

Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies

(EJVS)

Vol. 18, 2011, Issue 1

(©) ISSN 1084-7561

<http://www.ejvs.laurasianacademy.com/>

Pleonastic Compounding: An Ancient Dravidian Word Structure

Periannan Chandrasekaran

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 Krishnamurti also reports (*ibid.*:200) of an unpublished manuscript¹ by Emeneau entitled ‘Some Dravidian noun compounds’ wherein *veṇṇey* ‘butter’ and *pokkūz* ‘navel’ are reported to have been analyzed in addition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 Ṛg 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', *bṛ̥saya* 'name of a sorcerer/demon', *kīstá* '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 *ṣ* in these environments (2) *kīkaṭa* '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: *kīkaṭa*, person: *turvīti*, animal: *mayūrī* 'female peacock', plant: *kākambīra* 'name of a tree', water body: *śutudrī* 'name of a river, Sutlej'

³ See Witzel (2000:§12A 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* Koṇḍa. *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 six⁴ subcategories of relationships between the two nouns: (2-i) *xy* = *y* lives on *x* or *y* causes *x*: Tamil. *tēn-ī* ‘honey-bee’, Kuṛux. *tīn-ī* ‘bee’, Malto. *tēn-i* ‘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. *cī-kkāy*, 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-nīri* ‘rosewater’ (2-vi) *xy = y* has *x* (‘the meaning of *x* is not clear’): Tamil. *muḻam* ‘cubit’, Tamil/Malayalam. *muḻaṇ-kāl* ‘knee’, *muḻaṇ-kai* ‘elbow’, Kannada. *moḻa-kāl* ‘knee’ Telugu. *mrō kālu* ‘knee’, Kuṛux. *mũ-kā* ‘knee’ (3) Descriptive adjective + noun head: Tamil. *mutu* ‘old’ *mūtt-appaṇ* ‘father’s father’, Koḍagu. *mutt-tāy* ‘great-grandmother’, Telugu. *mut-awwa* ‘great-grandmother’ (4) verb as modifier + noun head: Tamil. *tiri* ‘to turn, revolve’, Kannada. *tiraṅṇile* ‘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 suffixes⁵ 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.

An example is worth citing at this stage⁶: Koṇḍa. *uma-gunji* and Parji. *uma-guñi* ‘owl’ with the components attested in Tamil. *ūman*, Malayalam. *ūman* ‘owl’, Kui. Kuwi. *gunji* ‘owl’, Gonḍi. *kunji* ‘large owl’ and Parji. *guñi* ‘owl’.

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-guñji* 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.

⁵ For details on standard Dravidian root, stem and word structure, see Subrahmanyam(2008:50-71, 1983:13-35), Zvelebil(1990:17), Krishnamurti(2003:92, 179-204)

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 (Subrahmanyam 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 Subrahmanyam.

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 intervocalically 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

Subrahmanyam (1983, 2008), Zvelebil (1990), Steever (1998), Krishnamurti (2001, 2003) and Andronov (2003).

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 guṇi* ‘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 guṇi* ‘owl’ and their associated etymons:

DEDR #747: Tamil. *ūmaṇ* owl Malayalam. *ūman* id. Parji. *uma guṇi* id. Koṇḍa *uma-gunji* id.

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

MTL lists also Tamil. *ūmaṇ* a kind of big owl, *ūmaikkōṭṭāṇ* a large species of owl,

ūmattaṅkūkai 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:

Subgroup	Language	* <i>ūma</i>	* <i>kuñci</i>	* <i>ūma-kuñci</i>
SDr I	Tamil	<i>ūman</i> , <i>ūmai</i> , <i>ūmatta</i>		
	Malayalam	<i>ūman</i>		
SDr II	Gonḍi		<i>kunji</i>	
	Koṇḍa			<i>uma-gunji</i>
	Kui		<i>gunji</i>	
	Kuwi		<i>gunji</i>	
CDr	Parji		<i>guññi</i>	<i>uma guñi</i>

We discuss briefly the phonology of the components before proceeding with the analysis. Parji *-ñ-* and *-ññ-* are reflexes of PDr **-ñc-* (DEDR: Table I) and *g-* in *gunji* and *guññi* forms, and the *-g-* in the *uma-gunji/guñi* are reflexes respectively of PDr **k-* and **-k-* as seen in the retention in Gondḍi. *kunji*. The *-nj-* (or *-ñj-*) cluster in *kunji* is an inherited phonetic feature of the PDr phonemic cluster **-ñc-* 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 *ūma-*, 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 (Subrahmanyam 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 **kuñci* reflexes are all without any contact with the only languages that have the *ũma* component, it is clear that the compound must have been formed at a stage when the components **ũma* and **kuñci* 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 **ũm* component with a different bird species as with Tamil. *umā-paṭci* ‘a species of paradise-bird’ (MTL) (*paṭci* < Skt. *pakṣin* ‘bird’). The underlying semantics of **kuñci* is most likely in PDr **kuñc* ‘cluster, hair’ as seen with DEDR #1639⁷.

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 *ũmaik-kōṭṭan* ‘a large species of owl’ and *ũmattañ-*

⁷ DEDR #1639 with only the *-ñc/-ñj-* stems: Tamil. *kuñcam* bunch of flowers, tassel, cluster of grass, bushy tail of the yak, weaver's brush; *kuñci* tuft of hair (esp. of man), crest of peacock, tassels (as insignia of royalty); Malayalam. *kuñcam*, *kuñci* tassel, brush (esp. of toddy-drawers); *koñcu* mane of animals. Kannada. *kuñca* bunch, bundle, cluster, tassel, brush, a kind of fan or chowry; *goñcal* cluster, bunch; *goñci* a mass; *goñce* mass, cluster; Tulu. *goñju* tassel; *kuñca* id., flybrush; *goñci*, *goñcilu*; 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, *guñja-* bunch, bundle, cluster

kūkai ‘a species of a very large size owl’ where *kūkai* in turn means again ‘rock horned owl’.

5.2 Kannada *oḍejāli* ‘Acacia planifrons’

This plant name in Kannada has pleonastically two components PSDr I. **oḍay* 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. *oḍejāli* *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 botonymic 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*, panicle babul’

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

5.3 Tamil *iṇanirai* ‘herd’

The redundant compound *iṇanirai* ‘herd’ is widely attested in classical Tamil texts occurring at least sixteen times in six different Caṅkam anthologies⁸ and at least twice in Cilappaikāram⁹. 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); Malaipaṭu:416; Naṛṛ(240:9, 291:8); Neṭu:4; Patirru(12:6, 67:7); Pura (257:8, 269:10);

⁹ Cilappati(12:16-2, 14:64)

free form as *inam*¹⁰ ‘pack, herd’ and *nirai*¹¹ ‘collection, herd’ in the same texts. Even if we leave out the occurrences¹² 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* (Pura:257:8)¹³ ‘the herds of enemies’, *palkalirru inanirai* (Patirru:67:7)¹⁴ ‘herds of many elephants’, *pal āṇ inanirai tazūiya villōr*¹⁵ (Pura:269:10) ‘bowmen who have seized herds with many cows’, *kavarnta inaniraikal*¹⁶ (Cilappati:12:16-2) ‘the herds seized’. Interestingly medieval commentators simply and variously gloss the compound *inanirai* as *nirai*¹⁷, *inaniraikal*¹⁸ (plural form), *niraiyinam*¹⁹ (!), *inamākiya pala niraikal*²⁰ or *inamākiya nirai*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.

¹⁰ DEDR #531: Tamil. *inam* class, group, kind, species, race, tribe, herd, associates. Malayalam. *inam* class of animals, swarm.

¹¹ DEDR #3673: Tamil. *nirai* row, column, line, series, order, regularity, arrangement, collection, herd; Malayalam. *nira* line, row etc.

