

STEPHAN HILLYER LEVITT

ON THE ETYMOLOGY OF SKT. *ĀNDHRA*

The Sanskrit forms *Andhra* and *Āndhra* refer primarily to a group of people, generally understood to be the Telugu-speaking people of South India. Both forms refer as well to the Telugu country, and to a king of that country (*MW* 45a, 142a; Ghatage *et al.* 1976- /7: 3811b-3812a).

The form with a short initial ‘a-’ also refers to a person of low caste, an offspring of a Vaideha father and a *Kārāvāra* (see *MW* 274b) mother who lives by killing game (see above references, as well). It is this usage which is the oldest, occurring first in *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* [*adhyāya*] 33, [*khaṇḍa*] 6 (Ghatage *et al.* 1976- /7: 3811b; *PW* 1: 259, *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* 7, 18), *Śāṅkhāyanaśrautasūtra* 15.26.1, and in the *Mahābhārata* and *Mānavadharmasāstra*, for instance. In the *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* it is placed side-by-side with *Puṇḍras* [the people of Bihar and Bengal, supposed to be descended from (*sg.*) a son of the *daitya* Bali of this name], *Śabaras* [a wild mountaineer tribe in the Deccan; the son of a *śūdra* and a Bhilli (*lex.*)], *Pulindas* [a barbarous tribe], and *Mūtibas* [a people].

The oldest usages of the form with a short initial ‘a-’ clearly referring to the Telugu-speaking people occur in the *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* 50(1).6, in the *Mahābhārata*, and in the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*, for instance. In its usage as referring to the name of the Telugu country, it occurs first in the *Mahābhārata*, in the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*, and in various *purāṇas*, for instance. The form *andhrī-kṛ-* (Ghatage *et al.* 1976- /7: 3813a) is noted in *Epigraphia Indica* as meaning ‘to translate into the *Andhra* language’.

The two forms, one with short initial “a-” and one with long initial “ā-” are given as alternate forms in the *Mahābhārata* in Sørensen (1904: 37a).

The Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Sanskrit on Historical Principles by Amrit Madhav Ghatage *et al.* (1976-) is not up to “ā-” yet.

MW 142a derives the form with a long initial “ā-” from within Sanskrit from the form with a short initial “a-”, and takes its primary meaning to be ‘belonging to the *Andhra* people’ > ‘the *Andhra* country’, ‘a king of that country’. But as a masculine plural form, it refers to ‘the inhabitants of that country’, which is to say ‘the *Andhra* people’. *PW* 1: 648 understands the form with a long initial “ā-” to be equivalent to the same with a short initial “a-”.

On the basis of the present available sources, the form with a long initial “ā-” would seem to occur first in the *Mahābhārata*.

The Sanskrit forms are without etymology.

Further, while *KEWA* and *EWA* treat *Draviḍa* / *Drāviḍa*, there is no mention of *Andhra* / *Āndhra*.

In the interest of comprehensiveness, I did a Google search for “Andhra meaning in Telugu”. Under “What is the meaning of Andhra in Telugu? / Yahoo Answers”, it is noted that the best answer given, dated December 21, 2009, was “The name Andhra [spelled as in English] means ‘Leader in Battle’”. I can note that this is not entirely discordant with the suggestion to be given below in this paper, as will be seen.

In recent years, Irvatham Mahadevan has suggested that the Sanskrit forms *Andhra* and *Āndhra* are an adaptation of an Indus Valley language masculine singular suffix attached as an honorific to the personal names and titles of the Harappan ruling classes. This suffix came to be generalized as a loan form in Sanskrit to denote the neighboring Dravidian-speaking people (Mahadevan 1970: 174 [§1.22], 179 [§1.41], 1973: 52 [§4.8], 2009b: 101-102 [§4.5; online version, pp. 11-12], 2010: 13-14 [§8], 2015: 20).¹

¹ Mahadevan’s interpretation of this suffix has developed through time. Compare as in the references given immediately below for Mahadevan’s overall interpretation of the “jar” sign, for instance.

Such a development, though, would be very unusual. The more normal development would be, for instance, PDr **il* ‘place’, ‘house, home’ (*DEDR* 494) > the locative suffix *-il* in Tamil, for instance (see Fabricius 1933: 88b, *TED* 1.2: 344b-345a).

The masculine singular suffix in Indus Valley script, according to Mahadevan, is represented by the “jar” sign. This sign has been interpreted before as a post-fixed determinative, as a genitive suffix, as representing the Dravidian oblique or attributive case-morpheme, and as representing a suffixed element such as “servant” used in the formation of proper names. Nor has there been general agreement as to the object represented by the symbol. It has been seen to represent a jar with lip and handles, a stylized pipal tree, or a ship (Mahadevan 1970: 165-167 [§§1.1-1.5]). Mahadevan’s overall interpretation is with more convincing reason. For Mahadevan’s interpretation, see Mahadevan (1970: 165-179 [§§1.1-1.41], 1998, 2009b: 99-102 [§§4.1-4.5; online version, pp. 10-12], 2011: 7-9 [§§1.9-1.13]).

