rough road (cf. Ta. *aṛuṅku*; Pfeiffer). [PDr \**aṛ-*: \**aṛ-al-*/\**aṇ-al-*]

And, on the assumption of original initial \**c-*: \**t-* which such an identification involves, as suggested in *DEDR*:

DEDR 3115 Ta. *taṛal* (*taṛalv-*, *taṛaṇṛ-*) to glow, be very hot, burn, shine; n. fire, live coals, embers; *taṛali* fire; *taṛarci* heat, glow; *taṇal* live coals, embers, fire. Ka. *taṇalu* glowing coals. Te. *t(r)ampi* fire pit, heap of cowdung cakes used as fuel; *tanuku* to burn (intr.). Kol. *tari* (*tarit-*) (fire) burns; *tarp-* (*tarapt-*) to light (fire). Nk. *tar-* to catch fire. Pa. *taṛ-*, *taṛv-* to be hot; *taṛkip-* (*taṛkit-*) to heat; *taṛuran* hot. Ga. (P.) *kis taṛkamul* burning coals. Go. (Tr.) *tarmī* a glowing piece of wood ash; (G. Ma. S.) *taṛmi*, (Ko.) *taṛm* burning coal, ember; (A.) *taṛmi*, (SR.) *taḍmī* fire (*Voc.*





1683); (ASu.) *tar̥mī* id. Kui *dlāva*, *dlāba*, *jlāva* live coal, embers (communication from P. S. Subrahmanyam). [PDr \**tar̥-*/\**taṇ-*: \**tar̥-al-*/\**taṇ-al-*]

The Gondi forms in *DEDR* 276 and, as noted above, the Kui forms in *DEDR* 3115 are presently listed in these entries with question.

Note that Skt. *cāṇḍā* would provide a form with initial *c-*, as postulated to exist.

The correspondence is charted in Table II. Such a semantic spread is also shared by other Dravidian words for ‘fire’ (see Levitt 2011- ); but in no other instance is the spread so broad in an individual set of etyma. Skt. *-ṇḍ-* instead of *-ndr-* is discussed below (sec. 8). To be kept in mind with regard to these etyma perhaps is the association of village goddesses (*grāma-devatā-s*), one of which the goddess Caṇḍī frequently is considered to be, with the ritual walking on hot coals and the association between walking on hot coals and warding off disease (see O’Malley 1935: 161).

An equally clear, but perhaps more striking example from the vantage of identity, occurs with regard to the Sanskrit plant name *caṇḍāta* ‘*Nerium odorum*’ (*L*; not noted in either *KEWA* or *EWA*, it would seem). Again, “syllabic loss” is required. Compare *DEDR* 210 Ta. *araḷi*:

*DEDR* 210 Ta. *araḷi*, *alari*, (*PPTI*) *aralai* oleander, *Nerium odorum*; *araḷi* fetid tree, *Sterculia foetida*. Ma. *araḷi*, *alari* *Nerium odorum*; *Plumeria acuminata*. [PSDr \**ar-aḷ-*: \**ar-al-*]

Here, we must assume that original initial \**c-* > Ø as in South Dravidian, regarding which see, for instance, Zvelebil (1970: 106). There is here no evidence within Dravidian itself of original \**c-*: \**t-*. Etyma are at present in evidence from Tamil and Malayalam only, however, and are truly few.

The root here is clearly different from that connected with Skt. *cāṇḍā* etc. But this root and derivative suffixes *-al/-al* when taken together provide us with a parallel formation to that argued for with regard to Skt. *cāṇḍā* etc. and *DEDR* 276 and *DEDR* 3115. The formation here appears to be closely parallel to Skt. *cāṇḍā* etc. There is the possibility here, however, that Skt. *-ṇḍ-* is the result of *! + nt* > *ṇḍ*, as mentioned above in section 2. Further, we may have here the addition of a derivative suffix *-nt-* to a new





root *\*al-* formed through metathesis of what would appear to be in the extant South Dravidian forms an original  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , with euphonic combination.

I must note that Dr. Allan Thrasher has objected to me with regard to separating the etymology of Skt. *caṇḍāta* from Skt. *cāṇḍā*, °ṛ on the grounds that *Nerium odorum* is closely connected in South Asia with the worship of Caṇḍī. Please observe, though, that Skt. *caṇḍāta* is not related to Skt. *cāṇḍā* etc. within Sanskrit; whereas *-āta* does occur as an ending on forms in *DEDR*. See, for instance, Te. *kalāta* in *DEDR* 1303 Ta. *kalāṅku* (*kalāṅki-*), Te. *kolāta* in *DEDR* 1827(b) Te. *kola*, and Te. *korāta* in *DEDR* 1851 Ta. *kurū*. Further, the connection here is semantically transparent.

I should also point out that *DEDR* does not include many terms for plants that must exist. I have extracted from *MW* all terms with *-ṇḍ-*, and many refer to plants that are not in *DEDR*.

Because of the close parallelism of this identification with Skt. *cāṇḍā* etc., this identification may be seen as support for the identification proposed for those forms. It is included, therefore, in Table II along with the charting of the correspondences in the semantic spread of Skt. *cāṇḍā* etc. and the proposed Dravidian related etyma in *DEDR* 276 and *DEDR* 3115.







## TABLE II

CĀṆḌA	
No Sanskrit derivation at present.	Proposed Dravidian derivation: <i>DEDR</i> 276 Ta. <i>aṛal</i> ( <i>aṛalv-</i> , <i>aṛaṅṛ-</i> ) [PDr * <i>aṛ-</i> : * <i>aṛ-al-l</i> /* <i>aṛ-al-</i> ]; <i>DEDR</i> 3115 Ta. <i>taṛal</i> ( <i>taṛalv-</i> , <i>taṛaṅṛ-</i> ) [PDr * <i>taṛ-</i> /* <i>taṛ-</i> : * <i>taṛ-al-l</i> /* <i>taṛ-al-</i> ] ( <i>DEDR</i> 276 and <i>DEDR</i> 3115 cross-referenced in <i>DEDR</i> on assumption of original initial * <i>c-</i> : * <i>t-</i> )
fierce violent cruel impetuous	rage, harass, impetuosity ( <i>DEDR</i> 276, Ta. Ka. Tu.). Compare also, perhaps, such meanings as: to suffer, be in distress, grieve, anguish, be afflicted, afflict ( <i>DEDR</i> 276, Ta. Ma. Ka. Te.)
hot	burning, smart ( <i>DEDR</i> 276, Ta. Ma. Ka. Tu.); excessive heat ( <i>DEDR</i> 276, Ma.); hot season ( <i>DEDR</i> 276, Tu.); fever ( <i>DEDR</i> 276, Go.); be very hot, burn ( <i>DEDR</i> 3115, Ta. Te. Kol. Pa.)
ardent with passion	lust, envy, jealousy ( <i>DEDR</i> 276, Ta. Ma. Ka.)
angry	to become angry ( <i>DEDR</i> 276, Ta.)
In compound, also: harsh	Compare: smart, cause smarting ( <i>DEDR</i> 276, Ta. Tu.)
In major derivatives:	
<i>caṇḍatā</i>	
warmth	warmth ( <i>DEDR</i> 276, Ta.); heat ( <i>DEDR</i> 276, Ta. Ma. To. Tu.; <i>DEDR</i> 3115, Ta.)
pungency	pungency ( <i>DEDR</i> 276, Ta.)
<i>Caṇḍī</i>	
name of Durgā	Perhaps compare <i>DEDR</i> 276 (Kōṇḍa) and <i>DEDR</i> 3115 (Ta. Ka. Te. Ga. Go. Kui) meanings ‘hot coals, fire pit,’ with ritual walking on hot coals, etc. in worship of village goddesses. Also see <i>DEDR</i> 276 (Kur.) in meaning ‘to feel pain in the soles of the feet from walking on a rough road.
Compare also:	
<i>caṇḍa-kara</i> ‘the sun’	the sun ( <i>DEDR</i> 276, Ta.)  Through “syllabic loss” and addition of a derivative suffix <i>-nt-</i> to a root ending with <i>-l</i> , with euphonic combination. Regarding the process of “syllabic loss” in this instance, compare:
CĀṆḌĀTA	
No Sanskrit derivation at present.	Proposed Dravidian derivation: <i>DEDR</i> 210 Ta. <i>araḷi</i> , <i>alari</i> , ( <i>PPTI</i> ) <i>aralai</i> [PSDr * <i>aṛ-al-l</i> /* <i>aṛ-al-</i> ] (On assumption of original initial * <i>c-</i> > Ø, as in South Dravidian.)
<i>Nerium odorum</i>	<i>Nerium odorum</i> (Ta. Ma.)  Through “syllabic loss” and addition of a derivative suffix <i>-nt-</i> to a root ending with <i>-l</i> or <i>-l̥</i> , with euphonic combination; perhaps through addition of a derivative suffix <i>-nt-</i> to a new root * <i>al-</i> formed through metathesis and what would appear to be in the extant South Dravidian forms C <sub>1</sub> and C <sub>2</sub> , together with euphonic combination after “syllabic loss” of <i>-VC<sub>1</sub></i> .





A fourth instance of such “syllabic loss” involves Skt. *gaṇḍa* ‘cheek’ (*Yājñ* +). A later Sanskrit form, *galla* ‘cheek’ (C), displays an associated form with *-l-*. *EWA* 3.151, 155 judges these forms to be “not sufficiently explained” and “not clear,” but notes that they seem to be connected (see also *KEWA* 1.317, 330; 3. 692, 694). Burrow (1948: 376) connects them with Ka. *gaṇḍa*, *galla* ‘cheek,’ Te. *gaṇḍamu*, Ma. *keṇḍa* id. But he and Emeneau leave these forms out of *DED* and *DEDR*. In 1972, he and Emeneau list Ka. *galla*, *galle* ‘cheek,’ Te. *gallamu* etc. as loans in Dravidian from Indo-Aryan (p. 478a). Ka. *gaṇḍa* etc. are not mentioned in this location.

Compare Skt. *gaṇḍa* and Skt. *galla* with *DEDR* 1337 Ta. *kavul*:

*DEDR* 1337 Ta. *kavul* cheek, temple or jaw of elephant. Ma. *kaviḷ* cheek. Tu. *kauḷu* the cheek; *kavunḍrasa*, *kavudrasa* cancer of the cheek. Te. *gauda* the cheek. Pa. *gavla*, *galva* jaw. Kui (K.) *kūlu* cheek. [PDr \**kav*-[*i/u*]*l*-: \**kūl*-]

The Telugu and Kui forms presently are included in this entry with question.

By the interpretation proposed here for Skt. *gaṇḍa*, and by the thesis of this paper with regard to euphonic combination, the Tulu and Telugu forms can be explained by the euphonic combination of *l + nt*, and perhaps *l + t*.<sup>5</sup> Tu. *kavunḍrasa*, thus, can be seen to be a formation parallel to Skt. *gaṇḍa*, except Tu. *kavunḍrasa* has not undergone loss of *C<sub>2</sub>* and vowel contraction. The Kui form is perhaps to be explained by loss of *C<sub>2</sub>* and vowel contraction, resulting in a long vowel. The Sanskrit forms may be explained if not by comparison with the Kui form through different vowel contraction or perhaps through vowel loss, by comparison with the Parji forms. With regard to Skt. *galla*, though this shows a form with *-l-*, note that in Prakrit *lla < dda < dra* (Pischel 1957: 206). Such sound changes often parallel, or reflect Dravidian euphonic developments. We can thus explain Skt. *galla* as developing from *l + t*, as in evidence in the Tulu and Telugu forms (see note 5 above). However, if the Kannada, Telugu etc. forms with

<sup>5</sup> By classical Tamil rules of euphonic combination, *l + nt > nr*, pronounced in modern formal Tamil as alveolar [*ndr*], as discussed above in section 2; *l + t > lr* or *lr*, pronounced in modern formal Tamil as an alveolar trill [*tr*], and *l* being realized in a number of Central Dravidian languages as *d* (Rajam 1992: 105-106, Levitt 2010: 65-67; Zvelebil 1970: 94-95, 97, and 97 n. 21).





-ll- mentioned above as having been removed from the Dravidian lexicon by Burrow and Emeneau in 1972 are indeed genuinely Dravidian forms, such an explanation would not maintain. Such would indicate forms within Dravidian with geminate root-final -l. In the case of Skt. *gaṇḍa* there is, of course, the addition of -nt- to a root-final -l. Skt. -ṇḍ- instead of -ndr- is discussed below in section 8.

Of note with regard to the interpretation of some of the data herein as possibly involving metathesis of C<sub>2</sub> and C<sub>3</sub> are, as noted in place, Ta. *alari* in *DEDR* 210 Ta. *araḷi*; and here in *DEDR* 1337 Ta. *kavul*, the Parji form *galva*.

## 6. Reduplication

Reduplication is indicated for Skt. *nānāṅḍr* in an association suggested previously by Burrow with forms that contain a consonant-cluster that reconstruct to PCNDR \*-nt- (*DEDR* 3644; see *KEWA* 2.131).

Such reduplication appears to be indicated in the Sanskrit form *karkāndhu* ‘jube’ (*VS*, B +) as well.

Skt. *karkāndhu* is at present without etymology (*KEWA* 1.170, *EWA* 1.312). Witzel (2001: 54 [1999 *Mother Tongue* version 10, 38]<sup>6</sup>) understands it to be an example of an Austroasiatic “Para-Munda” form with a double prefix *kār-/kəl-*, without providing a comparable Austroasiatic form.

The form occurs as a name of a man in *R̥gveda* 1.112.6.

The etymology proposed here is strengthened by the stability demonstrated by the names of plants and fauna. Among those forms in Sanskrit considered in *DEDR* to have near certain Dravidian etymology, for example, over 140 are the names of plants. These are cross-referenced with 95 sets of Dravidian etyma. And over 55 are the names of fauna. These are cross-referenced with 45 sets of Dravidian etyma. These numbers are significant in the context of the total number of Sanskrit forms that *DEDR* lists as having probable Dravidian etymology.

<sup>6</sup> The reference to this form on p. 10 in the 1999 printing appears to have been omitted due to a printing error in Witzel 2001 on p. 13.





Compare Skt. *karkāndhu* with *DEDR* 2070 Ta. *koṭṭaiy-ilantai*:  
*DEDR* 2070 Ta. *koṭṭaiy-ilantai* woody-fruited jujube, *Zizyphus xylopyrus*; *koṭṭai* jujube tree. Ka. *koṭṭa*, *koḍaci-giḍa*, *goḍaci-giḍa* *Z. xylopyrus* Willd. Tu. *koṭṭe-mullu* id. Te. *goṭṭi*, (*VPK*) *goṭṭike* id. Go. (M.) *ghotia* id.; (Tr.) *ghaṭōl marā* id., the ghonṭ tree [*Z. x.*] (*Voc.* 1260). [PDr. \**koṭ-*/\**koṭṭ-*: \**koṭṭ-*]

Indicated is stem reduplication in which *-ṭ-* > *-r-* as occurs in Brahui and some Central Dravidian (elsewhere in North Dravidian, and throughout Dravidian in various languages, *-ṭ-* > *-r-*, or *-ṛ-*). In this instance, the reduplicated syllable contains *-ṭ-* instead of *-ṛṭ-* as in the stem of the borrowed form.

Such reduplication appears to be indicated also for Skt. *karkaṭa* ‘crab’ (*C*), *karkaṭī* ‘female crab’ (*E*). This form is frequently connected with Gk. *χαρχίνοϋς* ‘crab,’ Lat. *cancer* ‘crab’ (see Pokorny 1959-69/1.531). *EWA* 3.64, though, opines that the form is probably a foreign word. As is pointed out by *KEWA* 1.169, the form appears late in Sanskrit, and is infrequent in Sanskrit. While such criteria cannot always be construed as a clear indication of non-Indo-European status, the possibility of a connection with Dravidian which explains the otherwise problematic *-ṭa* of the Sanskrit form, and which at the same time explains other meanings carried by the form and related forms, supports Mayrhofer’s viewpoint.

Compare Skt. *karkaṭa*, °ṭī etc. in the various meanings of these forms to *DEDR* 2049 Ta. *koṭi*, *DEDR* 2050 Ta. *koṭi*, *DEDR* 2051 Ta. *koṭicci*, *DEDR* 2052 Ta. *koṭiru*, *DEDR* 2054(a) Ta. *koṭu* and (b) Ta. *kōṭi*, *DEDR* 2055 Ta. *koṭu*, *DEDR* 2056 Ta. *koṭuku* (*koṭuki-*), *DEDR* 2063 Ta. *koṭṭu* (*koṭṭi-*), and *DEDR* 2069 Ta. *koṭṭai*. To facilitate comparison, this data is charted in Table III with a limited number of representative Dravidian etyma only, and together with necessary contextual material when relevant. Vagueness on the part of the Sanskrit sources which note these terms in particular definitions and the infrequent occurrence of many of these terms in literature makes certain identification impossible in a number of instances.





TABLE III

KARKATA	
Present Sanskrit derivation: Problematic. Often said to be cognate with Gk. <i>καρκίνος</i> , Lat. <i>cancer</i> .	Proposed Dravidian derivation: Variously from <i>DEDR</i> 2049, <i>DEDR</i> 2050, <i>DEDR</i> 2051, <i>DEDR</i> 2052, <i>DEDR</i> 2054(a) and (b), <i>DEDR</i> 2055, <i>DEDR</i> 2056, <i>DEDR</i> 2063, <i>DEDR</i> 2069, depending on meaning. Required for derivation is reduplication in which $t > r$ in the reduplicated syllable, as in Brahui and some Central Dravidian (elsewhere in North Dravidian, and throughout Dravidian in vari- ous languages, $t > r$ , or $r$ ).
crab ( <i>karkaṭa</i> , <i>karkaṭaka</i> [C]; <i>karkaṭī</i> female crab [E]). Also, <i>karkaṭaka</i> a pair of tongs (C).	<i>DEDR</i> 2051 Ta. <i>koṭicci</i> jaws; <i>koṭīru</i> , <i>koṭuppu</i> cheek, jaw. Tu. <i>koḍenji</i> the inside of the cheeks. [PSDr * <i>koṭ-</i> ] <i>DEDR</i> 2052 Ta. <i>koṭīru</i> pincers. Ma. <i>koṭil</i> tongs. Ka. <i>koṭ</i> hook of tongs. [PSDr * <i>koṭ-</i> ] Compare in the context of <i>DEDR</i> 1843 Ta. <i>kuraṭu</i> pincers, forceps, crab. Te. <i>koṛaḍu</i> a kind of pincers. [PDr * <i>kuṛ-aṭ-/*kor-aṭ-</i> ] And compare in the context of <i>DEDR</i> 2064 Ta. <i>koṭṭu</i> ( <i>koṭṭi-</i> ) to sting (as a scorpion, wasp); <i>koṭukku</i> sting of a wasp, hornet, scorpion, claws of a crab, lobster. Etc. [PDr * <i>kuṭ-/*kōṭ(t)-/*kōṭ-</i> ], freq. as- sociated with a suffix <i>-(u)k-</i> : * <i>kukk-</i>
the curved end of the beam of a balance ( <i>karkaṭa</i> [C]).	<i>DEDR</i> 2054(a) Ta. <i>koṭu</i> curved, bent, crooked; <i>koṭukki</i> hooked bar for fastening doors, clasp of an ornament; <i>koṭu-vāy</i> curved or bent edge (as of billhook); <i>koṭu-vāḷ</i> pruning knife, bill- hook, sickle, battle-axe; <i>kuṭavu</i> ( <i>kuṭavi-</i> ) to be crooked, bent, curved; n. bend, curve; <i>kuṭā</i> bend, curve. Kui <i>gōṭori</i> , (P.) <i>gōṭoni</i> hooked, bent like a hook. (Similarly throughout Dra- vidian; freq. used to refer to ‘billhook’ and ‘sickle.’) [PDr * <i>kuṭ-/*kōṭ(t)-/*kōṭ-</i> ]
a kind of cucumber, <i>Cucumis utilissimus</i> ( <i>karkaṭī</i> [C]).	<i>DEDR</i> 2054(a) ... Ta. <i>koṭuṅ-kāy</i> cucumber.
a pair of compasses in a particular position (partic. ref. to the angle) ( <i>karkaṭa</i> [L]), a pair of compasses ( <i>karkaṭaka</i> [C]).	<i>DEDR</i> 2054(b) Ta. <i>kōṭi</i> corner. Ka. <i>gōṭu</i> angle, corner, point of the compass, edge; <i>gōṇṭu</i> cor- ner, etc., point of the compass. Tu. <i>kōḍi</i> corner; <i>kōṇṭu</i> angle, corner, crook. [PDr * <i>kōṭ-/*kōṇṭ-</i> ]





kernel (*karkaṭikā* [L])

DEDR 2069 Ta. *koṭṭai* seed of any kind not enclosed in chaff or husk, nut, stone, kernel; testicles. Ma. *koṭṭa* kernel of fruit, particularly of coconut, castor-oil seed; *kuṟaṭṭa*, *kuraṭṭa* kernel. Tu. *koṭṭe* kernel of a nut, testicles; *korauṭu* kernel or stone of fruit, cashew-nut. [PDr \**koṭ(t)*-: \**k[u/o]r*-/\**k[u/o]t*-, standardly associated with a suffix -*aṭ(t)*-, -*iṭ*-, -*aṇṭ*-]

Also, perhaps:

a particular bird (*karkaṭa* [L])

DEDR 2049 Ta. *koṭi* banner, flag, streamer; *kōṭu* summit of a hill, peak, mountain. Etc. But also, Ta. *kuṭumi* bird's crest. Ko. *koṭ* crest of a bird. Tu. *koṭṭu* cock's comb, peacock's tuft. Pa. *kūṭor* cock's comb. Malt. *gorgo* comb of a cock. [PDr \**kūṭ*-/\**kōṭ*-: \**kuv*-*aṭ*-] Alternately, DEDR 2063 Ta. *koṭṭu* (*koṭṭi*-) to beat (as a drum, tambourine), hammer ... To. *kwīṭk*- (*kwīṭky*-) to tap (on door, something with stick); *kwīṭ fiṭ* woodpecker. [PDr \**k[u/o]t(t)*-]

the fibrous root of a plant (*karkaṭa* [L])

DEDR 2050 Ta. *koṭi* creeper, umbilical cord. Ma. *koṭi* creeper, what is long and thin, umbilical cord, etc. [PDr \**koṭ*-]

a kind of coitus (*karkaṭa* [L])

(?) DEDR 2054(a) ... Br. *kōṇḍō* on all fours, bent double.

a particular position of the hands (*karkaṭa*, *karkaṭaka* [L])

(?) DEDR 2054(a) Compare such meanings as: Ta. *koṭuṅ-kāi* folded arm. Ma. *koṭuṅ-kāi* bent arm. Ka. *kuḍu*, *kuḍa*, *kuḍi* state of being crooked, bent, hooked, or tortuous. Kui *kōṇḍōri*, *kōṇḍoni* bent, winding, zigzag; *kōṇḍa* (*kōṇḍi*-) to curl, be curly, bent, twisted.

a kind of fever (*karkaṭa* [C])

(?) DEDR 2055 or DEDR 2056. DEDR 2055 Ta. *koṭu* cruel, severe, Ma. *koṭu* extreme, steep; sever, intense, cruel. Etc. [PDr \**kuṭ*-/\**kōṭ*-] DEDR 2056 Ta. *koṭuku* (*koṭuki*-) to shrink or shiver with cold. Ma. *kōṭuka* to feel very cold. Etc. [PSDr \**kōṭ*-]

Other Sanskrit meanings not accounted for: *Momordica mixta* (*karkaṭā*); a small water jug (*karkaṭī*); the fruit of *Bombax heptaphyllum* (*karkaṭī*); a kind of poisonous root (*karkaṭaka*); a particular fracture of the bones (*karkaṭaka*); names of various unspecified plants and of various mythological beings (*karkaṭa*, °*ṭī*, *karkaṭaka*, °*ikā*).







In a third instance, there is the possibility of the merger of an Indo-European form with reduplicated Dravidian forms.

Skt. *babhrú* ‘deep brown, reddish-brown, tawny’ (*RV* +), ‘ichneumon’ (*E* +); *babhruká* ‘brownish’ (*B*), ‘a kind of ichneumon’ (*VS*, *B*) is cognate with Indo-European forms meaning ‘brown, bright, beaver, bear’ (Pokorny 1959-69/1.136-137; *KEWA* 2.409-410, *EWA* 1.210). The form in its color signification is used in Vedic Sanskrit more often in reference to the juice of the *sóma*-plant, or perhaps to the *sóma*-plant itself, than to any of its other referents. The most frequent color attribution to *sóma*, of course, is Skt. *hári*, which has a color range of ‘reddish brown, brown, tawny, yellow, pale yellow.’ Other references to *sóma* compare its brilliance to that of the sun. If we accept Wasson’s identification of *sóma* as the mushroom fly-agaric (*Amanita muscaria*), the juice of the *sóma*-plant (fly-agaric) would be what Wasson describes as ‘tawny yellow’ (1968: 37).

In this context, compare *DEDR* 4232 Ta. *pukar* and *DEDR* 5490 Ta. *veruku*:

*DEDR* 4232 Ta. *pukar* tawny color, brown; brightness, light, color; *pōr* tawny color. Ma. *pukar* dun color. Ka *pogar* shine, brightness, lustre, color. [PSDr \**puk-ar-/\*pok-ar-: \*pōr-*]

(In the context of Skt. *babhrú* as a color attribution of and an allusion to a cow or bull [*RV* 1.140.6, *RV* 2.32. 15], and in the context of references to *sóma* as a bull of such colors as *hári*, etc. [*RV* 9.2.6, *RV* 9.97.13], compare:

*DEDR* 4310 Ta. *pul* tawny color; *pullai* dull, yellowish color. Ma. *pulla* a yellowish color of cattle. Ko. *bul* liver-colored; *bul(n)* n. pr. dog or bullock; fem. *buly*. Te. *pula* yellowish; *pulla* bawn, tawny. Ga (S.<sup>3</sup>) *pula* light brown color (< Te.). Also,

*DEDR* 1931 Ta. *ce-*, etc. – primarily words denoting the color red or brown, but also applied to animals, e.g. Ta. *cēkil* tawny-colored bull, Ta. *cet-ā* tawny-colored cow.)

*DEDR* 5490 Ta. *veruku* tom-cat, wild cat; toddy cat, *Paradoxurus niger*. Ma. *veruku*, *viruku*, *meruku* civet cat. Etc. But also, To. *pešk* flying-fox. Tu. *beru* marten. Go. *warkār* (Tr.) mongoose [=ichneumon] (*Voc.* 3289). (North Dravidian forms: Kur. *berxā*, Malt. *berge*.) [PDr \**vir-uk-/\*vēr-[i/u]k-*]

Required in both instances would be methathesis of  $V_1C_2$  of





the root, etc., as is indicated as well in Br. *glūnt*, *klōnt* in Brahui forms for the names of lizards, referred to above in section 5. To be emphasized is that the Sanskrit meanings are in agreement with the related Indo-European meanings. They beg question, however, as to why the form was not associated with bears in India, and why it was associated with ichneumons. Are there not bears in India? Is a mongoose like a beaver? The meanings associated with the Dravidian forms, on the other hand, are specific and solve this problem. Further, should there have been a merger here, it takes on significance in the context of the merger involved with Skt. *mandrá* and *mad-/mand-* due to these latter forms' association with *sóma* (see sec. 14.15). With regard to PDr \**v* > North Dravidian *b-*, see the end of section 7 immediately below.

