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1 Introduction

A heretofore unidentified word structure with a special compounding pattern discovered in the Dravidian language family and reconstructible to the proto-stage is described here and an application of that pattern to systematically explain the structure and etymology of words in the Vedic substratum is also illustrated.

Sequences of at least two roots which function as words are reconstructible in Proto-Dravidian (PDr) or in at least one of the subgroups and their patterns have been dealt with in considerable detail by Krishnamurti (2003:200-204). Krishnamurti also reports (ibid.:200) of an unpublished manuscript by Emeneau entitled ‘Some Dravidian noun compounds’ wherein venṇey ‘butter’ and pokkūẓ ‘navel’ are reported to have been analyzed in addition to six other items mainly confined to individual languages. Steever (1998:384-5) discusses compound word formation of the North Dravidian language Malto in detail including balance-noun and balance-verb formations and, in the same compilation (pp238-9), Krishnamurti discusses Telugu compound formation. Scharfe (2006:241 but originally presented in 2003 probably unaware of Krishnamurti’s comparative treatment) remarks: “Unfortunately, most of

---

1 Reportedly published as Emeneau 2006 as listed in references (personal communication by Suresh Kolichala)

our reference works available on Dravidian linguistics are virtually silent on the topic of compounds”.

The importance of Dravidian word structure goes beyond simply understanding the Dravidian language family better. With the impasse reached in decoding the Indus archaeological symbols to identify the language(s) of the Indus Valley Civilization (or Harappan Civilization) and with serious debates over whether those symbols represent a language script at all (Farmer, Sproat and Witzel 2004 and Parpola 2008), it has become necessary to look to early textual sources such as the Rg Veda for help in resolving the Indus linguistic issue. It is in this context that there has been an increasing importance attached to works by various scholars (Kuiper 1955 and 1991, Witzel 2000, 1999a, b and c) that use the unusual phonology and structure of words in Vedic substratum to more securely identify the languages of the Indus Valley Civilization and South Asian substrate and adstrate languages in general. Thus it has become critical to better understand the structure of words in the various language families of South Asia (or the Indian linguistic area). The reader is referred to Southworth’s *Linguistic Archaeology of South Asia* (2005) for reconstruction of prehistoric sociolinguistic contexts of South Asia using ancient linguistic forms.

One of the most characteristic but equally frustrating aspects of the hundreds of foreign words identified by the above scholars in the Vedic substratum is their unusual structure, unusual in the sense of not conforming to Indo-European (IE) phonology and word structure formally specifiable by mechanisms such as Szemerényi’s formula (Witzel 1999c:4-5).
Some instances of Vedic foreign words (with comments from Kuiper 1991, Witzel 1999c:6 and Kuiper’s List by Witzel) with violations of IE phonology are: (1) bīsa ‘sprout of lotus’, bīsaya ‘name of a sorcerer/demon’, kīstā ‘praiser, poet’ which have prohibited occurrences of -s- after i, u, r, k in violation of the ‘ruki law’ (Kuiper 1991:25) which allows only ș in these environments (2) kīkāṭa ‘name of a tribe’, kīnāśa ‘ploughman’ with disallowed candidate root structures (kīk-, kīn-) and suffix structures (-ṭa, ā-śa) (3) kāṭa ‘hole, pit’, puṇya ‘lucky, meritorious’ with unconditioned retroflexes. These deviations make them foreign words borrowed into Vedic speech from the local languages spoken at that time, namely, ca. 1500-1200 BCE for the Ṛg Veda (Witzel 1999c:6) just after the end of the Indus Civilization and thus serve to identify the linguistic milieu at that time. These words² are typically names of tribes, persons, animals, plants and water bodies and, as Witzel remarks: “We can take these names as direct take-overs or IA adoptions of non-IA local names in the NW of the subcontinent” (Witzel 1999a:§4.1). Lubotsky (2001) has added a whole new class of words as belonging to the Indo-Iranian (IIr) substratum, namely, trisyllabic nouns with a long middle syllable as difficult to explain from IE morphology³, e.g. *kapauta (or kapōta) ‘pigeon’, *kapāra ‘vessel, dish’.

² For example (from Kuiper’s List by Witzel), tribe: kīkāṭa, person: turvīti, animal: mayūrī ‘female peacock’, plant: kākambīra ‘name of a tree’, water body: śutudrī ‘name of a river, Sutlej’
³ See Witzel (2000:§12Ṛ or p25) for a mildly critical treatment of this structure singled out by Lubotsky.
2 Currently known compounding patterns

Krishnamurti (2003:200-204) has classified Dravidian compound patterns into four major categories based on the parts of speech of the constituents and the likely meaning relationships between the constituents and adds a fifth called ‘compounds with doubtful compositions’. He has recognized (ibid:200) only those compound-like constructions that are attested by at least two languages so reconstructible to at least the subgroup level. A brief summary of them follows here using his own notations where the constituents of the compound are denoted by \( x \) and \( y \).

The major patterns are: (1) verb + verb (2) noun + noun (3) adjective + noun (4) verb + noun and (5) Compounds with doubtful composition. Their details are as below (only a subset of the sample etymons cited by Krishnamurti are reproduced here with his indication of boundaries inside words):

(1) Verb + Verb (doing \( x \) + doing \( y \)): Tamil/Malayalam. \( ār-āy \) ‘to investigate’, Kannada. \( ār-ay \), Telugu. \( ār-ayu \), \( ar-ayu \) Koṅḍa. rey- ‘to search’ where \( x \) and \( y \) are the verbs *\( ār \) ‘to become full’ + *\( āy \) ‘to search’.

(2) Noun + Noun: The first noun stands in attributive relationship to the second. In this category Krishnamurti has six\(^4\) subcategories of relationships between the two nouns: (2-i) \( xy = y \) lives on \( x \) or \( y \) causes \( x \): Tamil. \( tēn-ī \) ‘honey-bee’, Kuṟux. \( tīn-ī \) ‘bee’, Malto. \( tēn-ī \) ‘honey, bee’ (2-ii) \( xy = y \) comes out of \( x \) (\( x = source, y = object produced \)): for ‘tear’ Tamil/Malayalam. \( kaṇ-ṇīr \), Telugu. \( kan-nīru \) et al. [*\( kaṇ \) ‘eye’ and *\( nīr \) ‘water’] (2-iii) \( xy = y \) belongs to \( x \) (\( x = owner/resident, y = place \)): Tamil. \( kōy-il \) ‘palace, temple’, Telugu. \( kōv-ila \) ‘temple’

\(^4\) Subcategory numbering (vi) was skipped and (vii) used in the book
etc. [*kō = king, God and * il = house] (2-iv) xy = y is called x (x = proper noun, y = common noun): Tamil. cē-kāy, Telugu. sī-kāya ‘soapnut tree’ (2-v) xy = object y has quality x (y is head and x is attribute): Tamil. paṇi ‘dew’, paṇ-nīr, Tulu. paṇ-nīrī ‘rosewater’ (2-vi) xy = y has x (‘the meaning of x is not clear’): Tamil. muṇam ‘cubit’, Tamil/Malayalam. muṇan-kāl ‘knee’, muṇan-kai ‘elbow’, Kannada. moṇa-kāl ‘knee’ Telugu. mrō kālu ‘knee’, Kūruṇk. mā-kā ‘knee’ (3) Descriptive adjective + noun head: Tamil. mutu ‘old’ mūt-appan ‘father’s father’, Koḍagū. mutt-tāy ‘great-grandmother’, Telugu. mut-awwa ‘great-grandmother’ (4) verb as modifier + noun head: Tamil. tīrī ‘to turn, revolve’, Kannada. tiragniñe ‘turning, a wheel for raising water’, Telugu. tirugali ‘a hand-mill’ (the second element is *kal ‘stone’) (5) Compounds with doubtful composition: Kannada. pari-yāṇa, pari-vāṇa, hari-vāṇa ‘a plate-like vessel made of metal’, Tulu. harivāṇa; cf. Tamil. aruvāṇam ‘copper tray’.

3 The pleonastic word structure

Here we describe a totally new word-compounding pattern found pervasively in the Dravidian language family. The pattern is as follows:

The compound functions as a single word usually cited as a dictionary entry but consists of two or more components that are synonymous or near-synonymous with each other and the compound as a whole is also synonymous with its individual components. Components are usually stems that have one lexical root or its alternate
form followed by an optional sequence of derivative and formative suffixes\(^5\) or root extensions (Subrahmanyam 2008:50) but a component itself can be another pleonasm. There is no readily discernible relationship among the components such as head-modifier typically found with the Dravidian compounding patterns known so far. There is no evident role played by the position of the component, the components strung together in a seemingly superfluous or pleonastic manner but motivations such as paraphrasing are likely and are discussed later.


It is found that the distribution of a compound and of its components in different subgroups is independent of each other. That is to say, a language or a subgroup may have the compound with no record of any of the components with the relevant meaning. This would show that the compound was formed much before the language retaining the compound branched from its ancestor and that the language in question simply failed to inherit some of the individual components from its ancestry along with the compound. The Konda word *uma-guṇji* cited above is a classic example with the *ūma-* component not at all attested in Konda’s Central Dravidian (CDr) subgroup or in any of its neighboring subgroups but attested only in the farthest languages Tamil and Malayalam.

---


\(^6\) From DEDR entries #1647 and #747
This pleonastic pattern is reconstructible to PDr which fact will be established when we examine below the available evidence in detail.

4 Methodology

We use here only those words as evidence for this pleonastic compounding pattern that are already listed with the cited meanings in etymological dictionaries and in dictionaries of individual languages, and completely avoid arguing for any new interpretation of their meaning just in support of the thesis.

The primary source for comparative Dravidian lexicon is the Second Edition of A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary (DEDR) by Burrow and Emeneau (1984) and CDIAL by Turner for Indo-Aryan. Dictionaries for specific languages are also employed to carefully identify words left out of DEDR. It should be noted that Tamil etymons are transcribed in phonemic notation unlike with almost all other Dravidian languages.

As for establishing reconstructibility of this new compounding pattern to Proto-Dravidian, there are two possible options. One way is to show the widespread nature of this structural pattern in Dravidian, that is, in all subgroups; and the other is to show that an attested compound in a Dravidian subgroup could only have been formed at the PDr stage due to the lack of one or more of the components in the same subgroup and in its neighboring subgroups, ruling out recent or synchronic formation of the compound.

There are still sharp differences among Dravidian linguists over subgrouping (Zvelebil 1990:54-59, Krishnamurti 2003:492, Subrahmanyam 2008:1-48) and here
we follow the subgrouping by Krishnamurti (2003:492) also followed by Southworth (2005). This would be more conservative in PDr reconstruction than other subgroupings (Subrahmanya 2008:1-48, Zvelebil 1990:54-59) since languages of the Telugu-Kuwi group would be in South Dravidian II (SDr II) (within SDr) rather than in Central Dravidian (CDr) along with the Kolami-Parji group as per Subrahmanya.

For reconstructing an etymon to PDr, attestation in any two non-contiguous subgroups (Zvelebil 1990:59) is employed as the basic criterion but Southworth (2005:230-237) calls for further restrictions to make it more reliable by accounting for diffusion through contact among the languages of the subgroups. Southworth concludes (ibid:236-7) that, for PDr, the most reliable reconstructions are those with cognates in SDr and North Dravidian (NDr) excluding those cases where only the NDr language Kurux and CDr share cognates and the next best are reconstructions with SDr I and CDr where we must be alert to borrowings between Kannada-Tulu and CDr languages.

This paper uses standard Dravidian phonology and morphology extensively described in the literature. For various topics such as Dravidian subgrouping, historical Dravidian phonology including the reconstructibility of the full set of retroflex consonants to PDr, allophonic voicing/lenition of stops especially intervocally and after homorganic nasals, phonology of Dravidian roots, word formation, quantitative and qualitative alternation of vowels and the rules for sound changes from PDr to subgroups and to individual languages, the reader is referred to

5 The evidence

The available evidence spans many semantic domains such as animals, vegetation, natural and social phenomena indicating this as a fundamental feature of the Dravidian word formation.

We first examine an evidence in the form of a single compound that establishes productivity of this pattern in Proto-Dravidian and then cite evidence from various subgroups that shows its pervasiveness throughout the Dravidian family in all subgroups. For precedence of reconstruction of structural features to PDr based on pervasiveness criteria, see Steever (1993:28) for echo compound forms and Krishnamurti (2003:370) for serial verbs.