The masculine singular suffix is *-ṅ* in Tamil and *-nru* ~ *-ṅdu*, *-ndu* in Old Telugu, normally *-du* in modern Telugu, with reflexes in other CDr and in NDr, the latter going back to PDr **-nṭ*. The shift in Old Telugu from *nṛ* to *ṅḍ* was well on its way by the 9th c. CE and orthographic replacement of *nṛ* by *ṅḍ* appears from the 10th c. onwards. Zvelebil (1970: 172 [§1.40.6.1]) notes, “PDr **nṭ* remained in all Dravidian languages for a long time after the separation of the various groups and sub-groups. ... The merger of **ṭ* in this cluster with a dental or cacuminal stop began to operate comparatively late, prob. independently in each sub-family and/or language.”

Krishnamurti (1961: 70-71 [§1.165]) derives the sequence **nṭ* < the assimilation of a suffixal *-t-* to a preceding alveolar **n* [*n*]. See also Zvelebil (1970: 172 [§1.40.6.1]) who notes, citing this reference in Krishnamurti (1961), “The sequence **-n-ṭ-* is to be regarded as PDr. One source of the cluster was probably ***n-t-* through the assimilation of a suffixal **-t-* to the preceding alveolar **n*.” And see Krishnamurti (2003: 94 [§4.3.1]).

The addition of **-t-* can also be seen in the formation of numbers in Dravidian (Levitt 1989: 140-141, 2012: 157). See Krishnamurti (2003: 213 [§6.2.5]) regarding this being the neuter (non-person) suffix, perhaps to be considered the non-masculine gender suffix, rather than neuter (Krishnamurti 2003: 210 [§6.2.2], n.6).

However elsewhere, Krishnamurti accounts for PDr **n̄t̄* as coming from **n + *t̄*, not taking into account the development of this conjunct through a normal operation of euphonic combination (2003: 138 [§4.5.3.2]).

Krishnamurti takes the **t̄* in the masculine singular suffix **-n̄t̄* to be probably a nominative singular suffix or perhaps a nominative marker (1961: 263 [§4.44], 2003: 216 [§6.2.6]). This possibly would not be an inconceivable development from **-t-* in combination with the masculine singular marker alveolar **n* [n̄] in an interpretation of **-n̄t̄* as being in fact ***-n-t- > *-n-t̄-*.

The CDr and NDr masculine singular suffix is seen to reflect the PDr situation, Tamil and other SDr languages having lost the **t̄* of the suffix (Krishnamurti 1961: 263 [§4.44], 2003: 209 [Table 6.2], n. 3, 216 [§6.2.6]) – more properly, the **t* of the suffix.²

² D. Savariroyan (1907-8: 271) has earlier suggested a genetic connection between the singular neuter, or non-human (SDr) and non-masculine (most CDr and NDr) suffix *-t* (*-tu* euphonic) attached to Dravidian demonstrative and interrogative bases such as Ta. *a-tu, i-tu, e-tu*, and parallel Indo-European suffixes such as the Sanskrit nominative and accusative singular neuter declensions of the demonstrative and relative pronouns, Skt. *tat, etat*, and *yat*; Latin *illud, id, quod*; and English *that, it, what* (neuter of *who*). It has not escaped my notice that from a Nostratic vantage, the Brahui development of **-n̄t̄- > s* and the Kurux and Malto development of **-t̄-* to *r* and *s* (Kurux also *rr*), with the Kurux masculine singular third person demonstrative pronoun being *ās* (Malto being *āh*; **c/s > h* in several CDr languages such as Maṇḍa, Kui, and Kuwi), may be in genetic relationship with the Indo-European nominative singular masculine declensional suffix *-s*. This would correlate the masculine singular suffix in CDr and NDr, and PDr, with that in Indo-European. (Brahui has lost gender distinction in the third person demonstrative pronoun, and has extended the non-human, or non-masculine category to the masculine (human), preserving only the number distinction of singular and plural.) See Dolgopolsky (2008: no. 2006), which would connect the Indo-European nominative singular masculine declensional suffix *-s* as well with the stem of the Indo-European nominative singular masculine and feminine demonstrative pronoun **so(s)*, **sā* (Pokorny 1959-69/1: 978-979). Levitt (2014: 165 [2013: 77]), differently, on the basis of the sporadic replacement of **t-* by *c-/s-* in Dravidian, which he

It ought to be noted in passing that alveolar *ɳ* is in evidence only in Tamil and Malayalam. It is not clear whether this indicates two phonemes in PDr, or whether *ɳ* is merely an allophonic variation of **n*. The general consensus today is that *ɳ* is an allophonic variation of *n* in PDr (*DEDR* xii-xiii, n. 5, Zvelebil 1970: 129-130 [§1.28.1], Krishnamurti 2003: 138-139 [§4.5.3.2]).

Mahadevan understands his identification to have homonyms in PDr. See, for instance, Mahadevan (1970: 157-161 [§§0.1-0.7], 1973: 48-49 [§§2.8, 2.10-2.13], 1998: 70) regarding his methodology.