¹² For example, Naccinārkkiniyar on Malaipatu:416 *palyāṭṭu inanirai* (Pattuppāṭṭu 1998)

¹³ Old commentary: *poruntātāratu inamākiya nirai* (Pillai 1996)

¹⁴ Old commentary: *kalirriṇ nirai* (Patirru 1994)

¹⁵ Old commentary: *palavākiya inamāṇa āṇiraikal* (Pillai 1996)

¹⁶ Aṭiyārrkunallār gloss: *kaikkoṇṭu vanta inaniraikal* (Cilappati 2001:327)

¹⁷ Old commentary for Patirru:67:7. See footnote 14

¹⁸ Aṭiyārrkunallār on Cilappati:12:16-2. See footnote 16

¹⁹ Aṭiyārrkunallār on Cilappati:14:64: *inanirai - niraiyinam, inamākiya pala niraikal* (Cilappati 2001:371)

²⁰ See footnote 19

²¹ Old commentary on Pura: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 times²² 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 instance²³ the medieval commentator Naccinārkkīyār 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: *mākavicumpiṅ ucci* (Puṛa 60:2) glossed *mākamākiya vicumpiṅnatu ucci* ‘the zenith of the sky’ (Pillai 1996), *mākavicumpiṅ naṭuvu* (Puṛa 35:18) glossed *mākamākiya uyarnta vānattinatu naṭuvu* ‘in the midst of the high sky that is *mākam*’ (Pillai 1996) and *mākavicumpum* (Pari 1:47) glossed²⁴ by Parimēlaṣakar as *mākamākiya vicumpum* ‘and the sky that is *mākam*’ (Paripāṭal 1995).

5.5 Tamil. *ūrkoḷ* ‘halo’

We next consider the pleonastic compound Tamil *ūrkoḷ* ‘halo round the sun or moon’ where *ūr* means ‘halo round the sun or moon’ and *koḷ* also means ‘halo, brilliance, light’. The words *ūrkoḷ* in the sense of ‘halo’ is attested in the 10th century

²² *mākavicumpu* occurs in: Aka (141:6, 162:3, 253:24, 317:1), Maturai:454, Pari:1:50, Puṛa (35:18, 60:2, 270:1, 400:1)

²³ Maturai:454: *māka vicumpoṭu* glossed as *tikkukaḷaiyuṭaiya ākāyattutaṅē* ‘the sky with directions’ (Pattuppāṭṭu 1998)

²⁴ Even though he glosses the word *mākam* as *mākamāvatu pūmikkum cuvarkkattukkum naṭuva*[...] ‘*mākam* is that which is between the earth and the heaven’

text *Cīvakacintāmaṇi*²⁵, 12th century *Periyapurāṇam*, 14th century *Villipāratam* and in the later *Kanatapurāṇam*. The occurrences are: *maḷḷar kaṭṭaṣar katirai ūrkōḷ vaḷaittavā vaḷaittuk koṅṭār*²⁶ (*Cīvakacintāmaṇi* :1136), *ūrkoḷ vaḷainta māmati pōnru*²⁷ (*Periyapurāṇam* :1103:3-4), *ūrkoḷum veyilaic cūzntu*²⁸ (*Villipāratam* :11:258:1), *ūrkoḷ pariti taṅaic cūzntatu*²⁹ (*Villipāratam* :11:258:1), *piṛaṅku aṣal katir kāṇātu kār ura ūrkōḷ tōnrum kāṭci*³⁰ (*Kanatapurāṇam* :1327:3-4). The word *kōḷ* ‘halo’ is attested in *matiyaṅ kōḷ vāy vicumpiṭai naṭappatē pōl*³¹ (*Cīvakacintāmaṇi*:1098). The word *ūr* in the same sense is attested in the 10-12th century *Kamparāmāyaṇam*³² *ceṅkatir taṅkuvatu ōr ūr urratu enap poli oḷ muṭiyān*³³ (3:2:9:) and *ūr koṅṭa tiṅkaḷ enṇa*³⁴ (2:5:56).

The word *ūr* ‘halo’ is cognate with etymons such as Tamil. *uru* ‘to burn’, Kannada. *uri* ‘to burn, blaze, glow’ in DEDR #656³⁵ whose PDr root is **ūr*. The

²⁵ See Zvelebil:1975:p173, 178 for dating of *Cīvakacintāmaṇi*, *Periyapurāṇam*, *Villipāratam* and *Kanatapurāṇam*

²⁶ Meaning “the warriors encircled [him] like a halo does the Sun of intense heat” and “*matiyaṅ kōḷ vāy vicumpiṭai naṭappatē pōl*” (1098) where the word *kōḷ* is glossed by the medieval commentator Naccinārkkiniyar as ‘*parivēṭippu*’ (< Skt. *pariveṣa* ‘halo’) comparing the people surrounding the hero *Cīvakaṅ* 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 Naccinārkkiniyar as ‘*parivēṭippu*’ (< Skt. *pariveṣa* ‘halo’) comparing the people surrounding the hero *Cīvakaṅ* 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.; Koḍagu. *uri* burning sensation. Tulu. *uri* blaze, flame, heat; *uriyuni* to burn, blaze; Telugu. *uriyu* to burn; *uralu* to burn, be ablaze; Koṅḍa *rūṅ(u)* heat of summer. Maṅḍa. *rund-* to ignite, set alight. Kui. *ruta* to set fire to, ignite; *n.* setting fire to; *ru-* to set light to. Kuwi. *rund-* to ignite

word *kōl* ‘halo’ is cognate with etymons such as Tamil. *koḷli* ‘firebrand, fire’ in DEDR #2158³⁶ again with the semantics of ‘light, fire’.

It should be stated that the pleonastic compound *ūr̥kōl* 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. *cōnā(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 “*cōṇaimāriyīn corintanan*” (Kampa:piramāttira: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. *sōna* 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. *koḷli* firebrand, fire, quick-tongued person; *koḷuttu* to kindle, set on fire, ignite; burn; *koḷuntu*, *koḷuvu* to kindle (as fire). Malayalam. *koḷli* firebrand, firewood; *koḷuttuka* to set on fire, light, kindle. Kannada. *koḷli*, *koḷle* firebrand. Tulu. *koḷli*, *koḷli* id.

5.7 Tamil. *tuṇaṅkaral* ‘festival’

Tamil. *tuṇaṅkaral* comprises two components *tuṇaṅk-* and *aral* both meaning ‘festival’. This is lexicographic only. The ninth century Tamil nighaṅṭu *Piṅkalantai*³⁷ and the sixteenth century *Cūṭāmaṇi* list³⁸ *tuṇaṅkaral* in the sense of ‘festival’, the nighaṅṭu *Tivākaram* (ninth cent.) and *Cūṭāmaṇi* list³⁹ *tuṇaṅkai* ‘festival’ and *Tivākaram* again has⁴⁰ *aral* ‘festival’.

5.8 Kolami. *vallambā* ‘rice’

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

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

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

DEDR# 5287: Tamil. *valci* paddy, husked rice, boiled rice, food. Malayalam. *varru* grain of boiled rice from which the water is strained off. Telugu. *vaḍlu* unhusked rice, paddy. Kolami. *val* grain of unhusked rice; *valbi-am* husked rice. Naikri. *val* paddy. Naiki. (Chanda) *valku* (*pl.*) paddy, rice.

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 *iruḷum viḷavum tuṇaṅkaral eṅpa* (*Piṅkalantai*:10:621), *tuṇaṅkaral iruḷ viḷā ām* (*Cūṭāmaṇi*:11:84)

³⁹ *tuṇaṅkai āṭalum tirunāḷum viḷavum* (*Tivākaram*: 2010 or 11:109) and *tuṇaṅkaiyē viḷāp pēy kūttām* (*Cūṭāmaṇi*:11:84)

⁴⁰ *aralē viḷavum nīrum īrttiraiyum* (*Tivākaram*:2118 or 11:217)

5.9 Gondi. *rāghō-sīri* ‘parrot’

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

DEDR #5164: Naikri. *rāghok* parrot. Naiki. (Chanda.) *rāgo* id. Gondi. *rāgo*, *rāghō-sīri* id.

DEDR #2582: Gondi. *sīri*, *hiṛi* parrot Konda *sīra* id. Pengo. *hiṛa* 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. **z > *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. *hiṛa* also has the *h-* but it is an independent sound change of PDr **c- > *s- > *h-* from Proto-Pengo-Maṇḍa stage (Subrahmanyam 2008:261).

5.10 Gondi. *sargōḍā* ‘rat-snake’

This Gondi snake word is listed in DEDR #2816:

Telugu. *pen-jera* a species of rock-snake; *jerri-pōtu* whipsnake; *jerri godḍu* a kind of snake. Kolami. *jērigag* (presumably *jērigaḍ*) sp. snake (Hindi. *dhāman*). Parji. *jēri* id. Gondi.