5.1 Koṇḍa. uma-gunji and Parji. uma guṇī ‘owl’

First we examine the evidence for a single pleonastic instance inherited from the proto-stage. To this end we consider the words Koṇḍa. uma-gunji and Parji. uma guṇī ‘owl’ and their associated etymons:


DEDR #1647: Parji. guṇī owl, uma guṇī a kind of owl Gonḍi. kunji large owl  Koṇḍa. uma gunji owl Kui. gunji id. Kuwi.gunji id.

MTL lists also Tamil. āmaṇḍ a kind of big owl, āmaikkōṭṭāṅ a large species of owl, āmattaṅkūkai a species of a very large size owl
To better visualize the distribution of the words in various subgroups, we arrange them as in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>*ūma</th>
<th>*kuñci</th>
<th>*ūma-kuñci</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDr I</td>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>āmaṇ, āmai, āmatta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malayalam</td>
<td>āman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr II</td>
<td>Gōṇḍi</td>
<td>kunji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Konda</td>
<td>ūma-gunji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kui</td>
<td>gunji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuwi</td>
<td>gunji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDr</td>
<td>Parji</td>
<td>guññi</td>
<td></td>
<td>uma guññi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We discuss briefly the phonology of the components before proceeding with the analysis. Parji -ṅ- and -ṅṅ- are reflexes of PDr *-ṅc- (DEDR: Table I) and g- in gunji and guññi forms, and the -g- in the uma-gunji/guññi are reflexes respectively of PDr *k- and *-k- as seen in the retention in Gōṇḍi. kunji. The –nj- (or -ṅj-) cluster in kunji is an inherited phonetic feature of the PDr phonemic cluster *-ṅc- as all stops following their homorganic nasals were voiced in Proto-Dravidian (Krishnamurti 2003:93). Between the short vowel of uma- found in the compounds and the long vowel of Tamil/Malayalam āma-, the latter long vowel is original since if any of the languages preserve a long vowel in cognates, its quality can be taken to represent the quality of the PDr vowel (Subrahmanyan 1983:158-200, Krishnamurti 2003: 101-2). So we have phonemically PDr *ūm- and PDr *kuñci in play here.

The South Dravidian languages, Tamil and Malayalam, have no reflexes for *kuñci while there is no apparent record of free form reflexes for *ūma in the whole
combine of SDr II and CDr. Actually Koṇḍa, one of the two languages with the
compound, does not have any of the components in its lexicon. Since the only
languages that have the *kuṇci reflexes are all without any contact with the only
languages that have the ūma component, it is clear that the compound must have
been formed at a stage when the components *ūma and *kuṇci both were available in
the same lexicon which can only be Proto-Dravidian. This establishes that the
pleonastic compounding pattern was productive as early as the PDr stage.

As for the etymology of the components themselves, it must first be stated that
the compound above might not necessarily have been formed at a stage where it
came to mean ‘owl’ but it could have been at an earlier stage when it might have had
only its etymological sense, say, ‘bird’ or whatever ‘bird’ was supposed to mean, say,
‘flight’ or ‘feather, hair or cluster’. This can be seen from the occurrence of the *ūm
component with a different bird species as with Tamil. umā-paṭci ‘a species of
paradise-bird’ (MTL) (paṭci < Skt. paksin ‘bird’). The underlying semantics of
*kuṇci is most likely in PDr *kuṅc ‘cluster, hair’ as seen with DEDR #1639.

We can also observe the way these components participate in permutation and
combination with other components in the same semantic domain. We have Tamil.
kōṭṭan ‘rock horned owl’ but also ūmaik-kōṭṭan ‘a large species of owl’ and ūmattan-

---

7 DEDR #1639 with only the –ṭci-stems: Tamil. kuṇcam bunch of flowers, tassel, cluster of grass, bushy tail of the yak, weaver’s brush; kuṇci tuft of hair (esp. of man), crest of peacock, tassels (as
insignia of royalty); Malayalam. kuṇcam, kuṇci tassel, brush (esp. of toddy-drawers); koṇcu mane of
animals. Kannada. kuṇca bunch, bundle, cluster, tassel, brush, a kind of fan or chowry; goṅcal cluster,
bunch; goṅcī a mass; goṅce mass, cluster; Tulu. goṅju tassel; kuṇca id., flybrush; goṅci, goṅcilu;
bunch, cluster. Gondi. kunjar, kunjar hair-knot; kunjā the knob in the bun of hair tied on the top of the
head; kunja kelk plaited hair / Cf. Turner, CDIAL no. 4174, guṁja- bunch, bundle, cluster
kūkai ‘a species of a very large size owl’ where kūkai in turn means again ‘rock horned owl’.

5.2 Kannada odevāli ‘Acacia planifrons’

This plant name in Kannada has pleonastically two components PSDr I. *ōṭay and PSDr *cāli as seen from the following etymons:

DEDR #594: Tamil. uṭai Acacia planifrons; A. latronum; A. eburnea. Malayalam. oṭa a kind of thorny tree, umbrella thorn, A. planifrons. Kannada. odevāli A. planifrons (for jāli, see 2474).

MTL: Tamil. oṭai buffalo thorn cutch (Acacia latronum)

DEDR #2474: Tamil. cāli umbrella-thorn babul, Acacia planifrons; elephant thorn, A. tomentosa; buffalo-thorn cutch. A. latronum. Kannada. jāli thorny babool tree. A. arabica Wild.: A. Farnesiana. Telugu. jāli, jāla A. arabica (branches are cut and used for fencing)

To further see the pleonastic interplay of such botynomic components, we can examine Tamil. uṭaivēl ‘pea-podded black babul, Acacia eburnea’ but we also have vēl by itself synonymous with the compound, as seen in:

MTL: Tamil. vēl ‘babul genus acacia, panicled babul’

DEDR #5537: Tamil. vēl babul tree. Malayalam. vēla-maram an acacia, babul tree

5.3 Tamil iṉanirai ‘herd’

The redundant compound iṉanirai ‘herd’ is widely attested in classical Tamil texts occurring at least sixteen times in six different Caṅkam anthologies\(^8\) and at least twice in Cilappaiṅkāram\(^9\). It is made up of two components both widely attested in

---
\(^8\) Aka(21:26, 120:3, 199:11, 214:3, 225:7, 249:18, 269:3, 321:7, 357:8); Kuru(180:2); Kali(106:4, 113:29); Malaiṉpatu:416; Narṟ(240:9, 291:8); Neṭu:4; Patirṟu(12:6, 67:7); Puṟa (257:8, 269:10);
\(^9\) Cilappaiṅ(12:16-2, 14:64)
free form as inam\textsuperscript{10} ‘pack, herd’ and nirai\textsuperscript{11} ‘collection, herd’ in the same texts. Even if we leave out the occurrences\textsuperscript{12} where commentators appear to take the first component to mean ‘class’ or ‘type’ resulting in the compound being glossed as “herd of various types of [sheep etc.]”, we are still left with many where it is pleonastic. Some sample occurrences with no possible ambiguities either in the texts themselves or in their old commentaries are: pullār inanirai (Pūra:257:8)\textsuperscript{13} ‘the herds of enemies’, palkalirru inanirai (Patiṟṟu:67:7)\textsuperscript{14} ‘herds of many elephants’, pal ၀ inanirai tažiya villor\textsuperscript{15} (Pūra:269:10) ‘bowmen who have seized herds with many cows’, kavaṁra inaniraikal\textsuperscript{16} (Cilappati:12:16-2) ‘the herds seized’. Interestingly medieval commentators simply and variously gloss the compound inanirai as nirai\textsuperscript{17}, inaniraikal\textsuperscript{18} (plural form), niraiyinam\textsuperscript{19} (!), inamākiya pala niraikal\textsuperscript{20} or inamākiya nirai\textsuperscript{21} meaning ‘the nirai that is an inam’. Occurrence of niraiyinam in the medieval gloss is notable for the way it simply exchanges the components in position and still means the same, showing that the components serve the same role in either position.

\textsuperscript{10} DEDR #531: Tamil. inam class, group, kind, species, race, tribe, herd, associates. Malayalam. inam class of animals, swarm.
\textsuperscript{11} DEDR #3673: Tamil. nirai row, column, line, series, order, regularity, arrangement, collection, herd; Malayalam. nira line, row etc.
\textsuperscript{12} For example, Naccinārkkīnīyar on Malaipatu:416 palyāṭṭu inanirai (Pattuppāṭṭu 1998)
\textsuperscript{13} Old commentary: poruntāraru inamākiya nirai (Pillai 1996)
\textsuperscript{14} Old commentary: kalirgu nirai (Patiṟṟu 1994)
\textsuperscript{15} Old commentary: palavākiya inamāṇa āṇiraikal (Pillai 1996)
\textsuperscript{16} Aṭṭiyārkkunallār gloss: kaikkondu vanta inaniraikal (Cilappati 2001:327)
\textsuperscript{17} Old commentary for Patiṟṟu:67:7. See footnote 14
\textsuperscript{18} Aṭṭiyārkkunallār on Cilappati:12:16-2. See footnote 16
\textsuperscript{19} Aṭṭiyārkkunallār on Cilappati:14:64: inanirai - niraiyinam, inamākiya pala niraikal (Cilappati 2001:371)
\textsuperscript{20} See footnote 19
\textsuperscript{21} Old commentary on Pūra:257:8 (Pillai 1996:117). See footnote 13
5.4 Tamil mākavicumpu ‘sky’

The redundant compound mākavicumpu ‘sky’ occurs frequently in classical Tamil texts attested at least ten times\(^{22}\) in Caṅkam texts spread across four different anthologies employed by many different poets. It consists of two components mākam ‘upper space, sky, atmosphere’ and vicumpu ‘visible heavens, sky’ attested widely as free words in the same texts. Though in one instance\(^{23}\) the medieval commentator Nacciṅārkkiṉiyar glosses the first component mākam as ‘direction’, in all other instances we find glosses typical of pleonasm, mākamākiya vicumpu, meaning ‘the vicumpu that is the mākam’. Some sample pleonastic occurrences are: mākavicumpiṉ ucci (Puṇa 60:2) glossed mākamākiya vicumpiṉatu ucci ‘the zenith of the sky’ (Pillai 1996), mākavicumpiṉ naṭuvu (Puṇa 35:18) glossed mākamākiya uyarnta vāṇattinatu naṭuvu ‘in the midst of the high sky that is mākam’ (Pillai 1996) and mākavicumpum (Pari 1:47) glossed\(^ {24}\) by Parimēlaẓakar as mākamākiya vicumpum ‘and the sky that is mākam’ (Paripāṭal 1995).

5.5 Tamil. ūrkōḷ ‘halo’

We next consider the pleonastic compound Tamil ūrkōḷ ‘halo round the sun or moon’ where ār means ‘halo round the sun or moon’ and kōḷ also means ‘halo, brilliance, light’. The words ūrkōḷ in the sense of ‘halo’ is attested in the 10\(^{th}\) century

\(^{22}\) mākavicumpu occurs in: Aka (141:6, 162:3, 253:24, 317:1), Maturai:454, Pari:1:50, Puṇa (35:18, 60:2, 270:1, 400:1)
\(^{23}\) Maturai:454: māka vicumpōtu glossed as tikkukalaiyutaiya ākāyattutanē “the sky with directions” (Pattuppāṭṭu 1998)
\(^{24}\) Even though he glosses the word mākam as mākamāvatu pūmikkum cuvarkkattukkum naṭuvu[…] ‘mākam is that which is between the earth and the heaven’
text Cīvakacintāmaṇi, 12th century Periyapurāṇam, 14th century Villipāratam and in the later Kanatapurāṇam. The occurrences are: maḷḷar katuṭaṭar katirai ūrkōḷ valaittavā valaittuk koṇṭār (Cīvakacintāmaṇi: 1136), ūrkōḷ vaḷainta māmati pōḷru (Periyapurāṇam: 1103:3-4), ūrkōḷum veyilaic cāźntu (Villipāratam: 11:258:1), ūrkōḷ pariti taṇaic cāźntatu (Villipāratam: 11:258:1), piṇāṅku azal katir kāṅṭātu kār uṛa ūrkōḷ tōṇum kāṭci (Kanatapurāṇam: 1327:3-4). The word kōḷ ‘halo’ is attested in matiyaṅ kōḷ vāy vicumpīṭai naṭappatē pōḷ (Cīvakacintāmaṇi:1098). The word ūr in the same sense is attested in the 10-12th century Kamparāmāyaṇam ceṇkatir tāṅkuvatu ūr ūrratu eṇap poli ol muṭiyān (3:2:9:) and ūr koṇṭa tiṅkal eṇṇa (2:5:56).