By the rebus method that Mahadevan employs, the “jar” sign is seen to be identified by such supposed homonyms with the PDr masculine singular suffix that signify “jar” as Ka. *aṇḍige*, Te. *aṇḍemu*, *aṇḍiyamu*, *aḍigamu* ‘panier’ (*DEDR* 127); Ko. *aṇḍy* ‘milk pot, bamboo pot’, To. *aḍy* ‘clay pot’, Ka. *aṇḍe* ‘bamboo vessel with handle’, Tu. *aṇḍè* ‘bamboo or nutshell vessel’ (*DEDR* 130); Ta. *antai* ‘an ancient standard weight’ (see *TED* 1.1: 230b, which derives it in that location from *aṇḍai* [= *DEDR* 130] ‘a contraption that squirts water, used on certain festive occasions’ [*TED* 1.1: 169b]). With regard to Ta. *antai*, note that *DEDR* 127 defines Ka. *aṇḍige* as ‘one panier or pack, half a bullock load’, that is, a measure of weight. By phonetic transfer, the “jar” sign is equated with *-*ṇḍi*, the masculine singular suffix added to names and titles in the nominative case (Mahadevan 2009b: 100-101 [§4.4; online version, p. 11], 2011: 8 [§1.12]).³

sees to go back to pre-Dravidian, connects the latter with the regular stem of the Indo-European demonstrative pronoun **to-*, **tā-*, **tjo-* (Pokorny 1959-69/1:1086-1087), listed separately in Dolgopolsky (2008: no. 2310). (The latter, Dolgopolsky connects with the Dravidian neuter [inanimate gender] ending *-tu* in pronouns and numerals [see immediately above] and with the Dravidian etyma in *DEDR* 3196 Ta. *tāṇ* and *DEDR* 3162 Ta. *tām*. Levitt [2003: 184 (no. 30)] has connected the etyma in *DEDR* 3196 and *DEDR* 3162 as well with the etyma in *DEDR* 399 Ta. *āḷ* [as below] through a regular process of metathesis. And Levitt [2003: 179, 2014: 169 (2013: 83)] has suggested a connection between the Indo-European demonstrative pronoun and the Tamil locative suffix *-il*. See in this regard, as well, Levitt [1998: 149 (no. 19)].)

³ I shall not go into Mahadevan’s later “Early Dravidian” identification for the “jar” sign when in compound with the “bearer” sign, which he sees to be related to later Sanskrit

Further supporting his identification of the signification of the “jar” sign, Mahadevan provides such additional forms with the general meaning ‘male, elder person’ that appear to be connected to the masculine singular suffix **-n̄* as Pe. and Mand. *anḍren* ‘male, man’, Kui *anḍra* ‘a male’, Kur. *anḍrā* ‘male (of animals)’, *anḍyā* ‘a haughty man’, Skt. (lex.) *anḍīra* ‘male’ (*DED* and *DEDS* 111); Ta. *tantai* ‘father’, Te. *tanḍri*, (inscr.) *tanri* ‘father’, etc. (*DED* 2494 [*DEDR* 3067]).

And in keeping with his method of parallelisms, he suggests that ultimately derived from the honorific usage of the masculine singular suffix are such personal, clan, and dynastic names of Dravidian rulers as *aṅṭiran* ‘a personal name of Āy, a Vēḷ chieftain (*Puram.*, 129), *aṅṭar* ‘clan name of chieftains of cow-herds’ (*Akam.*, 59), *ātan* ‘a common personal name among the Chēras (mentioned in Mahadevan 1970: 174 [§1.22]; dropped in Mahadevan 1973: 49 [§2.13]), and *āndhra* (Mahadevan 1970), *andhra* (Pkt. *andha*; Mahadevan 1973) ‘dynastic name of Āndhra kings and the tribe’.

Further in keeping with his method of parallelisms, Mahadevan also entertains early on (1970: 171-173 [§1.18]) a parallel with a classical Tamil prefixed and suffixed honorific *a(n)tai* in both free and bound forms, which honorific is derived from the demonstrative pronominal base **a-* (*DEDR* 1), to which he early on sees the masculine singular suffix to be exclusively attached. He cites as examples *antai-y Pikaṅ* (*TBI*, 13) in which *antai* is a prefixed honorific, *Kuvīra antai* (*TBI*, 25) in which *antai* is a suffixed honorific in free form, *Koṅṛantai* (*TBI*, 65) in which *antai* is a suffixed honorific in bound form, *Patiṅ-ūr atai* (*TBI*, 23) in which *atai* functions as a suffix to a place name to indicate a male person’s status therein, and in kinship terms with a pronominal possessive prefix, *tantai-y* (*TBI*, 2). Mahadevan, probably quite correctly, takes **-an̄-* and **-ant-* to be allomorphs of one another.

Mahadevan in due course drops his reference to such forms as in *DED* and *DEDS* 111 when *DEN* and *DEDR*, citing *CDIAL*

Andhra dynastic names (2009a: 28[§2.8], 32-33 [§§2.19-2.20], 2010: 14-16 [§§9-13], 2011: 9 [§1.14], 2015: 22).