(A.) *sēri*, (Tr.) *sargōḍā*, (Ch.) *sargōḍal*, (Muria.) *hergōḍal* the rat-snake, dhāman; (Maṛia.) *er(e)gōḍali* a kind of snake (cf. Muria. *gōḍal* dhaman snake). Cf. 2011 Tamil. *cērai*.

It is obvious from the above that a component with a *gōḍ-* stem (phonemically **kōḍ-*) is appearing in combination with various other components and it occurs independently in the Muria dialect of Gondi in *gōḍal* ‘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 *sargōḍā*.

We exclude Telugu *jerri-*, *jerrī* 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 *sargōḍā*, *sargōḍal*, *hergōḍal* and *er(e)gōḍali*, we reconstruct their phonemic forms as **cēr̥kōḍā/cerekōḍa*, **cēr̥koḍal/cerekōḍal* and **cēr̥koḍali/cerekōḍali* or to put it succinctly as **cēr̥(e)kōḍa(li)*. The step-by-step reasoning is as follows. We reconstruct **cēr̥/*cer-e* for the stems *sar/her(er)* and **kōḍ-* 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 parallel⁴¹, we may cite:

DEDR #2819: Telugu. *ērālu* husband's brother's wife. Naiki.(Chanda.) *serutra* husband's younger brother's wife. Gondi. *sērandū, serndu, harndu, ervond, eṛond* spouse's younger brother (or spouse's younger sister's husband); *fem. serandal, serandār, serndar, harndar* spouses' younger sister; *sērīyār, sērīyāl* elder brother's wife; *sereyar* husband's brother's wife. Konḍa. *sēron* husband's younger brother. Maṇḍa. *hējun* wife's younger brother. Kui. *sejenju* husband's younger brother.

- Now treating the *goḍ-* 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 **-kōḷ-*. The etymon *goḍḍu* in Telugu. (*jerrī*) *goḍḍu* also derived from the same canonical root **kōḷ(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: **cērkoḷā/cerekōḷa, *cērkoḷal/cerekoḷal* and **cērkoḷali/cerekoḷali*.

As for DEDR's suggestion in this entry of cognacy with DEDR #2011⁴² 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

⁴² #2011 Tamil. *cērai, cārai* rat snake, *Ptyas mucosus*. Malayalam. *cēra* rat snake, *Amphisbaena* or *Coryphodon*. Kota. *ke-r va'b* sp. harmless snake. Toda. *ke-r, ke-r fo'b* sp. snake. Kannada. *kēre* rat snake, whip-snake, *P. mucosus*. Kodaga. *ke-re pa'mbi* sp. non-poisonous snake; *kariṅ ge-re pa'mbi* rat snake (*kari* 'black'). Tulu. *kērè* a kind of harmless snake. Cf. 2816 Telugu. *pen-jera*.

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*.

Areally we can relate this to the Vedic. *śārkoṭa* ‘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 Kuṛux. *keṅkō-beṅkō* ‘crooked, curved’

This is a case of an echo-like pleonastic compound where each component means ‘crooked’ in the NDr Kuṛux 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. *gingōṅ-gongōṅ aiānā* to be crooked, as a snake's progress. Kui. *kengeri, kingiri, kengoni* bent, curved, crooked. Kuṛux. *keṅkrnā* to be crooked, curviform; *keṅkrō, keṅkō-beṅkō* 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. *vaṅg-*, *vaṅgip-* id. Gadaba. *vaṅka* curve. Gondi. *vaṅg-* to bend, *vaṅgānā* to be bent; *vaṅkor, vaṅko* bent, crooked. Kuwi. *vwāṅgali* to be crooked; *wāṅginai* to be bent, stoop; *vaṅg* to bend, be bent. Kuṛux. *beṅknā, beṅka'ānā* to turn from a straight line, bend, curve; *beṅkō, baṅkā* crooked, bent, curved.

The components are derivable respectively from PDr **keñk-* and PDr **vāñk-* 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. *umbul-*, *umul-*, *ūml-* to urinate; *umbuluḍ* urine. Naikṛi. *umbuḷ-* to urinate. Naiki. (Chanda.) *umbul-* id.; *umulta*, *umlen* urine. Parji. *uml-*, *umbl-* to urinate; *umlukuḍ*, *umbulkuḍ* urine. Gadaba. *umbl-* to urinate; *umbulkur* urine; Kuwi. *mṛūkali* to urinate; *mrū’ka* urine; *murkinai* to piddle, piss; Kuṛux. *umbulnā*, *umulnā* to urinate; *umulkā* urine. Malto. *umble* to urinate; *umbl-muro* urine (*muro* id.)

As seen above Malto. *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-poruḷ-paṇ-moḻi* (‘one-meaning-many-words’) by the 12th

⁴³ Tolkāppiyam: collatikāram: 460: *oruporuḷ irucol pirivila varaiyār* (Cēnāvaraiyam 1996:625). Cēnāvaraiyar, the medieval commentator cites as examples *nivantōṅku perumalai* ‘soaring big mountain’ and *turukal mīmikai* ‘on top of the rock’.

century grammar *Nannūl*⁴⁴. The medieval commentator Parimēlaḻakar (Paripāṭal 1995:20) classifies the attributive verbal phrase *nivantu oṅku uyar* occurring in *nivantu oṅku uyar koṭi* (Pari:3:18) “the soaring flag” as *oru-poruṭ-pan-moḻi* where *nivantu*, *oṅku* and *uyar* each derive from verbs meaning ‘to rise’⁴⁵. It has also been called as *mīmikai* or *mīmicaicol* ‘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: *vazittaṭam*, *vaẓi* and *taṭam* all meaning ‘path, route’ heard everyday with bus routes; even for concepts so evidently recent as ‘ecology’ with Tamil. *curruccūḻal* ‘environment’ where *curru* and *cūḻal* both mean ‘surrounding, encompassing’.

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

⁴⁴ *Nannūl*:397: *oruporuṭ panmoḻi cirappiṇiṇ vaẓā* (*Nannūl* 1995:217)

⁴⁵ From the MTL: *niva* ‘to rise, to be elevated; to become high’, *oṅku* ‘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. *takappan* ‘father’

Here we have the case of a kinship term conforming to the new pattern. We have DEDR #3005 Tamil. *tak-appan* father, Malayalam. *takappan* grouped in an entry with *tak-* stem etymons where the semantics is ‘fitness, worthiness, excellence’ etc. , implying that *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 *tak-* means the same as the second stem. And indeed we find it here in Central Dravidian languages where Kolami. *ta·k* and Naikri. *tāk* mean ‘father’:

DEDR #3152: Kolami. *ta·k* father (always with preceding possessor), *ta·k ammaner* parents.
Naikri. *tāk*, *tāk-jaran* father; *amma tāk* parents

A very interesting fact here is that these two languages, Kolami and Naikri, do not seem to have any ‘father’ words with *ǎpp-* stem. The DEDR entry⁴⁶ with Tamil. *appan* ‘father’ etc., only has Kolami. *appa* ‘father's sister’ and Naikri. *appo/appok* ‘wife's younger brother’ even though Naikri’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* elder 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* reduced⁴⁷ 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. Naikri. *appo/appok* wife's younger brother. Gondi. *āpōrāl* father; *tape*, *tappe*, *tāpe* father; *tappe* (his, her) father. Konḍa. *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 *pāt-* : *pat-*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 **tākappan* 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:

DEDR #4154: Telugu. *piṭṭa* ‘bird’ Kolami. *piṭṭe* ‘young bird, chick’ *piṭṭa* ‘bird’ Naikri. *piṭṭa* id. Gadaba. *piṭode* ‘sp. Nightingale’. Gondi. *piṭṭe*, *piṭe* ‘bird’

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 *ōḍ-* stemmed bird words in Dravidian and we do indeed find some here:

DEDR #1040: Kurux. *ōṛā* bird (in general); *ōṛē* a small bird. Malto. *ōṛe* quail

Kittel: Kannada. *uḍupa*: ‘the bird called *cātaka*’ is derived from the same root but with the standard Dravidian umlaut⁴⁹ of *ō/ū*.