The word ūr ‘halo’ is cognate with etymons such as Tamil. uru ‘to burn’, Kannaḍa. uri ‘to burn, blaze, glow’ in DEDR #656 whose PDr root is *ūr. The

---

26 Meaning “the warriors encircled [him] like a halo does the Sun of intense heat” and “matiyaṅ kōḷ vāy vicumpīṭai naṭappatē pōḷ” (1098) where the word kōḷ is glossed by the medieval commentator Naccinārkkiṉiyar as ‘parivēṭippu’ (< Skt. pariveṣa ‘halo’) comparing the people surrounding the hero Cīvakaṇ to the halo around the moon
27 Meaning “like the beautiful moon encircled by a halo”
28 Meaning “and the halo surrounded the sun”
29 Meaning “the halo surrounded the sun”
30 Meaning “the scene where, with the shining sun’s rays blocked by the clouds, a halo appears”
31 where the word kōḷ is glossed by the medieval commentator Naccinārkkiṉiyar as ‘parivēṭippu’ (< Skt. parivesa ‘halo’) comparing the people surrounding the hero Cīvakaṇ to the halo around the moon
32 See Zvelebil:1975:p181-184 for dating of Kampan and his Irāmāvatāram
33 meaning “he with the golden crown that shines like a halo attached to the red sun”
34 Meaning ‘the moon with a halo, as it were’
35 Parts of DEDR #656: Tamil. uru to burn; Kannada. uri to burn, blaze, glow, n. burning, flame, blaze, etc.; Kodagu. uri burning sensation. Tulu. uri blaze, flame, heat; uriyunu to burn, blaze; Telugu. uriyu to burn; uralu to burn, be ablaze; Konda rūṁ(u) heat of summer. Manda. rund- to ignite, set alight. Kui. rūta to set fire to, ignite; n. setting fire to; ru- to set light to. Kuwi. rund- to ignite
word kōḷ ‘halo’ is cognate with etymons such as Tamil. kōḷḷi ‘firebrand, fire’ in DEDR #2158\(^{36}\) again with the semantics of ‘light, fire’.

It should be stated that the pleonastic compound ūrkōḷ might have been formed in the original etymological sense of ‘light’ (or ‘light’- ‘light’) before ending up in the specialized sense of ‘halo’. Still the point remains that it was originally pleonastic.

5.6 Tamil. cōṇā(i)māri ‘incessant rain’

The word Tamil. cōṇaimāri/cōṇāmāri is another attested example of this new word structure. It means ‘incessant rain’ and occurs as in “cōṇaimāriyiṇ corintaṉaṉ” (Kampa:piramāttir:59) meaning “like an incessant rain did [he] pour [it]”.

Its components cōṇai and māri also mean the same or similar as listed in the entries of DEDR:

DEDR #2899: Tamil. cōṇai dark moisture-laden clouds, incessant downpour of rain, constant drizzle from clouds gathering on hilltops; cōṇam cloud; cōṇā-māri incessant rain.

Kannada. sōne a thin, light but long-continued rain, incessant drizzle, incessant rain. Telugu. sōṇa rain, drizzle, thin but long.

DEDR #4819: Tamil. māri water, rain, shower, cloud, toddy, liquor. Malayalam. māri heavy rain.

\(^{36}\) Parts of DEDR #2158: Tamil. kōḷḷi firebrand, fire, quick-tongued person; kōḷuttu to kindle, set on fire, ignite; burn; kōḷuntu, kōḷuvu to kindle (as fire). Malayalam. kōḷḷi firebrand, firewood; kōḷuttuka to set on fire, light, kindle. Kannada. kōḷḷi, kōḷḷe firebrand. Tulu. kōḷḷi, kōḷḷi id.
5.7 Tamil. *tuṇaṅkaṟal* ‘festival’

Tamil. *tuṇaṅkaṟal* comprises two components *tunaṅk-* and *aṟal* both meaning ‘festival’. This is lexicographic only. The ninth century Tamil nighaṉṭu *Piṅkalantai* and the sixteenth century *Cūṭāmaṇi* list *tuṇaṅkaṟal* in the sense of ‘festival’, the nighaṉṭu Tivākaram (ninth cent.) and *Cūṭāmaṇi* list *tuṇaṅkai* ‘festival’ and Tivākaram again has *aṟal* ‘festival’.

5.8 Kolami. *vallambā* ‘rice’

Central Dravidian Kolami. *vallambā* ‘rice’ is pleonastic with its components as follows:

DEDR#174: Kolami. *amba* cooked rice; *amba* food; *vallambā* rice (*val* rice).

Naikri. *amba* boiled rice. (leaving out words with the sense of ‘porridge’ or ‘gruel’ as they are likely from a root meaning ‘fluid’)


The components are reconstructible to PDr *val* ‘rice’ and PCDr *amb-* ‘rice’.

---

37 See Zvelebil 1975:194-5 and 212 for dating of Tivākaram, Piṅkalantai and Cūṭāmaṇi
38 *irulum viẓavum tuṇaṅkaṟal enpa* (Piṅkalantai:10:621), *tuṇaṅkaṟal irul viẓā ām* (Cūṭāmaṇi:11:84)
39 *tuṇaṅkai āṭalum tirunāḷum viẓavum* (Tivākaram: 2010 or 11:109) and *tuṇaṅkaiyē viẓāp pēy kūttām* (Cūṭāmaṇi:11:84)
40 *aṟalē viẓavum nīrum īrttiraiyum* (Tivākaram:2118 or 11:217)
5.9 Gondi. rāghō-sīrī ‘parrot’

The SDr II language Gondi has the pleonastic compound rāghō-sīrī ‘parrot’ with the following components:


DEDR #2582: Gondi. sīrī, hīrī parrot Konda sīra id. Pengo. hīra a kind of bird.

Also Pengo. sīra ‘balance word to poṭi bird’ (Burrow and Bhattacharya 1970:229)

DEDR has not attempted reconstruction of the first component’s initial sounds even though it begins with r- which is not permitted by PDr phonotactics. The second component is phonemically *cīz- as PDr. *ź > *r was a shared innovation at the Proto-Gondi-Kuwi stage itself comprising all these three languages (Subrahmanyam 2008:35). The word initial s- and h- in the Gondi etymons are all products of the still ongoing phonological process in Gondi dialects: PDr *c- > s- > h- > ϕ (Krishnamurti 2003:127-128, Subrahmanyam 2008:254). Pengo. hīra also has the h- but it is an independent sound change of PDr *c- > *s- > *h- from Proto-Pengo-Manda stage (Subrahmanyam 2008:261).

5.10 Gondi. sargōdā ‘rat-snake’

This Gondi snake word is listed in DEDR #2816:

Periyāṁṃaṁ/uṃ Chaṃrāsekaṁ/uṃ (A.) sēri, (Tr.) sargōḍa, (Ch.) sargoḍal, (Muria.) hergoḍal the rat-snake, dhāman; (Maṛia.) er(e)goḍali a kind of snake (cf. Muria, goḍal dhaman snake). Cf. 2011 Tamil. cērai.

It is obvious from the above that a component with a gōḍ- stem (phonemically *kōṭ-) is appearing in combination with various other components and it occurs independently in the Muria dialect of Gondi in goḍal ‘dhaman snake’. Also obvious is a component, phonemically *cēr-, occurring independently as in Parji. jēri and Gondi. sēri and in compounded form in Kolami. jērigaḍ and Telugu. pen-jera. We need to show that the same occurs in other Gondi etymons such as sargōḍa.

We exclude Telugu jerri-, jerri forms as they are most likely to have their -rr- and -rr- as reflexes of PDr *-t/-tt- as opposed to PDr *-r- for the rest of the stems such as Parji. jēri.

For the Gondi etymons sargōḍa, sargoḍal, hergoḍal and er(e)goḍali, we reconstruct their phonemic forms as *cērkōṭā/cerekōṭa, *cērkōṭal/cerekoṭal and *cērkōṭali/cerekoṭali or to put it succinctly as *cēr(e)kōṭa(li). The step-by-step reasoning is as follows. We reconstruct *cēr/*cer-e for the stems sar/haer(er(e) and *kōṭ- for the gōḍ- stems for the following reasons:

- The word initial s-, h- and ϕ in the etymons are all products of the still ongoing phonological process in Gondi dialects: PDr *c- > s- > h- > ϕ. It is reported to be complete in some dialects such as Hill-Maṛia (Krishnamurti 2003:127-128, Subrahmanyam 2008:254). So we reconstruct a word-initial *c- for these etymons.
• The -a- in sar-stems is not original but is a Gondi change in its Northern dialects, that is, PDr *e > Gondi. e, a (dialectal) (DEDR: Table I: Phonetic Correspondences, Subrahmanyam 1983:117 and 2008:253, Andronov 2003:73).

For an exact phonological parallel\(^{41}\), we may cite:

DEDR #2819: Telugu. ērālu husband's brother's wife. Naiki.(Chanda.) serutra husband's younger brother's wife. Gondi. sēranḍā, serṇḍu, harṇḍu, ērṇḍu, ērṇḍu spouse's younger brother (or spouse's younger sister's husband); fem. serandaḷ, serandār, serndar, harṇḍar spouses' younger sister; sērīyār, sērīyāl elder brother's wife; sereyar husband's brother's wife. Konda. sēron husband's younger brother. Manda. hējun wife's younger brother. Kui. sejenju husband's younger brother.

• Now treating the god- stem is straightforward, since by standard Dravidian phonology, medial voiced stops in Dravidian etymons are allophones of nongeminate stop phonemes (Subrahmanyam 2008:124-127, Krishnamurti 2003:163). Hence for -gōḍ- we reconstruct *-kōṭ-. The etymon godḍu in Telugu. (jerri) godḍu also derived from the same canonical root *kōṭ(t)-.

Putting all the above together we phonemically reconstruct the first component in Gondi’s compound etymons as *cēr/*cere. And the phonemic reconstructions for the full compounds are: *cērkōṭā/cerekoṭa, *cērkōṭal/cerekoṭal and *cērkōṭali/cerekoṭali.

As for DEDR’s suggestion in this entry of cognacy with DEDR #2011\(^{42}\) Tamil. cērai, cārai ‘rat snake’, Kannada. kēre ‘rat snake, whip-snake’, Tulu. kērè ‘a kind of harmless snake’, there arises the problem that we have to posit palatalization of PDr *k- in Gondi, Kolami and Parji just to account for the *cēr- stems in this

---

\(^{41}\) For more see DEDR entries such as: 1963, 1980, 2798, 3433, 3770, 4411, 4423

entry, but PDr *k- was palatalized only in Tamil-Malayalam and in Telugu independently (Subrahmanyam 1983:292-3 and 2008:152-3, 243-4, Krishnamurti 2003:128-9). Hence it is more economical to treat them as originating from different roots PSDr *kēr and PDr *cēr.

Really we can relate this to the Vedic. śārkotā ‘serpent’ identified as non-IA in origin and much discussed by Kuiper (1991:41-2, 44) and Witzel (1999a:§3, 1999c:30,37) which is taken up in the section devoted to Vedic substratum.

5.11 Kurux. keykō-beykō ‘crooked, curved’

This is a case of an echo-like pleonastic compound where each component means ‘crooked’ in the NDr Kurux itself as can be seen with their cognates in:

DEDR #2032 (leaving out *koṅk- stems as they are most likely from a different root):

Gondi. gingōn-gongōn aiānā to be crooked, as a snake’s progress. Kui. kengeri, kingiri, kengoni bent, curved, crooked. Kurux. keykrnā to be crooked, curviform; keykrō, keykō-beykō crooked, curved or shaped like a hook.