50ab (no. 1111), removes these forms from the Dravidian lexicon, viewing them instead to be loan forms in Dravidian from Indo-Aryan (see *DEN* which lists these forms as *DBIA* [=Dravidian Borrowings from Indo-Aryan] S1 [p. 477b], *DEDR* App. 7 [p. 509b]). *CDIAL* 1111 includes such forms as Or. *aṅḍirā* ‘male’ and B. *āṅruā* ‘bull-calf’ with such forms as Skt. *āṅḍā* n. ‘egg’ (*R̥gveda*), *du.* ‘testicles’ (*Atharvaveda*), *aṅḍa* (Epic), and its Middle Indo-Aryan and New Indo-Aryan correlates. The latter is often viewed to be related within Indo-European to OSl. *jeḍro* ‘testicle’. See *KEWA* 1: 26, 72, 3: 626, *EWA* 1: 56, 162-163, 3: 9, 21, Levitt (2011: 142, 161). With regard to such a signification as ‘bull-calf’ compare *DED* and *DEDS* 111 and *DEDR* App. 7 Pa. *eṅḍka* ‘young male pig’, Kur. *aṅḍyā* ‘fierce, unmanageable (of bulls, bullocks, and male buffaloes), Malt. *aṅḍya* ‘a bull’. Also compare Skt. (lex.) *aṅḍīra* ‘uncastrated’ as well as ‘manly’, with S. *ānīru*, L. *ānur* ‘uncastrated’, P. *āṅḍū*, Ku. *āḍu*, N. *āṅru*, H. *āḍū* ‘uncastrated’ (*CDIAL* 1111).

To be noted with regard to the PDr masculine singular suffix that Mahadevan cites, and with regard to the various supporting lexemes that he suggests, is that Mahadevan is often playing fast and loose with phonology. The forms he cites as signifying “jar” in *DEDR* 127 and in *DEDR* 130 reconstruct to PDr **aṅḍ-*, with a retroflex nasal and a retroflex dental, not to PDr **-ṅḍ-*, in which we have an alveolar nasal and an alveolar plosive. The only way in which the two could be homophones is if both **ṅḍ-* and **ṅḍ-* in the target language had resulted in *ṅḍ*, as occurs in Telugu, regarding the timing of such development in which, see above. In NDr, which I have maintained elsewhere Meluḥḥan, or Indus Valley speech is, on the basis of Meluḥḥan words preserved in Ancient Mesopotamian texts and on the basis of Dravidian loan forms in early Sanskrit (see Levitt 2009, 2011: esp. 172-178), **ṅḍ* > Kur. Malt. *ṅḍ*, Br. *s*, while **ṅḍ* > Kur. *ṅḍ*, Malt. Br. *ṅḍ*.

There might be some help in this regard, however, in what I see to be early Dravidian loan forms in Vedic Sanskrit, which may indicate early confusion between alveolars, retroflexes, and dentals due to an alveolar pronunciation of retroflexes and, at the very least in some instances, of what were later considered

in Sanskrit dentals, as occurred in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian (see Levitt 2010: 23-25, 76, 2011: 151, 179-184, esp. 184, with regard to this latter point). Thus, Levitt (2011: 160) sees 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-ał-*, to suggest the source for the *Ṛgveda* and *Vājasaneyisaṃhitā* word *kuṇḍṛnācī* ‘house lizard (according to Sāyaṇa on *Ṛgveda* 1.29.6)’, the Dravidian form being collapsed slightly differently so as to obtain **kul-nt* (the *-ō* of the suffix *-ōnt* being structurally a union vowel). So also, Levitt (2011: 161-165) sees Skt. *cāṇḍā*, °ī ‘fierce, violent, cruel, hot, etc.; name of Durgā’, for which the earliest citation is in the *Atharvaveda*, to fall in with *DEDR* 276 Ta. *aṛal* (*aṛalv-*, *aṛaṇr-*) and *DEDR* 3115 Ta. *taṛal* (*taṛalv-*, *taṛaṇr-*), the syllabic loss being involved here being suggested, for instance, by the Kui forms *dlāva*, *dlāba*, *jlāva*, listed here currently with question in *DEDR*. With regard to the semantic match-up here, see the table on p. 165 (=Table II). Normally, *-l + -nt-* > **-nt-* [*l + n > ṅ, ṅ + t > *-nt-*]. Here, **-nt-* > *-ṇḍ-* is postulated. Also note the confusion in *Ṛgveda* manuscripts between *rāṇḍryā* and *rāṇḍyā*, which form occurs only once in *RV* 6.23.6. This form is without clear derivation (Levitt 2011: 142, 195 [Table V], 230-231). It must be noted that **-nt-*, realized in the standard transcription used for Tamil as *-ṇr-*, is in modern formal and higher standard Tamil pronounced as alveolar [ndr] (see Zvelebil 1970: 97, n. 21).

My suggestion with regard to the etymology of the Sanskrit forms *Andhra* and *Āndhra* is founded in part on the names that people give themselves worldwide, and in part on phonological parallels brought out in Levitt (2011).

Thus, the names that tribal groups in the hills around the Assam Valley in northeast India give themselves, such as “Dafla” and “Mizo”, mean ‘people’. So also, Bailey (1959: 109-110) has noted that such ethnic names as “Goth”, the name “Evenki” for the Tungus, and the name “Bantu”, are derived from words meaning ‘man’ or ‘men’. Bailey argues such is also the case for the people called by the ethnic name Ir. *daha-*, OPers. *dahā*. And as well, the name of the Finno-Ugric “Mari”

is said to have been borrowed from such a term in Indo-Iranian ([Anonymous] 2009b; Skt. *marya* ‘man, mortal; *pl.* people’ < PIE **merjo* [MW 791c, Pokorny 1959-69/1: 738-739]). See also Dolgopolsky (2008: no. 66), who attributes a meaning ‘member of one’s own ethnic group’ (→ ‘freeman’) for the PIE reflex of Skt. *ārya*, which carries a meaning in Sanskrit of ‘a respectable, honorable man, a man highly esteemed, noble’ (MW 152b; see Pokorny 1959-69/1: 67).