The intervocalic *-r-* of the Kuṛux and Malto etymons above is implied to be a reflex of PDr **-ṭ-* (phonetically *-d-*) by the placement of the DEDR entry in the midst of **ōṭ-* entries. This is also in line with the standard phonology of Kuṛux and Malto that their *-r-* is a reflex of either PDr **-ṭ-* or **-ṛ-* (DEDR table of sound correspondences where DEDR employs *r* for the retroflex approximant *ṛ*). So we can reconstruct the root stems in *ōṛā*, *ōṛē*, *ōṛe* (substantiated by Kannada. *uḍupa* from contactless SDr I subgroup with a radical stem phonemically **uṭ-*) to PDr **ōṭ-* (phonemically) as the long vowel quality in any Dravidian radical stem can be taken to represent the PDr quality (Subrahmanyam 1983:158-200, Krishnamurti 2003: 101-2).

So we can analyze Gadaba. *piṭode* as *piṭ-ode* where both the stems *piṭ-* and *oḍ-* mean ‘bird’ (traceable respectively to PDr. **piṭ-* and **ōṭ-*) 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 *ōṛ-* stem: In Kuṛux 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 **ōṭ-*): Tamil. *oṭi* break, *uṭaiṭṭu* breach; Kannada. *oḍi*, *uḍi* to be broken; Telugu. *ōṭi* broken; Naikri. *ōṛ-*, *ōṭ-* to break; Naiki (Chanda). *uṭup-* to break, *ōṭ* (*ōṭ-*) to break; Parji. *ōḍ-* to break (2) DEDR #945 (PDr **ōṭ-*): Tamil. *uṭaṅ* altogether, *-oṭu*, *-ōṭu* with; Tulu. *oḍa* with Telugu. *oḍam-baḍu* to consent

bird’ and in Malto to ‘quail’. We will see more bird words further on with an embedded -ōṭ- 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 *tītuva*, *tītuvu*, *tītukapiṭṭa* ‘lapwing bird’ (Gwynn), *tītuva* ‘the yellow wattled Lapwing’ (Brown) with a specialized meaning. In Gadaba. *purus tīte* ‘dove’ where *purus* is ‘dove’ or ‘pigeon’ (DEDR #4334⁵⁰), the component *tīte* serves the same role played by Telugu. *piṭṭa* ‘bird’ in *tītukapiṭṭa* above. A really Vedic. *tittira*, *tittiri* ‘partridge’ (CDIAL #5809) identified as foreign and suspected to be of Para-Munda in origin⁵¹ (Witzel 1999b:45) should be deemed as another specialization (with the standard stem alternation *tīt* : *titt-* known as Zvelebil’s Rule⁵²) 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. Kurux. *piō* ‘oriole’ and DEDR #4173: Tulu. *pīyavu* ‘small chicken’. Naiki. (Chanda.) *piyoṭe* ‘chick’ Gondi. *pise*, *pōnj pise*, *kor pise* ‘chicken’. The component PDr **pīc-* (intervocalic **-c-*, phonetically *-s-*

⁵⁰ Parts of DEDR #4334: Tamil. *purā* dove, pigeon Telugu. *burra-piṭṭe* a sort of pigeon. Gadaba. *purus tīte* dove.

⁵¹ Citing Munda language etymons Korku. *titiḍ*, Santali. *sengel titi* ‘guinea fowl’

⁵² “CV-CC:CVC Cf. Tamil. *meṭṭu*, heap of earth: *mēṭṭu* height, eminence, hillock” (Zvelebil 1990:14)

weakened⁵³ 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). A really cognate with them is Skt. *p̄yū* (*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 **p̄ic-* ‘feather’⁵⁴. Cf. Telugu. *piccika* ‘a sparrow’ (Brown).

Coming back to the component PDr **ōt-*, we find that its usage was very widespread in PDr stage itself and, in its alloforms such as **ōḍ-*, **ōṛ-*, was embedded in so many bird words:

Gondi. *gōrōḍ* ‘mya’ (DEDR #1766⁵⁵), Gondi. *kokoḍal* ‘heron, duck’ and Kui. *kokoṛa* ‘crane’ (DEDR #2125⁵⁶), Pengo. *kokoḍa* ‘crane, paddy-bird’ (Burrow 1970:202), Kuwi. *pioṭi* ‘golden oriole’ (DEDR #4125⁵⁷) and Naiki (Chanda). *piyoṭe* ‘chick’ (DEDR #4173⁵⁸). Also the ‘cock’ words from DEDR #2248⁵⁹: Naiki.

⁵³ See Subrahmanyam (1983:330 and 2008:79, 139-140), Krishnamurti (2003:93, 148)

⁵⁴ DEDR #4133: Tamil. *picir* fibre. Telugu. *pī̄cu* the fibrous parts of plants, etc. Gadba. *pī̄su* fibrous matter of fruits. Also DEDR #4226: Kui. *pī̄seri*, *plieri* tail feather of a peacock; *pieli* peacock. Malt. *pice* tail of a peacock; *picale* peacock in full plume. / Cf. Skt. *piccha-* peacock's tail; Turner, CDIAL, no. 8151

⁵⁵ Part of DEDR #1766: Tamil. *kurakam* myna, starling, *Acridotheres tristis*. Kannada. *goravaṅka*, *goravaṅke* the common maina, *A. tristis*, or the pastor. Telugu. *goruvaṅka*, *gōra*, *gōraṅka*, *gōriṅka*, *gōruvaṅka* myna, Gondi. *gōrōḍ* id.

⁵⁶ DEDR #2125 (has mixed up the two different roots **kūr-* and **kokk-*): Tamil. *kokku* common crane, *Grus cinerea*; stork, paddy bird; *kuruku* heron, stork, crane, bird, gallinaceous fowl, *aṅṅil* bird. Malayalam. *kokku*, *kokkan*, *kocca*, *kuriyan* paddy bird, heron; *kuru* heron. Toda. *košk* heron. Kannada. *kokku*, *kokkare* crane; *kukku* heron, crane. Tulu. *korṅgu* crane, stork. Telugu. *koṅga*, *kokkera*, *kokkarāyi* crane; Kolami. *koṅga* crane. Parji. *kokkal* id. Gadba. *kokkāle* heron; *koṅalin*, *kokalīn* crane. Gondi. *koruku* id.; *kokoḍal* heron, duck; *koṅga* crane. Kui *kohko* paddy bird. Kuwi *kongi*, *kokoṛa* crane. Brahui. *xāxūr* demoiselle crane.

⁵⁷ DEDR #4125: Kui. *pio* golden oriole Kuwi. *pioṭi* id. Ku. *piō* oriole

⁵⁸ DEDR #4173: Tulu. *pīyavu* small chicken. Naiki. (Chanda.) *piyoṭe* chick Gondi. *pise*, *pōnj pise*, *kor pise* chicken

⁵⁹ This entry has wrongly clubbed them with Tamil. *kōzi* etc., as if the analysis of *gōgōri* and the rest were *gō-gōri*.

(Chanda.) *gogoḍi*, *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*, **kōkōṭi*, **kukōṭi*, **kokVṭi* (unknown vowel *V* is most likely a short unstressed *-o-*) and **kokoṭ-* which should immediately remind one of Vedic. *kukkuṭa*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. *kuṅkaṭi*, *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-*):

Tamil. *kokku* 'common crane, *Grus cinerea*, stork, paddy bird'. Malayalam. *kokku*, *kokkan* 'paddy bird, heron'. Kannada. *kokku*, *kokkare* 'crane', *kukku* 'heron, crane'. Telugu. *kokkera* 'crane'. Parji. *kokkal* id. Gadaba. *kokkāle* 'heron', *kokalin* 'crane'. From DEDR #1627: Kannada. *kukkaṭi* 'fork-tailed shrike', Telugu. *kūkaṭimāga* id., and from DEDR #1871: Tamil. *kūkai* 'rock horned owl *Buba bengalensis*'. Kannada.

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, *Lanius lahotra*'. 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 stem⁶¹.

It is very easy to find a component stem from one compound and find its other related words. Looking at Gondi. *gōrōḍ* ‘mynah’ where we already identified PDr **ōḷ-* as the trailing component, we can now follow its initial component phonemically **kōṛ-* and observe⁶² its occurrence in Kannada. *goravaṅka*, *goravaṅke* ‘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 Kuṛux. *keṅkō-beṅkō* ‘crooked, curved’ above. The echo-like word *kalamalakku* occurs in 7th century Tēvāram *maṇattuḷē kalamalakkiṭṭut tiriyaṅ 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*, *kuṛil* Indian cuckoo, *Cuculus* or *E. orientalis*. Kannada. *kukil* cuckoo; *kūgula* cuckoo. Tulu. *kōgilè*, *kōjilè*, *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 components⁶³ *kal* and *mal* with the same sense of ‘agitate, stir, confuse’:

DEDR #1303 (a subset): Tamil. *kalaiṅku* to be stirred up, agitated, ruffled (as water), be confused, abashed; *kalakku* to confuse, nonplus; Kannada. *kalaku* to agitate, shake, perturb, make turbid, stir up, disturb; Tulu. *galjuni* to confuse; Telugu. *kalaguṇḍu* confusion; Kui. *glahpa* to mix by stirring, stir, confuse, perplex, confound, cause to be confused; act of stirring, confusing; Kurux. *xalaxnā* to disturb, make muddy (as water); Malto. *qalge* to disturb (as water).