DEDR #5335 (a subset): Tamil. vāṅku, vēṅku to bend, bending. Kannada. baṅku to be crooked, bend. Koḍagu. baṅg- to become bent, slope. Telugu. vaṅgu to bend, stoop, bow, become crooked, become low or humbled. Kolami. vaṅg- to bend; vaṅgip-. Naikri. vaṅg- id. Parji. vaṅ-, vaṅgip- id. Gadaba. vaṅka curve. Gondi. vaṅg- to bend, vāṅnā to be bent; vaṅkor, vaṅko bent, crooked. Kuwi. vāṅgali to be crooked; wanginai to be bent, stoop; vaṅg to bend, be bent. Kurux. beyknā, beyka’ānā to turn from a straight line, bend, curve; beykō, baṅkā crooked, bent, curved.
The components are derivable respectively from PDr *keŋk- and PDr *vāŋk- both with the sense of ‘crookedness’.

5.12 Malto. umbl-muro ‘urine’

This word from the NDr language Malto is a pleonastic compound with its components as follows:

DEDR #644: Kolami. unbul-, umul-, āml- to urinate; umbuluṭ urine. Naikri. unbul- to urinate. Naiki. (Chanda.) unbul- id.; umulta, umlen urine. Parji. uml-, umbl- to urinate; umlukuḍ, umbulkuḍ urine. Gadaba. umbl- to urinate; umbulkur urine; Kuwi. mṛākali to urinate; mṛā’ka urine; murkinai to piddle, piss; Kurux. umbulnā, umulnā to urinate; umulkā urine. Malto. umble to urinate; umbl-muro urine (muro id.)

As seen above Matlo. umbl- is reconstructible phonemically to PDr *umpul ‘to urinate, urine’. Malto. muro ‘urine’ may be cognate with Kuwi. murkinai ‘to piddle, piss’.

5.13 Traditional grammatical recognition

Tamil grammarians and commentators have recognized similar tendencies. For example piling words bearing the same sense in a sentence has been characterized as oruporuḷ irucol (‘one-meaning two-words’) by Tolkāppiyam⁴³ the earliest available Tamil grammar and as oru-poruṭ-pan-moẓi (‘one-meaning-many-words’) by the 12th

⁴³ Tolkāppiyam: collatikāram: 460: oruporuḷ irucol pirivila varaiyār (Cēṉāvaraiyam 1996:625). Cēṉāvaraiyar, the medieval commentator cites as examples nivantōṅku perumalai ‘soaring big mountain’ and tuṟukal mīmicai ‘on top of the rock’.
century grammar Naṉṉūl. The medieval commentator Parimēlaẓakar (Paripāṭal 1995:20) classifies the attributive verbal phrase nivantu ōṅku uyar occurring in nivantu ōṅku uyar koṭi (Pari:3:18) “the soaring flag” as oru-porut-pan-moṭi where nivantu, ōṅku and uyar each derive from verbs meaning ‘to rise’. It has also been called as mīmicai or mīmicaiccol ‘pleonasm, word redundantly used’ (MTL citing a medieval Vaiṣṇava commentary) (where not surprisingly mī and micai both mean ‘above’). But it should be noted that these commentators have all recognized only synchronically constructed phrases in their analyses.

5.14 The habit persists

The pleonastic compounding pattern still continues to this day at least in Tamil speech as evidenced by its usage in: vaẓittaṭam, vaẓi and taṭam all meaning ‘path, route’ heard everyday with bus routes; even for concepts so evidently recent as ‘ecology’ with Tamil. cuṟṟuccūẓa ‘environment’ where curru and cuẓal both mean ‘surrounding, encompassing’.

Even when it comes to English loan words it is common to combine them with Tamil words as in naṉu ceṇṭar (Tamil. naṉu ‘center’ and English. center), catch piṭi (Tamil piṭi ‘catch’) and so on. This is done productively by individuals as evidenced by pōṣtu kampam (Tamil. kampam ‘post, pole’) uttered by my Tamil taxi driver in Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu.

---

45 From the MTL: niva ‘to rise, to be elevated; to become high’, ōṅku ‘to grow, rise high, as a tree; to ascend, as a flame; to be lofty, as a building or a mountain’, uyar ‘to rise, as water; to ascend, as a body in the air, to be high, elevated, tall, lofty’
5.15 Summary of evidence

So far we have seen evidence of a single compound pleonastically reconstructible to Proto-Dravidian and of the widespread nature of the pleonastic compounding pattern in all the three subgroups of Dravidian. Based on this we can safely conclude that pleonastic compounding of words was productive at the Proto-Dravidian stage itself.

6 Etymological Solutions

Now that we have established and understood the new Dravidian word structure we are ready to solve many outstanding etymological issues in the Indian linguistic area. First we provide solution to some Dravidian words and then to foreign words found in Vedic texts.

6.1 Tamil/Malayalam. \textit{takkappan} ‘father’

Here we have the case of a kinship term conforming to the new pattern. We have DEDR #3005 Tamil. \textit{tak-appan} father, Malayalam. \textit{takappan} grouped in an entry with \textit{tak}- stem etymons where the semantics is ‘fitness, worthiness, excellence’ etc., implying that \textit{tak-appan} means something like ‘fit, great or good father’ which seems rather unlikely for such a kinship term. But analyzing it as a pleonastic structure we can propose a more satisfactory etymology wherein the initial stem \textit{tak}- means the same as the second stem. And indeed we find it here in Central Dravidian languages where Kolami. \textit{tark} and Naikri. \textit{tāk} mean ‘father’:
DEDR #3152: Kolami. ta:k father (always with preceding possessor), ta:k ammaner parents.

Naikṛi. tāk, tāk-jaran father; amma tāk parents

A very interesting fact here is that these two languages, Kolami and Naikṛi, do not seem to have any ‘father’ words with ṛpp- stem. The DEDR entry\(^{46}\) with Tamil. appan ‘father’ etc., only has Kolami. appa ‘father’s sister’ and Naikṛi. appo/appok ‘wife’s younger brother’ even though Naikṛi’s neighbors Gondi and Telugu have words with the sense of ‘father’.

Such a construction in kinship terms is not isolated in Dravidian as can be seen with Tamil. appattai ‘elder sister’ where both the stems app- and att- are synonymous: DEDR #156 Tamil. appāttai, appi ‘elder sister’ and DEDR #142 Tamil. atti elder sister; Kannada. attike elderly sister.

As such, with the components in contactless languages spread across SDr I and CDr subfamilies, the Tamil/Malayalam word takappan/n can be inferred to be from the PDr form *tākappan or takappan (with the original long vowel in tāk reduced\(^{47}\) to

---

\(^{46}\) DEDR#156: (a) Tamil. appan, appu father; term of endearment used to little children or inferiors; appacci father; appāttai elder sister; appi mistress of house; elder sister. Malayalam. appan father; appu affectionate appellation of boys. Kannada. appa father; frequently added to the proper names of men as a term of common respect; used endearingly to children by their elders; apa father; appu affectionate appellation of boys. Koḍagu. appē father. Tulu. appa, appē affix of respect added to proper names of men; appē mother; appa a mode of calling a mother. Telugu. appa father; mother; elder sister; frequently added to names of men as a term of common respect. Kolami, appa father’s sister. Naikṛi. appo/appok wife’s younger brother. Gondi. āpōrāl father; tape, tappe, tāpe father; tappe (his, her) father. Konda. aposi father (with reference to 3rd person). Kuwi. appa grandmother

\(^{47}\) by Krishnamurti’s Rule (Zvelebil 1990:14, Krishnamurti 2003:97) for radical vowel length reduction vowel: CVC: CVC + V. For example, PDr pāṭ- : paṭ-V- ‘to run, flee’.
tak- due to the succeeding vowel in appan at the time composition itself, or later due to non-segmental factors).

It should be noted that PDr *t̪̣̄kappan when originally composed must have meant ‘elder’ (rather ‘elder-elder’) with each component meaning ‘elder’ as this accounts for the senses of ‘elder sister, father’s sister, mother, grandmother’ along with that of ‘father’ for the app- stem in many of the Dravidian languages and that it got specialized to ‘father’.

6.2 Gadaba. piṭode ‘nightingale’ and other bird words

This word is a very important etymon in gaining a strategic understanding of not only Dravidian word structure but also the etymological pattern in Dravidian. We consider Gadaba. piṭode in the following:


Kannada (Kittel): piṭaka ‘the tailor bird, Orthotonues longicauda’

The Gadaba word piṭode is structurally striking in the unusual ending ode. How do we account for this? This makes it a good candidate for investigating pleonastic compounding and we look for ḍ- stemmed bird words in Dravidian and we do indeed find some here:

DEDR #1040: Kuṇux. ḍṛā bird (in general); ḍṛē a small bird. Malto. ṭre quail
Kittel: Kannada. *udupa*; ‘the bird called cātaka’ is derived from the same root but with the standard Dravidian umlaut\(^{49}\) of ð/ū.

The intervocalic -r- of the Kurux and Malto etymons above is implied to be a reflex of PDr *-t-* (phonetically -d-) by the placement of the DEDR entry in the midst of *ōt-* entries. This is also in line with the standard phonology of Kurux and Malto that their -r- is a reflex of either PDr *-t-* or *-z-* (DEDR table of sound correspondences where DEDR employs ṡ for the retroflex approximant ŋ). So we can reconstruct the root stems in ṥrā, ṭrē, ṭre (substantiated by Kannada. *udupa* from contactless SDr I subgroup with a radical stem phonemically *uṭt-* to PDr *ōt-* (phonemically) as the long vowel quality in any Dravidian radical stem can be taken to represent the PDr quality (Subrahmanyan 1983:158-200, Krishnamurti 2003: 101-2).

So we can analyze Gadaba. *piṭode* as *piṭ-oḍe* where both the stems *piṭ-* and *oḍ-* mean ‘bird’ (traceable respectively to PDr. *pīṭṭ-* and *oṭt-* and the compound got specialized in the sense of ‘nightingale’.

That this semantic development is not an isolated case can be established with many similar instances with other stems in the domain of bird words. While the *piṭ(t)-* stem is general in meaning as ‘bird’ in Telugu, Kolami, Naikri and Gondi, it is specialized to ‘tailor bird’ in Kannada. *piṭaka*. We can see the same semantic development in the NDr bird words with ṭr- stem: In Kurux it has the general meaning of ‘bird in general’ and an is specialized in the same language to ‘a small

\(^{49}\) For parallels: typical subsets of (1) DEDR #946 (PDr *ōtτ-*): Tamil. *ōṭi* break, *uṭaippu* breach; Kannada. *odi, udi* to be broken; Telugu. *ōṭi* broken; Naikri. *ōṭ*, *ōt-* to break; Naiki (Chanda). *uṭu*- to break, *ōt* (*ōtτ-*) to break; Parji. *ōḍ-* to break (2) DEDR #945 (PDr *ōt*-): Tamil. *uṭaṇ* altogether, *-ōṭu*, *-ōṭu* with; Tulu. *oḍam-baḍu* to consent.
bird’ and in Malto to ‘quail’. We will see more bird words further on with an embedded -õt- component.

Another independent evidence of such a semantic specialization is the tīt-titt-stem: DEDR #3275 has Parji. tīta ‘bird’, Gadaba. tīte id. with a general meaning but in Telugu we have tītuvu, tītuvu, tītukapiṭṭa ‘lapwing bird’ (Gwynn), tītuvu ‘the yellow wattled Lapwing’ (Brown) with a specialized meaning. In Gadaba. purus tīte ‘dove’ where purus is ‘dove’ or ‘pigeon’ (DEDR #4334\(^{50}\)), the component tīte serves the same role played by Telugu. piṭṭa ‘bird’ in tītukapiṭṭa above. Areally Vedic. tittira, tittiri ‘partridge’ (CDIAL #5809) identified as foreign and suspected to be of Para-Munda in origin \(^{51}\) (Witzel 1999b:45) should be deemed as another specialization (with the standard stem alternation tīt : titt- known as Zvelebil’s Rule\(^{52}\)) and as Dravidian. Interestingly Tamil. tittiri ‘a kind of kingfisher’ (MTL) is yet another specialization. The case for the Dravidian origin of Vedic. tittira is strengthened by the currency of its leading root stem in the general sense of ‘bird’ along with its inflected forms spread over contactless far away Dravidian subgroups with varied semantic specializations.