As well, Levitt (1998: 142-143 [no. 11], 2014: 170 [2013: 84-85]) has argued that Germ. *Deutsch* ‘popular, vulgar [speech]’, extended to an ethnic or national adjective < OHG *diota*, *diot* ‘people, nation’ (in the 15th and 16th c., “Dutch” was used in England in the same way as English now uses “German”, to refer to both the people and the language [OED 4: 1140a]) is genetically related to the name “Dravidian” (Skt. *draviḍa*). This latter is generally seen to be a reflex in Sanskrit of “Tamil” (Ta. *tamiṛ*; by the standard transcription used for Tamil itself, *tamiḷ*), the connection being suggested by the Sanskrit variants *dramiḍa* and *dramiḷa*, and the Pali and Prakrit reflexes *damiḷa*, *daviḷa*, *daviḍa* (see Caldwell 1913: 8-10, CDIAL 378b [no. 6632], EWA 3: 272-273). There have been many suggestions as to the meaning of the name “Tamil”, but a meaning ‘people, nation’ used as well to refer to their common language, is suggested from a literary aspect by Sivaraja Pillai (1936: 344-346; see Levitt 1998 write-up and Levitt 2009: 145, 2010: 22). Levitt also argues that related here is the ancient name “Druid”, for which the present etymologies given are questionable, and are perhaps even fanciful (see OED 4: 1081c, Pei 1962: 223, 227-228, Quiggin 1910: 597a). With regard to parallel examples with inserted and dropped “r”, see Levitt (2014: 170-172 [2013: 84-87]).

Phonologically, Levitt (2011: 175-176) has suggested that Skt. *kúśindha* ‘a trunk [of a tree]’, which occurs only in the *Atharvaveda*, the *Kāṭhakaḡrhyasūtra*, and the *Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa*, and which is otherwise without convincing etymology (KEWA 1: 247, EWA 1: 382), is to be related to the etyma in DEDR 1842 Ta. *koṛaṭu* ‘small block or clump of wood, plank’ ... Ka. *koṛaḍu* ‘trunk of a lopped tree, stump,

piece of wood', etc. (PDr $*k[u/o]t-ā-$ / $*k[u/o]t-ant-: *kur-$), in which the Sanskrit form shows the development in North Dravidian of $*-t- > -s-$. Here, also, $*-nt- > -ndh-$.

So also, Levitt (2011: 167-168) has suggested that Skt. *karkāndhu* 'jujube', which occurs in the *Vājaneyisaṃhitā*, the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*, the *Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra*, and in later Sanskrit, is to be related to *DEDR* 2070 Ta. *koṭṭaiy-ilantai* 'woody-fruited jujube' ... *koṭṭai* 'jujube tree', etc. (PDr $*koṭ-$ / $*koṭt-: *koṭt-$), the Sanskrit form showing stem reduplication in which $-t- > -r-$ as occurs in Brahui and some CDr (elsewhere in NDr, and throughout Dravidian in various languages, $-t- > -r-$, or $-r-$ as well). For parallel examples of such stem reduplication in Sanskrit of Dravidian-derived stems, see Levitt (2011: 167-172). Here, as well, $*-nt- > -ndh-$. Skt. *karkāndhu* 'jujube' is otherwise without etymology (*KEWA* 1: 170, *EWA* 1: 312), though Witzel (2001: 54 [1999 *Mother Tongue* version, 10, 38]⁴) understands it to be an example of an Austroasiatic "Para-Munda" form with a double prefix *kār-/kəl-*. Witzel does not provide a comparable Austroasiatic form, however.

And see the variant Sanskrit forms *puṇḍra*, *pundra*, *puṇḍhra*, *puṇḍa* for a word that first appears in its meaning 'sectarian mark' in the *sūtra* literature (e.g., *Śāṅkhāyanaśrautasūtra*, *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra*). A Sanskrit form *tri-puṇḍhra* occurs first in *Śāṅkhāyanagr̥hyasūtra* 2.10.9. Levitt (2011: 209-211) connects these variant Sanskrit forms with the etyma in *DEDR* 4327 Ta. *puḷli* 'mark, dot, speck', etc. (PDr $*puḷl-/*poḷl-$) and in *DEDR* 4492 Ta. *poṭṭu* 'drop, spot, round mark worn on the forehead', etc. (PDr $*poṭt-/*p[a/u]tt-: *pūtt-/*poṭt-$). In Levitt (2011) it is argued, with abundant parallel examples, that such Sanskrit forms are derived from Dravidian forms the stems of which end in $*-l$ or $*-l$ to which a common Dravidian formative suffix $*-nt-$ has been added ($-l + -nt- > *-nt-$ [$l + n > n$, $n + t > *-nt-$]; and as noted earlier as well, $-l + -nt- > *-nt-$ [$l + n > n$, $n + t > *-nt-$], the reflex of the latter pronounced in modern formal and high standard Tamil as alveolar [ndr]).

⁴ The reference to this form on p. 10 of the 1999 printing appears to have been omitted due to a printing error in Witzel 2001 on p. 13.

The phonologically parallel Sanskrit forms that are cited here all occur in late Vedic literature, as do the first references to the Sanskrit form *Andhra*.