DEDR #1306 (a subset): Tamil. *kalavaram* confusion of mind, perturbation, Telugu. *kalavaramu* confusion, state of being puzzled or perplexed.

DEDR #4736 (a subset): Tamil. *malaiṅku* to be agitated, turbid, confused, shake, move, tremble (as the eyes), perish; Kannada. *mallaiṅi*, *mallaiṅi* bodily agitation, bewilderment, fear, amazement. Telugu. *malayu* to be distressed Kolami. *melg-* to shake; *melageng* to move. Gadaba. *melg-* to stir, move. Gondi. *melhānā* to shake; *mellī-* to move.

Each of the components is derivable from PDr **kal-* and PDr **mal-* (or PSDr if the words with *mel-* 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. *kaḷam* + *malakku-*” but the retroflex *-l-* as original is untenable historically for that period and for the phonology of echo-like Dravidian compounds; moreover Tamil. *kaḷam* 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. *inairai* and *niraiyam* both meaning 'herd' seen earlier and with Tamil/Malayalam. *vāykkāl* 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* (*piṭṭa* means 'bird' in many languages other than Gadaba) and Telugu. *tītukapiṭṭa* (*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 *ūr* '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. *kofo* y ditch (in song). Kannada. *kāl*, *kālive*, *kāluve*, *kālve*, *kāvale* water-course, channel, brook. Tulu. *kālivè* 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. *Urōtakam* (*Urōḍagam*) and *Urakampākkam* town names in a 11th century Chola Tamil inscription (SII. Vol. 3:165-167), *Kākanti* alternate name of the city *Kāviriḥpūmpaṭṭiṇam* (Maṇimēkalai:22:37), *Antaḷi* or *Andaḷi* (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 compounding⁶⁶ and not prefixing.

Tamil Nadu. Caṅkam town endings *-antai Uṛantai* (Puṛa:39:8), *Marantai* (Kuṛu:34:6) suggest **ant-ai* meant *ūr* ‘town’

⁶⁶ Gurov’s etymology for *kīkaṭa* (in RV 3.53.14a) as from PDr **kīz* ‘low, bottom, mean’, *kaṭa* ‘place’, with loss of **z* from the compound **kīz-kaṭ-ar* ‘mean persons’ clearly taking his cue from *naicāsākhām maghavan randhayā naḥ* (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. *śārkōṭa* ‘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 7.58.7⁶⁷) 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 **cērkōṭā/cerekōṭa* the second component

⁶⁷ But listed as AV 7.56.7^d by Bloomfield 1990.

being a variant of the canonical root **kōtt-* 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 Subrahmanyam (2008:141):

DEDR #2359: Tamil. *aravu, aravam, ara, arā* snake. *Ma. aravu, aravam* serpent. Telugu. *trācu* id. Gadaba. *tāsu* krait. Gondi. *tarāsh, tarās, taranj taras, tārs, taras, tārs, taras(u)* snake ; *turashee* cobra. Konḍa *saras(u)* snake. Pengo. *rāc* id. Maṇḍa. *trehe* id. Kui. *srāsu, srācu* id. Kuwi. *rācū* id.; *rācu* id., in: *nāgarācu* cobra; *rācu* snake, snail. Cf. 2360 Ta. *cari*. / Cf. Prakṛt. (DNM) *sarāhaya-* snake.

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. *śarkoṭa*. As for the reconstruction of its second component *koṭa*, it should be noted that it has a single voiceless stop *-t-* after a long vowel which necessitates reconstruction to a geminate (*-tt-*) 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. *śarkoṭa* 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 *-tt-* as in **kōtta*, 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 *ītte* the third person singular present indicative form of the athematic verb *īḍ* (or *īḷ*) ‘to praise’ in Ṛg Veda itself (Lubotsky RVC). So we can reconstruct Vedic. *śārkōṭa* phonemically to PDr. **cār̥kōtta* or **carVkōtta* where *V* is an unstressed derivative vowel that caused reduction of the long vowel in **cār̥* and was lost later.

Now we discuss the common origin of the roots of the initial components of Vedic. *śārkōṭa* and Gondi. *sargōḍā*, namely, the component **cār̥* in **cār̥kōtta* and the component **cēr̥* in **cēr̥kōṭa* (intervocalic *-t-* would be phonetically a voiced *-d-*). Since, at some stage in PDr, word-initial palatals such as PDr **y-*, **ñ-* and **c-* caused neutralization of the following **ā̃* and **ē̃* (Krishnamurti 2003:99,139,143), we might be looking at the same root for those two components, namely, PDr **cĀr̥* (or **cĒr̥*) ‘to move or creep’ where *//Ā̃//* (or *//Ē̃//*) is the archiphoneme representing that neutralization (Krishnamurti 2003:143 and 2001:80). Indeed we have evidence of PDr **cār̥* 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. *jarāg-* ‘to slip’ Malto. *jarqe* ‘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 **c-*: “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 *š*-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-goḍī* and *gala-goḍikā* ‘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 *śārkōṭa*, 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 sporadic⁶⁸ and the available instances are meager (Subrahmanyam 2008:44, 138, 282, Krishnamurti 2003:125-6) and this sound change is for non-low vowels, viz., \check{u} and \check{e} . Ignoring then this sound change, we can find snake and reptile words with cognate components in Dravidian with $k\check{a}r$ -stems such as Tamil. *karattuviriyān*⁶⁹ ‘blood viper reddish in color’ (MTL), Tamil. *karattān*, *karattōnti*⁷⁰ ‘Blood-sucker, Calotes versicolor’ (MTL). It should be noted that Tamil. *karattōnti* itself is another pleonasm⁷¹. From the IA lexicon, we have as cognate components in Vedic. *kṛkalāsa* ‘lizard, chameleon’ (cited as a foreign word by Witzel 1999b:12) pointing to **kərəkālāsa* and *kardamaka* ‘a kind of snake’ (MW citing Suśruta) another structurally non-IE word.

6.7 Vedic. *kalmalīkīn* ‘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 once⁷² in the Ṛg Veda in the sense of ‘shining, twinkling’. We also have one *kalmali* listed as Vedic substrate by Witzel (1999b:43) with a query ‘shimmering (of stars)?’ and occurring four times in

⁶⁸ Subrahmanyam (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 ...”

⁶⁹ Cf. The word *viriyān* in DEDR #5413: Tamil. *virī*, *viriyān* viper; *virusu* id. Malayalam. *viriyān* id. and in DEDR #4038: Tamil. *panaiyān*, *panai-viriyān* krait, *Bungarus caeruleus*.

⁷⁰ Cf. *ōnti* in DEDR #1053: Tamil. *ōti*, *ōnti* bloodsucker lizard; *ōntān* bloodsucker; Malayalam. *ōntu* chameleon; bloodsucker, *Lacerta cristata*. Kannada. *onti* a kind of lizard or chameleon, bloodsucker, *L. cristata*. Koḍagu. *o'ndi*, *o'tike'tē* chameleon. Tulu. *ōnti* bloodsucker, salamander

⁷¹ Cf. *karatt-* in *karattān* and the word *ōnti* in DEDR #1053 in footnote above

⁷² *namasyā kalmalīkīnam nāmobhir* (RV:II.33.8c)

the Atharva Veda (XV.2.1⁷³) in association with *maṇi* (jewel) and thought to basically mean ‘light’⁷⁴.

Since *kalmalīkīn* 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 Arabic⁷⁵ 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)⁷⁶.

In the word *kalmalīkīn*, the *-in* ending is the possessive suffix and *-īk-* is a common derivational affix in IA cf. Vedic. *mṛṣīka* ‘compassion, favour’ from the Vedic verb *mṛṣ* ‘to be gracious or favorable’.