## 7. North Dravidian Phonological Features in Vedic Borrowings

In certain instances it is possible to identify the Dravidian language from which a Sanskrit form has been borrowed.

Thus, with regard to Skt. *pogaṇḍa*, *paugaṇḍa* (sec. 5) the lending language is clearly Telugu.

Similarly, in the instance of Skt. <sup>1</sup>*candrila*/<sup>1</sup>*caṇḍila* (sec. 14.8) the lending language is clearly Telugu as well.

In another instance, that of Skt *māruṇḍa* 'cowdung, or a place spread with it' (*L*), the lending language on the basis of present evidence is clearly Kui. Compare the Sanskrit and Kui forms with other forms in *DEDR* 5082 Ta. *meṛuku* (*meṛuki-*):

*DEDR* 5082 Ta. *meṛuku* (*meṛuki-*) to cleanse floor with cowdung solution, smear as the body with sandal paste, gloss over, varnish; n. cowdung, was, gum, soft waxy pill, mass; *meṛukku* smearing with cowdung water as the floor, cowdung, substance or solution used to smear any surface; *meṛukkam* ground or floor prepared by being smeared with cowdung water. Ma. *meṛu*, *meṛuku* wax; *meṛukuka* to anoint, wax, varnish, daub a place with cowdung; *meṛukku* anointing, varnish, daubing, polishing. Ir. *mēkku* wax. ... Ko. *mek* bee's wax; *mek-* (*meky-*) to cleanse floor with cowdung water. To. *mōšk-* (*mōšky-*) to smear with





dung of buffaloes as a ritual purification; *mōšk-* wax. Koḍ. *mukk-* (*mukki-*) to smear (mud, manure on ground). Te. *m(r)ēgu*, *mrēvu* to smear; ... Kol. *me·g-* (*me·kt-*) to purify with cowdung solution. ... Go. (Tr.) *maṛhuttānā* to paint cattle for the Pola or Diwali festival (*Voc.* 2748); ? *mācānā* (Tr.) to plaster mud on a wall or dam, (SR. M.) to smear; (G. Mu. Ma. Y.) *māc-* to plaster (*Voc.* 2773); (SR.) *miṭānā* to apply (*Voc.* 2823), (Hislop III, p. 132) *mitus-* to apply (sacred mark); (ASu.) *miṭṭūs-* to apply saffron powder on the forehead. Koṇḍa *miris-* (*-t-*) to rub and clean utensils with ashes, etc. Kui *mrāṇḍa* (*mrāṇḍi-*) to plaster, smear; n. plastering. Kuwi (S.) *mrspi kīnai* to polish; (Isr.) *mṇek-* (*-h-*) to make clean filling holes, etc. Br. *miring* to plaster. [PDr \**meṛ-*/\**miṛ-*/\**mer-*: \**meṛ-uk(k)-*/\**mē(ṅ)k(k)-*/\**mikk-*]

The Sanskrit form here is not recorded in *KEWA* or *EWA*. Nor does *CDIAL* provide a Middle Indo-Aryan or New Indo-Aryan reflex of this form.

In the case of Skt. *kodaṇḍa* ‘a bow’(C), ‘an eyebrow (shaped like a bow)’ (L), the lending language on the basis of present evidence is clearly Tamil. Compare Ta. *koṭu-maram* ‘bow’ in *DEDR* 2054(a) Ta. *koṭu* with regard to meaning and form. Required for derivation of the Sanskrit form is analogy with the Tamil form (Skt. *daṇḍa* = Ta. *maram*) and “syllabic loss” as in Skt. *pogaṇḍa*. On account of the length of this listing in *DEDR*, only a representative example of forms are given here:

*DEDR* 2054(a) Ta. *koṭu* curved, bent, crooked; *koṭumai* crookedness, obliquity; *koṭukki* hooked bar for fastening doors, clasp of an ornament; ... *koṭuṅ-kai* bent arm; *koṭu-maram* bow; *koṭu-vāy* curved or bent edge (as of a billhook); *koṭu-vāḷ* pruning knife, billhook, sickle, battle-axe; *kuṭa* curved, bent; ... Ma. *koṭuṅ-kai* bent arm; *koṭu-vāḷ* hatchet, large splitting knife; *kōṭuka* to be crooked, twisted, awry, warp (of wood). ... To. *kwīṛ fo-ḷ* billhook; *kwīṛ magoy* elbow. Ka. *kuḍu*, *kuḍa*, *kuḍi* state of being crooked, bent, hooked, or tortuous; *ḍoṅku* to bend, be crooked; ... Koḍ. *koṭṭi katti* billhook. ... Te. *koḍavali*, (*VPK*) *koḍali*, *koḍēli*, *koḍvali* sickle; *gōḍi-vaḍu* to bend (intr.); *gōḍi-veṭṭu* id. (tr.); *ḍoṅku* curvature; *ḍoṅkena* a sort of spear with a bent or curved head. ... Nk. *koṛval* sickle. Pa. *kūḍaṅ-gey* elbow; *koḍka* billhook. ... [PDr \**kuṭ-*/\**kōṭ(t)-*/\**kōṅṭ-*]

*KEWA* 1.271 opines that the etymology of Skt. *kodaṇḍa* is not





clear. *EWA* 3.126 speculates that it is probably to be put together with Skt. *daṇḍa*. Kuiper (1948: 78) sees the “*ko-*” of Skt. *kodaṇḍa* to be a Proto-Munda prefix.

In some instances, such as in the case of Skt. *hāndra* (variant of *hāntra*) discussed below (sec. 14.22), the lending language can be narrowed down to two or three possibilities, such as on the basis of present evidence Kuwi or a southeast dialect of Gondi.

For most of the standing Dravidian etymologies proposed for Sanskrit words, however, such identification from specific languages or specific groups of languages cannot be made.

There are certain features in the etymologies for Vedic Sanskrit words presented in this paper, nevertheless, which clearly indicate that the lending language or languages had undergone specifically North Dravidian phonological developments:

i. *\*m- > b-* [fV, [*\*m- > p-* (?)]. Certain Sanskrit words that appear to be cognate with Skt. *mad-/mand-* and the etyma listed in *DEDR* 4729 Ta. *mal*, display initial *b-* rather than initial *m-*. These words are Skt. *badva* ‘a large number, multitude’ (*B +*), *badvaśas* ‘in large numbers’ (*B*), *badvan* ‘a causeway, highway’ (*B +*), *badhyatās* ‘(freedom) from the crowd’ (v.l. *madhyatās* [*AV*]). See section 14.15 with regard to these forms.

The initial *b-* of the Sanskrit forms and the alternation between *b-* and *m-* is open to several interpretations (see sec. 14.15). The simpler of these, and therefore the more preferable, is that it reflects the development of *m-* to *b-* in ancient Iranian and Indo-Aryan (Bailey 1956, Burrow 1962). It is this, no doubt, that is reflected in PDr *\*m- > Br. b-* [fV, *m-* [non-fV (Krishnamurti 1961: 19, 2003: 137-138)]. The two developments are likely related. While the vowel in the examples here is not a front vowel, the examples perhaps can be interpreted as reflecting this North Dravidian development. The alternations here are clear. Note in this regard Krishnamurti’s 1961 example of Te. *muriyu* ‘to crumble’: Br. *bur-* ‘to crumble.’ This Brahui form has been left out of *DEDR*. See *DEDR* 4975 Ta. *muravu*, *DEDR* 5008 Ta. *muṛi* (*-v-*, *-nt-*), and *DEDR*, p. 756b.

Such a specifically North Dravidian interpretation is given support by a possible identification that the points being demonstrated in this paper enable us to propose in this context between





Skt. *punḍārīka* ‘lotus-flower’ (*RV* +) and the form Ta. *muḷari* ‘lotus’ in *DEDR* 4997 Ta. *muḷai* (-*v-*, -*nt-*; -*pp-*, -*tt-*). This Tamil form is included in *DEDR* 4997 with question. In the Sanskrit lexicon, we also find an alternate form containing *m-* in Skt. *mulālin/ °lī* ‘a species of edible lotus’ (*AV*). Burrow earlier (1948: 391) made such a connection as well with this set of etyma and Ta. *muḷari* for Skt. *mulālin/ °lī*. Previous suggested identifications for Skt. *punḍārīka* by Kuiper and Burrow, connecting the form respectively to an Austroasiatic color word and to a Dravidian word for water, have not been obvious (*KEWA* 2.300-301, 3.759, *EWA* 1.141; Kuiper 1948: 91-92, Burrow 1948: 385). The connection proposed here has in its favor semantic transparency. A derivative suffix -*nt-* would be added directly to -*l-* here, yielding Skt. -*ṇḍ-*, in much the same fashion that such a derivative suffix appears to have been added in Tu. *kavunḍrasa* prior to the addition of other derivative suffixes (see sec. 5, *DEDR* 1337 Ta. *kavul*). In this instance, the second derivative suffix, -*ar-*, is attested to in the Tamil form in citation. I can think of two possible explanations for Skt. *p-* instead of *b-*. One is *m-* ~ *v-* > *p-* within Dravidian (see Zvelebil 1970: 125-128, 158). The other is that Skt. *p-* instead of *b-* might be attributed to lack of contrast between voiced and unvoiced consonants in the lending language concerned. Such lack of contrast is also indicated by Skt. *tandra*<sup>o</sup>, *tandrā*<sup>o</sup>, and *tandri*<sup>o</sup> standing in compounds for *tantra*, *tantrā*, and *tantī* (see sec. 14.8 below). And especially relevant with regard to the etymology for Skt. *punḍārīka* ‘lotus-flower’ given here, Skt. *maluda*, *maluma* etc. ‘particularly high number’ (Buddh.): Skt. *badva* ‘a large number, multitude’ (*B* +), *badvaśas* ‘in large numbers’ (*B*), but *padma* ‘10 billion’ (*B* +) and the related *badvan* ‘causeway, highway’ (*B* +), v.l. *padvan* id. (*S*<sup>3</sup>) (see sec. 14.15 below).

ii. \*-*t-* > -*s-*. Another instance in which we appear to have a North Dravidian phonological development is in evidence in a comparison that can be made between Skt. *kúśindha* ‘a trunk’ (*AV*, *K*, *ŚB*) and *DEDR* 1842 Ta. *kuṛaṭu*. Here \*-*t-* > -*s-* as in Kurux and Malto. With regard to this phonological development see *DEDR*, pp. xii-xiii, Krishnamurti (1961: 45-46, 2003: 146), Zvelebil (1970: 94-95, 98). Compare, also, the discussion of *DEDR* 1517 Kur. *kiss*, Malt. *kisu* ‘pig’ in section 4 above.







DEDR 1842 Ta. *kuṛaṭu* small block or clump of wood, plank. Ma. *kuṛaṭu*, *kuṛaṭu* piece of wood; *kuṛana* log, stump, gnarled wood; *kuṛaṇṭi* board used as seat, stump; *kuṛaṇṭu* log. Ko. *kuḍ* club, bar of door, log. To. *kuḍ* large stick, club. Ka. *koṛaḍu* trunk of a lopped tree, stump, piece of wood; (Hav.) *kodaṇṭi* log of wood. Koḍ. *kutti* small piece of wood. Tu. *koṛaḍu* log, stump; *kodaḍu* chopping-block; (B-K.) *kudaṇṭi*, *kodaṇṭi* a small log of wood. Te. *koṛaḍu* the trunk of a tree of which the branches are lopped off, a stump. [PDr \*k[u/o]ṭ-at-/\*k[u/o]ṭ-aṇṭ-: \*kur-]

Skt. *kúśindha* is currently without a convincing etymology (KEWA 1.247, EWA 1.382).

Two other phonological developments attested to by the Sanskrit borrowings discussed in this paper are common to both North Dravidian and Central Dravidian. Together with the above points, these may be considered to indicate specifically North Dravidian origin for the earlier of the Sanskrit forms. These developments are:

iii. \*-ṭ- > -r-. This development has been noted with regard to *karkāndhu* (VS, B +) and Skt. *karkaṭa* etc. (sec. 6).

iv. \*-ḷ- > -l-. This development is required for the proposed correspondences made for Skt. *kundr-/gundr-*, *átandra* etc. (RV +), *mandra* (RV +), and *vandra*. It also has to be assumed for Skt. *kunḍrñācī* (sec. 5) and Skt. *puṇḍra* etc. (S +), and perhaps for other forms as well. The problem is discussed more fully in section 8 immediately below.

With regard to specific sound changes attested to by Sanskrit forms the import of which is not completely clear from the vantage of Dravidian, note \*-ṇṭ- > Skt. -ndh- in Skt. *kúśindha* and Skt. *karkāndhu*. Such suggests perhaps Dravidian post-nasal plosives, with regard to which see Kumaraswami Raja (1969), Krishnamurti (2003: 171-173).

v.  $C_1V_1C_2-V_2(N \text{ or } C_3)C_3-$  >  $C_1V(N \text{ or } C_3)C_3-$ . What is referred to here, so as to be non-specific to process, under the general rubric “syllabic loss” is according to Krishnamurti (2003: 96) a feature of Proto-Dravidian residual throughout Dravidian in instances in which  $C_2 = *k, *y < *y \text{ or } *c, *v < *v \text{ or } *k$ , and in which there is lengthening of the radical vowel. Zvelebil (1970: 66) notes additional medial consonants that seem to be lost at times.







Evidence for this is present in the sporadic way in which forms in which this process seems to have occurred appear throughout Dravidian, setting up alternate roots. What is referred to here as “syllabic loss,” though, is – as was indicated above in section 5 – broader than this. Thus, *DEDR* 329 Ta. *anuppu* (*anuppi-*) [PDr \**an-*, often associated with a suffix *-up(p)-*: \**amp-*], *DEDR* 4226 Ta. *pīli* [PDr \**pīc-*, often associated with a suffix *-[a/e]l-*: \**pīl-* (Naiki and Gadba also point to \**pīñc-*, and perhaps \**pikk-*)], *DEDR* 4341 Ta. *pun̄ku* [PDr \**pul-ik-/pul-iñk-*: \**pun̄k-/pun̄k-* (Tamil also indicates \**pūnt-*)].

Such a process appears to have been present in North Dravidian, although the evidence for it on the basis of the sets of etyma established in *DEDR* is scant. Thus, Br. *glūnt̄*, *gulōnt̄*, *klōnt̄* in *DEDR* 1338 Ta. *kavuli*, *kauli* [PDr \**kav-ul/\*kav-al*, but Br. \**kul-*] (see sec. 5 above with regard to these forms); Kur. *kūgna*, Malt. *kūge* in *DEDR* 1902 Tu. *kūrini* (Te. *kūr[u]ku*, Ga. [P.] *kūr-* etc. ... Kuwi [F.] *kūrnkali*) [PCDr \**kūr-*, usually associated with a suffix *-uk-*, but PNDr \**kūk-*]; and, for example, Br. *maringing* in *DEDR* 4902 Ta. *mucar* [PDr \**m[a/u/o]c-ar-*: \**mor-*, but Br. \**mar-*].

Also, consider *DEDR* 1818 Ta. *kuṛal* ‘tube, bone ...’ and *DEDR* 2188 Kur. *xōcol*, Malt. *qoclu* ‘bone’ through loss in *DEDR* 2188 of the medial *-r-* (see *DEDR* 1818 Te. *groccu*, *kroccu*, *krōcu*; *krōce*, *krōcce*). And consider *DEDR* 1910 Ta. *kūviḷam* ‘*Aegle marmelos*’ and *DEDR* 2072 Kur. *xoṭṭā*, Malt. *qoṭe* ‘*Aegle marmelos*’ (on the basis of \**-l-* + *-t-* or *-tt-*).

The present scanty data for the process in North Dravidian may be the result of the process itself.

Also consider with regard to Skt. *cāṇḍā* etc., as noted in section 5 above, Kui *dlāva*, *dlāba*, *jlāva* in *DEDR* 3115 Ta. *taṛal* (*taṛalv-*, *taṛanr-*) and Kur. *aṅgnā* in *DEDR* 276 Ta. *aṛal* (*aṛalv-*, *aṛanr-*) ... *aṛuṅku* (*aṛuṅki-*). The latter, while not providing appropriate forms for the derivation of Skt. *cāṇḍā* etc. in North Dravidian, show the process of “syllabic loss” in both Central Dravidian and North Dravidian with regard to what I see to be related Dravidian etyma.

Among the Sanskrit forms discussed here that indicate such loss had occurred in Dravidian one, though, does demonstrate in cognate Dravidian forms the appropriate alternate root. This is





the instance of Skt. *kuṇḍrñācī* (*RV*<sup>1</sup>, *VS*<sup>1</sup>) for which an appropriate alternate root is present in Brahui. A marginal exception to this exists in the case of Skt. *gaṇḍa*, *galla* (sec. 5). That appropriate alternate roots cannot be found elsewhere in Dravidian with a single exception in which the appropriate alternate root is in Brahui perhaps suggests that the language or languages from which Sanskrit was borrowing the forms in question was specifically North Dravidian, the modern vocabulary of which has been inundated with Indo-Aryan loans through contact with Indo-Aryan populations.

From among the approximately 25 borrowings from Dravidian in Vedic Sanskrit suggested earlier by Burrow (1946: 22-24), most have been withdrawn as being too far from certain. Compare the listing in Burrow's article with the listing of cross-referenced Sanskrit forms in *DEDR*, pp. 757-763. Skt. *bala* 'strength' (p. 19) was cross-referenced with Dravidian forms in *DED*, p. 570a; but this, too, was withdrawn for *DEDR*. With regard to *bala*, see *KEWA* 2.416-418, *EWA* 2.215. The three Vedic Sanskrit words with initial *b-* at first isolated by Burrow as being possible loans from Dravidian, it is perhaps worthy of note here, all displayed a phonological development that can be attributed by us to North Dravidian in *\*v- > b-*. With regard to PDr *\*v- > b-* occurring independently in South Dravidian and North Dravidian, see Zvelebil (1970: 155-158), Krishnamurti (2003: 141-142), and section 14.14 below. Among the forms discussed here for which *\*v- > b-*, or *bh-*, if you will, is Skt. *babhrú* (*RV* +; sec 6). The observation of Zvelebil (1970: 156) on the basis of the proposed Dravidian etymology for Skt. *bala*, that *\*v- > \*b-* may have been a feature within Proto-Dravidian, is unwarranted from the vantage of the data being presented here, though from a Nostratic vantage it might maintain. Later Sanskrit loans, such as Skt. *baka* 'heron, crane' (*E* +) (Burrow 1948: 387; *DEDR* 5206, p. 762a) show a similar development.





## 8. Variant Realizations in Sanskrit of the Dravidian Euphonic Combination of *-l-* + *-nt-*

The etymology for Skt. *nánāndṛ* clearly correlates a Sanskrit form with Dravidian cognates that reconstruct such as to contain PDr *\*-nt-*. The etymology for Skt. *gundrā*, used to refer to various reeds, bulrushes, and sedges, on the account of the stability demonstrated by the names of plants can be associated clearly with a Dravidian set of etyma the root of which ended with *-l*. Thus, the shape of a realization in Sanskrit of a Dravidian form containing cognates that might reconstruct so as to contain PDr *\*-nt-*, and the shape of a realization in Sanskrit of a Dravidian form containing cognates that reconstruct to a root that ends with *-l* and to which there must have been added with euphonic combination a derivative suffix *-nt-*, are both established.

There is, however, variation with regard to the realization in Sanskrit of this consonant cluster throughout our data. Thus, *nánāndṛ*, but *kuṇḍṛnācī*; *gundrā*, but also *guṇḍrā* and perhaps, *guṇḍā*; *puṇḍra*, but also *pundra*, *puṇḍa*, and *puṇḍhra*; in a form the certain derivation of which cannot be arrived at, *rāṇḍyā*, but also *rāṇḍryā*; *bhandra*, but also *bhaṇḍ-* and forms containing Skt. *-nd-*; *mandrā*, but also *mand-* and *manda*; *tand-*, but also *tandr-*. Further, as *\*l > l* is never the case (though there is merger of *\*l* and *\*l̥*), clearly to be included with these variations is *cāṇḍā*, °ī. There is also evidence from within Sanskrit that *-ndh-* is still another variation (see end of this section, and beginning of sec. 9).

In the context of the etymology proposed here for Skt. *cāṇḍā*, °ī, and indicated by the variant form *puṇḍa* for *puṇḍra* is that we cannot be certain in a number of instances whether *\*l > l* in the forms concerned, or rather whether it is euphonic combination of *-l-* + *-nt-* which is resulting in Skt. *-ṇḍ-*. *\*l > l* is indicated clearly by *kuṇḍṛnācī*, by *puṇḍra*, and with regard to one of the sets of etyma involved in Skt. *mand-* and *manda*. The resulting euphonic combination cannot be explained otherwise. But is such also involved in *gaṇḍa*, *caṇḍāta*, and *puṇḍārīka*? Similarly, is such involved in a relationship that can be established between Skt. *maṇḍala* and the etyma listed in *DEDR* 5313 Ta. *valai* (*-v-*, *-nt-*) and *DEDR* 5308 Ta. *valaṅkam*. The initial *m-* of the Sanskrit





word can be explained on the basis of the alternation that occurs between *v-* and *m-* throughout Dravidian (Krishnamurti 1961: 20, Zvelebil 1970: 125-128).

Skt. *maṇḍala* a disk (esp. of the sun or moon); anything round; a circle, globe, orb, ring, circumference, ball, wheel; the path or orbit of a heavenly body; a halo round the sun or moon; a circular array of troops; a district, arrondissement, territory, province, country; a surrounding district or neighboring state, the circle of a king's near and distant neighbors; a multitude, group, band, collection, whole body, society, company.

DEDR 5313 Ta. *vaḷai* (-*v-*, -*nt-*) to surround, hover around, walk around, move about (as foetus in a womb); (-*pp-*, -*tt-*) to surround (tr.); n. circle, surrounding region, bangle, bracelet; *vaḷaical*, *vaḷaippu* enclosure, courtyard; *vaḷaivu* circle, circumference; *vaḷaiyam* ring, circle, bracelet, ambit; *vaḷaiyal* bangle; *vaḷāvu* (*vaḷāvi-*) to surround; *vaḷākam* enclosing, surrounding; *vaṇaṅku* (*vaṇaṅki-*) to surround, encompass. Ma. *vaḷayuka* to surround; *vaḷekka* to enclose; *vaḷaccal* enclosing; *vaḷayal* surrounding; *vaḷappu* enclosure of a house, compound; *vaḷa* ring, bracelet; *vaḷaiyam* bracelet. Ko. *vaḷc-* (*vaḷc-*) to walk in a circle, make round; *vaḷ* bangle; *vaḷ ca-rym* all around. To. *paḷf-* (*paḷt-*) to drive (buffalo) with accompanying buffaloes (at funeral, or in purchase); *paḷ ir* buffaloes that are driven to funeral with buffalo that is to be slaughtered; *paḷ* ring at head of churning stick; *paḷ* circle, bangle. Ka. *baḷasu* to go in a circle or round, walk or wander about, be surrounded, surround; n. act of surrounding or encompassing, what surrounds, state of being circuitous, one round or turn (as of a rope, etc.); *baḷe* ring, armlet, bracelet. Koḍ. *baḷe* bangle, ring. Tu. *baḷè* bracelet, hoop; *balepuni* to enclose, surround, besiege. Te. *balayu* to surround, (K. also) besiege; (K.) *valayu* to turn around (intr.). [PDr \**vaḷ-*]

DEDR 5308 Ta. *vaḷaṅkam* large family. Ka. *baḷaga* mass, multitude, assemblage, troop, the family circle, relatives. Tu. *baḷagu* quantity, heap, multitude, body. Kor. (O.) *bali* clan. Te. *balāgamu* retinue, party, the circle of relatives or kinsmen, kith and kin. [PDr \**vaḷ-ak-*/\**vaḷ-aṅk-*]

The correspondence is charted in Table IV.

Burrow has suggested previously (1946: 11; *DEDR*, pp. 480b,





762c) that *DEDR* 5313 Ta. *vaḷai* (-v-, -nt-) is connected to Skt. *val-* in its signification 'to turn, to turn round' and to Skt. *valaya* 'bracelet, ring, girdle, circle, circumference.'

Burrow has also suggested earlier (1948: 389) that Skt. *maṇḍala* is to be connected rather with *DEDR* 4677 Ta. *maṇṭi* kneeling ... Ka. *maṇḍi* what is bent, the knee. This latter suggestion, though, was withdrawn (see *DED* 3828, p. 570b), and Burrow later (1971: 543-544) opted instead for a connection with OS. *mōdo* 'testicle.' Neither Burrow's original suggestion nor the Indo-European suggestion endorsed by Burrow in 1971 are as semantically transparent as the suggestion here, it ought be emphasized.

Whether it is -/̣- or -/̣- that underlies the Dravidian form that Sanskrit borrowed in this case cannot be determined on account of merger that took place in Dravidian.





## TABLE IV

MAṆḌALA	
No Sanskrit derivation at present (see <i>EWA</i> 2.294).	Proposed Dravidian derivation: <i>DEDR</i> 5313 Ta. <i>valai</i> (-v-, -nt-) [PDr * <i>val-</i> ] <i>DEDR</i> 5308 Ta. <i>valaṅkam</i> [PDr * <i>val-ak-/*val-aṅk-</i> ]
	<i>DEDR</i> 5313: to walk around, hover around, walk in a circle, make round; a round or turn (Ta. Ko. Ka.); to surround, enclose (Ta. Ma. Ka. Tu. Te.)
anything round:	
a circle	circle (Ta. To.)
circumference	circumference (Ta.)
a ring	ring, ring at end of a churning stick (Ta. Ma. To. Ka. Koḍ)
	bracelet, bangle, armlet, hoop (Ta. Ma. Ka. Koḍ.. Tu.)
circular array of troops	to besiege, surround, to drive (buffalo) with accompanying buffaloes (at funeral, or in pur- chase), buffaloes that are driven to funeral with buffalow that is to be slaughtered (To. Tu. Te.)
a globe	
an orb	
a ball	
a disk (esp. of sun or moon)	
a wheel	
halo round sun or moon	
orbit of heavenly body	[to go in a circle or round, wander about; state of being circuitous (Ka.)]
(Compare Sanskrit <i>val-</i> and derivatives, esp. <i>val-aya</i> ‘bracelet, armlet, ring, girdle, circle, circum- ference, ...,’ previously connected with <i>DEDR</i> 5313. With the exception of ‘orbit of a heavenly body’, the specific meanings that match up above are carried similarly by <i>valaya</i> – including ‘a kind of circular military array.’)	
a district, territory, country, a surrounding district or neighboring state, circle of a king’s near and distant neighbors (Compare Skt. <i>valaya</i> , ifc. often = ‘encircled by’; <i>valayita</i> , <i>valita</i> , both ifc. often = ‘surrounded by.’)	surrounding region, enclosure, courtyard (Ta. Ma.); [surrounding, encompassing, enclos- ing (Ta Ma. Ka. Tu. Te.)]





a multitude, group, band, society, company	DEDR 5308: multitude, assemblage, troop, retinue, party; the family circle or friends and relatives, clan (Ta. Tu. Kor. Te.)
(Compare Skt. <i>valaya</i> 'multitude, swarm.')	Through Dravidian alternation of <i>v ~ m</i> , and ad- dition of a derivative suffix <i>-nt-</i> to a root ending with <i>-l</i> or <i>-l̥</i> with euphonic combination.

Among the identifications proposed in this paper, we appear to have evidence as well for variations within Sanskrit with regard to Dravidian forms which contain *-nt̥-* that cannot be attributed to euphonic combination. Thus, *maṇḍūka*, but also *karkāndhu* and *kūsindha*. This is in accord with the evidence within Sanskrit that *-ndh-* was also a realization of the consonant-cluster that is our primary concern, which suggests merger within Dravidian.

Certain explanation of this data is impossible at present. Apparent is that the euphonic combination of *-l-* and *-nt-* followed the development of *\*-nt̥-* within the Dravidian languages concerned to some extent. It is only in such fashion that we can explain such forms as *tand-*, *mand-* and *manda*, *cāṇḍā*, *°ī* and *puṇḍra*, for example.

Particularly difficult are three points which must be emphasized:

i. Within the *Ṛgveda* itself we have evidence for  $l + nt >$  Skt. *-nd-*, *-ndr-*, *-ndr̥-*, *-ṇḍr-*, and *-ṇḍr̥-*, and for Drav. *\*-nt̥-*  $>$  Skt. *-ṇḍ-*. Within the *Atharvaveda* we find evidence for Drav. *\*-nt̥-*  $>$  Skt. *-ndh-*. This amounts to almost all our variation.

ii. We find evidence for  $l + nt >$  Skt. *-ndr-* in forms that enter classical Sanskrit, albeit in most instances in lexical citation. These stand beside forms with *-ṇḍ-*, *-ṇḍr-*, *-ṇḍhr-*, and perhaps *-ndh-*.

iii. Variant realizations of the Dravidian forms concerned stand beside one another throughout our data. Thus, *mandrá* beside *manda* and *mand-*; *átandra* etc. and *tandr-* beside, in one instance only, *tand-*; *rāṇḍryā* beside *rāṇḍyā*.

Perhaps part of the explanation is to be attributed to  $l + CD̥rN-$  Dr *-nd-*. Such a possibility, while indicated by Brahui cognate forms for Skt. *kuṇḍr̥nācī* is contradicted, however, by such variations as *rāṇḍryā* beside *rāṇḍyā* and *gundrā* beside *guṇḍrā*.

That the data indicates more than one lending language is al-



ways a possibility. Such may be indicated by Skt. *cāṇḍā*, °ī, which is a type of variation that we get once in the *Atharvaveda* in reference to the name of a class of demons, and that we do not get again until epic literature. Certainly, such variation in our later data as *-ṇḍ-* and perhaps *-ndh-* as the result of the euphonic combination in discussion, point toward a merger in the lending language of PDr *\*-n̄-* and *\*-ṇ̄-*, as noted, such as occurred in Tulu, Telugu, Parji, and Gadba. As noted above, Hock (1996) followed by Levitt (2010) have argued such merger of alveolars and retroflexes in Central and North Dravidian is paralleled by Prakrit sound changes, and may as well provide an explanation for many of our retroflex consonants in Sanskrit (see sec. 3).

The variation that occurs within the same form within a given piece of literature, and within forms from the same set of Dravidian etyma within the same period of literature, however, requires explanation.

Possible is dialect or idiolect variation within Dravidian. Such may be indicated, for example, by the variation involved with *tand-*, by the semantic transfers that occurred between *mand-*, *mandrá*, and *manda*, and by *rāṇdryā* being a variant reading for *rāṇḍyā*.

Also possible as a factor here is difficulty in arriving at Sanskrit equivalents for disconsonant Dravidian sounds. A Central Dravidian and North Dravidian conjunct such as *-ṇḍ-*, for example, can be expected to have created problems from the standpoint of Sanskrit euphonic rules. Such may be behind Skt. *-ndh-* in such forms as *karkāndhu* and *kūsindha*. Also note that Kuiper (1990: 72) regards *rāṇdryā*, for *rāṇḍyā*, as being due to hypercorrection, an “inserted *r*” being put in by a later Sanskrit purist.



## 9. Internal Sanskrit Evidence for the Dravidian Euphonic Combination of *-l-* and *-nt-*

There is in the Sanskrit lexicon a limited amount of evidence that supports the hypothesis that Sanskrit borrowed forms from Dravidian in which a suffix *-nt-* (perhaps, also, *-ṅt-*) has been added directly to a Dravidian root ending with *-l-*:

i. Skt. *bhalla* ‘auspicious’ (*ChUp*<sup>1</sup> [?], *L*): Skt. *bhandra* ‘auspicious’ (*L*), Skt. *bhaṅd-* ‘to be or render fortunate, to do an auspicious act’ (*L*), Skt. *bhand-* ‘to be or make fortunate or excellent’ (*L*). This correspondence is discussed in context in the discussion of Skt. *bhandra* below (sec. 14.14).

ii. Skt. *malvá* ‘unwise, silly, foolish’ (*AV*): Skt. *manda* ‘dull-witted, silly, stupid, foolish’ (*KathUp* +). This correspondence is discussed in context in the discussion of Skt. *mandrá*, *manda*, and *mad-/mand-* below (sec. 14.15).

iii. Skt. *galla* ‘cheek’ (*C*): Skt. *gaṇḍa* (*C*). The forms are associated with one another in Western Sanskrit lexical tradition (*MW* 351a; see also *EWA* 3.150, 155).

iv. Skt. *kilkin*, *kilvin*, *kinvin* ‘horse’ (*L*): Skt. *kindhin* (v.l. for *kilkin*), *kuṇḍin* (v.l. for *kindhin*). The euphonic combination here results alternately in *-ndh-* and *-ṅḍ-*, and *-ṅv-*. Compare *DEDR* 1711(a) Ta. *kutirai* and (b) Te. *gurramu* [PDr *\*kut-*, usually associated with a suffix *-(V)r-*: *\*kutt-/\*kūr-*], which contains etyma for ‘horse.’ For a clear explanation of the Central Dravidian forms in *DEDR* 1711(b) as due to vowel contraction and consonant assimilation, see Zvelebil (1970: 100).

Zvelebil (1970: 100), *DEDR* 1711(a), *TED* 2.2: 414a, all relate Ta. *kutirai* to Ta. *kuti* ‘to jump, leap, bound; n. a jump, leap’ (*DEDR* 1705).

See also *TED* 2.2: 412a where *kuti* means not only ‘jump, leap’ (< *kutu*), but also ‘endeavor’ (< *kutu* < *kul*).

Ta. *kul* carries among its meanings firstly the meaning ‘to move forward, to move the body in a graceful and affected manner,’ not unlike the movement of a horse; also, ‘to go fast’ (*TED* 2.2: 506a).

Thus, Ta. *kutirai* < *kuti* < *kul*. This provides us with a clear explanation of the *-l-* of the Sanskrit forms, to which we have a suffix *-nt-* added.





With regard to Skt. *kilkin*, *kilvin*, and *kiṅvin*, note that in Dravidian *-k-* and *-v-* are regular derivative suffixes as well as *-nt-*. Here we have three common derivative suffixes, *-nt-*, *-k-*, and *-v-* alternating in the Sanskrit forms in question, the forms with *-nt-* and one of the forms with *-v-*, with euphonic combination in force.

With regard to the alternation of *\*-l-/\*-l-* and *\*t-* in metathetical forms in Dravidian, see Levitt (2003b).

We might also note here that Kalki, Kalkī, or Kalkin, “The White Horse,” the name of the 10<sup>th</sup> incarnation of Viṣṇu yet to come, which incarnation is seated on a white horse with a drawn blazing sword for the final destruction of the wicked, the renovation of creation, and the restoration of purity, is the same Sanskrit word, of Dravidian origin.

v. Skt. Pāṇḍava ‘name of the 5 sons of Pāṇḍu (Yudhiṣṭhira, Bhīma, Arjuna, Nakula, and Sahadeva) of *Mahābhārata* fame, or their adherents’ (*E* +): Skt. *pāla* ‘a guard, protector; a herdsman’ (*V* +), *pālay-* ‘to protect’ (*AV* +), Pāla ‘name of a dynasty of northeastern India (8<sup>th</sup> c. A.D. - 12<sup>th</sup> c. A.D.),’ Pallava ‘name of a dynasty of southern India (3<sup>rd</sup> c. A.D.[?] - 9<sup>th</sup> c. A.D.; zenith, mid-6<sup>th</sup> to mid-8<sup>th</sup> c. A.D.).’

Skt. *pālay-* is taken by *MW* 622c to be a denominative verbal form of *pāla* < *pā-* ‘to protect, to protect (a country; i.e. rule, govern). *EWA* 2.124 understands it as an *-l-* form of *pāray*<sup>o</sup>, causative of *pr-* ‘to bring over or to, rescue, save, protect, etc.’

Skt. *pāṇḍu* (*B* +) is ordinarily understood as a color word meaning ‘yellowish white, pale’ (*MW* 616a, *EWA* 2.118), the etymology of which is not reliably explained according to *EWA*.

The name of the Pallava dynasty is certainly not cognate with Ta. *pallava* ‘leaf, shoot’ (< Skt. *pallava*, though *DEDR* 3996 cross-references the forms it lists in that location with those in *CDIAL* 7969 and Skt. *pallava* as having probable ultimate Dravidian origin). The name of this dynasty would seem to apply to Skt. *pāla* ‘protector’ a Dravidian rule of morphophonemics: bases with a long vowel + short consonant alternate with basis with a short vowel + long consonant, thus (C<sub>1</sub>) $\bar{V}$ C<sub>2</sub>-: (C<sub>1</sub>) $\check{V}$ C<sub>2</sub>C<sub>2</sub>- (*Zvelebil* 1970: 85). Such a derivation is strengthened when the Pallavas having encouraged the growth of Aryan institutions in





the South is taken into account (Basham 1954: 74).

The proposed etymology of Skt. Pāṇḍava here, with a stem ending with *-l* and the addition of a suffix *-nt-* to a dialectical form in which *-l* and *-ḷ* have merged, is semantically straightforward.

More problematic are:

vi. Skt. *phaliga* ‘cask or leather bag or anything to hold fluids – applied to clouds or water receptacles in mountains’ (*L*), *phalka* ‘one who has an expanded or extended body’ (*L*), *phal-* ‘to burst, cleave open or asunder’ (*E +*): Skt. *phāṇḍa* ‘the belly’ (*S<sup>1</sup>*, *L*), *phaṇḍin* ‘name of a serpent demon’ (*L*).

The link between these forms would appear to be the mythology of Vṛtra in which Indra let loose the waters from the mountains from the slit belly of the serpent demon Vṛtra (Keith 1925/1.126-127). With regard to Skt. *phaliga*, however, *EWA* 2.202 notes that the form is not unanimously translated. Skt. *phāṇḍa* seems to be clearly related to the etyma listed in *DEDR* 3898 Ta. *paṇṭi* ‘belly, paunch, etc.’ See, however, *EWA* 3.348, 349, which opines that its etymology is not clear. Skt. *phal-* in its signification ‘to bear or produce fruit, ripen’ has been related to the etyma listed in *DEDR* 4004 Ta. *paṛu* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*) ‘to ripen (as fruits, grain), grow mature ...’ In its signification ‘to burst, cleave open or asunder,’ however, it has been provided with an Indo-European derivation (Pokorny 1959-69/1.985; see also *EWA* 2.201). The relationship of these forms with Skt. *phāla* ‘fruit’ and the surrounding controversy has been alluded to above in sec. 3.

Is the seeming semantic relationship between the Sanskrit forms here chance? Or, perhaps parallel to one interpretation of Skt. *sthaṇḍila* immediately below, could the Sanskrit forms be Dravidian loans from Sanskrit that were then borrowed back by Sanskrit? Or could they be from a Dravidian root that is not evident in *DEDR*, or an Austroasiatic root borrowed by Dravidian? See with regard to the multiplicity of interpretations of Skt. *phāṇḍa*, *KEWA* 2.391, 3.765.

One does have in *DEDR* 4013 Ta. *paḷa-paḷav-eṇal* onomatopoeic forms signifying ‘a bursting sound, cracking, crashing, popping’; and in the Kannada form *paḷak* within this entry, a form meaning ‘the sound produced when an earthen vessel with water breaks.’ Is the Dravidian root that underlies Skt. *phāṇḍa* and



therefore, also, the etyma listed in *DEDR* 3898 represented here, and could this have merged in Skt. *phal-?*<sup>7</sup>

Note the parallelism between Skt. *phalka* and *phaliga*, and *kilkin*, *kilvin*, *malvá*, and such forms as *badva* noted in the discussion of Skt. *mandrá* (sec. 14.15). A common Dravidian suffix *-k-/-v-* appears to be involved, in alternation with a common Dravidian suffix *-nt-*. With regard to the alternation of *-k-/-v-* in Dravidian, see Krishnamurti (1961: 34-35, 2003: 149-150), Zvel-ebil (1970: 121-122).

See, also, Hiersche (1964: 147-168) for a discussion of these forms.

vii. Skt. *sthalā* ‘dry land, firm earth’ (*TS* +), ‘ground, soil, place, spot’ (*E* +), *sthalā* ‘heap of artificially raised earth, mound’ (*TS*), *sthalī* ‘a tableland’ (*E* +), ‘soil, ground’ (*C*): *sthaṇḍila* ‘an open unoccupied piece of ground, bare ground, open field’ (*E* +), ‘a piece of open ground prepared for sacrifice’ (*B*, *S*). *MW* 1261c notes that according to some, Skt. *sthaṇḍila* is connected with Skt. *sthal-*, from which the other forms noted here are derived. *EWA* 2.763-764 judges its etymology to be unclear. Similarly, Skt. *sthalā*, °ī are without clear etymology (*KEWA* 3.525, *EWA* 2.764).

While not directly related to the present thesis, compare Skt. *vac-* and Skt. *vacanḍa*, Skt. *śikhā* and Skt. *śikhaṇḍa*. Perhaps, *sthaṇḍila* < *sthā* in this fashion? Could the form be a Dravidian loan from Sanskrit to which *-nt-* or *-ṇṭ-* had been added and which then was borrowed back by Sanskrit?

The lack of firm etymology for Skt. *sthalā*, °ī and the association by some, of these forms with Skt. *sthaṇḍila*, however, argue for a genuine Dravidian origin, and support for the present thesis.

viii. A comparable situation in which another common Dravidian suffix, *-t-*, is added to a stem ending in *-l* before the Sanskrit primary suffix *-a* is added, may strengthen the case here. This is a relationship between Skt. *śūla* ‘spear’ (*RV* +) and the Sanskrit term *śūdra*, the name of the fourth social class, the ‘folk’ (*RV* +) (< *śūl-+-t-+-a*).

Skt. *śūla* has an accepted Indo-European etymology (*KEWA* 3.366-367, *EWA* 2.651). Skt. *śūdra*, though, is considered not to have been satisfactorily explained (*KEWA* 3.364-365, 798; *EWA* 2.650).

<sup>7</sup> I purposely avoid here the obvious Nostratic connection suggested by the Dravidian onomatopoeic form and the Indo-European derivation of Skt. *phal-*.





By classical Tamil rules of euphonic combination, while  $-l- + -t- > -t-$ ,  $-l- + -t- > -r-$ , pronounced in Tamil as alveolar  $[tr]$  might be pronounced, the ‘ $r$ ’ here being pronounced with two taps. Voicing would probably be due to a Dravidian sound in an Indo-Aryan speaker’s mouth.

This explanation, it is to be noted, contradicts Fortunatov’s Law, by which we ought get in this case a single retroflex dental. With regard to this, see Burrow (1972) and Levitt (2010). This may perhaps indicate that the formation pre-dates the operation of Fortunatov’s Law (see Burrow 1972: 535, 542). Also, it is not out of keeping with the variation we are observing with regard to the results of  $-l- + -nt-$  in our Sanskrit etyma. Note Levitt’s observation, that PDr  $*-l-$  and  $*-l-$  merge in North Dravidian, which explains according to him why Fortunatov’s Law behaves as if dentals are being added to retroflex  $-l-$  by classical Tamil laws of euphonic combination, and which explains variant realizations he sees of Skt.  $-l- + -nt-$  in such forms as *sthaṇḍila*, *phāṇḍa*, and *gaṇḍa* (sec. 5) (2010: 70-71, 76). So also, this may be just so a variant realization, but of  $-l- + -t-$ .

Supporting this etymology is that in ethnographies of Tamil-speaking areas, the *śūdra* caste names are often translated as “Infantry.” See, for instance, Sivertsen (1963). And in Kerala, the *śūdra*-s function as the infantry. See also Levitt (1991-92), where it is argued that the different chesspieces correspond to the king and the four classes of Indian society, the pawns or “infantry” corresponding to the *śūdra* class.

For a possible parallel development, see Levitt (1998: 141-142) regarding a Nostratic etymology relating Eng. *folk*, Germ. *volk* with Dravidian etyma in *DEDR* 5536 Ta. *vēl* ‘dart, spear, lance, javelin, trident, weapon’ (PSDr  $*vēl-$ ). The  $-k-$  in the Germanic forms, like the added suffix  $-t-$  in the argued for here Sanskrit derivation of Skt. *śūdra*, is, as has been noted, a common Dravidian suffix. With regard to the alternation of front and back vowels, see other Nostratic etymologies proposed in Levitt (1998).





## 10. Aspiration

One of the forms clearly associated with Skt. *mad-/mand-* through the mediation of Dravidian is *badhyatás* (v.l. *madhyatás*) ‘(freedom) from the crowd’ (see sec. 14.15). Similarly, Skt. *mádhu* in its infrequent early signification ‘charming, delightful,’ perhaps is to be associated with Skt. *mad-/mand-* through the mediation of Dravidian, and not with the more basic Indo-European derived meanings ‘honey, mead, etc.’ associated with the form (see also sec. 14.15).

In the instance of Skt. *manthara*, Skt. *-nth-* clearly represents Drav. *\*-nt-*.

We have observed above with regard to Skt. *karkándhu* and Skt. *kúsindha* that one of the ways in which Drav. *\*-nt-* was realized in Vedic Sanskrit was *-ndh-* (sec. 7). The possibility of this perhaps suggesting Dravidian post-nasal plosives was mentioned in that place.

We have observed also that for the consonant-cluster which results from the euphonic combination of *-l-* and *-nt-* in Dravidian, we appear to have represented in Sanskrit several realizations which include *-ṇḍhr-* and, perhaps demonstrating merger with *\*-nt-*, *-ndh-*. The Sanskrit forms for which a consonant-cluster containing an aspirate are indicated, are *kindhin*: *kilkin*, *kilvin* and *punḍhra*: *punḍra*, *punḍa*, *pundra*.

It is not clear at this time whether this data is to be understood to demonstrate phonological developments within Dravidian, or to reflect only Sanskrit realizations of disconsonant Dravidian sounds.

## 11. Vowels

Vowels within Dravidian are generally regular. Such regularity, however, while usual, is less often the case with regard to Dravidian loanwords in Sanskrit. The irregularities observed in the proposed correspondences in this paper have been observed with regard to previously suggested Dravidian loanwords in Sanskrit. Thus: *a > ā*, *DEDR 1107 Ta. kañci* (Skt. *kāñjīka*, *kāñjī*, *kāñcika*); *a > ū, o*, *DEDR 4712 Ta. maral, marul* (Skt. *mūrvā*, *moraṭā*); *i/e > a*, *DEDR 2759 Ta. ceṭi ... Ka. siḍil* (Skt. *taḍit*); *e > a*, *DEDR 3414*





Ta. *teppam* (Skt. *tarpa*, *talpa*);  $e > a$ ,  $\bar{a}$ , *DEDR* 3732 Ka. *negar*, *negare* (Skt. *nakra*, *nākra*);  $u/o > a$ , *DEDR* 4987 Ta. *mullai* ... Ka. *molle* (Skt. *mallikā*);  $o > a$ , *DEDR* 5106 Ta. *mokkaṭṭai* (Skt. *matkūṇa*);  $o > u$ , *DEDR* 3507 Ta. *tonti* (Skt. *tunda*, *tundila*);  $o > \bar{u}$ , *DEDR* 4452 Ta. *po* (-*pp-*, -*tt-*) (Skt. *bhūka*).

## 12. Merger

Traditionally, Sanskrit studies have relied primarily on the concept of semantic extension to explain the broad range of meanings in many Sanskrit forms. That the merger of otherwise discrete forms, sometimes within Sanskrit itself, is to account in part for the broad range of meanings is, however, indisputable. This is particularly the case in otherwise unattested lexicographic citations.

Among the forms containing Skt. *-ndr-*, for example, Skt. *punḍra* (*punḍra*) displays the merger of at least three etymologically discrete Dravidian forms. Skt. *mandrá* and *mad-/mand-* indicate the merger of three etymologically discrete Dravidian forms with a root of Indo-European origin. The data for this merger is particularly good. Skt. *madhú* in its infrequent meaning ‘charming, agreeable,’ may indicate the merger of this form of Indo-European origin with a form based on Skt. *mad-/mand-* in one of its Dravidian derived meanings.

We find further indication of merger with Skt. *punḍarīka*. An etymology of Skt. *punḍarīka* ‘lotus-flower’ has been offered above (see sec. 7[i]). Skt. *punḍarīka* in its citable sense ‘sectarian mark,’ indicates merger with this form of either Skt. *punḍra* ‘sectarian mark’ or a Dravidian form cognate to that from which Skt. *punḍra* is to be derived. The lexicographic citation of Skt. *punḍarīka* as ‘tiger’ can be demonstrated here to be based on a merger of this form with a form derived from *DEDR* 4307 Ta. *puli*, to which a derivative suffix *-nt-* had been added:

*DEDR* 4307 Ta. *puli*, *pul* tiger. Ma. *puli* id. Ko. *puj* id. To. *pūsy*, *ūly* (< Badaga *huli*) id. Ka. *puli* id. Tu. *pili* id. Kor. (M. T.) *hili* id. Te. *puli*, *pedda puli*, *bebbuli* id.; *ciruta puli* leopard, cheetah. Kol. (Kin. P. Haig, Hislop) *pul*, (Kin. SR.) *perpul* tiger. Nk. *pul* id. Nk. (Ch.) *pul(a)* id. Ga. (Oll.) *berpul*, (S.) *pullu* (pl. *pulkul*), *berbullū*





(pl. *berbulkul*), (S.<sup>3</sup>) *pulu* id. Go. (Tr.) *pullī* (pl. *pulk*), (SR.) *puli*, (Ma.) *pul*, (W. Ph.) *puliyāl* id. (*Voc.* 2313). [PDr \**pul*-]

Skt. *-ṇḍ-* here is parallel with that in Skt. *cāṇḍā*, °ṛ and in Skt. *punḍa* for *punḍra*, which likewise results from the euphonic combination of *-l-* and *-nt-*. Skt. *punḍarīka* ‘tiger’ previously has received an assortment of explanations. The transparent etymology proposed here is of course the earlier etymology of Kittel proposed, but never generally accepted, on the basis of a Ka. form *hunḍi* with which he was familiar (PDr \**p* > *h-* in mid. and mod. Kannada) (see Kittel 1894: xxii; *KEWA* 2.301-302, 3. 759; *EWA* 3.327-328).

Another example of merger is to be found in Skt. *tunḍa*. In this word’s primary meaning ‘beak, snout, trunk of an elephant,’ it has been identified as being cognate with forms in *DEDR* 3311 Ta. *tunṭam* (*DEDR*, p. 761b; despite Burrow 1971: 544 in which he connects it rather with an Indo-European root *tud-* with a nasal infix [*\*tunḍa*], which form had undergone “spontaneous cerebralization”). *KEWA* 1.509-510 opines that the word in this meaning is from a non-Aryan word, citing assorted Dravidian suggestions. *EWA* 1.653 backsteps a little, and opines that the form is rather just not convincingly explained.

In the word’s meaning ‘*Cucumis utilissimus*,’ however, it is clearly to be related with Skt. *tundila-phalā* ‘*Cucumis utilissimus*’ and, on the assumption of “syllabic loss” as discussed elsewhere in this paper (see secs. 5, 7[v]), with the etyma listed in *DEDR* 2399 Ka. *savute*:

*DEDR* 2399 Ka. *savute*, *sauté*, *savate*, *savati*, *savunti* a kind of cucumber, *Cucumis utilissimus* Roxb. Koḍ. *cavte* cucumber. Tu. *sauté*, *savutè*, *tautè*, *tavutè* id. Kor. (M.) *cāvu*, (T.) *tavnte* id. [PSDr \**cav-*: \**tav-*, with which there are associated suffixes *-at-*, *-ut-*, *-unt-*]

The derivative form, Skt. *tunḍi*, in its meaning ‘emphysema of the navel, a prominent navel’ clearly is to be associated with Skt. *tunḍa* ‘belly, navel.’ This latter form has received both Austroasiatic and Dravidian etymologies. A clear demonstration of the form’s origin still is wanting (*KEWA* 1.511, *EWA* 1.654, 3.249).

Other meanings associated with this form and its derivatives, such as Skt. *tunḍikera* ‘cotton plant,’ are undoubtedly also the result of merger.

Merger of Dravidian forms within Sanskrit has previously





been attested in Burrow's association of Skt. *kuṇḍa* in two of its meanings, (1) 'round hole in the ground (for water or sacred fire), pit, well, spring' and (2) 'clump (as in *darbha-kuṇḍa*),' with the etyma listed in *DEDR* 1669 Ta. *kuṭṭam* 'depth, pond ... deep cavity, pit, pool' and in *DEDR* 2081 Ta. *koṇṭai* 'tuft ... tuft of hair,' for example (*DEDR*, p. 760a).

Merger of Dravidian forms with forms of Indo-European derivation in Sanskrit generally has been shied away from, though there are exceptions to this such as Skt. *kūṭa* in its meaning 'an iron mallet,' which in this meaning was provided with an Indo-European etymology by Burrow (1971: 550), but in its significations 'waterpot,' 'house,' and 'trap for catching deer' is seen by Burrow and Emeneau to be connected respectively with *DEDR* 1651 Ta. *kuṭam* 'waterpot,' *DEDR* 1655 Ta. *kuṭi* 'house,' and *DEDR* 1883 Ta. *kūṭu* 'nest, birdcage, coop ... trap for catching wild animals.' Merger has also been argued for an Indo-European form with Dravidian etyma in Skt. *ātmán/tmán* (Levitt 2001). And merger has been argued for a Semitic root with the Sanskrit root *bṛh-* in Skt. *bráhmaṇ* (Levitt 1995-96). The Sanskrit root *bṛh-* has a secure Indo-European pedigree (see Pokorny 1959-69/1.140-141)

Such merger, of course, is in clear evidence in situations of language contact. Compare, for example, the merger of OE *ræstan* and MF *rester*, OF *areste* in Eng. *rest*; OE *maniz*, *moniȝ* and OF *meyné*, *mesnie* in Eng. *many*; and note the influence of Fr. *ile*, *yle* on OE *ízlant* (*íezlant*), *íland* in Eng. *island* (Jespersen 1938: 88-89; forms noted taken from *OED*, which see).

### 13. Contact with Dravidian Prior to the Composition of the *Ṛgveda*

The presence of Dravidian loanwords in the *Ṛgveda* has been noticed earlier by Burrow and Kuiper, and by Emeneau. More recently, Witzel sees Dravidian loans in the *Ṛgveda* from the middle *Ṛgveda* on. See section 3 above. The exceptionally good evidence of merger of Indo-European and Dravidian forms in Skt. *mad-/mand-* and *mandrá*, the replacement of the Indo-European semantic content by that of Dravidian forms, and the occurrence of forms





with such semantic content in the earliest strata of the *R̥gveda* argues for contact with Dravidian for a period of time prior to the beginning of the composition of the hymns in the *R̥gveda*, as argued earlier by Kuiper (see sec. 3). Such a period necessarily must be allowed for the loans to be made, to become adopted and, in this instance, to replace the original Indo-European semantic content.

Of note is that these forms primarily refer to *sóma*, and the drinking of *sóma*. Could the cognate Dravidian forms have been associated with an indigenous Dravidian use of *sóma*, and could this be the reason for the almost total replacement of the original Indo-European semantic content? If we accept Wasson's identification of *sóma* as the mushroom fly-agaric, the oft-touted linguistic connection between Dravidian and Uralic would support an indigenous Dravidian use of *sóma*. It is Uralic peoples for whom a contemporary use of fly-agaric has been recorded (Wasson 1968: 164-168). For a recently argued close connection between Uralic and Dravidian, see Hakola (2009), which volume is currently being expanded on the basis of additional vocabulary brought to Hakola's attention by a newly obtained copy of *TED*. Also, Mahadevan (1985 and 1994) has argued that the *sóma*-cult was of Dravidian Indus Valley civilization origin, and Levitt (1989a: 7<sup>2</sup>-8<sup>2</sup>, 7<sup>1</sup>, 37, 2-sided foldout) has suggested North Dravidian cognates for Skt. *sóma*.

Of especial note in this regard is that Uri Tadmor in Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009: 64) points out that on the basis of the data collected in their volume, the semantic field that is most affected by borrowing is "religion and belief."

#### 14. Sanskrit Forms Containing the Consonant-Cluster *-ndr-*

Sanskrit forms containing the consonant-cluster *-ndr-*, as has been indicated, are a heterodox group. In two instances, no meanings can be associated with the forms in question (*tāspandra* etc., *lāndra*). In one of these instances, the form itself cannot be determined with accuracy (*tāspandra* etc.). In a third instance, the lexicographically associated meaning used in final composition only is in the context of Sanskrit semantics not limited enough to attempt etymological identification (*rundra*). Two additional







forms, Skt. *syandrā/spandrā* (*syand-/spand-*) and Skt. *sāndra* remain without etymology. Table V gives a breakdown of the origins of the forms for which identifications could be made.

TABLE V  
THE TWENTY-TWO FORMS IN SANSKRIT THAT CONTAIN THE CONSONANT-CLUSTER *-ndr-*

<b>Indo-European (2)</b>		
Sanskrit root + <i>-ra</i>	2	<i>indra, candrā</i> (° <i>ścandrā</i> )
<b>Dravidian (12)</b>		
Skt. <i>-ndr-</i> < <i>l + nt</i>	7	1 <i>kundr-/gundr-</i> 3 Alternation with <i>-nd-</i> : <i>átandra</i> etc.: <i>tand-/tandr-</i> ; <i>mandrá: mad-/mand-</i> ; <i>vandra: vand-</i> (?) 1 Alternation with <i>-nd-</i> , <i>-ṅd-</i> : <i>bhandra:</i> <i>bhand-/bhaṅd-</i> 1 Alternation with <i>-ṅdr-</i> , <i>-ṅd-</i> : <i>gundrāḥ</i> / <i>gundrā, guṅḍā</i> 1 Alternation with <i>-ṅdr-</i> , <i>-ṅḍhr-</i> , <i>-ṅd-</i> : <i>pundra/puṅḍra</i> etc.
Skt. <i>-ndr-</i> < * <i>-nt-</i>	2	<i>nānāṅdr, nānāndra; rāṅḍryāḥ/rāṅḍyāḥ</i> (?)
Skt. <i>-ndr-</i> hypercorrect for <i>-ṅd-</i>	1	<sup>1</sup> <i>candrila</i> / <sup>1</sup> <i>caṅḍila</i>
Variant for form in <i>-tra</i> with Dravidian radical element	1	<i>hāndra</i> (= <i>hāntra</i> )
Specifics of connection indicated by parallel forms not certain	1	<sup>2</sup> <i>candrila</i> / <sup>2</sup> <i>caṅḍila</i>
<b>Other (3)</b>		
Greek loanword	1	<i>kendra</i>
Sanskrit folk etymology	1	<i>idandra</i> (= <i>idaṃdra</i> )
Orthographic confusion	1	<i>andraka</i>





**Not Listed:** *tāspandra/tāsyandra* etc., *rundra*, *lāndra*, *sāndra*, *syandrā/spandrā*

Of note here is that a number of the forms in play are verbal forms. It is generally believed that verbs are generally resistant to borrowing. Uri Tadmor, though, in Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009: 61), points out that while nouns are more borrowable than verbs, verbs are indeed borrowed as well. In the samples discussed in their volume 14% of the total words were verbs, while 31% were nouns. And in the case of two languages, the proportion of loan verbs was greater than loan nouns.

A discussion of each form follows:

#### 14.1. *andraka*

Skt. *andraka* is citable only as a variant reading for *ādraka* in the *Nalopākhyāna* and the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*.<sup>8</sup> The latter is derived by standard Sanskrit rules of derivation from Skt. *rd-*.

The form appears to be a variant due to orthographic confusion. This is indicated by the limited occurrence of *andraka* always in alternation with *ādraka*, and by the alternation between *an-* and *ā-*. This latter can be explained by the occasional orthographic practice of indicating long *ā-* and *-ā-* in *Devanāgarī* script not by a vertical line after a character, but rather by a hook curved to the left just over the upper right side of a character – in this case over the character for short *a-*.<sup>9</sup> Such, either because it is not clear or because it is not familiar to the scribe, is sometimes construed as an *anusvāra*. The subsequent *-r-* before the consonant, also written as a hook but over the upper right side of the consonant, must then have been displaced.<sup>10</sup> The initial long *ā-* of the original form now would be, of course, initial short *a-*.

We thus have in Skt. *andraka* not a legitimate Sanskrit word,

<sup>8</sup> The citations in *PW* are to *Gild. Bibl.* 49: 471 and *Gild. Bibl.* 133: 31 respectively.

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, The New York Public Library Spencer Collection Indic MS. 80 infrequent variant *ā*. Compare also *Brāhmī* script *a-* and *ā-*, and contemporary *Devanāgarī* script *i-* and *ī-*. Such a practice is particularly common in *Jainalipi* manuscripts.

<sup>10</sup> For examples of such realizations in Purāṇic material, see Levitt (1977 and 1979; especially, 1977: 23-30).





but rather an unacceptable manuscript reading that is paleographically explicable but that has been given lexicographic credibility.

#### 14.2. *idandra* (= *idamdra*)

See Levitt (2008a: 211-212).

#### 14.3. *indra*

See Levitt (2008a). See also, perhaps, Levitt (2011) for some of the significant linguistic aspects of the Indo-European argument.

#### 14.4. *kendra*

Skt. *kendra* has been identified as a loanword from Gk. κέντρον (*PW* 2.427; *EWA* 3.121). The form occurs first in classical Sanskrit. In citable occurrences it is used as an astronomical term of technical import. Wilson (1832: 247b) lists the term as well in a number of technical mathematical usages.

#### 14.5. *kundr-/gundr-*

Skt. *kundr-* is citable only in *Dhātupāṭha* 32.6, where it is given a meaning ‘to tell a lie.’ *kud-* and *gundr-* occur as variants (*MW* 290c, 291b, 358c; the forms are not listed in *KEWA* or *EWA*).

The frequent and repeated use of a small number of definitions in the *Dhātupāṭha* is likely indication that those specific definitions are not to be taken at face value. That *Dhātupāṭha* definitions are accurate at least when such is not the case, however, is demonstrated perhaps by the present form. Compare Skt. *kundr-* and *DEDR* 1372 Ta. *kaḷ* (*kaṭp-*, *kaṭṭ-*), etyma in which focus on theft and deceit. These forms have been connected with Skt. *khala* ‘rogue’ and Skt. *kalama* ‘thief’ (Burrow 1946: 9, 1948: 371; *DEDR*, p. 759c, 760b):

*DEDR* 1372 Ta. *kaḷ* (*kaṭp-*, *kaṭṭ-*) to rob, steal, deceive ... *kaḷlam* guile, deception, secrecy, lie, stealing, robbery, fraud ... *kaḷlaṇ* thief, robber, deceitful person ... Ma. ... *kaḷavu* theft, lie, cheat; *kaḷavan* thief; *kaḷlam* theft, untruth, false, forged ... *kaḷlan*





thief, liar, rogue. ... Ka. *kaḷ* (*kaḷd-*) to steal; n. stealing, falsehood, deceit ... Tu. *kaṇḍuni* to steal; *kaṇḍu* thief, rogue ... *kaḷu* false, untrue, fraud, cheating, lie ... Te. ... *kallari*, *kallarīḍu* a liar, deceiver, cheat, rogue. ... Br. *xalling* to lift (cattle); *kalp* deceitful. [PDr \**kaḷ(l)-*: \**kaṭ(t)-*: \**kaṇ(t)-*]

I provide here a limited number of representative Dravidian etyma only.

#### 14.6. *gundrā*/*guṇḍrā*, *guṇḍā*

Skt. *gundrā* and Skt. *guṇḍrā* are not standardly noted to be variants of one another. But while their occurrences are discrete, they fall together on semantic grounds: they both refer to reeds, bulrushes, and sedges, particularly *Cyperus*. Thus, *gundrā* ‘the root of *Cyperus pertenuis*, *Cyperus rotundus*, *Typha augustifolia* – a kind of reed or sedge, *Saccharum sara* – a reed, the plant *paṭaraka* – which would appear to be a bulrush or sedge’; *guṇḍrā* ‘a kind of *Cyperus*.’ See also *EWA* 3.159, which notes that *guṇḍa* is probably to be placed with *gundrā*. *EWA* judges the etymology of *gundrā* to be unclear.

Compare *DEDR* 2235 Ta. *kōrai*, which contains the names of various kinds of *Cyperus*. Necessary in this regard, however, is to keep in mind the alternation preserved in Tamil in *DEDR* 2231 Ta. *kōru* (*kōri-*), *kōlu* (*kōli-*) [PDr \**kōr-*: \**kōl-*: \**kōt-*] between forms in \**kōr-* and \**kōl-*. These latter forms carry such meanings as ‘to bale, to draw up, to gather, to catch fish, to rake,’ together with related substantives such as ‘ladle, fishing net, drag with which rivers are cleared.’ Such an extension of an alternate root from a logically related form of similar shape is required since *DEDR* 2235 carries three forms from Tamil, Malayalam, and Kannada only. Such an assumed alternate root is justified on grounds that it thereby provides semantic transparency to the Sanskrit forms. Parallel in the Sanskrit and Dravidian forms is that neither group focuses on a particular species of *Cyperus*:

*DEDR* 2235 Ta. *kōrai* sedges and bulrushes, *Cyperus*. Ma. *kōra* *C. juncifolius*. Ka. *koranārigaḍḍe* a kind of sedge, *C. hexastachyus* Rottb. [PSDr \**kō r-*]



14.7. *candrā* (°*ścandrā*)

Skt. *candrā* (°*ścandrā*) standardly is derived from Skt. *ścand-/cand-* by addition of the primary suffix *-ra*. It appears to be an Indo-Aryan development. *ścand-/cand-* occurs in citable form only in the intensive particle and only in *Ṛgveda* 5.42.4 (*MW* 386b, 1093c; Whitney 1885: 177; Grassmann 1873: 1414). The conditioned preservation of the consonant-cluster *śc-* is comparable to that for *car-* in *upāscarat* in *Maitrāyaṇīsamhitā* 4.2.9, and is indicative of an initial Indo-European \**s-*. Cognate forms for *ścand-/cand-* are citable in Greek, Albanian, Latin, and Cymric (= Welsh) (Pokorny 1959-69/1.526). See *EWA* 1.528-529.

14.8. <sup>1</sup>*candrila*/<sup>1</sup>*caṇḍila*

Skt. <sup>1</sup>*candrila* and Skt. <sup>1</sup>*caṇḍila* are both forms that occur only in classical Sanskrit lexicographic sources (*PW* 2.946, 925-926, *MW* 388a, 383b). Both forms mean ‘barber.’ Kuiper (1991: 71) sees <sup>1</sup>*candrila* to be a hypercorrect Sanskrit form for Skt. <sup>1</sup>*caṇḍila* containing what he refers to as an “intrusive *r*.” Skt. <sup>1</sup>*caṇḍila* Kuiper (1948: 78, 160) sees to be derived from Munda words for ‘bare, bald,’ and to have Pa. *thaṇḍila* ‘bare ground’ (Sanskritized as *sthaṇḍila*<sup>11</sup>) as a variant.

*KEWA* 1.370 and *EWA* 3.179, 178 view its etymology to be “uncertain,” or “not clear.”

Compare, though, the Telugu forms in *DEDR* 1542 Ta. *kiṇṭu* (*kiṇṭi-*):

*DEDR* 1542 Ta. *kiṇṭu* (*kiṇṭi-*) ... Ko. *kej-* (*kej-*) to flay, cut open or cut up (carcass, meat). To. *kōd-* (*kōḍy-*) to flay. Tu. *ceṇḍāḍu* to destroy, ruin. Te. *ceṇḍu* to cut; *ceṇḍāḍu* to cut to pieces ... Malt. *kinde* to cut flesh or fish. [PDr \**k[i/e]ṇṭ-*: \**keñc-*]

This is most probably related within Dravidian to a root final \**-l/\*-l-* variant of *DEDR* 1564 Ta. *cirai* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*):

*DEDR* 1564 Ta. *cirai* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*) to shave, cut with a sickle; *ciraiyaṇ* barber; *cirāy-* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*) to get scratched (as in the skin); *curaṇṭu* (*curaṇṭi-*), *curaṇṭu* (*curaṇṭi-*) to scratch, scrape with fingernail or instrument, erase; *curaṇṭi*, *curaṇṭi* scraper, scrapings.

<sup>11</sup> See, however, section 9(vii) above.





Ma. *cira* shaving; a grater, scraper for coco-nuts (also *cirava*); *cirekka* to shave, scrape; *cireppu* shaving, scraping; *cirayan* a shaved person; *cirampan* the god of barbers ... *cikkuka*, *cikayuka* to scratch (as fowls) ... Ka. *kere* to shave, scrape, scratch ... *keran̄tu* to dig with the nails, scratch; *gere* a scratch as with the fingernails. Tu. *kerepuni* to scrape, polish; *kereñcuni*, *keran̄tuni* to scratch the ground (as a fowl) ... Kol. *kerk-* (*kerekt-*) to shave ... Nk. (Ch.) *ker-* to shave. Pa. *kir-*, *kirv-*, *kirc-* to scratch ... Kur. *xercnā* (*xircyas*) to rub off, scour. Malt. *qerce* to scrape; *qére* to shave; *qértre* to be shaved; *qéru* barber ... . [PDr \*k[i/u/ě]r-/\*kur-: \*k[i/e]k(k)-]

Such a root final *\*-l-/\*-l-* variant can be found in *DEDR* 1588 Ta. *kiłai* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*), cross-referenced in *DEDR* with *DEDR* 1582 Go. *kille*:

*DEDR* 1588 Ta. *kiłai* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*) to dig up, stir, scratch up (as fowls), root up (as pigs), burrow into (as roots), excavate; (*-v-*, *-nt-*) to pry out (as a thorn from the flesh with a needle); *kiłaippu* digging, scratching, burrowing ... *kiłlu* (*kiłli-*) to dig out, scoop ... Te. *kelāku*, *kelan̄ku*, *kelanu* to stir, mix; *kellagincu* to stir up, loosen, dabble, enrage, exasperate. [PDr \*k[a/i/e]l-]

*DEDR* 1582 Go.(Mu.) *kille* upper part of a comb (*Voc.* 697). Konḍa (BB) *kiṛa* to comb; *kiṛpa* a comb; *kiłpa* a variety of comb. Pe. *giṛ-* (*-t-*) to comb ... Kuwi (Su. Isr.) *kiṇ-* (*-h-*), (P.) *kiṭ-* (*-it-*) to comb ... . [PDr \*kił(l)-/\*kiṇ-/\*kiṭ-]

That *DEDR* 1582 Go. (Mu.) *kille* contains forms for ‘comb’ strengthens the argument for a relationship with Skt. <sup>1</sup>*caṇḍila* ‘barber,’ and *DEDR* 1542 Ta. *kiṇtu* (*kiṇti-*) and *DEDR* 1564 Ta. *cirai* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*), which latter set of etyma also contains forms for ‘barber.’ That both *DEDR* 1564 Ta. *cirai* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*) and *DEDR* 1588 Ta. *kiłai* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*) contain forms for ‘scratch (as fowls)’ strengthens the argument for a connection between these two sets of etyma.

With regard to the alternation of *r* and *l* in Dravidian, suggested earlier by Konow (1903: 456), for instance, who cites in that place Bishop Robert Caldwell as well, see Levitt (1989b) and Levitt (in press) regarding words for the number ‘one.’ See also, for instance, *DEDR* 2231 Ta. *kōru* (*kōri-*), *kōlu* (*kōli-*) cited above in section 14.6 under the discussion of Skt. *gundrā*/*gundrā*,







*guṇḍā*. In most instances in Dravidian, this alternation is masked by euphonic combination. With regard to root final *\*-l-* and *\*-l-* both occurring in matching Dravidian forms with initial *\*t-*, see Levitt (2003b).

Tamil, Malayalam, and Telugu all palatalize *\*k-* before a front vowel. The development seems to be independent in Tamil and Malayalam on the one hand, and in Telugu on the other, though, as such palatalization in Tamil and Malayalam is blocked before a following retroflex consonant, whereas such palatalization takes place before a retroflex consonant as well in Telugu. When such palatalization does not appear in Telugu before a front vowel, the forms are considered to be loanwords from Kannada or some other neighboring language in which *k-* remains before a front vowel (Zvelebil 1970: 106-107; Krishnamurti 1961: 6-7, 2003: 128-129).

Thus, Skt. *<sup>1</sup>caṇḍila* could only come from a form such as Te. *ceṇḍāḍu* in *DEDR* 1542 Ta. *kiṇṭu* (*kiṇṭi-*). Even the final syllable, with Skt. *-l-* for Te. *-ḍ-* matches here. As Kuiper (1991: 71) notes, in instances Skt. *ḍ > ḷ*, as in *Coḷa* for *Coḍa* (Ta. *Cōraṇ*) in *Mahābhārata* 3.48.18 and 7.10.17 (which *ḷ > l* in North Indian manuscripts). Skt. *ḍ > ḷ* is especially the case in Vedic texts (Whitney 1889: 3, 19 [§§ 5a, 54]). See also Pischel (1957: 166-167, 172-173, 174-175 [§§ 226, 240, 244]).

Note further that Krishnamurti (2003: 501-502) cites a reference to Andhras, or speakers of (Pre-)Telugu, as far back as *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* 7.3.18, to which text he gives a date of 7<sup>th</sup> c. B.C., and in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, to which he gives a date of 4<sup>th</sup> c. B.C. Thus, a Telugu origin for the form is indeed possible.

It is not entirely clear whether the forms in *DEDR* 1542 Ta. *kiṇṭu* (*kiṇṭi-*) are based on forms parallel to Ta. *curaṇṭu* (*curaṇṭi-*), Ma. *ciraṇṭuka*, *curaṇṭuka*, Ka. *kerāṇṭu*, Tu. *kerāṇṭuni*, etc. in *DEDR* 1564 Ta. *cirai* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*) through “syllabic loss”; or are based rather on the euphonic combination of root-final *-l* as in the etyma in *DEDR* 1588 Ta. *kiḷai* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*) and *DEDR* 1582 Go. (Mu.) *kille*, with the addition of a suffix *-nt-*. Note the addition of such other common Dravidian suffixes such as *-k-*, *-ṅk-*, and *-p-* in these latter two sets of etyma, and such common Dravidian suffixes as *-kk-*, *-pp-*, *-mp-* etc. in *DEDR* 1564 Ta. *cirai* (*-pp-*, *-tt-*), but not *-nt-* in any of these three sets of etyma. This suggests





that forms with such a suffix are located elsewhere in *DEDR*. Also note that *DEDR* 1564 displays an alternate root formed with syllabic loss before a common suffix *-k(k)-* in Ma. *cikkuka*, *cik-ayuka* and Ko. *kekarv-* (*kekart-*), *kekrv-* (*kekrt-*). That the forms in *DEDR* 1582 Go. (Mu.) *kille* mean ‘to comb’ and ‘comb’ would seem to suggest, though, that Skt. <sup>1</sup>*caṇḍila* is based on a form with root final *-l*, and that this would be the immediate etymology for such forms as Te. *ceṇḍāḍu* ‘to cut to pieces.’

Skt. <sup>1</sup>*candrila*, as suggested by Kuiper, would be a hypercorrect Sanskrit form.

Also no doubt related here, given the semantics of the Dravidian forms, are the Sanskrit lexical forms *caṇḍa* ‘circumcised,’ *caṇḍika* ‘circumcised’ (*PW* 2.923, *MW* 383ab).

Kuiper (1948: 80) sees Skt. *caṇḍa* in this meaning to be a variant of the lexical Sanskrit words *śaṇṭha* ‘unmarried,’ *ṣaṇḍha* (*śaṇḍha*, *ṣaṇḍa*) ‘impotent, eunuch,’ and to go back to a Proto-Munda word for ‘bare’ > ‘having no husband or wife (= unmarried, widow), having no children (= barren), or parents (= orphan).’ This seems far-fetched.

*EWA* 3.177 judges the etymology of the form in this meaning to be “unclear.”

A relationship between these Sanskrit forms and Te. *ceṇḍu* ‘to cut’ seems straightforward.

#### 14.9. <sup>2</sup>*candrila*/<sup>2</sup>*caṇḍila*

Skt. <sup>2</sup>*candrila* and Skt. <sup>2</sup>*caṇḍila* also occur only in classical Sanskrit lexicographic sources (*PW* 2.946, 925-926 [see 6.973 s.v. *vāstūka*, *vāstuka*], *MW* 388a, 383b). They carry the meanings ‘*Chenopodium album*’ and ‘a kind of vegetable.’ These forms are not treated by *KEWA* or *EWA*.

In the context of the Dravidian forms given above as related to Skt. <sup>1</sup>*candrila* and Skt. <sup>1</sup>*caṇḍila*, and in the context of the etymology given in section 14.6 for *gundrā/guṇḍrā*, *guṇḍā*, compare here *DEDR* 1617 Ta. *kīrai*:

*DEDR* 1617 Ta. *kīrai* greens, pot-herbs, vegetables ... Ma. *cīra* greens, eatable leaves, esp. *Chenopodium album* and various *Amarantus* species; *kīra* greens; (Tiyya) *kīra*, *cīra* spinach ...





Ka. *kīre*, *kire* various species of greens. Te. (B.) *kīra*, *kīre* herb, vegetable, greens. [PDr \**kīr-*]

The specific forms from which the Sanskrit etyma come are not in evidence in *DEDR*. Note that the Telugu forms listed here are loans from Kannada. Also note, as mentioned above in section 5 when discussing Skt. *caṇḍāta*, many of the plants listed in *MW* are not referred to in *DEDR*. We seem to be missing many Dravidian names for many South Asian plants.

Required for this proposed etymology to work is analogy with the etymologies proposed for Skt. <sup>1</sup>*candrila* and Skt. <sup>1</sup>*caṇḍila*, and for Skt. *gundrā*/*guṇḍrā* and *guṇḍā*.

#### 14.10. *átandra*, *tandrī́*, *tandrā*: *tand-/tandr-*

Skt. *átandra*, *tandrī́*, *tandrā* standardly are derived by suffixation of *-ra* to *tand-*, with *tandrī́* and *tandrā* being regarded as feminine forms of \**tandra*, or of °*tandri* and \**tandra* respectively (*PW* 3.234). Skt. *atandrita* is standardly derived from *tandrā* (*PW* 3.235; Lanman 1884: 162b).

Grassmann (1873: 521) explains the occurrence of Skt. *tandrat* in *R̥gveda* 2.30.7 as due to mislection, and Skt. *tandrāyate* in *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* 7.15.5, *Taittirīyāraṇyaka* 3.14.1 and 3.14.4, and *Śāṅkhāyanaśrautasūtra* 15.19.1 as a denominative formation based on \**tandra*. *PW* 3.234 explains Skt. *tandrāyate* in similar fashion, but considers Skt. *tandrat* in *R̥gveda* 2.30.7 to represent an acceptable alternate stem *tandr-* that occurs also in *sūtra* literature. The reference, undoubtedly, is to *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.2.158 where a root *tandr-* is given as the base for *tandrālu*, and to *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.2.36 where a root *tandr-* is given as the base for *tandrā*. Albert Debrunner in Wackernagel (1896-1964/2.2: 290, 406, 848) likewise considers Skt. *tandrāyate* to be a denominative, accepts *tandr-* as an acceptable alternate stem for *tand-*, and following Pāṇini derives *tandrālu* from this stem. *MW* 436c cites a further instance of an alternate stem *tandr-* in Mahīdhara's commentary on the *Vājasaneyisaṃhitā* 15.5, leaves it ambiguous as to whether one is to derive such forms as Skt. *tandrī́* from this stem or from a stem *tand-*, and lists *tandrāyate* as a causative of a stem *tandr-* rather than a denominative. Skt. *atandrita* he





lists under Skt. *átandra* in perhaps noncommittal fashion (*MW* 12a). Vishvabandhu Śāstrī (1935-65/1.3: 1463a), while following Pāṇini in listing an alternate stem *tandr-* and deriving *tandrālu* from this, lists Skt. *tandrāyate* as a denominative formation, and Skt. *tandrī́* as a form based on the stem *tand-*. Chlodwig Werba's opinion that Skt. *tandr-* is a secondary root back-formed from the regular adjective *tand-ra* has been mentioned above (sec. 1).

An explanation of Skt. *tandrat* as itself a denominative, while it is conceivable on the basis of comparison with a small number of rare, sporadic, and sometimes doubtful instances of forms that display a similar formation without the denominative suffix, is contraindicated, of course, by Pāṇini's treatment of the form and by the occurrence of denominative forms with an aberrantly accented denominative suffix (*-áya-*, for *-ayá-*) within the same literature. Alternately, should one choose to regard the accenting of the suffix as representing a causative formation with normal accenting (*-áya-*), the interpretation of Skt. *tandrat* as a denominative is also contraindicated as one simply does not have a causative of a denominative in Sanskrit.

To be noted is that there also occur forms of the shape *tandrá*, *tandrī́*, and *tandri* that are judged by their occurrence in compounds that occur in more standard form elsewhere or by semantic criteria to be variant forms for *tántra*, *tantrī́*, and *tantí* respectively. As such, these forms are derived from the Sanskrit root *tan-*.

As has been indicated above (sec. 1), Skt. *tand-* contains nothing in common semantically with Skt. *tan-*, of which it is supposed to be an old extended form. Kuiper (1955: 176-177), too, has objected to the standard Indo-European derivation of Skt. *tand-*, and the standard derivations of *tandr-*, on semantic, historical, and linguistic grounds. He would see Skt. *tand-* and *tandr-* to reflect a Munda loan.