The Sanskrit forms *Andhra* and *Āndhra* are seen here to be derived from the etyma listed in *DEDR* 399 Ta. *āl*, which forms mean primarily ‘person’, ‘male person’, ‘manly person’. Thus,

DEDR 399 Ta. *āl* man, husband, servant, labourer, adult; *ālaṅ* husband; (Tinn.) *āliyan id.*; *āṅ* male, manliness, courage, superiority, warrior; *āṅaṅ* manly person; *āṅmai* manliness, virility, courage; *ātavaṅ* man, youth. Ma. *āl* a person, able person, servant, slave; *āṅ* male; *āṅma* bravery. Ko. *a-l* man, servant, husband. To. *o-l* man, Toda; *o-l* coolie (< Ta.). Ka. *āl* servant, soldier, messenger, a grown person in general; *āl*, *āṅ* male, manliness, bravery; *ālike* state of being a person; *ālutana*, *ālṭana* service; prowess, valour; *ālma*, *āṅma*, *āṅba* husband; *āṅmu* to be manly, vigorous; *n*. manliness, vigour. Koḍ. *a-lī* servant; *a-ṅī*, *a-ṅ a-lī* man, male; *a-ṅuṅṅī* male child (< *a-ṅī-kuṅṅī*). Tu. *ālṅ* person, labourer, messenger; *ālmage* servant; *āṅṅ* adj. male; *āṅṅjōvu*, *āṅṅṅvu* a male, a man (*jōvu* child); (Bright and Ramanujan) *āṅṅū* boy. Kur. *āl* adult male, husband, servant, mankind; *ālas* an adult male, person, husband, friend, servant, soldier. Malt. *āl-urqe* to grow up to maturity. Cf. 291 Ta. *aḷ* strength. *DED(S)* 342(a). [PNSDR *āl-/*āṅ-/*āt-].

Note here the Toda form *o-l*, which supports our etymology for *Andhra* and *Āndhra* here as it is used both to mean ‘man’ and as a self-designation of the group.

Also, note that all the forms listed here are either North or South Dravidian – the position of Tulu as belonging together with Central or South Dravidian being ambiguous. And note that the only form with a short initial “a-” in this grouping of etyma is Tu. *āṅṅṅvu* ‘a male, a man’. I feel certain, though, on the basis of the derivations in Levitt (2011) which add for the purpose of deriving Sanskrit forms a Dravidian formative suffix *-nt-* to Dravidian forms that end in either **-l* or **-l* that the

etyma currently listed in *DEDR* App. 7, all of which contain an initial short “a-”, and which contain both CDr and NDr forms, are to be grouped together with *DEDR* 399 Ta. *āl* just as the parallel forms listed in *DEDR* 400 Ta. *āṭṭi* ‘woman, wife’ are so listed.

The forms in *DEDR* 400 reconstruct to PDr **āl-/*āt-/*āṭṭ-/*āṇṭ-* : **āt-/*āṭṭ-* : **ār-*. Several of the CDr forms here reconstruct to **āl-*, such as Te. *ālu*, (inscr.) *ālu* (*pl. āṇḍru*) ‘woman, wife’, Konda *ālu* ‘wife’, which **in part** suggests why such CDr forms with “*ṛ*” are not found in *DEDR* 399. As well, the SDr forms here and many of the CDr forms are formed with the addition of a formative suffix *-t-* or *-tt-* to forms ending with **-ḷ*. With regard to classical Tamil reflexes of what may be argued are distinctly Dravidian rules of euphonic combination, see Rajam (1992: 106-107; *-ḷ + -t- > -ṭṭ-*, *-ḷ + -t- > -t-*). See also Krishnamurti (2003: 94 [§4.3.1]; *-ḷ + -t- > -t-*, *-ḷ + -tt- > -ṭṭ-*).

The forms in *DEDR* App. 7 would add the parallel Dravidian formative suffix *-nt-*. Thus,

DEDR App. 7 Pa. *eṇḍka* young male pig. Pe. *aṇḍren* (*pl. aṇḍraṇ*) male, man. Mand. *aṇḍren* (*pl. aṇḍraṇ*) *id.* Kui *aṇḍra* a male animal or bird; male. Kur. *aṇḍrā* male (said only of animals); *aṇḍyā* fierce, unmanageable (of bulls, bullocks, and male buffaloes), haughty, overbearing (of men). Malt. *aṇḍya* a bull. / Skt. (lex.) *aṇḍīra-* male, Or. *aṇḍīrā id.* (Cf. Turner, *CDIAL*, no. 1111. *DED(S)* 111, *DEN DBIA* [=Dravidian Borrowings from Indo-Aryan] S1. [PDr **aṇṭ-*].

The lexical Sanskrit form *aṇḍīra-* ‘uncastrated, manly’ (definitions as in *KEWA* 1: 626, *EWA* 3: 9), or ‘a full male, a man’ and ‘strong’ (definitions as in *MW* 12a), and the New Indo-Aryan parallel forms pointed to earlier in this paper would, in fact, be loan forms in Indo-Aryan, as listed initially in *DED* and *DEDS* 111 and as noted in passing early on in Mahadevan (1970: 174 [§1.21], 1973: 49 [§2.12]) – though not connected with the Central and North Dravidian masculine singular suffix as Mahadevan had suggested. These forms would have merged

with Skt. *āṇḍá n.* ‘egg’ (*Rgveda*; Burrow 1971: 545, also *ānda* in *Aitareyāranyaka* 3.1.2), *du.* ‘testicles’ (*Atharvaveda*), *aṇḍa* (Epic) and its Middle Indo-Aryan and New Indo-Aryan correlates, which forms would be of independent derivation (see above). This is indicated clearly in Ghatage *et al.* (1976- /2.1: 896a) where the Sanskrit lexical form *aṇḍīra-* is noted to mean not only ‘having testicles’, but also ‘competent (person), proud of valour’, ‘noble person’, and ‘virile person’. Compare the meanings given in *DEDR* 399 Ta. *āḷ*. And note that Skt. *aṇḍa* is listed as appearing with the meaning ‘individual’ in the *Bhāskarī* (Sarasvatī Bhavana Texts, Allahabad; Ghatage *et al.* [1976- /2.1: 889a-890a]).

As well related to the forms listed in *DEDR* 399 Ta. *āḷ* and *DEDR* 400 Ta. *āḷṭi*, and the forms currently listed in *DEDR* App. 7 Pa. *eṇḍka* would be the Sanskrit form *aṇḍara* ‘name of a tribe’ (*MW* 12a), which would be a later Sanskrit realization of the late Vedic forms *Andhra* and *Āndhra*, the phonology of the latter as in parallel late Vedic forms pointed out in Levitt (2011) and mentioned above. Skt. *aṇḍara* occurs mostly in Sanskrit grammatical works of various dates, starting with Pāṇini’s *Gaṇapāṭha* (Ghatage *et al.* 1976- /2.1: 894a).

Aside from the primary meanings of ‘person’, ‘male person’, ‘manly person’ for the etyma in *DEDR* 399 Ta. *āḷ* which I see to be the basis of the Sanskrit forms *Andhra* and *Āndhra*, also note such meanings as ‘warrior’ among the Tamil forms, ‘soldier’ among the Kannada and Kuṛux forms, ‘courage’ among the Tamil forms, ‘bravery’ among the Malayalam and Kannada forms, and as pointed to immediately above, ‘valour’ among the Kannada forms. We are thus brought back to the “Yahoo Answers” meaning ‘Leader in Battle’ that I found for “Andhra [spelled as in English]” on the Internet.

On the basis of comparison with the names of other ethnic groups worldwide, however, which mean primarily ‘people’, ‘men’, and perhaps ‘nobles’ or ‘respectable men’, such a meaning would perhaps be secondary, the primary meaning being ‘manly people’ or ‘brave people’.

But, perhaps, in the form’s early Sanskrit usages, when we consider its Sanskrit context, it may have been used with other

of the form's overtones to mean 'servants' or 'slaves'. This would be consonant with the way Sanskrit civilization viewed outsiders and people considered to be of low and mixed caste. Or, consonant with the Kurux parallel forms in *DEDR* App. 7, as well, it may have been used initially with the meaning 'fierce people' or 'unruly people'.

ABBREVIATIONS

- CDIAL* 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.
- DED* Burrow, Thomas and Murray Barnson Emeneau. 1961. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- DEDR* Burrow, Thomas and Murray Barnson Emeneau. 1984. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*, 2nd ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- DEDS* Burrow, Thomas and Murray Barnson Emeneau. 1968. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary, Supplement*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- DEN* Burrow, Thomas and Murray Barnson Emeneau. 1972. "Dravidian Etymological Notes". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 92.3: 397-418, 92.4: 475-491.
- EWA* Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1992-2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen*. 3 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitäts-Verlag. (1986-92)
- KEWA* Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1956-80. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. 4 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag. (1953-56)
- MW* Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, new ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. (Rpt., 1970)

- OED* 1989. *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., prepared by J. A. Simpson and E. S. C. Weiner. 20 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- PW* Böhtlingk, Otto and Rudolph Roth. 1855-75. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch herausgegeben von der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. 7 vols. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- TBI* Mahadevan, Irvatham. 1968. "Corpus of Tamil-Brāhmi Inscriptions". In *Seminar on Inscriptions, 1966: Speeches and Papers*, ed. R[amachandran] Nagaswamy [Irā. Nākacāmi]. Madras: Books (India) Private Ltd. [Cited in Mahadevan 1970.]
- TED* Devaneyan, Gnanamuthu [Tēvanēyaṅ, Nānamuttan] *et al.* 1985-2011. *Centamiḷ corpirappiyal pērakaramutali* [A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Tamil Language]. 12 vols. (in 31 vols.). Chennai: Directorate of Tamil Etymological Dictionary Project.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 2009a. "What is the meaning of Andhra in Telugu? / Yahoo Answers".
<https://in.answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20091221190015AAG9uFh> (accessed September 7, 2015).
- 2009b. "Mari Language". *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia* [website]. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mari_language (accessed March 11, 2009).
- Bailey, Harold. 1959. "Iranian *arya-* and *daha-*". *Transactions of the Philological Society* 58.1: 71-115.
- Burrow, Thomas. 1971. "Spontaneous Cerebrals in Sanskrit". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 34.3: 538-559.
- Caldwell, Robert. 1913. *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian Family of Languages*, 3rd ed., rev. and enl. by J. L. Wyatt and T. Ramakrishna Pillai. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., Ltd. (Rpt. Chennai: University of Madras, 2009).
- Dolgopolsky, Aharon. 2008. *Nostratic Dictionary* [published online]. Cambridge: The McDonald Institute.
<http://www.dspace.cam.ac.uk/handle/1810/196512>
 (accessed several times in March, April, and July 2012 and on October 24, 2015).
- Fabricius, Johann Philip. 1933. *A Dictionary, Tamil and English, Based on Johann Philip Fabricius's "Malabar-English Dictionary"*, 3rd ed., rev. and enl. Tranquebar: Evangelical Lutheran Mission Publishing House.
- Ghatage, Amrit Madhav *et al.* 1976- . *An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Sanskrit on Historical Principles*. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute. [As of 2011 (Vol. 9, Pt. 3) only through "api"].
- Krishnamurti, Bhadriraju. 1961. *Telugu Verbal Bases, A Comparative and Descriptive Study*. University of California Publications in Linguistics, 24. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Krishnamurti, Bhadriraju. 2003. *The Dravidian Languages*. Cambridge: University Press.

- Kuiper, Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus. 1991. *Aryans in the Rigveda*. Leiden Studies in Indo-European, 1. Amsterdam and Atlanta, Georgia: Rodopi.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 1989. "The Alternation of *r* and *l* in Dravidian". *Indian Linguistics* 50: 130-146. [This paper was printed with many printing mistakes. "Errata" in *Indian Linguistics* 52 (1991): 149-150].
- 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. 2003. "The Alternation of **-l-/*-l-* and **t-* in Metathetical Forms in Dravidian". *Folia Linguistica Historica* 24.1-2: 175-192.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 2009. "The Ancient Mesopotamian Place Name 'Meluḥḥa'". *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. "Sanskrit *-ndr-* and Dravidian". *Indologica Taurinensia* 37: 139-251.
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 2012. "The Number 'One'", together with comments from four discussants and a "Response to Discussants". *Mother Tongue* 17: 103-166 (paper proper, 103-118; response, 149-166).
- Levitt, Stephan Hillyer. 2014. "Indo-European and Dravidian: Some Considerations". *Mother Tongue* 19: 155-180. [Earlier version, with major printing errors in the bibliography, in *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 42.2 (2013): 63-99].
- Mahadevan, Iravatham. 1970. "Dravidian Parallels in Proto-Indian Script". *Journal of Tamil Studies* 2.1: 157-276.
- Mahadevan, Iravatham. 1973. "Method of Parallelisms in the Interpretation of Proto-Indian Script". In International Conference-Seminar of Tamil Studies (3rd: 1970: Collège de France), *Compte-rendu de la troisième conférence internationale, = Proceedings of the Third International Conference Seminar, Paris 1970*. Eds., X. S. Thani Nayagam and François Gros. Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie, 50. Pondichéry: Institut Français d'Indologie. Pp. 44-55.

- Mahadevan, Irvatham. 1998. "Phonetic Value of the 'Arrow' Sign in the Indus Script". *Journal of the Institute of Asian Studies* 15.2 (March): 69-74.
- Mahadevan, Irvatham. 2009a. *Vestiges of Indus Civilization in Old Tamil*. Tamilnadu Endowment Lecture, Tamilnadu History Congress, 16th Annual Session, 9-11 October 2009. Tiruchirapalli, Tamilnadu.
- Mahadevan, Irvatham. 2009b. "Meluhha and Agastya: Alpha and Omega of the Indus Script." *Journal of Tamil Studies* 76: 89-110. [Also available online at <http://www.harappa.com> (accessed January 1, 2010)].
- Mahadevan, Irvatham. 2010. "Harappan Heritage of Andhra: A New Interpretation". *International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics* 39.1: 9-17.
- Mahadevan, Irvatham. 2011. *The Indus Fish Swam in the Great Bath: A New Solution to an Old Riddle*. Bulletin of the Indus Research Centre, 2. Chennai: Indus Research Centre, Roja Muthiah Research Library.
- Mahadevan, Irvatham. 2015. *Interpreting the Indus Script: The Dravidian Solution*. Convocation Address, Dravidian University, 26 February 2015. Kuppam, Andhra Pradesh.
- Pei, Mario. 1962. *The Families of Words*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Pokorny, Julius. 1959-69. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2 vols. Bern and München: A. Francke Verlag. (1948-69; 5th impression, Tübingen and Basel: A. Francke Verlag, 2005).
- Quiggin, Edmund Crosby. 1910. "Druidism". In *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed. Vol. 8. Cambridge: The University Press. Pp. 597a-598a.
- Rajam, V. S. 1992. *A Reference Grammar of Classical Tamil Poetry (150 B.C. – Pre-Fifth/Sixth Century A.D.)*. Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, 199. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Savariroyan, D. 1907-8. "The History of the Suffix *kaḷ*". *The Siddhanta Deepika, or The Light of Truth* 8: 271-275.
- Sivaraja Pillai, K. Narayan. 1936. "The Derivation of the Word 'Tamil' – A Philological Causerie". In *Dr. S. Krishnaswami*

Aiyangar Commemoration Volume. Madras: The Committee. pp. 339-347.

Sørensen, Søren. 1904[-1925]. *An Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata, with Short Explanations and a Concordance to the Bombay and Calcutta Editions and P. C. Roy's Translation*. London: Williams and Norgate. (Rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1963).

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 (Rgvedic, 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. 1970. *Comparative Dravidian Phonology*. *Janua Linguarum, Series Practica*, 80. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.