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

The *kal-* stem is cognate with the following Dravidian etymons:

⁷³ “*kālmalir maṇiḥ*” Whitney(2000:57-60)

⁷⁴ Whitney: “*kalmali*” with no translation, Monier-Williams: “splendour, brightness, sparkling”, Böhtlingk and Roth: „viell. Glanz (etwa der Sterne)“, Kuiper (1955:170): “meaning obscure”

⁷⁵ Citing: Hoffman, Karl. 1952. *Wiederholende Onomatopoetika im Altindischen*. Indogermanische Forschungen 60.254-64, p263, n.3.

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.”

Tamil. (MTL) *kalippu* ‘brightness’ (*lex.*), *kali* ‘to become manifest’, *kaliz-tal* ‘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. *kaliz-tal* is attested in Caṅkam Tamil texts as in *aṅkaliz mēni* (Ainḱurunūru: 174) meaning “body with beauty shining forth” and *kaliz taḱir aṅinta irum ciṅai māattu* (Akanānūru:97:20) “mango tree whose dark branches have beautiful tender shoots”. Tamil. *kalippu* ‘brightness’ is listed⁷⁷ by the 9th century nighaṅṭu 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 13th century commentary on Tirukkōvaiyār as: *mallarran niramōnriḱ* (Tirukkōvaiyār 4:9, Pērācīriyar commentary⁷⁸) 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 placement⁷⁹ suggesting **mel-*) and the stem *mal-* in Pengo. *mil-mal* in ‘to

⁷⁷ *tuppuk kalippuk kaṅaral pommāl poriyē pokkam pūp polivu ākum* (Piṅkalantai:7:475)

⁷⁸ Pērācīriyar’s gloss : “*aṅakaiyutaiya taṅ tirumēni yonriṅkaṅ*”

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 PSDr **mal-* ‘shine, beauty’.

Kuiper in the same discussion on this foreign word (Kuiper 1955:170) cites Vedic. *malmalābhavant-* ‘flashing, glittering’ (*bhavant* is the present participle of Skt. *bhū* ‘to be’) occurring in Taittirīya Saṃhita⁸⁰ and other Vedic texts⁸¹ which can also be seen as derived by reduplication from the same Dravidian root as the second component of *kalmalīkīn*. This also shows that the second component of *kalmalīkīn* was an independent root to start with and was combined in a pleonastic manner with an assonant root **kal-*.

6.8 Vedic. *kalyāṇa* and *kalyāṇī* ‘beautiful, auspicious, prosperous’

Please see the discussion of Old Tamil phrases *kali koḷ yāṇar* and *kali yāṇar* 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 (Chevallard

raising before apicals” says Krishnamurti (2003:117-8) and cites, alongwith many other examples, PDr **man* ‘to be’ PCDr **man* but Parji. *men* ‘to stay’. And “The Primitive Dravidian vowels are as a general rule retained in Pengo” (Burrow and Bhattacharya 1970:7)

⁸⁰ Taittirīya Saṃhitā (1.4.34.1) (Bhashyam 2005): *jvalantīm tvā sādāyāmi malmalābhavantīm tvā sādāyāmi* which Keith(1914:242) translates as “I place thee that burnest. I place thee that flashest”

⁸¹ Bloomfield(1990): Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhita II.13.19, 165.10; Kāthaka Saṃhita 40.4; Taittirīya Āraṇyaka 3.19.1

2005:407). For a classic areal treatment of onomatopoeics the reader is referred to Emeneau's "Onomatopoeics in the Indian Linguistic Area" (Emeneau 1980:250-93).

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 *koḷ*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 *koḷ* connects nouns with differing senses. For example, *koḷi koḷ pācarai* (Pura:69:9) 'war camps with ... banners' where *koḷi*⁸³ means 'banner, flag' and *pācarai*⁸⁴ 'war camp'.

Some examples of the pleonastic or paraphrastic occurrences are:

iṭumpai koḷ paruvāral (Pura:174:4)⁸⁵: 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 *iṭumpai* means 'suffering, affliction, distress, calamity', *paruvāral* '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: *koḷ(lu-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 *nālattu iṭumpai koḷ paruvāral tīra* (Pura:174:3-4)

1999:113). This awkward structure is easily explained with the motivation of paraphrasing the head word *paruvaral*.

kuzūuk koḷ peruṅ kulai (Netu:24)⁸⁶: where the medieval commentary by Naccinārkkīṅiyar (Pattuppāṭṭu 1986) glosses it as *tiraṭṭiyaik koṅṭa tārukaḷ* where *kuzūu*⁸⁷ means ‘class, assembly, crowd’, *kulai* ‘cluster, bunch, as of fruits, flowers’, *tiraṭṭi* ‘multitude, assemblage’, *tāru* ‘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.

tōṭu koḷ iṅanirai (Patirru:12:6)⁸⁸: This is an interesting case where we have an already pleonastically compounded head word (*iṅanirai*) preceded by a synonymous noun (*tōṭu*). We have already discussed *iṅanirai* ‘herd, collection’ in the evidence section above and here we see it preceded by *tōṭu* 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 *iṅanirai*.

kali koḷ yāṅar (Pura:66:6)⁸⁹: Meaning “fresh income (or prosperity) with the property of prospering”, the old commentary (Pillai 1996) glossing it as *tazaittalaiḱ koṅṭa putuvaruvāy* where *kali*⁹⁰ ‘flourishing, thriving, prospering’, *yāṅar* ‘fresh

⁸⁶ *kamukin ... koṣu maṭal aviṅnta kuzūuk koḷ peruṅ kulai* (Netu:23-24)

⁸⁷ Its variant *kuzu* means (MTL): class, society, band, assembly; assembly or gathering of women; flock, herd, swarm, shoal, bundle, heap

⁸⁸ *pīra mān tōṭu koḷ iṅanirai* (Patirru:12:6)

⁸⁹ *niṅṅinum nallan ... kalikoḷ yāṅar veṅṅip parantalai mikap pukaṣ ulakameyti* (Pura:66:6) where *veṅṅip parantalai* 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. Koṅḱa. *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 dozens⁹¹ 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 *mallaḻ⁹² yāṇar* (Aka:216:12) and instances where *yāṇar* in turn serves attributively with other synonyms as in *yāṇar vaḻam⁹³* (Aka:181:14, Porunar:245).

There is an occurrence where the connecting verb *koḻ* is left out as in the phrase *kali yāṇar* (Maturai:118⁹⁴) which the medieval commentator Nacciṇārkkiniyar glosses (Pattuppāṭṭu 1986) as *perukkiṇai uṭaittākiya putuvaruvāy[inaiyuṭaiya]* 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* meaning⁹⁶ ‘to grow luxuriantly, to increase’ which is still the same sense as with the nominal form above. The variant forms of *kali koḻ 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: *mallaḻ* ‘abundance, wealth, fertility, richness’. Also DEDR #4729.

⁹³ MTL: *vaḻam* ‘fertility, productiveness, luxuriance, abundance, fulness, advantage, profit, wealth, riches, income’. Also DEDR #5304.

⁹⁴ *oliyōvāk kaliyāṇar mutuvelḻilai* (Maturai:118-9) where *mutuvelḻilai* 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 *kali yāṇār* is astonishingly near-identical in phonological form and senses (for ‘beauty’ see below) to Vedic. *kalyāṇa*-⁹⁸ (and feminine *kalyāṇī*) ‘beautiful, auspicious, prosperous, fortunate, lucky’ whose etymology has been very unsatisfactory. Mayrhofer (KEWA:185) suggests, under *kalyaṇ*, a composition *kali* + *-āṇa-* 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 propose¹⁰⁰ a semantic evolution from a hypothetical Proto-Vedic **kaly-āṇi-* ‘having beautiful hips’ > ‘beautiful’ and treats the masculine *kalyāṇa* as a secondary derivation from the feminine form but still acknowledges, “the word *āṇi* cannot be of IE origin” (*ibid*:190). Citing a work of Pinault¹⁰¹, Lubotsky (IAIL) also remarks on *kalyāṇa/kalyāṇī*: “Doubts remain, however. Since *āṇī-* is a loanword, it is not unreasonable to assume that *kalyāṇī-* is a loanword, too”. Vedic. *āṇī* ‘linch-pin’ is, of course, identified as a foreign word (*Kuiper List* #35). But, in Dravidian, the components *kal-* and *yāṇ-* are attested in the sense of ‘beauty’ too. For a reconstruction of PSDr **kal-* ‘beauty’, see the discussion of Vedic. *kalmalīkin* above. This should be contrasted with Pinault’s hypotheses of

⁹⁸ Once as *kalyāṇa* (RV 1.31.9) and thrice with the word forms of *kalyāṇī* (RV 3.53.6, 4.58.8, 10.30.5)

¹⁰⁰ Pinault (2006:176) assumes for *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 *āṇī* ‘linch pin’

¹⁰¹ Pinault, G-J. 2003. Sanskrit *kalyāṇa-* interprété à la lumière des contacts en Asie Centrale. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 98:123-161

“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 *Kali*¹⁰². 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. *yāṇ-* stems in the sense of ‘beauty’, we have¹⁰³: “*yāṇuk kavīṇ 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 aṣakum nanṟum yāṇar eṇṇum peyar* (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

¹⁰² “... name of a man whose beauty and vigour were restored by the gods” (Pinault *ibid*).