Compare, however, the semantic spread of *tand-/tandr-* and its derivatives to that of *DEDR* 3127 Ta. *taḷar* (*-v-*, *-nt-*):

Skt. *tand-/tandr-* and derivatives: languid, fatigued, laziness, lassitude, exhaustion, tired, wearied, sleepiness.

*DEDR* 3127 Ta. *taḷar* (*-v-*, *-nt-*) to droop, faint, grow weary, enfeebled, infirm, or decrepit, grow slack, become relaxed as a tie or grasp, become flabby from age, suffer, lose one's vitality;





n. slackening; *taḷarcci*, *taḷartti* slackness, looseness, flexibility, weakness, infirmity, faintness, languor, depression, laziness, remissness; *taḷarvu* growing slack, relaxing, faintness, weakness, depression, sorrow; *taḷarttu* (*taḷartti-*) to loosen (tr.) ... Ma. *taḷaruka* to relax, slacken, be allayed, grow faint, weary ... *taḷarkka*, *taḷarttuka* to moderate, abate. Ko. *taḷa-r* (*taḷa-ry-*) to take rest. Kod. *taḷe* (*taḷev-*, *taḷand-*) to become weak; *taḷat-* (*taḷati-*) to make weak, exhaust. Tu. *taḷabaḷa*, *taḷamaḷa* exhaustion, weariness. Malt. *talqro* tender, delicate, weak. [PDr \**taḷ-ar-*: \**taḷ-*]

The correspondence is charted in Table VI.

Malt. *talqro* provides a form parallel to that required for the formation of Skt. *tand-/tandr-* through the addition, with euphonic combination, of a derivative suffix *-nt-*. Thus, Skt. *tand-* and *tandr-* may be interpreted as variants of the same Dravidian form. Such a case is supported by the lack of contrast between *-ntr-*, *-ndr-*, and *-nt-* alike in instances in which *tandrā°*, *tandrī°*, and *tandri°* stand for *tántra*, *tantrī*, and *tantī* respectively. To be considered in this regard is that the stem *tand-* has itself only a single finite occurrence in *R̥gveda* 1.138.1.

Given such a situation in which *-nd-* and *-ndr-* would appear to be variants of the same Dravidian form, it is difficult to determine whether Skt. *átandra*, *tandrī*, *tandrā* ought to be interpreted as formed by the addition of the suffix *-ra* to the Sanskrit root with corresponding feminine forms in *-ī* and later *-ā*, or by the addition of *-a* and *-i* with corresponding feminine forms in *-ī* and later *-ā*.<sup>12</sup> Skt. *atandrita* certainly suggests the latter interpretation as it is easiest explained as a past passive participle of *tandr-* in composition with a negative prefix. Similarly, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* suggests *tandrā* < *tandr-*. Given such a derivation for both *tandrā* and *tandrālu* in *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, in the present context it would appear that there is cause to extend this interpretation to *átandra* and *tandrī* as well. By such an interpretation, Skt. *tandrāyate* would be, as suggested by *MW* 436c, a normally formed causative based on *tandr-*, as against an aberrantly formed denominative based on *tandrā* < *tand-* or *tandra* (*Vājasaneyisaṃhitā* 15.5) < *tand-*.

<sup>12</sup> Skt. *tandra* occurs as the name of a *chandas* in *Vājasaneyisaṃhitā* 15.5, and *tandri* occurs in a context in which it is not in final composition in Mahīdhara's commentary to *Vājasaneyisaṃhitā* 15.5 (Weber 1852: 461-462).





This simplifies the situation with regard to *tand-/tandr-* and its derivatives a great deal.

TABLE VI

TAND-/TANDR- AND DERIVATIVES	
<p>Present Sanskrit derivation:  <i>tand-</i> = expanded form of <i>tan-</i>; <i>tandr-</i> = variously interpreted alternate stem; <i>tandrāya</i> – viewed variously as denominative of <i>*tandra</i> (see, however, <i>VS</i> 15.5) or <i>tandrī</i>, or causative stem of <i>tandr-</i>. No consensus. (Of note: <i>tand-</i>, <i>RV</i><sup>1</sup>; <i>tandr-</i>, <i>RV</i><sup>1</sup> <i>VS</i><sup>1</sup> <i>PāṇŚ</i><sup>2</sup> Mahīdh<sup>1</sup>.)</p>	<p>Proposed Dravidian derivation:  <i>DEDR</i> 3127 Ta. <i>taḷar</i> (-v-, -nt-)            [PDr <i>*taḷ-ar-</i>: <i>*taḷ-</i>]</p>
<p>languid            fatigued            laziness            lassitude            exhaustion            tired            wearied</p>	<p>languor (Ta.)            laziness (Ta.)            to exhaust, exhaustion (Kod. Tu.);            [lose one's vitality (Ta.)]            to grow weary, weary, weariness (Ta. Ma. Tu.)            [to take rest (Ko.)]            to grow faint, faintness (Ta. Ma.)            to become weak, weak, weakness (Ta. Kod. Malt.)</p>
<p>sleepiness</p>	<p>to droop, grow slack, slackening, slackness, to loosen, to become loose, looseness (Ta. Ma.)            depression (Ta.)            enfeebled, infirm, decrepit, flabby from age (Ta.)            suffer (Ta.)            sorrow (Ta.)            to relax, become relaxed, slacken, be allayed, moderate, abate (Ta. Ma.)            tender, delicate (Malt.)            Through <i>*l &gt; l</i>, and addition of a derivative suffix <i>-nt-</i> to a root ending with <i>-l</i>, with euphonic combination.</p>

#### 14.11. *tāspandra/tāsyandra* and *tāspindra(?)*/*tāsvindra*

*PW* 3.322a, on the basis of a notice in Weber (1850-98/3[1855]: 217a), listed Skt. *tāsyandra* and *tāsvindra* as varying forms of







the names of two *sāmans* in the *Āraṇyagāna* of the *Sāmaveda* (*Ār* 3.3-4). Later, Böhtlingk (1879-89/3.26c-27a), on the basis of A. C. Burnell's edition of the *Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa* (= Burnell 1876), changed this listing to *tāspandra*, being the name of a *ṛṣi* and also two *sāmans*, with *tāsyandra*, *tāspindra*, and *tāsvindra* being variants. *MW* 446a omitted the two forms noted earlier by Weber.

The forms occur in *Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa* 2.3.3-4 in a listing of *sāmans* (Burnell 1876: 69). Skt. *tāspandra* and *tāsyandra* are variants for the first name in the text; Skt. *tāsvindra* is the form that occurs for the second name in manuscripts that give a second name. \**tāspindra* is a form reconstructed by Burnell and not warranted on the basis of the manuscript evidence he provides. That Skt. *tāspandra* is the name of a *ṛṣi* appears to be an assumption on his part.

Without clearly associated semantic content for these forms, no attempt at an association of them with Dravidian can proceed.

*KEWA* and *EWA* do not consider these forms.

#### 14.12. *nānāndṛ*, *nānāndra*

Skt. *nānāndṛ* 'husband's sister' occurs in *Rgveda* 10.85.46. It occurs also in Ujjvaladatta's commentary on *Uṇādisūtra* 2.99 and in lexicographic citation as *nanandṛ*. The derivative forms, Skt. *nānāndra* 'husband's sister's son' and *nānāndrāyaṇa*, a patronym from *nānāndra*, occur in *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 4.1.104 and 4.1.100 respectively.

These forms have been related to Skt. *nanā* 'an expression for mother' and alternately, along with Skt. *nandinī* and *nandā* 'husband's sister,' to Skt. *nand-* and to Dravidian and Uralic forms for 'husband's sister' (Pokorny 1959-69/1.754; *KEWA* 2.131). The final *-ṛ* is regarded generally as due to analogic leveling to such forms as Skt. *svāsṛ* 'sister' (*KEWA* 2.131, *EWA* 2.10).

Pokorny considers the form to be Indo-European, and to be related to Skt. *nanā*. *KEWA* and *EWA* consider the form to rest probably on a babble form or affectionate form of familiar address akin to Skt. *nanā*, which they see to be the basis for the form. *KEWA* considers any further statement to be unsafe. The parallel to Dravidian and Uralic forms carrying the meaning





‘husband’s sister’ *KEWA* considers to be significant. But *EWA* opines that it is not to be considered seriously.

By the opinion expressed here the connection of the form, together with Skt. *nandinī* and *nandā*, also ‘husband’s sister,’ to the etyma listed in *DEDR* 3644 Ta. *nattaṅār* is correct. The final *-r* of Skt. *nānāṅdr*, however, while it may in part have involved analogic leveling, is more directly to be explained as reflecting the Dravidian consonant-cluster in question. Skt. *nandinī* and *nandā* in the specific meanings concerned could reflect an alternate realization of the same consonant-cluster, as is in evidence in Skt. *tand-/tandr-* and Skt. *mandrá* and *manda*, for example.<sup>13</sup> The reduplication in evidence in Skt. *nānāṅdr* is paralleled by the reduplication in evidence in Skt. *karkāndhu*, for example. These latter two points are discussed in full above (sec. 6, sec. 8).

Compare Skt. *nānāṅdr*, *nānāṅdra*, and also *nandinī* and *nandā*, to *DEDR* 3644 Ta. *nattaṅār*:

*DEDR* 3644 Ta. *nattaṅār*, *nātti*, *nāttūṅ* husband’s sister. Ma. *nāttūn* id., brother’s wife. Ko. *na-tu-ṅy* sister-in-law, female cross-cousin (woman speaking in all cases). Ka. *nādani*, *nādini*, *nāduni* husband’s sister, brother’s wife; (Spencer) husband’s younger sister, wife’s sister, younger brother’s wife. Pa. *andil*, *tandil* elder brother’s wife. Koṇḍa *nāṅra* wife’s younger sister. Maṅḍ. *nāṅjar* id. Kui *nānja* younger sister-in-law. Kuwi (F.) *nanjo* sister-in-law; (Isr.) *nānjo* wife’s younger sister. Kur. *nāsgo* elder brother’s wife. [PCNDR \**nānt̪-*; PSDr \**nāt-*: \**nātt-*]

Of interest is that the root alternation that occurs between South Dravidian on the one hand, and Central and North Dravidian on the other hand, with South Dravidian displaying forms that reconstruct to PSDr \**nāt-*: \**nātt-* and Central and North Dravidian displaying forms that reconstruct to PCNDR \**nānt̪-*, indicates that Skt. *nānāṅdr* was borrowed from North Dravidian or Central Dravidian. With regard to the pronunciation of the modern formal Tamil reflex of \**-nt̪-* as alveolar [*ndr*], and this being not unindicative of the postulated interpretation of PDr \**-t̪-*, see section 2 above. See also the Koṇḍa reflex of \**-nt̪-*, for instance, which is *-nr-* (= *-ṅdr-*), or early inscriptional Telugu *-nr-*.

<sup>13</sup> For an alternate interpretation, see the last paragraph of this section.





With regard to Skt. *nandinī* and *nandā* in the specific meanings concerned, it ought to be mentioned that there is not only the possibility that these forms could be an alternate realization of the same consonant-cluster as in *nānāṅḍr*, but also that there is the possibility that these forms reflect *-nt-* instead of *-t-* or *-tt-*, a common alternation in South Dravidian. In general in Dravidian, single or geminate stops often alternate with the stop preceded by a nasal of the same class. For example, from a Nostratic vantage, Eng. *tube*, Lat. *tubus*, akin to Lat. *tuba* ‘trumpet,’ which forms are without certain etymology in Indo-European (Ernout and Meillet 1985: 705b), and the etyma in *DEDR* 3389 Ta. *tūmpu* ‘tube’ ... Ka. *tūbu* ... *tumbu* ... Te. *tūparamu* ... *tūmu* ... . By this analysis, these later Sanskrit forms would be of South Dravidian origin, while the older *nānāṅḍr* etc. would be of North Dravidian or Central Dravidian origin.

#### 14.13. *pundra*

Skt. *pundra* is listed along with *puṅḍhra* as an incorrect reading for Skt. *puṅḍra* (*PW* 4.774, 758; *MW* 634a, 632a). There is also a lexicographic variant, *puṅḍa* (*PW* 4.756, *MW* 631c). Clearly, *puṅḍra* is the primary if not the correct Sanskrit form for this word that first appears in its meaning ‘sectarian mark’ in the *sūtra* literature (e.g., *Śāṅkhāyanaśrautasūtra* 15.26.1, *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra* 1.1.30). The variations that occur in the literature from the earliest period, such as *tri-puṅḍhra* in *Śāṅkhāyanagrhyasūtra* 2.10.9 represent, however, perhaps not incorrect readings but alternate forms of the word that exist in Sanskrit side-by-side with what became the standard form (*puṅḍra*) from the time of the form’s origin in Sanskrit. Such alternation has been discussed in section 8.

A non-Indo-European origin for the form is generally accepted. *KEWA* 2.302, while noting an Austroasiatic suggestion by Kuiper, accepts as probably correct the suggestion of Burrow that the form is to be connected with Dravidian forms for ‘mark, dot, speck, sectarian mark.’ In *DED* and *DEDR*, however, the forms for ‘mark, dot, speck’ were separated from those for ‘sectarian mark’ as indicating different roots, and the suggestion appears to





have been withdrawn (*DED* 3550, 3676[b], p. 570a; *DEDR* 4327, 4492, p. 761c).

It is the opinion here that in consideration of the semantics of forms added to *DED* in *DEDS*, the merging in *DEDR* 4492 of words for ‘drop, spot’ in *DED* 3676(a) with those for ‘sectarian mark’ in *DED* 3676(b), separated in *DED* into subsets (a) and (b), and the arguments in the present paper, the suggestion can be reinstated.

The Dravidian etyma concerned are to be found in *DEDR* 4327 Ta. *puḷḷi* and *DEDR* 4492 Ta. *poṭṭu*:

*DEDR* 4327 Ta. *puḷḷi* mark, dot, speck. Ma. *puḷḷi* dot, speck, point. Ko. *puḷy* dot. Tu. *kar-buḷè*, *kar-boḷḷè* a fowl having white plumage with black spots. Te. *bolli* spotted white; white leprosy, leucoderma (or with 5496[a] Ta. *veḷ* – which terms mean primarily ‘white, clear, bright, shining’). [PDr \**puḷḷ*-/\**poḷḷ*-]

*DEDR* 4492 Ta. *poṭṭu* drop, spot, round mark worn on the forehead. Ma. *poṭṭu*, *poṛru* a circular mark on the forehead, mostly red. Ka. *boṭṭu*, *baṭṭu* drop, mark on the forehead. Koḍ. *boṭṭi* round mark worn on the forehead. Tu. *boṭṭa* a spot, mark, drop; (B-K.) *buṭṭe* a dot. Te. *boṭṭu* a drop, the sectarian mark worn on the forehead. Kol. (SR.) *boṭṭa* drop. Pa. *boṭ* id. Ga. (P.) *boṭu* drop, spot. Koṇḍa *boṭu* drop of water, mark on forehead. Kuwi (F.) *būttū*, (Isr.) *buṭu* tattoo. [PDr \**poṭṭ*-/\**p[a/u]ṭṭ*-: \**pūtt*-/\**pott*-]

Argued here is that Skt. *puṇḍra* etc. ‘sectarian mark’ is derived from a Dravidian form to be connected with *DEDR* 4327 Ta. *puḷḷi* ‘mark, dot, speck’ through the addition of the common Dravidian suffix *-nt-*. Such is, of course, the form’s basic meaning in such Sanskrit compounds as *ūrdhva-puṇḍra* ‘an upright mark; an upright, or perpendicular sectarian mark on the forehead’ and *tri-puṇḍra* ‘that having three marks; a triple sectarian mark consisting of three lines of marks on the forehead, back, shoulders etc.’

It is argued here that these forms in *DEDR* 4327 underlie those in *DEDR* 4492 Ta. *poṭṭu*, which can be derived from the forms in *DEDR* 4327 Ta. *puḷḷi* through the addition of the common Dravidian suffix *-t-* (or *-tt-*). Such a process may perhaps be in evidence in the instance of Ma. *poṛru*, which by this suggestion would be derived from a Tulu form borrowed from Kota or Toda (\*-ḷḷ- > Ko. To. -ḷ- > Tu. -l-). The classical Tamil rules of euphonic combi-





nation concerned would be  $l + t > t$  or  $tt$ ,  $l + t > rr$  (Subrahmanya Sastri 1930: 23-24 [*Tolkāppiyam* 1.5.150-151], 62 [*Tolkāppiyam* 1.8.369-370], 66 [*Tolkāppiyam* 1.8.399-400]; Rajam 1992: 104-107). To be emphasized, though, is that both etymological sets have Proto-Dravidian integrity.

The identification of Skt. *punḍra* etc. with these two sets of etyma is buttressed by an observed alternation in which Sanskrit contains forms containing Skt. *-ṇḍ-*, *-nd-* etc., while extant Dravidian forms indicate a root containing PDr. *\*-t-*, *\*-t-* etc. A comparable alternation can be seen above with regard to Skt. *nandinī* and *nandā*, for example, in their possible relationships to the South Dravidian etyma listed in *DEDR* 3644 Ta. *nattaṇār* (sec. 14.12). So also, Skt. *karkāndhu* in its relationship to etyma in *DEDR* 2070 Ta. *koṭṭaiy-ilantai* (sec. 6). Such an alternation would as well correlate Skt. *bindú* ‘a detached particle, drop, globule, dot, spot’ (*AV* +), and in lexicographic citation ‘a colored mark made on the forehead between the eyebrows (= *punḍra*),’ with the etyma listed in *DEDR* 4492 Ta. *poṭṭu* that mean ‘drop, spot, dot.’<sup>14</sup>

Skt. *punḍra* in meanings other than its primary meaning ‘sectarian mark’ appear to be the result of merger. Thus, Skt. *punḍra* ‘lotus blossom (esp. white),’ would have the same origin as Skt. *punḍarīka* discussed above (sec. 7[i]). The connection between Skt. *punḍra* ‘worm,’ Skt. *pīlu*, Skt. *pulaka*, and Skt. *phullaka*, all also ‘worm,’ and the etyma listed in *DEDR* 4312 Ta. *puṛu* has been pointed out in *DEDR*.

In the form’s meaning ‘sugar cane (esp. a red variety of it)’ and as the name of various other plants the form’s origins remain obscure (*KEWA* 2.302).

In its meaning as the name of a people an Austroasiatic origin has been argued. *EWA*, though, opines that this is not clear (*KEWA* 2.302, *EWA* 2.141). On the basis of the arguments in this paper, however, we can suggest that the form may perhaps be cognate with Skt. *pulinda* ‘name of a barbarous tribe’ and the etyma with which this has been identified, with question, in *DEDR* 4323 Ta. *puliṇaṇ*, *puliṇaṇ* ‘hunter, mountaineer’ ... ‘a caste of jungle dwellers.’

<sup>14</sup> A full discussion of this data cannot be entered into in this context.



14.14. *bhandra*

Skt. *bhandra* is a word of lexicographic citation noted to mean *badrá* ‘auspicious, favorable’ (*RV* +) (*MW* 1331a).

Conceivable is that the form is to be considered a late derivative of *bhand-* (*RV*, *Dhātup*, *Vop*, *L*) formed on analogy with *bhadrá*, which has at least from the time of Yāska (?ca.700-500 B.C.) been associated grammatically with *bhand-*.<sup>15</sup>

In argument against this, though, is that while there are a few exceptions, the suffix *-ra* is normally added to the weak form of the root. Further, it would be unusual to have two alternate words both formed by the addition of the suffix *-ra*, one from the weak form of the traditionally associated root and one from the strong form of the same root.

From the vantage of the present context, in argument against this viewpoint is that there exists in lexicographic citation a Sanskrit word *bhalla*, also defined ‘*bhadrá*’ (*MW* 748c); that there occurs in *Chandogyopaniṣad* 4.1.2 a form *bhallākṣa* used as a term of address to a flamingo which has traditionally been interpreted as ‘*bhadrákṣa*,’ ‘one having auspicious eyes’ (Weber 1850-98/2[1853]: 88, *PW* 5.219, Burrow 1979: 152, *EWA* 2.254); and that there is cited in the *Dhātupāṭha* a root *bhaṇḍ-* ‘to be or render fortunate, to do an auspicious act’ (*MW* 745b).

The traditional interpretation of Skt. *bhallākṣa* has been questioned (see *KEWA* 2.484). And Müller (1879-84/1.56) and Hume (1931: 215), for instance, translate it as “short-sighted friend” and “short-sight!” respectively.

Indeed, the form and its content may suggest a hyper-Sanskritization of Skt. *balākā* ‘crane’ (*VS* +) and/or a pun on *balākā*.

Arguments against the traditional interpretation do not alter the fact, however, that by the tradition Skt. *bhalla* means *bhadrá*; and that according to the rhetorician Vāmana the form is “rustic.” This latter point is taken to explain why the form occurs commonly in Middle Indo-Aryan and New Indo-Aryan, but in Sanskrit is only a late lexical form (see *CDIAL* 9408, Burrow 1979: 151-152).

We have in Skt. *bhandra*, *bhalla*, and *bhaṇḍ-* exactly the type

<sup>15</sup> An Indo-European derivation of Skt. *bhadra* is not to be questioned (*EWA* 2.244).







of evidence in Sanskrit itself that reflects the argument in the present paper, as was referred to above (sec. 9).

Skt. *bhandra*, Skt. *bhalla* – in the traditional sense, and Skt. *bhaṇḍ-* are all without firm Indo-European etymologies, though *CDIAL* 9408 and Burrow (1979: 151-152) argue that Skt. *bhalla* is from *\*bhadla*, an *-l-* form of the usual Skt. *bhadrá* (see *KEWA* 2.483-484, *EWA* 2.254 [s.v. *bhallākṣa*]; Skt. *bhandra* and, in meanings here, Skt. *bhaṇḍ-* not discussed in *KEWA* or *EWA*, though *KEWA* 2.471 alludes in passing to Skt. *bhaṇḍ-* in the meanings here). With regard to Skt. *dra* > *ḍḍa* and, rarely, *dda* in Middle Indic, which latter in turn also > *lla*, see Pischel (1957: 206 [§294]).

On account of the almost solely lexicographic occurrence of the forms with which we are dealing here, the forms must be approached through the terms used to define them – *bhadrá*, *śivá*, *kalyāṇa* (*MW* 745b, 748c, 1331a). These terms all have broad semantic spreads that are roughly equivalent, albeit with slightly different emphasis in each. As it is *bhadrá* that is used to define *bhandra* and *bhalla*, the semantic spread of this word is used as the standard in our identification. To be emphasized, however, is that our search is for possible Dravidian cognates for *bhandra*, *bhalla*, and *bhaṇḍ-*, and not for *bhadra* in its various nuances.

Also to be emphasized is that certain English words that occur in the Sanskrit lexicon and that occur frequently in Sanskrit literature in some instances have been avoided in *DEDR*. One of these words is ‘auspicious,’ the primary meaning of *bhadrá*, *śivá*, and *kalyāṇa*, which meaning is not to be found in *DEDR*.

If one keeps these considerations in mind, two good match-ups emerge for the semantic spread of *bhadrá*. These are found in *DEDR* 5373 Ta. *vāṛ* (-v-, -nt-) and in the combined semantic spread of *DEDR* 4550 Ta. *poli* (-v-, -nt-) and *DEDR* 4551 Ta. *poli* (-v-, -nt-).

The former, *DEDR* 5373, does not indicate forms of an appropriate shape such that we might derive from it Skt. *bhandra*, *bhalla*, and *bhaṇḍ-*. It is noted here as it provides a parallel instance of a semantic spread in Dravidian such as that in question, and therefore provides a measure against which an association of *DEDR* 4550 and *DEDR* 4551 with a meaning ‘*bhadrá*’ can be assessed.



The latter, *DEDR* 4550 and *DEDR* 4551, are separated from one another in *DEDR* it would appear on the grounds that the etyma in *DEDR* 4551 demonstrate possible semantic relationship with *DEDR* 4305 Ta. *pular* and *DEDR* 4570 Ta. *poṇ*. Their two semantic spreads are not separated from one another in *TED* 6.3: 207b, though some of the definitions in *DEDR* 4550 such as ‘interest paid in kind’ are included with Ta. *poli*, n. ‘heap of unwinnowed grain, winnowed paddy,’ etc., which latter meanings are not included in *DEDR*, on p. 208a. The two sets of etyma are combined here further on the basis that forms in *DEDR* 4551 provide support for the proposed identification, as well as add to the identification itself from a semantic vantage.

Compare Skt. *bhandra*, *bhalla*, and *bhaṇḍ*- through use of the definition ‘*bhadrá*,’ with *DEDR* 5373 Ta. *vār* (-v-, -nt-) and with *DEDR* 4550 Ta. *poli* (-v-, -nt-) and *DEDR* 4551 Ta. *poli* (-v-, -nt-). On account of the length of some of these listings, they are abbreviated here:

Skt. *bhadrá* (used to define Skt. *bhandra* and *bhalla*): blessed, auspicious (= favorable, prosperous), fortunate, happy; good, gracious, friendly, kind; excellent, fair, beautiful, lovely. In compound, also: prosperity, welfare; fortune; splendid.

(a) *DEDR* 5372 Ta. *vār* (-v-, -nt-) to exist, live, flourish, be happy, live life of a married woman, live according to a definite set of rules; n. regularity, order; *vārttu* (*vārtti*-) to felicitate, congratulate, bless, praise; n. benediction, praise; ... *vārkkai* livelihood, living, lifetime, married life, happy state, wealth, prosperity; *vārcci* living, prosperity, wealth, felicity; *vār̥vu* prosperity, happiness, happy life ...wealth ... *vāruttu* (*vārutti*-) to bless, praise, extol ... Ko. *va-l* (*va-ly*-) (woman) lives prosperously with husband ... *vadk* prosperity, property ... To. *poθk*- (*poθky*-) to prosper; *poθk* wealth ... Ka. ... *bār(u)* living, life, livelihood, state of living prosperously or happily, marriage, property ... *bār* to live, begin to live prosperously ... Koḍ. ... *badik*- (*badiki*-) to live, live happily ... Tu. *bāluni* to thrive, prosper, exist, subsist, last, endure; *bālāvuni* to make thrive, prosper ... Konḍa *batki* (-t) to live, flourish; *batku* life, living, prosperity. Kui *bārti* longevity, long life. ... [PDr \**vār*-/\**pār*-, often associated with a derivative suffix -(V)t-: \**vat*-/\**pat*-]



(b) *DEDR* 4550 Ta. *poli* (-v-, -nt-) to flourish, prosper, abound, increase, live long and prosperously; n. interest paid in kind ... *polivu* prosperity, abundance ... Ma. ... *polivu* accumulation, contribution; *polima* increase, excellence ... *pularcca* living, livelihood ... Koḍ. *poli-* (*poliv-*, *poliñj-*) to increase (intr.; crop, cattle); (*polip-*, *polic-*) (god) increases (crop, cattle); n. interest paid in kind (esp. on paddy; *pola-* (*polav-*, *poland-*) to live happily; *polat-* (*polati-*) to make to live happily. Tu. *poli* interest in kind, increase, abundance; *pollusu*, *polsu* interest, gain, luck; *pulleḷu* abundance, increase. Te. *poli* gain. [PDr \**pul-/pol-*]

*DEDR* 4551 Ta. *poli* (-v-, -nt-) to bloom (as the countenance), shine; *polivu* brightness of countenance, beauty, splendour, gold; *polam*, *polan* gold, beauty, jewel. Ka. *pol* to be fit or proper, excel. Te. *polucu* to be suitable, agreeable, beautiful, appear, seem, (K. also) shine; *pol(u)pu* beauty, agreeableness ... [PDr \**pol-*]

This data is charted in Table VII(a).

Support for the identification of *DEDR* 4550 and *DEDR* 4551 with *bhandra*, *bhalla*, and *bhand-* comes from *bhand-* in various of *its* lexicographic definitions and from various derivatives of *bhand-* in lexicographic definitions. Such a connection, as noted, is in accord with observed variant realizations of the conjunct in question in Sanskrit. Specifically, the lexicographic definition of *bhand-* as ‘to be or make fortunate or excellent’ would appear to be connected directly with *bhandra* etc. Also plausible is that such a meaning is a development within Sanskrit due to the traditional association of this root with Skt. *bhadrá*, as is routine understanding. Arguing against this, however, are such lexicographic definitions for *bhand-* as ‘to shine’ and ‘to be or make glad,’ which are consonant with identification with *DEDR* 4550 and *DEDR* 4551. Also consonant with this is Skt. *bhandana* (pl.) ‘rain-making sunrays’ (*L*) and, in an instance of parallelism with Skt. *bhadrá*, *bhandila* ‘fortune’ (*L*). Skt. *bhand-* in the definitions isolated here is not to be confused with an earlier *bhand-*, which is hardly citable outside Vedic literature (*MW* 745c, 746c).

This data is charted in Table VII(b).

Skt. *bhandila* in its lexicographic meaning ‘tremulous motion,’ it ought to be noted, might be connected with *DEDR* 5307 Ka. *baḷaku* [PDr \**vaḷ-/vaḷ-/van-*], the etyma in which entry all





mean ‘tremble, shake.’ In this regard, PDr \*v[*ā*, *ī*, *ē* > *b*- in Kan-  
nada, Koḍagu, Tulu, Baḍaga, Kurumba in South Dravidian and  
in all North Dravidian. There is also possible evidence for this in  
Telugu. The South Dravidian and North Dravidian developments  
are independent of one another. (Zvelebil 1970: 155-158, Krishna-  
murti 2003: 141-142).

TABLE VII

(a) Semantic correlation of Skt. *bhadrá* with the etyma listed  
in *DEDR* 5372 Ta. *vāṛ* (-*v*-, -*nt*-) [PDr \**vāṛ*-/\**pāṛ*-, often associ-  
ated with a derivative suffix -(*V*)*t*-: \**vat*-/\**pat*-] and *DEDR* 4550  
Ta. *poli* (-*v*-, -*nt*-) [PDr \**pul*-/\**pol*-], *DEDR* 4551 Ta. *poli* (-*v*-, -*nt*-)  
[PDr \**pol*-].

BHADRÁ*	<i>DEDR</i> 5372	<i>DEDR</i> 4550, 4551
blessed	to bless, praise, extol, congratulate, felicitate; benediction	
auspicious (= favorable, prosperous [ <i>Webster</i> s. p. 75a])	to prosper, to live prosperously, prosperity; to flourish, to thrive, to live well	to prosper, to live prosperously; to flourish, to abound (4550)
fortunate		
happy	to be happy, to live happily, happy state; felicity.	to live happily (4550)
good, gracious, friendly, kind [Compare Indo-European cognate forms]		
excellent [Compare Indo-European cognate forms]		excellence (4550); to excel (4551)
fair, beautiful, lovely [Compare Indo- European cognate forms]		beauty, beautiful (4551)
pleasant, dear		agreeable, agreeableness (4551)
In compounds also: prosperity, welfare	prosperity, wealth	prosperity, abundance, accumulation (4550)
fortune		gain, luck (4550)
splendid		splendor (4551)
*Order is that in which the forms are listed in <i>MW</i> . All meanings are from the <i>Rgveda</i> , except those in compound only.	Also: to exist, live, subsist, endure, survive; long life; marriage, to live married life (prosperously); to live according to a set of rules, regularity, order; property; over- luxuriant; reign, government; etc.	Also: to live long; interest paid in kind; to increase; to measure corn in heaps, etc. (4550). (For other definitions in <i>DEDR</i> 4551 see [b] below, except: gold, jewel; to be fit or proper; to be suitable; woman.)





(b) Correlations of *bhand-*, and derivatives of *bhand-* in lexicographic citation supporting an identification of *bhandra*, *bhalla*, *bhaṇḍ-* with *DEDR* 4550, 4551.

<i>bhand-</i> 'to be or make fortunate or excellent'	See charting above under (a)
<i>bhand-</i> 'to shine'	<i>DEDR</i> 4551 Ta. <i>poli</i> (-v-, -nt-) shine. Te. <i>polucu</i> shine.
<i>bhand-</i> 'to be or make glad'	Compare <i>DEDR</i> 4551 Ta. <i>poli</i> (-v-, -nt-) to bloom (as the countenance); <i>polivu</i> brightness of countenance.
<i>bhandana</i> (pl.) 'rain-making sunrays'	Compare <i>DEDR</i> 4551 etyma for 'shine' above, and the cross-referenced <i>DEDR</i> 4305 Ta. <i>pular</i> [PDr * <i>pul-</i> ] which contains such meanings as 'to dawn, light to appear, to shine through whiteness.'
<i>bhandila</i> 'fortune'	See charting above under (a). <i>DEDR</i> 4550 Tu. <i>pollusu</i> , <i>polsu</i> gain, luck. Te. <i>polu</i> gain.

#### 14.15. *mandrá*

There are in the Sanskrit lexicon two roots *mad-/mand-* (see Whitney 1885: 118).

Skt. *mad-/1.mand-* is cognate with forms throughout Indo-European (Pokorny 1959-69/1.694-695). Its infrequent Sanskrit signification 'to boil, bubble (as water),' is considered standardly to be the base meaning of the Sanskrit verb. Its more frequent Sanskrit significations 'to rejoice, be glad, be delighted; to be intoxicated, be drunk; to be inspired, inspired,' are considered standardly to be semantic extensions in Sanskrit (Grassmann 1873: 977, Lanman 1884: 211a). The meanings 'to intoxicate, to be drunk' are shared with Avestan and other Iranian languages. As noted in section 1, Lat. *mattus* 'drunken' is the single striking exception to the general lack of semantic concord between the Indo-Iranian forms on the one hand and other related Indo-European forms on the other. No doubt on the basis of the Iranian forms and the single Latin form, *EWA* 2.299-300 opines that the form in Proto-Indo-European carried the meaning 'to be wet, be damp ~ be drunk.' Such might not be warranted, however, as the





Iranian material is late from the vantage of the Vedic material, and may rest on it (see Levitt in press).<sup>16</sup>

The root occurs in both strong and weak forms in Vedic Sanskrit. In classical Sanskrit only the weak form of the root occurs.

Skt. *mandrá* is considered standardly to be derived from *mad-/1.mand-* through the addition of the primary suffix *-ra* (Grassmann 1873: 1003, *MW* 787c, etc.). The semantic concord between the late and post-Vedic signification of *mandrá* and the significations of *mad-/1.mand-* is obscure.

Skt. *mad-/2.mand-* is viewed to be cognate to Gk. μένω, μίμνω, Lat. *maneō*, *-ēre*. For additional cognates, see Pokorny (1959-69/1.729). The root is considered to be a semantic development from and expansion of Skt. *man-* ‘to think, believe, know ...’ The expansion of the stem is considered by Grassmann (1873: 993) to have occurred at a time posterior to the composition of the *Ṛgveda*. Accordingly, Grassmann (1873: 979) places Skt. *mamattana* in *Ṛgveda* 10.179.1 together with *mad-/1.mand-* under a separate definition (978). *PW* 5.471 places this occurrence together with what it views to be the two other occurrences of *mad-/2.mand-* in the *Ṛgveda*. According to *PW*, the root occurs in finite form and only without prefix in the *Ṛgveda*. It occurs in finite form with the prefix *upa-* in *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 3.7.3.14, 4.3.2.4, and 4.6.9.6, and with the prefix *ni-* in Sāyaṇa’s commentary on the *Ṛgveda*.<sup>17</sup> Without prefix the root carries the signification ‘to tarry, stand still, pause.’ Grassmann (1873: 993) also includes with the *Ṛgvedic* forms the form *parimamanyāt* in *Ṛgveda* 10.30.2, which form *PW* does not appear to consider (see, also, *PW* 5.516 under *pari-man-*). Grassmann defines this as ‘to bring to a standstill, hold fast.’ The form “*parimamandhi*” given by Pokorny (1959-69/1.729) is an error, probably due to confusion of Grassmann’s listing of the just mentioned form together with his listing of *mamandhi*, without the separable prefix *pari*, in *Ṛgveda* 10.26.20. Occurrence of the root in finite form, thus, is rare; and its earliest occurrences are subject to different interpretations.

<sup>16</sup> The Avestan significations, it can be suggested, point to the close connection between Elamite and among the North Dravidian languages Brahui, and to connections between a perhaps primarily North Dravidian Indus Valley civilization (= the Ancient Mesopotamian “Meluḥḥa”) and the Ancient Mesopotamian “Magan” (see Levitt 2009; in press).

<sup>17</sup> The reference to Sāyaṇa is from Westergaard (1841: 171a).







Skt. *manda* is derived standardly from *mad-/2.mand-* through the addition of a primary suffix *-a*. With the exception of its occurrence with the signification ‘dull-witted, stupid, foolish,’ in *Kāthopaniṣad* 2.2, it occurs exclusively in post-Vedic Sanskrit in such meanings as ‘slow, tardy, lazy; weak, faint (as light), low (as the voice) ...’ The early signification of the form continues as well into epic and classical Sanskrit. Semantic concord between this signification and that of *mad-/2.mand-* is not transparent. Regarding the etymology of this form, *EWA* opines, “not clear.”

Nor is there transparency between *mad-/2.mand-* and such other standard derivatives as *mandara* ‘name of a sacred mountain,’ *mandāra* ‘coral tree,’ *mandira* ‘house, palace, temple ...,’ *mandurā* ‘a stable for horses.’

It is proposed here that *mad-/1.mand-* has taken on the semantic spread of two sets of Dravidian etyma (*DEDR* 4729 Ta. *mal*, *DEDR* 4723 Ta. *maruḷ*). *mad-/2.mand-* represents the semantic spread of a third set of Dravidian etyma (*DEDR* 5078 Ta. *mel*).

This situation is paralleled by the sets of Dravidian etyma represented by Skt. *mandrá* and *manda*. The former, Skt. *mandrá*, in its earlier Vedic occurrences corresponds with one of the sets of Dravidian etyma (*DEDR* 4729 Ta. *mal*) that has merged in *mad-/1.mand-*. In its later Vedic meanings, it corresponds to the set of Dravidian etyma represented in *mad-/2.mand-* (*DEDR* 5078 Ta. *mel*). The latter, Skt. *manda*, in its Vedic occurrences corresponds to the second set of Dravidian etyma that has merged in *mad-/1.mand-* (*DEDR* 4723 Ta. *maruḷ*). In its later epic and classical Sanskrit occurrences it corresponds to the set of Dravidian etyma represented in *mad-/2.mand-* (*DEDR* 5078 Ta. *mel*).

This collocation of forms results in near semantic transparency with regard to the associated definitions of Skt. *mandrá* and *manda*.

Phonologically, *-ndr-* and *-nd-* are to be interpreted here as representing the same original Dravidian sounds, formed by the euphonic combination of *-l-* and *-nt-*. From the vantage of Sanskrit, Skt. *mandrá* can be analyzed as formed by the addition of a primary suffix *-ra*, but historically both Skt. *mandrá* and *manda* are to be analyzed as formed by the addition of a primary suffix *-a*. This is suggested, to note one point, by the paradigmatic relationship that maintains between *mad-/1.mand-*, *mad-/2.mand-*,





*mandrá*, and *manda*.

In this instance, of course, what we have is the merger of Dravidian forms in Sanskrit, most probably with an original root of Indo-European origin.

This data is charted in Table VIII. Included is independent lexical support from Sanskrit that demonstrates elsewhere in Sanskrit occurrences of etyma cognate with two of the sets of Dravidian etyma in question in forms required for these correlations.





TABLE VIII  
CORRESPONDENCES OF MAD-/MAND-  
AND DRAVIDIAN ETYMA

(a) Paradigm:

*mad-/1.mand-*DEDR 4729 Ta. *mal* [PDr \**mal-/mal-*]DEDR 4723 Ta. *maruḷ* [PDr \**mar-V-/mar- u-*]*mandrá*DEDR 4729 (*V*)DEDR 5078 (*RPrāt, B +*)

(b) Semantic correspondences:

*mad-/1.mand- + mandrá (V)*

Mn: to rejoice

to be glad/gladden

to be pleased, happy, at ease

to be delighted

Sanskrit forms supporting this identification –

*badva* a large number, multitude (*B +*)*badvaśas* in large numbers (*B*)*badvan* a causeway, highway (v.l. *padvan*) (*B +*)*badhyatás* (freedom) from the crowd(v.l. *madhyatás*)(*AV1*)*padma* 10 billion (*B +*)Perhaps: *maluda, maluma, mālutā, māluda, māludu*, each appearing to be a different high number (*BHskt*).Deriv. *mad-* such as *matta, mada* in meaning ‘pride, arrogance’ – not carried by finite verbal forms.*mad-/1.mand-*Mn: to be drunk, intoxicated / to intoxicate  
to inflame, enspirit*manda (KaṭhUp +)*

Mn: dull-witted, silly, stupid, foolish

*mad-/2.mand- (RV<sup>3</sup> U<sup>1</sup> Sāy<sup>1</sup>)*DEDR 5078 Ta. *mel* [PDr \**mel-/mel-V-: \*mell-*]*manda*DEDR 4723 (*KaṭhUp +*)DEDR 5078 (*E +*)

DEDR 4729 semantic spread includes ‘to rejoice, to be pleased, to be delighted’ + ‘to shine, be splendid.’ Meanings cited primarily from Telugu. However, Tamil ‘cheerfulness; elegance, brilliance, beauty.’

Compare DEDR 4729 Kannada semantic spread = ‘to be raised or elevated, be haughty, be puffed up, insolent, act in an overbearing manner; great, big, chief, principal; a large concourse, crowd.’ Also, Tu. *malla, mallavu, mallāvu* ‘great, large, big, extensive’; and Te. *mallaḍi* ‘a crowd.’

Compare DEDR 4729 Ta. Ka. Tu. Te. ‘be proud; be haughty, be puffed up, be insolent, act in an overbearing manner; greatness, superiority, loftiness, pride, arrogance.’

Through addition of a derivative suffix *-nt-* to a root ending with *-l* with euphonic combination. Merger with Indo-European form.Compare DEDR 4723 semantic spreads for, as examples, Ta. *maruḷ* ‘bewilderment of mind, confusion, ignorance, delusion, illusion, wonder, intoxication, madness, toddy, imp, devil, possession as by a spirit’; Ta. *maruṭtam* ‘that which intoxicates, toddy, cheating’; Ma. *maruḷ* ‘frenzy, possessedness, evil spirit.’

Compare DEDR 4723 meanings of ‘bewilderment of mind, false understanding, torpor, foolishness, stupidity, one who simulates stupidity, etc.’ in its semantic spread. By itself this is not significant. In conjunction with significations ‘to be drunk ... to enspirit,’ however, this takes on significance.





Sanskrit forms supporting this identification –  
*malvá* unwise, foolish, silly (*AV*)

Deriv. *mad-* such as *matta*, *mada*, *madana* in meanings ‘lust, in rut, love, sexual passion’ not carried by finite verbal forms.  
Compounds with deriv. such as *matakāśinī*, *mattagāminī* for ‘bewitching or enticing woman.’

Significations identical with Skt. *manda*. Provides evidence of a Dravidian form \**mal-* for PDr \**mar-V-/\*mar- u-*.

Such significations carried by Telugu forms. Telugu and Tulu only Central Dravidian forms in evidence. Tamil and Tulu carry forms for ‘entice, allure, seduce.’ See immediately above; also such forms in *DEDR* 4723 as Ta. *maruṭṭi* ‘temptress, fascinating woman, blandishing woman.’

Through “syllabic loss,” \**l* > *l*, addition of a derivative suffix *-nt-* to a root ending with *-l* with euphonic combination. Merger with Indo-European form.

[Regarding *mad-/1.mand-* in meanings ‘to boil, bubble (as water),’ ‘to enjoy heavenly bliss:’]

[Compare *DEDR* 4618 Ta. *makīr* meanings ‘re-joice, joy, delight, forget oneself in joy, bubble up in boiling, intoxication from liquor, toddy ...’ and *DEDR* 4894 Ta. *mukīr*, *mokkuḷ*, *mōṛ ai* meanings ‘to bubble up, ferment.’ Analogous semantic extension above, or Indo-European?]

*mad-/2.mand-*  
Mn: to tarry, stand still, pause

*mandrá* (*RPrāt*, *B* +)  
Mn: low, deep (of sound), hollow, rumbling a low tone, the low or base tone of the voice

*manda* (*E* +)  
Mn: slow, tardy, moving slowly or softly, loitering, idle, lazy, sluggish; weak, slight, slack; gentle, feeble, dull, faint, being indulgent; sick, languid.

Compare collocation of meanings in *DEDR* 5078: ‘soft, tender; to become soft, be light; softly, slowly, gently; the weak, the emaciated; expression signifying being soft, gentle; to be weak, become lean, thin, languish; slowness, tardiness; slowly, stealthily; slowly, tardily, quietly, gently, mildly, softly, gradually, by degrees; etc.’ Compare esp. Ta. *meli* (*-v-*, *-nt-*) ‘... soften (a hard consonant), lowered in pitch (in music).’ Also possibly related, *DEDR* 5077 under Ka. *mel(u)* ‘... eat with a muttering sound, mumble, eat.’

The correspondence of *DEDR* 4729 Ta. *mal* with those meanings of Skt. *mad-/ 1.mand-* that do not refer to intoxication or inspiration and with Skt. *mandrá* in its earlier Vedic occurrences is not obvious on the surface from the combined semantic spread of all the languages represented. This may be attributed to the fact that the semantic spread of *DEDR* 4729 is not evenly represented throughout the various Dravidian languages for which etyma have been recorded for it. The correspondence is evident, however, from the Central Dravidian data represented by Telugu: *mad-/1.mand-* and *mandrá* (*V*): to rejoice; to be glad, gladden; to be pleased, happy, at ease; to be delighted; cheerful; to shine, be splendid or beautiful.

*DEDR* 4729 Ta. *malivu* abundance, fullness, cheerfulness; *mallal* strength, abundance, wealth, richness, elegance, bril-





liance, beauty. Te. *malayu* (B.) rejoice, be pleased, eager, delighted, shine, be splendid, unfold, display. [PDr \**mal-/\*mall-*]

Support for the correlation of the Sanskrit and Dravidian forms proposed here is evident in additional forms in the Sanskrit lexicon.

Compare Skt. *badva* ‘a large number, multitude’ (B +), *badvaśas* ‘in large numbers’ (B), *badvan* (v.l. *padvan*, S<sup>3</sup> [see Parpola 1969: 33 for references]) ‘a causeway, highway’ (B +), *badhyatās* (v.l. *madhyatās*) ‘(freedom) from the crowd’ (AV 12.1.2), *padma* ‘10 billion’ (B +), and perhaps Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit *maluda*, *maluma*, *mālutā*, *māluda*, *māludu*, each appearing to be a different high number, with Kannada, Tulu, and Telugu forms in DEDR 4729 Ta. *mal*. The Sanskrit forms are without convincing etymologies at present. Only *badva* and *badvan* are treated in KEWA 2.405, 3.766; EWA 2.207.

DEDR 4729 Ka. *malya* great, big, chief, principal; *mallaḷi* a large concourse, a crowd. Tu. *malla*, *mallavu*, *mallāvu* great, large, big, extensive, chief, principal, important. Te. *mallaḍi* a crowd.

It is not clear whether these Sanskrit forms are to be related more directly to *mad-/1.mand-* or to forms within Dravidian formed through the addition with euphonic combination of a derivative suffix other than that focused on in the present discussion, such as *-t-* or *-t-*. Of note is that the Buddhist forms would show the Dravidian root with a suffix containing *-t-* or *-d-*, but without euphonic combination in force.

The initial *b-* of the Sanskrit forms and the alternation between forms in *b-* and *m-* is open to several interpretations. It can be explained as evidence of the frequent Dravidian development of *m- > v-* (Zvelebil 1970: 125-127). The occurrence of initial *b-* and not *v-* can be explained as reflecting the alternation of Sanskrit *b* and *v* in such forms as Skt. *vadh-/badh-* and *badhirá/vadhirá* (see Whitney 1889: 18 [§50a]). Also, an alternation between *v* and *b* is in evidence in Dravidian (Zvelebil 1970: 156-157). But the simplest explanation is that it reflects the ancient Iranian and Indo-Aryan development of *m-* to *b-*, which I would see reflected in Br. *b*[fV, *m*[non-fV for PDr \**m-*. With regard to this, with references, see section 7(v) above. Also discussed in that place is the *p-/b-* alternation demonstrated by these forms. A perhaps comparable development is in evidence in a possible connection made





in that place between a form comparable to Ta. *muḷari* ‘lotus’ in *DEDR* 4997 Ta. *muḷai* (-v-, -nt-, -pp-, -tt-) and Skt. *puṇḍārīka* ‘lotus-flower’ (*RV* +).

Compare as well the frequent meanings ‘pride, arrogance,’ associated with derivatives of Skt. *mad-* such as *matta* and *mada*. Such meanings are not indicated by *mad-/1.mand-* in finite verbal usage. They are, however, in concord with meanings attached to Tamil, Kannada, Tulu, and Telugu forms in *DEDR* 4729 Ta. *mal:*

*DEDR* 4729 Ta. *mali* (-v-, -nt-) to abound, be plentiful, be full, increase, be proud, become large, swell, spread, expand. Ka. *male* to be raised or elevated, be haughty, be puffed up, insolent, act in an overbearing manner. Tu. *mallastigè*, *mallādigè* greatness, superiority, loftiness, pride. Te. *mallarmu* pride, arrogance.

The proposed correspondence of *DEDR* 4723 Ta. *maruḷ* with those meanings of Skt. *mad-/1.mand-* that refer to intoxication or inspiration is suggested in part because *DEDR* 4723 would also serve as the best source of Skt. *manda* in its earliest meanings. Such an identification is then strengthened by the paradigmatic relationship it establishes between *mad-/1.mand-* and the earlier significations of *mandrá* and *manda*, and *mad-/ 2.mand-* and the later significations of these forms. It further is suggested because it provides in a conceivably appropriate phonetic shape a direct source for the meanings that refer to intoxication and inspiration as well as for the meanings of derivatives of *mad-* that refer to sexual excitement and acute lust and, in composition, bewitching and enticing women. This thereby eliminates the need for postulating that such significations are otherwise unattested semantic extensions of an Indo-European form.

By this proposal, the Dravidian form borrowed would have developed to *\*mal-*. Among the proposed cognate etyma within Dravidian such development is demonstrated by Ka. *mal*, *maḷḷu*, *meḷ*. From within Sanskrit such development is attested to by Skt. *malvá* (*AV*). The meanings of this Sanskrit form, ‘unwise, foolish, silly,’ are identical to the earliest meanings of Skt. *manda*. We therefore may view the two forms as cognates.

Skt. *mad-/1.mand-* in meanings that refer to intoxication or inspiration, the early meanings of Skt. *manda* and those of Skt. *malvá*, and derivatives of *mad-* such as Skt. *matta*, *mada*, *madana*







in meanings not carried by finite verbal forms can be compared with *DEDR* 4723 Ta. *maruḷ* (*maruḷv-*, *maruḷt-*):

*mad-/1.mand-* to be drunk, intoxicated, to intoxicate; to inflame, enspirit. *manda* dull-witted, silly, stupid, foolish. *malvá* unwise, silly, foolish. *matta* excited by sexual passion, in rut, rut-tish (as an elephant), furious, mad, insane. *mattā* any intoxicating drink, spirituous or vinous liquor. *matta-kāśinī* a bewitching or wanton woman. *matta-gāminī* a bewitching or wanton woman. *mada* sexual desire or enjoyment, wantonness, lust, ruttishness, rut (esp. of an elephant). *madana* passion, love or the god of love.

*DEDR* 4723 Ta. *maruḷ* ... n. bewilderment of mind, confusion, ignorance, delusion, illusion, wonder, intoxication, madness, toddy, imp, devil, possession as by a spirit ... *maruḷaṅ* bewildered person, person under possession by a spirit or deity ... *maruḷtu* (*maruḷti-*) to entice, fascinate, infatuate, bewitch, threaten, menace, cause to be changed, resemble, allure, coax, cheat; n. threatening, enticing; *maruḷtam* that which intoxicates, toddy, cheating; *maruḷti* that which intoxicates, toddy; temptress, blandishing woman, fascinating woman ... Ka. *marave*, *maruvu* intoxication, madness, fury, bewilderment, paralysis, torpor, etc.; *marasu* to become furious, begin to rage; *marali*, *maruḷi* person who in reality is clever but simulates stupidity ... *maruḷ* to be bewildered, etc.; n. bewilderment, confusion, madness, foolishness, stupidity, fury, ecstasy, frenzy, state of being possessed; a mad or foolish person, an evil spirit, demon, imp; *maruḷa* a bewildered, bad, foolish man, a badly disposed man ... *maḷ*, *maḷḷu*, *meḷ* bewilderment, etc. (= *maruḷ* n.). Tu. *marlu* madness, insanity; mad, insane, foolish; *marlāṭa* foolishness, silliness, pranks, tricks; *marlāvuni* to entice, decoy, allure, seduce ... Te. *marulu* love, passion, desire, lust; an evil spirit; *marulu-konu* to fall in love; *marulu-kolupu* to enamour, captivate, charm, inflame with love .... [PDr \**mar-V-*: \**mar-uḷ*]

The proposed collocation of forms for *mad-/1.mand-*, and *mandrá* and *manda* in their earlier meanings, leaves unexplained *mad-* in that meaning that generally is understood to be the root's base meaning reflective of its Indo-European connection., 'to boil, bubble (as water).' It also leaves unexplained, as there is not an exact correspondence in the recorded data, *mad-* in its meaning 'to





enjoy heavenly bliss.’ It is possible that we have here a connection with *DEDR* 4618 Ta. *makir̥* (-v-, -nt-) and *DEDR* 4894 Ta. *mukir̥*; *mokkul̥*, *mōrai*, the etyma of which contain these meanings. This, however, would not be as straightforward as the above correlations form the vantage of Dravidian. It would also involve redundancy in meaning with regard to some correspondences without explaining other common meanings. In part because of this point, such a correlation is not upheld by independent lexical support. Not implausible is that the semantic spread represented here was also represented or came to be represented by one of the Dravidian forms already isolated, perhaps after merger in Sanskrit. This, however, is speculative. Such a semantic spread in Dravidian may have facilitated merger with the Indo-European root.

The correspondence of *DEDR* 5078 Ta. *mel* with Skt. *mad-/2.mand-* is suggested by the meanings of *mad-/2.mand-* occurring together with the later meanings of *mandrá* and *manda* in *DEDR* 5078:

*mad-/2.mand-* to tarry, stand still, pause. *mandrá* (*RPrāt*, *B* +) low, deep (of sound, hollow, rumbling; a low tone, the low or base tone of the voice. *manda* (*E* +) slow, tardy, moving slowly or softly, loitering, idle, lazy, sluggish; gentle, feeble, dull, faint, being indulgent; sick, languid.

*DEDR* 5078 ... Ta. *mella*, *mella* softly, slowly, gently ... *mel-liyar* the weak, the emaciated, the poor ... *meli* (-v-, -nt-) to be weak, become lean, thin, suffer, languish, perish, become poor, reduced in circumstances, be softened (as a hard consonant), be lowered in pitch (music); (-pp-, -tt-) to weaken, make lean, thin, cause suffering, destroy, soften (a hard consonant), lower the pitch ... *melivu* weakness, feebleness, languor, fatigue, etc. ... Ma. ... *mellē* slowly, gently, softly ... To. ... *mely* slowly, stealthily; *meli*... very slowly ... Te. ... *mellāgā* slowly, tardily, quietly, gently, mildly, softly, gradually, by degrees; *mellana* slowness, tardiness; *mellani* slow, quiet, etc. ... [PDr \**mel-/mel-V-*: \**mell-*]

Suggested by the data and the paradigm in Table VIII(a) is that usage of *mandrá* in meanings related to one of the sets of etyma that had merged in 1.*mand-* is discontinued after the Vedic period, as is 1.*mand-* itself in the main outside the four Vedas and the *Brāhmaṇa*-s. The root’s weak form *mad-* remains functional. Usage of *mad-/2.mand-* in finite form begins in the period of the





*R̥gveda*'s composition, but never becomes well established. It, however, becomes the basis for a new form *mandrá* beginning in the later Vedic period. Beginning in the epic period it provides a new form, *manda*, which joins in usage a late Vedic form *manda* that had been based on the set of etyma that had merged in the discontinued 1.*mand-* and was not involved in the earlier form *mandrá*.

The identification of Skt. *mad-/1.mand-* and *mandrá* (*V*) with Dravidian forms is not insignificant on account of the close association of these forms in usage with Indra, Soma, and Agni. Thus, in the *R̥gveda* the root's weak form *mad-* displays clear reference to Indra or to Soma more frequently than to any other deity or concept. Out of 79 occurrences of 1.*mand-*, 50 refer unambiguously to Indra or Soma. And out of 69 occurrences of *mandrá*, 44 refer unambiguously to Agni. Such argues for a prior Dravidian association with the usage of what was to become known as *sóma*, perhaps with the carrying over of technical terminology into Sanskrit in *mad-/1.mand-* and *mandrá* (*V*). In this context, to be emphasized, as noted above in section 13, is that Uri Tadmor in Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009: 64) points out that on the basis of the data collected in their volume, the semantic field most affected by borrowing is "religion and belief."

Also significant is the association of etyma in *DEDR* 4723 Ta. *maruḷ* with Skt. *mad-/1.mand-* as among the etyma in this group are South Dravidian forms that refer to inspiration or inspiration in the sense of possession. Such suggests the possibility that in the Vedic references we may have indication of the peculiar morphology of South Asian possession – marked by an absence of family history of possession on the part of the possessed, and by the seemingly ad hoc onset of possession in public arenas.

Problematic is the fact that the weak stem of Skt. *mad-/1.mand-* does not appear to indicate differentiation of *DEDR* 4729 Ta. *mal* and *DEDR* 4723 Ta. *maruḷ* by either referent, stem usage, or transitive-intransitive dichotomy. For this weak form of the root, however, Grassmann (1873: 977-981) did not keep separate what are here regarded as two semantic spreads. And for 1.*mand-*, Grassmann (1873: 1000) combined these. Evidence of such merger on the basis of derivatives of the Sanskrit root and from independent lexical support, though, is strong. No one has





ever had reason before to believe that what we have here are two semantic spreads merged. No one, therefore, has ever combed through the data systematically with this in mind.

Other examples of merger of Dravidian forms within Sanskrit have been cited or referred to above (sec. 12). Still additional examples can be cited involving the complex of forms under immediate discussion.

Skt. *mádhu*, for instance, provides possible indication of a merger of an Indo-European form with a form of Dravidian origin that had merged in *mad-/1.mand-*. In its signification ‘honey etc.,’ *mádhu* is clearly related to Indo-European forms (Pokorny 1959-69/1.707). However, such infrequent significations as ‘charming, delightful’ in *R̥gveda* 2.39.6 and *Vāḷakhilya* 2.4, for example, argue on semantic grounds for a relationship with *mad-/1.mand-*, early derivatives of *1.mand-*, and *DEDR* 4729 Ta. *mal*. A parallel form containing *-dh-* is in evidence in Skt. *badhyatás* (v.l. *madhyatás*), also related here to *DEDR* 4729. The problem with regard to the interpretation of *-dh-* here has been referred to above (sec. 10).

Also, the large number of forms presently classed as derivatives of *mad-/2.mand-* frequently contain no obvious semantic relationship to one another or to *mad-/ 2.mand-*. For example, *mandara* ‘the name of a sacred mountain,’ *mandāra* ‘the coral tree,’ *mandira* ‘a habitation.’ A connection has been proposed previously between Skt. *mandurā* ‘a stable for horse’ and *mandu* in *mandu-pāla* ‘groom’ with the set of etyma listed in *DEDR* 4777 Ta. *maṅru*, and attention has been drawn to Skt. *mandira* with regard to this set of etyma (Burrow 1948: 389). These suggestions were withdrawn, though, in *DED* and *DEDR*. Suggested here is a connection between Skt. *mandara* and the grouping of etyma listed in *DEDR* 4741 Ta. *malai* (*-v-*, *-nt-*) [PDr *\*mal-V-*] ‘to oppose, fight against, wrangle, dispute, contend’ and the cross-referenced *DEDR* 4730 Ta. *mal* [PDr *\*mal-/\*mall-*]. The latter is used primarily in reference to wrestling and boxing. It has been identified previously as the source of Skt. *malla* (Burrow 1946: 17-18; *DEDR*, p. 762b). It also refers, however, to quarreling and fighting in general:

*DEDR* 4730 Ta. ... *mallu-kkaṭṭu* to wrestle, scuffle, quarrel. ...





Ka. *mallāḍu* to strive and struggle for the retention or obtainment of things; *mallāṭa* mutual strife or struggle for ... .

While the phonological shape of the etyma in *DEDR* 4741 argues against a relationship of this set of etyma with Skt. *mandara*, that of *DEDR* 4730 would be consonant with such. The basis of such a relationship would be in the mythology of dispute and contention, and mutual strife, associated with Mount Mandara and the unlikeliness of this mythological tradition feeding back to forms with the phonetic shapes of those listed in *DEDR* 4730 Ta. *mal* and *DEDR* 4741 Ta. *malai* (-v-, -nt-) without good cause. This correspondence is charted in Table IX.

TABLE IX

MANDARA	
Present Sanskrit derivation: 2. <i>mand-</i> (?). See, however, lack of semantic concord between forms classed as derivatives of 2. <i>mand-</i> .	Proposed Dravidian derivation: <i>DEDR</i> 4741 Ta. <i>malai</i> (-v-, -nt-) [PDr * <i>mal-V-</i> ], <i>DEDR</i> 4730 Ta. <i>mal</i> [PDr * <i>mal-/mal-</i> ] ( <i>DEDR</i> 4741 and <i>DEDR</i> 4730 cross-referenced in <i>DEDR</i> .)
Name of a sacred mountain [The mountain figures in the myth in which the gods and Asuras cooperate with one another to churn the ocean so as to retrieve things lost in the deluge, including the Vedas. Struggle for the Vedas between the gods and Asuras ensues. See particularly the Kannada forms noted opposite.]	<i>DEDR</i> 4741: to oppose fight against wrangle dispute contend  <i>DEDR</i> 4730: Refers to wrestling and boxing; also to quarreling and fighting in general. Ka. <i>mallāḍu</i> 'to strive and struggle for the retention or obtainment of things' Ka. <i>mallāṭa</i> 'mutual strife or struggle for' Ta. <i>mallu-kkaṭṭu</i> 'to wrestle, scuffle, quarrel'
	Through addition of a derivative suffix -nt- to a root ending with -l with euphonic combination.

We have, thus, in *mad-/1.mand-*, in *mad-/2.mand-*, in the derivative forms of these roots, and in the forms classed at present





as derivatives of *mad-/2.mand-*, evidence of the merger with an Indo-European form of perhaps at least five sets of Dravidian etyma, *DEDR* 4729 Ta. *mal*, *DEDR* 4723 Ta. *maruḷ*, *DEDR* 5078 Ta. *mel*, perhaps, but with question, at least with regard to Skt. *mandira* ‘house, palace, temple ...’ *DEDR* 4777 Ta. *maṅru* ‘hall of assembly, golden hall of Chidambaram’ ... ‘house,’ and *DEDR* 4730 Ta. *mal*. See also in this regard the connection suggested in section 4 between Skt. *manthara*, also presently connected etymologically within Sanskrit with 2.*mand-* and *manda*, and *DEDR* 4977 Ta. *muri* (-v-, -nt-).

#### 14.16. *rāṅdryā* (*rāṅdryā*)

Skt. *rāṅdryā* is a variant form in *Rgveda* manuscripts for *rāṅdryā*. The form occurs once only in *Rgveda* 6.23.6 and is of uncertain meaning and form (Grassmann 1873: 1158-1159). Sāyaṇa defines the form as *ramaṅīya* ‘agreeable, pleasant, gratifying’ (Müller 1890/2.756).

Given such limited occurrence and the uncertainty with regard to meaning that such entails, it would be foolhardy to attempt in this context an identification of this form with Dravidian.

See also *EWA* 2.446, which concludes that both the word’s form and meaning are unclear.

A few points, however, are worthy of note for anyone who might read *Rgveda* 6.23.6:

i. An alternation between *-ndr-* and *-ṅd-* in the forms under consideration has been discussed above (sec. 8) and is indicative of the type of situation discussed in the present paper. As noted above, however, Kuiper (1990: 72, 71) views *rāṅdryā* to be a hypercorrect form inserted by a later purist.

ii. The initial *r-* of the form would appear at first glance to prohibit a Dravidian origin for the form. Such an initial consonant does not occur in Dravidian naturally except through processes of metathesis and simplification specific to certain languages. That metathesis was a process in the northern Dravidian languages from which Sanskrit was borrowing has been demonstrated above (sec. 4). Further, an initial vowel in a Sanskrit loanword from Dravidian perhaps might be dropped, as is perhaps the case in the proposed







derivation of Skt. *kola* from *DEDR* 771 Ta. *ekkala* (sec. 5).

iii. Conceivable is that the form is to be connected with the group of etyma in *DEDR* 990(a) to (d), Ta. *oru*, *ōr*, which contain forms for the number ‘one,’ but which in 990(d) Ta. *oṅru*, *oṅṅu* also carries the extended meanings ‘to agree, be friendly’ and ‘to be intimate, be united with, be possessed of.’ Such would be in accord with Sāyana’s definition.

More than this it would not be safe to say at present.

#### 14.17. *rundra*

Skt. *rundra* is in lexicographic citation only. It is noted to mean ‘rich in,’ in final composition. A meaning such as this, which is vague from the vantage of Sanskrit lexicography, does not provide enough information for an investigation into possible Dravidian cognates. While *EWA* 3.430 lists this word, it notes little about it and of its etymology, opines “unclear.”

#### 14.18. *lāndra*

Skt. *lāndra* occurs only in a list of words in *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.4.29 without definition. An investigation of possible Dravidian cognates is therefore impossible. The form is not listed by either *KEWA* or *EWA*.

#### 14.19. *vandra*

Skt. *vandra* occurs in Ujjvaladatta’s commentary on *Uṇādisūtra* 2.13 and in lexicographic citation only. It is derived standardly from Sanskrit *vand-* by the addition of the primary suffix *-ra* (see, for example, *MW* 919b). Skt. *vand-* is considered to be a nasalized form of Skt. *vad-*. The latter has cognate forms in Greek and Lithuanian (Pokorny 1959-69/1.76; *KEWA* 3.142, 790; *EWA* 2.502-503). The semantic spread of the two forms, however, is quite different. Skt. *vad-* involves speaking, talking, or addressing; Skt. *vand-* involves praising and doing homage.

The number of sets of Dravidian etyma that begin with PDr \**p-* and that refer to speech with various specialized connota-





tions is legion. Standardly, \**p*- > *v*- does not maintain. Alternation between *p*- and *v*-, however, does occur much as alternation between *b* and *v* occurs in Sanskrit (Zvelebil 1970: 86-87). In this connection, there is in Sanskrit an alternation between *b* and *v* in the writing of Skt. *bandin* ‘a praiser, bard, herald,’ which form is connected with Skt. *vand*- (KEWA 2.406-407, EWA 3.353).

From among those sets of Dravidian etyma that begin with PDr \**p*- compare Skt. *vand*- and *vandra* with DEDR 4235 Ta. *pukaṛ* (-*v*-, -*nt*-):

DEDR 4235 Ta. *pukaṛ* (-*v*-, -*nt*-) to praise, extol, applaud; n. praise, eulogy, fame, exploit; *pukaṛcci*, *pukaṛvu* praise, adulation; *pukaṛtal* adoration; *pukaṛmai* praiseworthiness, fame; *pukal* fame, renown. Ma. ... *pukaṛ*, *pukaṛca* praise, renown ... Ka. *pogaṛ* to praise; n. praise, renown ... Tu. *pugaruni*, *pugaḷuni*, *pogaṛuni*, *pogaḷuni* to praise, eulogize, flatter ... Te. *pogaḍu*, *povaḍu* to praise, applaud, eulogize, flatter; *pogaḍika*, *pogaḍ(i)ta* praise, fame, flattery. Kui *pōnga* (*pōngi*-) to be sounded abroad, be famed, praised, made known; n. fame ... Malt. *pogole* renown, praise; *pogolare* to be praised; *pogolatre* to praise, extol. [PDr \**puk*-/\**pōk*-/\**pōnk*-, \**puk*- and \**pok*- often associated with a derivative suffix -*aṛ*- or -[*a/u/o*]/-]

Of interest, but at present only of limited significance, is that the North Dravidian forms listed in this set of etyma, which are from Malto, fall in with those forms that reconstruct to PDr \**pok*-[*a/u/o*]/-. A standardly associated derivative suffix of the shape \*- [a/u/o] /- enables us to obtain Skt. -*ndr*- or -*nd*- through the euphonic combination of -*l*- and a suffix -*nt*-. Required in this instance for the proposed correspondence is what is referred to here as “syllabic loss” (sec. 5, 7[*v*]) and \**l* > *l* (sec. 7[*iv*]), sec. 8). Skt. *vand*- would, by analogy, fall into a paradigm that would place it in normal Sanskrit juxtaposition to *vad*-. Skt. *vandra* would be either a later formation through the addition of -*ra*, or an alternate form to *vand*- with -*ndr*- that does not appear in literature until Ujjvaladatta’s commentary on the *Uṇādisūtra*. Such would parallel the alternate realizations of the Dravidian consonant-cluster in question in Skt. *mandrá* and *manda*, and in Skt. *tand*-/*tandr*-. That the form appears in Ujjvaladatta’s commentary indicates the possibility of a problem with regard to the normal derivation of this form.





Of note is that the Dravidian semantic spread of this grouping of etyma does not contain meanings that correspond to the meanings ‘to show honor, do homage, worship’ of Skt. *vand-*. This perhaps is idiosyncratic to the specific Dravidian etyma listed at present in *DEDR* 4235 Ta. *pukaṛ* (-v-, -nt-). Compare *DEDR* 3951 Ta. *paracu* (*paraci-*), *DEDR* 4003 Ta. *paṛiccu* (*paṛicci-*), and *DEDR* 4605 Ta. *pōrru* (*pōrri-*) which similarly contain forms meaning ‘praise,’ and which also carry such significations as ‘honor, worship, reverence, adoration.’

#### 14.20. *sāndra*

Skt. *sāndra* is cited by Burrow (1955: 22; 1973 ed., 22) as being connected with Old Church Slavonic *sedry krivnyje* and *sjadry krovnyja* ‘thickened, congealed blood,’ and as such as being an example of vocabulary shared by Indo-Iranian and Balto-Slavonic but not by other Indo-European languages. Pokorny (1959-69/1.906, 2.36) omits mention of the Sanskrit form and lists Germanic cognates for the Old Church Slavonic forms. *KEWA* 3.458 considers the form to be unclear and necessary of explanation from within Indic. *EWA* 3.509-510, similarly, opines that the form is not convincingly explained. The Sanskrit form occurs first in classical Sanskrit. It is not associated with any root. Its semantic spread is broad, despite only infrequent citation. Such, of course, argues for a more immediate Indic source for the form.

No grouping of Dravidian etyma that might be related to the wide Sanskrit semantic spread with semantic transparency has emerged during the present investigation. Perhaps of note are the not dissimilar semantic spreads of *DEDR* 84 Ta. *aṭai* (-v-, -nt-) and *DEDR* 524 Ta. *iruku* (*iruki-*), for example. Such indicate that semantic spreads not unlike that of Sanskrit *sāndra* can be cited for Dravidian.

#### 14.21. *syandrā/spandrā*

Skt. *syandrā* is standardly derived through the addition of the suffix *-ra* to Skt. *syad-/syand-* (Viśvabandhu Śāstrī 1935-65/1.5: 3501 n. ‘h,’ which cites *PW* and Grassmann 1873). This latter is





viewed standardly to be of uncertain etymology (*KEWA* 3.550-551, *EWA* 3.781-782). Burrow (1955: 291; 1973 ed., 292) has suggested that it is a collateral form of Skt. *sic-* derived by the accretion of a stem formative suffix *-d* in combination with *n* after dropping *-c*. He has also linked this root in a weak grade to Skt. *sīndhu* through the addition of a suffix containing a laryngeal (1955: 71, 87, 179, 196; 1973 ed., 72, 88, 180, 197). This perhaps forces available data. It further leaves unaccounted for, the near pervasive emphasis of *syad-/syand-* on the rapidity of fluid motion and of motion in general, and such significations as ‘transient, transitory’ for *syandrā* in *Ṛgveda* 19.41.5.

Of note is that the root has been confused traditionally with Skt. *spand-*, and that Viśvabandhu Śāstrī (1935-65/1.5: 3501a ) lists most occurrences of the root in the *saṃhitā*-s under *spand-*, listing *syandrā* as *spandrā* (see also *EWA* 3.782, 2.773). Such, of course, parallels the alternation observed above between *tāspandra* and *tāsyandra*.

No matchup with Dravidian can be attempted until a defensible correlation can be established for the initial consonant-cluster.

#### 14.22. *hāndra*

Skt. *hāndra* is listed by Wilson (1832: 973b) with the meaning ‘dying, death.’ It would appear to be a variant form of Skt. *hāntra* ‘dying, death,’ which occurs in Ujjvaladatta’s commentary on *Uṇādisūtra* 4.159 and in lexicographic citation. Both words are listed in *MW* 1288a under Skt. *han-*, apparently on the basis of semantic extension from ‘to kill, slay.’

Compare these forms, however, with Skt. *hātu* ‘death,’ also in lexicographic citation and listed in *MW* 1296b under Skt. *hā-* ‘to abandon, relinquish.’

Further, compare Skt. *hāndra*, *hāntra*, and *hātu* to the Gondi and Kuwi forms, and Pengo and Maṇḍa forms in *DEDR* 2426 Ta. *cā* (*cāv-/cākuv-*, *cett-*). The Koṇḍa form is included here for additional clarity with regard to suffixation:

*DEDR* 2426 Go. (Tr.) *saiānā* (*sās-*), (W. SR.) *sāyānā*, (L) *hānā*, (Mu. M. S.) *hā-* to die ... (L) *hāva*, (W.) *sātāl* dead (*Voc.* 3335). Koṇḍa *sā-* (*-t-*) to die ... Pe. *hā* (*-t-*) to die ... Maṇḍ. *hā* to die ...





Kuwi (F.) *haiali* (*hat-*), (S.) *hānai*, (Su.) *hā* (*-t-*) to die; (Isr.) *hāki* death. [PDr \*cā-/ \*ce-]

The Sanskrit forms appear to be loans from South Central Dravidian. By this identification, Skt. *hāntra* would be formed by the addition of a suffix *-tra* to a borrowed form \**hān-* from Gondi or Kuwi. Skt. *hāndra* would be a variant of the form, which could not be associated clearly with any Sanskrit root.

Neither *KEWA* nor *EWA* treat these forms.

## 15. Summary

Sanskrit forms containing the consonant-cluster *-ndr-* are a particularly marked group of perhaps twenty-two basic forms.

Three – *nānāndr*, *vandra*, and *hāndra* (as *hāntra*) – are referred to in either the *Uṇādisūtra* or in Ujjvaladatta's commentary on the *Uṇādisūtra*. The *Uṇādisūtra* is traditionally associated with forms which, in the grammarian Patañjali's words, are “crude forms without origin” (Aufrecht 1859: vi).

Several, such as *pundra* and *rāndryā*, are variants of forms that standardly are accepted as forms of non-Indo-European origin.

Several, such as *tāspandra* and *lāndra*, are not variants of forms containing a consonant-cluster other than *-ndr-* but are clearly of non-Indo-European origin.

In one instance, that of *ātandra*, *tandrī*, *tandrā*, and *tand-*, the standard relationship has always been with Indo-European, but this has always created problems on account of semantics and on account of the alternate stem *tandr-*. These forms have been suggested here to be related to Dravidian.

In another instance, that of *mandrá* and *mad-/1.mand-*, the standard relationship has also always been with Indo-European forms. These forms have been suggested here to contain the semantic content of Dravidian forms, and to be the result of merger. The collocation of forms proposed provides for the root and its derivatives semantic transparency, and simplifies the situation with regard to a second root *mad-/2.mand-* and its derivatives.

One form, Skt. *sāndra*, occurs so late and so infrequently but with such a broad spread of meanings, that it is problematic as to





whether it is to be connected with possible Indo-European cognates or with a more immediate Indic source.

Skt. *indra* and *candrā* (°*ścandrā*) can be seen thus to be themselves particularly marked within this group of marked forms in that they have Indo-European derivation. That of Skt. *indra*, of course, has standardly posed problems. That the only two genuine forms with Indo-European derivation that contain the consonant cluster *-ndr-*, otherwise characteristic of forms with extra-Indo-European connections, are the names of Vedic gods is certainly a point that at some time must receive explanation.

From the vantage of Dravidian, it has been demonstrated that early Sanskrit was borrowing from forms that were distinctly North Dravidian, that the forms borrowed by Sanskrit contained the direct addition of suffixes to roots, that euphonic combination was in force in these instances, and that this euphonic combination was not disconsonant with classical Tamil rules of euphonic combination. Further, the Dravidian forms borrowed by Sanskrit sometimes display the metathesis of  $C_2$  of the root and a consonant or consonant-cluster of a derivative suffix. And the loss of  $C_2$  and possible vowel loss or contraction – referred to here as “syllabic loss” so as to be non-specific to process – was characteristic of North Dravidian and was present in Proto-Dravidian. Such a process has been argued before to be characteristic of South Dravidian on the one hand; and on the other, of Proto-Dravidian residual throughout Dravidian. Evidence from Sanskrit for reduplication in Dravidian in other than onomatopoeic forms has also been presented.

It has been further suggested, on the basis of the evidence present with regard to *mandrā* and *mad-/mand-*, that contact with Dravidian must have been extensive prior to the composition of the *Rgveda*, and that perhaps there was an indigenous Dravidian use of *sóma* prior to the Indo-Iranian usage of *sóma* in South Asia.

An index of the Sanskrit forms for which Dravidian etymologies have been proposed or suggested follows. Except for instances in which additions have been made in or changes have been suggested to etymologies considered to be near certain by *DEDR*, standing Dravidian cross-references cited are not listed.







	<u>section</u>
<i>karkaṭa, karkaṭī, karkaṭaka</i> crab, pair of compasses, etc. (see Table III) (E +)	sec. 6
<i>karkāndhu Zizyphus jujuba</i> (VS, B +)	sec. 6
<i>Kalki, Kalkī, Kalkin</i> (E +)	sec. 9(iv)
<i>kindhin</i> (see <i>kilkin</i> )	
<i>kilkin, kilvin</i> ( <i>kindhin</i> ) horse (L)	sec. 9(iv)
<i>kuṇḍrñācī</i> house lizard (RV <sup>1</sup> , VS <sup>1</sup> )	sec. 5
<i>kundr-</i> ( <i>gundr-</i> ) to lie ( <i>Dhātup</i> )	sec. 14.5
<i>kūsindha</i> trunk (AV, K, ŚB)	sec. 7(ii)
<i>kodaṇḍa</i> bow (C) eyebrow (shaped like a bow) (L)	sec. 7
<i>kola</i> hog ( <i>Yājñ</i> +)	sec. 5
<i>kroḍa</i> hog (C), <i>kroḍī</i> sow (C)	sec. 5
<i>gaṇḍa</i> cheek ( <i>Yājñ</i> +)	sec. 5
<i>galla</i> cheek (C)	sec. 5
<i>gundr-</i> (see <i>kundr-</i> )	
<i>guṇḍā</i> <i>Scirpus kysoor</i> (L), a kind of reed (L) (see <i>gundrā</i> )	
<i>guṇḍrā</i> (see <i>gundrā</i> )	
<i>gundrā, guṇḍrā</i> <i>Cyperus</i> (C)	sec. 14.6
<i>caṇḍa, caṇḍika</i> circumcised (L)	sec. 14.8
<i>cāṇḍā, caṇḍī, caṇḍatā</i> fierce, violent, cruel, hot, etc. ; name of Durgā (AV <sup>1</sup> , E +)	sec. 5
<i>caṇḍāta Nerium odorum</i> (L)	sec. 5
<sup>1</sup> <i>caṇḍila</i> barber (L)	sec. 14.8
<sup>2</sup> <i>caṇḍila</i> <i>Chenopodium album</i> (L)	sec. 14.9
<sup>1</sup> <i>candrila</i> (see <sup>1</sup> <i>caṇḍila</i> )	
<sup>2</sup> <i>candrila</i> (see <sup>2</sup> <i>caṇḍila</i> )	
<i>tand-</i> ( <i>tandr-</i> ): <i>ātandra, tandrī, tandrā</i> (see Table VI for definitions) (RV +)	sec. 14.10
<i>tuṇḍa</i> (see <i>tundila-phalā</i> )	
<i>tundila-phalā, tuṇḍa Cucumis utilissimus</i> (L)	sec. 12
<i>padma</i> 10 billion (B +)	sec. 14.15





<i>puṇḍārīka</i> lotus-flower (esp. white) ( <i>RV</i> +)	sec. 7(i)
tiger ( <i>L</i> )	sec. 12
sectarian mark ( <i>C</i> )	sec. 12
<i>puṇḍra</i> , <i>pundra</i> , <i>puṇḍhra</i> , <i>puṇḍa</i>	sectarian mark ( <i>S</i> +) sec. 14.13
	lotus-flower ( <i>L</i> ) sec. 14.13
	worm ( <i>L</i> ) sec. 14.13
	name of a people ( <i>L</i> ) sec. 14.13
<i>pundra</i> (see <i>puṇḍra</i> )	
<i>pogaṇḍa</i> , <i>paugaṇḍa</i> young, boy; boyhood, boyish ( <i>C</i> )	sec. 5
<i>paugaṇḍa</i> (see <i>pogaṇḍa</i> )	
<i>phāṇḍa</i> belly ( <i>S</i> <sup>1</sup> , <i>L</i> )	sec. 9(vi)
<i>phāṇḍin</i> name of a serpent demon ( <i>L</i> )	sec. 9(vi)
(?) <i>phaligá</i> cask or leather bag, etc. to hold fluids ( <i>RV</i> <sup>a</sup> )	sec. 9(vi)
(?) <i>phalka</i> one who has an expanded or extended body ( <i>L</i> )	sec. 9(vi)
<i>badva</i> a large number, multitude ( <i>B</i> +)	sec. 14.15
<i>badvaśas</i> in large numbers ( <i>B</i> )	sec. 14.15
<i>badvan</i> ( <i>padvan</i> , <i>S</i> <sup>3</sup> ) a causeway, highway ( <i>B</i> +)	sec. 14.15
<i>badhyatás</i> ( <i>madhyatás</i> ) (freedom) from the crowd ( <i>AV</i> <sup>1</sup> )	sec. 14.15
(?) <i>bandin</i> ( <i>vandin</i> ) praiser, bard, herald ( <i>L</i> )	sec. 14.19
(?) <i>babhrú</i> , <i>babhruká</i> tawny; ichneumon ( <i>RV</i> +)	sec. 6
<i>bindú</i> drop, dot, spot ( <i>AV</i> +)	sec. 14.13
<i>bhaṇḍ-</i> (see <i>bhandra</i> )	
<i>bhand-</i> (see <i>bhandra</i> )	
<i>bhandana</i> (pl.) rain-making sunrays ( <i>L</i> )	sec. 14.14
<i>bhandila</i> fortune ( <i>L</i> )	sec. 14.14
tremulous ( <i>L</i> )	sec. 14.14
<i>bhandra</i> : <i>bhaṇḍ-</i> , <i>bhand-</i> auspicious, to be auspicious ( <i>L</i> )	sec. 14.14
<i>bhalla</i> auspicious ( <i>ChUp</i> <sup>1</sup> [?], <i>L</i> )	sec. 14.14
<i>māṇḍala</i> anything round, a circle, etc. ( <i>B</i> +)	sec. 8
territory, country ( <i>S</i> +)	sec. 8
<i>maṇḍúka</i> frog ( <i>RV</i> +)	sec. 4
<i>mad-/mand-</i> : <i>mandrá</i> , etc. (see Table VIII) ( <i>RV</i> +)	sec. 14.15
(?) <i>madhú</i> charming, agreeable ( <i>RV</i> , <i>TS</i> )	sec. 14.15





<i>madhyatás</i> (see <i>badhyatás</i> )	
<i>manthara</i> (see Table I) ( <i>E</i> +)	sec. 4
<i>Mandara</i> name of a sacred mountain ( <i>E</i> +)	sec. 14.15
<i>malluda</i> , <i>malluma</i> , <i>mālutā</i> , <i>māluda</i> , <i>māludu</i> particularly high numbers ( <i>Buddh</i> )	sec. 14.15
<i>malvá</i> unwise, foolish, silly ( <i>AV</i> )	sec. 14.15
<i>māruṇḍa</i> cow-dung or a place spread with it ( <i>L</i> )	sec. 7
<i>mulālín</i> , <i>mulālī</i> an edible lotus ( <i>AV</i> )	sec. 7(i)
(?) <i>rāṇḍyā</i> ( <i>rāṇdryā</i> ) agreeable (?) ( <i>RV</i> )	sec. 14.16
(?) <i>rāṇdryā</i> (see <i>rāṇḍyā</i> )	
(?) <i>vand-</i> : <i>vandra</i> to praise, extol ( <i>RV</i> , <i>AV</i> , <i>S</i> )	sec. 14.19
(?) <i>vandin</i> (see <i>bandin</i> )	
(?) <i>sthalā</i> dry land ( <i>TS</i> +), <i>staṇḍila</i> an open field ( <i>E</i> +), etc.	sec. 9(vii)
<i>hātu</i> (see <i>hāndra</i> )	
<i>hāndra</i> , <i>hātra</i> , <i>hātu</i> dying, death ( <i>L</i> )	sec. 14.22
In addition, two forms are cited here to show process, in which it is just Dravidian suffixes that appear to be added to forms of Indo-European or probable Indo-European derivation, resulting in what would seemingly be etymologically opaque forms:	
<i>Pāṇḍava</i> name of the 5 sons of <i>Pāṇḍu</i> ( <i>E</i> +)	sec. 9(v)
<i>sūdra</i> name of the fourth social class ( <i>RV</i> +)	sec. 9(viii)

## Tables

- I. *manthara*
- II. *caṇḍa* / *caṇḍāta*
- III. *karkaṭa*
- IV. *maṇḍala*
- V. The Twenty-Two Forms in Sanskrit that Contain the Consonant-Cluster -*ndr*-
- VI. *tand*-/*tandr*- and Derivatives
- VII. *bhandra* etc.
- VIII. Correspondences of *mad*-/*mand*- and Dravidian Etyma
- IX. *Mandara*



## REFERENCES

1974. *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*. Springfield, Massachusetts: G & C. Merriam Company. [= *Webster's*]
1989. *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Prepared by J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner, 20 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. [= *OED*]
- Andronov, Mikhail Sergeevich. 1969. *A Standard Grammar of Modern and Classical Tamil*. Translated by the author from the original Russian. Madras: New Century Book House. (Original, 1966.)
- Aufrecht, Theodor (ed.). 1859. *Ujvaladatta's Commentary on the Uṇādisūtras*. Bonn: A. Marcus.
- Bailey, Harold Walter. 1956. "Iranian *miṣṣa*, Indian *bīja*." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 18: 32-42.
- Basham, Arthur Llewellyn. 1954. *The Wonder That Was India*. New York: The Macmillan Co. Rpt. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1959.
- Bhat, D. N. Shankara. 1965-66. "Studies in Tulu." *Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute* 25: 11-31.
- Blažek, Václav and Claude Boisson. 1992. "The Diffusion of Agricultural Terms from Mesopotamia." *Archiv Orientální* 60.1: 16-37.
- Bloch, Jules. 1924. "Sanskrit et Dravidian." *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 25.1(76): 1-21.
- Bloch, Jules. 1930. "Some Problems of Indo-Aryan Philology. Forlong Lectures for 1929: II, Indo-Aryan and Dravidian." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 5.4: 730-744.
- Bloch, Jules. 1965. *Indo-Aryan from the Vedas to Modern Times*, English edition. Largely revised by the author and translated by Alfred Master. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, Adrien-Maisonneuve. (Original, 1934.)
- Böhtlingk, Otto. 1879-89. *Sanskrit Wörterbuch in Kurzerer Fassung*, 7 vols. in 1. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserli-

- chen Akademie der Wissenschaften, zu beziehen durch Eggers und Comp.; [etc. etc.]. Rpt. in 7 vols., Graz: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1959.
- Böhtlingk, Otto and Rudolph Roth. 1855-75. *Sanskrit Wörterbuch*, 7 vols. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. [= *PW*]
- Burnell, Arthur Coke (ed.). 1876. *The Ārsheyabrāhmaṇa (Being the Fourth Brāhmaṇa) of the Sāma Veda: The Sanskrit Text, Edited Together with Extracts from the Commentary of Sāyaṇa, etc., An Introduction, and Index of Words*. Mangalore: Stolz and Hirner, Basel Mission Press.
- Burrow, Thomas. 1945. "Some Dravidian Words in Sanskrit." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 44.1: 79-120. Rpt. in Burrow (1968), 236-284.
- Burrow, Thomas. 1946. "Loanwords in Sanskrit." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 45.1: 1-30. Rpt. in Burrow (1968), 285-318.
- Burrow, Thomas. 1948. "Dravidian Studies VII: Further Dravidian Words in Sanskrit." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 12.2: 365-396. Rpt. in Burrow (1968), 178-235.
- Burrow, Thomas. 1955. *The Sanskrit Language*. London: Faber and Faber. New and rev. ed., 1973.
- Burrow, Thomas. 1962. "Sanskrit *āmoda*- 'fragrance, perfume'." *Indological Studies in Honor of W. Norman Brown*, ed. by Ernest Bender, 23-27. New Haven: American Oriental Society. (= *American Oriental Series*, 47.)
- Burrow, Thomas. 1968. *Collected Papers on Dravidian Linguistics*. Annamalainagar: Annamalai University. (= *Department of Linguistics Publication*, 13.)
- Burrow, Thomas. 1971. "Spontaneous Cerebrals in Sanskrit." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 34.3: 538-559.
- Burrow, Thomas. 1972. "A Reconsideration of Fortunatov's Law." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 35.3: 531-545.

- Burrow, Thomas. 1979. "On the Treatment of the Indo-European Consonant Group *-tl-* in Sanskrit." *Indologica Taurinensia* 7: 151-158. (= *Dr. Ludwik Sternbach Felicitation Volume*, 1.)
- Burrow, Thomas. 1983. "Notes on Some Dravidian Words in Sanskrit." *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 12.1: 8-14.
- Burrow, Thomas and Murray Barnson Emeneau. 1961. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. [= *DED*]
- Burrow, Thomas and Murray Barnson Emeneau. 1968. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary, Supplement*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. [= *DEDS*]
- Burrow, Thomas and Murray Barnson Emeneau. 1972. "Dravidian Etymological Notes." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 92.3: 397-418, 92.4: 475-491.
- Burrow, Thomas and Murray Barnson Emeneau. 1984. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. [= *DEDR*]
- Caldwell, Robert. 1856. *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian Family of Languages*. Rpt. of 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., rev. and ed. by J. L. Wyatt and T. Ramakrishna Pillai, Madras: University of Madras, 2000. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 1913; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1875.)
- David, H. S. 1966. "Suggestions to Research Schools and Lexicographers in Tamil and Dravidology." *Tamil Culture* 12.1: 5-12, 12.2-3: 231-246, 12.4: 269-285.
- Devaneyan, Gnanamuthu [Tēvanēyaṅ, Nāṅamuttaṅ] et al. 1985-2007. *Centamiḷ corpirappiyal pērakaramutali* [*A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Tamil Language*], vols. 1-8.3, 11 [in 25 vols.]. Chennai: Centamiḷ Corpirappiyal Akaramutalit Tiṭṭa Iyakkaka Veḷiyiṭu [Directorate of Tamil Etymological Dictionary Project]. [= *TED*]
- Dil, Anwar S. (ed.). 1980. *Language and Linguistic Area, Essays by Murray B. Emeneau*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press. Rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970. (*William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series*.)





- Emeneau, Murray Barnson. 1954. "Linguistic Prehistory of India." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 98.4: 282-292.
- Emeneau, Murray Barnson. 1956. "India as a Linguistic Area." *Language* 32.2: 3-16. Rpt. in *Language in Culture and Society, A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*, ed. by Dell Hymes, 642-653. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964. 2<sup>nd</sup> rpt. in *Dravidian Linguistics, Ethnology and Folklore, Collected Papers by M. B. Emeneau*, 172-186. Annamalainagar: Annamalai University, 1967. (= *Linguistics Department Publication*, 8.) 3<sup>rd</sup> rpt. in Dil (ed.), 105-125.
- Emeneau, Murray Barnson. 1962. "Bilingualism and Structural Borrowing." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 106.5: 430-442.
- Emeneau, Murray Barnson. 1967. "The South Dravidian Languages." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 87.4: 365-413.
- Emeneau, Murray Barnson. 1969. "Onomatopoeics in the Indian Linguistic Area." *Language* 45.2: 274-299. Rpt. in Dil (ed.), 250-293.
- Emeneau, Murray Barnson. 1971. "The Indian Linguistic Area." *Symposium on Dravidian Civilization*, ed. by Andrée F. Sjoberg, 34-68. Austin and New York: Jenkins Publishing Company. (= *Asian Series of the Center for Asian Studies of The University of Texas at Austin*, 1.) Rpt. in Dil (ed.), 167-196.
- Emeneau, Murray Barnson. 1974. "The Indian Linguistic Area Revisited." *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 31.1: 92-134. Rpt. in Dil (ed.), 197-249.
- Ernout, Alfred and Antoine Meillet. 1985. *Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue latine, histoire des mots*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed., quatrième triage augmenté d'additions et de corrections nouvelles par Jacques André. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
- Gopinathan Nair, B. 2004. Review of Krishnamurti (2003). *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 33.1: 205-222.
- Grassmann, Hermann. 1873. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. 4., unveränderte Aufl. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1964.
- Hakola, Hannu Panu Aukusti. 2009. *Lexical Affinities Between Tamil and Finnish (A Contribution to Nostratic Studies from the Angle of Close Genetic Affinities Between the Dravidian and Uralic Language Families)*. Kuopio, Finland: H. P. A. Hakola.



- Haspelmath, Martin and Uri Tadmor. 2009. *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: DeGruyter Mouton.
- Hiersche, Rolf. 1964. *Untersuchungen zur Frage der Tenues aspiratae im Indogermanischen*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1975. "Substratum Influence on (Rig-Vedic) Sanskrit." *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 5.2 (Fall): 76-125. (= *Papers on Historical Linguistics: Theory and Method*, ed. by Ladislav Zgusta and Hans Henrich Hock. Urbana, Illinois: Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois.)
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1996. "Pre-Ṛgvedic Convergence Between Indo-Aryan (Sanskrit) and Dravidian? A Survey of the Issues and Controversies." *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit, Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language*, ed. by Jan E. M. Houben, 17-58. Leiden: E. J. Brill. (= *Brill's Indological Library*, 13.)
- Hume, Robert Ernest (tr.). 1931. *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads ... with an Outline of the Philosophy of the Upanishads*, 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Rpt. London: Oxford University Press, 1971. (1<sup>st</sup> ed., 1921.)
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1941. *Die alt-indoarischen Wörter mit -ṇḍ-, besonders im Ṛgveda*. Dissertation. München. See Karl Zistl, *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch* 30 (1947-48; issued 1955), 142-143 (no. 92). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1938. *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Rpt. New York: The Free Press, 1968. (1<sup>st</sup> ed., 1905; 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed., 1912.)
- Keith, Arthur Berriedale. 1925. *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. [= *Harvard Oriental Series*, 31 and 32.]
- Kittel, Ferdinand. 1894. *A Kannada-English Dictionary*. Mangalore: Basel Mission Book and Tract Depository.
- Konow, Sten. 1903. "Notes on Dravidian Philology." *The Indian Antiquary* 32: 449-458.
- Kramrisch, Stella. 1975. "The Mahāvīra Vessel and the Plant Pūtika." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 95.2: 222-235.

- Krishnamurti, Bhadriraju. 1961. *Telugu Verbal Bases, A Comparative and Descriptive Study*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. (= *University of California Publications in Linguistics*, 24.)
- Krishnamurti, Bhadriraju. 2003. *The Dravidian Languages*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus. 1948. *Proto-Munda Words in Sanskrit*. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij. (= *Verhandeling der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks Deel 51, No. 3.*)
- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus. 1955. "Rigvedic Loanwords." *Studia Indologica, Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel zur Vollendung seines 70 Lebensjahres*, ed. by Otto Spies, 137-185. Bonn: Selbstverlag des Orientalischer Seminars der Universität Bonn. (= *Bonner Orientalistische Studien, n.s. 3.*) Rpt. in *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 31.2 (1992): 1-49.
- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus. 1967. "The Genesis of a Linguistic Area." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 10.2-3: 81-102. Rpt in *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 3.1 (1974): 135-153.
- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus. 1984. "Was the *pūṭīka* a Mushroom?" *Amṛtadhara, Professor R. N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume*, ed. by S. D. Joshi, 219-227. Delhi: Ajanta Publications.
- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus. 1991. *Aryans in the Rigveda*. Amsterdam and Atlanta, Georgia: Rodopi. (= *Leiden Studies in Indo-European*, 1.)
- Kumaraswami Raja, N. 1969. *Post-Nasal Voiceless Plosives in Dravidian*. Annamalainagar: Annamalai University. (= *Department of Linguistics Publication*, 18.)
- Lanman, Charles Rockwell. 1884. *A Sanskrit Reader, Text and Vocabulary and Notes*. Rpt. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Lévi, Sylvain, Jean Przyluski and Jules Bloch. 1929. *Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India*. Compiled and translated from the French by Prabodh Chandra Bagchi. Calcutta: The University of Calcutta.

- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 1977 and 1979. "The *Sahyādrīkhaṇḍa*: Some Problems Concerning a Text-Critical Edition of a Puranic Text." *Purāṇa* 19.1: 8-40, 21.1: 77-79.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 1980. "Sanskrit  $\sqrt{\text{mand/mad}}$ , 'Background Noise' and Dravidian." *The Journal of Sanskrit Academy, Osmania University* 2: 25-64.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 1989a. "Mushrooms in Dravidian." *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 18.1: 1-41 and 2-sided foldout, 18.2: 1-12.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 1989b. "The Alternation of *r* and *l* in Dravidian." *Indian Linguistics* 50: 130-146. "Errata" in *Indian Linguistics* 52 (1991): 149-150. (This paper was very sloppily set, and was printed with an abundance of printing errors. Hopefully, if I can publish a collection of my papers on Dravidian topics, this will be published in corrected copy in that place.)
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 1995-96. "II. Sanskrit *brāhman* and Semitic *BRK*." *Indologica Taurinensia* 21-22: 215-248. "Corrigenda" published as a 2-page insert in back of *Indologica Taurinensia* 28 (2002). Insert not included in all copies of the volume. (This paper was supposed to have been proofread in Turin, but it never was. This resulted in its being published with a wide array of printing errors. Hopefully, if I can publish a general collection of my Indological articles, this will be published in that place without these errors.)
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 1991-92. "Chess – Its South Asian Origin and Meaning." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 72-73: 533-547, 6 figures (unnumbered).
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 1998. "Is There a Genetic Relationship Between Indo-European and Dravidian?" *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 26.1-2: 131-159.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 2001. "III. Sanskrit *ātman*/*tmán* and Dravidian *\*āḷ*, A Possible Solution to a Problem Based on a Postulated Nostatic Sound Correspondence." *Indologica Taurinensia* 27: 95-120.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 2003a. "New Dravidian Etymologies for Sanskrit Words." *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 32.2: 7-22.



- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 2003b. "The Alternation of \*-l-/\*-l̥- and \*t- in Metathetical Forms in Dravidian." *Folia Linguistica Historica* 24.1-2: 175-192.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 2008a. "Skt. *indra*: Grassmann's Connection with  $\sqrt{\text{indh}}$  Again." *Indologica Taurinensia* 34: 211-264.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 2008b. "Dravidian and Austroasiatic." *Chemmozhi* 2.2-3: 31-33.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 2009. "The Ancient Mesopotamian Place Name 'Meluhḥa'." *Studia Orientalia* 107: 135-176.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 2010. "Fortunatov's Law and Dravidian." *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 39.1: 19-90.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 2011. "New Considerations Regarding the Identity of Vedic *sóma* as the Mushroom Fly-Agaric." To appear in *Studia Orientalia* 111.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 2011- . "The Alternation of Initial Consonants in Dravidian." *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 40.2: 129-146; to be continued.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. [in press] "The Number 'One'." Submitted to *Mother Tongue* in April 2010.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. [in press] "Vedic-Ancient Mesopotamian Interconnections and Dating of the Indian Tradition." Submitted to *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* in September 2010.
- Lisker, Leigh. 1951. "Tamil Verb Classification." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 71: 111-114.
- McAlpin, David. 1981. *Proto-Elamo-Dravidian: The Evidence and Its Implications*. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society. (= *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 71.3.)
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1956-80. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, 4 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag. (1953-56.) [= *KEWA*]
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1992-2001. *Eymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen*, 3 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitäts-Verlag. (1986-92.) [= *EWA*]



- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, new ed. Rpt. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1970. [= MW]
- Müller, F. Max (tr.). 1879-84. *The Upaniṣads*, 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Rpt. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1962, (= *The Sacred Books of the East*, 1 and 15.)
- Müller, F. Max (ed.). 1890. *Rig-Veda-Saṃhitā, The Sacred Hymns of the Brāhmins, Together with the Commentary of Sāyaṇācārya*, 4 vols. 2<sup>nd</sup>. ed. London: Henry Frowde.
- O'Malley, L. S. S. 1935. *Popular Hinduism, The Religion of the Masses*. Cambridge: The University Press.
- Parpola, Asko (tr.). 1969. *The Śrautasūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyana and Their Commentaries, An English Translation and Study*, 1.2 *The Agniṣṭoma (LŚS I-II, DŚS I-VI)*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica. (= *Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum*, 43.2.)
- Pischel, Richard. 1957. *Comparative Grammar of the Prākṛit Languages*. Translated from the German by Subhadra Jhā. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., with added index by Martino De Zilva Wickiremasinghe published earlier in parts as supplements to *Indian Antiquary* 34-38 (1905-1909), Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965. (Original, 1900 [= *Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde* 1.8].)
- Pokorny, Julius. 1959-69. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols. Bern and München: A. Franke Verlag.
- Rajam, V. S. 1992. *A Reference Grammar of Classical Tamil Poetry (150 B.C. – pre-fifth/sixth century A.D.)*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society. (= *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society*, 199.)
- Ramaswami Aiyar, L. V. 1935-38. "Dravidic Sandhi." *The Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society*, n.s. 25.4: 265-270, 26.1-2: 91-112, 26.3-4: 169-185, 27.1-2: 35-53, 27. 3-4: 239-265, 28.1: 20-27, 28.2: 94-110, 28.4: 306-311.
- Renou, Louis. 1959. Review of *KEWA*, Lief 6-11 (*bis pásyati*). *Kratylos* 4: 42-46. Saminathier, U. V. [Cāminātaiyar, U. Vē.] (ed.). 1931. *Maṇimēkalai*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Ceṇṇai: Kēcari Accukkūṭam.
- Śāstrī, Viśvabandhu. 1935-65. *A Vedic Word-Concordance*, 5 vols. in 16 (vol. 1.1, 1942). Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute. (= *The Śāntakuṭī Vedic Series*, 1-15, 15a.)





- Scharfe, Hartmut. 2006. "Indo-Aryan and Dravidian Convergence: Gerunds and Noun Composition." *Themes and Tasks in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan Linguistics*, ed. by Bertil Tikkänen and Heinrich Hettrich, 197-253. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers. (= *Papers of the 12<sup>th</sup> World Sanskrit Conference, Held in Helsinki, Finland, 13-18 July, 2003*, ed. by Petteri Koskikallio and Asko Parpola, 5.)
- Sivertsen, Dagfin. 1963. *When Caste Barriers Fall, A Study of Social and Economic Change in a South Indian Village*. [Oslo]: Universitets Forlaget and George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Southworth, Franklin C. 1974. "Linguistic Stratigraphy of India." *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 3.2: 201-223.
- Southworth, Franklin C. 1979. "Lexical Evidence for Early Contacts Between Indo-Aryan and Dravidian." *Aryan and Non-Aryan in India*, ed. by Madhav M. Deshpande and Peter Edwin Hook, 191-233. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, The University of Michigan. (= *Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia*, 14.)
- Subrahmanya Sastri, P. S. (tr.). 1930. *Tolkāppiyam, The Earliest Extant Tamil Grammar, with a Short Commentary in English, 1: Eḷuttatikāram*. Madras: Published in The Journal of Oriental Research. (= *Madras Oriental Series*, 3.)
- Subrahmanyam, P. S. 2004. Review of Krishnamurti (2003). *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 33.1: 185-204.
- Turner, Ralph Lilley. 1929-30. Review of *Prakritic and Non-Aryan Strata in the Vocabulary of Sanskrit* by A. C. Woolner. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 5: 128-129.
- Turner, Ralph Lilley. 1966-85. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London: Oxford University Press, 1966. *Indexes*, comp. by Dorothy Rivers Turner, 1969. *Phonetic Analysis*, by Ralph Lilley Turner and Dorothy Rivers Turner, 1971. *Addenda and Corrigenda*, ed. by J. C. Wright, 1985. [= *CDIAL*]
- Wackernagel, Jakob. 1896-1964. *Altindische Grammatik*, 3 vols. Bd. 1, *Lautlehre* (1896). *Nachträge zu Bd. 1*, by Albert Debrunner (1957). Bd. 2.1, *Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition* (1905). *Nachträge zu Bd. 2.1*, by Albert Debrunner



- ner (1957). Bd. 2.2, *Die Nominalsuffixe*, by Albert Debrunner (1954). Bd. 3, *Nominalflexion – Zahlwort – Pronomen*, by Albert Debrunner and Jakob Wackernagel (1930). *Register zur Altindische Grammatik von J. Wackernagel und A. Debrunner (Bd. 1-3)*, by Richard Hauschild (1964). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Wasson, R. Gordon. 1968. *Soma, Divine Mushroom of Immortality*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World. Rpt. [New York]: Harcourt Brace Jovanovic, Inc., [1972]. (= *Ethno-mycological Studies*, 1.)
- Weber, Albrecht. 1850-98. *Indische Studien: Beiträge für die Kunde des indischen Alterthums*, 18 vols. in 17. Berlin: F. Dummler, 1850-63; Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1865-98.
- Weber, Albrecht (ed.). 1852. *The Vājasaneyi-Saṅhitā in the Mādhyandina and the Kāṅva-Śākhā, with the Commentary of Mahīdhara*. Berlin: F. Dümmler; London: Williams and Northgate. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1972. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.= *Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series*, 103.)
- Werba, Chlodwig H. 1997. *Verba indoarica: die primären und sekundären Wurzeln der Sanskrit-Sprache*, Pars I: *Radices primariae*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Westergaard, Niels Ludvig. 1841. *Radices Linguae Sanscritae*. Bonnae ad Rhenum: H. B. König.
- Whitney, William Dwight. 1885. *Roots, Verb-Forms and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language*. Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel. Rpt. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1945. (Rpt.= *American Oriental Series*, 30.)
- Whitney, William Dwight. 1889. *Sanskrit Grammar*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 9<sup>th</sup> issue, 1960.
- Willman-Grabowska, Hélène de. 1929-30. "L'idée de l'Ātmán du Rigveda au Brāhmaṇa." *Rocznik orientalistyczny* 7: 10-25.
- Wilson, Horace Hayman. 1832. *A Dictionary in Sanscrit and English, Translated, Amended and Enlarged from an Original Compilation Prepared by Learned Natives for the College of Fort William*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Calcutta: Printed at the Education Press.



- Witzel, Michael. 2001. "Substrate Languages in Old Indo-Aryan." *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 30.2: 1-94. See also "Substrate Languages in Old Indo-Aryan (R̥gvedic, Middle and Late Vedic)" in *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies* 5.1 (August 1999): 1-67, and "Early Sources for South Asian Substrate Languages" in *Mother Tongue*, special issue (October 1999): 1-71.
- Zvelebil, Kamil V. 1970. *Comparative Dravidian Phonology*. The Hague: Mouton. (= *Janua Linguarum, Series Practica*, 80.)
- Zvelebil, Kamil V. 1990. *Dravidian Linguistics, An Introduction*. Pondicherry: Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture.