That such a specialization took place very early can be seen with: DEDR #4125: Kui. pio ‘golden oriole’ Kuwi. pioṭi id. Kuṟux. piō ‘oriole’ and DEDR #4173: Tulu. pīyavu ‘small chicken’. Naiki. (Chanda.) pīyoṭe ‘chick’ Gondi. pise, pōnj pise, kor pise ‘chicken’. The component PDr *pīc- (intervocalic *-c-, phonetically -s-

\(^{50}\) Parts of DEDR #4334: Tamil. puṟā dove, pigeon Telugu. buṟra- piṭṭe a sort of pigeon. Gadaba. purus tīte dove.

\(^{51}\) Citing Munda language etymons Korku. titid, Santali. sengel tīti ‘guinea fowl’

\(^{52}\) “CV-CC:CVC Cf. Tamil. meṭṭ/u, heap of earth: mēṭ/u height, eminence, hillock” (Zvelebil 1990:14)
weakened\textsuperscript{53} at PDr stage itself to -y-) had the sense of ‘oriole’ as can be seen from the senses attested in SDr II Kui/Kuwi and NDr Kurux but also had the sense of ‘chicken’ as seen from SDr Tulu and SDr II Gondi and CDr Naiki (Chanda). Areally cognate with them is Skt. \textit{pīyu} (\textit{lex.}) ‘crow, owl’ (MW). Then the stem can be inferred to have had the general sense of ‘bird’ originally most likely from the root PDr \textit{*pīc-} ‘feather’\textsuperscript{54}. Cf. Telugu. \textit{piccika} ‘a sparrow’ (Brown).

Coming back to the component PDr \textit{*ōt-}, we find that its usage was very widespread in PDr stage itself and, in its alloforms such as \textit{*ōd-}, \textit{*ōr}, was embedded in so many bird words:

Gondi. \textit{gōrōd} ‘myna’ (DEDR \#1766\textsuperscript{55}), Gondi. \textit{kokoḍal} ‘heron, duck’ and Kui. \textit{kokoṇa} ‘crane’ (DEDR \#2125\textsuperscript{56}), Pengo. \textit{kokoḍa} ‘crane, paddy-bird’ (Burrow 1970:202), Kuwi. \textit{pioṭi} ‘golden oriole’ (DEDR \#4125\textsuperscript{57}) and Naiki (Chanda). \textit{piyote} ‘chick’ (DEDR \#4173\textsuperscript{58}). Also the ‘cock’ words from DEDR \#2248\textsuperscript{59}: Naiki.

\textsuperscript{54} DEDR \#4133: Tamil. \textit{piciṇ fibre}. Telugu. \textit{pīcu} the fibrous parts of plants, etc. Gadba. \textit{pī} \textit{su} fibrous matter of fruits. Also DEDR \#4226: Kui. \textit{piṣer}, \textit{plier} tail feather of a peacock; \textit{pieli} peacock. Malt. \textit{pice tail} of a peacock; \textit{picale} peacock in full plume. / Cf. Skt. \textit{picca}-peacock’s tail; Turner, CDIAL, no. 8151
\textsuperscript{58} DEDR \#4125: Kui. \textit{pio} golden oriole Kuwi. \textit{pioṭi} id. Ku. \textit{pio} oriole
\textsuperscript{59} DEDR \#4173: Tulu. \textit{piyavu} small chicken. Naiki. (Chanda.) \textit{piyote} chick Gondi. \textit{pise}, \textit{pōnj pise}, \textit{kor pise} chicken

This entry has wrongly clubbed them with Tamil. \textit{kōzi} etc., as if the analysis of \textit{gōgōrī} and the rest were \textit{gō-gōrī}.
(Chanda.) gogodi, gogori 'cock', Gondi. gōgōri, gugorī, ghogri, gogor 'cock'. Areally Skt. bakoṭa (lex.) ‘a kind of crane’ (MW) has this component embedded in it.

Examining the ‘cock’ words from Naiki (Chanda) and Gondi listed above, they are phonemically *kokoṭi, *kōkōti, *kukōti, *kokVti (unknown vowel V is most likely a short unstressed -o-) and *kokoṭ- which should immediately remind one of Vedic. kukkuṭā\(^{60}\) ‘cock’ (CDIAL #3208) identified as non-IA in origin (Kuiper 1991:58, 68 and Witzel 1999c:41). Their underlying semantics lies most likely in ‘feather, hair’ as seen with DEDR #1634: Telugu. kunkaṭi, kūkaṭi a lock or tuft of hair, crest of peacock. Gondi. kukur(i), kukur cock's comb; kūkōḍ, kokkōr id.; kookooree crest on a bird's head. Konḍa. kukuṭi hair.

Here we are looking at a yet another very widespread PDr stem *kōkk-/*kūkk- ‘bird’ in compounded forms. That it had developed its free-standing usage in PDr is evident in words spanning SDr and CDr from DEDR #2125 (which as noted above has confounded another root stem kur-/kor-) :


\(^{60}\) For an instance of bird words with an embedded -uṭ- stem Cf. Kannada (Kittel) kiruṭiga ‘the bay-backed shrike’, kiruṭige ‘the Keroula shrike, Keroula Indica; the great Indian shrike, Lanius burra; the Lahtora butcher bird, Lanuis lahota’. For examples of a simple uncompounded bird word with cognate with the kir-tem, Pengo. kira ‘sp. bird (with a large tail)’ (Oriya. kiroṭi) (Burrow and Bhattacharya 1970:200). Cf. also Skt. kīra ‘parrot’.
gūge, gūgi id. Now we can find an areal etymology for Skt. kokila ‘Indian cuckoo’ too based on the same Dravidian stem\(^\text{61}\).

It is very easy to find a component stem from one compound and find its other related words. Looking at Gondi, gōrōd ‘mynah’ where we already identified PDr \(*ōt-\) as the trailing component, we can now follow its initial component phonemically \(*kōr-\) and observe\(^\text{62}\) its occurrence in Kannada. goravaṅka, goravanke ‘the common maina, A. tristis, or the pastor’ and Telugu. goruvaṅka, gōra, gōraṅka, gōriṅka, gōruvaṅka ‘myna’ where it occurs uncompounded in Telugu. gōrā ‘mynah’ but is compounded with vaṅka which, in turn, occurs free in Tamil. vaṅkā ‘a bird’ (DEDR #5206). A cognate of the gōr- stem words above is Tamil. kōracam ‘a kind of partridge’ (MTL).

6.3 Tamil. kalamalakku ‘to agitate, confound’

We take up the case of echo-like compounds in Dravidian and provide a pleonastic explanation for it as with Kuṟux. keykō-beykō ‘crooked, curved’ above. The echo-like word kalamalakku occurs in 7\(^\text{th}\) century Tēvāram maṅattulē kalamalakkiṭṭut tiriyun kaṇapati (Tēvāram:4.2.5) “the Gaṇapati that goes around causing agitation in [their] minds”. The verb kalamalakku with the sense of ‘causing

\(^{61}\) DEDR# 1764 Tamil. kuyil koel, Indian cuckoo, Eudynamis honorata; Malayalam. kuyil, kūril Indian cuckoo, Cuculus or E. orientalis. Kannada. kukil cuckoo; kāgula cuckoo. Tulu. kōgilē, kōjilē, kuyilu; id. Kuwi kuhu paṭa id. / Cf. Skt. kokila- Indian cuckoo; cf. Pkt. kuhila- id.

\(^{62}\) See footnote 55 for the DEDR entry #1766
to flounder, to stir, agitate, confound' (MTL) is pleonastic with two components\(^63\) 
\(k.al\) and \(m.al\) with the same sense of ‘agitate, stir, confuse’:

DEDR #1303 (a subset): Tamil. \(k.al\)\(a\)\(n\)\(k\)u to be stirred up, agitated, ruffled (as water),
be confused, abashed; \(k.al\)\(a\)\(l\)\(a\)\(k\)\(k\)u to confuse, nonplus; Kannada. \(k.al\)\(a\)\(k\)u to agitate, shake,
perturb, make turbid, stir up, disturb; Tulu. \(g.al\)\(j\)\(u\)\(n\)i to confuse; Telugu. \(k.a\)\(l\)\(a\)\(g\)\(u\)\(n\)\(d\)\(u\) confusion;
Kui. \(g.l.a\)\(h\)\(p\)\(a\) to mix by stirring, stir, confuse, perplex, confound, cause to be confused; act of
stirring, confusing; Ku\(r\)\(u\)\(x\). \(x.a\)\(l\)\(a\)\(v\)\(n\)\(a\) to disturb, make muddy (as water); Malto. \(q.a\)\(l\)\(g\)\(e\) to
disturb (as water).

DEDR #1306 (a subset): Tamil. \(k.a\)\(l\)\(a\)\(v\)\(a\)\(r\)\(a\)\(m\)\(u\) confusion of mind, perturbation, Telugu.
\(k.a\)\(l\)\(a\)\(v\)\(a\)\(r\)\(a\)\(m\)\(u\) confusion, state of being puzzled or perplexed.

DEDR #4736 (a subset): Tamil. \(m.a\)\(l\)\(a\)\(n\)\(k\)u to be agitated, turbid, confused, shake, move,
tremble (as the eyes), perish; Kannada. \(m.a\)\(l\)\(a\)\(n\)\(i\)\, \(m.a\)\(l\)\(a\)\(r\)\i bodily agitation, bewilderment, fear,
amazement. Telugu. \(m.a\)\(l\)\(a\)\(y\)\u to be distressed Kolami. \(m.e\)\(l\)\(g\)- to shake; \(m.e\)\(l\)\(a\)\(g\)\(e\)ng to move.
Gadaba. \(m.e\)\(l\)\(g\)- to stir, move. Gondi. \(m.e\)\(l\)\(h\)\(\_\)\(n\)\(a\) to shake; \(m.e\)\(l\)\(l\)\(i\)\- to move.

Each of the components is derivable from PDr \(^*\)\(k.a\)\(l\)- and PDr \(^*\)\(m.a\)\(l\)- (or PSDr if
the words with \(m.e\)- stem are ignored) each with the same indicated semantics.

6.4 Summary of etymological and structural patterns

From the discussions above we can observe the following:

(a) Words which start off general in meaning get specialized variously in the
same semantic domain and their stems are then found as such in free words or as
components in pleonastic compounds. What this means for etymological efforts is

\(^{63}\) MTL proposes an unsure etymology: “prob. \(k.a\)\(l\)\(a\)\(m\) + \(m.a\)\(l\)\(a\)\(k\)\(k\)u” but the retroflex \(-l\)- as original is
untenable historically for that period and for the phonology of echo-like Dravidian compounds;
moreover Tamil. \(k.a\)\(l\)\(a\)\(m\) is attested predominantly in the sense of ‘place, floor’ etc. (and is from PDr
as seen in DEDR #1376) which semantics is irrelevant here.
that we can relate words from the same semantic domain by their component stems purely based on phonology even though they differ in their specific final meanings.

(b) Components may be found singly in free words, or be combined and positioned randomly in a compound with no evident role implied by the position. There are cases where the components have simply exchanged their positions as with Tamil. inanirai and niraiyinam both meaning ‘herd’ seen earlier and with Tamil/Malayalam. vāyykkāl and kālvāy ‘channel’\(^{64}\). The consequence of this random permutation and combination is that it is actually quite possible to predict new names or words in the domain and find that it is attested in the Indian linguistic area.

(c) Components which have retained their general sense till this day may be found in initial position as seen in the ‘bird’ words above as with Gadaba. piṭ-ode (piṭta means ‘bird’ in many languages other than Gadaba) and Telugu. tīṭukapiṭṭa (tīte means ‘bird’ in Parji and Gadda). This, when viewed in a situation where the second component’s etymology is unknown, would be unrecognizable to an observer used to Krishnamurti’s pattern (2-iv) with the compound ‘proper noun x + common noun y’ where ‘y is called x’. Such is the case with the Vedic place name Ūrjayantī identified as non-Aryan in origin by Witzel (1999c:§4.3) where now we can identify the initial component as the Dravidian place word ār ‘village, town’ (DEDR #752)\(^{65}\).

\(^{64}\) DEDR #1480: Tamil. kāl, kāl-vāy, vāy-kkāl irrigation channel. Malayalam. kāl-vā(y) river mouth; irrigation channel; vāy-kkāl small or narrow canal; kāva gutter. Toda. kofoy ditch (in song). Kannada. kāl, kālivē, kāluve, kālve, kāvāle water-course, channel, brook. Tulu. kālivē channel for irrigation, canal. Telugu. kālava, kāluva canal, channel, gutter, drain, sewer. Gondi. kālva irrigation channel (< Telugu.). Cf. 1478 Tamil kāl and 5352 Tamil. vāy.

\(^{65}\) Cf. Uṟōṭakam (Urōdagam) and Uṟakampākkam town names in a 11th century Chola Tamil inscription (SII. Vol. 3:165-167), Kākanti alternate name of the city Kāvirippāmpatṭinam (Maṉimekai:22:37), Antaḷi or Andal (SII. Vol 2.:292, 296), Antiyūr modern town in Erode district of
6.5 Etymology of the Vedic substratum

Now we turn to providing etymological solutions based on the pleonastic structure to words occurring in the early Vedic texts and which have been identified securely as non-IE in origin based on their violation of strict phonological and structural rules defined for originally IE words. By Vedic we mean here Vedic Sanskrit or the Old Indo-Aryan (OIA) language. The major contribution to the study of these substrate words here is the alternative to the prevailing analysis which views most of the substrate words as composed of prefixes, infixes and suffixes from ancestral forms of the Munda family of languages which Witzel calls Para-Munda, “an unknown western Austro-Asiatic language” (Witzel 1999b:8) developing on the ideas of Kuiper.

Witzel also states: “We can be on secure ground only if we can establish certain patterns, especially recurrent suffixes or prefixes, and can reconstruct, in this fashion, an underlying substrate or correspondences with Munda, Dravidian, etc.” (1999a:§4.1). Here we engage in exactly such an exercise, only that instead of recurrent affixes we analyze these words as pleonastic compounds having first-class lexical stems as recurrent components. Gurov is reported (Krishnamurti 2003:38) to have shown several of the substrate words to have Dravidian etymologies based on compounding\(^6\) and not prefixing.

---

\(^6\) Gurov’s etymology for *kīkaṭa* (in RV 3.53.14a) as from PDr *kīẓ* ‘low, bottom, mean’, *kaṭa* ‘place’, with loss of *ḥ* from the compound *kīẓ-kaṭ-ar* ‘mean persons’ clearly taking his cue from *naicāśākhám maghavan randhayā nah* (RV 3.53.14d) in the same *kīkaṭa* verse but it confounds tribe name origins with much later derogatory references (Cf. Vedic. *kirāta*)
For a critical treatment of the issues and controversies involved in the methodologies and approaches to pre-Ṛg Vedic ‘Subversion’ (language shift) versus convergence (bilingualism), the reader is referred to Hock (1996:17-58) who, Krishnamurti (2003:42) says, “has persistently questioned the theory of a Dravidian substratum in Indo-Aryan from pre-historic times” since 1975 and “suggests that Ṛgvedic Aryans and non-Aryans met as ‘near-equals’”. These arguments, however, do not prejudice the validity of the etymologies of the Vedic foreign words as Dravidian but can only use the results as further data for resolving the issue.

Reserving the full discussion of the Vedic substratum for a future paper, I briefly discuss their etymological pattern to give an idea of the applicability of my methodology here.

6.6 Vedic. śarkoṭa ‘serpent’

Vedic. śārkoṭa ‘serpent’ has been identified as non-IA and much discussed by Kuiper (1991:41-2, 44) and Witzel (1999a:§3, 1999c:30, 37) where they take the initial śar- stem as a Munda prefix while acknowledging at the outset that “in modern Munda there are, owing to the typological change that has taken place in these languages, only some petrified relics remain” (Kuiper 1991:39).

This well known ‘serpent’ word, occurring at least twice in the Atharva Veda (Whitney 2000) as in śārkoṭam arasaṁ viṣam (AV 7.58.7\(^{67}\)) and arasasya śarkoṭasya (AV 7.58.5), can now be related to the same pleonastic structure as with the Gondi sargōḍā etymon which was discussed earlier in detail. Gondi. sargōḍā was reconstructed phonemically in Dravidian to \(^{cērkōṭa/cerekōṭa}\) the second component

\(^{67}\) But listed as AV 7.56.7\(^{d}\) by Bloomfield 1990.
being a variant of the canonical root \(*kōṭī-\) from which the second component of śarkoṭa is also derived but with a geminate stop which will be worked out later. The question now is about the initial part śār- of śarkoṭa which in Dravidian would phonemically be \(*cār-\) but, as shown earlier, the sargōḍā etymons have PDr \(*cēr\) as the root of the initial component. The \(*cār-\) component can be related as a cognate to the Dravidian snake etymons in DEDR #2359 below whose stems are reconstructed to PDr \(*carac\) by Emeneau (1994:361) and Krishnamurti (2003:122-3) and to \(*caracc(u)\) by Subrahmanyan (2008:141):


Without a derivative vowel the root ought to be PDr \(*cār\) as word-final -r is not permitted after a short vowel in PDr (Krishnamurti 2003:120). With this we have PDr. \(*cār\) for the śār component in Vedic. śārkoṭa. As for the reconstruction of its second component koṭa, it should be noted that it has a single voiceless stop -ṭ- after a long vowel which necessitates reconstruction to a geminate (-ṭṭ-) in PDr for it. The reason is that, comparatively, a single voiceless stop occurring in postvocalic position in any of the Dravidian languages can be traced back to a geminate stop in PDr and if it was a single stop it would appear as a lenis consonant (Krishnamurti 2003:163). If Vedic. śārkoṭa is a direct takeover from a local Dravidian dialect and not the result of changes in transmission, then we can infer that the source Dravidian
dialect had already simplified geminate stops to single stops. That this could easily have been the case in the Vedic period is supported by the fact that simplification of a geminate stop after a long vowel was a very early Dravidian development since all Dravidian languages except Tamil-Malayalam simplified geminate stops to a single stop (Krishnamurti 2003:163, Subrahmanyam 2008:57). Moreover if the local Dravidian dialect had had the second component of this serpent word with a -tī- as in *kōṭta, the borrowing Vedic speech would have had no reason to simplify it as the Vedic language did support geminate stops after long vowels as evidenced by the many occurrences (at least twelve) of īṭṭe the third person singular present indicative form of the athematic verb īḍ (or īḷ) ‘to praise’ in Rg Veda itself (Lubotsky RVC). So we can reconstruct Vedic. sārkōṭa phonemically to PDr. *cārkōṭṭa or *cārvkōṭṭa where V is an unstressed derivative vowel that caused reduction of the long vowel in *cār and was lost later.

Now we discuss the common origin of the roots of the initial components of Vedic. sārkōṭa and Gondi. sargōḍā, namely, the component *cār in *cārkōṭṭa and the component *cēr in *cērkōṭa (intervocalic -r- would be phonetically a voiced -d-). Since, at some stage in PDr, word-initial palatals such as PDr *y-, *ī- and *c- caused neutralization of the following *d and *ē (Krishnamurti 2003:99,139,143), we might be looking at the same root for those two components, namely, PDr *cĀr (or *c.Aēr) ‘to move or creep’ where //Ā// (or //Ē//) is the archiphoneme representing that neutralization (Krishnamurti 2003:143 and 2001:80). Indeed we have evidence of PDr *cār in the sense of motion in the DEDR ‘slip’ entry #2360 as cross-referenced by the above cited DEDR ‘snake’ entry #2359 (citing here only the etymons needed
for PDr reconstruction): Tamil. *cari ‘slide, slip’, Kannada. *sari, jari ‘slide’, Telugu. *jaragu ‘slide, creep’ Kolami. jārāg- ‘to slip’ Malto. jārgē ‘to fall’. Since all three subgroups have the same stem with the sense of sliding or motion we have PDr *cār- ‘slip, move’. Krishnamurti relates (ibid.) *cēr- ‘to go, reach’ entries from DEDR #2814 here for the alternation of *ā and *ē after PDr *c-.

In relating the phonetic development of PDr *c- to the ś- in śarkoṭa here, it is worth quoting Emeneau’s reconstruction (Emeneau 1994:347) of the phonetics of PDr *kōṭ(t)-: “There is no difficulty, considering the occurrences of the palatal affricate in all the subgroups of the family, in reconstructing this pronunciation for PDr *c-.

The more specific description will include ‘blade-alveolar palatal’ and will specify that the affricate has as release a sibilant of the ś-type”.

The second component PDr. *kōṭ(t)-, whose Dravidian cognates have been cited in the Gondi treatment, is also to be seen in non-IE words in the IA lexicon such as Skt. gala-gōḍī and gala-gōḍikā ‘a kind of snake’ (MW citing Caraka VI.23) with standard Dravidian voicing of intervocalic stops.

Next we discuss Vedic. karkoṭa here which occurs at least once as karkoṭo nāma sarpaḥ (RVKh 7.55.7) (Bloomfield 1990). As for the relationship of Vedic. karkoṭa with śarkoṭa, the second component in each of them is the same but their first components, based on the Dravidian phonological discussions above, must be from different roots. Witzel (1999c:30) sets up a k/ś alternation as a “northwestern peculiarity”. Even within Dravidian, a change of PDr *c- to k has been identified
mainly as a shared innovation in NDr but it is sporadic\textsuperscript{68} and the available instances are meager (Subrahmanym 2008:44, 138, 282, Krishnamurti 2003:125-6) and this sound change is for non-low vowels, viz., ū and ē. Ignoring then this sound change, we can find snake and reptile words with cognate components in Dravidian with kār- stems such as Tamil. \textit{karaṭṭuviriyāṇ}\textsuperscript{69} ‘blood viper reddish in color’ (MTL), Tamil. \textit{karaṭṭāṉ, karaṭṭōnti}\textsuperscript{70} ‘Blood-sucker, Calotes versicolor’ (MTL). It should be noted that Tamil. \textit{karaṭṭōnti} itself is another pleonasm\textsuperscript{71}. From the IA lexicon, we have as cognate components in Vedic. \textit{kṛkalāśa} ‘lizard, chameleon’ (cited as a foreign word by Witzel 1999b:12) pointing to *\textit{kṛkalāśa} and \textit{kardamaka} ‘a kind of snake’ (MW citing Suśruta) another structurally non-IE word.

6.7 Vedic. \textit{kalmalikīn} ‘shining, twinkling’

This word has been identified by Kuiper (1955:170, 1991:91) and Witzel (1999b:12) as a non-IE foreign word in Vedic. It occurs once\textsuperscript{72} in the Ṛg Veda in the sense of ‘shining, twinkling’. We also have one \textit{kalmali} listed as Vedic substrate by Witzel (1999b:43) with a query ‘shimmering (of stars)’ and occurring four times in

\textsuperscript{68} Subrahmanym (2008:138) says of a 1988 Emeneau study as “attributing this irregular change to the instability of the affricate” and finally concluding that “replacement of the palatal by velar is sporadic…”

\textsuperscript{69} Cf. The word \textit{viriyāṇ} in DEDR \#5413: Tamil. \textit{viri, viriyāṇ} viper; \textit{virusu} id. Malayalam. \textit{viriyāṇ} id. and in DEDR \#4038: Tamil. \textit{panaiyāṇ, panai-viriyāṇ} krait, Bungarus caeruleus.


\textsuperscript{71} Cf. \textit{karaṭṭ-} in \textit{karaṭṭāṉ} and the word \textit{ōnti} in DEDR \#1053 in footnote above

\textsuperscript{72} namasyā \textit{kalmalikīnām nāmobhir} (RV:II.33.8c)
the Atharva Veda (XV.2.1\textsuperscript{73}) in association with \emph{mani} (jewel) and thought to basically mean ‘light’\textsuperscript{74}.

Since \emph{kalmalikén} has a reduplicative pattern like a typical “onomatopoeic” it is worth mentioning here the words of Emeneau from his classic areal treatment of this topic (Emeneau 1980:250-93) on the IA onomatopoeic material: “Remarkably few IE etymologies hold for the IA material. There seems to be no Old or Middle Iranian material, and the abundant Modern Persian material may have been formed under the influence of Arabic\textsuperscript{75} or of Turkic. Since the material of the type on which we are concentrating is Indic, and hardly IE at all, we must look for indigenous influence on IA from the earliest period” (p265)\textsuperscript{76}.

In the word \emph{kalmalikén}, the -\textit{in} ending is the possessive suffix and -\textit{ik-} is a common derivational affix in IA cf. Vedic. \emph{mṛḷīka} ‘compassion, favour’ from the Vedic verb \emph{mṛḷ} ‘to be gracious or favorable’.

The stem \emph{kalmal-} is to be analyzed in Dravidian as a pleonastic compound \emph{kal-mal} where each component stem means ‘shine’. We have already seen above an almost exact phonological and structural parallel with Tamil. \emph{kalamalakku} ‘to agitate, confound’.

The \emph{kal-} stem is cognate with the following Dravidian etymons:

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{73} “kálmalir maniḥ” Whitney(2000:57-60)
\textsuperscript{75} Citing: Hoffman, Karl. 1952. \textit{Wiederholende Onomatopoetika im Altindischen}. Indogermanische Forschungen 60.254-64, p263, n.3.
\textsuperscript{76} And nearly repeats the same in his conclusion (Emeneau 1980:268): “The IA family does not inherit the pattern from IE (the Old Iranian lack is notable)”, “… Consequently, we may postulate diffusion of both the pattern and some etymological items from the indigenous families into IA.”
\end{flushleft}
Tamil. (MTL) kalippu ‘brightness’ (lex.), kali ‘to become manifest’, kaliḻtal ‘to shine forth, as beauty’; Telugu. (Brown) kaliki ‘a beauty, a charm or grace, charming, lovely, pretty’, kaliki-tanamu. ‘prettiness’. Also DEDR #1300: Tamil. kala, kali ‘appear’. Tamil. kaliḻtal is attested in Caṅkam Tamil texts as in anḵaliḻ mēṇi (Aiṅkuṟunūṟu: 174) meaning “body with beauty shining forth” and kaliḻ talir anĩnta irum ciṅai māṭtu (Akanāṅūṟu:97:20) “mango tree whose dark branches have beautiful tender shoots”. Tamil. kalippu ‘brightness’ is listed\(^77\) by the 9\(^{th}\) century nighaṇṭu Piṅkalantai in the synonyms for polivu ‘beauty’. These would provide reconstruction to PSDr *kal- ‘shine, beauty’.

The mal- stem is cognate with the following Dravidian etymons:

DEDR #4729: Tamil. mallal ‘elegance, brilliance, beauty’; Telugu. malayu ‘shine, be splendid, unfold, display’. DEDR #4739: Tamil. malar ‘appear, rise to view’. Also Kannada. (Kittel) malatu ‘to shine, to unfold, display’.

Tamil. mallal ‘beauty’ is attested in a 13\(^{th}\) century commentary on Tirukkōvaiyār as: mallarran niramonnīl (Tirukkōvaiyār 4:9, Pērāciriyar commentary\(^78\)) meaning “in one of his beautiful forms”. Also relevant are the DEDR #5079 etymons Parji. melk- ‘to lighten’, malk- ‘(light) to flash’; Pengo. malkā- ‘to lighten’ which are most likely with an original radical vowel PDr *a (in spite of the entry’s placement\(^79\) suggesting *mel-) and the stem mal- in Pengo. mil-mal in ‘to

\(^77\) tuppuk kalippuk kaṅaral pommal poriyē pokkam pūp polivu ākum (Piṅkalantai:7:475)

\(^78\) Pērāciriyar’s gloss : “azakaiyuṭaiya tan tirumēṇi yonrīṅkan”

\(^79\) Parji. has regular change of PDr *a > e/#_[+alveolar] but rarely the other way round (Subrahmanyam 1983:46, 2008:277). Pre-Parji had a regular change of “low vowel fronting and
lighten’ which would secure this all the way back to PDr, otherwise we have at least PDr *mal- ‘shine, beauty’.

Kuiper in the same discussion on this foreign word (Kuiper 1955:170) cites Vedic. *malabha-vant- ‘flashing, glittering’ (*bha-vant is the present participle of Skt. *bhū ‘to be’) occurring in Taittirīya Saṃhita\textsuperscript{80} and other Vedic texts\textsuperscript{81} which can also be seen as derived by reduplication from the same Dravidian root as the second component of *kalmalíkín. This also shows that the second component of *kalmalíkín was an independent root to start with and was combined in a pleonastic manner with an sonant root *kal-.

6.8 Vedic. *kalyána and *kalyáñi ‘beautiful, auspicious, prosperous’

Please see the discussion of Old Tamil phrases *kali kol yá-ñar and *kali yá-ñar in the Context and Motivations section.

7 Context and Motivations

The basic structure of the pleonastic pattern is not entirely new to or isolated in Dravidian as can be seen from the repetitive or reduplicative structure seen in echo compounds (Zvelebil 1990:73, Steever 1998:28) and in the doublets found in a subset of expressions classified as onomatopoeics, intensives, expressives (Emeneau 1980:250-93 and 1994:323-7, Zvelebil 1990:73) and as ideophones (Chevillard\textsuperscript{82}).

\textsuperscript{80} Taittirīya Saṃhita (1.4.34.1) (Bhashyam 2005): *jvalantiṁ tvā *sādayāmi *malabha-vantiṁ tvā *sādayāmi which Keith (1914:242) translates as “I place thee that burnest. I place thee that flashest.”

\textsuperscript{81} Bloomfield (1990): Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhita II.13.19, 165.10; Kāṭhaka Saṃhita 40.4; Taittirīya Āraṇyaka 3.19.1

We can find syntactic vestiges of the pleonastic speech tendency in Tamil Caṅkam texts where frequently we see curiously structured noun phrases in which the head noun is preceded by a synonymous noun with a stock intervening verb kol\(^{82}\) ‘having, containing’. They are awkward to rephrase in the syntax otherwise prevailing in the Caṅkam corpus or to translate into English and we can clearly see that their awkwardness arises from their paraphrasing nature. This is unlike other phrases of the predominant type where the same intervening verb kol connects nouns with differing senses. For example, koṭi kol pācarai (Puṟa:69:9) ‘war camps with … banners’ where koṭi\(^{83}\) means ‘banner, flag’ and pācarai\(^{84}\) ‘war camp’.

Some examples of the pleonastic or paraphrastic occurrences are:

\[ ituṃpai kol paruvaral (Puṟa:174:4)\(^{85}\): \text{where it is glossed by the old commentary} (Pillai 1996) as nōy koṇṭa tuṇpam which, in a template form, may be translated as ‘tuṇpam with nōy’ where ituṃpai means ‘suffering, affliction, distress, calamity’, paruvaral ‘suffering, affliction’, nōy ‘sorrow, grief, affliction, trouble’ and tuṇpam ‘affliction, sorrow, distress, trouble’ (MTL). A literal translation would, of course, be awkward sounding something like ‘distress with affliction’. So translators often choose to ignore this structure and say “anguish [of the world]” (Hart and Heifetz}

---

\(^{82}\) MTL: kol([u-tal]: to seize, grasp, to acquire, take possession of, occupy, to contain, hold

\(^{83}\) MTL: ‘banner, flag, standard, streamer’

\(^{84}\) MTL: ‘encampment or tent of an invading army; warcamp’

\(^{85}\) nāḷattu ituṃpai kol paruvaral tīra (Puṟa:174:3-4)
1999:113). This awkward structure is easily explained with the motivation of paraphrasing the head word *paruvaram*.

*kuzuu* *kol peruń kulai* (Nețu:24): where the medieval commentary by Naccinäkkiniiyarn (Pattuppätțu 1986) glosses it as *tiraččiyai kōnta tāṟukal* where *kuzu* means ‘class, assembly, crowd’, *kulai* ‘cluster, bunch, as of fruits, flowers’, *tiračci* ‘multitude, assemblage’, *tāṟu* ‘bunch, cluster, as of plantains, dates, areca nuts’. A literal translation would be ‘big bunches [of areca nuts] with cluster(ing)’ clearly a paraphrasing of the word *kulai* motivating this phrase.

*tōțu kol iṇanirai* (Pattirru:12:6): This is an interesting case where we have an already pleonastically compounded head word (*iṇanirai*) preceded by a synonymous noun (*tōțu*). We have already discussed *iṇanirai* ‘herd, collection’ in the evidence section above and here we see it preceded by *tōțu* meaning again ‘collection, assemblage, crowd, cluster, bunch’. A literal translation would be ‘the herd [of other animals] having assemblage’ clearly indicating the intent to paraphrase the word *iṇanirai*.

*kali kol yānar* (Puṟa:66:6): Meaning “fresh income (or prosperity) with the property of prospering”, the old commentary (Pillai 1996) glossing it as *tazăittalaik kōnta putuvaruvāy* where *kali* ‘flourishing, thriving, prospering’, *yānar* ‘fresh

---

86 kamukiṉ … kozu maṭal aviznta kuzūu kol peruń kulai (Nețu:23-24)
87 kusu *kuzu* means (MTL): class, society, band, assembly; assembly or gathering of women; flock, herd, swarm, shoal, bundle, heap
88 piṟa māṉ tōțu kol iṇanirai (Pattirru:12:6)
89 niṉṉiṉum naṉ … kalkol yānar venṉp paraṉtalai mikap pukaẓ ulakameyi (Puṟa:66:6) where venṉp paraṉtalai is a town name
90 DEDR #1300: Tamil. *kali* to grow luxuriantly, sprout, increase; n. flourishing, prospering. Telugu. *kalugu* to accrue be produced or caused; *kalimi* possessions, wealth. Konḍa. *kalgi* to accrue as prosperity, happen. Kuwi. *kalg*- to get, become, accrue
income, fertility, wealth’, *taḻaittal* ‘to flourish, thrive, grow luxuriantly, as plants, to be abundant, as a flood, to multiply, to grow, prosper, as a family people, state’ and *varuvāy* ‘origin, source’ (MTL). The word *yāṇar* ‘fresh income, wealth’ is attested dozens\(^91\) of times in Caṅkam texts (Lehman and Malten 1993). Here again translators avoid the awkward construction and simply say ‘wealthy [Veṇṇi]’ (Hart and Heifetz 1999:51). We also find instances where the word *yāṇar* is preceded attributively by other synonyms as in *mallal*\(^92\) *yāṇar* (Aka:216:12) and instances where *yāṇar* in turn serves attributively with other synonyms as in *yāṇar vaḷam*\(^93\) (Aka:181:14, Porunar:245).

There is an occurrence where the connecting verb *koḷ* is left out as in the phrase *kali yāṇar* (Maturai:118\(^94\)) which the medieval commentator Nacciṅārkkiṅiyar glosses (Pattuppāṭṭu 1986) as *perukkiṉai uṭaittākiya putuvaruvāy[iṇaiyuṭaiya]* meaning ‘[with] fresh income having abundance or influx (of wealth)’\(^95\). Here the word *kali* may also be taken to be syntactically the verb *kali* meaning\(^96\) ‘to grow luxuriantly, to increase’ which is still the same sense as with the nominal form above. The variant forms of *kali koḷ yāṇar* and *kali yāṇār* illustrate dramatically how pleonastic word structure develops. The word *kali* is descended from PDr * kal-* ‘abundance, prosperity’ based on DEDR #1300 (See footnote 90).

---

\(^91\) Even after excluding the cases where *yāṇar* likely means ‘beauty’

\(^92\) MTL: *mallal* ‘abundance, wealth, fertility, richness’. Also DEDR #4729.

\(^93\) MTL: *vaḷam* ‘fertility, productiveness, luxuriance, abundance, fulness, advantage, profit, wealth, riches, income’. Also DEDR #5304.

\(^94\) olyōvāk kaliyāṇar mutuveḷḷiai (Maturai:118-9) where mutuveḷḷiai is a town name and kaliyāṇar is a single metrical foot or cīr in Tamil prosody

\(^95\) MTL: *perukku*(noun) influx, as of wealth. *perukku-tal* (verb): to cause to increase or abound; to make greater, to fill, to cause to swell and overflow, to multiply. Also DEDR #4411.

\(^96\) See footnote 90
Moreover it should certainly be remarked that the Caṅkam phrase \textit{kali yāṇār} is astonishingly near-identical in phonological form and senses (for ‘beauty’ see below) to Vedic. \textit{kalyāṇa} \footnote{Once as \textit{kalyāna} (RV 1.31.9) and thrice with the word forms of \textit{kalyānīḥ} (RV 3.53.6, 4.58.8, 10.30.5) \footnotemark[98] to Vedic. \textit{kalyāṇa-} \footnote{Pinault (2006:176) assumes for \textit{āṇi} an original meaning of ‘hip, haunch’ taking his cue from the meaning ‘the part of the leg just above the knee’ occurring in Suśruta which, he goes on, was metaphorically transferred to the two linch-pins at both ends of the axle resulting in Vedic \textit{āṇi} ‘linch pin’} \footnote{Pinault, G-J. 2003. Sanskrit \textit{kalyāṇa-} interprétée à la lumière des contacts en Asie Centrale. \textit{Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris} 98:123-161} (and feminine \textit{kalyāṇī}) ‘beautiful, auspicious, prosperous, fortunate, lucky’ whose etymology has been very unsatisfactory. Mayrhofer (KEWA:185) suggests, under \textit{kalyāṇ}, a composition \textit{kali} + -\textit{āna} but says “vor allem bezüglich des letzten Gliedes ganz unsicher” (“very uncertain especially regarding the last member”). Pinault (2006:177) remarks, “the retroflex nasal in the last syllable has remained a puzzle” and goes on to propose\footnote{Pinault, G-J. 2003. Sanskrit \textit{kalyāṇa-} interprétée à la lumière des contacts en Asie Centrale. \textit{Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris} 98:123-161} a semantic evolution from a hypothetical Proto-Vedic *\textit{kaly-āṇi}- ‘having beautiful hips’ > ‘beautiful’ and treats the masculine \textit{kalyāṇa} as a secondary derivation from the feminine form but still acknowledges, “the word \textit{āṇi} cannot be of IE origin” \footnote{Pinault, G-J. 2003. Sanskrit \textit{kalyāṇa-} interprétée à la lumière des contacts en Asie Centrale. \textit{Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris} 98:123-161} (\textit{ibid}:190). Citing a work of Pinault\footnote{Pinault, G-J. 2003. Sanskrit \textit{kalyāṇa-} interprétée à la lumière des contacts en Asie Centrale. \textit{Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris} 98:123-161}, Lubotsky (IAL) also remarks on \textit{kalyāṇa/kalyāṇī}: “Doubts remain, however. Since \textit{āṇi}- is a loanword, it is not unreasonable to assume that \textit{kalyāṇī}- is a loanword, too”. Vedic. \textit{āṇi} ‘linch-pin’ is, of course, identified as a foreign word (\textit{Kuiper List} #35). But, in Dravidian, the components \textit{kal-} and \textit{yāṇ-} are attested in the sense of ‘beauty’ too. For a reconstruction of PSDr *\textit{kal}- ‘beauty’, see the discussion of Vedic. \textit{kalmalikin} above. This should be contrasted with Pinault’s hypotheses of
“obsolescence of the adjective *kali ‘beautiful, good’ in the standard Vedic language” and “indirect remnants in Old Indo-Aryan of IE *kal-i ‘beautiful, well done’” in the RV personal name *Kali⁹². But the IE origin of that personal name itself has been deemed highly unlikely and is listed as a foreign word (Kuiper 1991:7,91).

For Tamil, āṇ- stems in the sense of ‘beauty’, we have⁹³: “yāṇuk kaviy ām” (Tolkāppiyam:col:381) meaning ‘yāṇu is beauty’ and “yāṇar … kaṭṭazaku” (Tivākaram:1397) meaning ‘yāṇar … great beauty’. In addition to the Dravidian evidence for the sense of ‘prosperous’ presented earlier which covers the senses of ‘auspicious, good, lucky’, we have specifically for the sense of ‘goodness’: putumaiyum aẓakum naṟrum yāṇar ennum payar (Piṅkalantai :10.9.1) meaning ‘the name yāṇar for newness, beauty, goodness … ’. Comparatively it should be noted here that only Old Tamil preserves the PDr *y- but it occurred only¹⁰⁴ before ā (Krishnamurti 2003:143, Subrahmanyam 2008:86). So phonologically Old Tamil yāṇ- is identical to the PDr sequence *yāṇ-. No wonder Zvelebil (1990:59) remarks: “On the whole, Old Tamil has preserved … a very archaic state of affairs”. The economy of the solution offered by Old Tamil yāṇ- with its actual attestation of the senses of ‘prosperity, beauty’ in combination with its PDr-stage phonology should be

⁹² “… name of a man whose beauty and vigour were restored by the gods” (Pinault ibid).
⁹³ These are from grammatical and lexicographic treatises. MTL lists some literary occurrences but they are rather late, as late as 16th century. But in Caṅkam occurrences like on pū yāṇar (Kuru:24:1) we can see the sense of beauty as the most applicable, “the beauty of the bright flowers” even though commentators employ blanket usage of putuvāvat “fresh income” even here.
¹⁰⁴ Ignoring the two occurrences of yāku ‘black monkey’ in the Caṅkam corpus (Lehman and Malten 1993). Old Tamil *yē- became ā- in later Tamil and PDr *yē- became ā- or ē- in other Dravidian languages (Subrahmanyam 2008:86, Krishnamurti 2008:142-3). Cf. DEDR #516 (subset): Tamil. yāṇai, āṇai elephant Telugu, ēṇugu, ēṇika id. Parji. ēnu id. Gondi. yēṇi, āṇi, ēni id.
compared with IE/IA etymologies involving *āṇi or otherwise for explaining the nasal retroflex in Vedic. kalyāṇī.

Coming back to the motivations for the Dravidian pleonasm, it is quite likely that this paraphrasing habit started from a speech protocol or convention in the primordial days of Dravidian (Pre-Dravidian?) of a speaker paraphrasing her word in terms of another word hopefully already known to the listener. This might have been necessitated by the extreme diversity in the lexicon.

It is also likely that other factors independently contributed to pleonasm in words originally not intended to be as such. Such a development is possible with Krishnamurti’s compounding pattern (2-iv) with xy = y is called x (x = proper noun, y = common noun). The progression of events is as follows: both x and y originally start with the same general meaning (e.g., ‘bird’) but x gets specialized (e.g. ‘nightingale’) and y is applied in the general sense (e.g., ‘bird’) as a category word to mean ‘nightingale the bird’ and the compound xy survives as a unit in a particular language long after y’s general sense has been lost by that language but is retained in some other sister language providing us the clues. So it is pleonastic only as received not as composed. This can happen even where one or both of x and y is already a pleonasm. Then we are looking at accretionary pleonasms with arbitrary number of components accreted along the way.

8 Conclusions and Summary

A heretofore unidentified word structure in the Dravidian language family, namely, the pleonastic compounding pattern has been identified, described and
established with ample evidence. At least one pleonastically structured word \(*ūma-guṇji\) (phonemically \(*ūma-kuṇci\) ‘owl’ is reconstructible to the proto-stage of the Dravidian family establishing the productiveness of this pattern at that stage. To avoid relying on that single shared word as a critical evidence and to provide an independent proof of Proto-Dravidian productivity, the widespread nature of the pattern throughout the Dravidian language family has been established by the presence of such words in all the three subgroups of the family spanning many semantic domains such as animal and plant names, natural phenomena and human activities. Syntactic vestiges of pleonastic speech remained in the Tamil Caṅkam corpus as evidenced by instances of curiously structured noun phrases in which the head noun is preceded by a synonymous noun with a stock intervening verb \(kol\) meaning ‘having the property of’, motivation of paraphrasing being the most reasonable explanation for this unusual syntax. Such a syntactic vestige combined with other evidence strongly establishes it as an organically developed feature and rules out accidental nature of this pattern or borrowal of this feature from other language families through contact.

I have then applied this pattern to solve many etymological issues in Dravidian especially in the domain of bird words notoriously archaic. The analysis of Gadaba \(pīṭode\) ‘nightingale’ showed that, using the combination of semantic specialization (already recognized by the compilers of DEDR in the entries cited in that discussion) and tracing a chain of shared components subject to such a semantic specialization as a regular tool, one can apply the pleonastic pattern to arrive at the etymology of a very large number of words in the same domain efficiently. It was also shown there
why, in the light of semantic specialization, it is very important to avoid attempting etymology of words in isolation. This technique is a critical contribution of this paper as a new systematic tool in Dravidian and South Asian etymology.

Another major finding of this paper has been that certain Vedic substrate words can be analyzed systematically as Dravidian pleonastic compounds. As a model application of that etymological principle, a few Vedic foreign words śārkōṭa and karkoṭa ‘serpent’, kukkuṭa ‘cock’, kalmalikīn ‘shining, twinkling’, malmalā (in malmalābhavant) ‘flashing, glittering’ and kalyāṇa (and kalyāṇī) ‘beautiful, auspicious, prosperous, fortunate, lucky’ have been analyzed here. It has been shown that even echo-like structures in Dravidian are meaningful pleonasms and that the same conclusion applies to Vedic instances like kalmalikīn ‘shining, twinkling’.

Going forward, now that we are better equipped, we can, both in Dravidian and in Indo-Aryan substratum and adstratum, analyze fruitfully plant and animal words, town names, personal names, tribe and country names and even names of musical modes, astronomical words and other curiously structured words all typically having complex structures with no reasonable etymologies so far.

It is also hoped that future releases of Dravidian etymological dictionaries such as the DEDR take into account the findings here and, realizing the strategic importance of Dravidian etymology, start providing reconstructed roots for the various stages of Dravidian in addition to any involved affixes, formatives or “root extensions” (as Subrahmanyan 2008 passim). Starostin’s on-line Dravidian

\[105\] However the general structure of such formatives, affixes and root extensions needs a strategic revision by being subjected to the same PDr phonotactics as lexical roots. Formatives currently stated
Etymology database (Starostin 2006) is already engaged in such a fashion providing reconstructed intermediate protoforms with meanings going up the Dravidian tree with notes. Krishnamurti (2003:6-15, 523-533) provides a considerable number of reconstructions by way of reconstructing the Proto-Dravidian culture and otherwise.

Witzel (2000:5) had remarked: “… IA etymologies now are (or should be) at a comparatively high level of linguistic sophistication; they must include the explanation not just of individual words but also of their constituent parts, of related roots and suffixes. The same cannot yet be said for Dravidian and Munda: DED and DEDR still consist of lists of related words only, with no explanation of their structure and the interrelation between related roots or expanded roots (roots plus certain suffixes) …”. I hope that this newly reported pleonastic pattern goes a long way towards correcting that deficiency regarding Dravidian word structure and advances our knowledge of the origins of the Vedic substratum and thus our understanding not only of the languages of the Indus Valley Civilization but also of the substrate and adstrate languages of South Asia in general.

as, e.g., -]' (Krishnamurti 2003:92) need to be combined with the vowel preceding them. This calls for viewing them historically as grammaticalized lexical roots. Widespread grammaticalization of PDr *man ‘be’ (DEDR #3914) in verb morphology is a good example (Steever 1993:99-101) as auxiliary verb in Koṇḍa. soRa’ manar ‘they have gone’ (Steever 1998:262) and as an affix in Old Tamil. ceymmana ‘they (will) make’, ennmanār ‘they (will) say’ (Steever 1993:99). In addition and in our immediate context, it helps in systematically uncovering pleonasms as with Gadaba. piṭoḍe ‘nightingale’ as piṭ- od-e.
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10 Abbreviations

(Source refers to the actual published source listed in the references section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aka</th>
<th>Akanāṉūṟu (source Cologne IITS database)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Atharva Veda (Whitney)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cilappati</td>
<td>Cilappatikāram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDIAL</td>
<td>Comparative Dictionary of Indo-Aryan Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDr</td>
<td>Central Dravidian subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Indo-Aryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampa</td>
<td>Kampārāmāyaṇam (source Cologne IITS database)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuru</td>
<td>Kuruṇtokai (source Cologne IITS database)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaipatu</td>
<td>Malaipatukaṭām (source Pattuppāṭṭu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturai</td>
<td>Maturaikkāṇci (source Pattuppāṭṭu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTL</td>
<td>The Tamil Lexicon, Madras University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>Monier-Williams Sanskrit-English Dictionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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