¹⁰³ 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 *oṇ 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 *putuvaruvāy* “fresh income” even here.

¹⁰⁴ Ignoring the two occurrences of *yūkam* ‘black monkey’ in the Caṅkam corpus (Lehman and Malten 1993). Old Tamil **yā-* became *ā-* in later Tamil and PDr **yā-* became *ā-* or *ē-* in other Dravidian languages (Subrahmanyam 2008:86, Krishnamurti 2008:142-3). Cf. DEDR #516 (subset): Tamil. *yānai*, *ānai* elephant Telugu. *ēnūgu*, *ēnika* id. Parji. *ēnu* id. Gondi. *yēnī*, *ainī*, *ēnī* 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-guñji* (phonemically **ūma-kuñci*) ‘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 *koḷ* 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. *piṭode* ‘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 *śārkoṭa* and *karkoṭa* ‘serpent’, *kukkuṭa* ‘cock’, *kalmalīkīn* ‘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 *kalmalīkīn* ‘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 Subrahmanyam 2008 *passim*)¹⁰⁵. 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., *-l* (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^l manar* 'they have gone¹' (Steever 1998:262) and as an affix in Old Tamil. *ceymmaṇa* 'they (will) make', *eṇmaṇār* 'they (will) say' (Steever 1993:99). In addition and in our immediate context, it helps in systematically uncovering pleonasm as with Gadaba. *piṭode* 'nightingale' as *piṭ-od-e*.

9 Acknowledgements

I immensely thank Bhadriraju Krishnamurti, Sudalaimuthu Palaniappan and Suresh Kolichala for their valuable corrections and suggestions for improvement. Any errors and omissions are surely and completely my responsibility.

I would also like to thank immensely the Cologne Institute of Indology and Tamil Studies for their digital versions of many Sanskrit and Tamil dictionaries in various forms including scanned images and for their searchable database of critical Tamil texts which has made searching for specific constructs very easy and has improved the quality of the paper. I also thank the University of Chicago's Digital Dictionary of South Asia project for their digital online databases of the DEDR, CDIAL, various Tamil and Telugu dictionaries and the Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Project for their various Indo-Aryan databases.

10 Abbreviations

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

Aka	Akanānūru (source Cologne IITS database)
AV	Atharva Veda (Whitney)
Cilappati	Cilappatikāram
CDIAL	Comparative Dictionary of Indo-Aryan Languages
CDr	Central Dravidian subgroup
DEDR	Dravidian Etymological Dictionary, Second Edition 1984
IA	Indo-Aryan
IE	Indo-European
Kampa	Kamparāmāyaṇam (source Cologne IITS database)
Kuru	Kuruntokai (source Cologne IITS database)
Malaipaṭu	Malaipaṭukaṭām (source Pattuppāṭṭu)
Maturai	Maturaikkāñci (source Pattuppāṭṭu)
MTL	The Tamil Lexicon, Madras University
MW	Monier-Williams Sanskrit-English Dictionary

Narr	Narrīnai (source Cologne IITS database)
NDr	North Dravidian subgroup
Neṭu	Neṭunalvāṭai (source Pattuppāṭtu)
OIA	Old Indo-Aryan (= Vedic Sanskrit)
Pari	Paripāṭal
Patirru	Patirruppattu
PDr	Proto-Dravidian
Porunar	Porunarāruppaṭai (Source Cologne IITS database)
Pura	Puranānūru
RV	Ṛg Veda
SDr	South Dravidian subgroup
SII	South Indian Inscriptions
Skt	Sanskrit

11 References

Akanānūru. See Cologne IITS Database.

Anderson, Gregory D.S. 2008. *The Munda Languages*, Routledge. Edited by Gregory D.S. Anderson.

Andronov, Mikail. S. 2003. *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages*. Lincom Europa.

Bhashyam, Vijayaraghavan. 2005. *Taittiriya Samhita*. Online at <http://www.sanskritweb.net/yajurveda/#TS> at Sanskrit Web by Ulrich Stiehl.

Bloomfield, Maurice. 1990. *A Vedic Concordance*, Motilal Banarsidass, Reprint of the 1906 edition in the Harvard Oriental Series.

Böhtlingk and Roth = *Sanskrit Wörterbuch* by Otto Böhtlingk and Rudolph Roth, Cologne Digital Sanskrit Dictionaries, Online at: <http://www.sanskrit-lexicon.uni-koeln.de/pwgindex.html>

Brown, Charles Philip. *Telugu-English Dictionary*. (1) Paper edition: 2002. Asian Educational Services, New Delhi/Madras. (2) Online version: 2004. Digital Dictionaries of South Asia of the University of Chicago.

Burrow, T. and Bhattacharya, S. 1970. *The Pengo Language: Grammar, Texts and Vocabulary*. Oxford University Press.

CDIAL = Turner, R.L. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. (1) Paper edition: 1999. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi. (2) Online version: 2006. Digital Dictionaries of South Asia of the University of Chicago.

Chandrasekaran, Periannan. 2007. “*Vaiśambalyā, Vaiyai and Chambal: Structural Patterns and Etymological Principles for Hydronyms in the Indian Linguistic Area*”, Communication presented at the 217th Annual Meeting of the American Oriental Society.

Cēnāvaraiyam 1996. *Tolkāppiyam Collatikāram Cēnāvaraiyam* (Tholkappiam Chollathikaram Senavarayam). Edited by K. Sundaramurthi. Annamalai University.

Chevillard, Jean-Luc. 2004. “Ideophones in Tamil: A historical perspective on the X-enal expressives”, *South Indian Horizons: Felicitation Volume for Francois Gros on the occasion of his 70th Birthday*, Institut Francais de Pondichery.

Cilappati = Cilappatikāram. *Cilappatikāra mūlamum arumpatavuraiyum aṭiyārkkunallāruraiyum*. 2001. Edited by U.Vē.Cāminātaiyar, Dr. U.Vē.Cāminātaiyar Nūlnilaiyam. 10th Edition.

Cīvakacintāmaṇi. 1986. *Cīvakacintāmaṇi Mūlamum Naccinārkkiniyaruraiyum*. Tamil University of Tañcāvūr, photoprint of the 1969 7th edition by U.Vē. Cāminātaiyar Library.

Cologne IITS Database. Online at <http://webapps.uni-koeln.de/tamil/lyrik/>.

DEDR = Burrow, T. and Emeneau, M.B. 1984. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*. Second Edition, Oxford University Press.

Emeneau, M.B. 1980. *Language and Linguistic Area*. Essays by Murray B. Emeneau. Selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford University Press. Stanford, California.

-----, 1994. *Dravidian Studies: Selected Papers*. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

-----, 2006. *Some Dravidian Noun Compounds*, International Journal of Dravidian Linguistics, Vol. 35, pp1-7.

Farmer, Steve., Richard Sproat and Michael Witzel, 2004. *The Collapse of the Indus Script Thesis : The Myth of a Literate Harappan Civilization*, Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies, Vol. 11, Issue 2.

<http://www.ejvs.laurasianacademy.com/ejvs1102/ejvs1102article.pdf>

Gwynn, J.P.L. 1991. *A Telugu-English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press. Online at the Digital Dictionaries of South Asia web site of the University of Chicago.

Hart, George and Heifetz, Hank. 1999. *The Four Hundred Songs of War and Wisdom*. Columbia University Press, New York.

Hock, Hans Henrich. 1996. "Pre-ṛgvedic convergence between Indo-Aryan and Dravidian? A survey of the issues and controversies", *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language*, Edited by Jan E.M. Houben, E.J. Brill.

Kamparāmāyaṇam. See Cologne IITS Database.

Kantapurāṇam. See Cologne IITS Database.

Keith, Arthur Berridale. 1914. *The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled TAITTIRIYA SAMHITA*, Part 1, Kandas 1-3. The Harvard University Press.

KEWA = Myerhofer, Manfred. 1956. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (A Concise Etymological Sanskrit Dictionary), Universitaetsverlag Carl Winter, Heidelberg.

Kittel, Rev. F. 1996. *A Kannada-English Dictionary*. Asian Education Services, New Delhi/Madras. Reprint of the 1894 edition by Basel Mission Book & Tract Depository.

Krishnamurti, Bhadriraju. 2001. *Comparative Dravidian Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

-----, 2003. *The Dravidian Languages*. Cambridge University Press.

Kuiper, F.B.J. Rigvedic loan-words. In: O. Spies (ed.) *Studia Indologica. Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres*. Bonn: Orientalisches Seminar 1955, 137-185.

-----, 1991. *Aryans in the Rigveda*. Rodopi B.V. Amsterdam-Atlanta, GA.

Kuṛiñcippāṭṭu. See Pattuppāṭṭu.

Kuṛuntokai. See Cologne IITS Database.

Lanman, Charles Rockwell. 2001. *A Sanskrit Reader*. Motilal Banarsidass Publishers. Delhi.

Lehman and Malten. 1993. *A Word Index for Caṅkam Literature*, Institute of Asian Studies.

Lubotsky, Alexander. (= RVC) *Rgvedic Word Concordance*, (1) Online at: <http://www.indo-european.nl> and (2) the paper version: *A Rgvedic Concordance*, American Oriental Society, New Haven, Connecticut, 1997.

-----, (= IAIL). *Indo-Aryan inherited lexicon*, Online at: <http://www.indo-european.nl> by the Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Project.

-----, 2001. *Indo-Iranian Substratum*, in: *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: Linguistic and Archaeological Considerations*. Ed. Chr. Carpelan, A. Parpola, P. Koskikallio. Helsinki, Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura 2001: 301-317.

Maṇimēkalai. 1998. *Maṇimēkalai*. Edited by U.Vē. Cāminātaiyar (3rd edition 1931), Dr.U.Vē.Cāminātaiyar, Dr. U.Vē. *Cāminātaiyar Nūlnilaiyam*, Chennai.

MW = Monier-Williams, Sir Monier. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Available as (1) Online version: Cologne Digital Sanskrit Lexicon (2) Paper Version: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi. 2002.

MTL = *Tamil Lexicon*. 1982. University of Madras. Available as (1) Paper version: Reprint of the 1924-1936 edition. Edited by S. Vaiyapuri Pillai. (2) Cologne Online Tamil Lexicon (3) University of Madras Tamil Lexicon by the Digital Dictionaries of South Asia of the University of Chicago, June 2007.

Nanṇūl. 1995. *Nanṇūl Mūlamum Mayilainātaruraiyum*, edited by Dr.U.Vē.Cāminātaiyar, Dr. U.Vē. *Cāminātaiyar Nūlnilaiyam*. Online version by Tamil Virtual University (<http://tamilvu.org>).

Paripāṭal. 1995. *Paripāṭal mūlamum parimēlaṣakaruraiyum*, 6th Edition, Dr.U.Vē.Cāminātaiyar, Dr. U.Vē. *Cāminātaiyar Nūlnilaiyam*, Chennai

Parpola, Asko. *Is the Indus script indeed not a writing system?* In *Airāvati*: Felicitation volume in honor of Iravatham Mahadevan, published by Varalaaru.Com, Chennai, August 2008. On-line at: <http://www.harappa.com/script/indus-writing.pdf>

Patirru = Patirrupattu. 1994. 8th Edition of *Patirrupattu mūlamum paṣaiya uraiyum*, edited by Dr. U.Vē.Cāminātaiyar, Dr. U.Vē. *Cāminātaiyar Nūlnilaiyam*, Chennai.

Pattuppāṭṭu. 1986. *Pattuppāṭṭu mūlamum Nacciṅārkkīniyar uraiyum*. Photoreprint by the Tamil University of Tañcāvūr of the 1961 print of U.Vē.Cāminātaiyar's 3rd edition of 1931.

Periyapurāṇam. See Cologne IITS Database.

Piṅkalantai = *Piṅkala Nikaṇṭu*. Unknown old print. Published during World War One or Two as mentioned in the publisher's note.

Pillai. Auvai. Cu. Thuraicami 1996. *Puranānūru*. Reprint of the 1951 Edition of the old commentary with notes by Auvai. Cu. Turaicāmi Pillai. Tirunelvēli Caiva Cittānta Nūrpattippuk Kazakam Limited, Ceṅṅai.

Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2006. Further links between the Indo-Iranian substratum and BMAC in *Themes and Tasks in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan Linguistics* Edited by Tikkanen and Hettrich, Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference Vol.5 held in Helsinki, Finland, July 2003, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, New Delhi.

Scharfe, Hartmut. 2006. Indo-Aryan and Dravidian convergence: gerunds and noun-compositions in *Themes and Tasks in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan Linguistics*. Edited by Tikkanen and Hettrich, Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference Vol.5 held in Helsinki, Finland, July 2003, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, New Delhi.

SII Vol 2. = *South Indian Inscriptions: Tamil Inscriptions*. Volume II (Part III, IV & V), Navrang, New Delhi, 1984 (Reprint of the 1895-1913 edition by E. Hultzsch, V. Venkayya and Krishna Sastri).

SII Vol 3. = *South Indian Inscriptions: Miscellaneous Inscriptions in Tamil*. Volume III (Part I & II), Archaeological Survey of India, New Delhi, 1987 (Reprint of the 1929 edition by Hultzsch).

Southworth, Franklin C. 2005. *Linguistic Archaeology of South Asia*, RoutledgeCurzon, New York, NY. ISBN 0-415-33323-7

Starostin, George. *Dravidian Etymology*, on-line at <http://starling.rinet.ru/cgi-bin/main.cgi?root=config&morpho=0>

Steever, Sandford B. 1993. *Analysis to Synthesis: The Development of Complex Verb Morphology in the Dravidian Languages*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
-----, 1998. (Editor). *The Dravidian Languages*, Routledge.

Subrahmanyam, P.S. 1983. *Dravidian Comparative Phonology*, Annamalai University.

-----, 2008. *Dravidian Comparative Grammar - 1*, Publication No. 580, Centre of Excellence for Classical Tamil, Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore.

Tēvāram. 1985. *Tēvāram: Hymnes Śivāites du Pays Tamoul*, Edited by T.V. Gopal Iyer, French Institute of Pondicherry. Volumes 1-3.

Tirukkōvaiyār, 1995. *Tirukkōvaiyār* (Pēraciriyar Uraiyum Paṣaiyavuraiyum), Edited by Cuppiramaṇiyap Piḷḷai, Annamalai University.

Tivākaram. 1990. Editors: Mu. Caṇmukam Piḷḷai and I. Cuntaramūrtti, *A Critical Edition of Tivakara Nikantu*, Madras University.

Tolkāppiyam. See Cologne IITS Database.

Villipāratam. See Cologne IITS Database.

Whitney, Dwight D. 2000. *Atharva-Veda Samhitā*. Sanskrit Text, English Translation, Notes & Index of verses according to the translation of W.D. Whitney and Bhāṣya of Sāyaṇācārya, Parimal Publications, Delhi. Original 1905 Harvard Oriental Series edition edited and revised by K.L. Joshi.

Witzel, Michael. 1999a. Aryan and Non-Aryan Names in Vedic India: Data for the linguistic situation c.1900-500 B.C. Harvard University.

-----, 1999b. Early Sources for South Asian Substrate Languages. *Mother Tongue Special Issue* October.

-----, 1999c. Substrate Languages in Old Indo-Aryan (Rig Vedic, Middle and Late Vedic), *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies* 5:1.

-----, 2000. The Languages of Harappa.

<http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~witzel/HarLang.pdf>

-----, *Kuiper's List*, <http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~witzel/kuiper.pdf>

Zvelebil, Kamil. 1975. *Tamil Literature*. E.J.Brill. Leiden, Netherlands.

-----, 1990. *Dravidian Linguistics An Introduction*. Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture.